



"IF ANY MAN HEAR MY WORDS, AND BELIEVE NOT, I JUDGE HIM NOT: FOR I CAME NOT TO JUDGE THE WORLD, BUT TO SAVE THE WORLD."

Vol. 10. No. 43.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 31, 1895.

Price, 3 cents.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
 No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
 Entered at the New York Post-Office.

ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.
 CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, }
 LEON A. SMITH, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

THE "REASONS" THEN AND NOW.

BEFORE another number of this paper reaches the reader, at least two more Seventh-day Adventists will have been placed upon trial for their faith; one in Maryland, the other in Tennessee.

It is denied that the prosecution of these men is persecution, for "it is only enforcing the civil law." "They are not fined, imprisoned, or worked in the chain-gang for their religion, but only for violation of civil law." "They are left perfectly free to observe Saturday if they wish to do so, and they must respect *our* rights." Such are some of the excuses offered for pursuing with the "law," conscientious, upright men, whose lives are admitted to be above reproach.

It is not for the purpose of soliciting sympathy for Seventh-day Adventists that we state these facts, but to secure consideration of the principles involved. The contention that it is not religious persecution fails, in view of the facts as we have repeatedly given them to the public; for while Seventh-day Adventists are singled out and punished, frequently for the most trifling acts of unobtrusive private work, men who observe no day, or who at least frequently work on Sunday and do not observe the seventh day, are not molested. True, it would not make the "law" any better or justify its existence if all who violated it were prosecuted, but the purpose of its enforcement against Seventh-day Adventists would not be so apparent.

But, as before remarked, it is not for the purpose of exciting sympathy that we present these facts. It is that by seeing the evil of the practical workings of such "laws," men may be led to examine the principles, to recognize the moral obligation resting upon every man to obey God regardless of consequences; and also to recognize the fact that there is an infallible standard of right and justice in all things.

This perfect law of moral action is revealed in the Word of God, while in our civil relations this undeviating and perfect rule of action is written in the very law of our being.

This latter truth is expressed in the Declaration of Independence, in the words: "We hold these truths *to be self-evident*, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men."

This law of justice which, when obeyed, secures to every man civil liberty, is seen and recognized in proportion as the individual members of civil society recognize moral obligation; hence the largest measure of civil liberty is enjoyed in those countries that have most gospel light. Civil liberty is however incidental to, rather than the object of, the gospel. The purpose of the gospel is to bring men into harmony with God by writing the divine law in their hearts;¹ and this law being the "law of liberty"² not only gives true liberty to every one who is conformed to it; but it leads such an one to award to his fellowmen everything which he claims for himself.

The underlying principle of Christianity is supreme loyalty to God and *perfect recognition of the equality and rights of our fellow-creatures*. The Scriptures sum up all human duty in two precepts: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;" and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."³ And again: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."⁴ This is the perfect law, in obedience to which there is perfect liberty.

According to the pagan conception of the rights of man and of civil society, divinity inheres in the State; hence the maxim: "The voice of the people is the voice of God." This is a denial alike of a positive moral standard and of inalienable right. Under such a system toleration may exist, but liberty is impossible.

The Son of God came into the world to set men free, and to teach the divine truth that

there is an absolute standard of right established by God himself; and that nothing which is contrary to that standard is of any binding force whatever, or imposes upon the most humble man any obligation at all.

In the familiar words of the Saviour, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's," the Lord declared the absolute independence of every man from every other man *in everything pertaining to God*; and it was to teach this doctrine that the followers of Christ were sent into all the world.

The doctrine was not new, for it was divine; and the same truth which our Lord taught, and which his disciples were commissioned to teach, was truth as soon as there was a moral creature in existence. The three Hebrews asserted their independence of human government in their relations to God when they refused to worship the golden image.⁵ Daniel asserted the same principle when he disobeyed the king's commandment and prayed to God three times a day as he had done aforetime.⁶ But it was not until the gospel commission was given to the apostles that this doctrine was preached to the world in its fullness. And the preaching of this gospel of liberty was accounted treason against the State.

Paganism was so interwoven with the manners, customs and government of the people, that to introduce another religion was indirectly to attack the civil polity of Rome.

Even in the every-day-affairs of life, the Christian was compelled to run counter to the religious prejudices of his heathen neighbors. Gibbon says:—

The Christian, who with pious horror avoided the abomination of the circus or the theater, found himself encompassed with infernal snares in every convivial entertainment, as often as his friends, invoking the hospitable deities, poured out libations to each others' happiness. . . . Every art and every trade that was in the least concerned in the framing or adorning of idols, was polluted by the stain of idolatry.

The dangerous temptations which on every side lurked in ambush to surprise the unguarded believer, assailed him with redoubled violence on the day of solemn festivals. So artfully were they framed and disposed through the year, that superstition always wore the appearance of pleasure, and often of virtue. . . . On the days of general festivity, it was the custom of the ancients to adorn their doors with lamps and with branches of laurel, and to crown their heads with garlands of flowers. This innocent and elegant practice might have been tolerated as a mere civil institution.

¹ Jer. 31: 33.

² James 1: 25.

³ Matt. 22: 37, 39.

⁴ Matt. 7: 12.

⁵ Dan. 3: 1-26.

⁶ Dan. 6: 1-22.

But it most unluckily happened that the doors were under the protection of the household gods, that the laurel was sacred to the lover of Daphne, and that garlands of flowers, though frequently worn as a symbol either of joy or mourning, had been dedicated in their first origin to the service of superstition. The trembling Christians who were persuaded in this instance to comply with the fashions of their country and the commands of the magistrates, labored under the most gloomy apprehensions from the reproaches of their own conscience, the censures of the church, and the denunciations of divine vengeance.¹

To transgress these time-honored social customs was more than simply to offend the religious sensibilities of the people. Any disrespect to the gods of Rome was disrespect to the Roman State, because the two were so closely connected. These pagan rights which were so interwoven with the lives of the people, were not merely religious, but they were civil institutions as well; hence, to become a Christian was to be arrayed not only against the religion of Rome, but against the Roman Empire. It was for this reason that pagan Rome persecuted the early Christians.

Such was the logic of paganism in the palmy days of the Roman Empire, and such the "justification" of intolerance in the American Republic in the closing decade of the enlightened 19th century. In his dictum in the King case in Tennessee, August 1891, United States Judge Hammond said of Sunday enforcement:—

The courts cannot change that which has been done, however done, by the civil law in favor of the Sunday observers. The religion of Jesus Christ is so interwoven with the texture of our civilization and every one of its institutions, that it is impossible for any man or set of men to live among us and find exemption from its influences and restraints. Sunday observance is so essentially a part of that religion that it is impossible to rid our laws of it, quite as impossible as to abolish the custom we have of using the English language, or clothing ourselves with the garments appropriate to our sex. The logic of personal liberty would allow, perhaps demand, a choice of garments, but the choice is denied. So civil or religious freedom may stop short of its logic in this matter of Sunday observance. It is idle to expect in government perfect action or harmony of essential principles, and whoever administers, whoever makes, and whoever executes the laws, must take into account the imperfections, the passions, the prejudices, religious or other, and the errings of men because of these.

There is in this much of mere sentiment. But it was not for a theory merely that Rome pursued the Christians. Rome claimed to be supreme, to hold in her hands absolutely the destiny of every citizen. To become a Christian was to challenge the supremacy of Rome; it was to deny the authority that was claimed by the Roman State.

