



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

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, MARCH 16, 1893.

NUMBER 11.

## 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.

THE various propositions to have Congress legislate affirmatively for the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday are just as vicious in principle as that which has prevailed to close the Fair. The different bills before the Pennsylvania legislature, in reference to the Sunday law of the State, to reduce the fine, and legalize certain forms of business, come within the same category.

CONGRESS had no right to decree, either directly or indirectly, that the World's Fair should be closed on a given day, in deference to the religious views of either a minority or a majority. It had no more right to say that it should be open in opposition to the religious practice or belief of either a minority or a majority. The only possible course for Congress in this matter, and have acted within the principles of justice and the Constitution, would have been strict neutrality.

THE same thing is true of legislatures. They have no more right to legislate affirmatively, in reference to any religious observance, than negatively. The measures introduced in the Pennsylvania legislature,—to reduce the penalty affixed to the Sunday law of Allegheny County, and legalize the manufacture and sale of newspapers on Sunday, and the offering for sale of temperance drinks, etc.,—were just as uncalled for, and just as much beyond the proper legislative sphere as the original law of 1794 forbidding all labor, trade, and diversion, on Sunday. The right to make and sell newspapers, or to follow trade and labor in general, can not properly be restricted on Sunday for any reason which would not apply just as well on Wednesday; for as a matter of absolute right, all these are just as proper, and for that matter rightfully lawful, on Sunday as on other days, or on other days

as on Sunday, whether the legislature bid or forbid. In this case the assumption of despotic right to prohibit, presumes the same despotic right of affirmative command, if that should be the legislative choice. In Russia, this assumption has reached the stage of practical experimental reality.

WHO will acknowledge that the legislature may rightfully command him to labor on Sunday under penalty of fine and imprisonment? Who will agree that the State may reasonably and rightfully decree that he shall rest on Wednesday, and abstain from all secular occupation? If the State may so decree as regards Wednesday, it may decree, if it so choose, that he must work on that day, or some other day, or all other days. Can it not be said that persistent and faithful labor by its citizens tends to the welfare of the State; it is a necessity for the support of the citizen himself; public policy therefore demands that the citizens should be required to labor? The State, therefore, having assumed the right, for the benefit of the State and the citizen,—as a matter of public policy, a police regulation,—to require the citizen to rest on Wednesday, may, if in its judgment changed social and economical or political conditions render it advisable, require him to work on Wednesday. The same reasoning from the same standpoint applies equally in either case; and is just as applicable to Sunday as to Wednesday.

THERE is no distinction, then, in principle between the affirmative and negative Sunday law; both are equally iniquitous. Neutrality is the only just course. It naturally follows, therefore, that the same thing which is true of the Sunday law is also true of its exemption. That is so. The exemption pre-supposes the right to enforce upon others that from which the privileged party is exempt. In all religious laws that is denied by the party exempted. There exists no right, in the first place, to make or enforce the law, consequently there can exist no right to exempt. The assumption of the right to exempt is a cumulative claim of the propriety of the original legislation and of State authority in the matter. It is, as it

were, creating an exception, that it may more conclusively prove the rule. Especially is this seen when the fact is taken into consideration that all exemption clauses affixed to Sunday laws require the exempted class to strictly and conscientiously observe another day and be able to present such proof of this religious observance as shall satisfy the magistrate before whom they may be brought for violation of the Sunday law. The only apparent exception to this is in the enumerated list of acts which cover the statutory interpretation of “works of necessity and mercy.” What is this but the same law applied to another day? There is a distinction in the days, but no difference in the requirement or the principle which is sought to be applied.

THERE has been introduced in the legislature of Tennessee a bill which reads thus:—

*An Act to prohibit interference with the Religious Rights or Liberties of Certain Classes of Persons:*

Section 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee:* That Section 2289, of Milliken & Vertree's compilation of the statute laws of the State of Tennessee, be and is hereby so amended as not to apply to persons known as Seventh-day Baptists, Adventists, or any other persons whose religious faith teaches them to conscientiously believe that another day than the one generally observed by the people of the State is the proper one authorized by God as a day of rest. Provided that their usual avocations shall not interfere in any manner with the peace, quiet, or proper rights of others, and provided further, that said persons shall observe one day in each week as a day of rest, as commanded in the Scriptures.

Section 2. *Be it further enacted:* That all laws or parts of laws in conflict with this act be and are hereby repealed.

Section 3. *Be it further enacted:* That this act take effect on and after this passage, the public welfare requiring it.

The impulse which has called out this measure is, in the highest degree, laudable, and a credit to the humanitarian feelings of the legislator who presented it, and of those who advocate its adoption. But the impulse, unfortunately, has not sound and logical legislative principles upon which to base its action. In the first place, from a legislative point of view purely civil, it would be a mistaken course. When a wrong is done by the enforcement of statutory law, the true course for the legislature to take is not to legislate for the relief of each particular

case of hardship or wrong as it appears, but to apply the general principles which may meet and satisfy all cases. If the application of this principle, when found, abrogates the law entirely, it is conclusive proof that the whole law is vicious and should never have been placed upon the statute books. But a still more important element than one which may form a part of any strictly civil statute enters into this question. The whole matter is found to be a religious question, and therefore not a subject of civil legislation at all. If the law is a religious law, every exemption from its action, short of an entire repeal, would also be religious in character.

That Sunday laws are religious laws and intended for the enforcement of religion, has been so many times and so clearly shown, and is in itself so evident, that to rehearse the points which show it to be so is unnecessary. They are religious and nothing but religious. Exemption clauses attached to them will also be religious. Consider this exemption clause which has been quoted and see if it is not so in this case. Look first at the title to the act. Does it prohibit interference with the religious liberties and rights of any and all citizens? No! Only those of "certain classes of persons." Why not? Is it that the right to interfere with the religious liberties of certain other classes of persons is reserved? It certainly is. There is a sense in which it is a religious right to be non-religious; it *surely* is an inalienable right. The legislative privilege of coercing this class is reserved in this title when read with the body of the bill. Again, the right to coerce into the observance of Sunday those who make a profession of that form of religion, of which Sunday is the distinguishing mark, is reserved by this title and the bill itself, both by virtue of being an exemption clause and by virtue of the naming of certain particular classes within the clause.

Again, in the body of the bill, two religious denominations are specified, and a general expression attached covering all religionists who differ with the majority as to the observance of the first day of the week. The language includes all "whose religious faith teaches them to conscientiously believe that another day than the one generally observed by the people of the State is the proper one authorized by God as a day of rest." What is required here? That the exempted should be taught by a "religious faith" to believe "conscientiously" in another day "authorized by God." A conscientious belief which is the result of religious faith in the authority of God is certainly a religious belief,—and that this exemption clause requires. But not only does it require belief, and religious, conscientious belief, but it requires that the individual shall act according to that belief, and "observe one day in each week as a day of rest, *as commanded in the Scriptures.*" An injunction to observe a religious form in accordance with *the Scriptures* can scarcely be anything else than a religious injunction. How clear it is that this exemption, and all exemptions, affixed to religious laws, are no less religious in intent and effect than the original statutes themselves.

