

# THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JUNE 19, 1889.

NUMBER 21.

## The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE  
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
No. 48 BOND ST., NEW YORK;  
18 POST ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.;  
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.

EDITORS,

E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

It is generally supposed by Christian people that sin is the worst thing in the universe. It seems, however, that Rev. Charles F. Thwing, D. D., of Minneapolis, Minn., has discovered something worse. He says, "The man who refuses to take rest on Sunday is not simply committing a sin, but what is possibly worse, is committing a blunder." This shows conclusively, we suppose, that there should be a civil law which will prevent men from committing blunders. The law of God may be sufficient to restrain from sin, but it seems that it is entirely impotent in the matter of blunders, and it follows that it should be supplemented by civil enactment.

"DARK AGES" is the expression used by Protestants to designate that period in which Catholicism ruled the Old World. Now that Protestants are straining every nerve to bring the civil institutions of this country under the control of the church, does it not look as though they rather envied the Papal prestige of those by-gone days? When they seek to re-inaugurate a system of government similar to that which they have been wont to style dark, is it not because they prefer a condition of darkness? The effort to erect in the United States an image to the power that held sway in Europe during the Dark Ages, is made by so-called Protestants. Then is Protestantism really a failure, as charged by Catholics? or is this backward move merely a proof that men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil?

THE following from the *Light of Home*, published at Alfred Center, New York, is a pointed and truthful statement:—

It is clear that, without any opposition on the part of those who observe the seventh-day Sabbath, public opinion in California is opposed to the re-enactment of any general Sunday law. Prohibitory legislation against liquor traffic on all days ought to be obtained in California and elsewhere. Any law which is directly or indirectly in the interest of religious observance of any day has no right to demand a hearing, there or elsewhere. All laws which are based upon the idea that it is wrong to attend to "secular affairs" on

Sunday seek to establish a religious observance of the day. Some men may injure themselves through overwork by not resting on Sunday, but ten times as many injure themselves by dissipation, smoking, drinking, etc., when the law compels men to make it a holiday. If Sunday laws are to be supported mainly on hygienic grounds, they must be made to include smoking, drinking, "late suppers," and scores of other unhealthy practices which compulsory idleness induces.

### The Proposed Authority for the National Sunday Law.

As authority for Sunday, and as the basis of national Sunday legislation, Dr. Herrick Johnson before the Senate Committee appealed to the fourth commandment. The "American Sabbath Union," whose grand aim is a national Sunday law, likewise declare the basis of their movement to be the fourth commandment. It is proper, therefore, to inquire what authority there is for Sunday laws in the fourth commandment. As it is a question of legislation and of law, it would be proper to examine it from the standpoint of law. Suppose, then, that the Blair bill, or one to the same purpose, were enacted into a law, and the courts in construing it should take judicial cognizance of the fourth commandment as the authority and the basis of the law.

Courts are governed by certain well-established rules in the construction of laws. Let us notice some of these rules and see what would be the result of a judicial construction of such a Sunday law on the basis of the fourth commandment.

1. "What a court is to do is to declare the law as written."

The fourth commandment as written is as follows: "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it."

That commandment as written says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Consequently, at the very first step, the first day of the week, as declared in the bill and as these people demand, would be completely shut out. But if any should innocently inquire, The seventh day of what? the commandment itself is ready with an explicit answer. It is the day upon which the Lord rested from the work of creation. In that work he employed six days, and the seventh day he rested, and that, and that alone, as Doctor Johnson has

said, established the weekly division of time. As those seven days formed the first week of time, the seventh day of those seven was the seventh day of the week. And that is the seventh day fixed in the commandment. This is confirmed by the Scriptures throughout. The New Testament declares that the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes. Mark 16:1, 2 says:—

"And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun."

The people mentioned in this scripture came to the sepulcher very early in the morning of the first day of the week; yet the Sabbath was past. This national Sunday bill, and the people who favor it, propose to secure the religious observance of the Sabbath on the first day of the week. But no such thing ever can be done, because, according to the Scripture, the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes; and it matters not how early persons may come to the first day of the week and its observance, they will not be early enough to find the Sabbath there, because, by the word of the Lord, it is past before the first day of the week comes.

This is made yet more positive, if need be, by the record in Luke 23:56 and 24:1, which reads as follows:—

"And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them."

Here it is declared that certain people rested on the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment, and then on the first day of the week did what they would not do on the Sabbath-day. This proves conclusively that the Sabbath-day—according to the commandment which these men cite, and which it is supposed the courts will have to interpret when such a bill becomes a law—is the day before the first day of the week; which plainly demonstrates that the seventh day named in the commandment is nothing else than the seventh day of the week. Therefore, if courts, in the interpretation of this commandment as the basis of a Sunday law, declare the law as written and as defined by the plain word of the Lord, they will have to declare that the seventh day, and not the first day of the week, is the Sabbath.

2. "In the case of all laws it is the intent of the lawgiver that is to be enforced."

What, then, was the intent of the Lawgiver when the fourth commandment was given? Did

the Lawgiver declare or show in any way his intention?—He did. When the Lord gave that law at Sinai he did not leave it to the people to interpret it to suit themselves, nor to interpret it at all. By three special acts every week kept up continuously for nearly forty years, he showed his intent in the law. The people were fed by manna in their forty years' wandering. But on the seventh day of the week no manna ever fell. On the sixth day of the week there was a double portion, and that which was gathered on that day would keep over the seventh, which it could not be made to do over any other day in the week. By this means the Lawgiver signified his intent upon the subject of the observance of the day mentioned in that law; and keeping it up continuously for so long a time made it utterly impossible that his intent should be mistaken.

Therefore, if the courts of the United States shall ever take judicial cognizance of the fourth commandment, which is held forth by these people as the basis and the authority for their movement, according to this rule the seventh day of the week, and not the first day, will have to be declared the Sabbath.

3. "When words are plain in a written law there is an end to all construction; they must be followed."

This rule, in these very words, was declared by the Hon. John Bingham, when, as special judge-advocate appointed by the representatives of the United States, he was conducting the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson. Are the words of the fourth commandment plain words? Are they words of common use? They are. There is not an obscure nor an ambiguous word in the commandment. Then, according to this rule, if ever that question becomes one of judicial cognizance in the courts of the United States, as the plain words of that commandment must be followed, and as they plainly declare, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," that is all the courts can declare.

Therefore, the conclusion of the whole matter thus far is, if our courts are to remain courts of law, and are to be guided by the established rules for the construction of laws, they never can uphold any law founded on the fourth commandment for the observance of the Sabbath on the first day of the week.

