

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY 31, 1889.

NUMBER 27.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK;
18 POST ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.;
12TH & CASPER STS., OAKLAND, CAL.

EDITORS,

E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

"ALL religious despotism commences by combination and influence, and when that influence begins to operate on the political institutions of a country the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence."—*U. S. Senate Report, 1829.*

It is ridiculous for any one to say that the fathers of the Constitution had any idea of establishing an atheistic nation. Almost all of them were professing Christians, but they felt that their business was to construct a civil government—a republic, not a theocracy. To have introduced the name of God into the Constitution as the head of the Nation, and then to have left his relations and his honors undefined, nor provisions made for his worship and his support on the part of the Nation, would have introduced a subject of perpetual contention in the body politic, because it would have stood as an anomaly in the great instrument. The logical sequence must have been the establishment of a State religion of some sort as a legacy of perpetual strife.—*Rev. Dr. Armitage, Pastor of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, New York.*

In a recent article in the *Union Signal*, Mrs. J. C. Batcham says of the Blair Sunday-Rest bill: "All our arguments for the bill are based upon the *civil* Sabbath, not because we do not appreciate the religious aspect of the case, but because we think that it has nothing to do with a bill before Congress which must be sustained by other than religious considerations."

Commenting on this the *Christian Statesman* severely asks:—

"Does the writer mean to say that the obligation of the fourth commandment is not binding on nations and governments as well as individuals? . . . In other words, have nations nothing to do with the Christ who is Lord of the Sabbath? One chief purpose of the Blair Sunday-Rest bill is to set the Government itself, in its Post-office Department and at other points, in a right attitude toward the Sabbath. Are there no religious considerations which bear on the question of the adoption or rejection of that measure?"

We are surprised at the native simplicity of the *Statesman*. Of course all the arguments for the bill are from a civil standpoint simply and only

because its friends know full well that the American people are afraid of religious legislation. But this policy makes it none the less true that the underlying motive is the exaltation of Sunday as a religious institution. The work of the American Sabbath Union and its various auxiliaries is identical with that of the National Reform Association, namely, as stated without challenge by Rev. W. D. Gray, secretary of the Missouri Sabbath Association, to change that feature of our fundamental law which accords with the Declaration of Independence when it declares that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." To state the matter in the fewest possible words, Mr. Gray might have said: "The object of this movement is to destroy religious liberty in the United States."

To Crush The Liquor Traffic?

ON Sunday evening, June 30, the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association held a meeting in the Salem M. E. Church, Philadelphia, at which several active workers for a Sunday law were present. One of the principal speakers was Lewis D. Vail, the attorney for the Law and Order Society. After speaking of the continental Sunday, and arguing that the working men would be great sufferers by its introduction into this country, Mr. Vail spent the greater portion of his time talking about saloons and licenses. Speaking of a recent Supreme Court decision, he said:—

"The Supreme Court says that their location is not a matter of public convenience, and they can all be located in a solid block, if they so elect. These so-called wholesalers can sell at any time on a week day, and eventually they will sell on Sunday. They will send their own men to the Legislature, and will work to control every branch of the Government. What you and I have to do is to fight for this control of the Government, and vote only for men who are pledged to work for good laws and for a better observance of the Sabbath. You may rest assured that God will look out for his Sunday, but we must do our work. God will grind this glorious country into powder if we disobey his laws. If a so-called Christian man votes for a man opposed to God's law, even if he belongs to a dozen churches, the devil will get him at last."

One need not take long to determine from the above what the Law and Order Society regards as the greater evil, the liquor traffic or Sunday work. Mr. Vail seems to feel very bad to think that the liquor-sellers are in danger of controlling every branch of the Government, and that they will locate their saloons anywhere they please. But the only remedy he and his Law and Order Society have in mind is, to fight for the control of the Government, and when they get this control to—do what? To crush out the liquor traffic? Oh no; to stop the sale of liquor on Sunday. The Law and Order Society has not yet got educated to the idea that selling liquor on any other day of the week than Sunday is disorderly.

If Mr. Vail really thinks that Sunday belongs to the Lord, he would do well to leave it with him and trust him to take care of it; but we cannot avoid the suspicion that the reason why he and the other leaders in the Sunday-law move are working so zealously for Sunday laws is, that they do not believe that God has any regard for Sunday any more than for any other day; and they are afraid that if they leave it with him the law will not be enforced, and they are determined to make people keep Sunday whether or no.

Rev. Mr. Redner, speaking of the prevailing disregard for Sunday, said the trouble was not so much with the chief justice and the other justices as with Christians, and professed Christians. That is exactly the point. Sunday is a church day; it is one of the days which "the church," according to the catechism, commands to be kept holy along with Christmas, New Years, Easter, St. Patrick's day, etc. But a large majority of professed Christians do not carry out the commands of the church. They disregard the obligations which they took upon themselves when they joined the church; and because of this disregard of church law, by those who belong to the church, the Sunday is not kept as a holy day. And now certain leaders in the church are knocking at the door of Congress with all their might to induce that body to pass a law to enforce the observance of Sunday.

In other words, they are asking Congress to come to the help of the churches, and compel church members to obey its laws. This is the sole object of Sunday legislation, and stamps the movement for Sunday laws to be purely a step toward the securing of Church and State.

E. J. W.

'Religion and the State.

[We take this article from the *Journal and Messenger* of May 23, a Baptist paper published in Cincinnati, Ohio. Our readers will understand that it is an editorial review of a contributed article written in advocacy of National Reform. The arguments presented by the *Messenger* will not be lost upon candid, thinking men.]

On our second page will be found an article entitled National Reform, written by the Rev. J. M. Foster, secretary of the National Reform Association. It is an effort to justify the purpose of some of our fellow-citizens to bring about such a union between the Church and the State that the latter may become the executive of the former. It is the result of adherence to the old idea of the theocracy as it existed in Israel and pertained to the Hebrews, previous to the appointment of their king, and even subsequently. It is the result of a failure to distinguish between the nation Israel and the true spiritual Israel, between the "seed" and the "children" of Abraham. It is an effort to apply the principles governing the

relation of child and parent to those who are aliens and strangers to the family and the covenants.

It is a mistake constantly making in matters pertaining to reforms, that the State stands in the place of God, and that its business is to decide what is right and what is wrong, what is sin and what is not sin, and to legislate accordingly, forbidding and punishing sin, as such, because it is condemned in the law of God. It is an effort to load upon the State the responsibility of taking the "vengeance" out of the divine hand and punishing the evil doer, not simply because of his offense against society, but because of his offense against divine law. And all this is, as it seems to us, a mistaken view of the province of government.

As we understand it, government is a social compact, in which the individual surrenders to the State certain natural rights, in view of the promise, expressed or implied, on the part of the latter, to prevent or punish the infringement of those rights by any other member of the same society; and only when it is doing for the individual what he has a natural right to do for himself, only when it is protecting the individual against interference with his natural rights, or is preventing him from interfering with the natural rights of another, can the State be regarded as in its proper place. The State has a right to protect itself from harm, because thus it protects its individual members from harm; it has a right to promote the temporal interests of its citizens, and thus it promotes its own interests. Take, for example, the sin of lying; there can be no doubt that it is one of the most grievous and most prevalent of sins; and yet the State takes no cognizance of it, except when it is in a court of justice, or when it is shown to have been specifically injurious to another citizen. And so we might go on through the long catalogue and show that it is the business of the State simply to protect its citizens in the enjoyment of all their natural rights, and whatsoever is more than that cometh of evil. By these principles we, as Baptists, have always stood and ought to stand. We recognize one Master, God, the eternal, the unchangeable, the just. . . . For our religious beliefs and practices we refuse to give account to men, and the further the State keeps away from us, as it pertains to these things, the more it will be doing the will of our Master.