Will not those hearts which have been warmed by this impulse of humanity, receive still farther the inspiration of courage to stand for the pure justice and right

reason which must always accompany true religion undefiled, and ask unequivocally for the complete repeal of all religious legislation, without subterfuge, exception, or exemption? W. H. M.

### "The Limits of Legitimate Religious Discussion."

THE trend toward religious legislation, or rather toward a restriction of what is popularly known as religious liberty, is shown more plainly, or rather avowed more openly, by the Right Rev. Leighton Coleman, S. T. D., LL. D., Bishop of Delaware, in an article under the foregoing title, in the *North American Review* for January, than by any other writer who has yet given his views on this subject to the public through the medium of the press.

The bishop's first proposition is that "there is a discussion styled religious which is not legitimate." He describes it thus:—

It is such as calls in question the fundamental principles of religion. Any discussion which involves disrespect to them transcends its proper bounds.

Admitting the necessity of defining the term religion, Bishop Coleman continues:

My own view of the subject shall be confined to the United States. The inquiry will at once arise: "Is there here any form of religion which may be called national, and which its adherents may on that account consider entitled, so far as its fundamental principles are concerned, to limitation of debate?"

Without hesitation, I answer "Yes." From the very beginning of its colonization, this country has distinctly recognized Christianity as its religion. It is just as easy to prove its formal and constant acknowledgment in the beginning as it is to prove that there is no such formal acknowledgment in our present national Constitution. Yet this very lack of formal acknowledgment, when considered in connection with the fact that Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, can be fairly considered as testifying not only to the existence, but, also, to the supremacy of Christianity.

This is the same interpretation put upon the First Amendment to the Federal Constitution by the Supreme Court, hence it is not original with the bishop. It is, however, a most monstrous perversion of the fundamental law of a great Nation. The idea that the framers of that amendment designed thereby to establish Christianity, or any other form of religion, in this country is too absurd to be entertained by any except the intensely bigoted or the basely interested. Every fair-minded man *knows* better.

Continuing, Bishop Coleman says:—

In further support of the contention that Christianity is the national religion of America I would not only appeal—as one can do very confidently—to the common sentiment and practice of all classes, but also to the well-weighed utterances of the judiciary, from the first days of our political independence.

The bishop then quotes Chancellor Kent, of New York, and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in support of his proposition that in this country Christianity is protected by law, and then says:

So, then, I repeat that a discussion which would include within its limits an attack upon the fundamental principles of Christianity is, so far as that attack is concerned, distinctly illegitimate.

We recognize this dogma when applied to civil affairs. When a citizen essays to bring into dispute the fundamental principles of that form of government under which he is living, he is accounted a traitor, and is liable to arrest and punishment. . . . Is it not much more treasonable to bring into contempt the institutions and tenets of Christianity? And especially so, since it is a time of war? For in the conflict which Christianity is waging there is no discharge. It will last

as long as the world in which we live. Therefore it is that a perpetual limit must be placed to the questioning or denial, by way of discussion, of such things as are essential to Christianity.

Hardly anything is more injurious to the State than a lack of confidence between man and man. It threatens the disruption of the very bonds of society. And this is the risk that is run in allowing religious discussions to go on indefinitely and wantonly, robbing men of their faith in God and Christ, and so, in time, of their faith in one another, for faith in man has its highest development among those who believe in God.

Just how much is involved in the propositions quoted from Bishop Coleman, the readers of this paper need not be told. They will readily understand that were his views to be crystallized into law, or what would amount to about the same thing, into court decisions, freedom of speech, even in religious things, would be a thing of the past. The mere utterance of such sentiments is ominous, for already the legal precedents exist in many of our States to give all the force of law to every proposition laid down by the bishop. He himself thus argues this very question:—

It may suffice to adduce one or two authorities on this point. Chancellor Kent, of New York, delivered, in 1811, the following opinion: "The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity as their faith and practice." "True," he went on to say, "the Constitution has discarded religious establishments," but what then? "It does not forbid judicial cognizance of those offenses against religion and morality which have no reference to any such establishment, or to any particular form of government, but are punishable because they strike at the root of moral obligation and weaken the security of social ties." He added: "To construe it as breaking down the common-law barriers against licentious, wanton and impious attacks upon Christianity itself, would be an enormous perversion of its meaning."

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania subsequently ruled that "even if Christianity were not a part of the law of the land, it is the popular religion of the country; an insult to which would be indictable as tending to disturb the public peace;" adding that "no society can tolerate a wilful and despicable attempt to subvert religion."

Having thus fortified himself in the proposition that "any discussion which calls into question the fundamental principles of religion," transcends proper bounds and can be prohibited by civil law, Bishop Coleman defines what he regards as some of the "fundamental principles of Christianity." He says:—

None is more distinctly so than a belief in the personality of its Founder, Jesus Christ. And with this belief in his personality is the equally fundamental belief in him as both God and Man.

But few persons question the fact of His existence. More refuse to acknowledge his divinity. And herein lies a transgression of the limits of legitimate religious discussion. Indeed, one who denies the divinity of Christ takes himself out of religious discussion altogether—at least so far as this country is concerned. He robs Christianity of that which primarily makes it *the* religion of the world, and reduces it simply to a system of wilful deceit and shameless wickedness. . . . Such an assault is beyond the pale of legitimate discussion.

Just how far-reaching the bishop would make his rule will appear from the following:—

One can not but regret the recent appearance in this *Review* of an article which, while professing to be a review of the life and works of a French author, lately deceased, was really an arraignment of Christianity, and a wanton attack not only upon Christ's claim to divinity, but also upon his goodness of character.

Such an article certainly transgresses those bounds of religious discussion which I have ventured to lay down; and this not only because of assailing the fundamental principles of Christianity, but, further, because of its vain repetition of what has been so many times answered with such unquestionable reasonableness.

This shows that not simply would the bishop invoke the civil law against these grosser assaults upon religion calculated

to provoke breaches of the peace, but that he would prohibit all discussion that involved a denial of the fundamental principles of Christianity, no matter how elevated its tone from a literary standpoint. This would involve a religious censorship of the entire press of the country, and utterly destroy all freedom of religious discussion. Discussion could not pass the limit. It could involve neither a denial of Christ's divinity nor of the obligation of the divine law as recognized by the civil law. The bishop says:—

And these limits I would set not only as regards the discussion of His nature and his character, but also as regards the discussion of his commandments. Let me illustrate my meaning here by reference to the two great sacraments of the Christian religion, baptism and the Supper of the Lord. These were unquestionably ordained by Christ himself. And they are accounted "as generally necessary to salvation." Yet how largely are they ignored by people living in these United States. And how flippantly, oftentimes, is the question of their obligation discussed! The question, I submit, is beyond the legitimate limits of a religious discussion. It is treasonable to the King of kings, and thus becomes in itself irreligious.