Just here, however, another element comes into court, and that is the theological. The theologians step in right here and declare that the intent of the fourth commandment has been changed, and that now instead of that commandment's requiring the observance of the seventh day in remembrance of creation, it requires the observance of the first day of the week in remembrance of the resurrection of Christ. To reach this point they first declare that the phrase "the seventh day" in the commandment is indefinite; that it does not enjoin the observance of any particular day, but only of one day in seven. Such a construction is clearly in violation of established rules for the construction of law; it involves an assumption of power on their part that can never be allowed. Admitting for argument's sake that that phrase in the commandment is indefinite, it must be admitted that the Lord when he wrote it intentionally made it indefinite, because the Scripture says that when he had spoken these words he added no more; he had nothing more to say on the subject. What he said then was final. If, then, that statement be indefinite he intended it so, and no other

power than the Lord ever can, or ever has the right to, make it definite. But the theologians, just as soon as they have made it indefinite, to escape the obligation it enjoins to observe the seventh day, at once make it definite in order to sustain the supposed obligation to keep the first day of the week. Consequently, when they make it definite, after having declared that the Lord made it indefinite, they assume the power and prerogative to do what the Lord intentionally declined to do; and in that they put themselves above God.

So much for their theological assumptions. Such a course, however, is not only an assumption of almighty power, but on the basis of law it is a violation of the rule which declares that—

4. "No forced or unnatural construction is to be put upon the language of a statute."

To make the phrase "the seventh day" in that commandment indefinite, and to mean one day in seven and no day in particular, is nothing else than to put a forced and most unnatural construction upon the language not only of the commandment itself throughout, but on all the language of the Scriptures upon the subject of the commandment.

Further, to make that commandment support the first day of the week in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ is a direct violation of that other rule of law which declares that—

5. "A constitution [or statute] is not to be made to mean one thing at one time and another at some subsequent time, when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in the case seem desirable. . . . The meaning of the Constitution [or statute] is fixed when it is adopted, and it is not different at any subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it."

The meaning of the fourth commandment when given was, as has been clearly proved, that the seventh day of the week should be observed, and for the reason that God rested that day from the work of creation and blessed the day and hallowed it. The Sabbath-day was established for that reason, before men had sinned, and before there was any need of the resurrection of Christ. If man had never sinned, the day would have been observed for the reasons given, in commemoration of the rest of the Creator from his work of creation. That being the meaning of the commandment when the commandment was given, that must be the meaning of the commandment so long as the commandment remains, and according to the rules of law it never can be made to mean anything else, although the theologians should wish to have it so, and circumstances concerning the resurrection may seem to them to make it desirable.

The question here very properly arises, Shall the courts of the United States, in violation of these rules, adopt the wishes of the theologians and make that statute to mean that which it was never intended to mean? In contemplation of such an issue, the words of Judge Cooley—"Constitutional Limitations," page 57—are worthy of consideration by Congress as well as by the judges of the United States courts. He says:—

"A court or legislature which should allow a change in public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty."

The theologians have given to the fourth commandment a construction which is not in any

sense warranted by the intention of the Author of the commandment. They go to the National Legislature and ask it to allow itself to be influenced by theological sentiment in giving to a written Constitution of the Government of God a construction which is not warranted by the intention of the Founder of that Constitution. As Judge Cooley says, "Such a thing done to a human constitution, an earthly statute, would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty." But if this be true in the case of things wholly human and earthly, what should be thought of such an action with reference to the divine Constitution and heavenly law?

Will the National Legislature allow this theological sentiment to influence it to commit an act with reference to the Constitution and laws of the living God, which, if committed with reference to the laws of man, would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty? Not only do we ask, Is the National Legislature ready to do this, but is it ready also, by doing it, to force the United States courts into the sanctioning of it in direct violation of the plainest principles of every rule for the construction of law? Is the National Legislature ready to take the step which would turn all our courts of law into courts of theology? For such would be the only effect of the enactment of such a law as is here demanded by the theologians, because when the law comes to be interpreted by the courts upon the basis upon which the law is enacted, the first day of the week as the Sabbath can never be sustained by rules of law nor by the principles of interpretation established in law. The only way that it can ever be sustained is by principles established by the theologians, and by theological distinctions, in total disregard of the rules of law; and the effect of it can be nothing else than to turn our courts of law into courts of theology.

The Scriptures also plainly and logically show the seventh day to be the Lord's day. Yet this law proposes to enforce the observance of the first day of the week as the Lord's day. As it is not a universally accepted view that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, the question will certainly come before the courts for decision. When the courts come to construe the law, it will be proper, if not indeed necessary, that they shall consult the word of the Lord in regard to the question of what day is the Lord's day, and as to what its proper observance is. When the courts, or any other persons, inquire of the word of the Lord upon the subject of the Lord's day, they find the expression used but once in the Bible, and that in Rev. 1:10, saying, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." But this does not say what day of the week is the Lord's day, nor does the book in which this text is found say anything further upon the subject.

Other texts, however, in the Bible, speak on the subject in such a way as logically to show what day is there meant by the expression "the Lord's day." The Lord himself said, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28. The Lord also said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Here are two plain scriptural statements, which may form the major and the minor of a syllogism; thus:—

*Major*—The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath.

*Minor*—The seventh day is the Sabbath.

The only conclusion that can ever be drawn from these two premises is that,

Therefore, the Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

That conclusion is just as sound as these two statements of Scripture are, and the two statements of Scripture are as plain and positive on that subject as any two statements ever can be made. Therefore, the Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

Taking this conclusion as the major in a second syllogism, we have this:—

The Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

That day of which he is Lord is the Lord's day.

Therefore, the seventh day is the Lord's day.

This logic is unquestionable; this conclusion is as true as the Scripture itself. Therefore, just as surely as courts undertake the interpretation of any statute enforcing the observance of the Lord's day, and enter upon an inquiry as to what day is the Lord's day, they will, if logical, be brought face to face with the fact as demonstrated by the word of the Lord itself, that the seventh day, and not the first, is the Lord's day.

But it will probably be said that the courts are not to enter on the interpretation of Scripture; they are to interpret the law as it is enacted and as it is written, and that the law as it is enacted says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, and that that is as far as the court can go. Suppose this be granted, then it puts the United States Government into a position where it establishes and enforces the observance of an institution as the Lord's which is not the Lord's, and which is directly contrary to the word of the Lord on the subject of the institution and its observance.

One or the other of these alternatives, therefore, the United States Government will be forced to adopt as surely as this bill, or any one like it, shall ever become a law. The Government will either have to become the authoritative interpreter of the Scripture for all citizens of the Government, or else it will have to put itself in the place of God and authoritatively declare that observances established by the State, and which the State chooses to call the Lord's, are the Lord's indeed, although the word of the Lord itself declares the contrary. Is the United States Government ready to take either of these positions? Is the Congress of the United States ready to force the Government of the United States into a position where it will be compelled to take one or the other of these positions? The taking of either position by the Government of the United States would be nothing else than for this enlightened Nation, in this period of the nineteenth century, to assume the place, the power, and the prerogatives of the Governments of the Middle Ages in enforcing the dogmas and the definitions of the theologians, and executing the arbitrary and despotic will of the church.

