



"IF ANY MAN HEAR MY WORDS, AND BELIEVE NOT, I JUDGE HIM NOT."—Jesus Christ.

VOLUME 14.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 5, 1899.

NUMBER 39.

*Published in the interests of Religious Liberty—Christian and Constitutional.*

*Any one receiving the American Sentinel without having ordered it may know that it is sent by some friend. Therefore those who have not ordered the Sentinel need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.*

(Entered at the New York Postoffice.)

THE devil is a master hand at the game of politics.



THE true theory of civil government is no respecter of persons.



IT is a good deal better to look at the dark side of truth, than at the bright side of error.



IMPERIALISM takes away the enlightening torch in the hand of the goddess of Liberty, and puts in its place a dripping sword.



SINCE the "prince of this world" is Satan, to ask Jesus Christ to be this world's king under the present order of things, is to ask him to go into partnership with the devil.



THE "powers that be" which are "ordained of God," are not the power ordained of God to spread the gospel in the earth and turn wicked men "from the power of Satan unto God."



WHAT is the use of trying to overthrow the demon of Sabbath desecration, by means which have proved wholly inadequate to dethrone the demon of intemperance? Only that which will cast out the latter from its seat of power in the heart, can put down the former. The true remedy for one moral evil is a remedy for all.

IF there could be such a thing as a "civil" weekly sabbath, it would be necessarily a counterfeit of the divine institution, and would therefore be under the divine condemnation.



IT matters not what any man may do to become morally better if he does not believe the Word of God; and as belief must be wholly a voluntary act, it follows that men can not be made better than they are—society can not be saved—by any system of force.



AS no one can keep a command of God without faith, and Sabbath-keeping is a command of God, no one can keep the Sabbath without faith; and therefore all the resolutions that can be passed by trades unions, or legislation enacted, on the subject of Sabbath observance, can not promote such observance in the least.

### Force vs. Example in Civilization.

THE United States has started out on a career of conferring the blessings of its civilization upon other peoples of the earth, *by force*. In not every case may it be compelled to subjugate such a people by actual war, as in the Philippines; but in every case its policy is to enforce complete submission to its sovereignty, as the first step to the realization of the promised blessings.

In changing to this policy from that heretofore pursued, the United States has exchanged the power of persuasion by example, for the power of compulsion through fear. It has declared that the latter is more potent for lifting people to a higher civilization than is the former. It has declared that people can be unwillingly lifted to this higher plane more readily than they can be willingly. It has declared that the sword is a mightier civilizer than the pen; that the whirlwind and

earthquake, rather than the "still small voice," manifest the working of Providence.

The doctrine which it has thus affirmed is not true. There is no question at all but that the influence of the United States over the world, as a republic based upon the true principles of government, and exemplifying the blessings of free government before all people, is vastly greater than any influence it can exert as a martial figure brandishing its sword before the world and declaring that its civilization must be extended in the earth by its military prowess.

Such an exhibition awakens in the onlooking world scorn and derision, hatred, and some fear, but never any feeling of increased regard for American principles of government and of desire to adopt them in other lands.

The United States has, unquestionably, during this nineteenth century, exerted a great moral influence upon the world. This is a truth which by many seems now to be forgotten or overlooked. It has continually instilled into the minds of all people the aspiration for free government. It has continually dropped into the soil of their hearts the germ of freedom which had power to grow and become a giant tree, rending asunder the institutions of despotism as the clods of earth are rent by the pushing sprout. It has thus continually worked along the line by which the greatest and most complete revolutions among earth's peoples are brought about; for as all history shows, such revolutions come always from a force generating within the hearts of the people, rather than from a force pressing upon them from without.

The United States could not indeed expect to persuade other governments of the earth—the monarchies of the Old World—to abdicate their power and voluntarily step aside in favor of republics; nor was it necessary that its influence upon the nations should take effect in that way. But it could expect to instill the love of free government into the hearts of the people of other lands, until they themselves should rise up and set aside the institutions of monarchy and the principles that had held them in subjection to a ruler, replacing them with the principle of self-rule and the institutions that are based upon it. This is a statement justified not alone by reason but by historical events.

There is in the hearts of all people a natural love of free government; a love which can be awakened and fostered, and which, nourished by a mighty influence streaming continually from the shores of the New World, would grow and in time work wonders for Old World peoples held in governmental bondage. And this would be true not only in Europe, but in the less civilized lands of Asia; in those very lands, indeed, where the United States is now seeking to impose its civilization by fire and sword. With the great Republic standing true to the principles on which it was set up, the leaven of free government would ere long have done for

remote and semi civilized lands all that the same Republic is essaying but will not be able to do by force of arms.

Other lands do not want American civilization, and least of all do they want that civilization imposed on them. American civilization, as it is in the United States, is fitted only for the United States. But the spirit and principles of free government are the same in all lands; and the structure of free government must be reared upon those principles by the people themselves. The civilization of every land should be its own. Free government in one land, cannot mean the establishment there of an alien civilization.

---

### The Message Must Be Given.

---

It is written in the Scriptures of truth that the things which happened in old time were for examples and are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come. Then of all times in the world's history, now is the time in which the things written in the Scriptures are of importance to the world, and must be told to the world.

Of all the parts of the Scriptures, those parts which relate to the nations and kingdoms of the world are of the most particular interest in this time of our day. There is much scripture that touches individual experience: this is of equal value at all times and to all people. There is also much scripture that concerns *national* destiny: this in the case of each particular nation, in its own particular time in the past, was all-important for that time as the message of God; and being a national example is of particular interest in instruction and warning to every nation that follows. And when the world has come to the time of the end, then *all* these national examples cited in the Word of God stand with their lessons of instruction and admonition as a manifold message to the nations of to-day whose guilt and ruin must be the greater as they despise and reject the manifold message of the Word of God.

The history and fall of Israel, of Assyria, of Babylon, of Medo-Persia, of Grecia, and of Rome, has all been recorded in the Bible, for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world have come, and for the admonition of the nations of the earth in this time of the end. And the lessons of instruction and admonition, which are in these historical records in the Bible must be, and they will be, given definitely and distinctly to the people and the nations that are upon the earth in this time of the end.

God has put into his Word messages that concern nations, as well as messages that are to individuals. It was so in Israel, it was so in the empire of Assyria, it was so in the empire of Babylon, it was so in the empire of Persia, of Grecia, and of Rome. Some of the kings of Judah; one of the kings of Assyria; Nebuchadnezzar of

Babylon; Darius the Mede; and Cyrus and Darius, and Xerxes and Artaxerxes the Persians, listened to the messages of God. The kings of Israel, and the last ones of Judah, Belshazzar the last one of Babylon, the last ones of Persia, none of the Greek empire and none of the Roman paid any attention to the messages of God to them, nor to those concerning their time.

It came about, in the order of God, that the rulers of all these nations met the truth of God in such a way as to be responsible for its rejection and for the consequences which followed to themselves and to their respective nations and empires. Belshazzar, Alexander, and Nero, are but examples in bold relief on the one side, as are Nebuchadnezzar, Darius, and Cyrus on the other, of what the Lord has ever done and is ever doing to rulers; and especially in times of crisis. But the great difficulty has ever been, and still is, that in the vast majority of instances these messages of God are passed by as nothing more than mere incidents, and many times as hardly even that. Nevertheless those rulers in so doing rejected the message of God to them, and for their day and nation; and were responsible for the consequences that might have been avoided, and which at the very least were hastened by their unheeding course.

