



‘Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political.’

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 5, 1893.

NUMBER 1.

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, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

TO-DAY the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the eighth year of its publication. Each year of the seven, now in the past, has been one of success and of the greatest encouragement; but the year that is just past has been more so than perhaps all the others put together. And the year to come we expect to be no less full of success and encouragement than the one just gone; indeed it promises to be even more eventful.

THE SENTINEL was established to expose the evil designs and mischievous workings of the National Reform movement, and to warn against the dangers to Government and people, to State and Church, which lay wrapped up therein. True, from the first the people would not believe what we said in this respect; but we never cared for that: what we are here for is to set forth what we know to be the truth on this subject. Whether men will believe it or not is their affair.

WE have declared from the beginning that the combined churches would take possession of the Government to use it for their own purposes; and that the chief purpose for which they would use the Government would be to compel the observance of Sunday, at the dictation of the arbitrary will of the Church, in making void the law of God and establishing the living image of the Papacy. Let us now survey the field of the SENTINEL'S notice and see where we stand to-day; bearing in mind at the same time the fact that the people who publish the SENTINEL have known, and have published, more than forty years that that which has come would come.

It would seem that all people in the United States would be glad of the opportunity to rejoice evermore that by its

supreme law this Nation is pledged to religious freedom. It would seem that everybody ought to be glad of the opportunity to herald to all the world the fame of a nation under whose protection all people might dwell wholly unmolested in the full enjoyment of religious rights, and the liberty to worship or not to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences.

SUCH, however, is not the case. As religious bigotry knows no such thing as enlightenment or progress; as ecclesiastical ambition never can be content without the power to persecute; so, from the beginning, complaint has been made against the character of the United States Constitution as it respects religion, and constant effort has been made to weaken its influence, undermine its authority, and subvert its precepts.

From the very beginning, this feature of the Constitution has been denounced as foolish, atheistical, the strictly national sin, the cause of epidemics, etc., particularly by ministers of such religion as had not sufficient power of truth to support itself, and doctors of a divinity so weak and sickly that it could not protect itself, much less protect and bless its worshippers, or anybody else.

OCTOBER 27, 1789, "The First Presbytery Eastward in Massachusetts and New Hampshire," sent to President Washington an address in which they complained because there was no "explicit acknowledgment of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent, inserted somewhere in the Magna Charta of our country." In 1803, Samuel B. Wylie, D. D., of the University of Pennsylvania, preached a sermon in which he inquired: "Did not the framers of this instrument . . . in this resemble the fool mentioned in Ps. 14:1, 3, who said in his heart, 'There is no God?'"

IN 1812, President Dwight, of Yale College, preached a sermon in the college chapel, in which he lamented the failure of the Constitution to recognize a god, and declared that "we commenced our national existence, under the present system, without God." The next year he recurred to it the saying that "the gross-

est nations and individuals, in their public acts and in their declarations, manifestoes, proclamations, etc., always recognize the superintendency of a Supreme Being. Even Napoleon did it." Of course Napoleon did it. It is such characters as he that are most likely to do it; and then, having covered himself with the hypocritical panoply, to ruin kingdoms, desolate nations, and violate every precept of morality and every principle of humanity. Yes, Napoleon did it; and so did Charlemagne before him, and Clovis, and Justinian, and Theodosius, and Constantine, to say nothing of hundreds of the popes. But the fathers of this Republic were not such as any of these, the noblest pledge of which is the character of the Constitution as it respects religion; for all of which every Christian can most reverently thank the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

IN 1819, on a thanksgiving day appointed by the governor of Pennsylvania, Dr. Duffield preached a sermon at Carlisle, in which he declared the Constitution "entirely atheistical." Other such testimonies as the foregoing might be given to a wearisome extent, but with one more these must suffice. In 1859, Prof. J. H. McIlvane, D. D., of the College of New Jersey—Princeton College—published an article in the *Princeton Review* for October, in which he really lamented that "the practical effect" of the Constitution as it is, with respect to religion, "is the neutrality of the Government with respect to all religion;" and seemed to be much grieved "that no possible governmental influence can be constitutionally exerted for or against any form of religious belief." So far, however, all these criticisms and denunciations had been merely individual. Though they were strongly seconded and promoted by the legislative, judicial and executive authorities in almost all the States, there was as yet no organized attack upon the Federal Constitution, or regular war upon its principles.

IN 1863, however, such an organization was effected and such a war was begun. In February of that year, "a convention for prayer and Christian conference" was

held in Xenia, Ohio, to consider in particular the state of the country. The convention met February 3, and on the 4th, Mr. John Alexander, then of Xenia, now of Philadelphia, presented for the consideration of the convention, a paper in which he bewailed the "human frailty and ingratitude" of the makers of the Constitution, and deplored the national sin of which they and all their posterity were guilty, because they had well-nigh legislated God out of the Government; and closed by declaring that "the most important step to be taken," was "to amend the Constitution so as to acknowledge God and the authority of his law," and proposing the following "as an outline of what seemed to be needed":—

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, [recognizing the being and attributes of Almighty God, the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, the law of God as the paramount rule, and Jesus, the Messiah, the Saviour and Lord of all,] in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The convention approved the spirit and design of the paper, and ordered its publication. The following July 4, "a few delegates" met in Pittsburg, issued an address to the country, and formed a plan for the calling of a national convention, which met in Allegheny, January 27, 1864. It is reported as "an earnest, prayerful, and most encouraging meeting." It adopted a series of resolutions, and

A MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS,

which latter is worth quoting, as showing the rapid growth of their designs upon the national Constitution. It runs as follows:

To the Honorable, the Senate and House of Representatives, in Congress assembled:

We, citizens of the United States, respectfully ask your Honorable bodies to adopt measures for amending the Constitution of the United States, so as to read in substance as follows:—

"We, the people of the United States, [humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler among the nations, and his revealed will as the supreme law of the land, in order to constitute a Christian government,] and in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, [and secure the inalienable rights, and the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to ourselves, our posterity, and all the people,] do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

"And further: that such changes with respect to the oath of office, slavery, and all other matters, should be introduced into the body of the Constitution, as may be necessary to give effect to these amendments in the preamble. And we, your humble petitioners, will ever pray," etc.

Resolved, That a special committee be appointed to carry the memorial to Washington, lay it before the President, and endeavor to get a special message to Congress on the subject, and to lay said message before Congress.