Thus, from whatever point this subject of Sunday laws may be viewed, it clearly appears that the only effect that it can ever have will be only evil, and that continually. Let Congress now and forever decidedly refuse to have anything to do with it in any way whatever. And let all the people, instead of sanctioning a movement to bring the national legislation down to the degraded level of that of the States on this subject, put forth every effort to bring the legislation of the States up to that place where it shall be limited, as the power of Congress is limited, by the declaration of the National Constitution, that they "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

A. T. J.

### Christopher Ephraim's Tottering Morality.

SOMEONE has favored us with a copy of the *Home Record*, a paper published at Leavenworth, Kansas, which contains an article that shows very clearly the spirit that actuates some of those who are zealous for a Sunday law. The article in question is by Mrs. H. F. Hartough. It purports to be the experience of an old lady with a young lady who was circulating the protest against religious legislation. After a little introductory gossip about her son, Christopher Ephraim, who was a little wild, the old lady describes the visit of the young lady and her introduction of her business, and finally asks what the petition is. The story then proceeds in the old lady's language, as follows:—

"It is against establishing a religion in this country," says she, "that will make a man keep a proscribed Sabbath-day, or believe in things he cannot believe in. It is against recognizing God in the Constitution."

"That Sabbath business made me think of Christopher E. How he went to base-ball games and races on Sundays in summer-time, and hunting in winter time, an' it wasn't doing him any good. So I says, says I, 'I'm in favor of getting more of God an' the Sabbath in our Constitution! It won't hurt our systems one bit. Now, my Christopher Ephraim is lettin' all the Sabbath get out of his constitution, an' he's failin', morally. His foundation is totterin', an' he'll fall, sure as fate, if there ain't something done. I want a law passed,' says I, 'that'll compel people to keep the Sabbath-day just as much as to keep 'em from killin' folks.'

"Whether they believe in it or not, eh?" says she, sneerin'.

"Certainly," says I. "If a man believes in killin' would you let him murder your family, ma'am?"

"That's quite a different matter," says she.

"No, 'tain't," says I, getting warm. "One's just as right as the t'other. It's no more right for my son to go to base-ball games on Sundays, an' horse-races, an' all such, than it is for him to steal or kill. No, ma'am; I want a Sunday law an' want it enforced, an' if somebody or other don't believe in keepin' the law let 'em go where there ain't none. We don't want 'em here."

"She looked at me as if she felt sorry for me. She actually did. But I didn't mind her looks. I was thinking about Christopher E., and how he was doomed to destruction if these things wa'n't put a stop to, an' I just went on: 'This land's getting too free,' says I, getting up and resum' my dustin'. 'We've put the Bible out of the public school for fear of hurtin' somebody's feelings; we've let the base-balls run for fear the workin' men wouldn't get exercise enough, an' now them freedom-lovin' folks want us to give up our Sunday. Pretty soon they'll come sneakin' 'round an' petition Congress to compel the preachers to hunt texts out of the daily papers or the magazines instead of the Bible, for fear o' hurtin' their feelings. They ain't patriots, they're heathen infidels, an' the quicker we send 'em out o' this land the freer we'll be.'"

This little story was of course written with an object, and that object was to prejudice people against those who oppose Sunday legislation and Church and State union. We propose to give a brief review of the portion which we have just copied, with the object of showing the real purpose of these Sunday workers.

The first point that we notice is the idea that religious legislation will make men good. The old lady gives as a reason why she is in favor of recognizing God in the Constitution, that her Christopher Ephraim is "lettin' all the Sabbath out of his constitution, an' he's failin', morally. His foundation is a totterin', an' he'll fall, sure as fate, if there ain't something done." The idea seems to have obtained a firm foothold that men can be made moral by law; but there is not a law in the universe that can make man moral or religious. The moral law does not make man

moral, and will not prop up a "totterin'" morality. God's own righteous law cannot make men righteous. The ten commandments only point out the unrighteousness of men, and drive them to Christ, whose righteousness may be imputed to them, and who, through their faith in him, will enable them to fulfill the righteousness of the law.

When people talk about propping up tottering morality by civil enactments, they show their ignorance of what morality is. Does the writer of that story imagine that the enactment of the Sunday law, and the recognition of God in the Constitution, will keep man from falling?—It seems so, and that is a regular National Reform idea; for in the *Christian Nation* of December 5, 1888, the Rev. N. M. Johnston tells of the time when Christ's "gospel will prevail, and wickedness be suppressed by law." In a speech in Monmouth, Ill., September 29, 1884, reported in the *Christian Statesman* of November 6, of the same year, M. A. Gault said:—

"This movement includes the triumph of every moral reform. Every true reform is simply an effort to get back to some one of the ten commandments. If that law was taken as a standard of religion, and if public sentiment were lifted up to that standard, it would do away with stealing, intemperance, profanity, Sabbath desecration, licentiousness, murder, and every evil that now vexes society. So we do not flatter ourselves when we say that the glorious millennial day will be ushered in by the triumph of this movement."

This shows just how much knowledge these National Reformers have of what sin is. They are going to suppress Sabbath-breaking, murder, licentiousness, etc., by law; but the truth is that very often the most vicious are those of whom the law cannot take any notice, because their viciousness is concealed in their own hearts. When a man commits a murder, the law can punish him, but it cannot prevent him from committing the murder. For instance, here is a man that has received some injury at the hands of another. He broods over the wrong, and cherishes anger and hatred until his revengeful feelings assume entire control of him, and he resolves to murder the object of his hatred. He fixes on the time when he will carry his murderous designs into effect, secretes himself at the place where he expects the man to pass, has his knife all in readiness to give the fatal blow, but his intended victim passes by another way where he cannot reach him without exposing himself, and so his plan is frustrated. Is he any less a murderer than though he had carried his design into effect? If he should die that moment, would God hold him any less guiltless than though he had killed the man? No; for the Bible declares that whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. Yet not another soul on earth has known of this man's murderous intentions. Then how would it be possible to suppress murder by law?

Take the case of Sabbath-breaking. It is not simply the abstaining from labor on that day that constitutes Sabbath-keeping. Through the prophet Isaiah, the Lord says that to honor him by keeping his Sabbath, men must not do their own ways nor find their own pleasure, nor speak their own words. Now the minions of the Inquisition cannot keep such persistent watch over men as to know every word they speak, and does anyone suppose that the thoughts can be prevented from running riot even in the house of worship? Is anyone so foolish as to suppose that any law can change a man's heart, and make him honor the day, or even the place of worship?