I am quite prepared to admit that there are some points in regard to the sacraments which may be legitimately discussed, *e. g.* the *mode* of baptism. But as to their necessity, there is no room for debate. That question has been settled, and whoever, by argument or by practice, shows disrespect to such a fundamental principle of the Kingdom puts himself out of court, and is, I repeat it, guilty of treason. It is not an open question. In fact, it has never been anything else but a closed question, except as those who are rebellious have dared to debate it.

How long would the bishop permit a discussion of the *mode* of baptism? If the principle were to prevail that the great majority had a right to forbid the denial of the necessity of any baptism at all, would not the same majority have an equal right to forbid a denial of the necessity of a particular *mode* of administering the ordinance? It certainly would have just the same right in the one case as in the other. But the whole principle is wrong; no such legitimate authority resides in any majority, however large.

It is scarcely probable that the bishop's ideal will ever be realized so far as baptism and the Lord's Supper are concerned; but the principle has had a practical application; and is having its legitimate and natural development in the United States to-day. Almost every State has its Sabbath laws requiring the recognition of one day of the week as sacred to rest and worship. Sunday is always specified, but in most States observers of the seventh day are permitted to do ordinary work on the first day of the week. That is, recognizing the Sabbath institution they are permitted to dissent from the majority as to the particular day to be observed, but they must not in practice deny the divine authority upon which the Sabbath institution rests; nor must they challenge the right of the State to enforce the observance of a day as sacred time. Such has in the past been the status of this question. Now, however, a large number of people are coming to regard a practical denial of the claims of the particular day observed by the majority as destructive of social order, and so to be prohibited by law. Any practical disregard of Sunday is, to use the bishop's expression, coming to be regarded as "beyond the legitimate limits of religious discussion," and so "treasonable to the King of kings," and consequently to the State, and so to be prohibited by civil statute.

The bishop's views may be regarded by many as extreme; but only because he applies his principles to questions of which

the law has thus far taken only a very limited cognizance. Precisely the same argument in principle is made every day in regard to Sunday, and but few people, comparatively, see the evil there is in it. The bishop attempts to justify his position on the ground that to assail the principles of Christianity, "threatens the disruption of the very bonds of society." This is the identical argument relied upon to furnish a "civil" basis and justification for Sunday legislation. The principle is the same, and the argument is as good in the one case as in the other. Shall not Bishop Coleman's article serve to open the eyes of some who have hitherto been blind to the real issues involved in the question of liberty of conscience? C. P. B.

### The Inaugural of the National Religion.

MATTHEW QUAY, the patron saint of the congressional and Pennsylvanian Sunday, has succeeded quite remarkably in throwing about himself—in the closing days of the Fifty-second Congress, and the Harrison administration—a far-shining halo of governmental religion. In fact so intense are these rays, and so well directed as to light the face of the incoming administration with its ghostly lustre. It was a stroke of political genius to involve the new President in the religious toils ere yet his foot had touched the threshold of the White House. The committee having in charge the planning of the inauguration festivities had decided upon entertaining the crowd necessarily remaining over Sunday with concerts by the Marine Band, in the Pension Building. With reference to those concerts the *Congressional Record* has the following in its report of the proceedings of the Senate, Tuesday, February 28.

MR. QUAY.—I present a petition of sixty clergymen of the city of Washington, which I ask to have read.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The petition will be read if there be no objection.

THE CHIEF CLERK.—The petition is as follows:—

To the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

#### A PETITION.

WHEREAS, It having been announced by the Inaugural committee through the daily papers that, as a part of the programme for the inaugural ceremonies, three concerts by the Marine Band are to be held in the Pension Office building, on Sunday, March 5, proximo; and—

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States, in deference to the Christian sentiment of the Nation clearly and unmistakably expressed by the religious press, the pulpit, and by petition, has by legal enactment closed the doors of the Columbian Exposition on Sundays:

Therefore, believing to permit the holding of such concerts on Sunday by a band of musicians connected with one of the great departments of the Government, in a Government building which is occupied by another great department, and as a part of the ceremonies connected with the inauguration of the President of this great Christian Nation, by and with the sanction of her chosen rulers, would be a national sin; believing also that such desecration as proposed is unprecedented, would result in incalculable harm, and would be used as an authority and example for the complete secularization of Sunday:

We earnestly petition that orders be issued forbidding the use of any Government building for such purpose on that day.

Signed by W. R. Graham, pastor of Congress Street Methodist Protestant Church; W. Sherman Phillips, pastor of Mount Tabor Methodist Protestant Church, and many others.

THE VICE PRESIDENT.—The petition will be referred to the Special Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

MR. QUAY.—In this connection I desire to state that I took pains to ascertain whether the statements of the petitioners are correct. In the *Washington Post* of Sunday last I find a paragraph which I ask the Chief Clerk to read. It will be observed that the music by the Marine Band is not exactly sacred.

THE VICE PRESIDENT.—The Chief Clerk will read as requested.

(The Chief Clerk read the three programmes for Sunday morning, afternoon, and night.)

MR. QUAY.—To show that these concerts are to be held for the purpose of obtaining money, I send up a paper to be read. It is not signed by the officials in charge of the inaugural ceremonies,

but it is on their official paper and furnished in response to a request for information.

[Inaugural ceremonies, March 4, 1893.—General committee: James G. Berret, chairman; Alex. Porter Morse, secretary; Charles G. Glover, treasurer. Executive committee: James L. Norris, chairman; J. Fred. Kelley, secretary; William Cranch McIntire, corresponding secretary; James L. Barbour, Henry L. Biscoe, Gen. H. V. Boynton, Alexander T. Britton, John Joy Edison, Rear-Admiral S. R. Franklin, U. S. N., Lawrence Gardiner, Curtis J. Hillyer, Robert O. Holtzman, J. Harrison Johnson, Charles C. Lancaster, George W. McLanahan, Theodore W. Noyes, John W. Ross, Francis A. Richardson, Richard Smith, Michael I. Weller, Beriah Wilkins]

HEADQUARTERS LENMAN BUILDING,  
No. 1425 New York Avenue,  
Washington, D. C., ———, 1893.

Price of ball tickets, \$5.  
Price of concert in morning and afternoon of Sunday and Monday, 50 cents.

Price of evening concert Sunday and Monday, \$1.  
Programmes have not yet been issued.

MR. QUAY.—In view of these facts, although not exactly in order at this time, I ask for the adoption of the resolution which I send to the desk.

MR. MCPHERSON.—Before the Senator offers his resolution I should like to inquire what the paper relates to which has just been read by the Secretary. I could not understand from the language whether it is a petition from our own people or from citizens of a foreign government. I was unable to ascertain from the reading what language it is printed in. I should like to know to what the whole matter relates.