Thus what we call persecution in Rome was to the Romans, simply enforcing the law. From their standard they could pursue no other course. The emperors were under solemn obligation to their subjects to maintain unimpaired the authority of the Empire, and the better the emperors, the more regard they had for the government, the more conscientious in the discharge of their duties, the more intolerant they were toward those who challenged their authority.

The Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, was a man of spotless character. "This man," says John Stuart Mill, "a better Christian in all but the dogmatic sense of the word, than almost any of the ostensibly Christian sovereigns who have since reigned, persecuted Christianity." And why? Because as Mill says: "No Christian more firmly believes that atheism is false, and tends to the dissolution of society, than Marcus Aurelius believed the same things of Christianity."²

As a ruler Marcus Aurelius "deemed it his duty not to suffer society to fall to pieces; and

saw not how, if its existing ties were removed, any others could be formed which could again knit it together. The new religion openly aimed at dissolving these ties; unless, therefore, it was his duty to adopt that religion, it seemed to be his duty to put it down. Inasmuch, then, as the theology of Christianity did not appear to him to be true or of divine origin," "the gentlest and most amiable of philosophers and rulers, under a solemn sense of duty, authorized the persecution of Christianity."

But Christianity finally prevailed in the Roman Empire to the extent that Rome acknowledged the right of every man to freedom of conscience, and proclaimed such freedom to all. It was then that the papacy, though in its infancy, took from the world the liberty which had been won for it through the sufferings of the early Christians, and another system was established more intolerant, more despotic, even than paganism.

Through the Dark Ages this power held sway over the consciences of men. In the Reformation of the 16th century the true principle was again asserted; and to this the liberty of conscience which we enjoy to-day is due. But the high-water-mark of human liberty has been reached and already the ebb has commenced. Men are turning again to pagan maxims and methods. Again, to the State is assigned the place which belongs alone to God. "Law" must be enforced whether right or wrong, and "nothing is persecution which is authorized by 'law.'"

Thus reasoned the pagans when endeavoring to stamp out Christianity because it opposed itself to the laws of the Roman Empire prior to the rise of Constantine; thus reasoned the papacy in the Dark Ages, and thus reasons the popular Christianity and so-called Christian civilization of to-day. And if the principles advocated in the 19th century in the United States are true, then all the persecution of the past stands justified, for it has only been the enforcement of civil law.

CONSCIENCE IN POLITICS.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROOSEVELT has written a letter to a leading representative of the "good government" political party in this State, in which, while expressing his admiration for the "conscience vote" in politics, he also affirms that this vote should pay due attention to "questions of expediency."

Mr. Roosevelt is a warm supporter of the fusion ticket, and asserts that the "good government" party, in running a separate ticket, furnishes an example of "the conscience vote gone wrong." This vote ought, in other words, to be given to the fusion party, because that is the only one that can hope to be successful against those who are deemed the enemies of political purity.

This brings up the simple but important question whether the voter's conscience is to reform politics, or allow itself to be "reformed" thereby. It appears to us that any good conscience which has "fused" with the principles of the fusion platform, has suffered a downward "reform" quite equal in extent to the elevation it seeks to bring to the politics which it touches.

The reader will remember that this fusion platform advocates a Sunday which, while suppressing all "unnecessary" labor in the interests of public morality and health, admits of "orderly and harmless recreations," and such a measure of freedom in the selling of beer, tobacco, and the necessaries of life as may be deemed not in conflict with the pursuance of religious exercises and devotions.

We cannot see how any one who regards Sunday as a sacred day, can be blamed for inability to make his conscience fuse with this idea of Sunday observance.

Such facts clearly point out the necessity of keeping politics and religion entirely separate. If religion has any proper place in politics, then, in the issue which is now before the people, the conscientious voter must vote for such a degree of Sunday observance to be enforced by law as his conscience tells him to be right and in harmony with his convictions as to the character of the day. And he who believes Sunday to be a sacred day cannot, without violating his conscience, vote for the establishment of any observance which is not in harmony with that conception.

The truth is, that when religion is dragged into politics, the result is always a degradation of religion, and in very many instances, a degradation of the consciences of the voters. And this is certainly not the way to secure the purification and elevation of politics.

NEITHER INCREDIBLE NOR INCONSISTENT.

THE bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, assembled at Minneapolis, Oct. 22, issued their "pastoral address," in which, we are told, the chief points of interest are the references: "to the massacre of Christian missionaries in China, and the Sunday observance law." Concerning the latter the address says:—

Recent events in some parts of our country compel us to call your earnest attention to a widely spread and determined attack upon the use and purpose of the weekly day of rest known at the beginning of the Christian era, as the Lord's day. It is declared in the law of God to be his own day, and by the Saviour of man to be "made for man." It is protected by a divine command and by the perpetual sanctity of a human right. Men may and ought to worship God every day, but for the greater assurance of this duty one day in seven has, with the formal sanction of all Christian civilization, been set apart for its due observance. This order cannot be disturbed without grave evils to the individual and the family, to society and to State.

It seems almost incredible that our modern life should be capable of bringing into play any powers of evils that could seriously threaten the existence of so divine and beneficent an institution. And yet the peril and disaster of such a menace confront Christian people in wide areas of the country. We exhort you, dear brethren, to meet this menace with unflinching courage and resolute determination, and in no opportunity that may be presented to decline battle with the insatiate greed of the liquor traffic and the growing desire for popular pleasures and amusements, which with increasing boldness claim all days alike for their uses.

These words are, of course, spoken with reference to "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." It is the growing disregard of this day as a religious institution that is viewed by these bishops as an occasion of alarm and an "almost incredible" feature of "our modern life."

Yet these bishops know very well that the day "declared in the law of God to be his own day, and by the Saviour of man to be 'made for man,'" is not the first day of the week at all, but the seventh day. They know that God's Word never calls the first day of the week the Sabbath, or a sacred day, or commands anybody to keep it. It is by the will and the wisdom of man that the reverence and honor due the seventh day of the week, and given to it by God's people of old, have been transferred to the first day.

Now, cannot these bishops, and all other people as well, see that there is nothing more "incredible" in this modern laxity of Sunday observance, than there was in the transfer of Sabbath obligations from the seventh day to a day never called the sabbath by divine sanc-

¹ "Decline and Fall," Chap. XV., par. 15, 16.

² "Mill on Liberty."

tion? Is it not plain that the same authority which can erect an institution, can also without blame, pull it down or set it aside? This is certainly true; and since Sunday as a religious institution rests wholly upon the will and wisdom of man, we fail to see any act of impropriety, or occasion for surprise, if by the same will and authority, as represented in the present generation, this institution is changed from a day of rest and religious devotions, to one of "popular pleasures and amusements."

We are presenting the case in accordance with the logic of the bishops' position, and that of all those who observe Sunday as the "Christian sabbath." We do not want the world, or any part of it, to disregard God's holy day. No person can do this without suffering incalculable loss. But when we take the position that this day is the first day of the week, standing as we then do upon the will and authority of man rather than upon the Word of God, we thereby sanction the very thing which we would so earnestly seek to prevent.

If we would, without inconsistency, raise our voice against Sabbath desecration, we must do so from the standpoint of the word and authority of God alone.

MARYLAND'S PLEDGE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

THIS pledge or guarantee of freedom to the citizens of Maryland in the practice of religion, is contained in Article 36 of the Constitution of 1864, which is now in force. That article declares:—

That, as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore no person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless under the color of religion any man shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights.

