

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.-Thomas Jefferson.

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY 13, 1889.

NUMBER 4.

The American Sentinel. PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY, NO. 43: BOND ST., NEW YORK; 26 COLLECE PLACE, CHICAGO, ILL.; 18 POST ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.; 12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL. E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES, SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS: J. H. WAGGONER, E. W. FARNSWORTH, DAN T. JONES.

THE Christian Statesman says: "We recognize the ability of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, published in Oakland, California, against the cause of National Reform, and we admire the consistency with which it follows its own premises to their uttermost conclusions."

We highly appreciate that recognition. We never did bear any malice to our opponent; and since we have succeeded in raising its estimation of us from contempt to respect, it is barely possible that we may induce it to listen to reason on some points. At any rate, if consistent opposition to National Reform will do the work, we are sure of keeping its respect and admiration.

"WHAT can be done to stem the tide of rampant immorality, which is rising all around us?" was the subject of discussion at a recent meeting of ministers. This is a question which is attracting much attention of late, and the usual solution is an appeal to civil law. It is strange that none of them ever think of following the rule laid down by the apostle Paul, for use in such cases. He wrote to Timothy of a time when people would not only be immoral, but would choose teachers who would wink at, if not pander to, their lusts, and his injunction was, "Preach the Word?" That old pioneer of Christianity knew of no other way to combat immorality. He said that the weapons of his warfare were "not carnal." But now the appeal is constantly to the civil law. What has caused the change? Is it that men are so differently constituted now that the gospel cannot affect them? or is it because the ministers have not the same gospel that Paul preached.

LET it be distinctly understood that we quote in the SENTINEL no extracts from journals opposed to National. Reform aims. Not that we do not print selected articles opposed to that work, but we make no statements concerning its aims, and what is being done or is proposed to be done, except what we glean either from official organs, or from journals friendly to that cause. This gives those statements, damaging as we show them to be, additional weight. We propose to convict them on their own testimony. Readers of the SENTINEL may depend on it that the aims of those who are working to secure religious legislation are accurately represented by it. And here we wish to call attention to one fact, and readers of the official organs of the National Reform Association will uphold us in the statement, that if you want to get a full, accurate, and comprehensive view of the principles of what is called National Reform, you must take the AMERICAN SENTINEL. You will find it nowhere else. Send for the first three volumes, and read up on the subject.

IT is possible that some may think we have strained a point in our article on another page, entitled, "A Sign of the Times," and that Sunday laws will never be so rigidly enforced as to lead to a man's house being searched to see if he is quietly at work. But we have not drawn on our imagination in the least, for in Belleville, Ontario, a man was recently prosecuted and fined for keeping open his photograph gallery on Sunday. We might state, incidentally, that this man is a conscientious observer of the seventh day. This reminds us that in nearly every case of prosecution for working on Sunday, of which we ever heard, the victim was a seventh-day keeper. And this is one of the things that confirms us in the belief that the prime factor in the enactment and enforcement of all Sunday laws, is sectarian bigotry. If the people who so zealously work for such laws, would openly declare that they want to have a chance to vent their spite on those who differ with them in faith, we could have more respect for them than we can when they cover their real desire under a pretense of wanting temperance.

The Gospel of Christ is Not a Political System.

THE National Woman's Christian Temperance Union Convention for 1888 passed the following resolution:---

Resolved, That Christ and his gospel as universal king and code should be sovereign in our government and political affairs, and that obedience to his law is the only path to political righteousness and peace."

Is it true that Christ is a divine politician? Is it true that he is a political king? Is it true that the gospel of Jesus Christ is a political code? Is it true that political righteousness and peace are the objects of his law? It is *not* true. Not one of these things is true. The idea of the resolution is as far from the truth as anything could possibly be and not be downright blasphemy.

For the sake of illustration, let us put this resolution to the test. Suppose the gospel were adopted as the code of this land. It would then be the bounden duty of every court to act according to the code.

There is a statute in that code, which says, "If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and

if he repent, forgive him. And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him." Remember, they have resolved that this shall be the code in our Government. Suppose, then, a man steals a horse. He is arrested, tried, and found guilty. He says, "I repent." "Thou shalt forgive him," says the code, and the Government must conform to the code. He is released and repeats the act; is again arrested and found guilty. He says, "I repent." Thou shalt forgive him. And if he does it seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turns to the court, saying, "I repent," the court must forgive him; for so says that which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has resolved should be the governmental code.

It will be seen in an instant that any such system would be destructive of civil government. This is not saying anything against the Bible, nor against its principles. It is only illustrating the absurd preversion of its principles by these people who want to establish a system of religious legislation here. God's Government is moral, and he has made provision for maintaining his Government with the forgivenes of the transgression. But he has made no such provision for civil government, and no such provision can be made. No such provision can be made and civil government be maintained. The Bible reveals God's method of saving sinners against his moral Government; civil government is man's method of preserving order, and has nothing to do with sin, nor with the salvation of sinners.

But that such a mixture would be destructive of civil government, is not all; it would be destructive of the gospel as well. For when the gospel of Jesus Christ is brought down to the low level of politics, and is made an element in political contests, it is destroyed; its whole spirit is perverted, and in a little while the profession of it is only used to sanctify all manner of ambitious scheming. The gospel of Jesus Christ, maintained upon the high plane where Christ has placed it, is the best thing the world ever saw or ever can see. But that gospel perverted, and degraded to the low level of human pride; made an instrument of worldly ambition, and used to sanctify human passions, human caprices, and political strife, becomes the worst evil that ever afflicted a people. The one is the mystery of godliness, worthy only of the supremest effort of the mind to understand, the most devout reverence of the soul to contemplate, and the constant, sincerest effort of the life to imitate. The other is the mystery of iniquity, worthy only of the eternal abhorrence of every intelligent creature.

In the face of the Saviour's express statement that his kingdom "is not of this world," the Woman's Christian Temperance Union declares that he "shall be this world's king; yea, verily, THIS WORLD'S king;" king of its courts, camps, commerce, colleges, eloisters, and constitutions. It declares that this kingdom of Christ "must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics." The Union demands the ballot in the hands of women, in order to turn this Government into a theocracy, and have men "swear an oath of allegiance to Christ in politics, and march in one great army up to the polls to worship God." With all this, their resolution to make him and his gospel the king and code in our government and political affairs, and obedience to his law the only path to political righteousness and peace, is strictly consistent. But the Woman's Christian Temperance Union will have to go but a little farther in this direction before it will justly deserve the open and determined opposition of every person who has any regard for eivil government, or any respect for Christian principles. A. T. J.

That Wonderful Letter.