Take the matter of licentiousness. The law

punishes the adulterer and the seducer, but it cannot prevent licentiousness. Here is a man whose very soul is rotten with iniquity. He cherishes lustful desires toward someone of the opposite sex, and his whole thought is how he can accomplish his design. He thinks of it by day, and dreams of it by night. He lives in an atmosphere of impurity, and is wholly corrupt. In imagination he again and again accomplishes his desires; but something happens to prevent the overt act, and nobody but himself knows his evil purpose. Yet, according to the Bible, he is as guilty as though the act had actually been committed. The Saviour said that he who looks upon a woman with lust, has already committed adultery. But law cannot prohibit lust. Even the agents of the Inquisition cannot fathom a man's thoughts and read his corrupt desires.

So it is utter folly to speak of suppressing immorality by law. It is not only folly but it is wicked, for it leads to an establishment of a false standard of morality. When men talk of putting down immorality by law, they thereby say that the outward observance of the law, which is all that can be secured, is all that constitutes morality. Therefore they deceive the man who is outwardly correct in deportment but abominably corrupt in heart, into the belief that he is an upright man.

The writer of the article under consideration makes the old lady say: "I want a law passed that will compel people to keep the Sabbath-day just as much as to keep them from killing folks." Now granting that it is just as wicked to break the Sabbath as it is to murder, it does not follow that there should be a civil law against Sabbath-breaking, just as to punish murder. The two things are entirely dissimilar. A man may break the Sabbath, and do no injury to any person besides himself. He does not interfere with the inalienable right of any individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as he does when he commits murder. He does not by his act compel anybody else to do wrong. His act begins and ends with himself; therefore the Government cannot rightfully take any notice of it.

But says one, What about the hilarious, boisterous Sunday picnics, in which drunken hoodlums annoy people, disturb worship, and endanger or destroy property?—Why, deal with them just as you would on any other day of the week. The same law that arrests the drunken hoodlum for making a nuisance of himself on Monday will do it on Sunday. The old lady in the story said that her Christopher was doomed to destruction if Sunday labor and amusements were not stopped. This again shows the National Reform theory that the people of the country are to be saved by law. The State is to take the place of the church, and men are to be swept into the kingdom of Heaven by wholesale, whether they will or no. The gospel knows nothing of such methods of salvation.

Only one point more need take our attention. That is the intolerance of religious legislation. Says the old lady: "I want a Sunday law and want it enforced, and if somebody or other don't believe in keeping the law, let them go where there ain't none. We do not want them here." And again, "The quicker we send them out of this land, the freer we shall be." These statements stamp this Sunday-law movement as being the very essence of National Reform, for the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL have often read the statement made by Mr. Graham, one of the

vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, to the effect that if the enemies of their movement did not like it they could go to some barren land, and in the name of the devil and for the sake of the devil, stay there till they die. Now notice where this false zeal for religion will lead these people to. First, they must Christianize the country by law. Those who do not like the law and do not wish to be Christianized after their methods can leave the country. But some other country to which they might go will be fired with the same kind of zeal, and so will refuse to receive them. Thus we may imagine them wandering from country to country only to find that all are zealous for the same sort of millennium, and that the people are getting so good that they will not tolerate anyone who they think is bad, and that will be the one who does not think as they do. Then what?—Why, then the only thing to do with these persistent heretics, who refuse to be Christianized according to the National Reform idea, will be to put them to death. There will be no room for them on the earth. This was the conclusion that was reached in the days of the Papal supremacy. And if National Reform, which is the image of the Papacy, shall ever be carried to its finality, it will result again. The spirit of so-called National Reform from Sunday legislation to the end of the chapter is the spirit of intolerance and persecution.

E. J. W.

#### A Voice from Missouri.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL.—*Dear Sir:* As a friend of religious liberty, I certainly sympathize with you in your noble effort to maintain the liberty vouchsafed to us by the Revolutionary fathers, and which is so unmistakably taught by Christ and his apostles. Having for the last eighteen years been a minister of a church which adheres strictly to the observance of the first day of the week (Sunday), what I have to say can be looked upon in no other light than in the cause of justice and a willingness to grant to others the same rights and privileges I demand for myself.

I have before me the "National Sunday bill" as introduced into the United States Senate by Senator Blair, and the amendments proposed by the American Sabbath Union, and I can look upon the measure in no other light than as a stepping-stone to a union of Church and State, and a repetition of all the intolerance and bigotry that characterized the Dark Ages. I am opposed to the Blair bill, first, because it antagonizes the teachings of the Bible; second, because it undermines the principles of a free Government; and third, because it is an invitation to a serious and bloody religious war. I want to go on record as being, first, last, and forever, opposed to all such arbitrary laws, cunningly devised by designing men as a means to assist them to ride into power.

I have a right to express my opinion in common with every other citizen, and I am willing to grant to others the same privilege; but it seems that there are some persons in this country who are not satisfied unless they are trying to pull down someone else. I want each individual to be free in politics and religion. Let every man be his own pope, vote as he pleases, and think for himself.

There can be no objection to the principles of morality (in the common acceptance of the word) being taught in our public schools, but there is no use in talking about teaching the "principles

of the Christian religion" in the schools, for before it could be done, some ecclesiastical conclave would have to decide as to what constitutes the "principles of the Christian religion." And after all it would not be the principles of the Christian religion, for, as taught by Christ and his apostles, those principles are one thing, and, as taught in the creeds and dogmas of men, they are quite another. Religion should be left to individuals, each man to worship as he pleases and when he pleases.

Constantine's decree fixed a sabbath, and united Church and State; and the logical result was the Papacy—that wicked power which in the name of religion put to death 70,000,000 souls, and destroyed political and religious liberty for over 1,200 years. It is to be hoped that the United States will not make the same fatal mistake. Religion and politics cannot be mingled together without corrupting both. Unite Church and State, then the blood of our fathers will have been spilt in vain, and political as well as religious liberty in this country will be at an end. Pass the Blair bill, and the time will not be far distant when the horrors of Roman and Protestant cruelty will be repeated in this country. God forbid that such should ever be the case! Religious intolerance is bad enough without being backed up by the strong arm of the Government to enable it to carry out in fact what it would do if it had the power. A church that has not got merit enough to stand without the aid of human law, is not worth being continued, and deserves to come to naught.

Apostate churches have always tried to enlarge their borders by the aid of human law; but not so with Christ and his followers—and when teaching and moral suasion fail, the proper work of the man of God is at an end.

Every Union soldier who signed the Sunday-law petition has done just that much to build up the very thing that he fought to pull down. As our Government now stands, it gives to every man the right to "worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience." And no one but an ecclesiastical bigot, or would-be tyrant, would want it otherwise.

What would the world have thought of Christ and his apostles should they have gone to Cæsar and asked him to force, by decree, the Jews and pagans to keep the first day of the week, and teach the "principles of the Christian religion" in their synagogues and temples? This is just what these "orthodox" churches are asking our Government to do. I am neither Jew nor Seventh-day Baptist, but when it comes to opposing them by human law, I am opposed to it.