And the United States to-day is not an exception. Evils are flooding this nation to day, concerning which the national responsible authorities were plainly and repeatedly warned. Those authorities were told of these things at the opportune time, when by heeding the message they could have cleared themselves of all responsibility for any coming evil, could have honored God, themselves, and their position, and at the very least could have stayed the tide of evil. *And this must, and will, still go on.*

It is true that there will be those who will say, as there have been those who have said, that that is "meddling with politics." But it is nothing of the kind. Was Daniel meddling with politics when he gave to Nebuchadnezzar, to Belshazzar, to Darius and to Cyrus the message of God as it was in the Word of God? Was the high priest at Jerusalem meddling in politics when he gave to Alexander the Great the message of God written for that very time? Were the Christians in the Roman empire meddling in politics when they gave the message of God as in his Word, concerning the coming ruin of that empire and the planting of the ten kingdoms? Were they guilty of treason in telling to all people that the empire would certainly go to utter ruin, that the Barbarians would certainly triumph, and that every soul must seek God with all the heart to escape that certain ruin? They were so charged of course; but was it fair so to charge? Were they guilty?

No more were these men in our day meddling in politics when they presented time and again to State legislatures and governors, and to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, and to the President, the message of God in counsel and warning against the

evils that would certainly come, upon the rejecting of the law of God and the principles of justice and human liberty.

And still this work must go on, and still it will not be in any sense meddling in politics. To hold forth, by tongue and pen, to people and rulers, the message of God as he has given it in his Word and portrayed it in the course and end of the great empires of history, can not possibly be meddling in politics; it can not possibly be treason, nor can it truly be said that it is interfering in affairs of government with which religion has nothing to do. *Not* to do so, is nothing less than to see the sword come and the people be not warned. But God has set watchmen *to see the sword coming*, and to *warn the people*. And he says that if the watchmen see the sword come, and, because of a cry of "meddling in politics" or for any other "reason," he blow not the trumpet and the people be not warned, whosoever is taken away by the sword, "his blood will I require at the watchman's hand." And if the watchman be such, or stood in such an attitude, as *not to see any sword coming*, the result is the same to him and to the other wicked.

No, history has not occurred in vain. Neither have its vital lessons been set down in the Word of God in vain. And if in this all-important time those who know these things should hold their peace, the very stones would cry out. And if those who in this time profess to know these things, or have opportunity to know them, be yet unknowing, then shall the message and deliverance arise from another place, and these will be overwhelmed in the destruction that overtakes all them that be asleep in this startling time.

Blow the trumpet and warn the people. Tell them Thus saith the Lord God: whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear. And in so doing thou hast delivered thy soul.

A. T. J.

---

### Sunday Idleness and Crime.

---

THE idea that the civil government ought also to be religious, never has to go further than to Scotland to find facts for an illustration. Recently the city council of Glasgow, by a vote of forty-eight to twelve, denied a petition presented by several labor unions, the University faculty, and even some leading clergymen, asking for the opening of the People's Palace, with its art gallery, on Sunday. The account states that "Dr. John Hunter, of Trinity Congregational Church, presented the petition. He represented that drunkenness and licentiousness were more rife on Sunday than on other days, and largely so because of compulsory inactivity and idleness. Sunday should meet every need of our higher nature, and bring opportunity for quiet and elevating recreation, as well as for meditation and worship. This larger view of the best use of the day for physical

and intellectual as well as moral and spiritual needs must not, he said, be confounded with its desecration. Similar arguments were used by other ministers supporting him; but the Presbyteries of the Established, Free, and United churches, together with other religious bodies, made common cause in opposition, and carried the day."

It is just as true in America as in Scotland that "drunkenness and licentiousness"—and mischief in other forms—will be more rife on Sunday than on other days because of compulsory idleness. If a person *will not* occupy himself religiously on Sunday—and no law can make him do that—for the sake of all that is good let him be *occupied* in honest work or innocent recreation.

THE prosperity of a country depends, not on the abundance of its revenues, nor on the strength of its fortifications, nor on the beauty of its public buildings; but it consists in the number of its cultivated citizens, in its men of education, enlightenment and character. Here are to be found its true interests, its chief strength, its real power.—*Martin Luther.*

### "The White Man's Burden."

WE have been told much of late about the "white man's burden," by which is meant his supposed duty to go to the dark skinned races of the earth and confer on them the blessings of his superior civilization. A glance at the history of what the white man has already done in this line ought to be sufficient to dispel the illusion that the mere civilization of the white man, imposed upon the uncultured heathen, is going to be any benefit to the latter. The whole testimony of the history of the white man's contact with such peoples is that, unless he goes to them with the gospel, he carries to them a curse rather than a blessing.

We note in an exchange the following impressive statement of facts and conclusions upon this subject:—

"The rapid decrease of the natives in many countries where the white man has established himself, has often been remarked and commented upon by writers and historians. Our ideas associated with the 'survival of the fittest' can not account for the appalling waste of life that haunts the white man's steps.

"Other reasons, more tremendous in their reality, are readily seen when we measure the real facts of the case. When the white nations undertake to civilize one of the wild tribes of men, the missionary is sent with the gospel of Jesus Christ. This is the truest civilizing agency in the world; but usually the same vessel that carries the missionary, carries also a cargo of fire-water or distilled damnation in the shape of alcoholic liquors, as Satan's complement to the force of civilization.

"When the white man went to New Zealand he brought his strong drink, and presented it to the natives. But the untutored tastes of the natives could

not at once tolerate the new beverage, so they called it *wai-perau*—rotten water. They were not, however, able to withstand the temptation of the white man's beer, and the wine-glass has almost dug the grave of the nation. Only about 39,000 of the natives now remain, and the decrease is registered at 2,139 in five years.

"The drinking practises of the civilizing nations have served to introduce every other form of immorality and disease known to the white man. Disease, evil practices, and the drink demon, form a terrible combination, against which native life and energy seem to have little or no defense.

"In speaking of the condition of things in India, Archdeacon Jeffreys speaks truly when he says: 'For one really converted Christian as the fruit of missionary labor—for one person "born of the spirit" and made "a new creature in Christ Jesus"—for one such person, the drinking practises of the English have made one thousand drunkards. If the English were driven out of India to morrow, the chief trace of their ever having been there would be the number of drunkards they left behind.'

"The prophet of Patmos pictures the martyrs as falling in awful slaughter before the rider on the pale horse—representing the work of Rome in the Dark Ages. But in the mock drama of civilization thousands, yea, millions, of natives have fallen in the very cruelty of slaughter, through the engines of ruin sent among them by the white man.

"If this diabolical adjunct to civilization affected only the native races, the picture might not appear quite so dark. But nationality affords no immunity from such a curse. Dr. John W. Butler writes thus of the drink habit in Mexico:—

"With the multiplying of American bar rooms it is appalling to note in the city of Mexico the rapidity with which the American cemetery is filling up. I believe that about one half of the graves made there during the past ten years were made by demon drink. Beer generally marks the spot, while pulque, tequila, and whiskey quickly consummate the awful work. While this sad goal is being reached, hard-earned wages which should go to family support, here or in the home-land, are simply squandered in the bar-room or its worse annexes.'

"Sad it is that the increased intelligence of civilization should manifest itself in an increase of plans and methods that lead to death. But sad as it may appear, it is nevertheless true. Human wisdom apart from the Divine guidance is very apt to result in the greatest folly. The learning and refinement of ancient Rome found its pleasure in the carnage and excitement of the arena and the gladiatorial combats. Scenes that would have made even the savage recoil were applauded with wild enthusiasm.

"And so in these days of modern civilization we see brought to view, through the white man's curse, scenes that would make even the soul of the savage sick with horror. How long will our boasted civilization falsely appropriate its title? Instead of being an angel of life to the heathen, it has, for the greater part, proved an agent of destruction.

"Many heroic souls have gone abroad, inspired by the love of Heaven, to uplift and bless the nations that

sit in darkness. But their noblest efforts have been greatly neutralized by the satanic energy of the white man's curse."

The true "white man's burden" in foreign lands is the white man himself, whenever he goes with heart untouched by the grace of God.