At this same meeting also

A PERMANENT ORGANIZATION WAS EFFECTED,

first called "The National Association to Secure the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States," with John Alexander as president, and Zadok Street, a Quaker, as vice-president. The name of the association was afterwards shortened to what it has been ever since—"The National Reform Association." And such is the origin, organization, and aim of this regular war upon the Constitution and principles of our Government. From the first, churches and colleges

throughout the land have been open to the dissemination of the nefarious doctrines of the association which have thus rapidly permeated society. The association worked alone, though steadily gaining influence and power, until 1885, when it secured the alliance of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Through this alliance it readily secured the further alliance, in 1887, of the National Prohibition Party. In 1888, it secured the alliance of the American Sabbath Union; and through this, in 1889, it secured that which it had been earnestly seeking ever since 1881,—an alliance with the Catholic Church.

Possessing thus the weight and influence of almost all the religious and religio-political elements of the country, the association, in 1888,

BEGUN ITS DIRECT ATTACK UPON THE CONSTITUTION.

Through Senator Henry W. Blair, a resolution was introduced in Congress to amend the Constitution with a recognition of Christianity as the national religion. With this also and as a consequence of it, there was also introduced by Senator Blair, his bill establishing the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath and the Lord's day. While Senator Blair remained in Congress, these propositions were diligently, and even dishonestly, urged upon the Government. Other bills to the same purpose as the Blair Sunday bill were also urged upon Congress in the same way. When Senator Blair was left out, his proposed amendment went with him; but the National Reform combination went on without it to secure their main object—Sunday observance by national law—though they knew it to be unconstitutional, as the Constitution stands.

Thus stood the association and its legislative efforts at the beginning of 1892. And before the year was two-thirds gone, they had

SECURED ALL THEY EVER ASKED,

only not altogether in just the way they asked it. They had asked that this be made "a Christian Nation." February, 29, 1892, the Supreme Court of the United States officially and unanimously declared that "this is a Christian Nation," and justified all the evil accompaniments of that mischievous phrase, even to the divinity of Christ,* the inspiration of the Scriptures, Sunday laws and all. Of this a long-time representative National Reformer, in the *Christian Statesman*, November 19, 1892, breaks forth as follows:—

CHRISTIAN POLITICS.

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION.

THE GREATEST OCCASION FOR THANKSGIVING.

[Department edited by Rev. Wm. Weir, Washington, Pa., District Secretary of the National Reform Association.]

"This is a Christian Nation." That means Christian Government, Christian laws, Christian institutions, Christian practices, Christian citizenship. And this is not an outburst of popular passion or prejudice. Christ did not lay his guiding hand there, but upon the calm, dispassionate, supreme, judicial tribunal of our Government. It is the weightiest, the noblest, the most tremendously far-reaching in its consequences of all the utterances of that sovereign tribunal. And that utterance is for Christianity, for Christ. "A Christian Nation!" Then this Nation is Christ's nation, for nothing can be Christian that does not belong to him. Then his word is its sovereign law. Then, the nation is Christ's servant. Then it ought to,

*We would not be understood as denying the divinity of Christ nor the inspiration of the Scriptures. Both are Bible doctrines and worthy of all acceptance. But this Government has no more right to take cognizance of these questions than has the Pope to declare that "there is but one God and Mahomet is his prophet." All such questions are beyond the proper sphere of civil government.

and must, confess, love, and obey Christ. All that the *National Reform Association* seeks, all that this department of Christian politics works for, is to be found in the development of that royal truth, "This is a Christian Nation." It is the hand of the second of our three great departments of national government throwing open a door of our national house, one that leads straight to the throne of Christ.

Was there ever a Thanksgiving day before, that called us to bless our God for such marvelous advances of our Government and citizenship toward Christ?

"O sing unto the Lord a new song, for he hath done marvelous things; his right hand and his holy arm hath gotten him the victory. Sing unto the Lord with the harp, with the harp and the voice of a psalm."

WILLIAM WEIR.

The National Reformers had declared that this movement was an effort to change that feature of our fundamental law which declares that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and establish the divine will as the authority in government with themselves the interpreters of that will. This Sunday legislation by Congress the National Reform combination secured, under threats such as this:—

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 for the World's Fair, except on conditions named in these resolutions.

CONGRESS YIELDED.

To these threats Congress yielded, and submitted to the dictation and demand which was thus made; and openly confessed that it did so because of the alternative conveyed in the threats. Now it is an undeniable truth, and but the statement of a principle, that, "To permit a church,—any church—to dictate, beforehand, what laws should or should not be passed, would be to deprive the people of all the authority they have retained in their own hands, and to make the church the governing power instead of the people." This is precisely what the combined church power of the United States, as manipulated by the National Reformers, did under threats; and Congress yielded to the threats and surrendered to the dictation. It follows, therefore, inevitably, that the National Reformers have thus deprived the people of all the authority which the people had retained in their own hands, and have made themselves the governing power instead of the people. Their effort has succeeded. They have "changed that feature of our fundamental law, which declares that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

They have also established the divine will as the authority in government, with themselves as the interpreters of that will, and the governmental power as the executive of their interpretation. They had long demanded that "the Government" should "simply set up the moral law and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it." In the matter of

CLOSING THE WORLD'S FAIR

on Sunday, in *Congressional Record*, July 10, 1892, page 6614, the National Reformers and Congress made the following record:—

MR. QUAY.—On pages 122, line 13, after the word "act" I move to insert:

"And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the Sabbath day."

The reasons for the amendment I will send to the desk to be read. The Secretary will have the kind-

ness to read from the Book of Law I send to the desk, the part enclosed in brackets.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The part indicated will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

“Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy: six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.”

The foregoing is all that was said or done in relation to the question that day. The next legislative day, however, the question was taken up and discussed. The debate was opened by Senator Manderson of Nebraska. And in the *Record* of July 12, pages 6694, 6695, 6701, we read as follows:—

The language of this amendment is that the Exposition shall be closed on the “Sabbath day.” I submit that if the senator from Pennsylvania desires that the Exposition shall be closed upon Sunday, this language will not necessarily meet that idea. The Sabbath is not Sunday.

The words “Sabbath day,” simply mean that it is a rest day, and it may be Saturday or Sunday, and it would be subject to the discretion of those who will manage this Exposition, whether they should close the Exposition on the last day of the week, in conformity with that observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists, or should close it on the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath. It certainly seems to me that this amendment should be adopted by the senator from Pennsylvania, and, if he proposes to close this Exposition, that it should be closed on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

Therefore I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I hope may be accepted by the senator from Pennsylvania, to strike out the words, “Exposition on the Sabbath day,” and insert “mechanical portion of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.”

MR. QUAY.—I will accept the modification so far as it changes the phraseology of the amendment proposed by me in regard to designating the day of the week on which the Exposition shall be closed.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The senator from Pennsylvania accepts the modification in part, but not in whole.

MR. HARRIS.—Let the amendment of the senator from Pennsylvania, as modified, be reported.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—It will be again reported.

THE CHIEF CLERK.—On page 122, line 13, after the word “act” it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting:

“And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.”

