**“Front Page” American Sentinel 5, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is in one sense with feelings of considerable regret that the SENTINEL finds it necessary to sever its direct connection with California. Personally our associates there have been of the very pleasantest. Dear friends are there whom we hold in ever grateful remembrance. Professionally our associations have also been of the pleasantest; and it is with the kindest remembrances toward our contemporaries, of Oakland and San Francisco, and especially the *Times* and the *Tribune* of Oakland, and the *Examiner* and the *Alta* of San Francisco, that the SENTINEL bids good-bye to the beautiful city by the Western Sea. Yet we all know that it was with the sole object of doing better service in the cause to which it is devoted that the SENTINEL made the change of location which it has made; and although we have been in our new quarters but a few days, we have already seen abundance of evidence of the propriety of the move that has been made. It is therefore with the best of courage that we enter anew upon our work with the beginning of this new year. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 1.1}

It is stated that the new government of Brazil proposes to sever the connection that existed under the monarchy between the State and the Roman Catholic Church. But while Catholicism was the State religion all other sects were tolerated. The only distinction made between that and other sects was that other denominations were restricted to the use of houses of worship “without the exterior form of temples.” This was construed to forbid simply the erection of steeples and the use of bells. The appropriations for religious purposes in Brazil in 1887-88 amounted to $454,000. The same budget appropriated $280,000 for education. Neither of these sums was large, and certainly the Brazilian establishment was not very expensive, but the new government will do well to abolish it and let the churches support themselves, while the government looks after the schools. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 1.2}

**“The American Sentinel” American Sentinel 5, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

With this number the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the fifth year of its publication. Started at Oakland, California, January, 1886, as an eight-page monthly, it attained the first year to a total circulation of more than 136,000 copies; the second year of more than 255,000; and the third year of more than 600,000. This rapid growth showed a demand for the paper which seemed to the publishers to call for a more frequent issue. Accordingly, in January, 1889, it was changed to an eight-page weekly; and more than a million copies were printed and circulated within a year. The rapidly multiplying demands for national religious legislation rendered it essential that our place of publication should be nearer the centers of information. We are therefore established at No. 43 Bond Street, New York City, from which place the AMERICAN SENTINEL salutes its old acquaintances and introduces itself to its new ones. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 1.3}

The SENTINEL exists for the purpose of opposing all manner of religious legislation, and every principle, effort, or movement, that tends in any way toward a union of religion and the State; and of maintaining in this opposition the principles announced by Jesus Christ and also embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 1.4}

The SENTINEL is positively Christian. And as positively and decidedly as it is Christian, just so positively does it maintain that Christianity, to remain pure and powerful, must never be connected, as such, in any way with the State; and that the State, properly to fulfil its functions, must never have anything whatever to do with religion, as such, or with religious observances. With the Supreme Court of Ohio we hold that “united with government, religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows us that the more widely and completely they are separated the better it is for both.” And with Dr. Philip Schaff we hold that “secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the church, and ecclesiastical power has proved an engine of tyranny in the hands of the State.” And the SENTINEL occupies this position because it is Christian, and because its editors and publishers love Jesus Christ and the religion which he brought to the world. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 1.5}

The SENTINEL maintains that civil government is an ordinance of God; that to the citizen it is supreme in civil things, for God has made it so by commanding Christians as well as all others to be subject to it; and that the authority of civil government is over only the civil relations of men, and does not extend at all to religious things. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 1.6}

The Saviour, when asked whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not, replied by stating a principle which is for all people and governments unto the end of the world—“Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.” He separates forever that which men owe to God from that which they owe to civil government. Religious duties and observances men owe to God; civil duties and obligations they owe to the State. Christ has separated these things; and what God has put asunder let no man join together. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 1.7}

Again, in Romans 13:1-10, every soul is commanded to be subject unto the higher powers, to pay tribute, to render to all thee dues; and then, after citing certain commandments which speak of the relation of men to their fellowmen, the Word says, “And if there be any other commandment commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.’” This word covers all the field in which the duty of any man can be related to civil government. With the men who do the things there named no government can ever find any fault. But in the points named there is not embraced any of the duties which men specifically owe to God. Therefore, within the line of man’s relations to his fellowman, God has set the limit to the jurisdiction of civil government. Civil government never can go beyond that limit without trenching upon ground where God has forbidden it to go. God has separated the duties which man owes to himself from those which civil government may require; and what God has put asunder let no man join together. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 1.8}

Therefore the SENTINEL maintains that it is the natural and inalienable right of every man to worship or not to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience; and that he is responsible to God alone for the exercise of that right. With George Washington we hold that “every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith.” Any interference with this right on the part of any person or power is as unwarranted as it is unjust. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 2.1}

The SENTINEL maintains that its principles, as thus set forth, are strictly in harmony with the original intent of the government of the United States under its Constitution. It was plainly declared by the framers of this government that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;” that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;” and that “the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion.” It is therefore not only as a Christian publication, but, per consequence, *as* a loyal American publication, that the AMERICAN SENTINEL proposes to disseminate its principles. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 2.2}

And the SENTINEL cordially invites the co-operation of all lovers of Christianity and of the American Constitution in the work to which it is devoted. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 2.3}

**“Queer Ideas of Morals” American Sentinel 5, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the Iowa Sunday-law convention, President Blanchard of Wheaton College, Ill., said: “I would rather swear for half an hour than buy a Sunday paper for half a minute;” and in the annual convention of the National W.C.T.U., one of the representative speakers said: “I am a Christian, yet I would rather tell a lie than to put on a corset.” It may be that both these persons are Christians according to their understanding of what Christianity is; but such statements as these certainly betray a serious confusion of ethical ideas. Yet these are the people who want the State to legislate on the subject of morals and religion, and to give legal force to their ideas of morals! When such people get control of legislation and of law their own narrow views and confused ideas of things become supreme, their will takes precedence of the will of God. Mr. Blanchard is the gentleman who some time ago announced that in this matter of religious legislation they are “the representatives of God!” With this idea the above quotations are consistent, because such has ever been the course of the self-appointed “representatives of God” in government and law. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 2.4}

**“Pushing the Matter” American Sentinel 5, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the Minneapolis *Journal* of the 14th ult. is interesting reading. It shows about as plainly as anything we ever saw, the temper of the Sunday-law advocates. They are determined to succeed and will stop at nothing which promises to aid their cause. The *Journal* says:- {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.1}

Within the past two weeks leading pastors of the city have been in receipt of a paper which outlines a plan whereby it is expected that better Sunday observance will be secured in Minneapolis. The Sunday newspaper, it will be seen from what follows, is the head and front of the offending. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.2}

This paper is in the nature of a solemn agreement made very binding, and it has already been signed by a large number of leading ministers of the city. The paper, or agreement, put into concise shape, is as follows:- {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.3}

“In order to correct the misapprehension that there is any difference of opinion among the pastors of this city with reference to the enforcement of Sunday laws, we pledge ourselves to stand by one another in this. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.4}

“1. We believe in using every right endeavor to bring about an abridgement of Sunday work in the public as well as in the private industries. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.5}

“2. We are united in demanding persistently and continuously the enforcement of all the laws whatsoever that refer to Sabbath desecration. And this means the closing of Sunday theaters. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.6}

“3. We pledge ourselves to withhold all patronage from the Sunday newspaper both in the matter of subscription and advertisement and to persuade our people, in so far as possible, to take the same position. We do this believing that the Sunday newspaper is the head and front of all offending.” {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.7}

The iron-clad agreement has been signed, as noted, by a large number of ministers of the city. But the signing of this manifesto is not all that has been done. The evening of the third Sunday in the month of January next has been selected as an occasion upon which the Sunday observance question is to have the biggest clerical shaking up in the history of the city. An elaborate plan has been prepared which, outlined, is as follows:- {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.8}

A large number of hacks or carriages will be retained and held for duty. Each minister in the city will have one of these three points above noted assigned to him as a text for a short, pithy address. He will make this address in his own church, for instance, will then be driven rapidly to another church nearest at hand where he will repeat the address, and then he will go to another church and another until he has used up all the evening’s time. Another minister will have another topic and will follow the same plan, and still another the last topic. Thus divided up by threes the ministers will keep moving from one church to another all the evening, giving to each congregation as many addresses as possible and all of them red hot. The State organization, which has the matter of Sunday observance in hand, will soon issue the formal call for these meetings. It is the intention of the movers in this affair to attract immense audiences to the churches and to give them the most earnest and powerful talks on the subject that the ministers of Minneapolis can utter. Said a gentleman closely connected with the movement this morning:- {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.9}