THE letter which Cardinal Gibbons wrote to W. F. Crafts has been the subject of a great deal of comment and conjecture. It is safe to say that that one letter has been of more service to the National Sunday Union than everything else that has been done. On the strength of that letter, the number of signatures to the Sunday law petitions was advanced at once from something over 6,000,000 to 14,000,000. Following is the entire letter, which we take, together with the introduction, from the January number of Our Day:

"Cardinal Gibbons has indorsed the petition for a National Sunday rest law in the following letter, which is here for the first time published in full:-

"CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, 408 N. CHARLES STREET, BALTIMORE, December 4, 1888.

"REV. W. F. CRAFTS-Rev. Dear Sir: I have to acknowledge your esteemed favor of the 1st inst., in reference to the proposed passage of a law by Congress 'against Sunday work in the Gov-ernment's mail and military service,' etc.

"I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labor, and who are endeavoring to gitimate legislation. As the late Plenary Council of Baltimore has declared, the due observance of the Lord's day contributes immeasurably to the restriction of vice and immorality, and to the promotion of peace, religion, and social order, and cannot fail to draw upon the nation the blessing and protection of an overruling Providence. If benevolence to the beasts of burden directed one day's rest in every week under the old law, surely humanity to man ought to dictate the same measure humanity to man ought to diverse the second of rest under the new law. "Your obedient servant in Christ, "JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS, "Archbishop of Baltimore."

There you have it. Now we ask, in all candor: Does it justify the claim that has been made for it? Was there any reason in that letter for doubling the number of signatures to the Sunday law petition, and throwing in a few thousand names extra? We say, No. There is not the slightest hint in it that the Cardinal thought he was acting officially. He says, "I am most happy to add my name," etc. If all the members of the Catholic Church virtually signed their names to that petition when Cardinal Gibbons did, then, by the same token, they all eat their breakfast whenever he eats his breakfast. Are the members of the Catholic Church so closely united to Cardinal Gibbons that every individual act of his becomes theirs? Must they, per force, actually sneeze every time he takes snuff? We know that he spoke only for himself, because intelligent Catholics have roundly denounced, as a piece of worse than political trickery, the effort to make it appear that he signed for the whole Catholic Church; and not only so, but many Catholics, and even Catholic priests, have signed the petition asking Congress not to pass the Blair bills.

And yet, in the very number of the magazine in which this letter is published, it is stated editorially, that "Cardinal Gibbons also sent him [Mr. Crafts] an official letter indorsing the petition on behalf of the Plenary Council of the Roman Catholic Church." Senator Blair, also, in presenting the petitions to the Senate, December 16, stated that the Cardinal had indorsed them in behalf of 7,200,000 Catholics. We can stretch our charity enough to imagine that the Senator had never seen the letter, since we do not positively know that he had seen it; and so we can absolve him from any attempt at willful deception. But what shall we say of the others, who had the letter in their possession? We will not mention the commandment which they have deliberately broken, for we have no desire to put them personally into the pillory; but we do want everybody to know by what base trickery and contemptible frauds the officers of the National Sunday Union are trying to influence legislation. And still these men propose to purify politics!

Sunday Law Meeting in Oakland.

THE meeting held in Hamilton Hall, Tuesday evening, January 22, in the interest of a Sunday law in California, was a very tame affair. The speakers read or recited their pieces in a perfunctory manner, having the appearance of men somewhat discouraged. Although they have little or no hope of getting any satisfaction at this session of the Legislature, they showed very clearly the spirit that underlies their movement, and the nature of the law that they want, and that is all that we are concerned about.

Dr. M. C. Briggs, of Santa Clara, and Dr. Dwinelle, of the Pacific Theological Seminary, were the speakers of the evening. In his opening prayer, Dr. Dwinelle prayed that the State might be awakened to the necessity of making Sunday not only a day of rest, but of moral quickening as well. In his remarks, he said: "The whole business of the community must cease practically, in order that all may have the benefit of the rest day." That is to say, that the Doctor does not and cannot rest on Sunday, unless everybody else stops work. The untruthfulness of such a statement should be apparent to all. Thousands of people in the United States and in Europe, who rest on the seventh day, and who enjoy their rest and worship, and get all the benefit from it that there is in a rest day, show clearly enough that it is not necessary to have a law compelling everybody to rest, in order to accommodate a few.

Dr. Briggs's speech was mostly a labored theological argument. It would be utterly useless to report him in this, for two reasons. First, because theology has nothing to do with the matter. If the Doctor could read on every page of the Bible a plain declaration that Sunday ought to be kept as the Sabbath, it would not have a particle of bearing on the matter of a State Sunday law. The State has no business to legislate in matters pertaining only to God; and second, because the Doctor stumbled so much over Hebrew roots, that his efforts excited only pity,

He did treat us to one brilliant, original piece of Biblical exegesis. Speaking of the phrase, "the morrow after the Sabbath," which occurs a few times in connection with the Passover, he said : "The morrow after the Sabbath, is mentioned all the way along as following the Sabbath." His conclusion was, that Sunday is the Sabbath ! When such arguments as that are hurled at us, our only refuge is silence. This may be taken as a fair sample of the arguments by which the necessity for Sunday laws is shown; and since it is less than nothing, we are driven to the conclusion that force of numbers will be the all-prevailing argument in taking away the liberties of the people.

When he struck the New Testament, he didn't venture any such original thoughts, but contented himself with retailing the stale argument on the Greek of Matt. 28:1, and similar passages, where the word "week" is rendered from Sabbaton. The Doctor asserted that that text should read, "the first of the Sabbaths," instead of "the first day of the week." This assertion was made with as much boldness as though all the scholarship of the world were not against such a rendering. Any Greek scholar or lexicon will tell him that the word Sabbaton has the meaning of "week," as well as of "Sabbath."

While the Doetcr was dwelling on this, we thought that we would like to quote to him Luke 18:12, where the Pharisee in the temple is represented as saying in his prayer, "I fast twice in the week." Here the same word is rendered "week" as in Matt. 28:1; and according to Dr. Briggs's theory of exposition, the text ought to read, "I fast twice in the Sabbath." Just imagine that well-fed Pharisee clasping his hands over his aldermanic sides, while he sanctimonously raised his eyes, and said to the Lord: "I thank thee that I am not as other men are, for I abstain from eating twice every Sabbath-day"! This is absurd, but no more so than the renderings given by Dr. Briggs; so we may dismiss his Scripture argument.

When the Doctor came right down to the matter of a civil law compelling men to keep Sunday whether or no, he was more at home, and spoke with more freedom. Said he, "We don't want to make men religious." How often that is reiterated. One would think that there was nothing that these eivil Sunday-law preachers dreaded so much as making men religious. He said that the Sunday law is designed only as "a measure of protection to those who are dependent on others; a police regulation; a sanitary arrangement." We can well believe that if it is ever enacted it will be a police regulation, and that is just what we oppose. We don't want any police regulation of religious matters. As to sanitary arrangements, we would have more confidence in them if they originated with the medical fraternity, instead of the preachers.

Only one thing more need be noted, and that is, his reason why there must be a law compelling everybody to rest on the same day. Said he, "If every man is at liberty to choose his own day of rest, my neighbor who doesn't keep my day will work on my day, while I want to rest. So there must be one day for the whole community."