The State has no right to enter into the place of God and punish any citizen, because of his sin against God. It has no right to punish sin, as sin. For the sinfulness of his acts the individual is amenable only to God himself. It is for the injury imposed upon his fellow-man—upon society—that the State takes cognizance, and its penalties should never have any other end than the prevention of the recurrence of the offense, either as to the same individual or as to another.

It is no part of the business of the State to teach religion or to look at questions from a religious standpoint. It has been sufficiently demonstrated that men cannot be made truly religious by law, and that attempts to make them such result in the most despicable hypocrisy and corruption. It was the mistake made by the Puritans in New England that they made religion a matter of statute law, and required all officers to be members of a church. The result was the "half-way covenant" and the condition of things found by Jonathan Edwards and set forth by him in his account of the religious condition of the

country when he awakened to it, about the year 1740.

It is true that the Puritans attempted to set up a theocracy in New England, and that they required everyone to be religious, to attend the church, to pay tithes, to observe certain fast and feast days, and especially to observe the Sabbath, according to their ideas; and because some Baptists and Quakers refused to conform to the ideas of the authorities, they were whipped and banished, and even hanged. Fortunately for us as a people, the Puritans did not settle the whole country, did not control all the colonies. In many things they were far superior to all others, but their defects were serious, and it was only after their good things had been fused with the good things of some others that the resultant was what we now delight in. It was as when two kinds of ore are brought together in the furnace and the resultant is a superior grade of iron. So it was when some other good things from some other sources were smelted together with the Puritan ideas, that the best results were obtained. And, much as we to-day rejoice in what has come to us from New England, we like it the more because it has been transfused and modified by the good elements in other colonies. This country has made a great improvement in its moral tone and fibre since the Baptists effected its deliverance from the danger which menaced it under the first draft of the Constitution. Let us not forget our mission.

Sunday Laws Discussed.

THE following paragraphs are from an article on Sunday laws by Wm. J. Fowler, published in the Rochester (N. Y.) *Post-Express*:—

"Every year during the prevalence of hot weather the Sunday question acquires unusual prominence. It is rather curious that the fiercest of the fight is going on while the clergy are off on their summer vacations. . . . It isn't a good state of things to have a very few men and women impressed with their personal responsibility for the good order of the entire community. Such responsibility needs to be more divided. . . . Whenever zealots in the name of religion attempt to manage the affairs of other people than themselves, they inevitably run against a multitude of snags. I do not deny that it is in this way that an enormous amount of earnest Christian zeal has been worse than wasted. My entire sympathy with the excellent motives of such people does not blind me to their woeful mistake. The unchristian asceticism of the Puritan forefathers of this country is an excellent illustration of my meaning. The American people have outgrown whatever was wholly superstitious in Puritanism, and for the sake of true religion I am heartily glad of it.

Christ subjected himself to great obloquy on account of his teaching. Pretty much all the religious men of his day hated him. The more "religious" they were, or rather the more Pharisaical, the more they opposed him. It was at last in an excess of religious zeal that they crucified him. It may be taken as another parallel to their utterly hypocritical conduct, that they tried to avoid the odium of killing Christ for religion's sake, and claimed that they did it to uphold the Roman authority, which they pretended that Christ had threatened.

"Jesus protested against this on his trial. It was, I think, the only time on that occasion that he did protest. He was entirely resigned to be crucified, provided it was done without false pre-

tenses. His manly nature could not abide a sham. So he made even Pilate see the point with the terse argument: "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." The Roman magistrate turned to the scribes and Pharisees, saying, substantially, "See ye to this. It is not my doings and I wash my hands of it." After that, Christ went to death without a murmur.

"It is reasonably certain that if Christ were living now he would rebuke most strongly any attempt to enforce religious observance of the Sabbath, or anything else, under a pretense of preserving civil order.

"The functions of civil government are far better understood in this country than in any other, and they are very limited. They consist almost entirely in preventing people from interfering with the rights of others. This is only another way of saying that every man is entitled to the largest personal rights so long as he does not injure others. It is no discredit to the Puritans that they did not understand this as men generally do to-day. Nor is it any derogation to the honor justly due to the Puritans to say that they had mastered only the alphabet of personal rights. They believed most heartily, and it was a great point gained for that time, in their own freedom to worship God unmolested according to the dictates of their own consciences.

"That other people had just as much right in this matter as themselves, did not occur to them. It was a little later evolution of this fundamental truth, that was revealed more particularly to the Quakers and Baptists whom the Puritans persecuted. I have always been rather glad that the doctrine of religious liberty was not at first fully revealed to the Puritan forefathers of Massachusetts. They were always a proud, high-spirited set of men, and if they had had so much truth given to their charge they would have been prouder and more unbearable than ever.

"But it is discreditable to men living now to try to mould religion and social order on the models set by the Puritans two hundred years ago. They were not the best models even for their day. Roger Williams and the Rhode Island colony set much better. . . . It seems to me that the way in which people pass their Sundays is nobody's business except their own, so long as their conduct interferes with nobody else. Whenever it does, the police magistrate can and generally does take cognizance of it.

"A considerable part of our Sunday laws are relics of Puritan legislation which the public has long outgrown. They cannot be enforced, and their non-enforcement while on the statute book has a demoralizing tendency, as it familiarizes the public mind with successful defiance of the law."

The Blair Sunday-Rest Bill.

[The writer of this article, which we take from the *Butler Eagle*, is an old and respectable business man of Coultersville, Penn., and a member of the Presbyterian Church. In a private letter to us he says: "I believe that the religion of Christ is the only true religion. Of all men that dwell on earth the true followers of Jesus is the farthest from being a persecutor."]

Christians all agree that one day in seven is to be set apart for holy rest and worship; but there is a controversy among them which day of the week is the right one, one part contending that the seventh, and the other that the first day of the week is the proper one to observe.

The thinking mind will recognize this as a purely religious controversy. Now, Senator Blair

proposes that the United States Congress shall step in and settle this dispute in the church. The query is, how Congress can do this without taking sides in a *religious* controversy. If Congress settles it, it will be in favor of one set of claimants and against the other, and in doing so will be deciding a *purely religious* question, which is union of Church and State. It is not necessary for the statute to declare in so many words that "Church and State are hereby united." That satanic union is effected when the State attempts to define any religious duty.

Again, all Christians agree that it is proper to use some kind of songs of praise in worship; here again they disagree, one part adhering to the Old Testament psalmody, and the other to the new.

Now if Congress is the proper tribunal to settle the other controversy, it follows that it is the proper one to settle this. If Congress can set the time for worship, it can also fix the mode.

These cases are logically one, and Senator Blair and his followers cannot separate them.

But lay aside all this reasoning. It does not matter whether Sunday laws are wholly religious or wholly secular, or partly one and partly the other, the result is persecution for conscience' sake.

There is no need of hair splitting to see the perfidy of all laws that forcibly interfere between a man and his God.

Let Congress once begin on this line of work and it will find plenty of it to do. The Catholics will petition for some advantage over Protestants; Protestants will ask for legislation against Catholics, and infidels will call for the closing of all the churches.

The chances will then be for a religious war and reign of terror that would make a French communist shudder.

The phariseism of the Blair bill would make angels weep.

DOUBLEYOU.

Practical Workings of a Sunday Law.