This amendment was afterward further amended by the insertion of the proviso that the managers of the Exposition should sign an agreement to close the Fair on Sunday before they could receive any of the appropriation; but this which we have given is the material point.

All of this the House confirmed in its vote accepting the Senate amendments. Besides this, the House had already, on its own part, by a vote of 131 to 36, decided that Sunday is the “Christian Sabbath;” and by a vote of 149 to 11 that the seventh day is not the Sabbath. And thus did the Congress of the United States, at the dictate of the churches, not only take sides in a religious controversy and discuss and decide a religious question, but put itself in the place and assumed to itself the prerogative of authoritative interpreter of the divine law. For, from the official record of the proceedings there appears these plain facts:

1. The divine law was officially and in its very words, adopted as containing the “reasons,” and forming the basis of the legislation. In other words, the legislation proposed only to enforce the divine law as quoted from the Book.

2. Yet those to whom the legislation

was directed and who were expected to execute its provisions were not allowed to read and construe the divine law for themselves; and this for the very reason that there was a possibility that they might take the divine word as it reads and as it was actually quoted in the official proceedings, and shut the Exposition on the day plainly specified in the divine word which was cited as the basis and authority for the action taken.

3. Therefore, to preclude any such possibility, Congress assumed the prerogative of official and authoritative interpreter of the divine law, and declared that “the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday,” is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of the divine law—that “the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday,” is the meaning of the word of the Lord which says: “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.”

By this legislation, at the dictation of the churches, Congress has distinctly and definitely put itself and the Government of the United States into the place where it has established, and proposes to enforce, the observance of an institution as sacred, and as due to the Lord, which not only the Lord has neither established nor required, but which is directly contrary to the plain word of the Lord upon the subject of this very institution and its observance as due to the Lord. And in doing this Congress has also assumed to itself the prerogative of authoritative interpreter of the Scriptures for the people of the land, and for all who come into the land; and puts itself in the place of God by authoritatively deciding that an observance established and required by the State, and which it calls the Lord’s, is the Lord’s indeed, although the Lord plainly declares the contrary.

But Congress did all this only at the dictation, under threats, of the combined churches, as led and managed by the National Reformers. The interpretation which Congress put upon the law of God is simply the interpretation which these church managers had put upon it long before. Congress was made simply the mouth-piece of the church managers, in putting into national law the construction which they had long ago determined should thus be put upon the moral law—this, too, a construction which makes void that law, and establishes the perverse will of man as of divine authority instead of the will of God as spoken, and written, and interpreted by the Lord himself.

In view of these things, no man can deny that so far as the Government is concerned, the National Reformers have secured just what they demanded, and so far have accomplished precisely what they aimed at. All that remains is for them to lay the governmental “hand on any religion that does not conform” to this which they have set up. And in the doing of it, they have caused this Nation to assume the place and the prerogatives of the governments of the Middle Ages, in enforcing the dogmas and definitions of the theologians, and executing the arbitrary and despotic will of the Church. And in so doing, they have set up the living likeness of the Papacy, the living image of the beast. Rev. 13:11-15.

A. T. J.

“It may be safely asserted that no live, spiritual, church of Christ ever used or desired the civil law to enforce religious dogmas or promote morality.”

Religious Law in the United States.

In this country civil interference with religion is confined to statutes, and legal precedents, enforcing the observance of Sunday; providing penalties for blasphemy and profanity; fixing the necessary religious belief requisite for the competency of witnesses; invalidating Sunday contracts; disqualifying ministers of the gospel,* and also such as deny the existence of a Supreme Being or a state of future rewards and punishments, from holding certain public offices; and requiring the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Of these none has as yet made its influence felt to any considerable degree except the statutes requiring Sunday observance.

All such statutes and legal precedents are exotics. They did not have their origin in our soil. They are of foreign importation. They come from three different sources—Puritan, Cavalier, and Roman Catholic. The characteristics of each may still be traced. The Puritan set his psalm tunes, his sword, and his Sunday observance to the same key, and he looks to the sword to maintain the correct pitch for psalm and Sunday, even yet. The Cavalier transferred his allegiance from the king and the State Church to the body of law and legal precedents which they bequeathed to him, and the authority of these he accepted with the same courtly grace, and just as unquestioningly. The Roman Catholic is Spanish and French in its derivation, and has never lost the evidences of its Latin birth, nor ever will.

Against these steadily flowing streams of precedent for the interference of the civil authority in religious matters the Constitution of the United States has proved no barrier. Gradually the tide of religious legislation, and of religio-legal decisions in the State courts has gained, until now it is true that scarcely a statute book can be found that is not tainted with the error; and not a State but that in its law reports can be found precedents establishing the authority of the courts in some affairs religious. That the civil prohibition of common labor and business, the selling of liquor, and the providing of, or attendance at, places of amusement on Sunday, is constitutional in the different States, has been supported from time to time, until now the large body of authority is in its favor. This has been accomplished by a steady accretion of precedents until the judicial authority has completely overshadowed the constitutional principle.

In the State of New York the court has said (and evidently based its decision upon the assertion), that, to establish the right to legislate upon and enforce Sunday observance, precedents “could be cited from the statutes and ordinances of every government, really or nominally Christian, and from the earliest period.” And the court declared farther, in the course of this opinion, that although acts were tolerated both in this country and in England contrary to the popular view of the proper observance of Sunday, still that fact “does not detract from the force of the long series of acts of the British Par-

*That the disqualification of ministers of the gospel for holding certain offices is upon religious grounds is evident from the language of the prohibition: for instance the Constitution of Tennessee provides that: “Whereas ministers of the gospel are, by their profession, dedicated to God and the care of souls, and ought not to be diverted from the great duties of their functions; therefore, no minister of the gospel, or priest of any denomination whatever, shall be eligible to a seat in either house of the legislature.”

liament representing in legislation the sentiment of the British nation, as precedents, and as a testimony in favor of a legislative regulation of the Sabbath."

In reference to Sunday amusements the New York court again said: "The legislature had the right to assume that the law was reasonably well settled, and sufficiently declared by competent judicial and legislative authority, that such representations on the first day of the week were a breach of the public peace and good order. The legislature was therefore right in conceiving that the title which expressed the purpose of legislating to preserve that peace and good order gave notice that such representations might be affected by it. It is not to be forgotten that the title does not point to legislation on the subject of the public peace and good order in general, that is on any and every day, but only on the first day of the week. So that the title is fitted to call particular attention to whatever is likely to disturb that peace and order on that day." The act to which the court referred was entitled, "To preserve the public peace and order on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday."

In Tennessee, the court has held that the right of the State to prescribe penalties for the violation of Sunday is "too well settled to admit of question or require discussion."