---

### Good Words About War.

---

SUCH are the following, spoken by a fearless English statesman, Mr. John Morley, in a speech at Manchester, England, relating to the anticipated war with the Transvaal:—

"The sword won't help you. I ask myself very often whether the man with the sword blundering in and slashing at the knots that statesmen ought to have untied, is not responsible for half the worst catastrophes in the political history of Europe. You may carry fire and sword into the midst of peace and industry, but such a war of the strongest government in the world against this weak little republic, and the strongest government in the world with untold wealth and inexhaustible resources, will bring you no glory. It will bring you no profit, but mischief will be wrought. You may make thousands of women widows and thousands of children fatherless. It will be wrong. You may add a new province to your empire. It will still be wrong. You may give greater buoyancy to the South African Stock and Share Market. You may create South African booms. You may send the price of Mr. Rhodes's charactered up to a point beyond the dream of avarice. Yes, even then it will be wrong."

---

### Is War Consistent With Christianity?—No. 1.

---

By Jonathan Dymond.

THAT the whole character and spirit of our religion are eminently and peculiarly peaceful, and that it is opposed, in all its principles, to carnage and devastation, cannot be disputed.

"Have peace one with another." "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

"Walk with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love."

"Be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another; love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous, not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing."

"Be at peace among yourselves. See that none render evil for evil to any man." "God hath called us to peace."

"Follow after love, patience, meekness." "Be gentle, showing all meekness unto all men." "Live in peace."

"Lay aside all malice." "Put off anger, wrath, malice." "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking be put away from you, with all malice."

"Avenge not yourselves." "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink." "Recompence to no man evil for evil." "Overcome evil with good."

Now we ask of any man who looks over these passages, what evidence do they convey respecting the lawfulness of war? Could any approval or allowance of it have been subjoined to these instructions, without obvious and most gross inconsistency? But if war is obviously and most grossly inconsistent with the general character of Christianity—if war could not have been permitted by its teachers, without an egregious violation of their own precepts, we think that the evidence of its unlawfulness, arising from this general character alone, is as clear, as absolute, and as exclusive as could have been contained in any form of prohibition whatever.

To those solemn, discriminative, and public declarations of Jesus Christ, which are contained in the "sermon on the mount," a reference will necessarily be made upon this great question; and, perhaps, more is to be learnt from these declarations, of the moral duties of his religion, than from any other part of his communications to the world. It should be remarked, in relation to the injunctions which follow, that he repeatedly refers to that less pure and less peaceable system of morality which the law of Moses had inculcated, and contradistinguishes it from his own.

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you: for if ye love them only which love you, what reward have ye?"

There is an extraordinary emphasis in the form of these prohibitions and injunctions. They are not given in an insulated manner. They inculcate the obligations of Christianity as peculiar to itself. The previous system of retaliation is introduced for the purpose of prohibiting it, and of distinguishing more clearly and forcibly the pacific nature of the new dispensation.

Of the precepts from the mount the most obvious characteristic is greater moral excellence and superior purity. They are directed, not so immediately to the external regulation of the conduct, as to the restraint and purification of the affections. In another precept it is not enough that an unlawful passion be just so far restrained as to produce no open immorality—the passion itself is forbidden. The tendency of the discourse is to attach guilt, not to action only, but also to thought. "It has been said, Thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say, that whoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment." Our lawgiver

attaches guilt to some of the violent feelings, such as resentment, hatred, revenge; and by doing this, we contend that he attaches guilt to war. War can not be carried on without these passions which he prohibits. Our argument, therefore, is syllogistical. War can not be allowed, if that which is necessary to war is prohibited.

It was sufficient for the law of Moses that men maintained love towards their neighbors; towards an enemy they were at liberty to indulge rancor and resentment. But Christianity says, "If ye love them only which love you, what reward have ye?—Love your enemies." Now, what sort of love does that man bear towards his enemy, who runs him through <sup>if you</sup> with the bayonet? We contend that the distinguishing duties of Christianity must be sacrificed when war is carried on. The question is between the abandonment of these duties and the abandonment of war, for both can not be retained.

It is, however, objected <sup>that</sup> the prohibitions, "Resist not evil," etc., are figurative; and that they do not mean that no injury is to be punished, and no outrage is to be repelled. It has been asked, with complacent exultation, what would these advocates of peace say to him who struck them on the right cheek? Would they turn to him the other? What would these patient moralists say to him who robbed them of a coat? Would they give him a cloak also? What would these philanthropists say to him who asked them to lend a hundred pounds? Would they not turn away? This is *argumentum ad hominem*; one example amongst the many, of that lowest and most dishonest of all modes of intellectual warfare, which consists in exciting the feelings instead of convincing the understanding. It is, however, some satisfaction that the motive to the adoption of this mode of warfare is itself an evidence of a bad cause, for what honest reasoner would produce only a laugh, if he were able to produce conviction?

But I must ask, in my turn, what do these objectors say *is* the meaning of the precepts? What *is* the meaning of "resist not evil?" Does it mean to allow bombardment, devastation, murder? If it does not mean to allow all this, it does not mean to allow war. What again do the objectors say *is* the meaning of "love your enemies," or of "do good to them that hate you?" Does it mean "ruin their commerce"—"sink their fleets"—"plunder their cities"—"shoot through their hearts?" If the precept does not mean all <sup>of</sup> this, it does not mean war. We are, then, not required to define what exceptions Christianity may admit to the application of some of the precepts from the mount; since, whatever exceptions she may allow, it is manifest what she does *not* allow: for if we give to our objectors whatever license of interpretation they may desire, they can not, either by honesty or dishonesty, interpret the precepts as to make them allow *war*.

I would, however, be far from insinuating that we are left without any means of determining the degree

and kind of resistance, which, in some cases, is lawful; although I believe no specification of it can be *previously laid down*: for if the precepts of Christianity had been multiplied a thousand-fold, there would still have arisen many cases of daily occurrence, to which none of them would precisely have applied. Our business, then, *so far as written rules are concerned*, is in all cases to which these rules do not apply, to regulate our conduct by those general principles and dispositions which our religion enjoins. I say, *as far as written rules are concerned*, for, "if any man lack wisdom," and these rules do not impart it, "let him ask of God."—From 'An Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with the Principles of Christianity.'

### The Liberty of Christ.—No. 3.

BY B. W. MARSH.

SATAN'S untiring purpose is to take from the inhabitants of earth all the freedom God has designed for them to enjoy. He persuades man to part with his liberty by promising him more liberty; this is the way he began, and he has ever since found it a good plan to follow.

Adam and Eve were given the freedom of the earth; they were at liberty to do as they pleased, and they pleased to do the thing that completely deprived them of the liberty to do as they pleased at all. That is, it pleased them to permit a third party (the devil) to interpret the Word of God for them, and it pleased him to interpret it to their understanding to be a lie; and having in this way got between man and God, it has been his chief pleasure for six thousand years to make man believe that everything God says is a lie. As long as Satan can stay between man and his Maker, man is a slave to the will of Satan, and is forced to accept his translation of the Work of God. When Eve permitted Satan to persuade her that the forbidden fruit was good, after God had said it was bad, she surrendered her freedom of thought, and placed herself in complete bondage to the one whom she permitted to do her reasoning.

This being the standpoint from which Satan has employed all his means to educate in all ages, it is not strange if at this time the majority of the human family should be more willing to have some one else exercise their power of individuality, than to stand directly in the channel of communication with God themselves.

God never designed that a third person should stand between man and his freedom of action. He has given no being the privilege or power to measure his Spirit to another, neither is the liberty to use personal influence, or mind pressure, upon another, from God. When mind pressure, personal influence, or any other kind of human influence, is used to sway the will of another, it is just as much religious intolerance, although directed in an-

other channel, as when force is used; the only difference between such intolerance and force being the lack of opportunity. The Spirit of God is the only medium God has ever chosen to influence the will of man, and He will always be revealed as it pleases God and not always as it may please man.