A union of Church and State is not only subversive of the liberties of the citizens of the State but it weakens the church also. Mr. Goldsmith, in his "History of Rome," page 306, says that "Constantine, being sole monarch of the empire, resolved to establish Christianity on so sure a basis that no new revolutions should shake it. He commanded that in all the provinces of the empire, the orders of the bishops should be obeyed." On page 308 he says: "After this, it never resumed its former splendor; but, like a flower transplanted into a foreign clime, languished by degrees, and at last sunk into nothing."

There is a move in this country, by the so-called "orthodox" churches, which if successful will bring about the same result. It does not require a prophet's eye to see what is coming. They will not ask just what they want at first,

but will commence with one thing and then ask for another, till they secure a perfect union of Church and State. I look upon such a law as proposed by Mr. Blair, as an invasion of the sacred rights of the sanctuary. Hands off, this is holy ground. It would be just as consistent to dictate as to what men and women shall eat and drink, or wear, as it would to say when and how they must worship. B. A. SMITH.

### How Others Look at It.

WE present the following to the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, not because it contains any points which have not already been given in these columns, but that they may see how others view these matters. We are glad of these evidences that the true principles of civil and religious liberty are finding advocates all through the land. The article is from the Camden (N. J.) *Post* of April 11:—

All asseverations to the contrary notwithstanding, it strikes me that Senator Blair's Educational Amendment is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It presents an issue which must be met, and before the damage is done is the time to meet it. Let us read the second section of the bill, and mark carefully every word:—

"SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion." That is to say, no State shall ever make or maintain a law respecting an establishment of religion, but every State in this Union shall make and maintain laws establishing the principles of the Christian religion; and to make assurance doubly sure, Section 3 declares that the United States shall guarantee to every State, and to the people of every State, and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided. And that is to say, the United States Government pledges itself that every State shall establish and maintain the principles of the Christian religion. This proposed amendment, therefore, at one stroke, establishes Christianity as the national religion, because it declares that every State shall maintain the principles of the Christian religion in the public schools, and the Nation is pledged to see that this is done.

Therefore there must be a national decision of some kind declaring just what are the principles of the Christian religion.

Then when that decision shall have been made, every State will have to receive from the Nation just those principles of religion which the Nation shall have declared to be the principles of the Christian religion, and which the Nation will have pledged itself shall be taught in the schools of every State. In other words, the people of the United States will then have to receive their religion from the Government of the United States, and no longer from the Bible, as their own conscience, enlightened by the Spirit of God, may dictate. Therefore, if Senator Blair's proposed amendment to the National Constitution does not provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national religion, then no religion was ever established or maintained.

But how shall the national decision be made as to what are the principles of the Christian re-

ligion? It will follow inevitably that there shall be officially called a national council of the churches to decide what are the principles common to all, and to establish a national creed, which shall be enforced and inculcated by national power in all the public schools in the United States. And that will be the establishment of a national religion. And that is exactly what Senator Blair's constitutional amendment assures, so surely as it or anything similar to it shall ever be adopted. Another important consideration is this: Under this amendment the teachers in the public schools will have to inculcate the principles of the Christian religion. Who are to compose the examining board that shall pass upon the qualification and orthodoxy of the teachers? Assuredly none but the leading theologians in the churches. This will require that such a board shall be stately convened to deal out what shall have been decided by each successive council to be the principles of the Christian religion.

It was in this way precisely that the thing was worked in the fourth century and onward. Constantine made Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman Empire. Then it became at once necessary that there should be the imperial decision as to what form of Christianity should be the imperial religion.

To effect this an imperial council was necessary to formulate that phase of Christianity which was common to all. The Council of Nice was convened by imperial command, and an imperial creed was established, which was enforced by imperial power. That establishment of an imperial religion ended only in the imperious despotism of the Papacy. As surely as the complete establishment of the Papacy followed and grew out of that imperial recognition of Christianity in the fourth century, just so surely will the complete establishment of a religious despotism after the living likeness of the Papacy, follow and grow out of this national recognition of Christianity provided for in the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Blair.

### Un-American and Unbearable Presumption.

At the hearing before the United States Senate Committee on the National Sunday law, the basis of Sunday observance and Sunday laws was revealed by Dr. Herrick Johnson, as follows:—

*Mr. Johnson*—"This appointment of one day in seven is arbitrary. There is nothing in nature to indicate that division of time. There is the day of twenty-four hours, there is the month, there is the year, all these are natural divisions; but there is nothing in nature to indicate the weekly division, the observance of one day in seven. It is arbitrary, and we regard that as an evidence of its divine origin."

*The Chairman*—"How do you base the Sabbath itself upon a divine ordinance when there is no natural law to indicate which is to be observed?"

*Mr. Johnson*—"It is in revelation, and it is bound to be exactly in accord with the laws of nature."

*The Chairman*—"You base the law of one day's rest in seven upon revelation; that is to say, upon the Bible?"

*Mr. Johnson*—"Yes, sir."

*The Chairman*—"There are many who doubt that it is established by revelation, are there not?"

*Mr. Johnson*—"I think no one who accepts

the Bible doubts that there is one day in seven to be observed as a day of rest."

*The Chairman*—"Will you just state the authority?"

*Mr. Johnson*—"Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work."

*The Chairman*—"Is there any other?"

*Mr. Johnson*—"There are references to this law all through the Bible."

*The Chairman*—"Now you come and change that Sabbath-day to which the Lord there refers?"

*Mr. Johnson*—"That we hold was changed by himself."

*The Chairman*—"When did he do that? and by what language?"

*Mr. Johnson*—"There was a meeting for worship on the first day of the week, the day the Lord arose, and seven days after there was another meeting for the same purpose, and then it is referred to as the Lord's day."

*The Chairman*—"After the change?"

*Mr. Johnson*—"Yes, sir; after the change."

*The Chairman*—"It is based, then, upon two or three days being observed as days of religious worship after the resurrection?"

*Mr. Johnson*—"Yes, sir."

Could anything be more presumptuous than is this scheme of the preachers, in demanding that the national Legislature shall frame into law and enforce upon all the people, such baseless assumption as the Sunday theory is shown by their own words to be?

### The Constitution in Harmony with Christian Principles.

THE various associations which are making a specialty of badgering Congress for a religious amendment to the National Constitution, do so on the assumption that the United States is a Christian Nation and should have a Christian Constitution. If these parties were actuated in their work by "the principles of the Christian religion," which they so loudly profess to have at heart, and only desired that Christianity have free course in the land, they would realize that the Constitution is already adapted to that end. It could not be bettered in that respect were such a result the main object of its existence.