“We mean business. We are going to push this matter. You say that there is a leading orthodox pastor in the city, who, it is reported, likes to read the Sunday paper? All right, just let him refuse to sign this paper then. That’s all. Just let him refuse to sign such a paper, and see what effect it would have. I tell you he’ll have to come out of the rain.” {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 5.10}

**“Prohibition” American Sentinel 5, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *American Standard* remarks that “a good deal is said about hard times in Iowa, yet the State has just paid the last dollar of her debt, and taxes are to be reduced one-third. If the prohibition has accomplished this, it’s a big feather in the cap of prohibition.” Whether prohibition in Iowa has reduced taxation or not, it has done one good thing: it has demonstrated, not only there but in Kansas and the Dakotas, that all hope of prohibition is not bound up in the so-called Prohibition party. It has been demonstrated in those States that when public sentiment is educated up to that point the people will adopt prohibition regardless of parties. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 6.1}

**“Notes” American Sentinel 5, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union is Rev. W. F. Crafts, of this city. Down at Washington City the other day, in a sermon on the Sunday-law question, he held up a backwards saw which he says he got at Nazareth, in Palestine, and which is emblematic of the course of certain leaders in the Sunday movement, and informed his audience that it was such a saw as that that Christ laid down “Saturday nights” at the close of his week’s work, and preparatory to his weekly rest on Sunday. And everybody knows, or ought to know, that Christ never worked on Saturday and never kept Sunday while he was in this world. Everybody knows, or ought to know, that Saturday was the Sabbath in Christ’s day; and that he rested instead of worked on that day. Sunday, we are informed by the theologians, is kept in memory of Christ’s resurrection; and it is hardly likely that he commemorated his own resurrection *before that even occurred*. Query: In that statement did Mr. Crafts manifest his own ignorance, or did he presume upon the ignorance of his audience? If the latter, was it honest? If the former, ought he not to learn before he takes it upon himself to teach? {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 7.1}

It is announced from Rome that Monseigneur Satolli, who recently returned to Rome from this country, has assured the Pope that “the Washington government looks favorably upon the idea of having a duly accredited diplomatic representative at the Vatican.” There is little room for doubt that this is true. The cry of “rum, Romanism, and rebellion” defeated one candidate for the presidency in this country, and forewarned by that circumstance each presidential possibility is now determined that nothing of the kind shall happen in his case. But there is absolutely no reason why this country should have a representative at the papal court. The craft Leo desires it because it would be an acknowledgment from one of the greatest powers of earth that he is of right a temporal prince, and that he is unjustly deprived of his dominions. But that is something that this country has no right to acknowledge; nor would our officials so much as think of doing so were it not for the political influence exercised in this country by the minions of a foreign pretender to a usurped throne in Italy. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 7.2}

December 9-11, the American Sabbath Union held its first anniversary in this city. The attendance was about fifty. Papers were read, speeches were made, and eighteen resolutions were passed. One paper “prepared expressly for the occasion,” but not presented, was entitled “Some Lessons Learned During the Past Year.” If that paper was prepared by the field secretary we should like very much to see it or hear it read, especially if he gave an impartial account of certain things which we know that he learned. The Union decided to establish the headquarters of the field secretary in Washington City. This is in order that he may be on the spot to superintend the passing of the Sunday laws which they demand. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 7.3}

The statement of Dr. Schaff that Sunday laws are a connecting link between church and State is a truth that can be demonstrated by more than one line of argument embodying proofs as strong as Holy Writ. Wherever there are Sunday laws, therefore, there is a union of church and State. This is one great reason why the AMERICAN SENTINEL is so uncompromisingly opposed to Sunday laws. Any union of church and State is only evil, and any laws or governmental forms that comprise any connecting link between the two are wrong. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 7.4}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 5, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

No man can ever of right make his religion the basis of any plea for governmental favor, nor the ground of any complaint of governmental discrimination. If there is not enough good in the religion to pay him for professing it then there is not enough to pay the government for taking any legal notice of it in any way whatever. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.1}

The basis of the State is the natural, its province is the temporal; the basis of the church is supernatural, its province is the spiritual. The church can never of right have anything at all to do with the State, and the State can never of right have anything to do with the church except as it has to do with any and all other bodies or corporations. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.2}

Mr. Crafts, it is said, admits that Washington is now the most orderly and quiet city on Sunday of any city in this country. “Its greatest failure is in not having a Sunday law.” But why have such a law if without it better order is maintained than is had elsewhere with Sunday laws? Is not the real object to secure from Congress some acknowledgment of Sunday sacredness? So it certainly appears, and so we believe. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.3}

We are indebted to a number of our exchanges for friendly and even complimentary mention upon the occasion of our removal from Oakland, Cal., to this city. We appreciate these notices, not only because they are a substantial benefit, but because they show that our work has not been lost upon our brethren of the press. We are glad to know that our efforts are appreciated, and that, in the final “tug of war” very many of the papers of the country will be found on the side of the liberty of conscience now guaranteed by our national Constitution. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.4}

December 9, 1889, in the United States Senate, Senator Blair of New Hampshire introduced both the measures looking to religious legislation, which he had introduced in the Fiftieth Congress-the Sunday-Rest Bill, and the Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution by which the “principles of the Christian religion” shall be taught in all the public schools of the country. We have no space to notice them further this week but in our next we shall notice the Sunday bill in full and as soon as possible the proposed amendment also. It is announced that Congressman W. C. P. Breckinridge will soon introduce a Sunday bill in the House. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.5}

The Sunday-law question is again before Congress. Very early in the present session several petitions were presented on the subject, some praying for the passage of a national Sunday law, and others protesting against any religious legislation what-ever. Sunday is a religious institution, and legislation concerning it is religious legislation. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.6}

National Reformers are unhappy because President Harrison’s message to Congress contained no recognition of God. In this particular it is said to be unlike the messages of all preceding Presidents. The omission was probably due to an oversight, but it is possible that the President had the good sense to know that the Lord is not pleased with unmeaning complimentary allusions to him, and that he abhors the hollow mockery of official piety. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.7}

The AMERICAN SENTINEL maintains the inalienable right of every man to profess any religion or none just as he chooses; but it denies the right of any association of religious people to compel those who are not religious to act as though they were, or to conform to any religious observance, or to recognize any religious institution. We likewise deny the right of the State to pronounce any religious or ecclesiastical institution a civil thing and by that means compel conformity to it. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.8}

In a recent address before the New York Baptist Pastor’s Conference on “The Significance of the Roman Catholic Congress and an outline of the Roman Catholic Movement of to-day,” Rev. D. C. Potter, D. D., said:- {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.9}

“That Catholic centenary congress in Baltimore was a jubilee, a Roman victory. Its first note was a paean, its last a doxology. Its voice was defiance, its grasp power, its purpose advance, and that, dare I say, irresistible. It evaded nothing, quibbled at nothing, but spoke out in a voice dominant and daring. The, Protestant church could stand on its platform with hardly a phrase change.” {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.10}

This is all true, especially the last sentence. But why is the last true? Is it because Rome has changed? Nay, verily; “Rome never changes.” It is because the Protestant church, so called, has ceased to be truly Protestant. We live in evil times when a union between Protestants and Romanists for the purpose of moulding legislation in the interests of “religion,” as they put it, but really in the interests of the dominant churches, as such, is not only possible but when it is an accomplished fact. All “religious combinations to effect political objects are dangerous,” and this one is doubly dangerous because the Protestant church of to-day can stand on a Romish platform and with Romanists advocate a papal policy. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.11}

In a recent informal talk before the W.C.T.U. of the District of Columbia Mrs. Bateham said that “the outlook for a Sunday law for the District is very hopeful. Everything is in good shape. Mr. Blair thinks thinks that there will be little opposition this year.” We believe that the Senator has reckoned without his host. There will probably be more opposition than he imagines. We are not prepared to say that Mr. Blair’s Sunday-law schemes may not eventually succeed; but we do feel sure of one thing, namely, that a Sunday-law shall not be foisted upon the American people without their being fully informed concerning the nature and tendency of all such measures. The heritage of civil and religious liberty received from the founders of the republic will not be surrendered without a struggle. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.12}

*Freethought*, a liberal paper published in San Francisco, says:- {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.13}

“Are not the Mormon Church, the Catholic Church, and all other churches perfectly consistent in claiming supreme power? If God is supreme and if the churches are the custodians of his word, why should they not speak with authority? That is the question.” {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.14}