There you have an expression of the mean selfishness out of which all Sunday laws spring. "My neighbor will work on my day, unless there is a law compelling him to observe it." Verv likely; but how about Doctor Briggs? Will he not work on the day on which his neighbor

wants to rest? Why, of course; but then, "what rights has my neighbor, that I am bound to respect? I'm in the majority." We don't wonder that men become infidels, when Doctors of Divinity, who profess to be living exponents of Christianity, show such an unrighteous disregard for the rights and feelings of others. The gospel which they teach is one which says, "Whatsoever ye would not that your neighbor should do to you, that do you to him if you feel like it and have the power."

We are happy to inform our friends that Christianity has nothing in common with such teaching. Christianity leads men to be considerate of others; and if a man is weak and in the minority, that is the very one whom true Christianity would seek out and protect. As we left the meeting, musing on the heartlessness of the men who are clamoring for Sunday laws, we could think only of these words, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret, unto their assembly; mine honor, be not thou united." E. J. W.

Who is the Unfair One?

THE Christian Statesman feels aggrieved at what it terms the SENTINEL's unfair criticisms on National Reform work. In its issue of January 10, it arraigns us in several counts, only one of which we will notice now. It says:---

"The same disposition to impute evil motives appears in the criticisms in the last number of the SENTINEL, on the signatures to the petition for a National Sabbath law, as accumulated and displayed last month at the National Sabbath Convention in Washington. That petition was signed by some millions of citizens with their own hand, and was indorsed officially by the representatives of many millions more. The supreme judicatures of the churches, the national conventions of labor organizations, and other representative bodies, directed their officers to sign it in behalf of their respective organizations. Cardinal Gibbons wrote a letter officially approving of the measure in behalf of the Roman Catholic These facts were fully, frankly, publicly Church. stated."

Yes; and that was just the ground of our charge. We know that there was no attempt to make it appear that all the alleged petitioners had signed in person. What we found fault with was the "facts" which they so "fully, frankly, and publicly stated." Our accusation was, that their "facts" were not true, and we leave it to anyone who reads the article entitled . "That Wonderful Letter," which appears on another page of this issue, to judge if our accusation was not a just one. That letter shows upon the face of it that it was unofficial, and everybody ought to know, what intellegent Catholics freely state, that Cardinal Gibbons had no power to sign any petition in behalf of 7,200,000 Catholics. Yet the Christian Statesman repeats that statement, even while protesting against our charge. We do not accuse it of intentional deception: we simply think it has a wonderful faculty for misapprehending facts.

We don't like to speak of such things. We wish the National Reform Sunday-law folks wouldn't do so. But since they do them, and seek to influence legislation by such frauds, we are compelled to mention them, not for the purpose of bringing odium on the individuals, but to show how far from Christian the whole scheme is. If National Reformers use such methods to secure their ends, what may we expect when they once get their "Christian" Government fairly established?

The United States Constitution.

Is our national Constitution right as it is? or will it not be right until some such amendment shall have been adopted as is now offered by Senator Blair, and heartily supported by the National Reform Association and its allies? As the amendment is offered supposedly in the interests of Christianity, a Scriptural answer to these questions ought to be not only acceptable but satisfactory. What then saith the Scripture? What are the words of Christ? We quote:---

"Then went the scribes and Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. We know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth. T. II us therefore, what thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness and said, Whose image and superscription is this? They said unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

In these words Christ has established a clear distinction between Cæsar and God, that is, between the civil and the religious powers, and between what we owe to the civil power and what we owe to the religious power. That which is Cæsar's is to be rendered to Cæsar alone; that which is God's is to be rendered to God alone. To say that we are to render to Cæsar that which is God's, or that we are to render to God by Cæsar that which is God's, is to pervert the words of Christ, and make them meaningless.

These words show, not only that there are things that pertain to Cæsar alone, and things that pertain to God alone, but that it is our duty as servants of Christ to know what these things are, and in obedience render to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, and to God that which is God's.

As the term Cæsar refers to civil government, it is apparent that the duties which we owe to Cæsar are civil duties, while those we owe to God are wholly moral or religious duties. Webster defines religion as "the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience, "and another definition is, "a man's relation of faith and obedience to God." It is evident, therefore, that religion and religious duties pertain solely to God, and that which is God's is to be rendered to him, and not to Cæsar; it follows inevitably that civil government can never of right have anything to do with religion, with a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God.

In support of the doctrine that civil government has the right to act in things pertaining to God, the text of Scripture is quoted which says: "The powers that be are ordained of God."

This passage is found in Rom. 13:1. The first nine verses of that chapter are devoted to the subject, showing that the powers that be are ordained of God, and enjoining upon Christians, upon every soul, in fact, the duty of respectful subjection to civil government.

By those who advocate a religious amendment to the Constitution, it is argued that because the powers that be are ordained of God, they must have something to do with men's relations to God. Is it a sound argument to say that because a thing is ordained of God, it is ordained to every purpose and work under the sun? A minister of the gospel is ordained of God,—but for what? To preach the gospel, and not, as too many ministers nowadays seem to think, to minister the law or politics. No minister of the gospel was ever ordained as a minister of the law, either moral or civil; and when a minister enters on any such work as that, he is doing a work that Christ never sent him to do.

By reading the first nine verses of the thirteenth chapter of Romans, it will be seen that this scripture is but an exposition of the words of Christ, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." It is God's own commentary on those words; and in them there is a recognition of the rightfulness of civil government; that it has claims upon us, and that it is our duty to recognize those claims. This scripture in Rom. 13, simply states the same thing in other words: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; for the powers that be are ordained of God."

Again, the Saviour's words were called out by a question concerning tribute. They said to Him, "Is it lawful to pay tribute unto Cæsar, or not?" Referring to the same thing, Rom. 13: 6 says: "For this cause pay ye tribute." In answer to the question of the Pharisees about the tribute, Christ said, "Render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's." Rom. 13:7 says, "Render to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due." We repeat, therefore, that Rom. 13:9 is the Lord's own commentary upon the words of Christ in Matt. 22:17, 21.

The passage in Romans refers first to civil government; the higher powers,---not the highest powers,----the powers that be. Next it speaks of rulers bearing the sword and attending upon matters of tribute. Then he exhorts, to render tribute to whom tribute is due, and to owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another fulfilleth the law. Then he refers to the last five commandments, and says, "If there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." There are other commandments of the same law to which Paul here refers. and he knew it. Why then did he say, "If there be any other commandment," etc. There was the first table of the law containing the commandments, which say, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me;" "Thou shalt not make any graven image;" "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," and the other commandment in which is comprehended all these, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." Paul knew all of these commandments. Why, then, did he say, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself?" Answer: Because he is writing upon the words of the Saviour, which relate to our duties to civil government. Our duties under civil government pertain solely to the government, and to our fellow-men; and the powers of civil government pertain solely to men in their relations one to another, and to the State. But the Saviour's words in the same connection entirely separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to civil government. The things which pertain to God are not to be rendered to civil government,---to the powers that be; therefore it was that Paul, although knowing full well that there were other commandments, said, "If there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying: Love thy neighbor as thyself;" that is, if there be any other commandment which comes into the relation between man and civil government, it is comprehended in this saying, That he

shall love his neighbor as himself; thus showing conclusively that the powers that be, though ordained of God, are so ordained only in things pertaining to the relation of man with his fellowmen, and in those things alone.