The principles of Christianity are thus laid down by Christ himself: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." He did not apply this merely to secular affairs; he was a religious teacher, and was imparting a religious lesson when he uttered those words. If this language means anything, it means that if ye would that men should allow you freedom in the exercise of your religious views, you must allow them the same. And this is just what the Constitution of the United States, as it stands, is intended to do,—allow everyone perfect liberty of conscience in the matter of religion.

All that Christianity asks of any Government is equality before the law. This much, Christianity is always willing that others should have. Whatever element in society would ask more, or seek to grant less, is unchristian. Any Government that will give one class of citizens the privilege of exacting more of another class than they are willing to give in return, could not fairly claim to be Christian; it would be a despotism, and Christianity is in no sense despotic. Christ never

compelled anyone to follow him; he said, "Who-soever will, let him come."

The first amendment to the Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Whosoever will may be a Christian, and Congress must not interfere; and whosoever will not has an equal right not to be; and the great Head of Christianity has given no further authority to any power. He certainly would not grant to any agency authority beyond what he himself would exercise. The unchristian advocates of a religious amendment say, in effect: "Whatsoever we would that men should do, we will urge the enactment of laws compelling them to do."

Under the protection to civil and religious liberty secured by the Constitution as it is, this country has grown and flourished, besides giving to Christianity such freedom as it never before enjoyed. Under the influence of our free institutions, both at home and abroad, Christianity has for a hundred years received encouragement unparalleled in history. Why, then, it will be asked, is not Christianity satisfied with the Constitution as it is? The reply is, *Christianity is satisfied*. It is the hydrahead of religious bigotry seeking power, everywhere springing up in worldly, ambitious churches, and in the hearts of unchristian professors of Christianity, that demands a change of the Constitution.

Therefore, in the name of Christianity, and for the sake of the free exercise of Christian liberty, let the Constitution remain as it is. A constitution guaranteeing equal and exact justice to all men harmonizes with Christian principles; while one inspired by religious intolerance cannot guarantee justice to all alike, and can be "only evil continually." W. N. GLENN.

#### A Plea for a Sunday Law.

THE following letter from a zealous National Reformer in Kansas will be fully appreciated by our readers:—

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL: As one of my neighbors is taking your paper, and I have been reading it, I would like to say a word on this Sabbath question. It appears to me that you are going to extremes in regard to the Sabbath. You don't think the laws of the United States should have anything to do with the Sabbath. Here I think you make a grand mistake. . . . I know, and you know, that if we had no Sabbath law, thousands of people would work all day Sunday, or stay in the saloons or gambling dens, or stay at home and read some trashy newspaper or dime novel, or be at some other mischief, while if we had a law to protect our Sabbath so that people would not dare to do these crimes, they would go to church; probably not for any good at the time, but by going and hearing the gospel they might become interested and be convicted and converted. We know the unconverted are blind in sins and are not likely to become Christians if they cannot be placed under the influence of the gospel, therefore ought we not to use every possible effort to bring them under the influence of the gospel? . . . Oh, that men would lay the world and worldly things aside, and put on the armor of almighty God, that when we come to leave this world we can say with the apostle Paul, "We have fought a good fight, we have kept the faith, and are going home to wear a crown of glory!"

This is genuine National Reform argument. If there is no Sunday law people will not go to church, and if they don't go to church they won't be converted; therefore they ought to be compelled to choose between going to church on Sunday and sitting all day with folded hands doing nothing! But suppose they should still refuse to

go to church? Oh, in that case a law would be in order compelling them to go! And that is just what this National Reform logic leads to every time if it is followed to its conclusion; for if the State has a right to interfere in one particular in matters of religion it has the right to interfere in all such particulars; if it may decide one question of religious duty it follows that it must be perfectly competent for it to decide all such questions, and then the State would be Pope.

We have the most implicit faith in the gospel, and believe most heartily that it is the power of God unto salvation to all that receive it, but we do not believe that any man or any set of men have any authority to force the gospel upon anybody, or even to so hedge them about with law that they will choose it as the least of two evils. The National Reform plan of getting people converted by legislative enactment is entirely foreign to the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ as we understand it, and as it is clearly revealed in the Scriptures. If any authority to coerce people has ever been given it must have been in a later revelation than the New Testament, one about which we know nothing, and one which must have come by way of the Pope of Rome or through the Inquisition.

#### Piety by Proxy.

THERE is a craze for doing all duties and curing all evils by proxy. Rich Christians try to do their charity by checks and other substitutes, and poor Christians leave all the praying and teaching and working to the pastor and his appointed assistants. The theory that every man has personal duties that no one can do for him is quite exploded, and the Romish idea that the church and the priest can settle all religious matters, private and public, is popular.

As a natural result of such opinions we find that many persons rely upon law to take their place in all public responsibility. A few men are elected or appointed to official positions, and thousands at once surrender all their interests and relinquish all their civic duties to these representatives. The claims of morality upon every individual, to use influence and force of character and self-denying effort in favor of right and justice and honesty and temperance, are ignored because there are laws to establish and enforce these claims. There are laws against all offenses, and police and magistrates to execute them, and therefore the average citizen is satisfied. If the law is broken or not enforced, it is no concern of the citizen, but only of the official. It is the duty of the individual to prevent intemperance in his family and among his servants; but instead of doing his personal duty to those dependent upon him he prefers to place this duty upon the law-makers, and charges them to prevent drunkenness by prohibitory law. Law has potency because it can punish, but it has no saving or reformatory power. The triumphs of the gospel of Christ from the time of the apostles have been signal examples of personal power under divine inspiration. The passage, "To every man his own work," needs reiteration and enforcement, for multitudes are putting off their own work upon other people.

This is one reason for empty churches and decaying charities and benevolent work that seems "run to seed." The personal Christian life is gone, and there is only a corpse or a machine; the spirit of individual duty has departed, and what is left will soon shrivel and decay. We

need love in place of law, life in place of form, the constraining love of Christ, which makes duty a pleasure, instead of the cold demand of the law, which is satisfied with a substitute or a proxy. Much that might be done to bring sinners to salvation is neglected, because those who ought to use their personal influence with friends and relatives and associates and dependents are timid or careless or unwilling to speak and act for Jesus.—*Augustus, in the New York Observer.*

#### Who Is Doing the Clamoring?

FOR several months past Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts has not ceased to tell us how the labor organizations all over the land were clamoring for Sunday legislation. He would have us believe that the workingmen had started such a sweeping crusade for Sunday that the ministers were almost forced to join them. But in his enthusiastic endeavor to exalt the American Sabbath Union, he overreached himself at the Boston Monday lecture, March 25, 1889. After stating that this union "originated in a petition to the Methodist General Conference, which met in May, asking it to take the initiative in forming a national society for the defense [not of the workingmen but] of the Sabbath, to be constituted by official representatives of [not the labor organizations but] the evangelical churches," he proceeded to name the religious organizations which had concurred in the arrangement, and then said:—

"This successful union, to prevent the heathenizing of America, of those churches that have not yet succeeded in uniting to Christianize Japan; this co-operation of such intense Republicans as our President, Col. Elliott F. Shepard, with such Southern leaders as Senator Colquitt, who has accepted honorary membership; and the co-operation this union has established outside of its membership on the basis of a broad humanity with the leading labor organizations and the head of the Catholic Church—this is surely as wonderful a 'union' as the churches can show." [All italics mine.]