No church calling itself Christian is consistent in claiming supreme power. God alone has such power and he has never delegated it to any man or to any body of men. The church can of right, as a church, have nothing to do with earthly governments. The great Head of the church himself declared, “My kingdom is not of this world,” and his followers cannot go beyond his word without forfeiting the right to call themselves by his name. Christ gave but one commission to his church, namely, to go into all the world and make disciples; this the apostles did by persuading men, and that is as far as the authority of the church extends. Any church which claims more than this is not Christian, though it may be so called, but anti-Christian. God has promised this world to his people, that is, to the meek (Matthew 5:5), but he has not yet made them lords over it, much less has he authorized them to take it for themselves. The true Christian is a missionary, not a politician. {AMS January 2, 1890, p. 8.15}

**“Front Page” American Sentinel 5, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Sunday-law workers are quite accommodating. If in any of their conventions there are not enough of those who openly favor religious legislation to carry their plans and resolutions on a religious basis, they will very obligingly declare the whole thing to be civil only and secure the indorsement upon that basis. Very accommodating indeed they are; but calling a religious or ecclesiastical thing “civil” does not make it any the less religious. Sunday legislation is religious legislation under whatever name it may be proposed. And religious legislation is forbidden by the Word of God. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 9.1}

With the view of raising the “standard of morality of both sexes, and stimulating the fervor of their religious belief,” the young emperor of Germany has, it is stated, issued an edict intended to put down dancing among the youth. Under the now order dancing is not to begin until after noon, is not to be kept up after 8 in the evening, and none except school children are to be allowed to join in the giddy round or the solemn square. Young people who are being prepared for confirmation are absolutely forbidden to appear at dances or to dance; and all parents and guardians of the young are called upon to use every means in their power to keep their children or pupils from dancing, and they are advised to substitute games for the popular form of recreation. Bismarck, it is said, opposed the ukase, saying:- {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 9.2}

“That policy will be sure to make the young people dance all the harder. Who knows but it may come to pass that dances will be held in secret, like political agitatory exercises, and that the devotees of Terpsichore will have their heads turned with seditious politics as well as with the comparatively harmless dizziness of the waltz?” {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 9.3}

Germany, it might be well to remember is a church and State country. Religion is taught in the public schools, and in various ways God is recognized as the source of all power; yet with the single exception of France, no so-called Christian country equals it in infidelity. It requires something more than imperial edicts, legislative action, and official red-tape to make Christians. We do think that professed Christians should not desire to dance; but if they do, no amount of governmental interference will make the matter one whit better. There is no merit in not doing a thing when there is no opportunity to do it. Hot-house Christians have never been a success. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 9.4}

**“Some Wholesome Suggestions to Ministers” American Sentinel 5, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

The drift of the age is in the direction of “morality” by civil law, and is too often to exclusion, or at least to the neglect of moral suasion. Instead of seeking to construct people in moral duties, and thus lead them to practice morality from and changes motives, even ministers are too often found appealing to the civil law to. This is a grave mistake, for while men may, and should be required under civil penalties to lead *civil* lives, it is neither proper nor possible to make them world except by persuasion. This was the method adopted by Christ and his apostles, and it is the one which should be followed what by his ministers. Directly in the line of that which we have said is the following from the Iowa *State Register*, of November 24, 1889, which contains some wholesome suggestions not only for ministers but to all who, though meaning well, are committing a grave error of attempting to reform men by making it impossible, or at least difficult, for them to do wrong. The *Register’s* article relates particularly to be temperance question, but the principle is the same as applied to other questions, and is for this reason that we presented to our readers. The *Register* says:- {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 12.1}

“We want to say to the preachers of Iowa at this crisis in public affairs, that in our judgment they are depending too much upon the law, and too little upon moral effort to bring about the condition of things we all desire. We have read with interest their letters and the resolutions they have adopted. We sympathize with them in their desire to banish the saloon and suppress the evils of intemperance. But we want to remind them that it takes more than a State statute to keep men from drinking, and reform those who are slaves to the drink have it. The law is good so far as it goes, but when a human appetite and passion is the subject, it doesn’t go the whole distance. There is something for the churches, something for the preachers, something for every good man and woman who wants to make the world better, to do. We notice in some of the resolutions which have been adopted at preachers’ meetings within the last few days, a disposition to look still more to the Legislature to suppress or to stamp out what ever drinking and violation of the prohibitory law still remain. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 12.2}

“We believe that is a mistake. The law has done, and is doing all that the law can, to close the saloons, and to keep men from drinking. Can the preachers truthfully say that they have done it and are doing all that they can? We wouldn’t accuse them of willfully neglecting their duty. But have they as ministers done the best in the most the could to keep men sober, to reclaim the drunkard, to save the boys from learning to love liquor, since the prohibitory law went into effect? {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 12.3}

“We have been watching the operation of the prohibitory law ever since it was enacted. We have been watching also the general course of the professed temperance workers toward it. We will credit the ministers with helping to enforce the law. They have preached enforcement from the pulpit. They have talked it on the streets, most of them have voted it at the polls. But when we have said that, haven’t we said it all? Haven’t we summed up the aggregate work of the clergy, and to quite an extent of the temperance organizations of the State? Our good friends, the preachers, have looked to the law to make and keep men sober, and have expected that would do the work which to a greater or lesser extent must be done in every community by personal effort. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 12.4}

If the closing of the saloons had stopped drinking, we should have nothing more to say. But every well-informed man knows that it has not. It is true, there is not as much shrinking as there was when the saloons were open; but there is far too much now. It is vital to deny that a great many boys are learning to drink; that a great many men are drinking who would be far better off, and their families be far happier, if they would let liquor entirely alone. These are facts and stubborn ones, too. It will not do to ignore them; for they have a very disagreeable and painful way of forcing attention to themselves. Now what is being done to teach these boys to leave liquor alone? What is being done to show these men the folly and the harm of their course? What is being done to stir up public sentiment against the use of liquor? Not one single thing so far as we know except the single exhortation to enforce the law and keep the saloons close. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 12.5}

“When was there a temperance meeting held in Des Moines to plead with man to sign the pledge in leave their drinking ways? When have our honored clergy held gospel temperance meetings to bring all power of Christian influences to bear upon the drinking habit? When did a blue ribbon club or any other organization start out its members to find the old soaks and induce them to sign the pledge and become men again? Was any such personal work done in the last year, or the year before that? All of these good people headed by the ministers have been relying upon the law to do the work which belong never can do. They have preached sermons and held public meetings to demand that the law be enforced, but all this time there were poor fellow’s sinking lower and lower, and there were young men fastening the chains of appetite about their necks, and hardly a word of public protest or private entreaty has been heard. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 12.6}

“We do not single out Des Moines as exceptional in this respect. We do not believe its honored ministers are any more deserving of reproached for criticism than the ministers of other cities. We mentioned Des Moines because it is the nearest example of what we have in mind, and because it has more effectual perhaps than any other large city in Iowa, close the open saloon. In calling attention to this neglect of moral effort, we are not asking for the return of the saloons, or pronounced in prohibition a failure. But we want to say that there is too much tendency to let the loss of plant the rightful work of the pulpit and the church. Our friends, the preachers, in some of the resolutions that have been adopted recently, demand that the Legislature shall pass additional laws to enforce prohibition in counties where it is not now in force.... But if the brethren will permit the *Register* to say it, there would be a good deal of work for the creatures in the river counties, even if the next Legislature should devise some scheme for closing the saloons. The saloons there are open because a majority of the people in those counties believe that it is not a crime to sell liquor and not a sin to drink it. If every saloon were closed to-morrow, they would still think the same, and would seek at one some way to evade this law and satisfy their appetites. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 12.7}

“Now if our friends, the preachers, will allow us, we will tell them a way to close the saloons and every river county without any help from the Legislature.... Let them turn a phalanx of their best workers lose in those counties, and start an old-fashioned temperance revival. Preach temperance, sang a temperance, talked temperance, reach out the hand of kindness and love to the poor drunkard, teach men that the saloon is the enemy of their homes, show them that the path of sobriety seek to is the way to happiness, and just as quick as a majority of the people have been converted, the saloons will be close, will stay closed. We would recommend that the district conference that demanded more legislation stop passing resolutions and move more into Scott county and go to work. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 13.1}

