

# THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER 25, 1889.

NUMBER 35.

## The American Sentinel.

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

EDITORS,

E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

No man acquires any additional right under civil government by becoming a Christian.

THE religious legislationists declare that "It is grand larceny to take away the toilers' weekly rest-day." Even if that were true, nobody can commit such larceny, because nobody can take away the toilers' weekly rest-day. Every man can have his rest-day who wants it bad enough to take it; and nobody can take it away from him. So nobody can ever commit any such larceny. But if it be grand larceny to take from the toiler his rest-day which nobody can do, then what is it for the government, under pains and penalties, to take away from the industrious citizen his work day, which these people by their Sunday law propose to do. Because, from the man who has taken his weekly rest-day on another day than Sunday, they intend to have the government to take away one of his work days. They propose under cover of governmental power to rob such a man of one-sixth of his income as a tribute to their ideas of the sacredness of Sunday. This is not only grand larceny in fact, it is so with tyranny added.

In a recent lecture on the question of Home Rule in Ireland, Prof. J. P. Mahaffy, of Dublin University, made a most important distinction between Catholicism and Protestantism, which it would be well for all to bear in mind. He had made the statement that Home Rule in Ireland meant Roman Catholic supremacy, and that that meant persecution. He then noticed the charge that Protestantism also has persecuted, which he frankly admitted, stating that those who attempted to deny it did themselves and their cause an injustice; but, said he, "When the Catholic Church persecutes, she persecutes according to her own principles, and when the Protestant persecutes, he persecutes against his own principles."

This is indeed a most important distinction, from which it follows that when the Protestant persecutes he adopts Catholic principles, and ceases to be Protestant. Now apply this to the National Reform Sunday movement. We find that wherever National Reform principles have been carried out, as in Arkansas and Tennessee, and Sunday laws have been enforced, there has been most bitter, malignant, and wicked persecu-

tion. And it is a fact that has never been denied by the leaders of the National Reform movement, that the enforcement of the Sunday laws in those States is strictly in accordance with so-called National Reform principles. No paper published in the interests of legal Sunday observance has ever disavowed one feature of that abominable and un-American persecution. Therefore we are justified in our assertion that the Sunday movement as set forth by the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, etc., is opposed to every principle of Protestantism; that every true Protestant will oppose the movement; and that he who does not oppose it, or at least does not withhold his assent from it, has no right to call himself a Protestant.

### "It Is Indeed a Union."

In the Missouri Sunday-law convention Rev. Mr. Tatlow said:—

"Neither the civil power as God's ordinance, nor the civil ruler as God's minister, within its special province, has any authority as such, to make void any of the ten commandments, whether by neglect in enforcing them or by indifference to their authority and claims. At this point, the party of civil policy protests and cries out that this is uniting Church and State. The Christian replies, it is indeed a union, but only so far as two separate jurisdictions—the one spiritual and primary, and the other secular and secondary—exercise each one its own appropriate authority, within its own individual province, to secure a twofold good to the twofold life of man. This union, therefore, is like the union of the spiritual in man acting conjointly with the body of man, the body being brought under and kept in subjection to the spiritual."

That is precisely such a union of Church and State as the Papacy advocates. The statement is almost word for word, as is the statement of the papal claims on the same point. The papal claim is, that the two powers in the world are the spiritual and the secular. That the spiritual is the church, and the temporal is the State. That the spiritual is superior to the temporal, and, as in the body man's temporal concern must be subject to the spiritual, so in the world the temporal power must be subject to the spiritual. The State must be subject to the church; and the temporal power, the State, must be brought under and kept in subjection to the spiritual, the church. And therefore, the Pope as head of the spiritual power is superior to kings who are the heads of the temporal. Consequently, all civil rulers must be subject to the Pope.

There is not a shadow of difference between the papal theory and this so distinctly set forth by Mr. Tatlow. It is indeed a union. A union of the most vital sort, a union as close as is the union of the spiritual and the physical in man. And this is the deliberate view set forth in a written

essay by a representative speaker in the Missouri State convention which was called to organize, and which did organize, a State Sabbath Union auxiliary to the American Sabbath Union, and at which the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union was present. Mr. Tatlow's view of this relationship, however, is not at all distinct in principle from that stated by the American Sabbath Union himself. He puts it up under the illustration of the two arms of the body, the religious being the right arm and the civil being the left arm. Mr. Tatlow only more clearly expresses how closely and intimately the two arms are expected to act together. And how the left arm is to be guided by the right arm, and kept in subordination to it. And then in the face of these plain statements of their own they will still put on an air of innocence injured almost to holy martyrdom, when we say to the people that the Sunday-law movement bears in itself a union of Church and State, with all that history shows that that term implies.

We have known all the time that it is indeed a union in which the spiritual is intended to be primary and the secular secondary. We have known all the time that it is indeed a union in which the secular authority is to be brought under and kept in subjection to the spiritual. This is what the SENTINEL has been telling the people for these four years. And now it comes forth plainly in their own words. And yet we doubt not that when we thus print it, and send it forth, that they will again deny that they intend to bring about a union of Church and State, or that their movement has any tendency whatever in that direction.

A. T. J.

### A Sunday-law Conviction in Georgia.

THE following is from the *Atlanta Constitution* of August 30:—

The conviction in Forsyth County of a man named Conklin, who was charged with chopping wood on Sunday, has created a decided sensation among the Seventh-day Adventists in Georgia.

The announcement of the conviction was made in the *Constitution* yesterday.

Rev. J. O. Corliss was in Atlanta yesterday and talked at length about the case.

"The witnesses testified," said he, "that they saw him chopping saplings just back of his house, but did not know what he was chopping them for. On being questioned, one of them said he lived within one hundred and fifty yards of the defendant's house, but had never seen him work on Sunday before. And yet he was convicted by a jury of twelve men and fined \$25 and costs, amounting in all to \$46.80.

"Now, in the ordinary course of events it would not be strange to fine a man convicted for violat-

ing the laws of the State. But it seems that this man had done no more than all his neighbors had done, that is, chop a little wood for immediate use, as a necessity. In fact, one of the witnesses it is said, has frequently driven his team all day Sunday to be at the market in Atlanta early Monday morning."

"What is the reason for the conviction, then?"

"Simply this: The poor man happened to have a conscience which led him to observe Saturday, the seventh day of the week, instead of Sunday, the first day of the week. He is a good citizen, pays all his honest debts, and is respected by all as a man. But it seems that the people of that vicinity have a corner on religion and are determined that no one shall indulge in a belief that is not received from them. At least, one would think so from the plea made before the jury by the State's attorney. They wanted to teach the defendant that he could not come into that county and overturn the Sabbath of their forefathers.

"You may talk about your jute bagging trusts and sugar trusts, but a religious trust is the most dangerous of all, and the more detrimental to the interests of the country, because it is more tyrannical and generates more bad blood. If this man, Conklin, had not actually violated the law of the State, and the State's witness failed to show that he had, on what principle of right and justice was he thus deprived of his hard earnings, to say nothing of being subjected to the odium of being thus arraigned as a criminal?"