The Pennsylvania court declared: "We do not feel called upon to give any opinion as to the policy, the propriety, or the justice of the law itself; that stands settled by authority, so far as authority can settle it, and that authority is not to be overlooked by individual sentiments, or by private opinion, whatever that may be."

Both the Ohio and the Missouri courts, and those of Tennessee as well, have decided that the legislatures of those States have authority from the Constitutions of their States to pass laws prohibiting labor and amusement on Sunday, and compelling its observance as a day of rest.

In several States, where the question has been before the courts, New York, Virginia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Missouri, etc., it has been held that the Sunday laws of the States were not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

All other religious laws, such as pertain to "Offences against God and Religion," and such as continue the precedent set in the cabin of the *Mayflower*, and are for the furtherance of religion by law, "for the glory of God and the maintenance of the Christian faith," are in a similar state of advancement proportionately to the amount of attention which has been turned upon them.

This great body of religious law now stands in the statute books and law reports of the different States. In some instances certain phases of religious law have found their way directly into State constitutions, where they stand as a strange anomaly in immediate contradiction of constitutional bills of rights. The great mass, however, of this branch of the law comes through judicial decrees, which owe their existence in the first place to a slavish adherence to foreign precedents which have been followed and multiplied until they have finally subverted constitutional principle. The lawyers and judges in this country, and the legislators as well, both State and na-

tional, who refer to constitutional principles rather than to precedent, to guide their legal and legislative action, are few. To this fact, more than to any other, this great body of religious law owes its existence; and through this fatal intellectual weakness and lack of moral stamina and independence it will continue to grow.

W. H. M.

Present Status of Religious Law in the United States.

THE weight of authority in a number of different States has given its sanction to the constitutionality of Sunday laws—more than that, it has been held that laws prohibiting Sunday labor are not in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Judge Hammond, of the United States Court, in his dictum given as a part of the decision in the appealed case of R. M. King, who was convicted in the Tennessee courts for Sunday work on his farm, virtually upheld this erroneous theory. It was understood at the time this decision was rendered that Judge Hammond had been in consultation upon the matter with the Supreme Bench, and that his decision was in harmony with the views of at least a portion of the membership of that highest judicial authority. This was shown to have been so by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of the rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, of New York City, *vs.* the United States, delivered by Justice Brewer, and from which there was no dissent. The opinion of Justice Brewer in this decision was couched in such broad and general terms that it may be quoted as authority for the upholding of any measure whatever which may be held to be for the promotion and maintenance of the Christian religion. Thus the advocates of religious legislation and the enforcement of religious laws now claim boldly, without fear of being successfully contradicted, that the Constitutions of the States and of the United States are powerless to prevent the progress of their purposes. That Congress has recognized this has been shown by its passage of the proviso to close the World's Fair on Sunday. Nothing can undo this which has been done except the unconditional repeal by Congress of the Sunday closing proviso, embodied in the express statement that it is a matter entirely outside the sphere of civil legislation, and the repudiation by the Supreme Bench of the religious dicta to which it has given the weight of its acquiescence in the opinion of Justice Brewer.

If Sunday laws infringe upon property rights, or upon religious liberty, or give preference to one religion over another, they are unconstitutional. It necessarily followed, therefore, that to hold them constitutional it must be decided that they do not deprive of property rights, or infringe religious liberty, or impair values. These decisions have been had. That Sunday laws do not infringe religious liberty and give preference to one form of religion above another, it would seem impossible to argue, but it has been argued, and the validity of the argument judicially accepted in the majority of cases where the question has been brought to an issue. It is true the argument refutes itself, but that has made no difference with the holdings of the courts, and does not detract in the least from the authoritative value of precedents in these cases.

For instance, it was said in the famous case of *Lindenmuller vs. the People*, which has long been quoted as a precedent, that—

it would be strange that a people, Christian in doctrine and worship, many of whom or whose forefathers had sought these shores for the privilege of worshipping God in simplicity and purity of faith, and who regarded religion as the basis of their civil liberty and the foundation of their rights, should in their zeal to secure to all the freedom of conscience which they valued so highly, solemnly repudiate and *put beyond the pale of the law* the religion which was dear to them as life, and dethrone the God who they openly and avowedly professed to believe had been their protector and guide as a people. . . . Different denominations of Christians are recognized, but this does not detract from the force of the recognition of God as the proper object of religious worship, and the Christian religion as the religion of the people, which it was not intended to destroy but to maintain. . . . The framers of it [the Constitution] did not suppose they had abolished the Sabbath as a day of rest for all, and of Christian worship for those who were disposed to engage in it, or had deprived themselves of the power to *protect their God from blasphemy and revilings*.

It would scarcely have been possible to put in words a better argument than this Judge unwittingly made for his opponent, but it is not on record that the opponent has yet appeared. On the contrary this *reductio ad absurdum* has been referred to as good precedent and of binding authority time and again.

In several States, and in the District of Columbia, blasphemy and profanity are punishable, and in those States where the question has been brought to an issue the courts have taken the position that such statutes and the common law doctrine of blasphemy are neither of them repugnant to the constitutions of the States.

It has been generally held that in those States where there are statutes against Sunday labor they would apply to the invalidation of contracts made on Sunday, though not without frequent dissent far more vigorous and able in character than the prevailing opinion.

The late decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, excluding the Bible from use in the public schools, is correctly declared by those who desire its compulsory reading to be made part of the school exercises, to be contrary to the judicial decisions in several other States where the matter has been brought up for adjudication.

In many of the States, incompetency to testify as witness in court for lack of religious belief has been done away with, but this can not be implicitly relied upon, as, for example, the code of Tennessee reads, "Every person of sufficient capacity to understand the obligation of an oath is competent to be a witness," yet every adjudicated case on this point in the Tennessee reports, after the adoption of this code as well as before, holds that a witness who disbelieves in God and in a future state of rewards and punishments is incompetent to testify.

In those States where office holding is subject to a religious test no protest is heard.

It is a most interesting fact that all of these religious laws are upheld, in the great majority of instances, avowedly because they are religious, and for the purpose of maintaining and enforcing religious precepts.

The present status of religious law in the United States is that of almost universal judicial acceptance. W. H. M.

"MEN are never improved in the mass."

Future of Religious Law in the United States.

WHAT is to be the future of religious law in the United States? is a question which may well be asked with serious misgiving. So far its progress has been continuous, and, of late, rapid. The judiciary is in servile subjection to the religious idea in legal precedents. The judiciary rules. The jurisdiction of the judiciary is increasing and extending year by year. That class and clique which controls the courts will govern the Nation. Constitutional principles are no longer of authority. No one refers to them, no one asks what they are. The question is, What does the court say? And the court asks, What has the court said? That answers the question in part. Its progress will continue.