“As we believe in short sermons, we will practice what we preach. But we would urge upon the ministers of Iowa of that they must not expect a lot to make men good, and pure, and noble.... Don’t expect the Legislature to do with a higher authority than man has laid upon human hearts and hands to do. We are disposed to look to the Legislature to much to reform society. As Francis Murphy says, they have an idea in the East that the people of Iowa are trying to change the Lord’s prayer so as to make it read, ‘Our Father who art in the Legislature.’ That won’t do. Don’t leave moral work to be done by the law. We don’t want to see our ministers acting as searchers and informers. Others can do that. They have a work which others can’t do. It is theirs to do the work which their great Example did. He saved men from their sins, but not with the sword of Cæsar.” {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 13.2}

**“No Compromise” American Sentinel 5, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Baltimore American* thinks that progress and religious liberty “has been great during the present century-greater, perhaps, than in all its predecessors combined; and it has logically follow the spread of general knowledge.” “But,” remarks that journal, “there must be more progress-very much more, too-before men learn to respect those who differ from them in religious matters, and to refrain from damnatory criticism.” {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 13.3}

This point, it intimates, is to be reached by compromise. But this is a mistake; there can be no compromise and religion, as there can be in politics. Nothing can be hoped for in the direction of greater religious liberty, or even the preservation of the degree of religious liberty which now exists, except as it comes through the recognition of the divinely-establish principle that in matters of faith men are answerable, not to their fellows, but to God alone. The true doctrine is that all men, no matter what their faith, are entitled to equal rights, both civil and social. The man who sits in judgment on another in the matter of his religion, and then attempts to punish him for what he is pleased to term “heresy,” simply usurps a prerogative of God. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 13.4}

**“A Baseless Basis” American Sentinel 5, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

The second article of the American Sabbath Union declares that:- {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 14.1}

“The basis of this Union is the divine authority and universal in perpetual obligation of the Sabbath as manifested in the constitution of nature,” etc. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 14.2}

The Sabbath is not manifested in the constitution of nature. The statement that it is so manifested is false, and the members of the American Sabbath Union noted to be false. Rev. Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, is a member of the American Sabbath Union, and not by any means been insignificant member. If they have any such thing as representative members, Dr. Johnson certainly may be named as one. In the congressional hearing, in behalf of the National Sunday law, December, 1886, held by the American Sabbath Union, Dr. Johnson was one of the speakers, and in his speech he said:- {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 14.3}

“This appointment of one day in seven is arbitrary. There is nothing in nature to indicate that division of time. There is the day of twenty-four hours, there is a month, there is the year, all these are natural division; but there is nothing in nature to indicate the weekly division-the observance of one day in seven. It is arbitrary, and we regard that as an evidence of its divine origin.” {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 14.4}

The statements of Dr. Johnson are evidently true upon their face, and they just as evidently prove that the statement, as to the basis of the American Sabbath Union, is false. The divisions of time into days, months, and years, is natural; there is in that in nature that clearly defines these divisions. But there is nothing in nature to mark even the weekly division of time much less is there anything in nature that would mark one of the days in the weekly division as a day to be religiously observed. The State exist and has its basis only upon the plane of the natural. The Sabbath is based only in the action of God and is manifested only in the revealed will of God. Both of which are pre-eminently supernatural. Therefore, the State existing only in the plane of the natural, and having to do only with the natural, can never of right have anything to do with the Sabbath, or with the weekly division of time which is caused by the Sabbath. That much of the basis of the American Sabbath Union is a fraud. And as the Sabbath Union exist for the purpose of securing religious legislation in behalf of the Sabbath, it follows that the basis of the American Sabbath Union rests upon nothing more tangible than does the “baseless fabric of a dream.” {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 14.5}

**“The Logic of It” American Sentinel 5, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

If a man should ask to be admitted into membership in a Christian church while asserting his unbelief in Christianity there is not one of the ministers of the American Sabbath Union who would admit him to membership. If anyone should ask to be baptized while maintaining an attitude of positive and unbelief in Jesus Christ there is not one of these ministers who would administer to him Christian baptism. They would deny his right have any share what ever in it. It is so also in the matter of the Lord’s supper. It is *logically* so also in the matter of the Christian Sabbath. But instead of standing logically to their proposition, they inconsistently demand laws by which men, who glory in infidelity and atheism, and in their hatred to Christianity, shall be compelled to observe the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest. In other words, they demand that the United States Government shall enact laws by which all the people who are not Christians and to do not want to be, shall be compelled to act as though they were Christians. If it be the Christian Sabbath, these people have no right to consent that anybody but Christians shall keep it; and far less have they any right to compel people to keep it who are not Christians. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 15.1}

If the church has the right to use the power of the Government to compel men to observe the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest, has she not an equal right to use the same power to compel the same persons to observe the same institution as a day of worship? And has she not an equal right to use the same power to compel all men to observe a Christian baptism, and to belong to the Christian church? In short if she has the right to use the power, where is the limit to the exercise of that right, except in her own arbitrary will? The results here suggested will follow as surely as the power is obtained. For, although the church is always a logical and inconsistent in demanding the use of the civil power, she is always strictly logical and consistent in the use of that power to the utmost limit. The only safety is in not allowing her the use of the civil power to the slightest extent. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 15.2}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 5, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Nation* notices the removal of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to this city, and remarks that “the firing will now be at closer range.” Possible the Nation will now be able to shoot a little closer to the mark. Hitherto its failures to hit anything have been unparalleled by any journal with which we are acquainted, with the possible exception of the *Christian Statesman*. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 16.1}

The ministers of Xenia, Ohio, have issued an address to their people, urging them to cease desecrating “the Sabbath” by refraining from burying the dead on that day, going to the post-office, reading secular papers, compelling servants to do household work, and traveling on Sunday, especially by railroad. This is all right; if the ministers of Xenia believe that Sunday should be so strictly observed it is perfectly right for them to persuade their people, or any other people, to keep it; but there the matter should end; they have no right to coerce people in such matters. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 16.2}

A Reader asks, “Can the Sunday bill become constitutional without being voted on by the people?” There is no way in which the people can ever have an opportunity to vote directly either for or against the proposed Sunday law. If Congress passes the bill and it is sustained by the Supreme Court, it will then be, for all practical purposes, constitutional. Of course we do not think that a Sunday law would be constitutional in the sense of being in harmony with the intent of the framers of the Constitution, but it is not at all unlikely that the courts would sustain such a law as that proposed by Senator Blair. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 16.3}

In the late convention of the American Sabbath Union in this city the field secretary denounced certain base-ball leagues as “bands of criminals” because they play ball on Sunday, and the same convention asked Congress to pass a “civil Sabbath law.” Now if the Sunday laws are “civil” statutes and forbid only that which is uncivil, then we should like very much for someone to tell what there is in the playing of base-ball on Sunday that is so intensely uncivil as to turn all who play it, into bands of criminals. In California also last summer the field secretary denounced as criminals all members of the legislature of that State who had voted against a Sunday law, and declared that every one of them “ought to be in the penitentiary.” Mr. Crafts is rather too prodigal with his denunciations properly to represent a minister of the gospel of Christ. Christ came not into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 16.4}

Let none be deceived by the plausible cry of “a civil Sabbath.” There is no such thing as a “civil Sabbath,” and nobody wants such a thing. A “civil Sabbath” could be nothing else than a weekly holiday, when public business would be suspended and the people be left free to do as they please so long as they are civil, just as they are upon any other holiday. But that would be the “Continental Sunday” with a vengeance; and that the Sunday-law advocates do not want. “Take the religion out and you take the rest out,” says Mr. Crafts, thus showing that, in his opinion, a Sabbath to be of any value must have a religious basis; and that is the truth. But when that is admitted where is the “civil Sabbath”? The fact is, as before stated, that there is, and in the very nature of the case, can be no such thing as a civil Sabbath. It is simply chaff used to catch sparrows. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 16.5}

The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union should take the president of that association aside and instruct him in regard to the real object which they have in view. Mr. Crafts has been “swinging around the circle” explaining to the people that the Sunday movement is in the interest of the working men, a sort of sanitary measure as it were. But Mr. Shepard is continually saying something which, to say the least, excites a suspicion that the field secretary has been keeping something back; in short, that the real object of the movement is something else than that which he has represented it to be. One of these unfortunate “breaks” on Mr. Shepard’s part was made in the recent meeting of the so-called Union in this city, when that gentleman offered some resolutions to the effect that the day of the inauguration of the president of the United States should be upon the first Wednesday of March, instead of upon the fourth day of that month. The reason for the change, as set forth in the resolutions, is that it would do away with the desecration of Sunday by enabling persons, east of the Mississippi, and those living even farther away, to leave their homes on Monday, attend the inauguration ceremonies, and return home by Saturday of the same week. This, says the resolutions, would prevent their “dishonoring the Lord’s day for the purpose of honoring the president of the country.” {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 16.6}