"The State's attorneys took a religious view of the case," continued Mr. Corliss. "They contended that the Adventists were trying to displace the Sabbath of our forefathers, and to overturn the religion of all past generations. Colonel T. L. Lewis, of Alpharetta, and Colonel Philipps, of Marietta, argued that it was unjust to punish the man for working on Sunday, as his conscience led him to observe Saturday as the Sabbath, and he had kept it sacred. They also claimed that he was chopping wood for household purposes. But he was convicted; and, to show their appreciation of his condition, as Conklin is very poor, Colonel Philipps and Colonel Lewis each gave him \$10 towards paying his fine."

#### An Inadmissible Admission.

THE Cumberland Presbyterian Church, at its General Assembly in Kansas City, last May, amongst its resolutions passed the following on the subject of the liquor traffic:—

*Resolved*, That, admitting that it is a crime, it cannot be legalized without sin. It cannot be licensed without legalizing it. Therefore to vote for license is sin.

This is a fair sample of the predicament into which men get when they undertake to create sins. It is probable that to their own satisfaction, that General Assembly has decided that to vote for license is sin. And, probably, that General Assembly is prepared to deal with the man who votes for a license as with a sinner, and to consign him to the place where all sinners are to go, except they repent.

But, have they proved that to vote for license is sin? The conclusion in a syllogism is always as good as the premises, but it is never any better, and it can't be any better. What then, is the premise in this one? Major: Admitting that it is a crime, it cannot be legalized without sin. Minor: It cannot be licensed without legal-

izing it. Therefore to vote for license is sin. The whole thing depends upon the major, "admitting that it is a crime." But suppose that is not admitted, then what? Then neither the minor nor the conclusion follows. So that all that syllogism amounts to, and all that the resolution amounts to in fact is, that if it be admitted that to vote for license is sin, then it is sin. But even that doesn't follow, because it may be admitted that a certain thing is sin when there may be no sin about it.

More than this. A thing may be admitted to be a crime and yet it be not sin at all. It is a crime in nearly every State in this Union to work on Sunday, and a good many people are doing their best to make it a crime anywhere in all the Nation. But to work on Sunday is not sin. An act may be a crime and yet not in any way a sin. To be a Christian in the days of Paul, in the Roman Empire, was to be guilty of the highest crime—*crimen majestatis*. But there were multitudes of people who committed that crime and yet were sinless in it.

Crime is a violation of human law—a law of the State. And human laws—laws of the State—may forbid that which is right, as the Roman Empire did when it prohibited the worship of any gods but such as were recognized by the Roman law; and as the different States of this Union do when they prohibit work on Sunday. For the Christians to worship God in the Roman Empire in the first two centuries was a crime, but it was not sin. For people to work on Sunday in nearly all the States is a crime, but it is not sin. Consequently, admitting a thing to be a crime does not at all admit it to be sin. It may be sin. But whether it is does not at all depend upon men's admitting that it is, but upon whether God says it is. If God says a thing is sin, it is sin, whether it be admitted or not, and whether it be a crime or not. And what God does not say is sin is not sin, even though it be admitted to be a crime.

We freely admit that the liquor traffic is sin, whether it is a crime or not depends upon what the State laws say. The liquor traffic is a crime in this country only in Iowa, Kansas, and Maine. In none of the other States is it a crime, because the State does not prohibit it.

Again: This resolution says, "Admitting that it is a crime, it can't be legalized without sin." But whether it is a crime or not, depends upon whether it is legal or not. If it is legalized, it is not crime. If it is forbidden, it is crime. Consequently, the admission is not admissible unless the law declares the fact, and if the law declares it, then it is a crime whether it be admitted or not.

This resolution illustrates the absurdities into which men run when they confound crime and sin, and religious with civil things, as the third party prohibition element does. It also shows what the SENTINEL has constantly affirmed, that, if prohibition were secured upon the basis upon which it is demanded by the third party prohibition element, the condition of affairs would actually be worse than they are now. Prohibition, on a civil basis, is right. But prohibition upon a religious basis,—the liquor traffic prohibited because it is irreligious or because it is immoral, or because it is a sin,—would introduce into the body politic such a confusion of elements as would, in a little while, prove the remedy to be ten thousand times worse than the disease.

#### Senator Douglas and the Clergymen.

In 1854 there were 3,050 ministers in New England, who were practical "National Reformers." They believed that government was not an institution "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and that governments do not "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;" But they believed all power is of God; and that the ministry, as God's representative on earth, is the fountain whence flows all power and authority.

Then, as now, they attempted to dictate to Congress, civil policy. They claimed the right to reprove, rebuke, and denounce with all authority and doctrine. So against the "Nebraska bill" they exercised that right thus:—

"To the Hon. Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled—

"The undersigned clergymen of different religious denominations in New England, as ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ, hereby in the name of Almighty God, and in his presence, do solemnly protest against the passage of what is known as the Nebraska bill. We protest against it as a great moral wrong, exposing us to the righteous judgments of the Almighty."

But Congress would recognize them only as citizens, and not as judges to pronounce the verdict and dire decrees of Jehovah. For this offense twenty-five ministers, assembled in Chicago, passed resolutions charging Congress with disrespect to man and God. Here is their own statement of their divine prerogative:—

"Resolved first, That the ministry is the divinely-appointed institution for the declaration and enforcement of God's will upon all points of moral and religious truth; and that as such, it is their duty to reprove, rebuke, and exhort, with all authority and doctrine."

In a letter dated April 6, 1854, Stephen A. Douglas replied:—

"I understand your position to be this: that you are 'ministers of the gospel;' that the 'ministry is the divinely-appointed institution for the declaration and enforcement of God's will upon all points of moral and religious truth;' that this 'divinely-appointed institution' is empowered 'to declare' what questions of a civil, political, judicial, or legislative character, do involve 'points of moral and religious truth;' and that, clothed with 'all authority and doctrine,' this 'divinely-appointed institution' proceeds to issue its mandates to the Congress of the United States 'in the name of the Almighty God.' This being your position, I must be permitted to say to you, in all Christian kindness, that I differ with you widely, radically, and fundamentally, in respect to the nature and extent of your rights, duties, and powers, as ministers of the gospel. If the claims of this 'divinely-appointed institution' shall be enforced, and the various public functionaries shall yield their judgment to your supervision, and their consciences to your keeping, there will be no limit to your temporal power except your own wise discretion and virtuous forbearance. If your 'divinely-appointed institution' has the power to prescribe the mode and the terms for the organization of Nebraska, I see no reason why your authority may not be extended over the whole continent.

"The will of the people, expressed in obedience to the forms and provisions of the Constitution, is the supreme law of the land. But your office as ministers is not provided for in the Constitution. Nowhere in the Constitution or laws of any of the States, or of the United States, is there to be found a provision constituting or recognizing you

and your brethren the 'divinely-appointed institution for the declaration and enforcement of God's will;' and therefore, in your character as a body of ministers, you cannot claim any political power under our system of government.