The greatest system of organization that the world has ever seen is now on foot, and well begun, to make religious law supreme throughout the nations of the earth; that is, to secure civil jurisdiction for that which shall be accepted as the Christian religion. The idea of organizing for this purpose, and the organization itself, had its origin in this country. The organization is remarkably adapted to secure the attainment of its purpose. Its character is two-fold,—religious and legal. It is consistent that it should be so, historical, logical, necessary. History shows this same alliance to have always been made heretofore when similar results were sought. It is logical that when man attempts to reverse the righteous order of things, and, instead of making God's cause his own, attempts to make his cause God's, he should strive to attain his end by human means. It is necessary, for God is party to no such reversal of right; he is not deceived.

This organization claims to have forty millions of adherents in the United States; it claims to have sent petitions representing over twenty-six millions of these to the authorities demanding that the gates of the World's Fair be closed on Sunday. It makes no difference that this is the most gigantic falsehood of the day.† This is the age in which truth is crushed to earth. So great is the prestige of this organization that under the magic influence of its religious "presto change," fraud becomes fair dealing, falsehood truth. Proceeding according to its motto—"All is fair in religion, law and legislation," it terrorizes judges and legislators until they openly plead that it is "bad politics" and "unwise statesmanship" to oppose its nefarious designs. Although this is one organization in effect, it is not in name. Its name is legion. Under these different names it numbers within its membership all grades of society, all ranks and conditions of life, all ages and both sexes. Never before was there such a massing of forces for any purpose, much less such a purpose.

Upon the measure and character of success which Providence shall permit to this great and militant apostasy depends the future of religious law in the United

States. To the intelligent and God fearing student of prophecy is given a general understanding of what this is to be; but the details are with God alone.

W. H. M.

Limitations to Majority Rule.

It is a commonly heard expression that in this country the majority must rule. While this is true in some things, the principle is not one that has a universal application. There is danger that it may be extended altogether too far. At the present time there seems to be an urgent need of a better understanding by the public upon the subject of the boundaries of the domain of popular government; for there are indications of an ignorance upon this point which can not fail to be attended with grave wrongs to individuals and evils to the State.

It ought not to be disputed by anyone that there are limitations to the principle of majority rule. The majority can not prescribe rules for the minority in everything, no matter how small that minority may be. If it can, there is no such thing as individual rights, for that which is subject to the will of a majority is not a right. A right is something which, in its very nature, is inherent in the one possessing it, independent of the will of all other persons. Otherwise it would become but a mere privilege, such as a superior might grant to an inferior, and take away again at his pleasure; and the saying would be true that "might makes right." But it is one of the fundamental principles upon which our Government stands, that "all men are created equal." It is not the prerogative of any one to be lord over any other, to prescribe rules by which he must live. They are equal in that all have an equal right to think and act as suits their inclinations; and this right is also limited, for the very fact that all are equal forbids each to do anything which would encroach upon the rights of his neighbor. For that which would interfere with the rights of others is not a right. Rights can not conflict. Rights run in parallel lines, never crossing, never clashing.

All individuals have rights. The Declaration of Independence declares that "all men are created equal," "and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;" and the same great truths are embodied in the fundamental principles of English and American law. (See Cooley's Edition of Blackstone's Commentaries, book 1, and introduction.)

"Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," are general terms, but it is not left for governments arbitrarily to define the limits to which these rights extend. There is a natural limit already fixed for each and every individual, and that limit, as has been said, is the line which bounds the rights of his neighbor. The rights of one must not be made to conflict with those of another. It may be generally stated by saying that every man has a right to do whatever he will, provided that in so doing he does not interfere with the like right of any and every other person.

These rights are a necessary consequence of the fact that all men are created equal. This fact gives to each one equal authority and leaves no one with any natural authority over and above another. The impres-

sion prevails quite generally that a collection of individuals—a community or a State—possesses authority of a higher kind than that which would be possessed by the individuals separately. But let us ask, where did the community or State get such authority? Where can it get any more authority than is granted it by the individuals composing it? and how can they grant it authority which they do not themselves possess? A can say to B, or to C, or to D, You must not do anything to interfere with my rights,—my life, my liberty, my property, etc.; and B or C or D can say the same to him and to all others; but A has no right to say what B or C or D shall do outside of that which concerns his own rights, nor has B or C or any other, such a right; and having no such right individually, they do not have it collectively, no matter how many of them there may be. No one of them got his rights and liberties from the others, but from his Creator, who, as the Declaration of Independence says, endowed him with them; and, therefore, only his Creator can rightfully take them away. Otherwise than this, he can be deprived of them only by forfeiture for misconduct.

The purpose of governments, as the Declaration of Independence asserts, is to protect these rights,—the rights of the individual. Governments are not instituted merely to run themselves, to become rich and great and powerful at the expense of the individuals composing them, and to perpetuate themselves regardless of the wishes of the governed; but to protect each individual in the enjoyment of his rights. The individual could not well protect himself against all others, so each delegates his right in this respect to certain ones chosen to make laws and preserve peace and order, and who are backed up by the power of the people who choose them. This is what constitutes government in its republican form,—the delegation of the power and authority of the people, the individuals, to their representatives. And this is done, directly or indirectly, by means of an election, in which each individual has an equal voice. The people do the governing, and those chosen to office are but the servants of the people, to carry out their will, and not in any sense rulers over them.

Governments should, therefore, exercise themselves in doing what they are instituted to do; viz., protect the people in the enjoyment of their rights; and outside of this they have no authority whatever; and governments, in their popular form, are but the expression of the will of the majority. The majority can and must rule in the sphere which governments are instituted to fill, in prescribing the manner in which the purpose of government,—the protection and preservation of individual rights—shall be carried out, whether that government be municipal, State, or national. Beyond this the majority have no right, and should have no reason to go. And let it be remembered that while popular governments represent the will of the majority, they are instituted to protect the rights of the *minority*,—the individual. The moment, therefore, that the government undertakes to regulate an individual's conduct in matters which do not concern the rights of others, it begins to do just the opposite of that which it was instituted to do, since it begins to invade, not protect, the rights of that one.

When, therefore, we hear it said that Mr. A or Mr. B must stop doing as he does,

†The method of petitioning adopted, made it not only possible that the same individuals should be counted again and again, as petitioners in favor of various measures of religious legislation, but rendered it inevitable that such should be the case. All the members of whole denominations were counted as petitioners, on the strength of the action of their highest representative bodies; then similar action was taken by the minor organizations within the denominations, down to churches and Sunday-schools, until tens of thousands had been counted from two to five times. And to crown the iniquity, over seven millions of Roman Catholics in the United States were counted as favoring religious legislation, on the strength of Cardinal Gibbons' indorsement of Mr. Crafts' petition for a national Sunday law.

because in this country the majority must rule, it is proper to stop and enquire whether his conduct pertains to that upon which the majority have the right to speak. If his conduct is an infringement upon the rights of his neighbors, if it is an infringement of the will of the majority in that which concerns the equal rights of all citizens, it must be regulated by their will. But if not, the individual is within the sphere of his own rights and liberties, so far at least as his fellow men are concerned, and no one has the right to molest him, however foolish or unwise his conduct may appear to others. He is outside the lines which mark the limitations of majority rule.