MR. QUAY.—The whole matter relates to the question whether the persons in charge of the inaugural ceremonies have by lawful means obtained the Pension building for the purpose of holding musical concerts there next Sunday. That is the allegation of the petition which has been read and which is signed by, I believe, sixty ministers of the city of Washington. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to as follows:—

Resolved, that the Secretary of the Interior be requested to inform the Senate whether authority has been given for the use of the building of the Pension Office by any person or persons on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, for musical concerts at which a pecuniary charge is made for admission.

The result of this "wise statemanship" of Mr. Quay and the Senate is told thus by the *Washington Post* of March 2.

There will be no sacred concerts at the Pension Office on next Sunday as originally intended. Owing to the refusal of the Secretary of the Interior to permit the use of the building for the purpose and for other causes, the idea has been abandoned.

The Secretary of the Interior received the following telegram yesterday from the President-elect:—

Lakewood, N. J., March 1, 1893.

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR:

I am strongly opposed to the use of the Pension Building for a Sunday concert on the 5th instant, and object to regarding such a thing as a feature of the inauguration.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

Secretary Noble immediately sent the following reply to Mr. Cleveland:—

Washington, D. C., March 1, 1893.

HON. GROVER CLEVELAND, Lakewood, N. J.

Your telegram received. Orders were issued already forbidding the use of the Pension Building on Sunday, and I am gratified that this action is in accordance with your wishes.

JOHN W. NOBLE, Secretary.

Before the telegram from Mr. Cleveland had been received Secretary Noble had forwarded the following communication to the chairman of the inaugural committee:—

Department of the Interior.

Washington, D. C., March 1, 1893.

COL. JAMES G. BERRET, Chairman Inaugural Committee. Present.

Sir: My attention has been called to the fact that it is the purpose of the Inaugural Committee to open the Pension Building on Sunday, the 5th instant, for one or more musical entertainments, at which a charge for admission will be made.

I have to inform you that, in granting the use of this building for the inaugural ball, it was not contemplated that the building would be open to the public on Sunday, and, as there will be opportunity on the subsequent day, during which the building is at the disposal of the committee, to give the concerts referred to, the use of the Pension Building on Sunday for that purpose will not be permitted.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. NOBLE, Secretary.

The correspondence upon the subject concludes with the following additional note to Mr. Berret:—

Department of the Interior.

Washington, D. C., March 1, 1893.

COL. JAMES G. BERRET, Chairman Inaugural Committee. Present.

Sir: Since my letter to you of this date, relative to the use of the Pension Office building for a musical entertainment on Sunday next, I have received a telegram from Mr. Cleveland, of which I enclose a copy, expressing his strong objection to the use of the building for a Sunday concert, and objecting to such a concert as a feature of the inauguration. I also inclose for your information a copy of my reply thereto.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. NOBLE, Secretary.

Last evening at the meeting of the Inaugural Executive Committee, the subject was discussed



at length, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

WHEREAS there seems to be somewhat of a sentiment against that part of the programme unanimously recommended by the promenade concert committee which included sacred concerts at the Pension Building on Sunday, March 5; and—

WHEREAS this committee in its representative capacity desires to eliminate any feature which might be misconstrued, or which would be objectionable to any and all religious sentiments: Therefore be it—

Resolved, That the Pension Building shall be closed on Sunday, March 5, and that in lieu of such concerts there shall be three concerts given on Tuesday, following those of Monday, as follows: One at 10 o'clock A. M. at fifty cents admission, the orphans and their worthy attendants to be admitted free; a second at 2 P. M., admission fifty cents, and a third at 8 o'clock P. M., dancing to begin at 9.30, and the admission at the last concert to be one dollar.

While the resolution was adopted without a dissenting vote, the members of the committee were a unit in protesting against the causes which occasioned such action. The matter was first brought up by Major W. Cranch McIntire, who offered the resolution, and explained the reasons for his course. He said that he heard, early yesterday morning, that certain influences had been brought to bear on the Secretary of the Interior to urge the latter to prohibit the use of the Pension Building for Sunday concerts. He went to the District authorities, procured permits for the same, and then saw the Secretary of the Interior. The latter stated he had already issued orders prohibiting Sunday concerts, and nothing could change his determination. Major McIntire further stated that there were a number of clergymen who had been instrumental in causing such action being taken by the Secretary.

M. I. Weller, Lawrence Gardner, James L. Barbour, C. C. Lancaster, and John Joy Edson, all spoke on the subject, the consensus of their remarks being that the action of the Secretary of the Interior was due to the representations of the clergymen.

Chairman Norris made an explanation of the whole matter to the effect that the resolution was necessary when all things were considered. He said that about three weeks ago he received intimation that there were a number of clergymen who were agitating an opposition to the Sunday concerts. He sent word to these clergymen and asked that they confer with the Executive Committee on the subject, but that the invitation was not accepted. Instead, they continued their opposition, and the only thing to do under the circumstances was to abandon the project. Mr. Norris referred to the fact that a telegram had been sent to Mr. Cleveland protesting against concerts on Sunday which did not specify that the music was to be of a sacred character.

Professor Fanciulli was present at the meeting, and he was asked to explain what he knew of the matter. The professor stated that yesterday morning he was notified by the colonel commandant to furnish the latter with the prepared programmes for the Sunday concerts. It was stated during the meeting that the Secretary of the Navy had been induced to enjoin the Marine Band from playing at the sacred concerts; but Professor Fanciulli knew nothing of such an order. During the discussion the query was raised as to whether the Marine Band would be permitted to give its proposed sacred concert next Sunday evening at Albaugh's Opera House, but no satisfactory answer could be obtained.

Major McIntire recalled that, during the occasion of the national drill, some years ago, Rev. Dr. Talmage spoke at the White Lot on a Sunday, and there was a band in attendance, and an admission fee was charged. A fence was erected about the place at the time, and no objection was raised.

Mr. R. O. Holtzman called attention to the fact that the failure to give the three concerts on Sunday would possibly result in a loss of about ten thousand dollars to the poor of the District, and that the protesting clergymen would be responsible for the same.

As is well known, whatever surplus is derived from the inaugural ball and concerts over the expenses of the inaugural ceremonies is devoted to charitable purposes, and the postponement of the concerts from Sunday to Tuesday will result in a loss, as the great bulk of visitors will have left by Monday night.

Every member of the committee keenly felt the position in which they were placed and did not hesitate to express their indignation at the course pursued by the clergymen. The fact that the concerts would have been an attraction for thousands of visitors who will otherwise spend the day in idleness or worse was commented on, and the ministers were criticized for their interference at such a late hour.

The influence which was brought to bear upon President Cleveland is shown by this telegram addressed to him at Lakewood, and which drew from him the communication to Secretary Noble quoted above.