"The persecutions of our ancestors were too fresh in the memories of our revolutionary fathers, for them to create, recognize, or even tolerate, a church establishment in this country, clothed with temporal authority. So apprehensive were they of the usurpations of this, most fearful and corrupting of all despotisms, whether viewed with reference to the purity of the church or the happiness of the people, that they provided in the Constitution that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.' Still fearful that in a process of time, a spirit of religious fanaticism, or a spirit of ecclesiastical domination (yet more to be dreaded, because cool and calculating) might seize upon some exciting political topic, and in an evil hour surprise or entrap the people into a dangerous concession of political power to the clergy, the first Congress under the Constitution proposed, and the people adopted, an amendment to guard against such a calamity, in the following words: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'

"The doctrine of our fathers was, and the principle of the Constitution is, that every human being has an inalienable, divinely-conferred right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; and that no earthly institution nor any institution on earth, can rightfully deprive him of that sacred and inestimable privilege.

"I have wandered over distant and extensive portions of the globe, during the past year, where the successor of Mohammed proclaimed and enforced God's will on earth according to the principles of inspired truth and obligation as recorded in the Koran; and, by the potency of his 'divinely-appointed institution,' held in the hollow of his hand and suspended on his breath, the lives, the liberties, and the property, of millions of men, women and children. When within his dominions and surrounded by his bayonets, I had neither the time nor the disposition to argue the question of his right to 'reprove, rebuke, and exhort, with all authority and doctrine,' in the name of the Almighty! But when I set foot on the shores of my native land, under the broad folds of our national flag, surrounded by the protecting genius of our American institutions, I did not feel like recognizing any such rightful authority of that 'divinely-appointed institution,' in temporal affairs, here or elsewhere.

"Our fathers held that the people were the only true source of all political power. But what avails this position, if the constituted authorities established by the people are to be controlled and directed—not by their own judgment, not by the will of their constituents, but—by the divinely-constituted power of the clergy?

"Your claims for the supremacy of this 'divinely-appointed institution' are subversive of the fundamental principles upon which the whole republican system rests. What the necessity of a Congress, if you can supervise and direct its conduct? Why sustain a vast and complex judicial system, to expound the law and administer justice and determine all disputes in respect to human rights, if your 'divinely-appointed institution' is invested with all authority to prescribe the rule

of decision in the name of the Deity? If your pretensions be just and valid, why not dispense with all the machinery of human government and subject ourselves, freely and unreservedly, together with all our temporal and spiritual interests and hopes, to the justice and mercy of this divinely-appointed institution?"

The Illinois "Little Giant" tore the veil from the whole wicked scheme. Let his words be read everywhere.

GEORGE A. BATES.

*Green Vale, Jo Daviess Co., Ill.*

### Religion and the Public Schools.

(Continued.)

BECAUSE of its great importance both as a State and National question, I beg permission of the committee to be allowed to present as a part of my argument, a portion of the argument of the Hon. Stanley Matthews, now Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, upon this very question, in the case of *Minor et al. vs. Cincinnati School Board et al.* I ask further to present this because it would be impossible for me to make an argument as good, and I seriously doubt whether anybody can ever make a better. After referring to the resolution of the Cincinnati School Board which forbade the reading of the Bible at the opening exercises of the city schools, Mr. Matthews said:—

"I do say that the reading of the Holy Bible in the manner repealed by this resolution is the teaching of a dogma in religion, held by only a portion of the religious community, objected to by a large part of the others, and that it is in a just, true and sober sense,—as to all who either reject it, in whole or in part, as a divinely inspired and infallible book, and as to all others, who admitting that to be its character, nevertheless deny that it can properly be understood without the interpreting aid of external authority, as to unbelievers, Jews, and Roman Catholics,—a merely sectarian book. Now, if your honors please, the community is divided, you may say, in a general way, as a matter of fact, of which your honors can take judicial notice, and to which your honors' notice is addressed specially by the answer in this case, into at least three main divisions of religious belief, throwing out of view all those who have merely a negative position, sometimes called nullifidians—believers in nothing, if you choose, except what they see, and hear, and feel. But I propose to confine myself now only to that division of the community as to their positive religious belief; and I will include under one name all Protestant Christians, including every variety of faith, every sect and denomination, from those who take a merely humanitarian view of the person and the work of our divine Saviour up to those who believe that he was the incarnate God, and embracing every possible shade and variation of religious belief.

"Here are all these varieties of belief. The gentlemen say, What is conscience? It may be a very small matter in their estimation, applied to other people a very small matter, not to be taken notice of; and one gentleman quotes the legal maxim '*De minimis non curat lex*,' in reference to the supposed conscience of an infidel.

"But this will not do. We may call the eccentricities of conscience vagaries, if we please; but in matters of religious concern we have no right to disregard or despise them, no matter how trivial and absurd we may conceive them to be. In the days of the early Christian martyrs, the Roman lictors and soldiers despised and ridiculed

the fanaticism that refused the trifling conformity of a pinch of incense upon the altar erected to the Caesar that arrogated to himself the title and honor of 'Divine,' or of a heathen statue. History is filled with the record of bloody sacrifices which holy men who feared God rather than men have not withheld, on account of what seemed to cruel persecutors but trifling observances and concessions.

"Conscience, if your honors please, is a tender thing, and tenderly to be regarded; and in the same proportion in which a man treasures his own moral integrity, sets up the light of conscience within him as the glory of God shining in him to discover to him the truth, so ought he to regard the conscience of every other man, and apply the cardinal maxim of Christian life and practice, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.'

"Now, here is the Christian community. Then there are a large number of the citizens of this community who are not Christians at all, and yet are devout religionists. They are the descendants of the men who crucified Christ; and yet, as old Sir Thomas Browne says, we ought not to bear malice against them for that, for how often since have we, who profess his name, crucified him, too!

"Quousque patiere, bone Jesu!

Judæi te semel, ego scepsis crucifixi;

Illi in Asia, ego in Britannica,

Gallia, Germania;

Bone Jesu, miserere mei, et Judæorum.

"But here they are in this community, devout worshipers of the only living and true God, according to their conscientious convictions; and I will say, if your honors please, in all respects capable of performing every duty of the civil State, and equally entitled to, not toleration—I hate that word, there is no such thing known in this country as toleration—but civil and religious equality, equality because it is right, and a right. Then there is another sect of religionists. . . . They are the Roman Catholics. I know the Protestant prejudices against the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Roman Catholic system of faith, and the Roman Catholic Church. I know, too, from a reading of that history, a part of which has been reproduced in argument upon this occasion, that the Roman Catholic Church has too well deserved that bitter memory at the hands of those whom it persecuted. But it is not to be denied that the victims of persecution, with singular inconsistency, have not always omitted the opportunity, when power was in their hands, to inflict upon their oppressors the same measure of persecution, as if the wrong consisted not in the principle, but only in the person.