The crisis that meets us to-day rests upon the awful truth that Satan has influenced the education of the world so long that he has endowed humanity, in the main, with his desires and ambitions; and has fired man with an unholy zeal to stand for the individuality of his fellowmen, and great liberty is promised the world in exchange for its greatest of all liberty—the *liberty of conscience*. But God has said of these that “while they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage.”

Satan having brought the world into bondage to himself, his system can do nothing less than place his subjects in bondage to one another. Therefore in the apostate churches, and the state as well, we find mind against mind, will against will, and force against force; for where bondage exists there must of necessity be an unceasing struggle for the supremacy.

In the great spiritual warfare carried on by the church against the state, the state is the weaker power, and is brought into bondage to the church by the representatives of the church becoming the representatives of the state. It does not matter whether the representative is a professor of any special religion or not; his mission is to be a willing tool under the powerful hand of the church. Therefore the gist of the matter is that the church in swallowing up the state has brought herself into a bondage that is bound to augment her strife for supremacy; and not only this: it has established a system of self worship which is nothing less than pagan worship. By this it is easy to see that a union of church and state is idolatry; and the record says, that all the world will bow to idols (worship the heast and his image), save they whose names are written in the Lamh's book of life. The “beast” possesses the characteristics of the “dragon” (paganism), and the “image” is like the “heast”; therefore there is no difference between these powers except in name, and the only difference between their idolatry is in their form of worship.

The men who are to-day hattling for recognition of God by the state, are working for a religion of force, which is idolatry; and there is not a political issue of any importance that comes before the nation in which this thing is not in some way a factor. Therefore the Seventh-day Adventist who in politics, or in any other way, becomes a part of the great machinery of state, has yet to learn to stand fast “in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.” O, may the God of heaven help his people to love liberty and truth; and even now may we accept the grace that will forever separate us from Babylon, to stand “fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.”

## How the New Testament Conquered.

London “*Christian Herald*.”

A ROMAN CATHOLIC priest in a village near Morlax, France, warned his flock that he had power to give absolution to any of them who might be guilty of theft, lying, or any other sin; but if any of them were guilty of reading the New Testament, he could not absolve them.

In the audience was a young man who, from his violent conduct, was the terror of the village, even his parents having to defend themselves against their son. This young man, hearing the priest's statement, said to himself: “I have committed all the sins the priest has mentioned, yet he will give me absolution for all, if I do not read the book. What kind of a hook can this be? I am going to get one and read it.”

When he went to the colporter, the man, knowing his character, at first refused, thinking he was only jesting; but when he saw that he was in earnest and explained his reasons, he gave him one.

A few days afterward his mother said: “How is it that Jean is so quiet and sober lately? He is never drunk, and retires to his own room after dinner.”

The father replied, “I don't know, but I will follow him.”

The next day, going quietly to the door of his son's room, he found him intently reading a book.

He returned and told the mother, “He is in his room reading some hook; I believe it is a New Testament.”

She replied, “If that is all the harm the New Testament is doing, ask him to come and read it to us. Perhaps we shall get some good from it.”

He came and did so. God blessed the reading to the father, mother, and lastly to himself.

The mother sent to the missionary, saying: “I will take the furniture out of one of my rooms and place chairs in it if you will come and read the Word of God to the neighbors, and tell them, though the priest refuses to give them absolution, God has forgiven us, and will also forgive them.”

The missionary did so, and God blessed the telling of the old, old story to many souls.

Some time after this the mayor sent for the missionary, and said: “I don't know how it is, but when the Bible went into that house it was the pest of the village, but now it is the paradise of the place.”

This proves that the Word of God is still “quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” Heb. 4:12.

“CIVILIZATION” says, Might makes right. Christianity says, Right is might.





THE pope has addressed a letter to the Brazilian bishops, in which he tells them they should interest themselves in public affairs, and that leading priests might well even enter congress, for the benefit of religion and their native land. And this, we may add, is good Catholic doctrine in the United States.

\* \* \*

TOUCHING the subject of the outcry raised by some would-be reformers over the prevalence of Sunday labor, it is stated on good authority that "out of 1,100,000 in Massachusetts engaged in gainful occupations, only 37,000 are employed on Sundays. This does not include those in domestic service, but does include 18,000 persons employed on railroads and steamboats. The remaining 19,000 are employed in hotels, restaurants, and other miscellaneous industries. There is no increase of Sunday labor, except in the business of transportation."

\* \* \*

BECAUSE of the test through which Admiral Dewey passed so successfully in Manila bay, on May 1 of last year, the American people have accorded him an unprecedented welcome home, and in so doing have imposed upon him the greatest test of all; for any man that can receive such homage and flattery as has been tendered him, without having his head completely turned and falling into the snare which pride sets for every finite mortal, is a most extraordinary man among his fellows. We sincerely hope that Admiral Dewey may again prove to be equal to the occasion, and may escape the harm which his well-meaning but unthinking friends have sought to do to him.

\* \* \*

THE advocates of an imperial policy for this nation never tire of instituting comparisons between the Filipino leader, Aguinaldo, and the revered "first American," George Washington; much to the disadvantage, of course, of the former. Having settled the point that Aguinaldo is in no way worthy of comparison with Washington, they assume that no question can remain of the superior rights of Washington and his followers over those of Aguinaldo and his followers, and the case for imperialism is proved.

\* \* \*

BUT thereby they expose the fatal weakness of their

cause, judged from the standpoint of American principles of government. For under those principles, no question is raised regarding the mental and moral qualifications of one man in comparison with another, or of one set of men in comparison with another set. With those principles there is no respect of persons; but it is expressly declared that "all men are created equal" in the matter of natural rights. And nothing could more plainly show the unamerican character of the plea made in behalf of imperialism than the fact that it assumes that men have not equal rights because they have not equal intelligence and capabilities.

\* \* \*

THAT Aguinaldo can not be compared with Washington, is true enough. But this has nothing at all to do with the question. The distinctively American doctrine is that all men have equal rights in spite of any and all inequalities between them. The poor ignorant negro slave toiling for his white master in the South, could not be compared with Washington; but the United States fought a most dreadful civil war to establish the doctrine that that poor slave had equal rights with the white man; and that doctrine, having been established at such a fearful cost to the nation, ought to be respected and maintained in this land to day.

\* \* \*

THE doctrine that all men have equal rights is a divine necessity. If it were not true, the gospel itself would not be true; and to deny one is to deny the other: Upon no other basis than that of the truth of this doctrine could the gospel work be carried on. For the gospel requires each man to believe for himself, to work out his own salvation, to give account of himself before God; and to do this he must be independent. If it could be right that a man should be the property of his fellow-man, subject to the will of his owner, God could not rightfully hold that man responsible for not exercising a will of his own for the salvation of his soul. God could not rightfully require a man to stand independently of all others in the day of Judgment, if he were not rightfully independent before that day.

\* \* \*

IT is true that the doctrine of equal rights has been but little recognized in the history of the world, and that the work of the gospel has proceeded in the earth under the most despotic forms of government. And it is true that the gospel forbids men to rise in rebellion against the government. But this is required in recognition of the power and supremacy of God, and not in recognition of the justice of the government. The gospel counsels all men to live in peace, but never sanctions governmental injustice. It has been proclaimed to the people living under monarchical government, but has never admitted the truth of the claims made by mon-



archs, such as that "the king can do no wrong," and that the subjects of the king were bound to obey him in all things. But always, it has affirmed the truth that men are by right free and independent, not only in theory, but by requiring every man to *act* in harmony with it. It has required men always to disobey any command, backed up by no matter how much of human authority which conflicted with the right. And in thus disobeying the commands of human governments, Christians have affirmed the truth of what the Declaration of Independence says, that "all men are created equal," and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." They have proclaimed this to be true, and that the institutions of despotism existed not because they were right, but only because of divine tolerance.