It would seem that such a declaration as this in the fundamental law of the State should constitute a bulwark of liberty behind which the citizen might, without molestation, quietly practice that form of religion which his conscience might dictate, even though his practice should be at variance with that of the majority of citizens around him. Certainly a constitutional guarantee of religious freedom is a meaningless thing if its design is not to protect those in the minority; for the majority have the power to protect themselves. And in all cases where the minority is sufficiently powerful to command the respect of their opponents, such a constitutional guarantee of protection would doubtless be of force; but in case the minority whose privileges are in question is very weak in numbers, so as to be most in need of protection, as is true of the Seventh-day Adventists in Maryland, it seems that the constitutional guarantee is without any force whatever.

In proof of this, we have but to cite the case of Mr. Faust, an Adventist shoemaker in Baltimore, who was arrested for working at his trade in his own house on Sunday, with closed doors, and so quietly that the arresting officer had to peep in at the window to discover that any work was being done. Mr. Faust was indicted by the grand jury, and is now awaiting the summons of the trial court.

The parties who instigated this persecution are themselves more worthy of indictment, according to the spirit if not the letter of the

constitutional provision under consideration; for that expressly guards against injury to any citizens "in their natural, civil, or religious rights." And the injury done in this case was no less grievous or less to be condemned because it was not done "under the color of religion." It was religious prejudice and animosity that prompted the whole proceeding; and certainly no worse motive for infringing upon "natural, civil, or religious rights" could be found.

It is useless to deny that the Sunday work done by Seventh-day Adventists is the direct result of their religious views. They are religious people, believing in the binding obligation of the Sabbath, as well as of the other precepts of God's law. Most of them, before becoming Adventists, were observers of the first day of the week, and such they would doubtless be to-day did they not believe the seventh day to be the Sabbath according to the testimony of God's Word. That they now labor on the first day of the week, is in most cases due entirely to this change of religious belief.

Furthermore; as the SENTINEL has often stated, the Adventists see that it is impossible to sanctify the seventh day, as the Word of God commands, without making a separation between it and the other days of the week; and to do this, according to the directions of the fourth commandment, they must make that day, and that alone, the weekly day of rest. In other words, they must rest on the seventh day and treat the first day as a working day, after the example set by the Creator.

It is therefore from the free exercise of their religion, and from that only, that their disregard of the first-day sabbath arises. And the fundamental law of the State guarantees to them, in common with all others, freedom and security in this respect. There is nothing in ordinary, quiet, peaceful labor that is against "the good order, peace, or safety of the State." Indeed, there is nothing that now menaces the interests of the State in this respect more than the fact that so many men are averse to honest labor, and are trying to get a living by some other means.

It is obvious that we have reached a time when even a constitutional guarantee is inadequate to afford the weak minority protection in the exercise of religion against the prejudice and bigotry of the majority. And this, coming upon the end of our one hundred years' practice of the principle of liberty to all in the exercise of religious belief, constitutes a portentous and baleful sign of the times before us.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INFALLIBILITY.

THE *Christian Statesman*, of Oct. 19, discusses the authority of the "powers that be" from what it conceives to be the Protestant standpoint, in contrast with the authority claimed by Catholics for the pope of Rome. The *Statesman* does not believe in the doctrine of papal infallibility, or in the infallibility of any man, State, or Church; nevertheless it claims that the State, aided by the counsel of the Church, has the right to speak in enunciation of the claims of the divine law as applied to human affairs, and command obedience thereto from every citizen.

Just what is to be gained by choosing a fallible State, counseled by a fallible church, as authority for determining the will of God, in preference to an "infallible" pope, the *Statesman* does not make clear. For our own part, if obliged to choose between the two, we would prefer the latter, since in that case, believing our authority to be infallible, we would

not be continually harassed by the fear that it might, notwithstanding the wise counsel of the fallible church, be in the wrong. We would feel that in such a matter we could not afford to run any risks.

"The truly Christian State," says the *Statesman*, "acknowledging as it will the ultimate authority of God and its own subjection to Christ and his law, will avoid many of the mistakes into which the nations of the world have almost constantly fallen. But it will give evidence in many ways of its fallibility. And yet in the midst of their errors of judgment in legislative enactments and governmental administration, the 'powers that be' may claim the true authority that comes from God in all they justly do for the maintenance of human rights." Of course whatever is "justly" done by the State "for the maintenance of human rights" has the sanction of God. He has ordained them expressly for this purpose, and there is no dispute among any persons who believe in God upon this point.

But it is not true that the State has any right to speak as an interpreter of the divine will, or that any person is bound to obey it when it presumes so to do. The *Statesman* admits that there will be "errors of judgment in legislative enactments and governmental administration;" and this alone invalidates the *Statesman's* position. For when the State makes one of its "errors of judgment in legislative enactments," and commands its subjects to do that which is wrong, what course is the citizen to pursue? Is he to yield to the law of the State, knowing that the law of God commands him otherwise? for the law of God commands everything that is right, and prohibits all that is wrong.

So long as the State keeps within its God-appointed sphere, confining the exercise of its power to the maintenance of human rights, no good citizen will question its authority or desire to disobey its injunctions. But when it presumes to pronounce upon questions of religious duty, as set forth in God's moral law, it touches upon that concerning which no fallible power has any right to issue a command. The plan of salvation would be a failure without an absolutely infallible authority to which every person is to be subject upon such points.

That authority is the Word of God, interpreted by the Spirit of God, given to every person in answer to the prayer of faith. "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God," and "God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." 1 Cor. 2:10. Wherefore it is also written, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." James 1:5. We are to come to God, and not to any man or organization of men,—to the divine word, interpreted by the Spirit of God, and not to the fallible State directed by the counsel of the fallible church, for guidance in the pathway of righteousness. Every person may thus be infallibly guided in every point of moral obligation.

The State is altogether out of her sphere in attempting to act the part of a moral guide. The very means by which the State is constituted precludes it from any right in this respect, for the ballot, representing the opinion of the majority, can never in this wicked world where Christians are so sadly in the minority, determine the question of any person's fitness for the position of dictator to his fellowmen on moral questions, whether he has the "aid" of the church's counsel or not. Even were the majority of voters Christians, this would not help the matter, since the fallibility of human judgment would prevent

any certainty that their choice would be the right one. And even could they unerringly select the very best man for their purpose, the fallibility of those same men would still constitute a fatal defect in the working of the plan. It would only be putting the best men in the place of God, and thus erecting a standard of moral authority infinitely below that which the need of the race demands.

In other words, not the authority which commands men, but the individual commanded, must be responsible for any deviation on his part from the pathway of moral rectitude. God could not hold any person accountable for wrong doing while there was a possibility that the authority to which he had been made amenable might be itself in the wrong.

According to the *Statesman's* plan, "a wise State" would not "refuse to receive the aid that the church can give toward a better understanding of the divine criterion of national conduct." In other words "the State would show its wisdom if, when some difficult question had to be decided in its counsels, and it was at a loss to know what was the requirement of the divine standard for nations, it would apply to the church of Christ for help in the interpretation of that perfect law." This is precisely what the "wise State" did in the Dark Ages. Nor was the proceeding such a difficult and dangerous one then as it will be now; for there was none then to dispute with the church of Rome the title of "Church of Christ," while now the number of contestants would be almost legion. What church shall it be that shall be privileged to thus direct the State in matters which involve an interpretation of the divine law? Shall it be Catholic or Protestant? and if Protestant, which one of the many Protestant sects? Does any one suppose that this question can be settled without a bitter contest? "Old controversies will be revived and new ones will be added;" the cause of pure religion will be neglected, unscrupulous hypocrites will seek church connection for political ends, and the church will sink lower and lower until it will present a literal fulfillment of the prophetic words, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Rev. 18:2.