THE State of Tennessee enjoys the bliss of a Sunday law; and if there is anything civilizing and elevating in such a law, then Tennessee should be a happy State indeed. A certain neighborhood proposes to have peace and harmony and to hinder their "morals" from being "insulted" by enforcing the Sunday law of the State, and for this purpose a league has been formed. The following is an exact copy of the pledge taken by this league when it was organized in this State last winter:—

"NOTICE—*To whom it may concern*—That the undersigned citizens of —, being desirous of the welfare of our community, and that peace and harmony may prevail, and that the morals of ourselves and our children may not be insulted and trampled upon by a willful violation of the *Sunday laws* of our land; do this day pledge our word and honor, that we will individually and collectively prosecute each and every violation of the Sunday law of our State that may come under our observation.

Dec. 10, 1888.

This league seemed to think that all that was lacking in the way of morals and peace and harmony could be secured by giving life to the Sunday law of the State. This league is composed mostly of the members of the Methodist Church. The Sunday law had long been violated by the people of this neighborhood. Scores of men have made Sunday a day for hunting and fishing. The gambler has used it as a convenience for his purpose. The church members of different denominations, and also the non-professors, have made it a rule, if business was urgent, to do com-

mon labor upon this day. This is the history with reference to the manner in which Sunday has been observed in the past, as gleaned from citizens of this neighborhood.

No one has been prosecuted for violating the Sunday law in the past, but of late this church, which has been organized here for many years, has discovered a supreme necessity for the enforcement of the Sunday law. But what has led to this discovery? Answer: The organization in this community of a small church who keep the seventh-day Sabbath.

Members of the Methodist Church which had been organized for many years, told the elder of the seventh-day church that, if they "*permitted*" him "*to continue*," their children would not know which the Sabbath-day was. They insisted that he must *move out* of the community if he wanted to keep the seventh day. He told them that he had been taught by them that this was a free country, and that he was allowed to worship God as he understood the Scriptures to teach. But they said that he must keep Sunday, and not teach their children that the seventh day is the Sabbath; and if he did not comply with their wishes, he would be prosecuted. He cited them to the past history of the community, wherein Sunday had not been observed, and yet they had not prosecuted anyone for its violation. Their answer indicated that all parties would be compelled to keep it from that time on, whether they kept any other day or not. He argued that if he conscientiously observed the day which he believed God required, they should not then compel him to keep a day in which he did not believe, as that would be tyrannical. He also stated to them that he was a poor man, and could not afford to surrender one-sixth of his time from the support of his family. He told them that he could explain the matter to his children, and that, as far as they were concerned, he had no fears but that they would know which is the Sabbath-day, and that the same course of action would be left open for them in the training of *their* children. But this was the point that gave them so much anxiety. They could never make it plain to their children; and, therefore, they would not tolerate his course. Nothing short of submission would be accepted by them.

This feature of National Reform work was going on in Tennessee while the notable National Reform Convention was being held in Washington City last winter. Now for the fruit. The Sunday gaming and shooting has gone on since the league was organized, precisely as it did before. But those who keep the seventh day have not been engaged in this kind of work. Others beside those who keep the seventh day, have worked upon their farms on Sunday during this time in a more public and noisy manner than has been done by those who observe the seventh day. But not one word of complaint has been made about it. When, however, the elder above referred to went out into his field on Sunday to quietly plow out (cultivate) his corn, which was so tall at the time as to nearly hide him from sight, he was promptly arrested. He will certainly be convicted as a criminal, and as he is a consistent Christian man, he feels that it would be wrong to pay a fine for doing what he verily believes is his religious duty to do. So he will go to jail and lie there for obeying God; and his professed Christian neighbors will send him there to satisfy their hatred toward the seventh-day Sabbath.

But is this all their zeal leads them to do?

No, no; this seventh-day-keeping church desired a minister to visit them during their quarterly meeting, and hold some services with them. But this Sunday-law league heard of it and determined that it was not likely to deepen their neighbors' faith in the sanctity of Sunday, nor to create any hatred toward the seventh-day people, to permit him to labor in this neighborhood. So they organized a vigilance committee, and armed them with shot-guns, rifles, and revolvers, and on Sunday night, fired into a congregation of men, women, and children. Their aim was to kill the minister, the elder of the church, and another leading member. Some fifteen or twenty shots were fired, but as they had to shoot through the wall of the building and the windows, no one was hit, yet the balls pierced the wall, cutting their way through both the weather-boarding and the ceiling. One rifle-ball passed exactly through the space behind the desk that had been occupied a moment before by the speaker. It seemed a direction of Providence that he had stepped to one end of the desk an instant before the shot was fired.

If the Reverend Doctor Brooks were here, he could not complain that the preachers do not "speak out." They are speaking out, and proposing that as many as do not worship as they do shall be killed. Rev. W. J. Coleman, who spoke at Lakeside, Ohio, in August, 1887, could find the army that he called for who are "ready to pour out treasure and blood" for the cause he was advocating. They are also ready to pour out the blood of innocent Christians, in order to compel people who observe the seventh day to keep Sunday.

The minister above referred to, whose assassination was attempted, had mildly but in a very plain and convincing manner, set before the people of the community the inconsistent and unkind manner in which they had proceeded. He also showed that their course was un-American and Papistic. They replied with the rifle and shot-gun.

We do not believe that National Reformers will approve of their course, but the speeches they make are, many of them, calculated to incite to just such deeds of violence. National Reformers should counsel moderation for the credit of their cause, if for nothing else.—*Wm. Covert, in Signs of the Times.*

Unnecessary Work.

THE "unnecessary work" done on Sunday is the great bugbear of some National Reformers; and the Des Moines, Iowa, *Register* takes up the cry, with, however, the following comforting assurance:—

"There is plainly a reaction in public sentiment in favor of refraining from all unnecessary work on the Sabbath.

There is no doubt that unnecessary work tends to wear out the physical system as well as to squander means that would be better expended in necessary employment. The true philanthropist will oppose unnecessary work at any time. But the National Reformers are in this, as in some other ideas that are in themselves good, entirely too exclusive,—they want them confined to Sunday. Having no other than human authority for the sanctity of the day, they evidently hope, by piling all the good things upon it, and confining them there, to make it holy.

First, they want to have temperance principles specially applied to that day, and are willing to have temperance limited there; thus their theory

of closing saloons on Sunday is virtually an argument that it is the peculiar character of the day that makes intemperance wrong. Then comes their plea that unnecessary work on *Sunday* is so very injurious to the health and morals of the people. It is a strange physiological theory that any unnecessary strain on the muscles or brain can be more hurtful on one day than on another; but such is the muddle in which they become involved who attempt to turn everything into a bolster for the Sunday-sacredness dogma.

Yet true to National Reform inconsistency, these Sunday law crusaders, while deploring the evil effects of unnecessary labor on Sunday, persist in paving the way for such labor by making it impossible for the masses to engage in legitimate work. There is more unnecessary strain indulged on Sunday by many people than would be if they were not otherwise shut up to idleness.

The Church and the State.

THE subject of the union of Church and State is very imperfectly understood by very many people. It has been thought that in order to form such a union some one sect or denomination must be made the State Church; but a little consideration will show any one that such is not the case. The National Reformers say that they do not want a union of Church and State, but a union of religion and the State. In a speech before the National Reform Convention held in New York City in 1883, Rev. Jonathan Edwards said:—

"We want such a religion, and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of the State require religion, it shall be the religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and the Christian morality shall have, in this land, an undeniable legal basis. We use the word "religion" in its proper sense, as meaning a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God."