---

### Words vs. Actions.

---

It is a strange echo of The Hague Peace Conference that is now heard in South Africa. It was supposed that material progress had been made at that conference in the direction of establishing the principle of arbitration for the settlement of international disputes; and there were facts to justify this supposition. As *The World* (N. Y.) says:—

"The Peace Conference at The Hague agreed upon an elaborate scheme of arbitration, intended to prevent such wars as that which Great Britain seems now to be forcing upon the Boers.

"It agreed that every effort to arbitrate should be exhausted before resort should be had to force; that the parties to every quarrel should invoke arbitration, and that neutral powers should be free to offer mediation without offense, even after armed conflict should have begun.

"As an additional inducement to peaceful adjudication the conference agreed upon a permanent court of arbitration open to all countries, whether signatory powers or not, and a permanent bureau through which appeals might be made to that court.

"There was no authority of course to compel any power to submit its case to that court, but it was agreed that all the signatory powers held themselves morally bound to do so in every case not otherwise arbitrated or settled by negotiation, except such as involved the national honor, independence or sovereignty."

And now England is pursuing a course which raises a question as to her sincerity in standing for arbitration at The Hague. And with this is raised the question whether others of the great powers were sincere,—whether any of them, with the golden prize glittering before its eyes which England sees in the Transvaal, would be any more ready than England is to risk its possible loss by arbitration. Does any nation love a principle of righteousness more than it loves gold?

The question at issue, says *The World*, "is clearly

one of those that should be settled by arbitration, and the Boers have earnestly besought Great Britain to submit it to that kind of impartial adjudication, stipulating only that one of the five arbitrators shall be selected by an entirely neutral government—that of Switzerland or that of the United States preferred.

"England rejects this proposal. Her excuse is that the Transvaal is not an independent state. But that is precisely the question in dispute, and no less eminent an English statesman than Sir William Vernon Harcourt says with emphasis: 'The Transvaal's independence is complete. Even in foreign affairs the only thing reserved is the final approval of the Queen to treaties negotiated.'"

England is not going to war with the Transvaal for the love of fighting. If war comes, it will be waged, on her part, for the establishment of British supremacy throughout South Africa. And the reason for establishing that supremacy is that "trade follows the flag," and trade means wealth. And as a first instalment of that coming wealth there will fall into her possession the richest gold mines in the world.

The love of money is still the root of all evil; and in these days of national grasping after wealth, the question of peace or war among the nations is determined almost wholly by that of which one the love of money demands.

---

### Religious Significance of Imperialism.

---

It has been pointed out in previous issues of the SENTINEL that imperialism is against Christianity; that it is contrary to Christianity in principle, and against it in practise as illustrated by the situation in the Philippine Islands. We do not, however, depend upon anti-imperialist sources for a statement of the religious significance of the national imperialist policy. This was made by Dr. Lyman Abbott, who is both an ardent "expansionist" and a "representative Christian," at the late International Congregational Council in Boston. Dr. Abbott put the gospel *behind* imperialism as the proper order to be followed in the work of evangelizing the world; stating that gospel mission work, going before the sword of imperialism in foreign lands, has been practically a failure. The significance of his words lies not in the fact that Dr. Abbott personally holds such views, but in the fact that, as the leading representative of the war-indorsing clergy of the land, he spoke for them and laid down the line upon which the issue for or against imperialism is to be fought out in the forum of the church.

The gist and meaning of Mr. Abbott's speech are well set forth in the following which we quote from the *Springfield Republican* (Mass.) of September 24:—

"It is fortunate for the discussion of our burning and all-important Philippine problem that one of its

most ardent advocates, Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, has been given a full opportunity to show what the essence of our policy is, and how far he, as a representative Christian, is ready to go in its support. The address of Dr. Abbott before the International Congregational Council Friday forenoon was an affirmation of the superiority of law in the development of mankind, compared with the force of the Christian spirit. The address ought to be published verbatim and read thoughtfully by every clergyman and layman who sympathizes with the McKinley policy of conquest.

"The practical repudiation of Christian missions as a pioneer force in civilization is formally and flatly made a part of Dr. Abbott's creed. He said that missions 'may save some individual lives, and will emancipate some fragments of some tribes, but as far as the illumination of Africa is concerned the mission stations are like glow-worms in the midnight darkness of a great meadow. If Africa is to be redeemed, first must go the law and after that the gospel.' A little further on he said, in so many words, that he put law before the gospel as the means of the world's redemption, and said that the authority of the law must be established before an effort is made to give the gospel. His argument was supported by the illustration of England's course, and he favored military conquest of inferior nations as a preliminary to giving them the gospel.

"It will be recalled by all those who have heard the arguments of such teachers as the late Julius H. Seelye, and who are familiar with the present argument for Christian missions, that the fundamental argument for missions as against other civilizing forces is that they alone can pave the way to civilization on the right basis, and that there is no civilizing efficacy in trade or in the contact of heathenism with civilization, apart from the latter's Christian influence. But Dr. Abbott has in public and with emphatic formality, declared that the present missionary policy is a failure, and he holds up to ridicule what has been done by the American board and other missionary bodies in Africa for over half a century. By the same standard, the missions in China and all other parts of the world are a failure. Yet the American board has heard, year after year, for seventy five years, reports from the front which have encouraged them to labor on, struggling for larger rewards. Only last year it was proved how wonderfully successful our missions had been, especially in China, and already it is said by the officials that this last year has resulted in more progress than in any previous year in the history of the board.

But, according to Dr. Abbott, these are all baseless and the work is in the wrong direction. First of all should come the military conquest of Africa, China, and the other heathen parts of the world. Force should be used, and after that has prevailed, then the gospel of love should be preached to the people whom the armies were killing just before. He justified war in his apotheosis of law. 'The army is a necessary means of enforcing obedience to law,' he said, and his whole argument was in defense of the predominance of force until force shall have conquered the world, and then it will be ample time to preach about divine love.

"Dr. Abbott had the support of a material part of his audience. Certainly, also, he did not have the support of another material part. Neither side can claim

the majority, though Dr. Abbott doubtless received the louder demonstrations of approval. But Dr. MacKinnell, in his clear and forceful presentation of the case against war, did not round out his sentences so as to command applause as Dr. Abbott did, and the audience was not provoked to applaud as by Dr. Abbott. But the fundamental positions of these men ought to be carefully considered. Dr. Abbott deftly wove a plea for the enforcement of law, and, having established principles regarding the enforcement of police regulations with which there would be general agreement, befogged the issue by applying those principles to all peoples who are inferior in military strength to some nation which might see fit to make war upon them. His theory would amply justify Russia in enforcing her despotism upon a people as free as the Swiss. It puts upon the strong nation the obligation to conquer the weak, and the strong one is always to be judge of the need of the conquest for the benefit of humanity, and there is no recognition whatever of any rights of property, life or liberty on the part of the weaker nation. If the Boers stand in the way of the Cape-to-Cairo railroad, then the Boers must be crushed. If the Filipinos do not have as good a government as the United States—no matter how perfect may be the order which now reigns in Luzon under Tagal rule, and no matter how hopeful may be the future if they are given the opportunity to rise,—they must be slaughtered until they yield.

"Dr. Abbott's argument repudiates entirely the spirit of Christianity. He would abolish all missionary effort until military conquest has been completed, and he would insist upon the doctrine of might makes right, provided the might is exercised by a man who says that he wants to promote civilization. But almost every conqueror says that.

It is well for the imperialists that Dr. Abbott has made his deliverance, and the two sides may well fight out the discussion on the line he laid down, for imperialism comes to that, though some do not admit it. But he sees it and admits it, and now it is to be hoped that there will be clearer thinking among his followers. Imperialism rests upon force and disregard of the rights of man and of the progress of Christianity. If the Congregational Council has done no other good to the public, it has more sharply defined the principles which are involved in this tremendous contest."