GROVER CLEVELAND, Lakewood, N. J.

Expressed Christian sentiment in city opposed to proposed use of Pension Building next Sunday for concert. Can you aid in closing? (signed.)

A. W. PITZER.

President of Evangelical Alliance.

It is evident that the power behind the presidential chair has but to speak and it is done.

Of Secretary John W. Noble, who thus ran before the incoming President in haste to appropriate to himself the honor of the enforcement of national religion at this time, the *Mail and Express*, of March 4, most unkindly says:—

He lost his religion at the beginning of the Harrison administration, as he explains it, by giving an Easter dinner, as had been his habit in St. Louis. The Chief Justice of the United States was there, and one or two of his colleagues in the Cabinet, and other great functionaries.

The emblems around the dining-room were appropriate for the resurrection of our Lord. But the day was Sunday. So some ministers in New Jersey notified him that he was to be censured for giving a public dinner on Sunday.

But he wrote them that he did not think much of their opinion, anyway; for he did not expect to go to heaven via New Jersey! Still, he discontinued his Sunday public dinners. "And now," said the Secretary of the Interior, "I have gotten my religion again, and am all right. I stopped the proposed Sunday concert to be given in honor of President Cleveland to-morrow in the Pension Building; and the Maryland Conference of Ministers have passed resolutions that I am all right. That settles it."

The whole matter is justly characterized by the *New York World* thus:—

The whole thing is folderol, cant, hypocrisy and an impertinent interference with the rights of those who wish to make music or to listen to it.

Moreover, in this country the Government is not set to prevent or discourage "sin." It has nothing to do with religious doctrine one way or the other. It has no concern with Sabbaths or holy days, except to protect all men equally in their right to observe such days as they please in such ways as their consciences may dictate. Anybody who thinks it wrong to listen to a concert on Sunday may stay away. But he has no right to ask the Government of the Republic to stop other people from attending because of his puritanical notions.

Of Matthew Quay, the political henchman of these false religionists, the *World* does not hesitate to say:—

Those Washington clergymen who are aghast at the sinfulness of permitting the Marine Band to give a concert Sunday seem strangely deficient in the sense of humor. For their mouth piece, chosen to utter their protest against this "national sin" of music on Sunday, they selected Matthew Stanley Quay, a notorious political corruptionist, and a man who a few years ago embezzled nearly half a million dollars from the treasury of his State, and by virtue of the statutes of limitation has escaped the punishment which might have brought repentance for his "sin."

It was one of the dramatic unities, quite unexpected, and so all the more striking, that the first inauguration, after the congressional adoption of the national religion of the United States, should witness in public connection with it the "inaugural" also of the governmental religion.

W. H. M.

### What?

[It is not surprising that this Tennessee correspondent should be so astonished at the action of the last Congress in the Sunday closing of the World's Fair as to break out into this rhapsody of amazement. But there are still more amazing things already in progress and yet to come. Let him and every one watch the progress of events, and take at every step a definite stand for the right and against the wrong.]

I CAN imagine how a man could be bribed with a dollar or two to vote for a man he had intended to vote for. Also how by the use of a dozen dollars or so, a man in a tight place might be bribed to vote for a man he had not intended to vote for.

I can imagine how by the use of a few hundred dollars, a mean man might be bribed to burn another man's stacks or barn; or for a few thousand dollars, a mighty mean man might be bribed to murder a fellow-man.

But what tremendous crime requires the enormous bribe of \$2,500,000? Is it possible that noble, honorable men would offer such a bribe as that? Is it possible that noble, honorable men could be bribed into a crime commensurate with such a huge appropriation?

Behold the Congress of the United States bribing the management of the Columbian Exposition into an actual union of Church and State!!

Behold the acceptance of the bribe by the management, and its enforcement of the contract!!

Indeed justice has fled from the haunts of men. For shame! For shame!! For shame!!!

L. L. GOODWIN.

Mayston, Tenn.

### History, Logic, and Truth.

[Rev. A. H. Lewis appeared as the only champion of truth, justice, and the correct principles of legislation, at the hearing concerning the State Sunday law before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, on Feb. 16, 1893. Extracts from the synopsis of Dr. Lewis' remarks published in the *Sabbath Recorder* are reprinted here.]

I APPEAR in behalf of the Seventh-day Baptists of the State of Pennsylvania, and in behalf of religious liberty for all men. I ask for the total repeal of the Sunday law of 1794.

The origin of the present law is connected directly with the Seventh-day Baptists. Before the Revolutionary War there were many Seventh-day Baptists in Philadelphia and the eastern part of Pennsylvania; they were among the most industrious, upright, and patriotic citizens. At the close of that war there was much general immorality and irreligion, arising from the disorders incident to such times, and from the influence of the moral and religious revolution going on in France in 1793. Philadelphia was the national capital. The yellow fever swept over the city that year, leaving a trail of desolation, sorrow and fear. Accustomed, as the men of that time were, to look upon such epidemics as a direct punishment for sins, the public mind was aroused to learn why such things had come to pass. During the war many laws against vice and immorality had fallen into disuse, or had expired by limitation. The legislature of Pennsylvania convened early in December, 1793, and a committee was appointed to report laws looking toward a better state of things. Religious men of all classes joined in urging this movement, the Seventh-day Baptists, both English and German, being among the foremost. Since the prevailing disorders were most marked on days of leisure, the Sunday question became a prominent factor in the case. When the excitement was at the highest the seventh-day Baptists discovered that the proposed law touching Sunday would press heavily upon them, not in the matter of vice or immorality, but in point of legitimate labor and business. Hence on Thursday, Jan. 2, 1794, they presented the following memorial, saying:

That agreeable to the dictates of their own consciences, they have set apart and kept the seventh day as their Sabbath, and by existing laws are subjected to severe penalties for working on the first day of the week (Sunday), which they conceive to be contrary to the constitution of this



commonwealth, they therefore pray that so much of the "act for the suppression of vice and immorality," etc., as imposes a penalty on them for working on the first day of the week, may be repealed.

This memorial was based on Section 3, Article 9, of the State constitution, which reads:—

All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and no preference shall be given, by law, to any religious establishments or modes of worship.

Religious men of all classes, joined in petitioning the legislature that this exemption be granted to the Seventh-day Baptists. The matter was laid over from Jan. 2 to Feb. 5, 1794; and there is good evidence that the exemption would have been granted but for one circumstance.