But, even in the face of such a statement as this made by one of their prominent leaders, the National Reformers insist that they are opposed to a union of Church and State, but their denial amounts to nothing. Religion and the State is only another name for that unholy alliance between the civil and the ecclesiastical power which has always been an unmitigated curse to both the Church and the State. Everybody admits that Constantine united Church and State. But his first step was only to declare Christianity the religion of the Roman Empire; when he had taken that step, however, it was necessary that he should in some way, define Christianity. Then, as now, those who professed to be Christians were divided, not into organized denominations as at the present time, but into numerous parties and factions under the leadership of their respective bishops. Between the extremes there was probably as great a diversity of opinion as exists now between Catholics and Protestants. Besides this there was a multitude of minor differences; and as the Emperor had declared the Christian religion to be the religion of Rome, it was necessary that this religion should be defined, and for this purpose a council was convened at Nice to decide the question as to what constituted the Christian religion. The National Reformers of our own day propose to take similar measures.

When the Blair Educational Amendment bill was under discussion a few months since, the question was asked, how it would be possible to carry it out owing to the diversity of views among Christian people. The answer given by the author of the bill was as follows:—

"I believe that a text-book of instructions in the principles of virtue, morality and the Christian religion can be prepared for use in the public schools by the joint effort of those who represent every branch of the Christian Church, both Protestant and Catholic."

Again, Dr. Schaff, in defining what parts of the Bible should be taught in the public schools, says:

"A competent committee of clergymen and laymen of all denominations could make a judicious selection which would satisfy every reasonable demand."

But to carry out these suggestions would be to do just as Constantine did, convene a council of the representative men of the various denominations to define the principles of the Christian religion, and with these principles authoritatively defined, and with the law on the statute books, and embodied in the Constitution requiring the principles of the Christian religion to be taught in the public schools, how much would we lack of having a union of Church and State? True, we might not have a denominational organization known as the State Church, and supported out of the treasury, but we would have practically the same thing, for we would have a creed officially recognized by the Government.

There is one phase of this question which is generally lost sight of, and that is the rights of non-church people, or if you please, non-Christian people. The National Reform idea is that every government is a government of God, and that the powers that be derive their power from God, and this not in the sense in which the apostle declares that "the powers that be are ordained of God," but in the sense that his law should be the basis of their law, or in other words that men should be governed by the divine law administered by their fellow-men.

"But on the other hand, the Declaration of Independence declares that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;" this, however, National Reformers deny. In the Missouri Sunday Convention recently held in Sedalia, Rev. W. D. Gray, the present secretary of the Missouri Sabbath Association, used these words:—

"I do not believe that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and so the object of this movement is an effort to change that feature in our fundamental law."

Several men, prominent in National Reform councils, were present on this occasion, but not one of them lifted his voice to disavow this sentiment, and the Association subsequently elected Mr. Gray as its permanent secretary; hence we are warranted in believing that he voiced the sentiment of the Association. But if the National Reformers be correct, and Governments do derive their just powers directly from God, and not from the consent of the governed, and if it is their duty to administer the law of God, it follows that they must decide what that law is, and what it requires; and if they have that right, then all good citizens should yield obedience to whatever decisions they may make. But to assent to such a thing would be to deny God, or at least to place men in the place of God, which amounts to the same thing.

The trouble with the whole scheme of National Reform is, that instead of making a man responsible to God it makes him responsible to earthly and fallible governments, for if the Government has the right to establish a religion and to define and say what that religion is, as it must do if it gives it any official recognition whatever, it has the right to change that religion, so that with every change in the Government there may be a change also in the religion. And if it is a duty

the citizen owes to God to yield obedience to the religion of the State, it is equally his duty to change his religion with each change of the Government. In short, National Reformers would destroy personal responsibility to God, and make the citizen responsible alone to the State. Instead of looking to the law of God to know what is right and what is wrong, a citizen would have to look to the law of the land, or at least to human interpretation of the law of God, to know his duty to God. For instance, under a Catholic government, it would be the duty of the citizen to adore pictures and images; while under a Protestant government, it would be sin and crime for him to do the same thing.

The only safe and tenable ground is to declare, as did the Saviour, that those things which are Cæsar's should be rendered to Cæsar, and those things which are God's should be rendered to God; or, in other words, that those duties which we owe to the State should be discharged to the State, and those duties which we owe to God should be discharged to God. In short, that the State can of right have nothing whatever to do with defining or enforcing the individual's duty toward God. Anything more than this puts men in the place of God, because it makes them judges of the divine law and allows them to usurp the place of conscience, and authorizes persecution for conscience' sake.

C. P. BOLLMAN.

The Uses of a Sunday Law.

MRS. J. C. BATEHAM seems to well understand that their much-coveted Sunday law, when they get it, will amount to nothing in the way of securing a satisfactory observance of the day. She says:—

"If we get this law, and we must persevere till we do get it, it will be cause for devout thanksgiving; but we shall still find that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and it will still rest with us individually, to so use the day as to obey God and the laws, and reap the fullest benefit from the day for ourselves and our families."

That is it exactly. No one can be compelled by law to serve God, or to change his belief. Get all the Sunday laws you please, and it will still rest with each person "individually, to so use the day as to obey God and the laws." The only important effects that the law can have are to make hypocrites, and to inaugurate religious persecution. All those who believe in keeping Sunday would keep it without any law,—if their belief was worth believing, they would even keep it in opposition to law. On the other hand, those who observe the day when they do not believe it is right, show by that very act that they are hypocrites; for any language or action which is contrary to moral conviction, is hypocrisy. A man may be a hypocrite to secure worldly applause, or he may do it to escape the penalty of the law. It is therefore certain that any person who is constrained by civil law to keep Sunday, is influenced by that law to be a hypocrite.

But what of those who adhere to their own convictions of duty, regardless of the civil power, and refuse to be made hypocrites by law? Only one thing can be done,—the State must inflict the penalty, just as it did upon Daniel and upon his companions. But to inflict temporal punishments upon any person for non-conformity to a religious institution, is persecution. Sunday is a religious institution, else it would not be proper to talk about its religious observance. Therefore, the enforcement of a Sunday law is religious persecution.

Such are the invariable uses of a Sunday law, if it is used at all. And these conclusions are not based upon theory alone, but upon actual experience.

This is the kind of a law of which Mrs. Bateham says, "we must persevere till we do get it," and which to her "will be cause for devout thanksgiving." A similar strain of enthusiasm and "devout thanksgiving" appeared a few months ago in the *Catholic Banner*, the organ of the Papacy in Barcelona, Spain. It said:—

"Thank God, we at last have turned towards the times when those who propagated heretical doctrines were punished with exemplary punishment. The re-establishment of the Holy Tribunal of the Inquisition must soon take place. Its reign will be more glorious and fruitful in results than in the past. Our Catholic heart overflows with faith and enthusiasm; and the immense joy we experience as we begin to reap the fruit of our present campaign exceeds all imagination. What a day of pleasure will that be for us when we see anti-clericals writhing in the flames of the Inquisition!"

When we remember the cruel persecutions which have already occurred in some States of this Union by the simple enforcement of strict Sunday laws; when we remember that the majority of the so-called Protestant ministers and their followers in those States experienced such "immense joy" in these persecutions that they almost unanimously remonstrated against the repeal of the laws; and when we remember that these same so-called Protestants are working with might and main to make such persecution general all over this country, looking forward to the time as a "cause for devout thanksgiving," we confess our inability to discover any very great difference between the Protestant heart of America and the Catholic heart of Spain.