This shows that the American Sabbath Union was called for by the churches; that it was made up of "official representatives" of the evangelical churches; that it was the churches that took the "initiative" in forming a "national society for the defense of the Sabbath;" and that this Sabbath Union importuned the official representatives of the labor organizations to co-operate with them. We know, too, that this was accomplished by long and earnest argument on the part of the union. And then they will tell us how the laboring classes are "begging" for Sunday laws!

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

THE advocates of a stringent Sunday law (without exemption) in Arkansas, on their recent defeat in the Legislature, declared their intention to persistently agitate the subject for the next two years, and prepare for an overwhelming victory at the next session. This is the sentiment and policy of religious coercionists throughout the country; now the question arises, What will the great majority of the people—who are undoubtedly opposed to Sunday laws—do while the enemies of religious liberty are at work? Wisdom would say, Manifest an equal degree of diligence to maintain the integrity of our free institutions. But there is such confidence in the apparent impregnability of our Government, that the masses will probably rest secure until it is too late. However, the SENTINEL proposes not to be found sleeping on guard, and its weekly warnings will be faithfully sounded forth.

Advertisements.

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

Civil Government and Religion.

BY A. T. JONES,  
One of the Editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain and Forcible.

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

"CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION"

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

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.

The Teachers' Outlook.

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

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

Another, and very important, feature of the magazine will be that all teachers and students are invited to join its circle of writers, out of which it proposes to draw its corps of future contributors. On this point it has some original plans of mutual helpfulness to carry out; aid to give writers in introducing them to the public, and suggestions to those who need practice and training in the expression of thought that will be helpful. Send 50 cents for magazine eight months. Agents wanted.

A POOR FOUNTAIN PEN

IS A NUISANCE;

But a Good One is a Joy Forever.

We carry a full stock of the best makes of fountain pens, and feel sure we can suit the most fastidious.

Remit \$2.50 and with it send a sample of the steel pen which suits you best, and we will send you a fountain pen that will give you satisfaction. It is so convenient to have a pen which is always ready, and which can be used as easily as a lead pencil.

Give us a trial order. Pens sent by registered mail. The trade supplied. Address,

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

THE GRANDEST BOOK

— ON THE —

GRANDEST SUBJECT!

And Within the Reach of All.

We have just issued a special "TOURISTS' EDITION" of our grand book entitled,

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS



[YO SEMITE.—"Its meaning is, according to the very best authorities, a large, or full-grown, grizzly bear; and is pronounced Yo Sem-i-tee."—In the Heart of the Sierras, page 58.]

The Yo Semite Valley

AND BIG TREE GROVES OF CALIFORNIA.

The most authentic and most intensely interesting description of this wonderful region ever written.

It is the same size page and contains everything that our elegant Subscription Edition does, except the artotype plates. It is printed on a fine quality of thinner paper, bound in flexible cloth binding, and makes a beautiful book. It contains nearly 500 pages of text and

OVER ONE HUNDRED ILLUSTRATIONS

and portrays by aid of the artist's genius and the author's facile pen the lofty mountains and charming valleys, the placid lakes and thundering cataracts, of the world-renowned Yo Semite. The mission of this work is to make the best possible representation of the marvelous scenery and sublime natural wonders of this unique region.

PRICE, \$1.50 PER COPY.

Read what Others Say of it:

"Many books have been written about the glorious and wondrous story of the Sierras. But it seems to me that this scholarly and venerable pioneer, who was publishing an illustrated magazine devoted largely to the themes he celebrates, when many of the younger authors were still at their nurse's knee, is the one man who is entitled, by his culture, his fine tastes, and, above all, his long and wonderful experience, to write the one great and responsible authority about the Heart of the Sierras."—JOAQUIN MILLER, the Noted Author and Correspondent.

"The illustrations, the text, the whole atmosphere of the volume, are worthy of their great subject, the Yo Semite—and what could I say more?"—REV. JOSEPH COOK, of Boston.

"It is a truthful, interesting, and instructive work."—GALEN CLARK, Yo Semite Valley. (For sixteen years the Valley's Guardian.)

"As might have been expected, Mr. Hutchings' story of the Valley that he knows and loves so well, is no cold description, but reads with all the charms of a romance."—San Francisco Hotel Gazette.

"Those who have not seen Yo Semite cannot do better, short of going to the Valley, than by purchasing Mr. Hutchings' handsome volume."—The Sacramento Record-Union.

In order to place this valuable book—the only one of the kind—within the reach of everybody, we offer this edition at the exceedingly low price of \$1.50 per copy, post-paid. Send on your orders quick, while the edition lasts.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO Oakland, Cal.

Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

G. H. KRIECHBAUM,  
DENTIST.

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

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

PACIFIC BUSINESS COLLEGE  
320 POST ST., S. F.  
Life Scholarship, \$75.  
SEND FOR CIRCULARS.

Great Reduction in Pure Hide

By calling at or addressing to 116 Front St., San Francisco, Cal., you will find it greater to your advantage by examining my stock of Glue before you purchase elsewhere. Ground and White Glue a specialty. Also keep in Stock Pure Neat's-foot Oil. CAL. GLUE WORKS, M. HOLJE, Prop.

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

West Shore Railroad

N. Y. C. & H. R. R. R. Co. Lessee.

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.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

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

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

Orders can be filled for back numbers at any time and in any quantity desired, as each number is printed from electrotype plates. Liberal discount when ordered in quantities. Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Or 43 Bond St., N. Y. Oakland, Cal.

Views of National Reform

SERIES 1.

This is a pamphlet of 151 pages, and contains all that the package of 13 tracts formerly published under the same name contained. The volume is pagged consecutively, has an index, so that any tract may be instantly referred to, and is much more convenient and attractive than when issued as a package of separate tracts. Price, 15 cents, with liberal discount when ordered in quantities. Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Or 43 Bond St., N. Y. 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, JUNE 19, 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.

THE *Advance* urges that because the President and Postmaster-General are church-members they should see to it that the Louisiana State Lottery be not allowed to use the United States mails in their swindling business. No lottery should be permitted to use the mails; but an appeal to the officers of the Government to enforce the laws should not be based upon the fact that they are church-members. If it be true that President Harrison ought to officially do certain acts because of his religious belief, it follows that another President, holding different religious views, should act differently. Every President should execute the laws faithfully, whatever his individual opinions and religious preferences may be.