---

### Senator Mason on "Expansion."

To a reporter for the *Washington Post*, Senator Mason, of Illinois, said recently that he would continue in Congress his opposition to the Philippine war, and added:—

"People make a great mistake when they say that I am against expansion. I am not. But expansion by purchase or any other honorable means is one thing; expansion by force is another. I do not believe that there was any necessity for this war upon the Filipinos. I believe that if we had adopted a resolution in Congress, assuring those people as we assured the Cubans that we had no selfish designs upon them, we never would have met with any opposition in the Philippines.

The fact is that we have given the Filipinos every reason to distrust us, and they are fighting for their own liberty.

"Talk about hauling down our flag! Will not our flag come down in Cuba? Certainly it will, if we are true to our promises. And the day that it comes down will be the biggest day in our history, because it will show that we are a great, unselfish nation, devoted to the eternal principles of right and honesty. If the Cubans want to be annexed later that is another question. Why can not we deal with the Filipinos in the same way?"

---

### The Golden Rule in Government.

*South African "Sentinel."*

A WRITER on the solution of certain questions recently said: "We have committed the Golden Rule to heart: now let us commit it to life."

You may think this doesn't mean very much, but if you will stop to consider it, you will find it to be the very best solution of every difficulty between men, and between nations. It is the best solution of the question we have just been considering,—the equality of rights in the Transvaal, irrespective of religious differences.

Do you think it would aid any in the settlement of the differences between England and the Transvaal? Let us get this rule before us, that we may study it: "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." Luke 6:31. I am quite sure that all existing difficulties could be settled by this rule, and that obedience to this rule would prevent difficulties. Let us see: Does any man wish to be deprived of his right to worship God according to his own convictions? Does he wish to be compelled to serve God as some one else may dictate? Then will he in any way lend his influence to deprive others of this right, or compel them to adopt certain forms of worship? Certainly not! Committing this rule to life, then, guarantees religious liberty to every man.

The people of the Transvaal would do well to study this divine rule, in view of the question that has been submitted to them for a year.

Does any man wish to be deprived of his rights of citizenship, which includes the privileges and the protection of the government, and a voice in its affairs locally and generally? It may be suggestive to inquire just here: What would be the need of governmental laws, if all would commit the Golden Rule to life? I would then love my neighbor as myself; hence I would regard his property, his life, his character, his rights as sacred as my own,—not because the law compelled me thus to do, but because I committed the Golden Rule to life.

Human governments enact laws regulating man's duty to his fellow-man, and this is necessary, because men have not committed the Golden Rule to life. But the Scripture is true, just the same: "The law is not

made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners;" and this is illustrated in the life of Christ in human flesh. He was a righteous man, not a sinner, so the law was not made for him. Could he therefore break it? and did he ignore human laws? By no means. He kept every just and right law; not because the law said "Thou shalt," and "Thou shalt not," but because he had committed to life the Golden Rule—because he loved his neighbor as himself. But bear in mind that Christ did not obey human laws, when those laws brought him into conflict with his duty to God.

The Lord has never sanctioned a law which would inflict punishment on a man who is not a sinner; therefore no human law could rightfully have put Christ to death,—nor can any human law rightfully inflict punishment upon a man who to-day obeys the law of God.

The Golden Rule is the right basis of civil government; not that human laws can compel men to love their fellow-men, but they can compel them to respect their rights. True religion goes beyond this, however, for it leads its possessor to respect the rights of his neighbor, because he loves his neighbor—because he has committed to life the principle which should govern the relation of man to his fellow-man. We still recommend this rule. In all the volumes of national law, nothing has ever yet been enacted to compare with the Golden Rule. In itself it covers every just law enacted by any and all governments. Let us again try committing it to life.

---

### Stepping-Stones in Crime.

THE attitude of the London press demonstrates anew the familiar truth of history that for a nation resolutely bent on criminal aggression the only difficulty is in beginning. Once the path of crime is entered upon one aggression leads to another. It is easier to advance than to go back or even to halt. Indeed, the forward impulse is usually accepted as a providential indication of manifest destiny. Thus the mere attempt by Great Britain to assert a repudiated "suzerainty" over the Transvaal has advanced to an open declaration of annexation, and the third step in crime is the destruction of the Orange Free State, a country over which even suzerainty is not claimed.—*N. Y. World.*

---

THERE is to be held next year in Paris, in connection with the World's Fair, an international congress on Sunday Rest, of which we find the following mention in *The Outlook*:—

"In September, 1900, under the patronage of the French government, an international congress will be held on questions concerning Sunday as a legally and socially recognized day of rest. The sessions will be held in the Palais du Congrès of the exhibition. The presi-

dent of the organizing committee is Senator Bérenger, and among the members of the committee are representatives from both Catholic and Protestant clergy, as well as members of Parliament, economists and statisticians, and delegates from the various chambers of commerce, manufacturers' unions, and railway companies. The congress will be open to all who are interested in its programme. The fee for membership has been fixed at ten francs. Only active members and delegates will have the right to take part in the sessions.

"The language of the congress will be French, although papers may be communicated in other languages, always provided that a summary is presented in French. Two sessions will be held daily, at nine and at three o'clock. The discussions will be limited to the matter stated in the programme, and speakers will not be given the floor for more than a quarter of an hour, nor will they be allowed to speak twice in the same session on the same subject, unless the Assembly should decide otherwise. The secretary of the congress is M. Bompard, 28 Rue d'Assas, Paris, France."

---

### "Expansion" a Moral and Legal Wrong.

*"Springfield Republican."*

IT may seem very convincing for the President and the American organs of imperialism to dismiss the entire question with the assertion that the Filipinos in arms represent a minority, yet let them compare the rights of that so-called minority with their own. The alleged minority at least is part of the country. It talks the language of the native population, was born and reared there. On the other hand, not even General Otis can speak the native language, not to mention minor dialects. Not one of the would-be American rulers and "assimilators," from Mr. McKinley and Lyman Abbot down, was born there; while Mr. McKinley himself and the vast majority of his followers were never within six thousand miles of Manila. Whose right to political leadership in a country is the better and sounder, that of a minority of the native population, which embraces the best blood of the civilized people, or that of an utterly alien race whose habitat is on the other side of the earth? Neither President McKinley nor the American nation is a majority of the Filipino people. Against alien pretensions the Filipinos in arms have infinitely stronger moral claims to leadership.

"But the islands are ours; we have bought and paid for them,"—such is the final position the administration takes. Said the president at Pittsburg: "Peace brought us the Philippines by treaty cession from Spain. The Senate of the United States ratified the treaty. . . . It became our territory, and is ours as much as the Louisiana purchase, or Texas, or Alaska." The flimsiness of this claim will be seen from an examination of the facts. The President did not base his claim to the Philippines on the right of conquest, for in

the protocol with Spain he retained only the city of Manila under American jurisdiction pending the conclusion of the treaty of Paris. Our navy and army had conquered nothing more than the city and the harbor, and no principle of international law makes a complete conquest of a country out of the capture of a single city, even if it be the seat of government. When ex-Senator Manderson, in a recent address, claimed that the Filipinos owe allegiance to the United States because the "inhabitants of conquered territory change their allegiance," he assumed a conquest that never took place. Even Spain refused to admit that the Americans had conquered the archipelago, outside Manila, and only after a long diplomatic contest let go her claim to her so-called sovereignty on a payment of \$20,000,000, which amounted to a sale. What we bought from Spain, however, was worthless.