L. A. SMITH.

Christian's Duty to Obey Civil Rulers.

EVERY man's first and highest allegiance in this world is due to his Creator. The first and great commandment in the divine law is supreme love to God. The test of love is obedience: "If ye love me," says the Saviour, "keep my commandments." And again we are told in the divine word that "by this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." Hence, the command to love God is in effect a command that we obey him. And this the divine law says alike to every man. "We know," says the apostle, "that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God."

But while God demands man's first and best affections, he throws the safeguards of his law around his creatures, and to each moral being he says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." But at an early period in the history of the race man rebelled against the law of his Creator; the divine injunction of equal love for fellow creatures no longer afforded the protection necessary, and so God ordained that men should organize for the protection and securing of their own natural rights. This we call civil government. But this in no way supercedes the divine government; it does not in any measure release the individual from obligation to obey the divine law. It simply provides a way whereby men may compel their fellows to yield to them that which is their due.

Notwithstanding the ordinance of civil government, God is still the great moral Governor; to him every soul is responsible; to him every free moral agent must give account. To permit any power whatever to come between the individual and God, would destroy individual responsibility toward God. If it were the province of the State to enforce the law of God, the individual would naturally seek to know not the will of God but the will of the State. The effect would be to put the State in the place of God, just as the Papacy puts the Pope in the place of God. On the other hand, had God not committed to man the conservation of his own natural rights, one of two things would have happened: either vengeance for transgression against human rights would have been so swift and certain as to defeat the very object of God in making and in leaving man free to choose or to refuse His service, or else punishment would have been so long delayed as to afford no protection to those in need of it. Civil

government as it exists is an absolute necessity for a race of social free moral agents, in a state of alienation from their Creator.

It is evident from the facts stated that there never can be any conflict between legitimate civil authority and the claims of the divine law. And yet the fact remains that there have been many and serious conflicts. Civil governments have frequently required of their subjects that which the divine law forbids, and have forbidden that which divine law requires. Why is this? The answer is that those in power have either willfully or ignorantly exceeded their legitimate authority. Were this not true it would have been the duty of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to have fallen down and worshiped the great image set up by Nebuchadnezzar in the plain of Dura, and God would not have delivered them out of the furnace into which they were cast. It would likewise have been Daniel's duty to have refrained from asking any petition of any god or man for thirty days, save of the king only, when so commanded by his earthly sovereign, and God would not have sent an angel and closed the mouths of the lions into whose den he was cast for his disregard of civil authority. But God did deliver Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, and he did vindicate Daniel's course, thus declaring in an unmistakable manner, and in thunder tones, that he alone is Sovereign of the conscience, that to him alone is unqualified allegiance due, and that he alone is the moral Governor of the universe.

Nor are the instances cited isolated cases in which the devoted servants of God have, in the face of death, chosen to obey God rather than men. The Bible and the history of the Christian Church are full of such cases. This principle was well understood and was fearlessly announced by the apostles who had received it from the Lord himself, couched in these matchless words, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." And when commanded by the civil rulers to refrain from doing something which Jesus had commanded, "Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we can not but speak the things which we have seen and heard." And again, "Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men." And such must be the Christian's answer to-day to any and every demand that conscience be subordinated to civil authority. The Christian can go to prison or to death, but he can not disobey God even at the behest of the greatest of civil powers. His invariable answer must be, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

Nor is this the expression of religious fanaticism. The principle thus stated is known and recognized by the best and most enlightened thinkers everywhere. In his work on moral philosophy, President Fairchild says:—

It is too obvious to need discussion, that the law of God, the great principle of benevolence, is supreme, and that, "we ought to obey God, rather than men," in any case of conflict between human law and the divine. There are cases so clear that no one can question the duty to refuse obedience. In all times and in all lands such cases have arisen. In a case of this kind, either of two courses is possible; to disobey the law, and resist the government in its attempt to execute it, or to disobey and quietly suffer the penalty. The first

is revolutionary, and can be justified only when the case is flagrant, and affects such numbers that a revolutionary movement will be sustained. . . . The second course will, in general, commend itself to considerate and conscientious men. It is a testimony against the law as unrighteous, and, at the same time, a recognition of government as a grave interest.

The reader has doubtless assented thus far to the correctness of the position taken in this article, and to the principle so succinctly stated by President Fairchild; it remains, therefore, only to illustrate this principle by citing one or two cases sufficiently near in point of time to enable all to understand fully what is involved in its practical application.

In Massachusetts, in 1644, a law was enacted requiring all parents to have their children sprinkled. A Baptist by the name of Painter, refused to obey the law and was whipped, which punishment he bore without flinching. This is only one of many similar instances that occurred in that colony. The Baptists not only held that immersion alone was baptism, and that persons old enough to exercise faith for themselves were the only proper subjects of the ordinance, but they regarded sprinkling as a counterfeit baptism, and believed that to submit to it would be to commit sin. Hence their refusal to submit to it. Even Pedo-Baptists now honor them for their fidelity to their faith.

One other illustration must suffice. Near Springville, in the State of Tennessee, reside some forty odd, Seventh-day Adventists. As their name implies, they hold that the seventh day of the week is the divinely ordained Sabbath, and they observe it religiously. As the Massachusetts Baptists regarded sprinkling as a counterfeit of Scripture baptism, so these Adventists regard Sunday as a counterfeit Sabbath, and believe that to recognize it even outwardly would be sin. Therefore they follow their ordinary pursuits on Sunday, having a care only not to disturb by noise any who desire quiet upon that day. But as the law of Massachusetts required all to have their children sprinkled, so the law of Tennessee requires all to observe Sunday by refraining on that day from all secular labor and business, "works of necessity and charity only excepted." But as was the case with the Massachusetts Baptists, to obey the law is with the Tennessee Adventists to violate conscience, and, as they view it, to sin against God. They, therefore, as did the Baptists before them, violate the law and suffer the penalty. Are they not fully justified in so doing? And is not fining and imprisoning Adventists in Tennessee for disregard of the Sunday law as truly persecution for conscience' sake as was the whipping of Baptists in Massachusetts two hundred years ago for disregarding the law which required them to have their children sprinkled? If not, why not?

C. P. B.

Tennessee Seventh-day Adventists and Their Persecutors.