WE learn from the *Pearl of Days* that the Particular Synod (Dutch Reformed), of New Brunswick, held in Philadelphia May 8, adopted unanimously a resolution condemning Sunday papers for interfering with worship and preventing attendance at the house of God. The resolution earnestly requested all their members to refuse to buy or read any such papers. This is certainly a proper way of getting at the matter. It is perfectly right for those who are conscientiously opposed to reading secular papers on Sunday to refuse to do so, but that is a very different thing from demanding laws to prohibit the publication of such papers, or to prevent those from reading them that wish to. So long as the various churches confine themselves to adopting resolutions requesting their members not to patronize Sunday papers, they will be tending strictly to their own business, and we have no fault to find with them.

WE have received from a friend in Cleveland, Ohio, a copy of a paper entitled *Herald of Reform*, Rev. Jas. P. Mills, A. M., editor and manager. This gentleman is also district secretary of the National Reform Association, and State secretary of the American Sabbath Union, and of course an ardent National Reformer.

The number which we have received is "Vol. 3, No. 5," dated May 15, 1889, which fact demands some explanation, since the paper is only a monthly, and the first number was issued in January, 1888, and the second in April of the same year. The explanation, as given by the publisher himself, is that the volumes have been stuffed to make it appear that the paper is old and well established. It is desirable to give this impression, says the honest publisher, that they may get a better advertising patronage, and also make it appear that the paper "has come to stay." From the standpoint of ordinary mortals, this would scarcely seem to be honest, but it is probably all right with National Reformers. Of course the paper is an ardent advocate of the legal enforcement of the law of God as understood by National Reformers, but we would suggest that while professedly advocating some portions of the decalogue so earnestly, the editor should not neg-

lect the ninth commandment, which is understood to forbid falsehood. We shall keep an eye on the *Herald of Reform* to see if it profits by our advice.

THE *Argus*, Leadville, Colorado, has an article on "Sunday, Its Use and Abuse," in which, referring to the Sunday-Rest bill, it says:—

"Clearly stated, the purpose of that bill is to compel a day, not of rest but of *worship*. It may be admitted that both are linked together in the bill, but the feature is the latter compulsion. In other words, it is a covert attempt to enforce a day of worship rather than to secure for the toilers a day of rest and recuperation. The enforcement of such legislation would be a flagrant abuse."

And of the proposed amendment providing that the principles of the Christian religion shall be taught in the public schools, the *Argus* says:—

"Religion does not require this sort of a constitutional amendment; the people do not want it. More than that, they will not have it."

That the *Argus* gives utterance to these sentiments not from opposition to religion but from love of simple justice is apparent from the following item clipped from another page of the same paper:—

"The arrest of the Salvation Army in Leadville was an unmitigated outrage, and ought to bring the blush of shame to a city government which allows, without a word of protest, the almost daily parades of a band hired for the purpose by the proprietor of the most notoriously infamous dive in the city. The officers are not, of course, to be censured for obeying the instructions of the council, but that body should have shown a little more respect for the fundamental laws of the land. If the parade was criminal in its purpose, or resulted in a breach of the public order, there would then have been justification for the arrest; but it cannot be alleged that any crimes were committed as a consequence of the parades, or that they were productive of riot or disorder. The action of the council was in derogation of all the tenets of common law and decency, and was very properly characterized by the bar of the city as an outrageous discrimination against an inoffensive class of citizens."

We are free to confess that Salvation Army methods are not according to our ideas of the fitness of things, but this is not a question of propriety, but of civil and religious rights, and we maintain that as a matter of simple justice they have the right to worship God just as they please, and to parade with music, just as any other organization is permitted to parade. No attempt to regulate religious worship by law should be tolerated for a moment in this country.

## Georgia Starts the Machine.

THE following indictment by the Grand Jury of Forsyth County, Georgia, is probably all that need to be said on the subject just now. It would seem that the mere reading of the indictment to any intelligent jury ought to secure the prompt acquittal of the accused. The trial, we understand, is to come off in August. We shall watch the case and let our readers know the result.

STATE OF GEORGIA, }  
Forsyth County. }

The Grand Jury, in the name and behalf of the citizens of Georgia, charge and accuse Day Conklin, of the county and State aforesaid, with the offense of misdemeanor for that the said Day Conklin, on the second day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, in the county aforesaid, with force and arms did unlawfully, then and there, pursue the work of his ordinary calling upon the said second day of December, eighteen hundred

and eighty-eight, which was then and there the Lord's day, by cutting timber and clearing lands and by digging and other work then and there, did said work and said cutting timber and said clearing and said digging, not then and there being work of charity, and not then and there being work of necessity, the said Day Conklin then and there being a tradesman, the said Day Conklin then and there being an artificer, the said Day Conklin then and there being a workman, the said Day Conklin then and there being a laborer, the said Day Conklin then and there being a farmer,

Contrary to the laws of said State, the good order, peace, and dignity thereof.

Forsyth Superior Court, Feb. term, 1889.

GEO. R. BROWN, *Solicitor-Gen.*

## Both on the Same Platform.

"CARDINAL GIBBONS," says the *Christian Guardian* (Toronto), "recently denounced, in a dedication sermon, any interference for the purpose of suppressing a certain Sunday-school which had been established in Baltimore for the promulgation of infidel doctrine. The Cardinal took the ground that he would be sorry to see the arm of the civil law used toward the suppression of the school, and added that as our Saviour never had recourse to the arm of the law or the sword in teaching his doctrine, the only weapons to be used against the school were those of argument and persuasion. The Cardinal's remarks have drawn forth the following observations from Joseph Cook:—

"Cardinal Gibbons seems to be in danger of Papal excommunication. He teaches in a recent sermon that the civil law should not be used to suppress heresy. A recent and famous syllabus declares that "it is a deadly error to teach that the force of the State may not be used to suppress dissent from Roman Catholicism." Cardinal Gibbons, in trying to persuade Americans that Vaticanism has no claws, is endeavoring to cover a very large wolf with the skin of a very small lamb."

It comes with rather bad grace for Joseph Cook to accuse Cardinal Gibbons of insincerity in this matter, though of course everybody ought to know that no thorough Papist can from his heart disavow that recent and famous syllabus; but Joseph Cook can find no reasonable fault with it, for it is only a concise statement of that which he, as a National Reformer, advocates most untiringly. Of course Mr. Cook would object to the Catholic Church using the power of the State in its interests, but as a National Reformer he admits the principle, and is in that respect no whit better than Cardinal Gibbons, the only difference being that one is a Catholic and the other a so-called Protestant.—*Signs of the Times.*

IN proportion as the ecclesiastics became legislators, heresies became civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments.—*Dean Milman.*

## 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.