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

Their Own Definition.

EVERY prominent advocate of a religious amendment to the Constitution disclaims any desire to bring about a union of Church and State. They scout the idea that the establishment of the Christian religion by legal enactment would constitute such a union, and insist that such a result could only be accomplished by the legal adoption of some one denominational creed as the religion of the Nation. But even their own definition will sustain the assertion that the National Reform movement is a Church and State enterprise. They shrink from the name, because of its unpopularity, but not from the principle.

Let us test the project, and the ultimate design of the originators by the construction of the term Church and State usually insisted upon by their adherents. The National Reform Association is the creature of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the association was organized for the express purpose of securing a recognition of the principles of that denomination in the Constitution of the United States. True, their plea is for "all Christian laws and usages," but that expression had in view the broader purpose of securing the assistance of other denominations; and the ruse is proving quite successful.

The leading organ of the denomination in question is a publication entitled the *Reformed Presbyterian*, and as long ago as 1870, through the medium of its columns, Rev. James Wallace set forth the aim of the pioneers of National Reform in the following unmistakable language:—

"This important truth of the Lordship of Jesus Christ over the nations, was attained by our reformed

and martyred fathers in Scotland, . . . and has been transmitted down to us sealed with their blood, and is the precious and peculiar inheritance of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and distinguishes her from all the other evangelical churches in this and other lands. No other church professes to maintain this great principle in its practical applications.

"The distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are the principles, and the only principles, of National Reform.

"The proposed Amendment of the Federal Constitution is an acknowledgement by the Government that God is the author and source of all authority and power in civil government; that the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations, and that his revealed will contained in the Bible is the supreme law of nations. Now the Association for National Reform proposes to have these distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church adopted into the Constitution of the United States, and annulling any parts of that Constitution that may be inconsistent with these principles. The adoption of this amendment into the Constitution would be the Government doing . . . the highest honor to the Lord Jesus Christ, and the greatest benefit to our church.

"The principles of National Reform are our principles, and its work is our work. *National Reform is simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the nation.*"

These statements are confirmed by Rev. J. R. W. Sloane's account of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, in the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," in which he says:—

"The more special and distinctive principle of this church, the one in which she differs from all others, is her practical protest against the *secular* character of the United States Constitution. Holding to the universal headship of Christ, and that civil government is a divine ordinance, and one of the 'all things' put under him as the mediatorial ruler of the universe, and that to him the allegiance of all nations is due, Reformed Presbyterians refuse close incorporation with any government which does not in some form recognize these principles, and give them *effective expression in its legislation*. On examination of the United States Constitution, that remarkable document is found to contain no recognition of God as the source of all legitimate civil authority, nor of his law as supreme above all human laws, nor of his Son as governor among the nations. . . . The Constitution does not recognize the Bible, the Christian sabbath, Christian morality, *Christian qualifications for civil officials*, and gives no legal basis for any Christian feature in the administration of Government. . . . They take the deepest interest in that reform movement which has for its object the amendment of the United States Constitution in those particulars in which they consider it defective. Indeed, they feel specially called to aid in its success, at whatever cost or personal sacrifice."

The Reformed Presbyterian Synod of 1886, in its report on National Reform, said: "It is ours to hold up the ideals of God which have originated the National Reform cause." And the Synod of 1885 said of National Reform, that "This is the tap-root of the Reformed Presbyterian Church."

Although the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has espoused the National Reform cause, and the Prohibition party is fast becoming its ally, there is no change of the original purpose. Although the American Sabbath Union—embracing nearly every denomination and various other elements, including "Christians and infidels, saints and sinners"—has been added to the army, there is still no perceptible change of principles. The recent quarter-centennial of the National Reform Association reckoned all the progress of the combined forces as so much gain for the cause of National Reform.

With all the auxiliaries that have been added to the original force, there has been nothing to indicate that the National Reform of to-day is in anything different from the National Reform of twenty years ago, when it was acknowledged to be

"*simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.*" Then the proof is clear, that no matter how many Christian denominations, or how many secular societies, or how many political parties may ally themselves to this movement, its success will be the placing in the Constitution, to be enforced by the Government, "the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church." And that, according to the definition insisted upon by those leaders who most emphatically deny such desire, will be to establish a Church and State Government.

W. N. GLENN.

Putting Themselves on Record.

WE published some two weeks since a contributed article which contained some account of the Minnesota Mass Convention of friends of the "Christian Sabbath," held in Minneapolis June 10, 11, 1889, but we again give some of the facts for the sake of additional comment.

In the third session of the Convention, Tuesday afternoon, June 11, the report of the Committee on Permanent Organization was submitted. The first article of their report for a constitution reads as follows:—

"The object of this Association shall be to preserve the Christian Sabbath, or Lord's day, as a day of rest and worship."

They reported that the Association should be called the "Minnesota Sabbath Association," auxiliary to the "American Sabbath Union." The other articles of the report were the same as those adopted in similar conventions. After it had been read it was moved that it be adopted as read. This was seconded. The chairman then said:—

"It is moved and seconded that the constitution as submitted be adopted. Are you ready for the question?"

Elder R. C. Porter then addressed the chairman, saying that he would like to offer an amendment to the first article of the constitution, as follows:—

"The object of this Association shall be to preserve the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship; but in securing this object only education, moral influence, and persuasion shall be employed, and the religious rights of all shall be guarded against compulsory laws."

Dr. W. F. Crafts—"I would like to know what denomination this brother represents."

Elder Porter—"The Seventh-day Adventists."

Dr. Crafts—(excitedly) "Yes; well, this convention is called as a State Convention of those who represent the Christian sabbath; and it is not in any sense for those who represent the Saturday Sabbath. They have no natural rights in a convention of this kind except as listeners and reporters."

The chairman sustained the objection, and the report of the committee was adopted.

From these facts we can see very plainly the spirit of the American Sabbath Union. We have nothing to say as to the propriety of the presentation of the resolution, or the refusal of the convention to listen to one who was not in full sympathy with them; but the point to which we wish to call especial attention is, that the leaders of the convention utterly refused to recognize the principle presented in the resolution. By this they have placed themselves on record as in favor of compulsory laws, which shall contravene the religious rights of the people; and they have shown that morality is not the object of their

work. They have shown this in that they refused to confine themselves to moral influences in their work, and morality can be advanced only by moral laws. But the moral law is the law of God, and moral laws can be enforced only by the moral governor, that is, God himself. All that men have to do in the line of the moral law is to persuade men to keep it.

The refusal of the American Sabbath Union, which was represented at Minneapolis, to use only moral means in their work, stamps their movement as not a Christian work. They are not working to advance the gospel, but simply to compel men by force and arms to conform to their ideas. It matters not by what name they call themselves, they certainly have no right to the name "Christian" so far as their efforts to secure Sunday laws is concerned.

The Sabbath Union and its Work.

THE Cuyahoga County Sabbath Convention was held at Music Hall, Friday morning, under the auspices of the American Sabbath Union. What a nice, smooth-sounding name that is, to be sure! "American Sabbath Union!" How it lulls the people to sleep with a sense of perfect security; for surely these exceptionally nice people who compose the "American Sabbath Union" can do nothing which the average American citizen dare criticise! And yet nothing more forcibly illustrates the dire necessity of patriotic instruction in the school-room, from the lecture platform, and from that most influential of all public teachers, the independent, fearless, and honest newspapers of the country.