If international law permits the transfer of millions of people from one government to another, in spite of the strenuous diplomatic protest of that people, and then brands them as rebels when they offer armed resistance to a sale of their country without their consent—then international law harbors a great moral iniquity. Fancy England selling Canada to Germany for \$2,000,000,000! Would the Canadians be "rebels" if they repudiated the sale and set up their own government? But Spain's sale of the Philippines was worthless for other reasons. The native government under Aguinaldo had already destroyed her sovereignty long before the Paris treaty was ratified. Spain sold something she did not rightfully possess. Her rule had become extinct, and in its place there had come into existence a new government, organized with administrative departments, with an army, with sea-ports, and enforcing law and order. The powers had not recognized it, yet it was entitled to recognition a hundred fold more than that government of Cuba whose recognition the foreign relations committee of the United States Senate had unanimously recommended in the winter of 1896-7. That in the presence of this new government Spain's power had become extinct had more than one demonstration before the Paris treaty was made and ratified. The native government had taken as prisoners of war thousands of the Spanish army, and a Spanish general, in our very faces, had peacefully surrendered to it the city of Iloilo in the island of Panay. These facts showed that Spain had no right to sell a sovereignty over the Filipinos to which they denied an existence, and which, in reality, as they claimed, now rested in themselves.

---

### Machine Religion.

THE trouble about the Church of England religion, the Roman Catholic religion, the Mohammedan religion, and others, is, that they are machine-system religions, soulless, sordid, formal. Such religious systems are

first-rate for "business," and for bossing politics and manipulating government. Machine religion, a religion of forms, is one that doesn't require its votaries to burden themselves seriously with piety or restraint. The bosses (priests) attend to all that, vicariously. Such machine is a valuable adjunct to business and money getting.—*Washington Chronicle*.

Somebody Else.

THE little opposition member in our family rose from prayers the other morning with the exclamation, "Papa, I had to open my eyes four times at prayers to see if Ruthie had her eyes shut."

Child life is not the only sphere where the doings of "somebody else" cause trouble. Grown-up children frequently permit Satan to put them on his private detective list. Thus the good that they would do is marred by watching for the inconsistencies of others. God has not made you the sin-bearer of the world, nor yet of your brother. "Every man must give an account of himself to God." When we begin measuring the life of another it means that we neglect our own. Christ's message is, "What is that to thee; follow thou me." God is well able to look after the "somebody else" without our selfish interference.—*Bible Echo*.

The Divine Touch.

PERHAPS the most expressive feature in the work and life of Jesus Christ was the fact that "he touched men." He did not harangue the masses or endeavor to rule the government. He met individuals in their need, and touched them. His work was a work of personal interest. He sought the individual. He talked to Nicodemus by night, and to the woman at Jacob's well. He called Zaccheus down from the tree, and Peter from his fishing boat. He sought to comfort Martha, of Bethany, and finally whispered the promise of life to a man awaiting death on the cross. If you would work as he worked, take personal interest enough in men to touch them in their need.—*Ex*.

Washington's Last Years.

IDEALLY HAPPY WERE THE GREAT STATESMAN AND HIS WIFE AT MOUNT VERNON.

AT the time of his retirement to Mount Vernon, after the expiration of his term as President, "the tall figure of Washington was only slightly bent, and he was still supposed to weigh upward of two hundred pounds," writes William Perrine, in "The Last Years of Washington's Life," in the October *Ladies' Home Journal*. "Accepting his gray hair and his false teeth, and some

trouble in hearing, there was little of the usual appearance of age in his muscular person, his gait and his strong, pock-marked face. He was affable and merry with his best friends, but while he had the true hospitality of a Southern gentleman in inviting every visitor from a distance to his table or to a bed over night, his politeness was generally formal. Yet if he particularly enjoyed the conversation of a guest he would pay him the compliment of listening to him until after nine o'clock, or even of lighting him with the candle to a bedroom for the night. Mrs. Washington at this time was a healthy, pleasant and unostentatious little woman, still showing traces of good looks and with seldom any other thought than of playing respectably her rôle of mistress of the house of a country gentleman, of caring for the negroes, or of amusing herself with her knitting. She had great pride in her receipt for making 'cherry bounce,' and on a midsummer day she cut out thirty-two pairs of breeches for the men working on the farm. She had said that she and the General felt like children just released from school when he left the Presidency, and she told of her satisfaction in settling down again to the 'duties of an old-fashioned Virginia housekeeper, steady as a clock, busy as a bee, and cheerful as a cricket.'"

A Card.

To all interested in carrying the gospel of Jesus Christ to the inhabitants of other lands and who desire to assist in supporting missionaries already placed and others who may engage in the work, the opportunity is given to make an offering to the Foreign Mission Board of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

Such donations should be sent to the FOREIGN MISSION BOARD, 150 Nassau Street, New York.

TO OUR PATRONS:

1. Write Names Plainly.
2. Remit by P. O. Money Order, or Express Order, or by Bank Draft on New York. Personal checks are not desired.
3. Make all Orders and Drafts payable to Pacific Press Publishing Co., not to the editor or any other individual.
4. We will receive Postage Stamps in small quantities and any kind of good money. Defaced coins will not be taken. If paper money or coin is sent, register the letter.

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

ORGAN OF THE

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY.

Single Copy, Per Year	-	-	-	\$1.46
" " Six months	-	-	-	.76
" " Three months	-	-	-	.38

ADDRESS,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
39 Bond St., New York.

# WANT TO READ MORE?

The following list of publications treat on subjects kindred to those contained in this paper and will be found especially valuable to interested readers.

## THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE, or CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION.

BY ALONZO T. JONES.

It shows how Christianity advanced in the Roman Empire, not only without the aid of the state, but in the face of the bitterest opposition from the state; it discusses what the Christian should render to God, and what to the state, and how the powers that be are ordained of God. The book then takes up the history and principles of the movement so active now in the United States, looking toward having the church try to regulate and cleanse politics, and shows what will be the certain results of following the policy advocated. This is one of the very best books that has ever been written on the relation of civil government and religion. No matter what your views upon this question, you cannot afford to miss reading this book.

Paper Covers, - - - 40c

## Baptist Principles

OF

Religious Liberty Applied to Sunday laws.

An appeal to Baptists to be true to their historic principles and practices touching religious freedom.

PLAIN BUT KIND.

Of it a leading Baptist Minister and Editor writes:—

"I have read your pamphlet on 'Baptist Principles of Religious Liberty' with great interest and entire sympathy. . . . I hope you will continue your efforts for the promotion of religious liberty."

Fifty-two Pages, Illustrated, Price, 6c.

## A Dictionary in Your Vest Pocket.

Absolutely Full Pronunciation; Synonyms; Plural Forms; Compound Words; 5,000 Difficult Words; Proper Names; Large Cities; Business Forms; Punctuation; Postal Regulations; etc., etc.

## THE NEW WEBSTER DICTIONARY

AND

COMPLETE VEST-POCKET LIBRARY

Contains: 1. A Dictionary. 2. A Gazetteer. 3. Manual of Parliamentary Rules. 4. Expert Calculator. 5. Literary Guide.

45,800 Words.

YOU NEED A DICTIONARY!

of this kind. Send to us at once for it.

Cloth, red edges, indexed, 25c. Morocco, gold edges, indexed, 50c. Extra Morocco, gold edges, indexed, 60c.

KANSAS CITY, MO  
OAKLAND, CAL.

## THE TWO REPUBLICS.

Of Great Importance to  
Every American Citizen.

By ALONZO T. JONES.