Further, as in this divine record of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no reference whatever to the first table of the law, it therefore follows, that the powers that be, although ordained of God, have nothing whatever to do with the relations which men bear toward God.

As the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man, and as in God's own enumeration of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no mention of any of the things contained in the first table of the law, it follows that none of the duties enjoined in the first table of the law of God, do men owe to the powers that be. That is to say, again, the powers that be, although ordained of God, are not ordained of God in anything pertaining to a single duty enjoined in any one of the first four of the ten commandments. These are duties that men owe to God, and with these the powers that be can of right have nothing to do, because Christ has commanded to render unto God-not to Cæsar, nor by Cæsar that which is God's.

Let us look a moment at this question from a common sense point of view; of course, all we are saying is common sense, but let us have this additional :---

"When societies are formed, each individual surrenders certain rights, and as an equivalent for that surrender, has secured to him the enjoyment of certain others appertaining to his person and property, without the protection of which society cannot exist."

I have the right to protect my person and property against all comers. Every other person has the same right, but if this right is to be personally exercised in all cases by every one, then in the present condition of human nature, every man's hand will be against his neighbor. That is simply anarchy, and in such a condition of affairs society cannot exist. Now suppose a hundred of us are thrown together in a certain place where there is no established order, each one has all the rights of every other one. But if each one is individually to exercise these rights of self-protection, he has only the assurance of that degree of protection which he alone can furnish to himself, which we have seen is exceedingly slight. Therefore we all come together, and each surrenders to the whole body that individual right; and in return for this surrender he receives the power of all for his protection. He therefore receives the help of the other ninety-nine to protect himself from the invasion of his rights, and he is thus made one hundred times more secure in his right of person and property than he is without this surrender.

But what condition of things can ever be conceived of among men that would justify any man in surrendering his right to believe? What could he receive as an equivalent? When he has surrended his right to believe, he has virtually surrendered his right to think. When he surrenlers his right to believe, he surrenders everything, and it is impossible for him ever to receive an equivalent; he has surrendered his very soul. Eternal life depends upon believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, and the man who surrenders his right to believe, surrenders stornal life. Says the scripture, "With the mind I serve the law of God," A man who surrenders his right to believe, surrenders God. Consequently no man, no association, or organization of men, can ever rightly ask of any man a surrender of his right to believe. Every man has the right, so far as organizations of men are concerned, to believe as he pleases; and that right, so long as he is a Protestant, so long as he is a Christian, yes, so long as he is a man, he never can surrender, and he never will.

The United States is the first and only Government in history that is based on the principle established by Christ. In article VI. of the National Constitution, this nation says, that "No rereligious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;" and by an amendment making more certain the adoption of the principle, it declares "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This first amendment was adopted in 1789, by the first Congress that ever met under the Constitution. In 1796 a treaty was made with Tripoli, in which it was declared, Art. II., that "The Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." This treaty was framed by an ex-Congregationalist clergyman, and was signed by President Washington. It was not out of disrespect to religion or Christianity that these clauses were placed in the Constitution, and that this one was inserted in that treaty; on the contrary, it was entirely on account of their respect for religion, and the Christian religion in particular, as being beyond the province of civil government, pertaining solely to the conscience, and resting entirely with the individual and God. It was because of this that this nation was constitutionally established, according to the principle of Christ demanding of men only that they render to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, and leaving them entirely free to render to God that which is God's if they choose, as they choose, and when they choose. Or, as expressed by Washington himself, in reply to an address upon the subject of religious legislation :-

"Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

We cannot more fittingly conclude this point than with the following tribute of George Bancroft to this principle, as embodied in the words of Christ, and in the American Constitution:-

"In the earliest states known to history, gov-ernment and religion were one and indivisible. Each state had its special deity, and of these protectors, one after the other might be overthrown in battle, never to rise again. The Pelopounesian war grew out of a strife about an oracle. Rome, as it sometimes adopted into citizenship those whom it vanquished, introduced in like manner, and with good logic for that day, the worship of their gods. No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Cæsar only that which is Cæsar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman Empire, than it was by the chief of the Roman Empire, than it was shorn of its character of universality, and en-thralled by an unholy connection with the unholy state; and so it continued till the new nature, the least defiled with the harren scoffings of the eigh-teenth century, the most general believers in Chris-tianity of any people of that age, the chief oar of the reformation in its pure forms, when it came to establish a government for the United States, re-fused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by fused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by

a corporate body, or having a headship in a mon-

arch or a state. "Vindicating the right of individuality even in the new nation religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its rela-tions to God the principle first divinely ordained of God in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the Am r-ican Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truths might move in its free-dom and purity and power."—History of the For-mation of the Constitution—Last Chapter.

Thus the Constitution of the United States, as it stands, is the sole monument of all history representing the principle that Christ established for earthly government. And under it, in liberty, civil and religious, in enlightment, and in progress, this nation has deservedly stood as the beacon light to all other nations for a hundred vears.

Whoever, therefore, attempts to amend that Constitution so as to connect it in any way with any religion, not only attempts to subvert the Constitution, but also to subvert the principles established by our Lord Jesus Christ. A. T. J.

A Sign of the Times.

THE Christian Statesman of November 29 had an article copied from the Christian Intelligencer, about the amount of business done by photographers on Sunday. Following are a few paragraphs from it, which will serve to show the drift of sentiment in regard to such labor:

"It is hardly probable that the Christian people of this city are aware of the extent to which the Sabbath is violated by the photographers. Many of the principal galleries are filled with waiting patrons, and their largest business is done on the

Sabbath. "The famous galleries, although not exactly open to the public, are ready to make appointments, and prefer that day to execute the pictures of the pop-

"And most of the small places, after passing a dull week, expect to make up on the Sunday busi-ness enough to give them a profit over the week's

"There is a wholesome law against this transact-ing business on the holy day, but it is not enforced.

A few years ago an attempt was made to close up the violators of the Sabbath, but it was not successful, and several of the prominent men in that effort, seeing no remedy, now keep open, and find their purses better filled, their bank account much larger, and their credit much better with the stock dealer. Now in view of this truthful statement, what is the duty of the Christian public in this matter?

The article carries with it its own answer to the last question, that is, from the standpoint of the . Statesman and the Intelligencer.