And this terrible picture is actually ere long to be realized, in the consumation of the movements which are everywhere fast dragging the Church into politics. And at that time the call will be sounded, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18:4.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION.

THE Board of Public Schools of Linwood, Nebr., recently decided to discontinue the repeating of the Lord's prayer or any other prayer, or the conducting of any religious exercise, in the schools under their control. The decision, of course, caused no small stir in the religious element of the place, the result of which was a petition containing three hundred and fifty names, praying the Board to reconsider their action.

The petition failed. The spokesman who voiced the sentiments of the majority of the Board, said, when the petition was presented: "I intend voting to-night as I did last Saturday night. I do it from a firm conviction that I am right, and that all who are now opposing me will yet acknowledge their error. There are none in Linwood more firm in their belief of the Bible than I am, nor any more anxious to see their children raised up in its

teachings than I. But the church and the home are the places for that, and my children receive it thoroughly at both places. I believe in crushing such troubles as these at the beginning. The majority should not force their views to obtain in the free schools."

By a majority of one, the School Board decided to adhere to their decision.

The religious element of Linwood, headed by the Presbyterian minister, will now agitate for the reestablishment of religious exercises in the schools. At an interview (as reported) the latter said: "This affair did not end, as far as I am concerned, Saturday night. I have already begun hunting up all authorities on the subject. We shall see what 'sectarian' means. I am now very hot on this subject, and will not talk on this subject from the pulpit while I am. But in two weeks I will be cooled down as well as prepared thoroughly. Then, look out."

The position of the Board is the right one. This nation is built upon the repudiation of the principle of "taxation without representation;" and when religion is admitted into the public schools, which all classes are taxed to support, this repudiated principle is reaffirmed; for it is impossible to represent all classes in any arrangement which admits of religious teaching or exercises as a feature of public school work. Such an arrangement makes the school in reality sectarian, for a sect is nothing else than a class or party of people who are distinguished from others by a difference of belief, and as properly designates atheists, Jews, or Mohammedans, as it does Christians; and only that is unsectarian which is common to all sects.

Religious instruction is indeed a prime necessity in the proper education of every child; but it must not be secured at the sacrifice of justice; and moreover, from the very fact that it is a matter of such importance, arises the necessity of safeguarding it more than can be done by committing it to the hands of public school teachers.

WHAT A CONSTITUTION IS.

[By Addison Blakely, Ph. D., Lecturer in Political Science and History, University of Chicago.]

A CONSTITUTION, in its broadest sense, is a photograph of a government and its workings. The written constitution is merely the most important characteristics or phases of this photograph set down in writing, in the interests of stability and for the conservation of justice.

The unwritten constitution is those methods of governmental procedure which have grown up or have been acquiesced in by governmental agents, either in the interests of convenience or from force of necessity arising from the demands of the people. Acts of arbitrary power, so common in past times, have had to give way, as enlightenment has advanced, to usages recognizing and protecting the rights of the people. As these usages acquire permanence they become part of the constitution and enter into the life and character of government.

In other words, the constitution is the photograph or description of the governmental institutions making up the machinery of governments. An institution is any mechanism used in the determination of what law is and in its enforcement. This is why the constitution is called the "fundamental law of the land." It is the law governing the ascertainment and enforcement of all other law.

The purpose of the constitution is to have an established and just mode of determining and applying the rights and obligations of

each in reference to others. The law is opposed to experiments—to all attempts at creation. It is necessarily conservative. It regards with jealous care the principles and maxims that have cost so much labor and blood. Every letter in our fundamental law has cost a life. Little wonder then that the law is conservative. It may be so to a fault; but better so than to be tossed to and fro by every gust of wind yclept reform. The law must be stable; it must be permanent. Else it were of little value.

These features of justice, stability, and age are what give to the great English constitution its importance and sacredness. The English people, in their several homes,—in Britain, in America, in Australia,—regard their fundamental law with reverence and awe. And rightly so. For well nigh a score of centuries this constitution has given to the English people the freest government and the most personal liberty of any constitution on earth.

A constitution, then, is merely the legal limitations, written and unwritten, governing the machinery of the body politic. Government itself, wherever crime is, is an absolute necessity. But a power so great, so universal, so irresistible as a governmental corporation necessarily is, must needs be confined in well-defined limits, or else the individual must perhaps suffer worse at the hands of this power than at the hands of the comparatively weaker criminal. Experience has demonstrated this, and the constitutional limitations of the age are the result. Thus the constitution is an afterthought. It is an upgrowth of political needs and the people's welfare. "Written constitutions," says Webster, "sanctify and confirm great principles, but the latter are prior in existence to the former."

And so declares the law. "What is a constitution, and what are its objects?" inquires the judicial magistrate in applying the fundamental law. "It is easier to tell what it is not, than what it is. It is not the beginning of a community nor the origin of private rights; it is not the fountain of law, nor the incipient state of government; it is not the cause, but consequence, of personal and political freedom; it grants no rights to the people, but is the creature of their power, the instrument of their convenience. Designed for their protection in the enjoyment of the rights and powers which they possessed before the constitution was made, it is but the framework of the political government, and necessarily based upon the preëxisting condition of laws, rights, habits and modes of thought. There is nothing primitive in it; it is all derived from a known source. It presupposes an organized society, law, order, property, personal freedom, a love of political liberty, and enough of cultivated intelligence to know how to guard it against the encroachments of tyranny. A written constitution is, in every instance, a limitation upon the powers of government in the hands of agents; for there never was a written republican constitution which delegated to functionaries all the latent powers which lie dormant in every nation, and are boundless in extent and incapable of definition."

Wherever force is, there is need for law. Wherever authority is granted, there is need for a measure of that authority. It is this purpose that the constitution serves. It expresses in words what exists in right and natural law, bounds over which those in control must not go. It is a restraint upon those exercising the "powers that be." The Constitution is for the purpose of affording legal

¹ Webster's Works, Vol. 2, page 292.

² 15 Missouri State Reports, p. 13; Cooley's "Constitutional Limitations."

protection to minorities against the forces exercised by majorities—it is to protect the weak against the strong.

When, therefore, the State legislature, the executive, or any other power attempts to interfere with one's freedom respecting Sabbath rest, the constitution steps in and calls a halt. It directs that no power of the State shall interfere with private rights; that religious belief and worship shall forever be free; that freedom to contract to work on any day shall not be abrogated; that, in short, men shall be men and not slaves. Such is the constitution, and such is the protection it is designed to afford.

THE WORLD'S "CHRISTIAN" NATIONS.

THE Apostle Paul, addressing the Christian Church at Corinth, wrote: "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh. For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

The Christian's warfare is different in its weapons, its nature, and its results, from that warfare which is "after the flesh." As the text declares, the Christian does not war "after the flesh," yet his warfare is not one-sided and incomplete, but is directed against every foe that can oppose him. It is the only warfare that needs to be conducted in this world.