The petition for exemption was referred to a committee, of which James McLene, who represented Franklin County, was a member. He was a Scotch-Irish Presbyterian who was fanatically opposed to everything connected with Roman Catholicism. Through a strange ignorance of the facts, McLene had determined that the Seventh-day Baptists were Papists in disguise, to whom no quarter should be granted. His persistent intolerance gained the victory, and the committee reported against the exemption. On the 22nd of April, 1794, under such influences, the present law was enacted. The Seventh-day Baptists and others have suffered persecution under it from time to time for a century, not because of evil, but because personal spite, or petty ambition has enabled intolerant enemies to cause their arrest and punishment for quietly working on their farms. A law which makes such wrongs possible ought not to abide the light of the closing years of this century. Perhaps "exemption" was all that could be hoped for in the shadows of 1794; but it is too late now to ask for less than repeal, for, as I proceed to show, the law violates the fundamental rights of all men and the fundamental doctrines of religious liberty.

THIS LAW IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION, WHICH OUGHT TO BE REPEALED.

Those who seek to evade this fact say: "The law does not compel men to attend church, nor be religious." This is an evasion. The law forbids "worldly employment or business on the Lord's day." "Worldly" has no meaning here except as opposed to "sacred;" this word, as contrasted with the next, "Lord's day," has no meaning except it be a day sacred to the Lord, a day specially set apart for his service, and in the interest of religion, and as contrasted with other days not so devoted. The term "Sabbath,"—so commonly used in this discussion, but which legislators dare not use in legal enactment lest the law apply to Saturday and not to Sunday—has no meaning except as a day which men should hold sacred to God. The law of 1794 assumes that it is wrong, is irreligious, sinful, to pursue "worldly" affairs on Sunday; the crucial point in the law is that it forbids certain things on Sunday which may be done on any other day without hindrance, because it is not wrong or irreligious to do them on other days. The things prohibited are not wrong *per se*, but only wrong at a certain

specified time, which the law declares to be the "Lord's" time. To say that such a law does not enforce a religious duty, is to deny the plainest facts of history and the clearest meaning of words. And more! no Sunday law has been enacted from the pagan law of Constantine in 321 A. D. to the late national provision touching the opening of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday, which did not spring from religious sentiments, and aim at preventing irreligious actions.

When the friends of Sunday wish to evade the claims of Saturday, the Sabbath, according to the Bible, they declare that the law of God, in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, does not designate a specific day of the week, but only any seventh day of rest after six days of labor. This is the latest and most popular interpretation of God's Sabbath law. Grant this, not as fact, but for the sake of the argument. By what right then does the law of Pennsylvania go so far beyond the law of God? Who gave the legislature of 1794, under the lead of James McLene, the right to declare that all men in the commonwealth shall cease from all worldly business on a specific day in each week? Was James McLene, with his fierce anti-papistic intolerance, coupled with an ignorance which kept him from knowing the difference between a Seventh-day Baptist and a Roman Catholic, a better religious guide than "Moses, the man of God?" If the Bible does not fix the Sabbath on any specific day, shall the State of Pennsylvania, in the face of its constitution, which declares that "No preference shall be given by law to any religious establishment or modes of worship" assume to determine what these men say the Bible forbids, by declaring that Sunday, a specific day, is the Sabbath? May this commonwealth visit fines and imprisonment on upright citizens because they practice what those who desire to retain this law say the Bible teaches, but what they themselves inconsistently deny when they plead for the law? Tested by popular assertions used to push Saturday out of sight, Pennsylvania has no right to go beyond protecting each man in Sabbatizing on any day he may choose. So far, these advocates of the law of 1794 are right, even though such arguments, invented to ward off the claims of Seventh-day Baptists, logically destroy all Sunday legislation.

BASED ON FALSE CLAIMS.

But a stronger indictment remains. *The law of 1794 is based on false claims.* It assumes that Sunday is the Sabbath according to the Bible, and that men sin against God who "desecrate it." Whatever the men of 1794 may have thought, every man who has looked into this matter knows that is not the fact. The Bible designates the "seventh day" as the Sabbath. That this means the seventh day of the week is shown by the fact that the Jews who received the law, so understood it, and have kept it in unbroken succession to this day; and also the fact that Sunday, "the first day of the week," can be located only by its relation to Saturday, the seventh day of the week. There is not a word or hint in the Bible about the transferring of the Sabbath law to Sunday or the "change" of the Sabbath. The modern theory of such transfer and change did not appear in history until the English Reformation, when it was invented as a compromise between the theory of the English

Seventh-day Baptists and that of the Roman Catholics. The "first day of the week" is mentioned but a few times in the New Testament. It is never spoken of as sacred, as the Sabbath, or as being in any way worthy of religious regard. Its observance is never connected with Christ's resurrection. The term "Lord's day" occurs but once in the New Testament, and there is no evidence that Sunday was then referred to. There is no definite proof that the term was applied to Sunday until one hundred and seventy years after Christ. In the face of such facts it is difficult to understand how men of this day can continue to assume what we can perhaps, forgive in the men of one hundred years ago.

Similar facts appear in the history of Sunday legislation. The earliest law, that of Constantine, 321 A. D., is wholly pagan in form and fact. It mentions the day only as the "venerable day of the sun." There is not a trace of Christianity in the law. Sunday legislation did not begin as a part of Christianity. Gradually it combined Christian with pagan elements. The term "Lord's day" does not appear until 386 A. D., in a law of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius; and the term "Sabbath," as applied to Sunday, does not appear in civil law or ecclesiastical literature until the Puritan Reformation in England, three hundred years ago. The assumption which underlies the law of 1794 ignores these facts. Historic honesty demands its repeal.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I earnestly and respectfully ask you to consider the repeal of this law of 1794, because,

(a) It contravenes the fundamental principle of religious liberty.

(b) It has always wrought injustice to those who observe the Sabbath—Saturday.

(c) It is unjust toward those who do not believe that they ought to cease from legitimate work on any particular day, for religious reasons.

(d) It rests on the false assumption that Sunday is the Sabbath, and that it is sinful to do on that day that which may be done on Monday without thought of wrong.

(e) It hinders the cause of genuine Sabbath reform by teaching men to rely on the civil law in matters which belong only to the Word of God and the decisions of religious conscience.

(f) It weakens and destroys conscience toward God by putting human authority, resting on false claims, before the divine law.

Permit me also to repeat that, in asking for repeal, I would remove no restriction against the evils which come with Sunday as a day of leisure; evils which Sunday laws help to create by enforcing leisure upon the irreligious. I would inaugurate new and more rigid legislation against saloons, gambling, impurity, rioting, and everything of this kind. I plead for a higher conception of Christianity and of Sabbath-keeping than civil law has given, or can give. I ask for a just and helpful application of Christian principles to all, regardless of creed. This is not a question of majorities, but of God-given rights. It is a question of truth and facts, not creeds and traditions. It is a question of principles, not of the percentage of opinions. That legislation best befits this great commonwealth, bearing the honored name of William Penn, which best attains a broad Christ-like application of the principles of religious freedom to

all classes, and to all questions of religious faith and practice. Before closing, I must come to the defense of "Presbyterian elders," and Christian people generally who take the Sunday newspapers, ride on Sunday trains, etc. I have heard these people much condemned in the convention just held for the purpose of inducing your honorable body to preserve the law of 1794. These men are not more wicked than men of a century ago. They have learned more of the facts concerning Sunday and have come to believe that it is not a sacred day. They have learned that the Bible does not declare Sunday work to be a sin. They do not fear that God will forge lightning to smite them if they do advertise in Sunday papers. This is the deeper meaning of the growing disregard for Sunday among Christian men. It is neither honest, charitable, nor Christ-like to denounce them as "hypocrites" and "greedy sinners," for rejecting the false claims of Sunday.