A COMPARATIVE  
HISTORY OF THE TWO GREATEST  
REPUBLICS,

## Rome AND THE United States

The study of years and elaboration of many volumes, are presented in a concise and pleasing manner. In reviewing the history of the Roman Republic, the rocks upon which she stranded have been clearly pointed out. It contrasts the principles underlying enforced religious observances, with the true principles of

### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM FOR EVERY MAN.

which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The "Two Republics" comprises 896 octavo pages, and is printed from clear electrotypes, on fine, tinted paper, beautifully and substantially bound, and is illustrated with 67 full-page engravings. The work is furnished in the following styles of binding:—

Thin paper edition, plain edges	\$1.85
Cloth, marbled edges,	2.50
" Gilt edges,	3.00

**FIGHTING AGAINST GOD.** A striking little brochure showing in prose and verse the futility of man's "fighting against God" by attempting to dictate to his fellowmen in matters of conscience. Beautifully illustrated with half-tone engravings. Price - - - 3c

**DUE PROCESS OF LAW AND THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DISSENT.** An interesting and instructive work upon the "Process of Law." "Christianity and the Common Law," "Individual Right of Religious Belief," "The Divine Right of Dissent," etc., in review of Judge Hammond's decision in the King case. By A. T. Jones. 120 pages. Price - - - 15c

**HOW SHALL WE REFORM SOCIETY?** are made from standard works of various denominations, from denominational organs, and from the utterances of prominent men in the Christian world, to show that while society needs reforming sadly enough, such reformation can never be effected by law. Four pages. Price - - - 1 1/2c

## The Boy Question Considered.

Five Perplexing Phases of the Boy Question Considered in a Bright Book entitled

### BEFORE HE IS TWENTY.

The following world famous authors have each contributed a most interesting chapter:

- ROBERT BURDETTE.
- FRANCES HODGSON BURNETT.
- EDWARD W. BOK.
- MRS. BURTON HARRISON.
- MRS. LYMAN ABBOTT.

The book is neatly bound in cloth, and contains portraits of the authors.

Price - - - 50 cents, postpaid

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,  
39 Bond Street, New York.

# A Great Paper.

Under date of  
**NOVEMBER 29, 1899,**  
 the

## SIGNS OF THE TIMES

will issue a double number special, to be called the  
**"WORLD'S HARVEST NUMBER"**

(32 pages and cover), handsomely illustrated. It will contain matter depicting in startling though truthful words the striking signs of the times in which we live, from TWENTY DIFFERENT STANDPOINTS, by AS MANY ABLE WRITERS, some of whom are of world-wide repute. All this in addition to editorials, original poems, original music, and miscellaneous matter—as much in quantity, and far better in quality, than the average \$1.00 book.

Read after November 1. Single copy, 10 cents; five to twenty copies, 5 cents each; twenty-five copies and over, 4 cents each.

Address, **Signs of the Times,**  
 Oakland, Cal.

Do not fail to secure a copy. It will be worth many time its cost.

## Nothing Better Published

on the

## CHANGE OF THE SABBATH

than those articles from Cardinal Gibbons in the *Catholic Mirror*, and which we have republished in tract form under the title of

### The Christian Sabbath.

Former Price 4c; now 2c; \$1.20. per 100, postpaid.

## A Greek-English Lexicon

TO

### The New Testament.

Revised and Enlarged by

THOMAS SHELDON GREEN, M. A.

WITH A PREFACE BY

H. L. HASTINGS,

*Editor of the Christian, Boston, Mass.*

AND A SUPPLEMENT BY

J. H. THAYER, D. D., LITT. D.

*Professor of New-Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School of  
 —Harvard University.—*

Containing additional Words and Forms to be found in one or another of the Greek Texts in current use, especially those of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott, and Hort, and the Revisers of 1881.

"The best thing of the kind for the money."

PAPER BINDING, Postpaid, 35c.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,  
 39 Bond Street, New York City.

## Two Important Sabbath Tracts.

In these days when there is so much agitation in regard to the Sabbath it is important to understand the question in all its bearings. The two new treatises announced below will be read with much interest.

### SHOULD NOT CHRISTIANS KEEP THE SABBATH?

Some unanswerable arguments in reply to Rev. R. A. Torrey's pamphlet entitled "Ought Christians to Keep the Sabbath?"

WORDS OF TRUTH, No. 20.  
 Price \$2.00 per hundred.

### THE SEAL OF GOD AND ITS COUNTERFEIT.

A clear, concise, and scriptural argument showing what is God's seal and what is its counterfeit.

BIBLE STUDENTS LIBRARY, No. 157.  
 32 Pages, Illustrated.  
 \$2.00 per hundred.





NEW YORK, OCTOBER 5, 1899.

UNTIL civilization can divorce itself from the demon of strong drink, let it not think it has any burden of duty to go to the heathen across the seas. See article on p. 612.

WITH the war spirit so rife among the nations as it is to day, the question whether war can be in accordance with the principles of Christianity, becomes doubly interesting and important. This question is ably discussed in this paper. See p. 613.

IF you have any lingering doubts regarding the attitude of imperialism towards the Christian commission to preach the gospel in all the world, to every creature, read in this paper what was said on the subject recently by Dr. Lyman Abbott, an ardent church advocate of the imperial policy. Read it anyway. P. 617.

READ what is said in this paper about the message which must be given to the nation at this time (p. 610), and remember that when a message must be given, there must be some one to give it; there must be some one who will say, This is my duty. We are all of us responsible for the spread of the truth after we have been enlightened by it.

THE Protestant Episcopal Diocesan convention, which was in session in this city the 28th inst., resolved "That we view with sorrow and fear the wide decay in the observance of the Lord's day and the other sacred times and seasons of the Christian year." This is the first time we have heard any concern expressed over the "other sacred times and seasons"

of the year, and these might well have been more clearly defined in the report. When a "Protestant" church begins to feel so much regard for the "sacred times and seasons of the Christian year," it is getting on to the ground occupied by the Church of Rome, and for the preservation of the "sacred times and seasons" may well copy from the practices of that church by which "sacred times and seasons" were first instituted. The only sacred time known to Christianity is the Sabbath, the seventh day of the week.

The attention of the convention might profitably have been called to the fact that the only Sabbath observance which is decaying is that which is backed up by the laws of the States. That which has no aid from the civil power—the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath—is not decaying, but is steadily on the increase.

A MASS meeting to protest against Sunday work was held in Duluth, Minn., September 24, in the First Methodist Church; about five hundred people being in attendance. The striking feature of the occasion was that it represented a combination of the clergymen and trade unions to work for Sunday enforcement. This has been a marked feature of the Sunday-enforcement movement in Pennsylvania the past year; but is as yet comparatively a new thing in the Sunday movement. It is, as we have before observed, a feature of great significance.

The movement in Duluth originated in a desire to stop Sunday work on the city docks. The president of the "trades assembly" was the first speaker. He said the labor organizations are against Sunday labor, and advocated the enforcement of strict Sunday laws as the only solution of the Sunday labor problem. The necessity of Sunday observance was urged by some from the standpoint of the interests of organized labor, and by others from the standpoint of religious obliga-

tion; both which reasons were combined as the basis of resolutions which were adopted.

Somehow the meeting overlooked the very important truth that, Sabbath observance being a duty toward God, as plainly specified in the moral law, its enforcement must be left to those agencies which are ordained to secure obedience to God, and hence can not properly be enforced by any human authority and power.

THE "hero of Manila" was made the center of a most tremendous demonstration of honor in this city on the last two days of the month. And this furnishes occasion for observing that worldly honor is a peculiar thing; in that, while it seems to be intended as a favor, it is really given without any regard whatever for the welfare of the recipient. For what mortal can, with safety to himself, be set on a pinnacle of fame and deluged with flattery by his fellowmen? What injury is worse than that which vanity inflicts, what fall greater than that which pride precedes? And the world knows this, but what cares the world about it? Let the victim face the danger and take the consequences, is its decision. And since worldly honor is not given to serve the interests of its recipient, is there really any other than a selfish motive actuating the ones who bestow it?

IN spite of all the barriers that modern sanitary science could erect across its path, the "plague" has made a steady march around the earth from India to South America, touching Egypt, Portugal, and other countries on the way. A writer who has studied the matter points out that the plague is deceptive in its working, beginning with a few cases of a mild type in the city attacked, then apparently dying out, only to reappear later with increased intensity and virulence, defying efforts which would be sufficient to check other epidemics. First it is confined to the "natives" living in unsanitary quarters of the city; but ere long it begins to number Europeans and people in sanitary districts among its victims. Such a hold has it now secured on the great city of Bombay, that medical experts declare the city is doomed, and the scourge will not die out until it finds no more victims on which to feed.