Now the question naturally arises what possible connection this proposed change in the day of the inauguration has with a movement in the interests of the working men? It certainly looks very much as though Mr. Shephard’s object is to ... Sunday, and to promote its observance as a sacred day. And inasmuch as the American Sabbath Union adopted the resolution without a dissenting vote, it would seem that the Union is in perfect accord with its president. And thus it appears that unless Mr. Crafts is mistaken as to his real motive, he stands alone in his efforts to preserve the health of that large and respectable class which he professes to serve. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 16.7}

The object of the American Sabbath Union is declared by article 3 of its constitution to be, “To preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship.” This object the Union proposes by legislation. It makes no other effort than by law to do this. And granting just here, for the argument’s sake their claim that they do not propose to compel everybody to worship, they do propose to compel everybody to *rest*, on what they themselves call “the Christian Sabbath.” Now Christian institutions and Christian ordinances belong only to Christians. The Christian church is for Christians only; Christian baptism is for Christians only, the Lord’s supper is for Christians only. If Sunday be the Christian Sabbath, it likewise is for Christians only; and they not only have no right to compel those who are not Christians to observe it but those who are not Christians have no right voluntarily to observe it. {AMS January 9, 1890, p. 16.8}

**“Front Page” American Sentinel 5, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is time for the National Reformers to cry out for the restoration of papal rule in Italy. They regard Romanism as better than “political atheism,” and it seems that with the mass of Italians there is no halfway ground. A writer in a religious journal says that “in swinging away from the Romish Church, comparatively few stop at Protestantism. The majority know little respecting it, and apparently care as little about it.” This is not a matter of surprise since they have been religious by law so long that they naturally regard all religion as simply a synonym of tyranny, and as soon as they have the opportunity they very naturally break away from the restraint which has been so galling to them. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 17.1}

An exchange notes the fact that “a certain amount of religious liberty has been granted in Finland, which, though it does not go very far, is, at all events, a welcome installment. It only at present gives professed Christians of any sect the right to educate their own children, though not those belonging to members of the State Church. Marriages contracted by members of acknowledged sects will in future be legal. Different views of Christianity will no longer make any difference in the privileges and duties of the citizen, and these prerogatives are extended so far as to give Christians of any sect the right of entering Government service. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 17.2}

“Religious demonstrations and processions are, however, prohibited, and as the Salvation Army has gained a footing in the country, no doubt they will soon come into collision with the authorities on that point. The Government has undertaken to examine into the doctrines and beliefs of every dissenting sect, and also to keep a close account of them; it has cut a nice task out for itself and it remains to be seen how the plan will work. It appears that any members of the community not professing some form of Christianity are still to be debarred the rights of citizenship, nor are they allowed to form organized communities or educate their children.” {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 17.3}

**“The Minneapolis Preachers” American Sentinel 5, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

The proceedings of those Minneapolis preachers, an account of which we published in the SENTINEL of January 2, is of more than passing interest to the people. It reveals some of the spirit that inheres in this Sunday-law movement all over the nation. That ironclad agreement and the boycotting action of the preachers under it, show how far they have departed from the methods and the spirit of Jesus Christ, whose ministers they profess to be. This, however, is not the beginning of that movement in Minneapolis. It has a history, and the history runs back nearly two years. In the spring of 1888, Dr. Josiah Strong, of this city, secretary of the Evangelical Alliance of the United States, visited Minneapolis and met with a committee of pastors of that place who had been appointed to confer with him upon the matter of organizing a branch of the Evangelical Alliance of that city. Several conferences were held, and plans were formed; but owing to the nearness of the summer vacation, no definite action was taken at that time. Rev. D. D. McLaurin, the Church of Immanuel, Minneapolis, was given charge of the plans formed, and of organizing the active work according to the plans. The first definite step toward organized action was taken Monday, October 15, 1888, at a meeting of the Minneapolis ministers in the Y.M.C.A. parlors. There the objects and the plans of the organization were quite fully set forth. One of the objects of the organization, and the one which is of special interest in this connection, is to take “a prominent part in State and municipal politics and government, watching closely all State and city legislation. In its name, and upon its recommendation, bills will be introduced into the Legislature and such legislation as will increase the penalties for the violation of the Sunday laws of Minneapolis will be especially favored and pushed.” {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 19.1}

The plan of organization, is a central alliance governed by an executive committee, and under the direction of this, ward alliances are formed as auxiliaries. Through the ward alliances a company of visitors is organized to make a thorough house-to-house canvass. To each of these visitors is allotted a division comprising ten families. These are to be visited once a month regularly to ascertain their condition and needs with the special design of getting them to attend church. All the churches, Catholic and Protestant, of the city are united in the alliance. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 20.1}

Upon all this matter of the organization and the work of this alliance we should not have a word to say except in commendation if it were in fact evangelical or if there were any evangelical intent in it. But as its object is political and not evangelical, we can never have anything to say of it except to denounce it as contrary to every principle of the gospel. Evangelical is defined as being “agreeable or consonant to the gospel or the truth taught in the New Testament.” The gospel is not political, it never can be furthered, but only hindered and corrupted by political methods such as are embodied in the plan of this Minneapolis political preachers’ alliance. It is proper that people should attend church, it is perfectly proper that proper methods should be employed to in-duce them to attend church; but when political methods are employed to get the people to go to church for the purpose of increasing the political influence of the churches, then such churches are just about the worst places that the people could be induced to go. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 20.2}

About the time of the organization mentioned above, Dr. McLaurin said that “The ministers of the city believe that Christian unity is strong enough now to make itself felt in ways that churches separately have little influence.” But, when Christian unity is strong enough to make itself felt politically, as the purpose of this alliance is, then the more of such strength Christians unity feels, the less strength it actually has. The only strength the Christians, individually, of the Christian Church collectively, can ever have to profit is the strength of Jesus Christ. And that strength is never made manifest in a political way. The only power that Christians ever can possess for good, is the power of godliness which can never be exerted by political means. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 20.3}

The steps taken by the Minneapolis ministers as printed in the SENTINEL of the 2nd are the fitting sequel of the plan and object of the organization of the Evangelical Alliance of that city in October in 1888. Complusory methods belong to the organization, compulsory religious observance is the object of Sunday laws, and that they should resort to boycotting pressure to compel both their fellow ministers and the people to conform to their wishes is only to be expected. And when such methods are so readily resorted to at the first, what will they not do at the last? The Evangelical Alliance and its secretary both had better stick to their evangelical work or else stop calling it evangelical, and give it its proper name of political at once. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 20.4}

**“An Excellent Thought” American Sentinel 5, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Advocate*, of this city, has the following item which contains an excellent thought which those who want Congress and our several State Legislatures to remove by legislation all the difficulties in the way of Church work would do well to consider. The *Advocate* says:- {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 21.1}

An attempt is sometimes made to explain the slow progress of religion in our large cities on the ground that the conditions of society are peculiarly unfavorable to evangelical Christianity. We are told that many of the inhabitants are German infidels and atheists, Italian and Irish Catholics, Jews and pagans, and that these are not easily reached by the gospel, and therefore progressive movements are not to be expected. Certainly these elements are antagonistic to Protestant Christianity, and present serious obstacles in the way of its progress; but did the gospel ever yet find a field which was free from antagonistic elements? Has the gospel any other name than to meet and overcome hostile forces and reduce a world of enemies to subjection? Human nature is one the world over, and the gospel is perfectly adapted to the work of saving men without respect to class or nationality. Wisdom to wield the sort of the Spirit is all that is wanting, and this wisdom cometh down from above. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 21.2}

If in harmony with this suggestion, the churches would pay more attention to wielding the “sword of the Spirit” and a little less to invoking the aid of the State, much good might reasonably be expected to result, not only to sinners but to the Church itself. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 21.3}

**“Notes” American Sentinel 5, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

A writer in a religious contemporary says that Italy is a hard soil for the growth of Protestantism. On the other hand are the Romanists, upon whom no impression can be made, and upon the other the Infidels, upon whom still less impression is possible. Unbelief among the Italian men, he says, is general in Rome, and their absence from Church is conspicuous. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.1}

This state of affairs is not to be wondered at since it is the legitimate result of the Church and State *regime* which has so long cursed Italy. Men may be compelled to observe the outward forms of religion, but that does not make them truly pious, and when the compulsion is remove they will surely go farther in the other direction than though they had not been coerced. Coercion in religion breeds hatred, and hatred is a very opposite of Christianity. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.2}