#### California and a National Sunday Law.

THE Sunday-law effort in the present legislature of California made its appearance in the form of a petition. The following is a copy of the petition:—

*To the California House of Representatives of 1893:* We, the undersigned, citizens of the State of California, twenty-one years of age and over, most earnestly petition your honorable body to enact a law forbidding all Sunday traffic and work, as well as all coarse and noisy amusements on that day of the week; making suitable exception for works of necessity and mercy, and for private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week by abstaining from labor and business on the same.

The petition bears the well-known stamp of the American Sabbath Union. It was expected that the union's agents would make a strong pull at this session. Their three years campaign in the State, at the close of which they confidently promised their supporters a Sunday law, has been zealously though quietly prosecuted. They had no doubt of their ability to educate the people up to that point in three years' time. The boast was that the union never had made a failure, and never would. But it can now record one defeat at least. The Sunday-law measure did not stand half the chance at the session this year that it did two years ago; this time it was not even honored with an introduction. The attempt to call it out by petition heard no favorable response but its own echo. Yet Sunday fares as well in California as in any other State. The bitter pill with the Sunday-law criers is that they have no opportunity to put their opponents in the chain-gang.

The special mark of the Sabbath Union lies in the religious requirement. They have always claimed that they only asked a civil rest day, but their dictum that those who observe another day shall do so "religiously" invariably discovers that the move is a religious one, and its purpose the enforcement of a religious tenet by the power of civil law. They well know that the masses of the people, as well as intelligent and capable lawmakers, are not blind to the fact that the civil government has no legitimate business to interfere with the religious scruples of the people, either to enforce or restrain; therefore they have so far endeavored to dress the Sunday-law movement in a civil garb, with a garniture of solicitude for the physical well-being of the working-

man. But the requirement that those who observe another day shall observe it "religiously" and "regularly" so, shows that such is the design for Sunday observance. The logical point is that men should be compelled to be religious at least one day in the week, and that the State is the proper authority to see that such duty is performed.

Should the legislature lend its aid to such a scheme, it becomes the abettor of two gross evils. First, it legalizes a process ostensibly to inculcate morals, but which can only result in making many hypocrites. Secondly, it places in the hands of bigots and fanatics a weapon with which they can persecute those who do not agree with them in the matter of true Sabbath observance, to an almost unlimited extent. And we know from the example of some other States that such men are not lacking when the opportunity is presented.

And, furthermore, when the door is once opened to legislation of a religious character, the demand will not cease with the first success. The tendency already is forcibly to set aside everything that comes in the way of ambitious churchmen and church work. And, surely, if the right exists to say what men shall do religiously on any particular day of the week, there is no reason why other and further demands shall not be enforced at the call of the same influence that should secure the first step.

But some will say there are Sunday laws in nearly all the other States, and only in a few of them have such persecutions arisen, and it is designed here to exempt the class that have been persecuted in those States. But it should be borne in mind that the American Sabbath Union is a New York corporation organized for the very purpose of securing more stringent enforcement of State Sunday laws, and making those laws more stringent in their provisions. And to this end a part of their programme is to secure the enactment of a national Sunday law so that the general Government will not in any of its operations infringe upon the State laws.

And our legislature should bear in mind that a California Sunday law is a prominent factor in the effort for a national law. And this is why the agents of the American Sabbath Union (the California branch) are so zealously working to secure a State law. California stands almost alone among the States as having no such law, and hence is a barrier to the design of presenting before Congress the argument of a unanimity of the States on the Sunday-law question. Therefore the importance to the union of securing something, be it ever so mild at present, that can be called a Sunday law. But when the national law shall have been secured, then, according to the programme, will come a general stiffening up on the part of the States in the matter of enforced Sunday observance. The California legislature should never become a party to any such sinister scheme against the rights and liberties of the people.—*Signs of the Times.*

WHEN argument takes the place of epithet hurling the victory of right principles will dawn, for epithets may be hurled by any one, but sound argument is possible only on the side of the right.—*Peabody Reporter.*

#### For the Repeal of a Sunday Law.

JANUARY 10, Hon. John Wacek, of Prague, Minn., member of the Minnesota legislature, introduced in the lower House of that body a bill for the repeal of three sections, Sections 225, 227, and 229, of the Minnesota Sunday law.

The circumstances which led to the introduction of this bill were as follows: Certain petty prosecutions for violations of the Minnesota Sunday law had come up recently before Mr. Wacek, as city justice in the town of Prague, which he dismissed without a hearing. Upon this, a minister of the place came to him and said, "I thought you kept the Lord's day." "Indeed I do," he replied, "but I do not propose you shall enforce your religion upon somebody else, because you believe so and so." This seemed to cause Mr. Wacek to appreciate the real nature of Sunday laws, and prompted him to introduce the bill referred to. It is not quite a clean sweep of the State Sunday law, but is a movement in the right direction. Its object is evidently in the interests of religious liberty and opposed to bigotry and intolerance.

In view of these facts the following resolutions were passed at the Religious Liberty institute then in progress at Minneapolis:—

Believing that it is the duty of the State to protect liberty of conscience, and that this is the limit of its authority in matters of religion; therefore—

*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the Minnesota branch of the National Religious Liberty Association, in convention assembled, at Minneapolis, that all religious laws or measures looking toward the enforcement of religious rites or institutions by the State, should be repealed; and further—

*Resolved,* That we favor the passage of the bill now before the legislature of Minnesota, introduced by Mr. Wacek, known as H. R. 42, being a bill to repeal those sections of the penal code relating to labor, sports, and traffic on Sunday.

This quotation is from the *Home Missionary* for February. The St. Paul correspondent of the *Review and Herald* of the date of February 22, says:—

The fight here for freedom of conscience is moving on. Many are becoming interested in the Wacek bill, which proposes to repeal three sections of our Sunday laws. We believe this is a move in the right direction and sent petitions throughout the State. One section asked to be repealed is what is called the Barber's law. As was expected, this aroused a spirit of opposition from that source. We took occasion to send out a petition favoring the repeal, with some Religious Liberty literature to over three hundred boss barbers in the State, with a letter addressed to each. Yesterday a letter was received from one of these, who said he received signatures from everybody in the village. He said: "I see the same spirit of persecution is here in Minnesota that is in Tennessee. The head of that viper should be crushed. I am glad to stand by you in the fight." . . . Another bill was introduced, the 9th inst., which makes Sabbath-breaking a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of \$100, ninety days imprisonment or both. This increases the fine, ten, and the imprisonment, eight fold over what the law now provides. It seems as though this bill was an aid rather than a hindrance to us in our work.