"Now, if your honors please, I try to stand impartial and neutral in this argument between these three sets of men. I am bound to look upon them all as citizens, all as entitled to every right, to every privilege that I claim for myself; and further, if your honors please, I do in my heart entertain the charity of believing that they are just as honest and just as sincere in their religious convictions as I am. I will say further, that from the study which I have made, as time and opportunity have been given me, of the doctrinal basis of the Roman Catholic faith, I am bound to say that it is not an ignorant superstition, but a scheme of well-constructed logic, which he is a bold man who says he can easily answer. Give them one proposition, concede to them one single premise, and the whole of their faith follows most legitimately and logically, and that is the

fundamental doctrine, the doctrine of what the church is, what it was intended to be, by whom it was founded, by whom it has been perpetuated, being the casket which contains to-day, shining as brightly as before the ages, the ever-living, actually present body of God, teaching and training men for life here and life hereafter. . . .

"Now, if your honors please, that is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church; that is the doctrine that is believed in by the Roman Catholic people; believed in sincerely, conscientiously, under their responsibilities, as they understand them, to answer to the bar of Almighty God, in the day of Judgment, according to the light which they have received, in their own reason and their own conscience; for you must bear in mind that the process by which a Roman Catholic attains his faith is the same by which your honors do. We seem to make a difference, in that respect, as if the Roman Catholic believed in his church in some other way, by some other organs than those which a Protestant uses when he comes to his convictions. Why, if your honors please, there is no compulsion about it; it is a voluntary matter; they believe it or not, as they choose; there is no external power which forces them to believe. They believe because they are taught; they believe because they are so educated; they believe because they have been trained up to it; just as we believe in the Protestant form of religion, because our fathers and our grandfathers and our grandfather's fathers were Protestants. They think they have sufficient reason for their belief; it may be an insufficient reason, but that don't make any difference to you and me; it is their reason, and that is enough. Now, they have—at any rate so far as the impersonal spirit of jurisprudence is concerned; so far as the presiding genius of the civil law is affected with jurisdiction; so far as, your honors, the embodiment of that artificial reason which consists in the collective wisdom of the State can take any notice—civil rights and religious rights, equal to yours and mine. Here are these three great divisions of men and of opinions and of religious faith and worship, all standing before you to-day upon a platform of absolute and perfect equality.

"But it is asked by some, who by asking it betray their want of comprehension of the real question: Have Protestants no rights? Cannot the majority of the community insist upon their consciences? Must the rights of minorities alone be consulted? Are we to be ruled by Catholics, or Jews, or infidels?

"The answer is obvious and easy. Protestants have no rights, as such, which do not at the same time and to the same extent belong to Catholics, as such, to Jews and infidels too. Protestants have a civil right to enjoy their own belief, to worship in their own way, to read the Bible and to teach it as a part of their religion, but they have no right in this respect to any preference from the State, or any of its institutions. They have no right to insist upon Protestant practices at the public expense, or in public buildings, or to turn public schools into seminaries for the dissemination of Protestant ideas. They can claim nothing on the score of conscience, which they cannot concede equally to all others. It is not a question of majorities or minorities, for if the conscience of the majority is to be the standard, then there is no such thing as right of conscience at all. It is against the predominance and power of majorities, that the rights of conscience are protected and have need to be.

"If it be said that the Protestant conscience

requires that the Bible be read by and to Protestant children, and it is a denial of a right of conscience to forbid it, waiving at present the obvious and conclusive answer that no such right of conscience can require that the State shall provide out of the common taxes for its gratification, it is enough to say, that Catholics then, too, have the same right to have their children taught religion according to their views; not out of the Douay Bible,—if they do not consider that sufficient, but by catechism and in the celebration of the mass, if they choose to insist; that Jews have the same right to have their religion taught in the common schools, not from the English version of the Old Testament, but according to the practice of their synagogues; and infidels have the same right to have their children taught deism, or pantheism, or positivism.

(To be continued.)

### Sunday-Law Meetings in Fresno.

FRESNO, CAL., August 26, 1889.

EDITOR SENTINEL: Thinking you would like to hear something in reference to Mr. Crafts' work here, I will send you a few items. Well, he has come and gone. He had two meetings, the first at 8 o'clock, Thursday evening, in the Baptist Church, the other at 3 in the afternoon, Friday, at the same place.

The address Thursday, occupied just an hour and a half. It was the same, I suppose, as he gives everywhere. He appears to have it learned by heart. He paid his usual respects to the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and while claiming that it did not much interfere with his work yet we noticed that he spent no little time trying to counteract its influence in the minds of those present. I should suppose in the three hours, or nearly, covered by both the addresses, he spent about a third of the time noticing the SENTINEL and Seventh-day Adventists. He did not have much to say about the Seventh-day Baptists, mostly about Adventists. Although trying to be pleasant and courteous, there was a vein of ill-disguised spite, and a spirit of retaliation running through his talk on this subject.

It evidently makes him ill-tempered to have his work opposed. He can and does pour out the vials of his wrath upon his opponents, and we who understand this movement know full well what he and his associates will do when they get the power. His meetings here and the spirit he has displayed in them have confirmed all our views of what is really behind and in this whole movement—an intolerant thirst for power, and determination to crush out all opposition.

When the vote was put it was against him. More being against the Sunday law than for it. He remarked that the large opposing vote was due to the Adventists, who were no doubt present in full force; that he could "tell them by their looks," etc. He was evidently not well pleased, and whether it was another "surprise party" to him I cannot say, but it was evident he was not pleased, and the local clergy seemed chagrined.

Possibly there were four hundred present at the first meeting. The vote on each side was not counted. If it had been, the "noes" would have had it by a nice little majority. The meetings, as regards attendance and enthusiasm, were a flat failure. His points received but faint applause in the audience.

There are eight organized churches here, not counting the Catholics or Adventists. I believe

the colored people have two small societies, but I did not see a colored person present. The average membership of these eight societies can, I think, be safely put at four or five hundred. It is safe to say that not more than two hundred of them were present at the largest meeting; so even the churches were poorly represented, so little interest do they take in the work. Two at least of the resident pastors were not present at all, or if so did not "take a front seat." They may have been out of town. Whether a local union was organized or not I have not been able to learn, but I suppose such was the case. Several sermons have since been preached on the Sunday question, so the preachers, some of them at least, are stirred up.

Well, let the good work go on. Send out the light and the truth, that all men may know the iniquity that lies in the American Sabbath Union's work.

The second meeting was devoted to answering written questions. About twenty, I should think were handed in. He had much to say at this meeting also against the SENTINEL and its methods, calling on the Seventh-day Adventists to repudiate it, and telling them that they were being deceived by it, etc., etc. None of the city papers spoke approvingly of Mr. Crafts' work. They passed it by in silence, as far as I have seen. The two dailies, however, spoke well of Professor Jones' open air address Wednesday evening.

N. J. BOWERS.

### The Law and the Gospel:

CALIFORNIA has no "Sunday law," and therein is, we believe, singular amongst the States.