The plainly implied demand is that such business should be stopped by law. And this indicates to what lengths the instigators of the Sundaylaw movement will go when they have secured the legislation which they want, and have the power in their hands. It shows that a system of espionage will be inaugurated, and that nobody's privacy will be sacred from the prying intrusion of the minions of such an iniquitous law.

There is no business that is conducted with more quietness than the business of photography. Nothing is less calculated to disturb public worship or private devotion. Even a monk in his cloister could not be disturbed by the business of a photographer next door, if he were not informed of its proximity.

When the photographer may be arrested for quietly conducting his work in an upper room on Sunday, then no person will be exempt. Some

zealous individual, anxious for political preferment, will find out that the merchant is in his private office on Sunday, looking over his ledger, and forthwith the merchant will be arrested. The lady who takes in sewing may be arrested for making button-holes or fitting a garment in her back parlor, on Sunday. The literary man who writes for hire may be arrested for quietly working at his desk on Sunday. In short, from such a wholesale stoppage of Sunday work as is desired by the Statesman, the Intelligencer, and all who may be classed as National Reformers, it will be but a step to the arresting of every citizen who is found away from church on Sunday, unless detained by sickness. That this is not an exaggerated conclusion is evident from the statement of Dr. Herrick Johnson, that he longed for the breath of the Puritan, for the Puritan Sabbath; and this is just what was done in the days of the Covenanters and Puritans. Robert Wodrow, a Scotch ecclesiastical historian, of whom it is said that his "veracity was above suspicion," and of his writings, that "no historical facts are better ascertained than the accounts . . . to be found in Wodrow," makes the following statement concerning the methods used to secure attendance at church :-

"It is thocht expedient that ane baillie with tua of the session pas throw the towne everie Sabbath day, and nott sic as they find absent fra the sermones ather afoir or efter none; and for that effect that they pas and serche sic houss as they think maist meit."—Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen.

In modern English this is as follows:---

"It is thought expedient that one bailiff with two of the session pass through the town every Sabbath day, and note such as they find absent from the sermons either before or after noon; and for that effect that they pass and search such houses as they think most meet."

In his "Collections" he says: "The session allows the searchers to go into houses, and apprehend absents from the kirk." Now when one of the great cries for a Sunday law is because people do not go to church, and when the only ground for stopping a photographer from working in the seclusion of his own room, could be that he was staying from church and at least inviting others to do so, the conclusion is inevitable that when the clamorers for a Sunday law get what they want, they will make no scruple of going into any house where they have reason to suspect that anybody is working on Sunday, and arresting the occupants.

Are we not warranted in saying that the liberties of the American people are in danger? Is it not high time that the people were awakening to the alarming growth of the religious legislation evil? Who will protest against the degeneracy of Protestantism? E. J. W.

Showing Its Parentage.

In the (Detroit) Christian Herald's brief report of the National Sunday Convention at Washington, the President, Col. Elliott F. Shepard, is reported as having said that "Congress and the law-making powers in this country have virtually repealed the fourth commandment." By this he of course referred to the failure to enforce Sunday observance. It is not our intention to make any argument on what is plain enough without, namely, that Sunday and the fourth commandment have nothing whatever to do with each other; that we pass for the present. But taking him on his supposition, that repealing the fourth commandment would affect Sunday, we wish to point out sharply the position which the National Sunday Union proposes to assume. Note well the following:----

Allowing that the failure to enact laws compelling people to keep Sunday, or the repealing of those already in existence, is a virtual repeal of the fourth commandment, then it follows that in their efforts to secure the enactment and enforcement of such laws, they are working for the re-enactment of the Fourth commandment. Is not that a logical conclusion? Certainly it is, and Colonel Shepard, as the representative of the Union, would admit it. Then mark this point:—

It was the Lord Jehovah who spoke the fourth commandment, with the other nine, from Sinai. It was God who enacted that law. Therefore the National Sunday Union, consisting of the National Reform Association, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and various religious organizations, in proposing to re-enact the fourth commandment, is proposing to put itself in the place of God. Not only so, but it is putting itself above God, by assuming that it is more competent to vindicate his law than he is himself. In this it is showing itself a true child of the Papacy, that "man of sin," the "son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Is not the likeness perfect? In other words, Is it not trying to make of this nation an image of the Papal beast? E. J. W.

Some Questions and Answers.

ONE who is interested in the work of the SEN-TINEL asks the following questions, to which we append replies:—

 $^{\prime\prime}$ Do you hold that the basis of your religion is to serve God? "

The *object* of our religion is to serve God. Its basis is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, with all that faith implies. 1 Cor. 3:11.

"Do you recognize and acknowledge the fact, that every blessing secured for the well-being of humanity is so much towards serving the will of God? Or, do you consider that every blessing to mankind is an expression of God's goodness?"

To the first part of this compound inquiry, we say unqualifiedly, Yes, if it be indeed a blessing. But not all things are blessings which are called blessings. And every blessing is also an expression of God's goodness, whether secured through man's agency or not.

"Do you believe that to neglect to discharge a plain duty is wrong?"

Most certainly; "to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Jas. 4: 17.

"Do you think that a passive consent to our present liquor traffic is a sin against God and a crime against humanity?"

A passive consent to any evil is sin against God. It is sin because it is a violation of the principle, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." But the liquor traffic is a crime only as it violates human laws. A passive consent to the violation of State laws would be a[°] crime. But it would not necessarily be sin. The law itself might be sinful, as were the laws of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius (Dan. 3 and 6); yet it was a crime against the State to violate them. The worldlings, the covetous, the licentious, the hypocrites, are all sinners; but just as long as they refrain from violating State law, they are not criminal. Sin has reference to the moral law of God alone, and extends even to motive, intention, and cherished thought. But crime pertains to overt act alone against the law of a State. Therefore sin need not be criminal, neither need crime be sinful. If the present liquor traffic is in the bounds of law, it is not crime, yet we are free to say that it ought by law to be made a crime. It certainly is evil and only evil.

"Do you feel it [the liquor traffic] to be one such of much consequence?"

We do. It numbers its victims by myraids.

"Why do you, as men professing temperance, morality, and Christianity, claiming to fear God and to keep his commandments, array yourselves against and oppose the humane and beneficent cause of temperance and prohibition?"