The Cuyahoga County Sabbath Convention is one of the most thoroughly un-American gatherings, both in point of purpose and sentiments expressed, that has ever taken place in this city. The object of the convention, plainly and simply stated, is to compel the citizens of Cleveland, the State of Ohio, and the United States of America, to observe the Sabbath, commonly called Sunday, according to the dictates and rules laid down by the American Sabbath Union. Of course the Constitution of the United States plainly provides that Church and State shall be forever kept separate, but the Sabbath Union does not ask for a union of Church and State. Oh, no! It simply demands of the National Government that it enforce upon the people the strict observance of a National Christian Sabbath.

The whole spirit of the convention may be summed up in the expression of Judge Dickey, who in a fine (?) burst of eloquence expressed the ridiculous and insolent sentiment that if people who emigrate to this country do not conform to the "American Sabbath," they should be refused admittance. According to this patriotic idea the observance of the "American Sabbath," as provided by the rules laid down by the American Sabbath Union, is the chief qualification of American citizenship. The *American Union* wishes to be distinctly understood on this question. It denies that there is or ever has been such an institution as an American Sabbath.

The Sabbath and all religions are prominent in the Constitution of the United States only by their entire absence. The Christian Sabbath has absolutely no authority whatever to bind the conscience of an American citizen. The Constitution guarantees perfect religious liberty and equality before the law of all its citizens. That the rights of citizens in this respect are so often infringed upon, and sometimes openly denied, is simply be-

cause they have allowed such religious organizations as the "American Sabbath Union" to influence legislation, with hardly a protest. If the people want their rights they must assert them. Unless they do this, and promptly, they will awake some fine morning to find themselves bound hand and foot with religious fetters as galling as ever caused our fathers to flee from their native land and found a new world, a Constitution and Government having for its watchword the perfect and absolute religious liberty of the individual, and the everlasting separation of Church and State!

The population of this country is made up of "every nation under the whole heaven," and each one has a right to enjoy his own religion without asking permission of prophet, priest, or king, or even a majority of his neighbors. The fact that the Christians are more numerous does not give them license to trample on the rights guaranteed the citizen by the Constitution, nor authority to force the people into religious observances at the dictation of the American Sabbath Union or any other religious organization.—*American Union, Cleveland, O.*

A Timely Warning.

WHILE so many of the ministers of the various churches are using voice and pen to further the interests of National Reform, it is refreshing to find occasionally one who has the independence to denounce the attempt which is being made to unite Church and State, and the manhood to declare for religious liberty as at present guaranteed in our National Constitution. Rev. Mr. Mitchelmore, of Central City, Nebraska, is one of the few ministers who do not believe in the Blair bills, nor indeed in any such legislation. In a discourse preached Sunday, June 23, and published in the *Merrick County Republic* of June 28, this gentleman took for his text Ex. 20:8, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy," and, after remarking that the Sabbath was made for man and that the man who does not rest one day each week suffers loss, he said:—

"My religion is made up of the ten commandments. Upon the first four there can never be any human legislation. I am responsible to God alone for the observance of these. And so I say as a Christian, as a citizen, as an American, you must not touch these. There can never properly be any union of Church and State; it is an unholy and unnatural alliance. If you will look back in American history you will see our forefathers leaving the mother country because of this very unholy alliance.

"Bunyan, you will remember, lay for twelve years in Bedford jail because he preached differently than the tenets of the Church of England required and because he would not give money to its support.

"So I might cite numerous examples. I know it is claimed that our forefathers persecuted others when they got to this country, but in this connection I believe they have been too harshly criticised. Alas! when they got here they found the same power ready to persecute that they were fleeing from. And they were persecuted and persecuted, and I want to say that the same spirit of intolerance is not dead. It exists to-day and only wants an excuse—the law to back it—to cause as much suffering as in the dark days of the past.

"I can cite you a case that occurred in the State of Arkansas in the year 1887, where a young man was thrown into jail for worshipping God, according to the dictates of his conscience, on Saturday. While he languished in confinement his wife and child died and his little property wasted. His suffering was none the less terrible because it occurred in this enlightened day and age. I could refer you, alas, to other similar cases, but I forbear. It shows you that old intolerance is not dead. As a further evidence of this there are a class of people trying to enact a Sun-

day law in free America, and if they succeed in doing so you need have no doubts but that they will enforce it. And the bill which is now before Congress, and to which I am opposed, always was opposed and always will be opposed, is called the Blair bill.

"I cannot begin to do this subject justice in the time allotted to me this morning. The Saviour said, 'My kingdom is not of this world, else my servants would fight.' It is apparent that the people who are pushing this bill through so quietly, so religiously, are not of his kingdom. See to it that the time never comes when there is a union of Church and State in this country. Fight against it not only yourselves, but teach your children to loathe and war against this monster evil which has filled the past with woe and tears."

Such warnings are none too frequent, nor have they begun to come too soon. The danger is a grave one, and everyone who loves liberty and true Christianity should help to sound the alarm.

The Danger Not Passed.

THOSE who imagine that the danger of a Sunday law is passed for the present, simply because the Blair bill is dead, should read both the the secular and religious newspapers published throughout the length and breadth of the land. This question is being more widely discussed than ever. People everywhere are taking sides, some for and some against Sunday legislation, and for various reasons the tide seems to be running in favor of some such measure as the Blair bill.

With a great majority this is not a matter of conscience but a matter of policy. It is asserted that the railroads are favoring the cessation of Sunday work because they find that they can do all their business in six days and do it at less expense than they can by running on Sunday. It is also urged that other branches of business can also effect a saving in this way. Of course this argument, if true, will prove potent, not only with railroads but with many in other kinds of business, and when one man makes up his mind to rest on Sunday it is only human nature that he should want others to rest likewise, for they are not willing that others should conduct business upon days when they are not engaged in it; hence the outlook is not only for Sunday laws, but for exceedingly stringent Sunday laws. It follows that the work of warning the people against the schemes of the National Reformers must be done quickly.—*Signs of the Times.*

ACCORDING to the *Christian Statesman* of July 4, "one chief purpose of the Blair Sunday-Rest bill is to set the Government itself, in its Post-office Department and at other points, in a right attitude toward the Sabbath?" Ah! we thought—no, we did not think, but it has been very persistently claimed, that the main object of the bill was to give the men employed in inter-state commerce and in the mail service a weekly day of rest for their health. The *Statesman* is neither as wise as a serpent nor as harmless as a dove, for it is trying to secure religious legislation and has not the wisdom to disguise the fact. The American Sabbath Union is working for the same thing, but tries to conceal its real purpose, and proposes to give the people a sort of a religious pill so sugar-coated with "civil sabbath" arguments that they won't know what they are taking till they have swallowed it.

AMONG all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what Government denominated the law of God.—*U. S. Senate Report, 1829.*

Advertisements.

ADVERTISING RATES made known on application. No advertisements of patent medicines, novelties, cigars, tobacco, liquors, novels or anything of a trivial, intemperate, immoral or impure nature accepted. We reserve the right to reject ANY advertisement.

Civil Government and Religion.

BY A. T. JONES,

One of the Editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain and Forcible.

This important work shows clearly the relation that should exist between Church and State at the present time, as proven by the Bible and history of the past twenty-five centuries.

"CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION"

Is a pamphlet of 176 large octavo pages. Price 25 cents. Millions of copies should be placed in the hands of thinking people AT ONCE. It clearly defines what position we, as American citizens, should sustain toward the effort now on foot to secure religious legislation. Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 12th and Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal. Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

THE WHITE IS KING!

Always in the Lead.

New Improvements!

New Woodwork!

The Best to Use, The Best to Sell.