The *Christian Advocate* of this city says:- {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.3}

That idleness is a prolific cause of vice and crime is made clear by facts constantly coming under the observation of those who read the papers and study the condition of society. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.4}

This is true, and being true is it not a little strange that so many of those who know that it is true or in favor of laws compelling people to be idle one day each week. There can be no doubt that Sabbath keeping is a good thing; but habitual idleness one day each week is not Sabbath-keeping; only those keep the Sabbath, in any proper sense of the Word, who observe the day on the Lord. The *Advocate* is right, “idleness is a prolific cause of vice,” and therefore all laws that foster idleness foster vice. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.5}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 5, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

Owing to a lack of funds the “publication of documents of the American Sabbath Union for 1890” has been postponed. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.6}

The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union announces that he will make another lecture trip across the continent and back, starting across in April and reaching the Atlantic again in August. Definite dates and places of giving the lectures, are not yet announced. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.7}

The local Sunday bill for the District of Columbia was presented in the House of Representatives by Representative Breckinridge, of Kentucky. The Speaker referred it to the Committee on Education and Labor, but by request it was afterward referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. We hope to have a copy of the bill for comment in our next issue. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.8}

We have received a circular from the secretary of the American Sabbath Union, announcing that the Union is to hold a convention at Washington, D. C., January 30 and 31. “Everybody” is invited, but “especially the friends of the American Civil Sabbath in Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.” “The leading purpose of the convention” as announced “is to urge upon Congress the request of the commissioners of the District of Columbia” for a Sunday law. The circular announces that “distinguished Senators, Congressmen, pastors and others are expected to speak””besides Mr. Crafts. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.9}

Colonel Shepard of the so-called Sabbath Union, is making himself ridiculous and bringing religion, which he is supposed to represent, into contempt by such utterances as the following which is attributed to him in a speech before the re-cent Dominion Evangelical Alliance:- {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.10}

The West Shore and Hudson River Railways, which were started for the purpose of running Sunday excursions, were driven into bankruptcy by the Lord. A new management cut off the Sunday traffic as far as possible, and now their finances are in good condition. At one time no Sunday elevated trains were run on the Sabbath, when it was arranged that a train should be asked for by a Christian minister, who, by the way, very soon was called from earth. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.11}

It may do to talk this sort of stuff to people who do not know the facts in the case, but it will not impress others much. The truth is that the West Shore Railroad was driven into bankruptcy by a most ruinous competition. Then it passed under the management of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad. The rates were increased and the number of trains reduced, and the Vanderbilts make money out of it. *And Sunday trains both freight and passenger are run*, and have been all the time, both on the West Shore and the New York Central. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.12}

It is stated that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has issued a pastoral address on non-church-going and its causes, which it asks to be read over the pulpits in all the churches on a convenient Sabbath. It points out that in Glasgow, the most populous city of Scotland, there are not fewer than one hundred and twenty thousand persons who are alienated from public worship. It is further remarked that there is a similar and alarming pro-portion of people in other towns, and even in rural parishes, who habitually absent themselves from church. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.13}

It may be interesting to remember in this connection that Scotland is probably the most strict Sunday observing country in the world; but it seems that something more than simply refraining from work on Sunday is required to make people pious, or even to insure their attendance at church. Evidently that which Scotland needs (?) is a law requiring every body to attend church who is not excused for some good and sufficient reason. The National Reformers should see what can be done for the country of the Covenanters. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.14}

We should like for some of the people who favor the suppression of base-ball on Sunday, to point out what there is about a base-ball game that is uncivil on Sunday any more than on any other day. No one pretends that the playing of a game of base-ball is uncivil in any sense. It cannot be shown that it is in any way uncivil on Sunday, and it is not because of any incivility in it that they propose to suppress it on Sunday. Nor is this all; the playing of base-ball is not even irreligious. It is true that men who are not religious play base-ball. It is equally true that men who are religious, and strictly so, can play base-ball and still be religious. Then it is not because the playing of base-ball is either uncivil or irreligious that they propose to suppress it on Sunday; it is solely because Sunday is held by certain people to be a religious day, and that it is to be devoted to religious exercises; and as the playing of base-ball is not a religious exercise, therefore it is not consistent with the religious observance of a day. Consequently the only purpose of the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws is to enforce the observance of it as a religious day. It is to compel people who are not religious to pay religious tribute to those who pretend to be religious. But if the Government is to do this in one thing when it is demanded, why not in every else as it may be demanded, and having a thorough-going union of Church and State at once. That will be the outcome of a national Sunday law. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.15}

There was lately organized, in the City of New York, a league professedly to maintain American institutions. We have not yet seen a copy of its constitution or any official statement of its objects, but from what we can gather from the newspaper report, it seems to be more than anything else an organization to maintain American Protestant institutions as against Catholic institutions. Like most of the attempts in this line, that have lately been made, this looks too much like an attempt to put Protestantism in the place of legal recognition rather than Catholicism, and no American institution can ever be defended by any such means as that. Protestantism as an established religion, is only the Papacy in principle and under another name. We shall give our readers more particulars in this matter hereafter. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.16}

“One of the most prominent characteristics of the American Sabbath Union, says its organ, the *Pearl of Days*, is its broad basis of practical Christian union for one national, civil, and religious object. Its only ‘shibbotleth’ is the preservation of ‘the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship.’ It has no ‘sibboleths’ no other motto upon its banner. For this supreme end Protestants and Romans Catholics can and do co-operate, even if they are not incorporated in the institution itself. Religion and patriotism combine together to keep and to hand down succeeding generations the blessing of ‘the Lord’s Day.’ {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.17}

Certainly the object of the so-called union is “civil and religious;” it is civil in that it demands that the civil power enforce a religious institution; and it is religious in that the great underlying motive of the leaders in the “union” is the exaltation of Sunday because of the sacredness which in their minds attaches to that particular day. The term “civil” which they use is simply sugar used to catch flies that might not relish the odor of Church and State vinegar. {AMS January 16, 1890, p. 22.18}

**“Front Page” American Sentinel 5, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

In his late speech in New York City, Mr. Crafts said:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.19}

Vermont is the only State in which the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union has not a Sabbath Observance Superintendent; the reason being that whatever may be the wrongs in Vermont, Sabbath breaking is not one of them. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.20}

Yes, indeed, the American Sabbath Union and the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union can boast, of Vermont. Vermont is directly in their line of things. The Sunday laws of Vermont are exactly after their own hearts; for we have it upon the authority of Mr. Crafts himself that the Vermont Sunday laws require people to go to church and to religiously observe, the day. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.21}

The *Christian Nation* says:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.22}

God, who is the source of all authority, has appointed our Lord Jesus Christ the Ruler of nations. The Bible, God’s revealed will, contains law for nations, and is the standard by which all moral issues in political life are to be decided. National acknowledgement of this authority, and obedience to this law, constitute a truly Christian nation. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.23}

It is an easy matter to say that this is so, but it would be difficult to prove it by any statement of the Scriptures themselves. God has promised the world to Christ, but it has not yet been given into his hands; nor will it be till the time comes for the destruction of all earthly powers. This is clearly indicated in the second Psalm. Christ himself said that his kingdom is not of this world, and has likened himself to a nobleman going into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return. And it is at the time of his return that he will take the kingdom. But some of his professed followers not content to wait for his return are officiously trying to force the kingdom upon him in his absence, with the sense, with the evident purpose of setting themselves up as his representatives, to administer the government in his stead. It is this usurpation of power which we oppose. Christ has his representatives in the world, but the only authority ever given to them is found in Mark 16:15 and parallel texts. Working under this commission the apostles besought men to be reconciled to God, and that is all anybody has any right to do. To adopt the Bible as the law for the government of the Nation would simply be to provide that the majority should dictate to the minority in all things pertaining to religious faith and practice. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.24}

**“Rome and Liberty” American Sentinel 5, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

This article which we clip from *Present Truth*, a religious paper published in London, shows that even in England the contest now being waged in this country between the principles of Protestantism and the principles of the Papacy, is being watched with no little interest. The fact is also recognized that the principles of the so-called National Reform Association are the principles of Rome. *Present Truth* says:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.25}

In an Encyclical published a few years ago, the Pope said, “All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the Constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church. All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose, for an instant, from view the above prescriptions.” It has been urged officially that this should be specially kept in mind in England and the United States. The activity of Catholics, *as Romanists*, in the field of politics and journalism in England, is a constant reminder that the advice is being acted upon. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.26}