The SENTINEL has no opposition to the beneficent cause of temperance and prohibition. It has advocated both from its beginning. But it is not partisan. It belongs to no party. It has not been established to support the Prohibition Party, or any other political party, but to defend the religious rights and liberties of American citizens, and to warn them of the dangers that now menace them. It is strenuously and persistently opposed to religious legislation in any form, whether in connection with temperance or otherwise. Yet this is what the leaders in the Prohibition party and Woman's Christian Temperance Union are endeavoring to do. Principles which, if crystalized into law, would destroy the religious liberty of this country, are found embodied in the State and national platforms of both these parties, and are declared, over and over again, to be among the objects for which these parties are striving. The logical outcome of these principles, if embodied in law, is a reproduction of the persecution of the Dark Ages and the Inquisition, with all their evils. These principles we oppose wherever found. The fact that they are connected with temperance and prohibition principles, and that good men, morally and socially, favor them, makes them all the more potent for evil. The encroachments on religious rights in the first centuries were, in many respects, less marked and pronounced than we now see and hear in the National Reform and Prohibition par ies and Woman's Christian Temperance Union. But those led to the Papacy; these, if their object is reached, will form an image to the Papacy. When the Prohibition party is willing to renounce its position as regards all religious questions, be assured it will meet no opposition from the SENTINEL. But we do not propose to support one good thing, uncertain in itself, and thereby bring a certain train of evils as great as it seeks to cure, or greater. We cannot "do evil that good may come." "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." M. C. W.

The Real Point of Conflict.

WILL it be permitted those who religiously differ with the Sunday law, when it is enacted, to construe its wording: "The Lord's day the Christian Sabbath," and "the first-day of the week," to mean one day in seven and no definite day in particular; a law enacted simply to secure a weekly rest one day in seven, each week? Will the courts, the ministers, and the churches, allow of such construction of the wording of their Sabbath law? and if not, why not? This argument is used by the two latter classes, to those who insist on the literal rendering of the Sabbath law, given by Jehovah himself from Sinai, which reads, "the seventh day is the Sabbath." "But ah!" they say: "that expression, the seventh day, does not mean the definite seventh day, but one day in seven. So you are at liberty to rest on Sunday or any other day. Now if this argument is valid when reasoning in reference to the law of God, why would it not be when discussing the laws of men?

But they tell us: "the definite day prescribed in the law must be insisted upon, or the whole law will be subverted, and general confusion will result. So say we of the law of God. And thus it appears that they and we agree perfectly upon the reading and application of the laws, and that the whole point of difference arises between us in reference to which law we are loyal to, just as it reads the law of God or law the of man. And so the real point of conflict, they themselves being the judges, and their line of argument the will, is between the two laws. G. B. STARR.

Who Are Working for the Sunday Law.

OUR National Reform friends, and all who are laboring so zealously to secure a Sunday law, have a good deal to say about our opposition to such a law. They accuse us of joining with infidels, and with those who are not in harmony with law and order and good government. As a matter of fact, we have not joined with anybody in our opposition to Sunday laws. We are against such laws, because we know that the State has no right to legislate concerning matters of religion, and because we know that such laws are unjust, and oppressive, and contrary to the spirit of true Christianity. If anybody else sees the injustice of such laws, and opposes their passage, or works against them on any ground whatever, we have no objection to make. This is a free country yet, and will continue to be so until National Reformers secure the control of it. We do not oppo e Sunday legislation by the State because somebody else does; if everybody else should favor such laws, we should oppose them just the same.

But we cannot see that National Reformers are in a position to denounce us very much because we oppose the same thing that men do who are not Christians. On the ground that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, it becomes them to be cautious. In the *Lutheran Observer's* enthusiastic report of the Sunday Convention held in Washington, we find this statement:—

"The church in which the convention was held was festooned with petitions from probably ten millions of people, representing Protestant and Papal churches, labor unions, saints, and sinners." No truer statement was ever made than this last. We venture the assertion that if the facts could be known, it would appear that the sinners outnumbered the saints in the proportion of ten to one. Yet the saints (?) who are engineering the Sunday movement are perfectly willing and very anxious to receive the co-operation of those very sinners, while they encleavor to heap contempt on us because some who do not profess to be Christians happen to oppose their work. Truly, consistency is a jewel not found among National Reformers or their allies.

The *Congregationalist*, also, in its issue of December 20, 1888, said of this effort to secure Sunday legislation:—

"A thing to be noted specially is that the movement affords ground for, and already has secured ot a large degree, the support of many who work for purely secular ends." They claim to be doing gospel work, and yet they bid for the support of those who have no interest in the gospel, but who work from professedly selfish motives. Polluk describes one who stole the livery of the court of Heaven to serve the devil in. This looks to us very much like stealing the devil's tools to serve the Lord with. Anything to win! seems to be their motto. It is a common saying, that politics makes strange bedfellows, and National Reform politics differ in no respect from the rule. E. J. W.

True Words.

In commenting upon the late, address of the Pope to the Sacred College, the *Christian Oracle* (Chicago) says:—

"If there is anything clearly taught in the New Testament, it is the distinction between the State and the Church, the kingdoms of this world and the kingdom of Christ. Nothing has so tended to weaken the power and influence of the cross of Christ as the assumptions of temporal power by those whose business it is to look after the things allotted to them.

These are true words, but their full force is probably not realized, even by the men who penned them. Certain it is, that thousands in our land to-day who suppose that they are opposed to all union of civil and ecclesiastical power, are aiding and abetting the very movement which, if successful, will surely result in the establishment of a system modeled after the Papacy. Should the Blair Amendment, which provides that the principles of the Christian religion shall be taught in the public schools of our land, become a law, some tribunal must décide what constitutes the principles of the Christian religion; and what will that be but the establishment of an American Papacy?

It is true that "nothing has so tended to weaken the power and influence of the cross of Christ as the assumption of temporal power" by religious teachers; and yet, knowing this, the clergy of our own land are striving after civil power to-day as never before. The present almost universal demand on the part of the popular ministry for religious legislation, will also greatly "tend to weaken the power and influence of the cross of Christ;" but it will greatly strengthen the political influence of the churches and of the ministers, and that is why they are clamoring for it.

Not Conscience, but Bigotry

ONE thing that must strike every one who follows the Sunday-law agitation, is the complaint that it is made about the laxness of Sunday observance on the part of church members. We have listened to several sermons and Sunday-law speeches, and in every instance it was declared that church members are largely responsible for the neglect of Sunday. In the January number of Our Day, Professor Ballantine, of Oberlin College, has an article on Sunday travel in the West, which turns out to be an account of how eastern tourists, who are church members, use Sunday for sight-seeing when they are in the West. It is a well-known fact that the first Sunday train into Boston was run at the request of the ministers and church people of that city. And even the good women of the W. C. T. U. call loudly for a Sunday law in order that they may be prevented from making the Sunday a day of hilarity and dissipation.

This being the case, why is it that a general Sunday law is wanted? Why impose a law on those whose conscience forbids them to rest on Sunday in order to make others rest, "according to the dictates of their own conscience?" It looks very much like putting B into jail because A is a thief. We can't understand such a procedure.

Now, we have no objection to offer if any church, as a church, shall make laws to compel its members to keep Sunday. We would not raise the slightest objection if all the churches should combine and pass a law that all their members shall keep Sunday, no matter how severe they make the penalty. What we object to is, their passing laws to make people keep Sunday who do not accept their form of religion, and then getting the State to enforce their church laws. If those who profess to have a conscience in the matter of Sunday observance would only act according to that conscience, they would not be troubled in their Sunday rest. The trouble is, that what they call conscience, is bigotry, which may be defined as one person's conscience for somebody else.