This is precisely the same thing as occurred in Pennsylvania. The attempt to do away with certain of the Sunday laws of that State, and reduce the fine affixed to the Allegheny County law, was followed immediately by an active effort on the part of the religious legislators to have the penalties to the State Sunday laws increased. In that case, also, it was thought that this exhibition of enthusiasm for persecution had opened the eyes of some to the true animus of the movement. However this may be, the agitation certainly serves for education, and in this campaign the watchword is, "Educate!" "Educate!"









NEW YORK, MARCH 16, 1893.

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 appearance of Rev. A. H. Lewis, of the Seventh-day Baptists, before the Judiciary Committee of the legislature of Pennsylvania, in defense of true religion and sound legislation was but the one voice against the many at that hearing; but the truth is a host, and he who speaks it needs not the support of numbers. If the principles which Dr. Lewis presented do not prevail in the minds of his listeners it will be because they are fully set in their own minds to believe a lie and do the evil thing to which it prompts them. Attention is called to the interesting history recounted to the committee by Dr. Lewis, and to the force and soundness of thought shown in the synopsis of his remarks printed elsewhere.

IN a letter to the editor of the *Mail and Express* denying that she has experienced any change of opinion in reference to religious legislation in general, and the Sunday closing of the World's Fair by act of Congress, in particular, Miss Frances Willard says:—

When the enemies of Christianity combine, its friends must unite, and while many excellent men and women who are not enemies have taken the popular view of the question, that very fact leads the White Ribboners to be more conservative than might otherwise have been the case.

By this we are to understand that those who opposed congressional action to close the World's Fair on Sunday, espoused the popular side of the question, and Miss Willard and the editor of the *Mail and Express* are on the unpopular side. The side advocated by forty or fifty millions must be the popular side. Is it possible that the majority in this country are on the unpopular side? Is it possible that there could have been a mistake in the figures? There is a discrepancy somewhere. One is forced to believe Miss Willard and accept her statement as truth. There were no forty or fifty millions advocating Sunday closing. Miss Willard is on the side of the minority, and the unpopular and not the popular wish has triumphed.

THE Brooklyn *Eagle*, in an editorial item in reference to the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, and the possible action of the management as to the acceptance, or non-acceptance, of the appropriation with the proviso attached, says, "Even if the managers are convinced that the majority is for opening, they may hesi-

tate to offend a powerful minority." This is a true statement of the legislative history of this whole matter of Sunday closing, hesitation to offend a powerful minority.

THE act of Congress by which it has closed the World's Fair on Sunday has already been used as a precedent for further proceedings by Government officials, in the same line, and also to remind the administration just entering upon its duties that a new factor has entered into governmental affairs, the influence of which must be acknowledged in official life. One paragraph of the ministers' petition to Congress, respecting the forbidding of the Sunday concerts in connection with the inauguration, reads thus:—

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States, in deference to the Christian sentiment of the Nation clearly and unmistakably expressed by the religious press, the pulpit, and by petition, has by legal enactment closed the doors of the Columbian Exposition on Sundays.

Therefore, of course, because of this now well established precedent, Congress must permit nothing which would be inconsistent with that, and the official course of the Government and its representatives must conform to the requirements of the national religion, otherwise the country will be under condemnation of "national sin." The strange arrogance of the clergy in these matters is shown in a report of the proceedings of the Baltimore Conference of Methodists, where, after appointing a committee to wait upon President Cleveland in reference to the imprisonment of a Methodist missionary in Brazil, this paragraph is found:—

It was suggested that Bishop Newman be also made a member of the committee, and the bishop gracefully accepted the trust, remarking: "I will gladly call on President Cleveland, because he has been converted and is now a member of the Church. His inaugural address breathed the spirit of piety. He is a Christian man. On two occasions I had to rebuke a President of the United States because in his annual messages the name of God did not appear. He seemed astonished, but I told him I was the ambassador of the King of kings, and he was rebuked. Grover Cleveland needs no such rebuke."

This is the tone of the prelates of old,—mingled flattery and authority.

IN Brazil, a Methodist missionary has been sentenced to four months' imprisonment for publishing a book derogatory to Roman Catholicism. The Methodist Conference lately in session, appointed a committee to confer with President Cleveland in reference to the matter and seek, if possible, his interference in behalf of the persecuted missionary. There is imprisonment and persecution because of opposition to papal methods within our own boundaries. Why is not that also a proper subject for Executive interference? Have the Methodists considered the advisability of consulting with the President as to the religious persecutions at home?

If the Methodist Conference has not noticed the persecutions in Tennessee and

elsewhere, and has failed to take any measures for their suppression, what is the reason? It is because in Tennessee and other States where there have been fines and imprisonment for conscience' sake, the Methodists and other Protestants have not been the persecuted, but have been themselves the persecuting power. What is the consistency in their asking the President to interfere, when what is done to them in Brazil is no different from what they are doing to others at home. Would President Cleveland be justified in quoting to Bishop Newman his own words with which he accepted a place on the committee to call upon the President, and prove their applicability by referring him to an injunction which reads, "Whosoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them"?

AN editorial writer in the *Sabbath Recorder*, of March 9, speaking of the Roman Catholic influence in this country, for the teaching of religion in the public schools and the union of Church and State, says:

Let us remember, however, that the people who are just now introducing that dangerous principle are not Catholics. Jesuits can well afford to go on a vacation, while Protestants prepare the way for all that they have been desiring and seeking. If the national Government, in obedience to the wishes of an organized minority, is willing to place the stamp of its approval on one religious institution, why not another? Once established the principle and its application is easily extended.

That the application of the principle of Sunday-closing by congressional and governmental authority is very easily extended is shown by the Sunday-closing episode connected with the inauguration of President Cleveland, the official record and correspondence in regard to which is reprinted on another page.

DURING the past three years the *Arena* has published almost one hundred papers from the pen of women. This doubtless accounts largely for the fact that the *Arena* is by far the most popular review among thoughtful women in America. Among other noteworthy features of this issue of the *Arena* are Dr. Alfred Wallace's "Social Quagmire and the Way Out of It," Louis R. Ehrich's "A Religion for all Time," Prof. S. P. Wait's "Life after Death," B. O. Flower's "A Pilgrimage and a Vision, or Social Contrasts in Boston," Dr. F. J. Furnival's "Defense of Shakespeare," Dr. Leslie Keeley's "Defense of the Gold Cure for Drunkenness," and a well-written paper on the "Money Question," by John Franklin Clark. The *Arena* continues to be brave, progressive, and in touch with the advanced thought on social, economic, educational and religious subjects.

#### 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.