Of course, by "Sunday law" is meant prescription by the State, that leads toward a particular observance of the day, and inflicts penalties for its violation. There are *Sundays* and *Sabbaths*, and people of equal sincerity and religious sensibilities differ upon the question of which day shall be kept to fulfill the commandment, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." Perhaps, derived from the intense theocratic tendencies of our Puritan ancestors, we have been rather prone to give a "Thus saith the Lord" tone to our legislation upon the Sunday question. But *powerful Christian* bodies have risen in the country, which dispute the authority of the first day of the week and plant their faith in the seventh day, which they keep holy; and on the first day they resume their ordinary occupations.

A Sunday law which inflicts penalties for plowing or planting, reaping or sowing, or ripping and sewing, on the first day, compels one set of Christians to smite another set, while both are sincere in their belief, of good report in their conduct, and equally serviceable to the State as good citizens.

California did not hesitate when the issue was made. She abandoned that sort of Sunday laws, and now every man does as he pleases, and being left to himself, with his moral sense as a guide, we are happy to say that nearly every man chooses to do well on *Sunday* and on the *Sabbath*. No man is in danger of arrest because, having kept his own Sabbath, he does not also keep another man's *Sunday*. The Israelites are freed from a sort of legal bondage, and California is peculiarly a land of religious liberty and toleration.

A great many good people were appalled when the Sunday law was repealed in 1883. They

predicted all sorts of dire results that have not followed.

We find in one of the religious newspapers of the State that a comprehensive inquiry has been made in nearly all the civilized countries of the world, to get a view of the condition of Sabbath observance that shall include them all. The question addressed in each case by the reverend gentleman who prosecuted the inquiry was: "Where have you seen the best Sabbath observance?" A San Francisco pastor answered: "Amongst the Christian people of California." The inquiries and answers were wrought into a book published in 1885, in which the investigator records this conclusion: "Both laymen and ministers say that even in California the Sabbath is better observed and Christian services are better attended than five years ago." And this was after two years' experience of no Sunday law!

The appearance of the word "even" in the verdict is slightly offensive.

"Even in California," as if from such sons of Belial but little is to be expected.

California is the only State in the Union where the law and the gospel are independent of each other, and where the day of rest and the day to be kept holy needs no law to enforce its observance. Instead of being a sign of retrogression and impiety, it is a sign of progress up to that pitch of respect for the day and toleration of the convictions of those who lay by the garments of worldliness on different days, that need no spur of the law, no detective espionage, no judge nor jail to vitalize them. Instead of being the odium of the State it is its special glory and greatest credit.

There is no room for compulsion in matters of religion. The Mohammedans believe in it. When they conquered Persia and converted it by force to the doctrines of the prophet, they made merry at seeing the Parsees, whom they had circumscribed by force, continue their prayers to the sun. It seemed a great joke to them that the fire-worshiper should not know that he had changed his supernatural allegiance and was wasting his time asking protection of a power from which he had been surgically alienated. Really, Sunday laws have no higher origin than had this Mohammedan idea of conversion by duress. California has shown that such laws are unnecessary to the observance of one day of the week as a season of testimony to faith in things unseen. More faithful testify now than before. The State no longer beats the bush for the Church, but the Church gets more game than ever.

We commend these facts and this example to the other States, hoping that their people will become as we are, devout and devotional, without being driven by the club of the law.—*Daily Alta California, August 4, 1889.*

#### Mr. Crafts in Riverside, Cal.

FROM the *Phoenix*, of August 31, we clip the following report:—

Last Monday evening, Mr. Crafts, of New York, lectured in the Congregational Church on behalf of the American Sabbath Union, or what he calls the "American Sabbath." The working classes were especially invited to come out, but they were conspicuous for their absence. The church was about two-thirds filled, mainly by church people and advocates of a State and National Sunday law. Considering the fame of the speaker, such a turnout does not argue much in favor of a Sunday law in Riverside.

Mr. Crafts is field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, and is a good specimen of what might be termed muscular Christianity. He is a fluent, forcible, and pleasant speaker. Phrenologically speaking, no one would take him for a logical speaker or an intellectual giant, nevertheless he would be inclined to carry conviction to a certain class of minds. We doubt, however, whether he made a single convert to his views; indeed, there were few at the meeting who would be inclined to dissent from any views expressed by him. What Mr. Crafts lacks in logic is made up in force, and what is wanting in argument is made up in assertion.

The workingman has nothing to gain from the American Sabbath Union which proposes to give him a rest on Sunday. We have never heard that the workingman complained of overwork, but rather of lack of work, and so when the workingman asks for work, and wants to be relieved of the incubus of Chinese labor, the American Sabbath Union tells him, We want to give you a rest on Sunday.

Mr. Crafts claims that the American Sabbath Union is indorsed by the Knights of Labor. This we deny. There are estimated to be 1,000,000 idle workers in the United States, and the American Sabbath Union proposes to help them by giving them a holy day on Sunday, so devoid of anything in the shape of rational amusement that they will be forced to go to church in sheer desperation.

Compare the *stone*, which the church proposes to give the workingman with what he himself is asking for.

In the International Workers' Congress, held in Paris a few days ago, the workers agreed on "Eight hours as a maximum day's work to be fixed by international law."

"At least one day's holiday to be given each week."

"Abolition of night work as far as practicable for men and entirely for women and children."

"The total suppression of labor by children under fourteen and protection of children up to eighteen."

"Prison and workhouse labor to be conducted under the same conditions as free labor, and to be employed as far as possible on great public works."

Mr. Crafts' arguments were a tissue of sophistries. He claims that eighty per cent. of the people of the United States are Protestants, ten per cent. Catholics, and the remaining ten per cent. is made up from all classes.

From what he says, one-half million of foreigners, "unwashed refugees, professors of liberty," are the sole cause of Sabbath-breaking, while the AMERICAN SENTINEL counteracts all the influence of the American Sabbath Union. It would be hard to say just what Mr. Crafts wants.

Jesuitism is by no means confined to the Roman Catholic Church, and there are many in Protestant garb who think the "end justifies the means." The subversion of our civil and religious liberties will be the result if the American Sabbath Union can have its own way.

This country is great and prosperous because it is free politically and religiously, and wherever the civil power is controlled the most by the religious power, there is the least freedom. Not by accident, but by design, is the absence of any religious test in our State and National Constitutions, and long may it continue to be. The bat-

tle of civil freedom has been fought on this continent for the whole civilized world, and as appearances go, the final battle of religious freedom will also have to be fought on our soil. When the day comes that the religious arm controls the civil arm, there will be an end of our greatness.

#### Danger Ahead!

THERE are always two sides to every question, yet "the other side" of many of the most important questions usually has but few champions in press, pulpit, or public, because although possessing even more intrinsic merit than the opposite side, it is unpopular, or perhaps, more properly speaking, unfashionable with "sawsieety." Such is the case with a number of questions which have been submitted to the consideration of the Constitutional Convention at Olympia, most prominent of which are: God in the Constitution, "Sunday rest," and exemption of church property from taxation. Unfortunately there seem to be few of the members, who have given "the other" side any study and who understand the true intent of the measures.