The recent Catholic Congress in America has drawn attention again to the work of Rome in the United States. A suspicious feature of the conference was the repeated and vociferous protestation of loyalty to free institutions. Those who are loyal at heart are content to let their lives and work show it, and do not find it necessary to multiply honeyed words. It was not many years ago that a papal encyclical anathematized “those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship.” Speaking of the present position of the controversy in America-and we can see there more fully developed, perhaps, the forces which are at work in this country the *Christian Commonwealth* says:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.27}

From across the Atlantic come many ominous warnings of a great struggle soon to come. The great Republic is awaking to the prospect of a battle which can in no way be decided, for it is simply a fact of inevitable destiny that the people of America must pass through a conflict with Rome. Rome! Name of unspeakable portent! The very word calls up a whole panorama of lurid apocalyptic visions: For ages the wave of human energy has rolled westward. And in our day the battlefield where the crowning struggle of liberty is to be fought seems likely to be found in the western Hemisphere. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.28}

But the *Commonwealth* draws inspiration from a recently published work showing the “increase of Protestantism and the decline of Popery.” It says:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.29}

The Protestant peoples are rapidly tending to out-number the Romish, and this single fact entirely settles the future outlook. As to America, when the Puritan element there is really roused the ambitious and dogmatic Romanism which is seeking to seat itself in a dominant attitude over the grand new prerogative of nations-liberty for all consciences-will quickly be convinced that it is in the minority and must never hope to emerge from such a position. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.30}

This faith as to the increase of Protestantism, is based on figures showing the increase of nominally Protestant people. But we do not forget the words,of an eminent European who said, “Protestants there are, but Protestantism is dead;” nor the words of the late Dr. Prochnow, “The land of Luther needs again the spirit of Luther;” nor the very recent remarks of Mr. J. A. Froude, That magnificent intellectual Protestantism is forever dead. The spirit that inspired Cromwell and William of Orange, oh! that spirit has altogether died out.” Were this not the truth, the children of the Reformation would do the works of the Reformation. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.31}

Even the “Puritan element” which is expected to become roused in America, has been fawning upon Romanism aacl begging its co-operation in powerful movement which is designed to amend a Constitution now guaranteeing freedom of conscience to all, so that it shall be what is called a ‘Christian Constitution,” which “would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel,” along with whom, it is declared, the Christian observers of the seventh-day Sabbath, and the Jews would have to be placed. To effect this revolution, the aid of the Romanists is necessary, and some time ago an article in the organ of this “reforming” movement, the Christian Statesman said, that although they might expect some rebuffs at first, the time had come “to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it.” The same programme anticipates the confirmation of religious instruction into favor, is what she calls the “true religion.” And when the tiger is unchained by the removal of those Constitutional barriers which have placed matters religious where the religion of Christ places them, outside the jurisdiction of civil government, it will need no prophet to foresee the result. We will let the *Christian Commonwealth* state it:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.32}

The 8,000,000 of Papists in the United States are being drilled day and night to demand supremacy over the civil power in the all-important department of public education. Should the people of the United States yield the control of the schools to the Romish hierarchy, the death-knell of popular liberty would be rung. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 22.33}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 5, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

The American Sabbath Union officially makes the following announcement of what it wants, and it is this:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.1}

What we want in this matter of Sunday work is total abstinence. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.2}

Mr. Crafts reports that he found a conference of ministers in New England that declined to indorse the petition to Congress for a national Sunday law. Good! May such conferences increase in number daily. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.3}

The secretary of Publications and Legislation of the American Sabbath Union, has issued a circular in which he says: “Some churches have appropriated a hundred dollars for the prevention of heathenizing America by Sabbath reform.” Well, the AMERICAN SENTINEL appropriates more than twice that amount every week, for the prevention of the heathenizing of America by such Sabbath reform as is represented by the American Sabbath Union. We know of one church that appropriates yet more than this for the same purpose. And let the good work go on. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.4}

A lady writes thus from Rockport, Atchison County, Mo.:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.5}

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: One of your papers came to me a few days ago. I must say I like tile spirit of freedom it breathes, for I see you not only wish to preserve the rights and liberties of the minority of Christians, but the free government our fathers bequeathed to us baptized in their own blood. I should consider myself unworthy of a free government or the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience except I am willing to grant to all, both great and small, the right to worship how, where, and what they please. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.6}

The American Sabbath Union says that its work for Sunday laws is “a real home missionary cause”, “of like importance with the Christianizing of heathen lands.” But the American Sabbath Union is attempting to do its work by legislation, especially national legislation, therefore the American Sabbath Union in asking State support thereby asks the State to take part in a missionary enterprise and do a missionary work of like importance with the Christianizing of heathen lands. This argues that the Government of the United States is a missionary society. The work of Christianizing heathen lands was committed by Jesus Christ to his disciples and not to the Roman Empire; to his Church and not to the State; and never since that has he committed that work, nor any part of it, to the State. It is committed, and belongs, to the Church only. If the Church cannot do that work without the help of the State, she cannot do it at all. Therefore the American Sabbath Union, in asking for Sunday laws asks the State to aid the Church. It asks for a union of Church and State in the work of “Christianizing” the people. Deny it as they may, the evil that is in this Sunday-law movement will crop out, unconsciously though it be. Let everybody understand that the Government of the United States is not a missionary society; but that the American Sabbath Union proposes to make it such a thing. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.7}

The American Secular Union makes the following announcement:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.8}

The American Secular Union, a voluntary association having for its object the complete separation of Church and State, in practice as well as in profession, and in no way committed to any system of religious belief or disbelief, acting herein by its President, Richard B. Westbrook, A. M., LL.D., as its special trustee and attorney-in-fact, hereby offer a premium of one thousand dollars ($1,000), lawful money of the United States, for the best essay, treatise, or manual adapted to aid and assist teachers in our free public schools and in the Girard College for orphans, and other public and charitable institutions professing to be unsectarian, to thoroughly instruct children and youth in the *purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrines*. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.9}

The papers should all be submitted by April 1, 1890, though more time will be granted if necessary, and the committee is now ready to receive manuscripts. Each manuscript is desired to be in typewriting, or, if written with the hand, must be very clearly written. It should have a special mark or designation, while the real name and post-office address of the author should be sent separately, in a sealed envelope bearing the same mark as the manuscript. Both manuscript and envelope to be addressed to R. B. Westbrook, No. 1707 Oxford St., Philadelphia, Pa., postage or express prepaid. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.10}

The Ridgewood Amusement Company of Queens County, N. Y., leased their grounds for playing base-ball and the clubs played on Sunday. The grand jury indicted the company for maintaining a nuisance in allowing Sunday base-ball. The company made no denial of letting the grounds nor of letting them for the purpose of playing base-ball, nor that base-ball was played there on Sunday. The company denied that it was a nuisance and brought many citizens and some officials, all residents, who testified that it was not a nuisance. Of course, the prosecution failed to convict. The American Sabbath Union is considerably annoyed at this, and says, “Every lawyer knows that it is a much more difficult matter to convict for maintaining a nuisance than to convict for Sabbath-breaking. The indictment should have been for Sabbath-breaking.” But Sabbath-breaking is distinctly an offense against God. It is essentially a religious offense and no man is responsible to any soul on this earth for Sabbath breaking; and when the power of the post State is employed to deal with the offense of Sabbath breaking that power is not carried entirely beyond every limit that properly pertains to the jurisdiction of civil government. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.11}

A correspondent of the *Central New Jersey Times* says in a recent communication to that paper:- {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.12}

Rome does not know what liberty of soul, body or conscience is, and she never has since she claimed temporal power. Catholics, however, have rights that should be respected, and it must be a source of regret that efforts, resolutions, and discussions, even of some religious bodies, have savored of compulsion and of legislation against Catholics. That is all wrong. If a Protestant majority can legislate against Catholics, a Catholic majority have just as good right to legislate against Protestants, and as a Baptist I want Catholics to have just the same rights and privileges as myself. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.13}

Certainly Catholics have just the same rights that Protestants have, and those rights should be respected. And when Protestants forget this and seek to evade the rights of the Catholic minority they cease to be Protestants, for not all Papists are in the Papal Church. The Protestant principle is that so far as his fellow-men are concerned every man shall be left perfectly free in matters of religion, and only those who act upon this principle are entitled to the Protestant name. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.14}

The home address of Alonzo T. Jones is 75 West 100th Street, New York City. {AMS January 23, 1890, p. 32.15}