IN view of the fact that several Seventh-day Adventists near Springville, Tenn., are under arrest for doing farm work on Sunday, and are to be tried at Paris, Henry County, during the January term of court, the writer was requested by the National Religious Liberty Association to go to Tennessee in the interests of these persecuted people.

It was learned, among other interesting

things, that not one of the parties now under arrest lives on the public road, nor was the work for which they have been indicted, performed in sight of the public road. Again, none of their neighbors have complained against them, and declare positively that they are not disturbed; and the only way by which they have been indicted and by which they can be convicted, is by requiring members of the church, and in some cases, members of the same family, to testify against each other. The father will be called upon to testify against his sons, and sons against their father. Should they refuse to thus criminate each other, the cases would assume a new phase.

If any thing need be added to show that this procedure is unalloyed religious persecution, it is in the fact that one of the young men now under arrest, was indicted for work done on the Sunday following the day he became a member of the church. Previous to this time he had not regarded any day and had worked on all days. This, however, was no disturbance, so long as he did not observe the seventh day.

The writer attended their meetings and visited them at their homes, and at no time did he hear them speak spitefully or disrespectfully of their persecutors. On the other hand they often expressed themselves as hoping that their enemies might know the truth, the love of which made them willing to suffer if necessary, both imprisonment and the chain-gang, or even death itself. It was touching to hear them plead in prayer for their enemies, that God would forgive them for their blind zeal in persecuting a harmless people.

The church people of Tennessee are not noted for their strict observance of Sunday. Although they usually refrain from manual labor on that day, they do not scruple to visit their neighbors, examine stock, view real estate, and negotiate trades and sales. Some observers of Sunday, who do not approve of the persecutions visited on their seventh-day neighbors, urge them to cease all observable work on Sunday, and devote the day to such business as will not require manual labor, or in their own words, "Keep Sunday about as we do." But this, the Seventh-day Adventists declare, would be to compromise the very principle at stake. They regard that part of the commandment which says, "Six days shalt thou labor," as binding as that part which reads, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." They declare that they could no more pretend to observe Sunday, which stands for a power antagonistic to the God whom they serve, than could the three Hebrews bow down and pretend to "worship the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar, the king, had set up."

However, these cruel persecutions are no surprise to the Adventists. From certain prophetic scriptures, notably chapters 12, 13, and 14, of Revelation, the denomination has for forty years, announced from press and pulpit that such persecutions would be realized. Furthermore, it is expected that they will not long be confined to Tennessee, but through recent federal measures such as the Supreme Court decision that "this is a Christian Nation," and the unprecedented action of Congress closing the World's Fair on Sunday, such persecutions will become general.

Instead of driving out these people as is the evident intention of their perse-

cutors, their church has grown rapidly under the persecution, and is now the largest congregation in that section of the country. These events which are regarded as evident fulfillment of prophecies long looked forward to, have stirred the entire church to greater activity. The congregation will be divided into three classes; the first will go out as missionaries to teach others the gospel so precious to them; another class will look after the families of those who labor in more distant fields, and will also work for their immediate neighbors; and still another class, those under arrest, will probably witness for their faith in the prison and chain-gang. No fear regarding their almost certain imprisonment was manifested. They asserted their freedom in Christ, and that "whom the Son makes free, is free indeed," whether in prison or out of prison. The wives and mothers are as courageous as are the male portion of the congregation. They prefer to suffer separation from their husbands and sons, and the disgrace which imprisonment will bring, rather than that their loved ones should compromise the faith they hold.

A. F. BALLENGER.

Chicago, Ill.

—◆—
An Exact Parallel.

MANY preachers, religious journalists, and others, deny that there is religious persecution in Tennessee. "The law does not," say they, "interfere with the Adventists keeping Saturday; it only says that they must keep Sunday." This they deny to be religious persecution.

For Americans to talk thus would be strange beyond expression, were it not for the fact that all peoples of all ages have, as a rule, been utterly incapable of either detecting or appreciating moral heroism, except when it favored their own selfish interests to do so.

No one will question that the early Christians were actually persecuted by the heathen emperors of Rome; yet tried by Judge Hammond's decision, or by these Tennessee apologists, there was no persecution about it, as they were not punished for practicing Christianity, but for refusing to observe heathen festivals, etc.

The exact parallel between third century Rome and these modern persecutors on this point, is concisely stated in "History of Rome," by Rev. Creighton, Fellow and Tutor, of Oxford University, thus:—

From time to time the emperors tried to put a stop to Christianity. They thought that it was teaching the people to disobey the laws, and that Christians were not faithful subjects. They could not understand a religion whose followers refused to take part in the religion of the State. *They did not object to the Christians having their own worship*, but they insisted that all members of the State should take part in the State festivals and sacrifices. This the Christians could not do, so the emperors from time to time persecuted them. It was not so much the wicked emperors who persecuted as the good ones; for they looked upon the Christians as rebels who ought to be put down. Thus Trajan, Decian, and Valerian were all persecutors; but Diocletian was most of all. The Christians alone held out for freedom.

Then, according to the rule which preachers apply to Tennessee Adventists, the early Christian martyrs were but fanatics.

These so-called National Reformers call themselves "successors to the Prophets." Yes, but *which prophets?* There were prophets of Baal as well as others.

GEO. A. BATES.

Neuport, England.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 12, 1892.

Referred to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition and ordered to be printed.

MR. DURBOROW introduced the following joint resolution:

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for opening the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section four of an act of Congress approved August fifth, eighteen hundred and ninety-two, to aid in carrying out the act of Congress approved April twenty-fifth, eighteen hundred and ninety, entitled "An act to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus by holding an international exposition of arts, industries, manufactures, and products of the soil, mine, and sea, in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois," and appropriating money therefor, be, and the same is hereby, so amended as to permit the gates of the Exposition to be open on each and every day of the week: *Provided*, That all machinery, merchandizing, and unnecessary labor shall be stopped within the grounds of said Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday: *And provided further*, That no employee shall be required to work more than six days in each week, and that it shall be, and is hereby, made the duty of the World's Columbian Commission, created by act of Congress approved April twenty-fifth, eighteen hundred and ninety, to make such rules or modification of the rules of the corporation known as the World's Columbian Exposition as will give full force and effect to the provisions herein contained.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 20, 1892.

Referred to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition and ordered to be printed.

MR. DURBOROW introduced the following joint resolution:

JOINT RESOLUTION

To repeal the religious legislation pertaining to the World's Columbian Exposition:

Whereas the United States Constitution specifically states that "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof": Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of Congress approved August fifth, eighteen hundred and ninety-two, appropriating five millions of Columbian half dollars to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus by holding an international exposition of arts, industries, manufactures, and products of the soil, mine, and sea in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, on the condition that the said exposition shall not be opened to the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday; and also that section four of "an act to aid in carrying out the act of Congress approved April twenty-fifth, eighteen hundred and ninety, entitled 'An act to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, by holding an international exposition of the arts, industries, manufactures, and products of the soil, mine, and sea, in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois,'" be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to leave the matter of Sunday observance entirely within the power of the regularly constituted authorities of the World's Columbian Exposition.