While an apparently harmless sentiment in itself, the recognition of that force which rules the universe—possesses deeper meaning in the preamble than many people imagine. What is the true meaning? Circumstances indicate this to be the entering wedge, the preliminary step, towards the union of Church and State, and the restriction and eventual suppression of religious liberty. The future is best judged by the past and present; the true meaning of this union is written in blood upon the pages of history.

That some kinds of laws seem to be necessary to preserve order and protect society there can be no doubt; but no special Sunday laws are required, because that day is no better than any other day; what is proper to be done on any day is proper to be done on Sunday, and what should not be done on a week day should not be done at all. The advocates of this measure, however, seek to establish a false standard of right and wrong,—that an act done on Sunday is wrong, while the same act performed on any other day would be meritorious. It is not the day when an act is done that makes it either right or wrong, but it is the intrinsic features of that act. Can you truthfully deny this, my Christian friend?

While one class of Christians recognize Sunday as a day of worship and rest, there are others who devote Saturday to the same purpose; the Mohammedan recognizes Friday as his Sabbath; while other classes recognize all days as alike holy. Those who keep Sunday and want legislation for that day ask that other people shall be forbidden to pursue their usual avocations on that day, because it disturbs their rest and worship, and they claim their rights are not properly protected; yet they seem to ignore this principle by refusing to abstain from work on Saturday, when they may possibly disturb the Sabbath rest and worship of the Jew and Adventist.

Are not the rights of the Jew and Adventist (who with the Liberal, Spiritualist and Agnostic oppose Sunday legislation) entitled to as much respect and protection as those of the Methodist or Presbyterian? The liberty of the latter class to worship who, when, where, and in what manner they please is not denied, and present laws afford ample protection from disturbance. We contend that if we wish to make our "day of rest" a holiday, to engage in such recreations and

amusements as shall be consistent with the rights of others, or if we wish to pursue our regular business we have that right and should be protected in it. Sunday is an excellent social arrangement, provided it is not managed entirely by priests, preachers, and church members; in that case it is a mere adjunct to superstition and bigotry.

The agitators for Sunday laws seem to lose sight of the fact that minorities have rights as well as majorities, and that there is no safety in society at any time or place, under any system of religious or civil law, when the rights of each individual, no matter how humble nor how much he may dissent from the common public opinion, shall be held less sacred than the rights of the majority. The question of religious belief and observance is a question between a man's own conscience and his God, if he has any; and it is a matter the State has no right to interfere with, directly or indirectly.

This measure of the Sabbath Union, like its progenitor the Blair bill, is a blow at the liberty and rights guaranteed every citizen of this free republic; it is a public acknowledgement that their religious system is a failure and cannot keep up with the procession in the march of progress which has marked the latter part of the enlightened nineteenth century; that it cannot stand upon its own merits, but seeks the State's aid to save its cherished myths, superstitions and errors, from decay; it shows the spirit of intolerance and bigotry that for centuries has animated and still animates the church. The world has had enough of religious persecution and intolerance. An inquisition such as the leaders of these measures contemplate would be no less arbitrary and ferocious through Protestants than were the leaders of the Romish Inquisition; the system is the same. In the fourth century the same movement of designing priests and politicians to unite Church and State by Sunday and similar laws, developed a theocracy, a religious despotism which left a trail of blood down through the Dark Ages. That the church of to-day can no more safely be trusted with political power than it could in the fourth century is best illustrated by recent utterances of some of its leading representatives in this Sunday-law movement.

It is understood that this question of enforcing an observance of the sectarian Sabbath will be submitted for the people's adoption or rejection as a separate article of the Constitution. Thus far the press has been eloquently silent in discussing the merits or demerits of this measure, probably for fear of offending the "very elect." *The Eye*, however, believes in a free and fair discussion. Under its present management its columns have been and will continue to be open to those who may hold different opinions from its editor. "Hear all sides; hold fast to that which is good. The truth will make you free."—*The Eye, Snohomish, Washington.*

It is not enough to say that "the requirement of one day of rest in seven is based on the necessities of human nature." Upon which of these necessities is it based? Is it based upon those necessities of human nature with which the State can have to do? The requirement of the seventh day's rest is based, *not* upon the *physical*, but upon the *spiritual* necessities of human nature. And with the spiritual part of man, civil government can never of right have anything to do. That pertains solely to God. The Sabbath rest therefore belongs to God. And Christ commands to render to God, not to civil government, that which is God's,

### A Sumptuary Measure.

THE disposition on the part of many people to favor the objects of the National Reform Association and the passage of the National Sunday-Rest bill can be attributed largely to ignorance of interests involved; but with many others the spirit of selfishness and persecution is very apparent. Inconsistencies will crop out. The following conversation will illustrate one prominent characteristic of these agitators:—

A—Will you vote the prohibition ticket this fall?

B—Most emphatically, No!

A—Don't you believe in the prohibition principle?

B—No, sir; it is a sumptuary measure; it interferes with the personal rights and liberties of men, and I will heartily oppose all such measures. Besides, this question is purely a moral one, and should never be interfered with by legislation.

In a short time the topic of conversation was changed, and the Sunday-law question came up, as follows:—

A—What do you think of the proposed Sunday law?

B—It is the very thing we need. It is high time something emphatic were done to enforce Sabbath observance.

A—Would you vote for such a law?

B—I would support a measure that would sink every steamer, and burn every railroad train that moved on Sunday, and confiscate the property and imprison every man who worked on the Sabbath.

The above conversation really took place between the writer and a prominent member of a Protestant church in Easton, Maryland. And with such a spirit they propose to put God in the Constitution and evangelize the United States.

S. H. WILLEY.

### No Sunday Law Needed for Protection.

THE *Union Signal* says: "A W. C. T. U. tent-meeting at South Omaha, Neb., conducted by C. J. Holt, was assailed by a shower of stale eggs, which fell without discrimination upon the just and the unjust, including the ladies. Judgment was visited upon the marauders to the extent of a fine of fifty dollars." Certainly these persons deserved punishment for their incivility, that is, for trespassing upon the rights of others. And the fact that they were punished as "marauders" and not as Sabbath-breakers, shows that no Sunday laws are needed to protect people in their right to worship. But we suppose they will keep right on asking for Sunday laws to protect public assemblies just the same. Suppose the above assault had occurred on Wednesday, and that the only way to bring the "marauders" to justice was by the enforcement of a Sunday law. As every one knows, a Sunday law could not be enforced on Wednesday or any other day but Sunday. A Sunday law is for Sunday and no other day. Hence, if they had to depend on Sunday laws for protection, they might be rotten-egged on every day but Sunday with perfect impunity. We are stupid enough to think that after they had tried a Sunday law for a month or two to keep off the eggs, they would make up their minds that one every-day law for eggs was worth more than all the Sunday laws in existence. A Sunday law, prohibiting the running of a saloon or the throwing of "stale eggs" only one day in the week, would be a disgrace to any govern-

ment. Such a law would make crime to consist in the time, instead of in the character, of an act. We believe in every-day laws for crime, and we will never consent to any law that exempts criminals from punishment six days in the week.