White Sewing Machine Co.,

108 & 110 POST ST., S. F.

F. S. PRESCOTT, Gen. Man'r.

THE YO SEMITE VALLEY,

BIG TREE GROVES, Etc.

"In the Heart of the Sierras"

Is the only book ever issued which in any way does justice to this wonderful Valley and its surroundings. The

FULL-PAGE ARTOTYPES

Are the most charmingly characteristic of any illustrations ever produced, and are perfectly true to life, having been photographed direct from nature.

THE WONDERFUL YO SEMITE

Is here presented in all its beauty and majesty. The book is just the thing for agents to handle, and good reliable agents are wanted everywhere to introduce this book. Our outfit is perfection itself and our terms to agents are VERY LIBERAL. Send for circulars and full particulars. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

Or 43 Bond St., N. Y.

Oakland, Cal.

The Teachers' Outlook.

Published by The Teachers' Publishing Company, Des Moines, Iowa. A monthly magazine for teachers and pupils that proposes to supplement other school journals rather than to occupy the same field. It will seek to provide an OUTLOOK upon affairs of life and facts in science and nature which illustrate and test theories; to stimulate thought, and give the teacher's mind a fresh source of inspiration.

A review of current events, civil and industrial problems, inventions, discoveries, etc., will be an important feature of the magazine, and a complete review of current literature will also be given by competent critics.

ANOTHER AND VERY IMPORTANT FEATURE of the magazine will be that all teachers and students are invited to join its circle of writers, out of which it proposes to draw its corps of future contributors. On this point it has some original plans of mutual helpfulness to carry out.

WANTED, ESPECIALLY—Writers of short, realistic stories, and articles on natural history and social science, from the Pacific Coast. Terms given in OUTLOOK. Sample copies 20 cts. None free.

NOW READY!

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW.

We do not mean that a National Sunday Law is now ready, but that a treatise under this name, prepared by Alonzo T. Jones, is now ready for circulation. This pamphlet contains the arguments in behalf of the rights of American citizens, and in opposition to the Blair Sunday-rest bill, which Mr. Jones presented before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Dec. 13, 1898.

Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"MIGHTY INTERESTING READING,"

And Mr. Jones's comments will make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruptions, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments.

The following specimen page from the book shows some of the questions and answers, and every page of the book is replete with sound arguments by Mr. Jones.

60 THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW.

Senator Palmer.—Do you suppose they intended there a practical theocracy?

Mr. Jones.—I do, sir; but let me read further, and you will get their own words.

Senator Blair.—If these women are trying to overthrow the institutions of the country, and are about to establish a sacerdotal State, we ought to know it.

Mr. Jones.—That is true, and that is why I am speaking here; we want the nation to know it.

Senator Blair.—These women need looking after, I admit.

Mr. Jones.—They do in that respect, and there are many men concerned in the same business.

Senator Blair.—Otherwise it would not be dangerous.

Mr. Jones.—It would be dangerous anyway. A theocratical theory of government is dangerous anywhere. It is antichristian, as well as contrary to right and the principles of justice.

Senator Blair.—Do you suppose that the government of heaven is a theocracy?

Mr. Jones.—Yes, sir; but a civil government—a government of earth—is not.

Senator Blair.—Then why is it dangerous?

Mr. Jones.—Governments of earth are not dangerous when properly controlled.

Senator Blair.—They only say that a true theocracy is yet to come. A millennium is supposed to be coming; perhaps they have reference to a millennium that we have not yet got, so that they will wait some years before they get it.

Mr. Jones.—But I am going to read what kind of laws they propose to make to bring in the millennium.

Senator Blair.—So far as you have read, you have not touched the question; for they say a true theocracy

Page 60, "National Sunday Law."

As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is

Based on Scripture and History, Constitution and Law,

Showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the Sunday-law movement of the fourth century, the Sunday-law movement of the nineteenth century, the methods used in securing indorsements to the petition for the Blair bill, and the workings of such Sunday laws as are proposed for the United States.

The work contains one hundred and ninety-two pages. Price, 25 cents. Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

1059 Castro St., Oakland, Cal.; 43 Bond St., New York.

SOME Desirable and Valuable

New Books.

In the Following List of Miscellaneous Books will be Found Something to Interest all. We Furnish them Post-paid at the

PUBLISHERS' PRICES.

Lives of the Fathers, Farrar, 2 vols., cloth.....	\$5.00
Life of Christ, Farrar, cloth.....	1.00
The Messages of the Books, Farrar, cloth.....	3.50
History of the Interpretation, Farrar, cloth.....	3.50
Life of St. Paul, Farrar.....	1.50
Syriac New Testament.....	2.50
Heads and Faces and How to Study Them, cloth.....	1.00
Hours with the Bible, Geikie, 6 vols. in 3, cloth.....	4.50
Holy Land and the Bible, Geikie, 2 vols.....	5.00
How We Got Our Bible, cloth.....	60
100,000 Synonyms and Antonyms, cloth.....	1.00
Life of Christ for the Young, Geikie, cloth.....	1.50
The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life, paper.....	50
The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life, cloth.....	75
The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life, cloth, gilt edges.....	1.00

ADDRESS,

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,

OAKLAND, CAL.,

Or, 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

G. H. KRIECHBAUM,

DENTIST,

Office 854 1/2 Broadway, Corner Seventh, Oakland,

Office Hours—9 to 12 A. M. and 1 to 5 P. M.
Rooms 17 and 18.

PACIFIC Business College,

320 Post St., S. F.

Life Scholarship, \$75

Send for Catalogue.

MORAL AND SCIENTIFIC COMPANION, Florence, Arizona; illustrated, wide-awake; 25c per year. Ads 1c. per word.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

Will contain articles on the various phases of the National Reform Movement, the Union of Church and State, Civil and Religious Liberty, etc. It will be uniform in size (page about 5x7 1/2 inches). Each number will contain from 8 to 56 pages, and will have a neatly engraved cover design. Price, 75 cents per year of 25 numbers. The following numbers are now ready:—

- No. 1. The National Reformed Constitution. Price, 3 cents.
- No. 2. Religious Liberty. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 3. The Evils of Religious Legislation. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 4. The Blair Sunday-Rest Bill. Price, 7 cents.
- No. 5. The Blair Educational Amendment. Price, 3 cents.
- No. 6. The Purity of National Religion. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 7. National Reform and Rights of Conscience. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 8. The American Papacy. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 9. The Salem Witchcraft. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 10. National Reform Is Church and State. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 11. What Think Ye of Christ? Price, 1 cent.
- No. 12. Bold and Base Avowal. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity. Price, 2 cents.
- No. 14. The Republic of Israel. Price, 1 cent.
- No. 15. National Reformed Presbyterianism. Price, 4 cents.

Orders can be filled for back numbers at any time and in any quantity desired, as each number is printed from electrotype plates. Liberal discount when ordered in quantities. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
Or 43 Bond St., N. Y. Oakland, Cal.

GOLDEN GRAINS: A SERIES OF TEN BOOKS FOR CHILDREN.

Each little book or pamphlet contains thirty-two pages of carefully selected stories. The following are the titles: Robin's Judgment Book; Annie's Savings' Box; Always the Bible; The Sisters' Lesson; The Hard Way; The Schoolboy's Dinner; Seven Times; The Wicket Gate; The Sensitive Plant; The Two Gardens. The whole set of ten books, over 300 pages, will be sent post-paid for 50 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

BURTON'S IMPROVED DRENCHING BIT.
No cure Straggling and Fighting to give Your Animal Education.
You have the satisfaction of knowing that they have taken the dose to the last drop. One person only is needed. It can be done by anyone who can put on a bridle. It is simple, strong, durable and inexpensive. Will last a lifetime. Every veterinary surgeon and horse-cornet needs one. PRICE, \$2.00. Sent by Mail, \$2.50. Sent by Express to U. S. or Canada on receipt of price.
MONARCH REIN BURTON CO.