But it is not the kind of warfare that the world most generally sees, and for which the greatest preparations are made, even by those who profess to be Christians; and in the light of the word of God spoken by Paul, how wickedly absurd appears the idea so commonly advanced by certain would-be reformers, that the leading civilized nations of the earth, which manifest a regard for religion, are Christian. By a mere comparison with pagan nations, it is plainly evident that the so-called Christian nations of our day are no more Christian in character than are those of "darkest Africa." Such a comparison we find in the *New York Sun* of Oct. 25. The *Sun* says:—

A delegate to the Convention of the American Board of Foreign Missions gave warning that if China were not speedily Christianized, she would endanger the civilized nations by raising vast hordes of fighters able to swoop down upon them. Brother Hyde does not seem to have thought of the fact that it is the Christianized nations of Europe which keep the vast hordes of fighters and do most of the fighting. In view of the armed millions and the many wars of the great powers of Christendom, we do not see how he can believe that the Christianization of China would prevent her from raising great fighting armies. When Christianized, she would probably want to keep up with European Christendom, in which case her armies would be larger than the combined armies of Russia, Germany, France, Austria, Italy, and England,—all Christian countries.

The *Ying Ping*, or national army of pagan China, added to the other Chinese armies, is smaller, in proportion to the population from which it is drawn, than the army of any of the Christian countries of Europe. The army needed in pagan India is small as compared with that needed in Christian Germany. Japan, since she adopted the customs of Christian nations, has raised an army far greater than she ever had before.

It is the Christian countries, not the pagan ones, that have set the example of maintaining gigantic military establishments. There have been ten times, or twenty, or a hundred times, more fighting and bloodshed in Christian Europe within the past century than in pagan China, though the population of China is probably greater than that of all Europe.

We do not see, therefore, how it can be supposed that the Christianization of China, if China after her Christianization shall follow the example of the Christian powers, is to prevent her from raising armies as big as Christian armies, and as savage on the field of battle as Christian armies.

The pagan races of continental Asia are far more

peaceful than the Christian races of continental Europe.

The Christian English, French, Dutch and Spaniards have butchered untold numbers of pagan Asiatics. It is possible that the Christianization of the Asiatics might be the means of leading them to retaliate upon their Christian enemies in Europe. If China shall ever be Christianized, and shall then put in the field armed hordes equal to those of Christian Europe, and able to fight as hard and as long as the Christians, she will be the foremost military power in the world.

We suppose that the *Sun* here uses the terms, "Christian" and "Christianization" in sarcasm. But the trouble is that through the prevailing low conception of Christianity, mere civilization is mistaken for it by very many minds. The degree of civilization which prevails to-day is indeed largely due to the influence of Christianity, and civilization is very good so far as it goes; but it falls infinitely short of being Christianity itself.

The Scriptures tell us something about a real Christian nation. We learn from it that a Christian nation will be saved from earth in the kingdom of God. Speaking of the time when the Lord God will "swallow up death in victory" and will "wipe away tears from off all faces," when his people will say, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us," the prophet says: "In that day shall this song be sung in the land of Judah: We have a strong city; salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks. Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth, may enter in." Isa. 26:1, 2. And, as we also learn from the Scriptures, the "truth" must be kept by each individual, for himself, in his own heart, to secure his entrance into the "strong city" of God's salvation. So that the only Christian nation on earth is the "nation" of those who, among all peoples and in all climes, keep the truth of God in their hearts.

"BLUE LAWS" REALLY DID EXIST.

[*New York Herald*, Oct. 7.]

NEW HAVEN, Conn., Oct. 6, 1895.—Attorney Henry G. Newton, of this city, who has a bias in favor of quaint and curious archaeological things, has accomplished some deep-sea dredging in the Elm City archives lately, groping after the authentic story of the famous old "Blue Laws" of the Nutmeg commonwealth. He came up out of the depths a day or two ago, and having divested himself of his antiquarian armor, furnished to the New Haven Historical Society the complete story of his findings.

Mr. Newton's report states positively that there is no such thing as Blue Laws anyhow—they are an out-and-out myth, just like all the rest of the treasured and trusted traditions of the world. In the second place, he alleges, what Blue Laws there are, are simply and solely an Elm City institution.

Attorney Newton says that the old Tory minister, the Rev. Sam Peters, who ran the English church in Hartford and in the Hebron village, among the wild hills to the east of that town, about the time of the Revolution, was to blame for all the Blue Laws ever enacted; that New Haven's alleged code of bluish acts was a fiction of his ingenious but spenetic and malicious brain.

The Rev. Samuel, who was English through and through, was not at all fond of his sharp-witted and cute but sombre-visaged Yankee parishioners and neighbors, and so, after the country, ringing with the peals of liberty bells, had become too warm to hold even a Tory clergymen comfortably and he had scudded back to England, he promptly sat down to his table and wrote his rancid book of Blue Laws—in violet ink, most likely. That was

somewhere about 1781, and his famed and wonderful work, which is now one of the curiosities of the earth, embodied more than two score of the very bluest Blue Laws—of twisted forged cast steel copper riveted, with galvanized wrought iron gearings—all the Blue Laws, in fact, that have been imputed to the handiwork of "blue," long-nosed, lean and vinegar visaged Yankees.

"HUMBUG AND FRAUD."

"Many years ago," said Lawyer Newton in discussing the subject, "a small book containing these supposed Blue Laws, which were really extracts from Peters' history, was published, and is even now referred to as an authority by the unsuspecting. I saw them, and my anger was kindled, for does not every dictionary and encyclopædia say they are a humbug and a fraud, and has not Trumbull's 'Blue Laws, True and False,' put an end to the infamous slander? And so it seemed to be time to say something about Blue Laws.

"Now, then, the existence of such a code of Blue Laws is fully disproved; in fact, the only authority in its favor is Peters himself, who is untrustworthy. Peters' 'History of Connecticut'—the Blue Laws are embodied therein—was first published in London in 1781. It was put forth anonymously, and its title page bore the inscription, 'By a Gentleman of the Province.' That its author hated Connecticut is hardly to be doubted, and New Haven seems to have been foremost among the objects of his detestation. My special purpose is to show how much of Peters' Blue Laws was actually in force in New Haven before the union of the New Haven colony with the colony of Connecticut; how much a hundred years thereafter and how much now."

To that end he minutely and specifically examined each one of Samuel Peters' forty-five Blue Laws, and carefully compared or contrasted the whole batch with the actual codes of laws of the Nutmeg State and of the colonies.

DOESN'T DISPROVE THEIR ACCURACY.

He found them, he said, to be a literal reproduction of old-time Connecticut or New Haven colony acts. Indeed, instead of refuting and confuting the old Tory minister's Blue-Law law book, Attorney Newton's disquisition showed, if it showed anything, that Mr. Samuel Peters was an admirably exact reporter, or, at least, copyist.

In fact, it is not easy to comprehend just what Mr. Newton's contention about Blue Laws is, unless he erroneously imagines that it is the popular idea that the colonies enacted a special and distinct code of adamantine laws, and in so many words gave it the theatrical title of "Connecticut Blue Laws." But no one, probably, ever supposed any such thing. And certainly, so long as it is proven that the Rev. Samuel Peters' book is a fairly accurate compilation or summary of the exceptionally rigorous and iron-edged Puritanic enactments of either the New Haven or Connecticut colonies, then Mr. Newton's averment that the Blue Laws are a myth is as incomprehensible as it is pointless.

Here are some of Peters' bluest laws, all of which are identical, in a vital sense, with old colonial enactments:—

No. 1. (Curious rather than blue.) The governor and magistrates convened and General Assembly are the supreme power under God of this independent dominion.

No. 2. From the determination of the Assembly no appeal shall be made.

No. 10. No one shall be a freeman or give a vote unless he be converted and a member in full communion of one of the churches allowed in this dominion.

No. 12. Each freeman shall swear by the blessed God to bear true allegiance to this dominion, and that Jesus is the only King.

No. 13. No Quaker or dissenter from the established worship of this dominion shall be allowed to give a vote for the election of magistrates or any other officer.