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

### The Sunday Movement in London.

AN energetic attempt is to be made at the half-yearly meeting of the Shareholders of the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway to put a stop to the system of cheap Sunday excursion trains. This renewed attack upon the workingman's holiday has been carefully organized, and a circular letter has been issued, under the auspices of the Lord's Day Observance Society, calling on all zealous Sabbatarians to unite heart and hand in depriving the workingmen of London of their weekly breath of fresh air. At present they can go to Brighton and back for a very small sum, and none, perhaps, but those who are in some sense workingmen themselves can appreciate the physical benefit which they derive from the excursion. Those who contend that all Sunday traveling which has for its object only health and recreation is Sabbath-breaking, if they are allowed their own way, would condemn thousands of laboring men to pass their entire lives, without a break, in the narrow, crowded streets or festering alleys of our great city. It is needless to say that this is only the spirit of intolerance which forbids the opening of museums and picture galleries on Sunday, breaking out in a fresh place, and throwing one more difficulty in the way of those social reformers who wish to see Sunday a day of rest from labor, without being converted into an excuse for intemperance. It does not matter whether public houses are closed or not. Unless the people are provided with other ways of spending their leisure, the old tradition will prevail, and drink will be obtained by some means. It is not found that Sunday closing does really diminish intemperance. But excursion trains unquestionably have that effect; and those who desire to abolish them can only consist of that class of reasoners who prefer the means to the end; and think that so long as a man sits still all day on Sunday, does no work, goes to no place of amusement, does nothing either to cultivate his taste or benefit his health, he is in the right road, though he drinks gin from morning till night, and keeps the Sabbath holy by degrading himself below the brutes. We have no desire to see the English Sunday reformed on the Continental model. We are not advocating any system which converts Sunday exclusively into a day of pleasure. We are arguing on sanitary grounds; and our contention is that it is quite as meritorious an action to bring a man away from the slums of London on a Sunday as it is to pull an ox out of the pit. The abuse of any principle does not necessarily condemn the use. Cheap Sunday trains have their drawbacks, no doubt. They are sometimes attended by a certain amount of riot, revelry, and intoxication, which is not appropriate to the day. But the question is whether all these evils would not be multiplied twenty-fold if the people who share in them stayed at home, or spent their money in the public house.—*London Standard.*

LET religious institutions be sustained by religious means. Let Christian duties be maintained by Christian methods. If this be done the State need not be called on to legislate for such ends, or interfere in any way.—*Western American.*

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.

**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.

**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  
**Dallas Weekly News.**

The Leading Weekly of the Southwest;  
12 Pages, 72 Columns.  
Contains Farm News, Stock News, General News, in fact, all the news. Ladies' and Children's Special Departments. Fine Premium List.  
A PICTURE FREE OF CHARGE.  
All those subscribing for one year prior to Oct. 1, 1889, will receive free of charge a copy of the celebrated picture entitled "The Horse Fair." Terms—\$.25 a year, cash in advance. Address,  
**A. H. BELO & Co., Publishers,**  
Dallas, Texas.  
Sample Copies Free to any Address.

**West Shore Railroad**

N. Y. C. & H. R. R. Co. 1888ee.  
The Picturesque Route for Business and Pleasure Travel.  
"SUMMER EXCURSIONS," a handsomely illustrated book, giving description of the Hudson River, Catskill Mountains, Saratoga and other New York State resorts, will be mailed on receipt of five cents in postage stamps.  
For tourist books, time-tables and information regarding West Shore Railroad, call on or address **H. B. JAGOE**, General Eastern Passenger Agent, 363 Broadway, or  
**C. E. LAMBERT**, General Passenger Agent, 5 Vanderbilt Ave., New York.

**A \$70 SEWING MACHINE**

FOR  
**\$50.00.**  
A new "NEW HOME" sewing machine, six drawer, latest improved attachments, new style woodwork, complete, FOR SALE FOR \$50.  
THE MACHINE HAS NEVER BEEN USED.  
Now is Your Chance to Get a Good Machine Cheap. Address,  
**S. N. CURTISS,**  
Box 1534. Oakland, Cal.



**WILLFUL AND MALICIOUS SLANDER!**

© **Rev. W. F. Crafts**

Against the  
Editors of the American Sentinel.

The SENTINEL LIBRARY No. 19 contains the

**AFFIDAVIT OF W. F. CRAFTS,**

Charging the Editors of the American Sentinel with

"Willful and Malicious Slander,"

**THE DEFENSE** of Prof. A. T. Jones and Dr. E. J. Waggoner,

TOGETHER WITH

FAC-SIMILES OF MR. CRAFTS' LETTERS, and \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION.

THIS IS A SPICY NUMBER,

AND ADVANCE ORDERS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED FOR HUNDREDS OF COPIES.

Mr. Crafts' charges have been published to the world through the secular press and the special documents of the American Sabbath Union, and a copy of this Defense should be placed in the hands of everyone who has read his charges.

His own letters prove that he has sworn to that which is not true.

THE PAMPHLET CONTAINS 80 PAGES. PRICE 10 CENTS.

Send on your orders. Address,

**Pacific Press Publishing Co.,**

43 Bond St., N. Y.

OAKLAND, CAL.

THE  
**National Sunday Law**

Argument by Alouzo T. Jones, 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, December 13, 1888. Mr. 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.

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 192 pages and will be sent postpaid on receipt of 25 cents.

Send for it! Read it! Send it to your Friends! Address all orders to

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**

12th and Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal.  
Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

**Charles Dickens'**

Complete Works in 15 Volumes with

**THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN**  
— ONE YEAR FOR ONLY —

**Two Dollars.**

**Sir Walter Scott's**

Complete Works in 12 Volumes with

**THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN**  
— ONE YEAR FOR ONLY —

**Two Dollars.**

THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN offers to subscribers as a premium their choice of either the complete works of Charles Dickens or Sir Walter Scott for two dollars. The books are all beautifully printed and substantially bound in paper covers.

Every subscriber to THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN also receives the Newspaper Library—six volumes. Thus for two dollars the subscriber may get twenty-one volumes of standard books, and THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN one year. Nothing equal to it was ever offered to the public before. Address,

**CRAMER, AIKENS & CRAMER,**

Milwaukee, Wis.

\* \* THE BEST \* \*

**Duplicating Inks**

FOR USE WITH

"CYCLOSTYLE," "MIMEOGRAPH," "COPYGRAPH,"

OR ANY

Duplicating Process in which a Stencil is Used, are the

CELEBRATED "REDDING INKS"

They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog the Stencil, and are in Every Way

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done with these Inks.

**Pacific Press Publishing Co.,**

Oakland, Cal.

Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

**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.

**TEN LECTURES**

— ON —

**NASAL CATARRH,**

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of Choice Prescriptions

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and

six Beautifully Colored Plates,

Besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs only 30 cents, and is in great demand.

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**

Or 43 Bond St., N. Y.

Oakland, Cal.