**“Front Page” American Sentinel 5, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

It seems that some effort was made in the last Congress to have some action taken on the Sunday-Rest bill, and that even on Sunday. The secretary of Legislation of the American Sabbath Union in complaining of “the God-defying, law-defying Sabbath desecration by Congress” on the Sunday before inauguration day, says: “The Christian men of Congress did not, as on a former occasion, prevent a Sunday session by denying the right of Congress to require Sunday work of any of its members, and retiring in a body, and so destroying the quorum. Instead of such a protest, there was only a shallow jest, called up by a Sunday motion relating to the Sunday-Rest bill, that it was not proper to work on such legislation on the Sabbath.” That was not a shallow jest. That was a very wise and a very pious observation. We suggest that that gentle-man be made chairman of the committee that has charge of the Sunday-Rest bill. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 33.1}

The Chicago *News* of the 6th inst., has the following item:- {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 33.2}

Mr. Joseph W. Morton of Chicago takes issue with the statement of the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, of the American Sabbath Union, that the petition for certain Sabbath reforms which was presented to the last Congress was signed by more than ten million adults. “To contain ten million signatures,” says Mr. Morton, “would require at least 166, 667 sheets, making more than 347 reams, which, at the average rate of twelve and one•half pounds to the ream, would weigh more than two and one-sixth tons. The length of the petition would be a little more than sixty-three miles.” Mr. Morton is very confident that no such petition was ever presented to Congress on any subject. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 33.3}

Of course, no such petition was ever presented. The SENTINEL has repeatedly shown how the petitions referred to were made to represent such a vast number of petitioners, and it is certain that there has never been in any country a greater abuse of the right of petition. Whole denominations were counted on the strength of the vote of a few men not chosen for any such purpose; and even worse than that, the whole Roman Catholic Church was counted as petitioners, simply because Cardinal Gibbons wrote a letter to Mr. Crafts, saying: “I am happy to add my name.” It is true that, owing to the strenuous efforts being put forth by the friends of Sunday legislation, there is a growing sentiment in favor of such laws, but it is not true that any such number as they claim have ever petitioned for a Sunday law in any legitimate manner. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 33.4}

**“Notes” American Sentinel 5, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

One of the recommendations adopted by the Paris International Sunday Congress, upon “The Weekly Rest Day from a Social Point of View,” is this:- {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 39.1}

The smallest amount of rest which one ought to have is one day in seven; we mean by that, the Sabbath day, for that which is necessary for man is not a day of relief from labor only, but a day for true moral elevation. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 39.2}

If it is a day of rest simply from a social point of view, what matters it which day it is. From a social point of view, one man or a thousand men can rest just as well on one day as another. But that is not what the Congress meant to recommend. The Congress “means” that the Sabbath day is the one which shall be observed for rest and which is the smallest amount of rest that any man ought to take, and that not for physical rest primarily, but for true moral elevation. In this the Congress abandons the social point of view, adopts the religious, and places the day of rest upon the religious basis, and by so doing, it contradicts itself in it recommendation. But this is not an exceptional case by any means. No argument has ever yet been made professedly from a civil or social point of view that did not in fact rest upon the religious. And no such argument never can be made. The thing if religious in itself. It cannot be made anything else and by no argument can it ever be made consistently to *appear* anything else. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 39.3}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 5, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Nation* criticises the SENTINEL for maintaining that “governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed,” and makes an extended argument to prove that this is not true. We know that it is not true according to the National Reform religious-legislation theory; but it is true according to the American theory, and the American theory is true according to the Word of God. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.1}

The American Sabbath Union prints the following inquiry:- {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.2}

Is it not time to start a righteous crusade, under the laws of God and of man, in abolition of this ruinous system of [Sunday] bondage? {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.3}

Oh, certainly it is! Let the crusade be started at once. Let this cruel bondage be abolished. And in order that this may be accomplished swiftly and certainly, we suggest that the American Sabbath Union change its name to the American Abolition Union. Let slavery be abolished, say we, forever! {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.4}

December 29th, Mr. Crafts, of the American Sabbath Union, delivered an address at Association Hall, 86th Street, New York City. In that address he said:- {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.5}

The national Lay Congress of Roman Catholics after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union, passed its famous resolution in favor of co-operation with Protestants in Sabbath reform of which the following is a full and correct copy: “There are many Christian issues in which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics and shape civil legislation for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice, and overlooking zealotry, we should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judeaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday. To effect this, we must set our faces sternly against the sale of intoxicating beverages on Sunday. The corrupting influences of saloons in politics, the crime and pauperism from excessive drinking, require legislative restriction which we can aid in procuring by joining our influence with that of the other enemies of intemperance. Let us resolve that drunkenness shall be made odious, and give practical encouragement and support to Catholic temperance societies. We favor the passage and enforcement of laws rigidly closing saloons on Sunday and forbidding the sale of liquors to minors and intoxicated persons.” {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.6}

Upon this Mr. Crafts remarks:- {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.7}

This does not mean that the millennium is to be built in a day. This is only a proposal of courtship, and the parties thus far have approached each other shyly. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.8}

When courtship has gotten so far along as the proposal, marriage is not far off, especially where the parties are so coy as is this species of Protestantism. And when this marriage between Protestantism and Catholicism is accomplished, what will become of the Protestant portion of the union? What kind of Protestantism is that, anyhow, which so willingly, or rather anxiously, carries on a courtship with Roman Catholics to the extent of receiving a proposal of marriage? Yes, that marriage is coming, and like every other great feature of Catholicism, it is contrary to nature-one woman marrying another. And the fruit of it will be, as pictured in the Scripture, a hideous, nondescript monster. Let there be raised up in this land a Protestantism that will assert itself not only against Roman Catholicism as such, but also against this degenerate Protestantism that has forgotten its place and its mission in the world. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.9}

The resolution “that drunkenness shall be made odious” by giving it governmental and religious sanction six days in the week, is likewise worthy of the Catholic Church. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.10}

The organ of the American Sabbath Union says that “the opposition to Senator Blair’s Sunday-Rest bill, introduced in the United States Senate, December 9, and printed in the *Pearl of Days*, is based upon a false assumption. That bill does not assume, as it is claimed, that civil legislation upon this subject appeals to the divine law for its support. Nothing of this kind appears in the bill.” Certainly nothing of the kind appears in the bill, for it has been omitted for the express purpose of disarming opposition to the measure. It is, however, not a false assumption to say that the bill is a religious measure and that the motives of its promoters are purely religious. A careful comparison of the bill as introduced in the Fiftieth Congress and as now pending in the Fifty-first Congress will convince anyone that precisely the same object is to be accomplished by the bill as it now stands, as it was hoped to accomplish by it as originally framed. We print on another page an article from one of our exchanges which shows this so plainly that none can fail to see it. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.11}

We notice that some of our exchanges, as well as a number of our correspondents, make the mistake of confounding the Blair Educational Bill with the Educational Amendment. These are not identical by any means. The Blair Educational Bill is a measure that has been advocated by Senator Blair for several years, and has passed the Senate several tines. The object of this bill is to appropriate a certain amount-seventy millions, we think-from the surplus funds in the public treasury to the different States of the Union according to the proportion of illiteracy. But this bill does not propose in itself to have anything to do with religion in the public schools; it simply proposes to take some of the surplus in the public treasury and divide it amongst the States for the States to use according to their own educational systems. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.12}

The Educational *Amendment* proposed by Senator Blair, is that which we have printed and commented upon in the SENTINEL. This proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States so that the principles of Christianity shall be taught in all the public schools in the Nation. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.13}

The Educational *Bill* would become a law, and of force, merely upon the action of Congress and the approval of the President. The proposed *Amendment* would be of no force until it was approved by three-fourths of the States. We shall print soon a copy of the Blair Educational *Bill* that our readers may understand just what the intent of it is. We make these remarks just now, only for the purpose of correcting the mistake that some have made, of confounding the bill with the proposed amendment. Please don’t do it any more. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.14}

The American Sabbath Union complains that, “New England is in peril from Sunday work and Sunday dissipation.” How can it be otherwise under Sunday laws? The effort of the Sunday-law workers is to preserve Sunday as a religious day. Secular work is not in harmony with the religious idea of the day, therefore, work is forbidden. When work is forbidden to those who are not religious they are compelled to be idle, dissipation is the sure outcome; and that also is out of harmony with the religious idea of day. As Sunday is held to be the palladium of salvation for the State; whatever State it is that has Sunday laws will always be in peril from Sunday work and Sunday dissipation. {AMS January 30, 1890, p. 40.15}