—◆—
Literary Note.

THE value and utility of that unique literary publication, *The Weekly Bulletin of Newspaper and Periodical Literature*, published at 5 Somerset Street, Boston, has been greatly enhanced by the recent addition of some important new features. Beside serving as a guide and index to the press of the country by affording a weekly classified and descriptive catalogue of the contents of over twelve hundred different papers and magazines, the *Bulletin* will hereafter supply the growing public demand for a review of the periodical press by devoting several pages every week to comprehensive summaries of the best and most interesting articles appearing in the monthly magazines and the daily and weekly papers.

As the *Bulletin* is a weekly publication, its readers will have the summaries of the best features of the press almost as soon as the original articles appear. The department of "Literary Notes" will also be enlarged and enriched, and other attractive features, such as an illustrated cover, portraits of authors, etc., will be introduced.

Extra copies of this number of the **SENTINEL** can be had for \$1 per hundred or \$8 per thousand. The articles in this paper giving the history of the National Reform movement, and defining the powers of the majority and the "Christian's duty to obey civil government" are alone worth many times the price of the paper. You can get nothing better for genuine missionary work.



NEW YORK, JANUARY 5, 1893.

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

THE rejoicing of the American Sabbath Union, so-called, and its allies over their supposed great victory in securing the passage of the Sunday closing proviso in the World's Fair bill, is now seen to have been premature. The battle over that particular question is yet to be fought, as appears from the joint resolutions introduced by Congressman Durborow, copies of which are printed on page 7 of this paper.

A HEARING upon these resolutions has been arranged for January 10, 11, 12, and 13—four days—the time to be equally divided between friends of the Constitution as it is, and those who would subvert it in the interests of a religious dogma. Thus do these measures not only again open up the whole question of Sunday closing of the great Fair, but the joint resolution introduced by Mr. Durborow on the 20th ult., brings prominently before the American people the much larger and more important question of the right of Congress to legislate upon religious questions.

THIS resolution, which recites in its preamble, that provision of the Constitution which provides that "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," should have the hearty support of every patriotic citizen of this Republic. The leaders and managers of the Sunday law cause in general, and of this Sunday closing crusade in particular, have arrogated to themselves the titles, "The best people of the land," and "The law abiding people of the country;" but the truth is, as shown in the history of the so-called National Reform movement given in the first article in this number of the SENTINEL, that for years they have waged a persistent and relentless warfare against the Constitution—the fundamental law of the land. They should now be stripped of the garments of hypocrisy with which they have clothed themselves, and be made to stand forth in all their hideous deformity, as subverters of the Constitution, and the enemies of both civil and religious liberty.

THE supreme law of the Government of the United States,—the Constitution,—positively prohibits any legislation on the subject of religion. Yet, in spite of this,

in utter disregard of the supreme law of the land, these men by threats of force—threats of the loss of votes, the only force at their command—obliged Congress to legislate upon a religious subject, to decide a religious question, and to take their side in a great religious controversy. And in this they have plainly overridden the Constitution, and violated the supreme law of the land. *And they know it.*

THE National Reform Association, the ringleader in this whole religious combination for political purposes, has been working for nearly thirty years for national Sunday legislation. But knowing that Sunday is religious, and religious only, its managers argued from the first that such legislation would be unconstitutional, as the Constitution stands; and, therefore, for nearly thirty years they have advocated and demanded an amendment to the Constitution which should declare this to be "a Christian Nation," and so create a basis for national legislation recognizing Sunday as "the Christian Sabbath." And they are demanding the same thing still.

THUS, by their own arguments for nearly thirty years, we know that the ringleaders in this Sunday closing crusade know that Sunday legislation by Congress is unconstitutional. Yet, in conflict with their own continued arguments, these men take the lead in petitioning and threatening Congress for Sunday legislation. One of their own number, who had argued for years the unconstitutionality of such legislation, spent the whole of the first session of the Fifty-second Congress at the Capitol as "a Christian lobbyist" to secure this very unconstitutional legislation. And now, having secured this legislation which they know to be unconstitutional, having thus knowingly violated the supreme law, having thus subverted the Constitution, these very men take the lead in getting up and managing mass-meetings to endorse their unconstitutional action, to prevent Congress from undoing its unconstitutional work, and vote themselves the law-abiding people of the Nation!

BUT instead of being the "law-abiding people of the land," they are the arch law-breakers of the land. Their action is as much worse than that of the average law-breaker, as the supreme law of the land is greater and more important than the local statutes. The average law-breaker damages the *individual*; these supreme law-breakers damage the *whole Nation*. The average law-breaker invades the rights of the *individual*; these supreme law-breakers have invaded, and even swept away, the rights of *all the people*. The average law-breaker disregards social order only in the locality where he is; while these supreme law-breakers strike at the very existence of

social order, by breaking down the chief governmental safeguard of a nation.

THESE facts should be fearlessly set before the committee having in charge the "resolution to repeal the religious legislation pertaining to the World's Columbian Exposition," and Congress should be asked to undo, as far as possible, the evil that has been done in yielding to the demands of these subverters of constitutional, republican government.

BUT it may be urged that these men represent a majority of the people of the Nation, and the majority should rule even if to do it they are compelled to subvert the Constitution, that constitutions represent simply the will of the majority, and that when they cease to express the popular will, they should be changed or overridden. The position is not, however, tenable. In the first place, the National Reformers do not represent a majority of the people; but even if they did, it would not justify them in subverting the Constitution. Constitutions are made, not to be overridden by the majority, but for the protection of the minority. The minority has rights which the majority is bound to respect; and constitutions are largely for the purpose of defining and protecting those rights.

APROPOS to this subject is the article on another page, on "Limitations to Majority Rule." The saying that "the majority should rule" is true only of those matters which come properly within the sphere of civil government. But religious questions are outside that sphere, not by constitutional guarantee, merely, but by the law of our being which makes us individually responsible to the Creator. The Constitution of the United States did not create religious rights, but simply recognizes them. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are . . . endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." And of these rights, Hon. Richard M. Johnson, in his matchless report to the United States Senate on Sunday mails, January 19, 1829, said: "*They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government can not deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotism may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them.*" The men who override constitutions and trample upon natural rights are the worst of tyrants, no matter what their profession may be.

THE *Mail and Express* is authority for the statement that the latest canvass of the House shows a majority of only five against Sunday opening. It is not stated which of the two joint resolutions upon this subject was made the basis of the canvass.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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,
43 Bond Street, New York City.