No. 14. No food or lodging shall be afforded to a Quaker, Adamite, or other heretic.

No. 15. If any person turns Quaker he shall be banished, and not suffered to return under pain of death.

BARS UP TO PRIESTS.

No. 16. No priest shall abide in this dominion; he shall be banished, and suffer death on his return. Priests may be seized by any one without a warrant.

No. 18. No one shall ride on the sabbath day or walk in his garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting.

No. 19. No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair or shave on the sabbath day.

No. 20. No woman shall kiss her child on the sabbath day.

No. 21. The sabbath shall begin at sunset on Saturday. [Mr. Newton, commenting, said: "The twenty-first Blue Law, making the sabbath begin at sunset, was, of course, the law of the New Haven Colony and the law of our forefathers down to a comparatively recent period. Under the Mosaic law Sabbath began at sunset, and such has been the law of the Sabbath since the evening and the morning of the first day."]

No. 22. To pick an ear of corn growing in a neighbor's garden shall be deemed a theft.

No. 24. When it appears that an accused has confederates, and he refuses to discover them, he may be racked. [This is about the only Peters' Blue Law to which Mr. Newton refuses to give a foundation in fact. He says: "I do not find any indication that this statement is true, and Trumbull says it is false." Anyhow, it is by no means a monstrously Blue Law, as compared with some of the black-and-blue ones already quoted.]

No. 27. Whosoever publishes a lie to the prejudice of his neighbor, shall sit in the stocks or be whipped fifteen stripes.

No. 28. No minister shall keep a school.

DEATH FOR MEN STEALERS.

No. 30. Men stealers shall suffer death.

No. 31. Whosoever wears clothes trimmed with gold, silver or bone lace, above two shillings by the yard, shall be presented by the grand jurors, and the selectmen shall tax the offender at 300 pounds estate.

No. 33. Whosoever sets a fire in the woods, and it burns a house, shall suffer death; and persons suspected of this crime shall be imprisoned without benefit of bail.

No. 34. Whosoever brings cards or dice into this dominion shall pay a fine of five pounds.

No. 35. No one shall read common prayer, keep Christmas, or Saints' day, make minced pies, dance, play cards, or play on any instrument of music, except the drum, trumpet and jewsharp.

No. 40. Adultery shall be punished with death.

PARENTAL CONSENT NECESSARY.

No. 43. No man shall court a maid in person or by letter without first obtaining the consent of her parents; five pound penalty for the first offense; ten pound penalty for the second, and for the third imprisonment during the pleasure of the court.

No. 44. Married persons must live together or be imprisoned.

No. 45. Every male shall have his hair cut round according to a cap.

In conclusion and self-contradiction, the lawyer frankly admitted that "the Blue Laws of Peters are, for the most part, a reasonably correct statement of the law and practice of our forefathers of New Haven. Some of them are exaggerations; a few are fictitious, but probably not intentionally so."

WHAT MAY WE NOT EXPECT NEXT?

The *Mail and Express*, of the 26th inst., had the following in its sporting columns:—

Many interesting club and century runs are scheduled for this afternoon and to-morrow by the local cycling clubs, which should bring out a large attendance of wheelmen. Nearly every popular town within easy riding distance of the metropolis will be visited by one or more clubs, and many exciting brushes on

the road may be looked for. Of course, interest principally will be centered in the 100 miles ride of the Century Wheelmen, in which nearly every prominent club for miles around New York have representatives entered, in hopes of capturing the handsome club trophy, which will be awarded to the organization having the largest number of survivors.

"To-morrow" was Sunday, Oct. 27; and the *Mail and Express* has long been the mouth-piece of the American Sabbath Union. The *Mail and Express* is also the champion of "law and order," and believes in enforcing "law because it is law," whether right or wrong, and that "the best way to secure the repeal of a bad law is by enforcing it." The Sunday "law" of New York forbids under penalty all "public sports, exercises, pastime, or shows, upon the first day of the week." The "many interesting club and century runs" "scheduled" for "to-morrow [Oct. 27] by the local cycling clubs," and noticed so approvingly by the *Mail and Express*, were all so many violations both of the "law" of New York and, from the standpoint of the *Mail and Express*, of the law of God. But does that paper really believe that Sunday is the Sabbath?

ENFORCING BAD LAW.

The President of the New York Social Reform Club Says a Bad Law Ought Not to be Enforced.

[*New York Sun*, Oct. 25.]

EX-ASSEMBLYMAN ERNEST HOWARD CROSBY, who introduced the High License bill in the Assembly several years ago, and is now president of the New York Social Reform Club, said last evening:—

"I do not sympathize with the present excise movement in this city. It seems to me most unfortunate that the question of honest government has got mixed up with it. I differ radically from those who think that the best thing to do with a law which is either bad in itself or ahead of or counter to public opinion is to enforce it. I believe that such laws should become dead letters.

"I fully understand the dilemma in which officials find themselves who have sworn to enforce unwise laws, but there is one simple way in which to resolve the dilemma, and that is to resign the office, or, better still, to decline to take such an oath."

ALL SUNDAY LAWS INTOLERANT.

THE intolerant character of all Sunday laws, even the most "liberal," is illustrated from a legal standpoint, as follows, by a writer in the *Boston Investigator*, who signs himself, "An Iowa Lawyer":—

John Doe and Richard Roe are arrested on Monday morning, accused of the crime(?) of working on Sunday. Mr. Doe, on being arraigned, pleads not guilty, but admits that he had worked all day on Sunday, and that it was not the work of either necessity or charity. The court says that he shall have to find the defendant guilty under the law which provides:

Section 4.072, Code of Iowa: "If any person be found on the first day of the week, commonly called sabbath, engaged . . . buying or selling property of any kind, or in any labor, the work of necessity and charity only excepted, . . . shall be fined in a sum not more than five dollars nor less than one dollar, . . . and shall be committed to the jail of said county until said fine, together with cost of prosecution, shall be paid."

Mr. Doe.—But, your honor, let me read the balance of that section, as follows: "But nothing herein contained shall be construed to extend to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath."

Now, sir, it is true that I worked all day yesterday,

but I conscientiously observed Saturday as my Sabbath.

The Court.—These facts, then, will change the nature of the case. Your conscience, although a matter of perhaps education, or a whim of your own, eliminates the element of crime from the case, and you are acquitted.

The case of Mr. Roe is called; and he pleads not guilty. Admits that he rested on Saturday and worked all day on Sunday, alongside of Mr. Doe.

Did you conscientiously observe Saturday as your Sabbath, or was your labor on Sunday that of necessity or charity?

Mr. Doe.—My conscience prompts me to tell the truth. There was no matter of conscience with me in resting on Saturday; it was a matter of personal preference; nor was there any necessity or charity in my labor on Sunday. I did it for the money. My conscience does not require me to observe any one day more than another. I disturbed no one with my labor, nor did I infringe upon the rights of any one.

The Court.—Your conscience prompting you to tell the truth, and not going to the extent of requiring you to observe one day as a sabbath, constitutes you a criminal. It is the duty of the court to protect society against the acts of criminals. Our statutes, unlike those of Tennessee, are quite liberal. In this State you have the choice of two days, while in that State you are limited to one. If you cannot conscientiously observe the one, we will compel you to observe the other. This law is destined to regulate the conscience of the citizen in case the citizen will not regulate it himself, so as to keep one day at least.

Such is one of the absurdities of Sunday "laws."

THE "JEWISH SPECTATOR" CORRECTS THE "SENTINEL."