Sinful and Tyrannical.

In the year 1785, Thomas Jefferson said: "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical." Well, the Blair Educational bill proposes to do this very thing. Section two provides that each State "shall establish and maintain" free public schools, in which, along with "the common branches of knowledge," shall be taught "the principles of the Christian religion." Section four declares, "That Congress shall enforce this Article by legislation when necessary." That is to say, should any State, or all the States, decide not to establish and maintain such schools, the National Government can compel them to. Or in other words, the Jew and the free thinker can be forced to "furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which they cannot indorse. According to the above Jeffersonian doctrine, this would be "sinful and tyrannical."

A man is taxed to support institutions in which are taught principles he does not believe. He does not believe in the Christian religion, yet he must help to financially support it. It would be as just to tax him to support the church and ministry, because their mission is to teach the Christian religion—the same as the Blair scheme. On the same principle a man could be taxed to support Sunday-schools, as their work is to teach "the principles of the Christian religion."

The proposed measure is a high-handed outrage upon American citizens, and the proposition ought to be treated with the contempt it so richly deserves. Should there come before Congress a proposal to establish free public schools, in which should be taught the principles of Paine and Ingersoll, what a howl of indignation would go up from Senator Blair and his friends all over the land, and with what zeal would they protest; and this would be right. Civil government has no right to legislate upon the people, atheism and infidelity, Judaism nor Christianity. The powers that be may not recognize a man as an atheist, or a deist, or a Mohammedan, or a Jew, or a Christian, but as a citizen. Congress cannot legislate in favor of religion or irreligion, heathenism or Christianity. It has nothing to do with such subjects. It cannot legislate against the Jew and the infidel, nor in favor of the Christian and his religion, and vice versa. Civil government has to do with civil affairs, not religious.

N. J. BOWERS.



Address. FAC SIMILE OF FRONT COVER. PAG SIMILE OF FRONT COVER. "PROPHETIC LIGHTS" Shows the exact fulfill-ment of the predictions of the Bible concerning grypt, Tyre, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome; also of the prophecies concerning the first ad-vent of Christ, which prove the inspiration of the Bible, and give assurance that other prophecies which are noted will as surely and exactly be fulfilled. Its unique and original illustrations are prophetic studies an i specimens of art. It is beautifully bound in cloth, front cover embossed in brown and gold, has gilt edges, and its dreas is well worthy the interesting matter which the author treats in the most entertain-ing manner possible. The book contains nearly 200 large octavo pages, and costs only \$1.25, post-paid. Send for one. PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal. Oakland, Cal. Or, 43 Bond St., New York City-

22

IPHTHERIA; ITS CAUSES, PREVENTION, AND PROPER TREATMENT.

By J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

The increasing prevalence of this devastating dis-ease, and its *alarming fatality* in so many cases, renders the subject of its nature and treament one of the greatest importance. This work gives a concise account of the Nature, Cause, and Modes of Prevention, and also

THE MOST SUCCESSFUL METHODS OF TREATMENT

Of this prevalent and fatal malady. It should be in every household, as its instructions, if faithfully car-ried out, will save many a precious life. Price, in board covers, 25 cents.

Oakland, Cal.

AMILY BIBLES. AIMILL DIDLED. Parallel edition: 2,200 pages: 2,000 illustra-tions. Liberal discounts to agents. Address PACIF10 PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Or, 43 Bond St., N. Y. Oakland, Cal.

Large variety in Plush and Morocco bindings. Prices low for first-class goods. Terms to agents, and eatalocue, sent on application. PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

ROWN JEWELS.

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE MONTHEY MAGAZINE, devoted to the dissemination of true temperance principles, and instruction in the art of preserving health. It is em-phatically

AND TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

. HEALTH

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE,

A SOURARL FOR THE FRONCH, Containing what everybody wants to know, and is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is un-limited, embracing everything that in any way affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and house-kcepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every faully needs, and may be read with profit by all. Price, \$100 per year, or with the 800-page premium book—"Practical Manual of Hygiene and Temperance," containing housekold and cooking recipes—post-paid for \$1.40. Address.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL,

OAKLAND, CAL.

31

JOURNAL

ATHERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY ELDER E. J. WAGGONER.

History repeats itself, because human nature is the same in all ages of the world. Hence, he who would know how to avoid error in the future, must know how errors have developed in the past. The "Fathers of the Catholic Church" shows the condition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, briefly states the principles of ancient heathen philosophy, and shows how the adoption of these principles by prominent men in the church, and the incautions lowering of the standard of pure Christianity, developed the Papacy, which was simply a new phase of paganism. It shows that by the time of Constantine every phase of the Papacy was fully developed, and was only waiting for supreme power. The chapter on

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

Is alone worth the price of the book. Fine Euglish cloth, substantially bound, contains about 400 pages, and will be sent post-paid at the nominal price of \$1.00. Address,

Pacific Press Publishing Gompany, OAKLAND CAL.

Or, 43 Bond St., New York City.



Devoted to the defense of American institutions, the preservation of the United States Con-

stitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of CIVIL and

RELIGIOUS Rights.

The SENTINEL will ever be uncompromisingly op-posed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact. It is well known that there is a large and influential association in the United States bearing the name of the "National Reform Association," which is endeavoring to secure such a Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will "place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." While there are many persons in this country who are opposed to, or look with suspicion upon, this movement, there are few, outside of the party, who realize what the influence of this amendment would be. The object of the AMERICAN SENTINEL will be to Vindicate the Rights of American Citizens, which we believe, are threatened by this association. It will appeal to the very fundamental principles of our Government, and point out the consequences which would be sure to follow should they scoure the desired Amendment to the Constitution. Every position taken will be care-fully guarded and fortified by sound argument. Due respect will always be paid to the opinions of others, but the rights of conscience will be fearlessly maintained.

TERMS.

Single copy, one year, for - -\$ 1.00 AMERICAN SENTINEL one year and "Prophetic Lights," paper cover, - 1.50

Sample copies of the paper FREE.

If no Agent in your vicinity, write to the

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

1059 Castro St. OABLAND, CAL.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., THOTOGRAPH ALBUMS.

A beautiful book of nearly 650 pages, and illustrated with the finest steel engravings, Prices remarkably low and discounts to agents large. Send for circulars and full particulars. PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal., General Agents for Pacific Coast.

DACIFIC

The American Sentinel.

32

.OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY 13, 1889.

NOTE.—No papers are sent by the publishers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to people who have not subscribed for it. If the SENTINEL comes to one who has not subscribed for it, he may know that it is sent him by some friend, and that he will not be called upon by the publishers to pay for the same.