**Smith's Diagram OF PARLIAMENTARY RULES.**

A lucid and interesting treatise on Parliamentary usages. By a simple map, with converging lines, it shows the relation of any one motion to every other motion, and at a glance answers over five hundred questions in regard to parliamentary matters. A very ingenious and useful arrangement.

The N. Y. Independent says: "Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules" is an admirably ingenious simplification of the confused matter of parliamentary practice. Mr. U. Smith has put more of the essence of parliamentary practice into small space and lucid order than we find in any other manual."

Breast-pocket size, 34 pages, bound in muslin. Price, 50 cents. Send for a copy.

**Pacific Press Publishing Company,**

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, SEPTEMBER 25, 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.

At the Los Angeles Sunday-law mass meetings the Roman Catholic Bishop Mora "appointed his Vicar-General and other eminent clergymen to be present and represent him," as indorsing the general features of the movement.

THE American Sabbath Union says he was written to from Nevada, "There is no use of your coming down here, everybody works on Sunday." Consequently the Union did not go to Nevada. If the Sunday-law movement is in the interests of Sunday rest, it would seem that such a place as that should be the very place where he would most need to go. But no, that is the very place where he does not go at all. This again shows the principle of the move to be, to call not-sinners but the righteous to repentance.

THE American Sabbath Union says:—

"It is sometimes said by opponents of Sabbath laws that government has no right to dictate how a man shall spend the day. But at quarantine, government proves its right to dictate how a man shall spend a fortnight when the general good requires it."

And it is unmitigated sophistry and inexcusable trickery to argue that Sunday work is as dangerous to the general public, as is a ship laden with pestilence or infected with small-pox, or cholera, or yellow fever. It would seem that the people must have taken leave of their senses who can be caught with such chaff as is being sown by the advocates of Sunday laws.

It is declared over and over again by the American Sabbath Union that "You can no more produce character without a quiet and legally protected Sabbath, than you can produce in California your marvelous fruits without water." What is here meant by a legally-protected Sabbath is one enforced by law. Now there are thousands of people in this Nation who keep the Sabbath or Saturday; and that day is not at all legally protected, according to the above idea. Yet everybody knows that as a body there are no better characters than those of the seventh-day Christians. And this character is produced without a legally-protected Sabbath in any sense as the Union uses that term. The reason of this is that those people depend on Jesus Christ, the true source of good character, rather than upon the civil power.

To evade the charge of prosecuting an unconstitutional measure, Mr. W. F. Crafts said at Los Angeles, September 1, that the phrase "an establishment of religion" in the Constitution means "the selecting of a single religion or a single sect, and supporting it by the State," and that they do not propose any such thing. Well let us see. They propose in their Sunday law to except "works of religion." What religion it is whose works shall be excepted, will have to be legislatively or judicially defined. The definition is intended to be, "The works of the Christian religion." Then just as soon as that shall be done, that

will be "the selecting of a single religion" by the State, and the supporting and protecting of that religion by the national power. Therefore by their own definition it is proved that the National Sunday law which they propose is a violation of the first amendment of the United States Constitution.

THE American Sabbath Union still persists that Sunday laws are constitutional under the National Constitution, because they have been declared to be constitutional in the States. In other words, persists that decisions of State Supreme Courts are decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Worse than this, however, is the fact that the people to whom it is told believe it. And yet worse than all is the fact that the great majority do not know enough of the National Constitution, or of the system of government of the Union, to be able to detect the falsehood; and do not have a disposition to study the question enough to find out the truth in the matter. A people who will thus carelessly allow themselves to be robbed of their liberties and constitutional rights, are unworthy of them.

In the Los Angeles Sunday-law convention, September 1, Rev. Mr. Hutchins said:—

"A government like ours must be held together by the adhesive power of virtue."

Now Mr. Hutchins was speaking in favor of the enactment of a National Sunday law, as necessary to preserve the government. His argument therefore is, that there is in law the "adhesive power of virtue." But this is not true. The only adhesive power of virtue that there is in this world is in the gospel of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the source of virtue to this world. "The whole multitude sought to touch him for there went virtue out of him and healed them all." This virtue can be secured only by faith; this faith can only be inculcated by the preaching of the gospel of Christ. The Sunday-law preachers are working by perfectly antagonistic means to secure what they profess to want. And this proves that they have forgotten the virtue and the power of the gospel of Christ.

HERE is a point that reveals not only the interest that the Sunday-law workers have in the workingmen, but also the true inwardness of the Sunday movement. Sunday night, September 1, the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union addressed a mass meeting in Los Angeles. The Los Angeles *Evening Express* tells the rest:—

"It was there given out to the vast audience that a full report of the address by Dr. Crafts would appear in this morning's *Times* and that the opportunity to procure a copy should not be neglected. Nothing was said, however, about the fact that the hard-working compositors employed in the *Times* office would have to work on Sunday night setting up Dr. Crafts' denunciation of Sunday work."

It is not Sunday work that they want to stop as much as it is Sunday-keeping they want to enforce. It is not so much the workingmen they want to protect, as it is the preachers that they want to empower.

THE proposition which it is said the Vanderbilt engineers made some years ago, that they "would be willing to do ten days' work in six if they could only have the seventh for rest," is rather extravagant for sober-minded practical men. No man can continuously do ten days,

work in six, even with the seventh day's rest, nor with two days' rest in seven. There is too much Sunday-law theology cropping out in that statement to allow it to be of any weight.

ADVICES from Flagstaff, Arizona, indicate that the American Sabbath Union has made some headway in that village. The field secretary had an audience of about seventy, at his lecture on the 5th instant. Of these, fifty voted in favor of a Sunday law. Our correspondent says: "Many who but a few hours before had laughed at the idea of there being any danger of such a law, are to-day supporting the scheme." People who value the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the Constitution as it is, should remember that the field secretary leaves an organization in every place he visits. They should remember, also, that although the great majority of the people of the United States are opposed to religious legislation, an organized minority may succeed in procuring measures that will fasten such a calamity upon the Nation. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

THE chronic unfairness of the "American Sentinel" appears in its incessant ringing of the changes on the union of "Church and State."—*Christian Statesman*.

And the chronic inconsistency of the *Statesman* appears in its incessant denial that it favors a union of Church and State, while carrying at its mast-head in every issue this avowed purpose: "To secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian Nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." If the *Statesman* is not dealing in unadulterated Church and State, it should take down the sign.

WE learn from a private letter from Los Angeles that the workingmen of that city, in whose interest the American Sabbath Union is professedly so much interested, did not take kindly to the recent Sunday-law demonstration under the auspices of the "field secretary." It seems that it was announced in a circular that one of the leaders of the workingmen would address them at one of the meetings, and that some of the Catholic priests would also be on hand and perhaps speak. When the time came, Mr. Butler (the representative of the workingmen) attempted to speak, but his fellow workingmen, not liking the tone of his remarks, hissed him down.

The writer continues: "This put a damper on the meeting, and the priests (if there were any present) were not called upon. Mr. C. [Crafts] seemed greatly discouraged, but made a few remarks, principally in denouncing the SENTINEL and Prof. Jones, and wound up in a towering rage."

## 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.