SOME weeks ago we printed the following:—

One of the ceremonies observed by Jews in the celebration of Yom Kippur, or the Great Day of Atonement, is the sacrifice of a live chicken by each household.

The head of the house, it is said, swings a live chicken over the head of each member of his family, after which the fowl is *killed by the rabbi* and eaten by the family.

New York has an ordinance against the sale of live fowls, and it has been the custom of the police to raid the Jewish quarter every year at the Atonement season and arrest all dealers found with live chickens in their shops.

This year the Jews got an injunction, restraining the health authorities from making the customary arrests, but for some reason it proved to be invalid, and the authorities manifested a special zeal in making the raid. About fifty arrests were made on September 27th.

The Jews declare the raid an outrage, and so it was. No sanitary code or other code that interfered similarly with a Roman Catholic festival or with the rights of popular Protestantism could survive a week in New York; and neither should this senseless regulation. It may be wise to restrict to some extent the sale of live fowls in a large city, but to apply such a rule so strictly as to prevent the Jews from observing a time-honored, though it must be confessed, a very foolish religious custom, is an exhibition of despotism more worthy of Russia than it is of an American city.

The *Jewish Spectator* quotes this and then makes this comment:—

Our worthy contemporary and liberal co-worker does not state the case quite correctly. It is not one of the ceremonies observed by Jews, but only by a number of orthodox Jews, who still cling to this *superstitious* custom, which has met with disapproval on the part of many celebrated orthodox authors of ritual codexes, and is "more honored in the breach than in the observance" by the intelligent orthodox Jews of New York and other cities. Nor is the chicken *killed by the rabbi*. (Why use italics?) Any orthodox Jew, an expert in killing fowls, having the *permission of an orthodox rabbi*, can follow this "bloody business." But the logic of the *SENTINEL* is sound and to the point. The sanitary code of large cities requires that no fowls should be kept for any length of time by dealers, but in this instance the fowls for *Kappores* are immediately killed after the performance, hence the raid of the police is but an exorcism of prejudice, and naught else. Had those poor Jews on East Broadway the influence of ward politicians, and of wealthy monopolists, the raid would not have been made with such vindictive zeal.

The Board of Health of the city of New York neglects to enforce many a sanitary regulation much

more important and of greater consequences. We are by no means in favor of the above-mentioned custom, fraught with superstition. In fact, we would like to see it suppressed and obliterated—but the policeman's club is not the instrument to do it. Education and a better understanding will lead the more ignorant adherents of Jewish orthodoxy to learn that the sacrificial polity of Israel has ceased, and soon will they, of their own volition, abolish an observance which has no biblical origin and authority, and has always been looked upon as a questionable minhag.

We give place to this as a matter of justice to those Jews who do not "still cling to this superstitious custom," and because we desire to place before our readers only the most reliable information upon all subjects. We were misled as to the exact facts by the daily papers.

"THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE."

HAVE you seen "The Rights of the People, or Civil Government and Religion"? Have you read it? The following is the Table of Contents:—

PART I.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION.

Christianity and the Roman Empire. What Is Due to God, and What to Cæsar. The Powers That Be.

PART II.—THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE.

How the United States Became a Nation. What Is the Nation? Who Made the Nation? Religious Right in the United States. Religious Right Invaded. The People's Right of Appeal. National Precedent on Right of Appeal. The Buglers, the Miners and Sappers. The Sunday-law Movement in the Fourth Century, and Its Parallel in the Nineteenth. Will the People Assert and Maintain Their Rights? Religious Right in the States.

APPENDIXES.

The Declaration of Independence. The Constitution of the United States. The Dred Scott Decision. The "Christian Nation" Decision.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Christ or Diana? George Washington. Thomas Jefferson. James Madison. Abraham Lincoln. Andrew Jackson. James G. Blaine.

This is one of the most valuable numbers of the "Religious Liberty Library" yet issued, and is amply worth the price of a year's subscription. It costs however, in paper covers, only forty cents, and can be had in cloth for \$1.00. It is an invaluable aid to the study of the present series of Sabbath-school lessons.

Address Pacific Press, 43 Bond St., New York.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET.

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

It perfectly secures pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it can not fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

Table with 3 columns: No., Description, Price. Includes items like Russia leather for 2 pens (10c), Seal skin (15c), and Seal skin (40c).

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices.

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street, New York City. Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

One of the Most Valuable Helps to the Study of the New Testament Ever Published.

A Sample Page.

XIII. XIV. I CORINTHIANS. 459

13 'Εάν ταις γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, γέγονα χαλκὸς ἤχων ἢ κίμβαλον ἀλαλάζον. 2 'Καὶ ἐάν' ἔχω προφητείαν, καὶ εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γνῶσιν, καὶ ἐάν' ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν, ὥστε ὄρη μεθιστάνειν, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐθέν εἰμι. 3 'Καὶ ἐάν' ἴψωμίω πάντα τὰ ἐπιπόρχοντά μου, καὶ ἐάν' παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα κευθῶμαι, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦμαι. 4 Ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ ζηλοῖ, ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ περιεργεῖται, οὐ φυσιοῦται, οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ, οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς, οὐ παροξύνεται, οὐ λογιζέται τὸ κακόν, οὐ χαίρει ἐπι τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, συγκαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πάντα στέγει, πάντα πιστεύει, πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα ὑπομένει. 8 Ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε ἐκπίπτει. εἴτε προφητεῖαι, καταργηθήσονται· εἴτε γλώσσαι, παύσονται· εἴτε γνῶσις, καταργηθήσεται. 9 ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκομεν, καὶ ἐκ μέρους προφητεύομεν. 10 ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον, τότε τὸ ἐκ μέρους καταργηθήσεται. 11 ὅτε ἦμην νήπιος, ὡς νήπιος ἐλάλουν, ὡς ἀνεπίστατος ἔβροχον, ὡς νήπιος ἐλογιζόμην. ὅτε ἐγενόνα ἀνὴρ, κατήργηκα τὰ τοῦ νηπίου. 12 βλέπομεν γὰρ ἀρτι δι' ἰσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον· ἀρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθη. 13 νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη, τὰ τρία ταῦτα· μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη. 14 Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε. 2 ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλῶσση, οὐκ

κάν λα. ἰ καν τλα. μεθιστάνει LTr. οὐδέν EOW. καν LTr. ψωμίω E. καν λα. κευθῶμαι I shall be buried T. οὐθέν T. ἡ ἀγάπη] LTr. συν. T. πίπτει LTr. [δέ] Tr. — τότε LTr. AW. ἐλάλουν ὡς νήπιος LTr. AW. ἐβροχον ὡς νήπιος, ἐλογιζόμην ὡς νήπιος LTr. 8 — δὲ but LTr.

THE INTERLINEAR LITERAL TRANSLATION

OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT WITH

The Authorized Version conveniently presented in the margins for ready reference

And with the various readings of the editions of Elzevir 1624, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford and Wordsworth.

Price \$3.00

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO., 43 Bond Street, New York. OAKLAND, CAL. KANSAS CITY, MO.

CYCLONE WASHER! We Have Struck It! The Champion of All Machines.

It washes in the most satisfactory manner the clothes of farmers, machinists, engineers, and bricklayers, cleaning the dirty collars and cuffs without rubbing. The work is effected by the compressed air forcing the water through the fabric, and therefore without wear to the material washed. The washing done cleaner, quicker, better, and in half the time. No tired feeling. A child of ten can operate it. Satisfaction guaranteed. Agents Wanted in every county. For particulars and circulars address, COON BROS., 131-137 So. Washington St., Battle Creek, Mich.