A GENTLEMAN in Bancroft, Iowa, in renewing his subscription to the AMERICAN SENTINEL, says: "God bless the efforts of the SENTINEL: If it does not meet with much reward in this world, I feel quite sure that God will openly reward it in the next. I have been a subscriber for two years, and would not do without the SENTINEL. I am circulating a petition in the interest of religious liberty; am doing it for the love I have for freedom in this respect." Many similar words of encouragement come to us. In return we say, God bless the army of workers for the AMERICAN SENTINEL and true religious liberty, and may their numbers increase many fold.

In speaking of our public-school system, the Catholic Telegram says: —

"It will be a glorious day for Catholics in this country when, under the law of justice and morality, our school system shall be shivered to pieces."

Then of course Roman Catholics ought to favor the Blair Amendment Bill, for if that will not shiver our system of public free schools, we know not what will. Then in that glorious day, in the rivalry which will come between the infidel and the Christian elements, the Catholics will hold the balance of power, and so be able to dictate just what "principles of the Christian religion" will be taught in our schools, as provided by the Blair Amendment. But all men may not be able to indorse what Rome calls Christian. And so legal persecution will follow.

WILL all who write to the AMERICAN SENTINEL please make a note of the following? When you write matter designed for publication, or send questions or any other matter for the editor, address your envelope to "Editor AMERICAN SENTINEL." If you send in subcriptions, or write only on business, address only "AMERICAN SEN-TINEL." If you have both business and correspondence, and do not wish to send two separate packages, put the business on a sheet by itself, and the matter for the editor on another sheet. The business offices and the editorial rooms are some distance apart, and a little care on your part will save us much inconvenience. Besides, each department wishes to keep on file, for reference, all matter that comes to it; but this cannot be done when business and correspondence are put upon one sheet. Please don't forget this.

THE National Reformers have a great deal to say about American institutions, the American Sunday, etc.; but the fact is, the movement is wholly un-American. In a speech the other day, the editor of *Free Thought* made the following point, which we think is exceedingly well taken:—

"Constantine, the Roman Emperor, who lived over three hundred years after Christ, first instituted the observance of Sunday as the sacred day—the Sabbath; and we of the nineteenth century are compelled to adjourn the celebration of our national anniversary, the fourth of July, when it comes upon a Sunday, in recognition of Constantine's Sabbath; and every time we do so, our flag is trailed in the dust before the Roman emperor. We want our rights respected."

The whole National Reform movement is but an effort to Romanize America. There is only one error in the above, and that is, that Constantine instituted the observance of Sunday as a sacred day. Although he issued the first law that ever existed in regard to Sunday, its observance as a sacred day was unknown till long after Constantine's time. His law was like the one which the National Reformers want; it was not designed to make men very religious, only to make some of them appear so outwardly.

JANUARY 17 was petition day in the United States Senate. On that day petitions from citizens of twenty-one States, two Territories, and the District of Columbia, were presented by various Senators. In fact the whole number of signatures—professedly about 14,000,000— were presented, and the petitions were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Of course the fact that the Senators presented the petitions from their respective States, proves nothing whatever as to their standing on the matter. But there was one man who did not propose to be, by any remote construction, identified with the thing desired by the petitioners. That was Senator Riddleberger, of Virginia. Said he:—

"I present a petition of citizens of Virginia, containing 1,851 individual signatures, in favor of a National Sunday rest law. I take it for granted it is the same as the other Senators here have presented, because of the red covering; and I present it recognizing the right of petition, but in presenting it I want to state what other Senators have not done, my unqualified opposition to any such legislation."

It is refreshing to know that some are not prevented by weak sentimentalism from speaking out their honest convictions. It is an encouraging fact, also, that Senator Riddleberger is one of the Committee on Education and Labor, to which these petitions are referred.

Ar the recent meeting held in Washington by sectarian delegates from nearly every State in the Union, to promote the scheme for establishing a national Sunday, or, in other words, enforcing by legislative enactment a Christian Sunday upon the people of the United States, great unanimity prevailed among the delegates upon the subject. Strong objections, however, were made by representatives of the Seventh-day Adventists, who worship on the ordained Sabbath, as do the Jews. A learned rabbi also entered a powerful protest, but as the opponents are a mere handful; and the supporters of the movement are numbered by hundreds of thousands, the voice of the former may be said to have been scarcely heard. This device for a Christian Sabbath, it seems to us, is but another scheme of the powerful body of fanatics who are making herculean efforts to have the Constitution of the United States so amended as to recognize our Government as a Government purely Christian in its character, with Jesus Christ as the ruler of the nation. When we contemplate these things, and also remember that our common schools are being assailed by the most aggressive and powerful religious sect in the land, well we may exclaim, with the immortal Washington, that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."-The Lewish Times and Observer.

A Word to Advertisers.

FOR the four months ending January 2, 1889, the AMERICAN SENTINEL enjoyed an average weekly circulation of over 25,000 copies.

Circulation for week of January 9, 27,320 copies; for January 16, 29,870 copies; for January 23, 28,300 copies; for January 30, 29,645 copies; for last week, over 30,000 copies.

Advertising rates made known upon application to our branch offices—43 Bond Street, New York; 18 Post Street, San Francisco; or AMER-ICAN SENTINEL, corner Twelfth and Castro Streets, Oakland, California.

Notice to Subscribers.

ON account of the SENTINEL becoming a weekly, it necessitates a change of date on the address label of many of those who subscribed for a monthly paper, and only expected to receive twelve numbers in a year. But we will send you twenty or more numbers, and let your subscription expire June 26, instead of December, 1889. Those who have just subscribed will get twice as many papers as they expected to receive; but, as the paper is now issued weekly, it necessarily shortens the time of yearly subscriptions to six months, or changes the date on your label from December to June.

Subscriptions dated March, 1889, expire with this paper. Those whose subscriptions are dated April, 1889. will receive two more papers; so please renew at once, and thus avoid missing any number. The subscription price is now, for the weekly, \$1.00 per year; or, if you will send us five new subscriptions, at \$1.00 each, we will send you the weekly AMERICAN SENTINEL, one year, free.

Subscriptions dated April, 1889, will expire with the paper of February 27; those dated May, 1889, with the paper of March 13; those of June, 1889, with paper of March 27; those of December, 1889, with the paper of June 26, 1889.

VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM.

PACKAGE NO. 1, 184 PAGES, 20 CENTS.

1. Religious L	egislation, 8	
	iberty,	
3. National R	eform and the Rights of Conscience, 16	
4. The Americ	can Papacy, 16	•
	ase Avowal 16	
	eform is Church and State, 16	
	ational Religion, 8	
	Witchcraft, 8	
	k Ye of Christ?	
10. National Re	eformed Constitution and the American	
Hierarch	ly,	
	lic of Israel,	
	eformed Presbyterianism,	
	al Reform Movement an Absurdity, 16	
	kage will be sent post-paid to any address for)r
twenty cents.		
Address,	AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.	

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL, DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far

- as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights,
 - both civil and religious,

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending oward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, - - - \$1.00 In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, each, - - 75c To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 5s. Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, 1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.