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

SOCIAL PURITY. A vigorous and stirring address on SOCIAL PURITY by J. H. KELLOGG, M. D., SUPERINTENDENT OF THE LARGEST MEDICAL AND SURGICAL SANITARIUM IN THE WORLD. Fifth edition. Fiftieth thousand. Also contains a "Talk to Girls," by Mrs. E. E. Kellogg, A. M., Associate Superintendent of Social Purity Department of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. This talk is full of helpful suggestions to mothers and their daughters respecting the means of promoting the development of a higher type of womanhood in the rising generation of girls. A copy should be placed in the hands of every man, woman and youth. 64 large octavo pages. Price, 15 cents; 20 copies, post-paid, \$2.25. Address; PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY 31, 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.

In a recent letter to the *Christian Statesman*, written from Cincinnati, District Secretary Foster says that the *Journal and Messenger* of that city gave an article on National Reform a few weeks since. But Mr. Foster forgets to say that the article was in point blank opposition to his so-called reform movement. It is an excellent article, and so we give it to the readers of the SENTINEL. We wish that it could be read by all who imagine that only infidels are opposed to the schemes of these pseudo-reformers.

THE *Christian Statesman* of July 4, quotes approvingly the words of Rev. W. D. Gray before the Missouri Sabbath Convention:—

"I do not believe that, as a political maxim, Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. And so the object of this movement is an effort to change that feature in our fundamental law."

These words need no comment, for they show positively and clearly that the object of both the National Reform Association and of the American Sabbath Union is to subvert the very principles of our Government and establish a religious despotism upon the ruins of our free institutions.

JULY 10 a memorial was presented to the Helena Constitutional Convention from the Montana Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, praying the convention to incorporate in the new constitution a clause providing for strict Sunday observance. Methodists were once persecuted for conscience' sake, but it seems that now they are themselves becoming persecutors. An article on another page of this paper shows how they are using the Sunday law of Tennessee to drive from the State those who conscientiously observe the seventh day, and at the same time their brethren in the North are laboring to make such things possible in Montana. Has Methodism lost its old-time power, that it is invoking the civil power in behalf of its dogmas?

WE oppose Sunday laws not because the day is without divine authority, but because it is a religious institution, and because with matters of religious faith and practice civil government cannot of right have anything whatever to do. The innate iniquity of Sunday laws is well illustrated by the administration of such laws in Arkansas, Tennessee, and Georgia, where they have been used not to preserve the peace of the community while a portion of its citizens are engaged in worship, but to oppress those who conscientiously observe another day in obedience, as they verily believe, to the divine command. In the States mentioned, as the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL are aware, men have been fined and imprisoned for digging potatoes, painting, plowing, and such other work.

But it may be urged that this is only enforcing the law; then why is it not enforced upon all alike? In all of these States, and in the very neighbor-

hoods where the hand of the law has been laid upon these seventh-day worshipers, members of other churches and men who belong to no church at all have been permitted to violate the law with impunity, no complaint being made against them. The law has simply been used to harass those who hold views that are distasteful to the majority of the community in which they live. Such laws are a disgrace to any State.

ADVOCATES of Sunday legislation urge in behalf of their measure that they are willing to grant an exemption clause permitting Seventh-day people to do "private work" on Sunday at "almost anything except to open shop, which would interfere with the general rest." But are seventh-day people the only ones who have any rights which are bound to be respected? How about others who have no conscientious scruples in regard to Sunday. Must they rest simply because others do?

THE *Denver, Colo., News* is in favor of a Sunday law which shall respect the "rights of those who from religious motives keep another day," and "also the rights of people who attach no religious significance whatever to any day." That would be a very peculiar sort of a law, and totally unlike any Sunday law ever enacted, for it would apply only to those who believe that they ought to religiously observe the day. That being the case it would seem that they might get along very comfortably without such a law, but possibly some of them need it to reinforce their consciences. But much as we would like to see them gratified, we are not prepared to admit that the State has any just right to compel any man to perform even those religious duties which he freely admits that he should perform.

WHEN the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union was before the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor last November, with the petition for a National Sunday law, the question was asked:—

"Could not this weekly rest-day be secured without reference to religion by having the workmen of of each establishment scheduled in regular order for one day of rest per week, whichever was most convenient, not all resting on any one day?"

The answer was:—

"A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out and you take the rest out. Greed is so strong that nothing but God and conscience can keep him from capturing all the days for toil."

And yet in the face of this it is denied that the Union is asking for religious legislation.

A CORRESPONDENT writing to this paper from Placerville, California, under date of June 17, says:—

"Yesterday the Presbyterian minister had a congregation of only seven persons, all ladies and one of them his wife. He embraced this opportunity to present the matter of a petition for a National Sunday law, which he did in this way. He said, 'All who are in favor of keeping the Sabbath stand up.' Of course all the seven arose. He then said, 'My object in taking this vote is to send a petition to Congress for a Sunday law, and I wished to take the sense of the church.' He also said that other churches were doing the same thing."

Our correspondent says he can give the name of every member present at this meeting, and that

the total membership of the church is over one hundred. This church will of course be reported as being unanimously in favor of a National Sunday law, and the entire membership will be counted as petitioners in favor of such a measure. This does not seem exactly honest to ordinary people, but it is in perfect keeping with National Reform methods.

WE have received No. 1, Vol. 1, of the *Western American*, a paper published in Chicago, Illinois; "devoted to politics that will preserve liberty, civil and religious." In his salutatory the editor says:—

"We shall courageously expose every attempt to unite Church and State, to secure fraudulently, public money for institutions under religious control, to weaken and in time destroy religious liberty."

And again he says:—

"If the teachings of Christ mean anything, they command his followers to keep their hands and tongues out of politics, to concern themselves only with a government that is not of this world, and to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

We welcome the *American* to this field, and hope that it will prove true to its motto, and to its statement of principles. Certainly there are not at the present time too many papers to oppose this work of a union of Church and State.

SUNDAY-LAW advocates persistently assert that they do not want a union of Church and State; that nothing could be further from their designs or desires. Nevertheless the logic of their position compels some of their leading spirits to confess the truth. An utterance of the Rev. T. H. Tatlow at the Missouri Sabbath Convention is an evidence of this:—

"The party of carnal policy protests, and cries out that this is uniting Church and State. The Christian replies: It is indeed a union, but limited, and applies only so far as two separate jurisdictions—the one spiritual and *primary* and the other secular and *secondary*—exercises each one its own appropriate authority, within its own individual province, to secure a two-fold good to the two-fold life of man."

And what is such a union, but a union of Church and State? And if the spiritual jurisdiction is primary, must it not dominate the civil? That was exactly the state of affairs in Rome in the palmiest day of the Papacy.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is always welcomed to our table. It is for religion; but religion free from the trammels of law. All experience has shown that a Church in alliance with the State proceeds at once to become a monstrous evil, and the religion of the devil. The thirst for power is natural to man, and the Churches of Rome and England have shown how religious men can abuse it. The Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury are alike the enemies of all true religion, true liberty, and true humanity. They are bulwarks of barbarism.—*Political Record, San Francisco.*

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 toward 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.