NEW YORK, OCTOBER 31, 1895.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

Do you want a complete exposition of Rom. 13:1-9? If so read "The Powers That Be," chapter III., "Rights of the People." For further particulars see the preceding page.

WITH this number we begin the publication of a series of articles from the pen of Prof. Addison Blakely, Ph. D., of the University of Chicago. The first one is, "What a Constitution Is," on page 340. Read it.

A SOUTHERN correspondent informs us that we have omitted from our "Roll of Honor," the *Tuskaloosa* (Ala.) *Gazette*. Doubtless we have omitted other papers also that were entitled to honorable mention as opposed to religious persecution. We regret this, as we would have been glad to have enrolled them all.

It will be remembered that it was charged some months ago that President Cleveland went fishing on Sunday. This was denied by his private secretary who explained that Mr. Cleveland only started Sunday night but did not actually fish on Sunday. But some people are not satisfied with this, and the *Mail and Express* of this city thinks that Mr. Cleveland ought to clear his skirts of the fishing charge before he thinks seriously of a third term.

A CORRESPONDENT, writing from Montgomery, Ala., informs us that that State has joined the crusade for Sunday enforcement upon Seventh-day Adventists. A man named Hasty, has been arrested at Headland for Sunday labor and was in jail when our correspondent wrote, October 21. Another Seventh-day Adventist, a Mr. Newman, of Dothen, has also been arrested and his trial has doubtless taken place ere this as it was set for the 21st inst.

THE article from the *Herald* of this city, "Blue Laws Did Really Exist," which we print on page 341, will be found to be of more than ordinary interest.

Mr. Newton, the writer quoted in the article referred to, set out to vindicate the colony of Connecticut against the charges made by Mr. Peters, the Tory preacher. He succeeds in proving nearly everything that Mr. Peters asserted concerning the Blue Laws. True, Connecticut had no code designated "Blue Laws," but it had the laws; and they were in most cases fully as blue as Mr. Peters painted them. The researches of this attorney fully substantiate our editorial utterance of the 3rd inst., namely: "We are well aware that no such code of laws ever actually ex-

isted as that sometimes printed as the Blue Laws of Connecticut. But we are also well aware that 'laws' did exist in the New England colonies, notably in Massachusetts and Connecticut, under which the ministers and magistrates assumed to punish nearly all the acts said to have been forbidden by the Blue Laws."

ACCORDING to the *Chester* (Pa.) *Times*, of the 16th inst., several meetings have been held there recently "to create and crystallize public sentiment toward securing the enforcement of existing laws on the sabbath day particularly." Let all persons in Chester who are meditating any offense against the laws of the State or the ordinances of the city, take notice and commit their crimes on some day of the week other than Sunday if they hope to escape due punishment!

THOSE who still uphold Sunday laws notwithstanding the use that is made of them to persecute conscientious observers of the seventh day, try to make much out of the fact that no effort is made to interfere with the latter in their seventh-day rest and worship. But, as is evident from the case of the Adventist arrested in San Antonio, Texas, for refusing to do road work, as commanded by the roadmaster, on the seventh day, the same spirit which endeavors to force these people to rest on Sunday, also seeks to compel them to labor on the day which they regard as the Sabbath. It is in both cases simply the spirit of disregard of the consciences and rights of a class politically insignificant, and holding an unpopular religion. It is simply a fortuitous circumstance that determines how this disregard shall be expressed,—whether by compelling the Adventists to rest on the first day, or compelling them to work on the seventh.

THE fact that Sunday is not kept by a part of the people, is regarded by certain others who do keep it, and with whose liberty to keep it no one thinks of interfering, as a "ruthless invasion of the very sanctuary of God by the destroying foot of the Philistine." These are the words of a Paulist priest, Rev. Alexander Dole, but they voice the sentiment of those who are pushing the Sunday crusade. Yet these same ones, when the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists is under consideration, say that the religion of the Adventists is not interfered with at all by the Sunday laws, since they are left perfectly free to rest and worship on the seventh day. The Sunday-law advocates must not only be left perfectly free in the matter of their own Sunday observance, but others who do not believe as they do must observe it also, else there is "a ruthless invasion" of that which Sunday-keepers hold sacred; but a law which leaves everybody free to disregard the seventh day, and furthermore puts those who do observe it in the chain-gang for working on the first day, is no invasion whatever of that which is held sacred by the Adventists! If this be consistency, then consistency is not a jewel.

THE SENTINEL has no sympathy whatever with Mormonism, but we nevertheless indorse this note from the *Sun*, of the 23rd inst. :—

The Mormon missionaries have as much right to propagate the religion of Mormonism in the State of North Carolina as the Presbyterian missionaries in China have to propagate the religion of Presbyterianism there. We should like to know the difference between the conduct of the Chinese mandarins and Vegetarians who drive out the Christian missionaries and that of the clergymen of North Carolina who have sent a written warning to the Mormon missionaries there to "retire from our community, and that at once." The Chinese have degraded the anti-missionary Viceroy, and chopped off the heads of a lot of the anti-missionary Vegetarians. What kind of punishment should be given by somebody to the Rev. M. D. Bynum and the Rev. H. J. Jennett, of New Hill, Wake County, N. C.?

The stories told in China against the Christian missionaries are even worse than those told in North Carolina against the Mormon missionaries.

Why people should fear false doctrine we cannot imagine. The truth is able to stand alone. Intolerance is the fruit of cowardice as bigotry is of ignorance.

THE "ARENA" FOR 1896.

THE publishers of the *Arena* have issued a prospectus for 1896 which presents a programme for the year which will be sure to attract many new readers besides retaining old ones.

The *Arena* is "the people's review, frank, fearless, unmuzzled and unsubsidized;" and though the price will be reduced from \$5.00 to \$3.00 per year, beginning with the December number, it promises to "be stronger, brighter, abler and more attractive than ever."

"The following," says the prospectus, "are among the many brilliant writers whose contributors will appear within the next three months:" United States Senator John T. Morgan, of Alabama; Rev. Minot J. Savage, of Unity Church, Boston, Mass.; Prof. Richard T. Ely, of University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Rev. Lyman Abbott, of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Prof. Frank Parsons, of Boston University School of Law, Boston; Rev. Edward Everett Hale, of Boston; Helen H. Gardener, of Boston; Prof. George D. Herron, of Iowa College; Hon. Walter Clark, LL.D., of the Supreme Bench of North Carolina; Rev. John W. Chadwick, D.D., of Brooklyn, N. Y.; Postmaster General William L. Wilson; Prof. Joseph Rodes Buchanan, M.D.; United States Senator Marion Butler, of North Carolina; J. Heber Smith, M.D., of Boston.

Book reviews will continue to be an interesting feature of the *Arena*, and "in a word," say the publishers, "no money, time or care will be spared in making the *Arena* a review that every man and woman who desires to keep abreast of the live and vital problems of our age will find indispensable, and a magazine which all the friends of justice, morality, and progress will be proud of."

The able article, "The Preacher and Plutocrat," published in the SENTINEL of October 17, was from the *Arena* to which our readers are indebted also for other valuable matter.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and is 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 and under 25 copies to one address, 1 year - 75c
 " 25 and under 50 " " " 1 " - 60c
 " 50 and under 100 " " " 1 " - 55c
 " 100 or more " " " 1 " - 50c
 To foreign countries in Postal Union, - - - 1 " - 5s

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