

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER 23, 1889.

NUMBER 39.

The American Sentinel.

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

EDITORS,
E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

THE *Catholic World* gives the exact situation in a nutshell. It says: "We are purely and simply Catholic, and profess an unreserved allegiance to the church, which takes precedence of, and gives the rule to, our allegiance to the State." And yet we have acquaintances who became exceedingly angry when in argument they were "cornered" by the statement that no true Catholic can be a good American citizen.—*The Eye*.

It is stated that in Servia a law has been passed requiring all shops and places of business to be closed, not only on Sunday, but on all the holy days of the church as well. All told, the number is 180. The law is rigidly enforced. A shop keeper who supplied a customer with a little rice on one of the interdicted days, was recently fined 100 franks for his crime. But this is only Sunday legislation carried to its legitimate conclusion. If the State has a right to say that business shall be suspended on Sunday, it has the same right to say that it shall be suspended on other so-called holy days.—*Signs of the Times*.

THOSE Chicago ministers who are grieved because men will drink Sunday, and because the mayor whom they helped to elect will not prevent their doing so, might read with profit the remarks of Elder Waggoner at the convention of the Seventh-day Adventists at Bloomington early this week. Said he:—

"If men can be brought to the observance of Sunday by persuasion, by preaching and writing, that is right, but to enforce it by law is destroying the purpose of evangelical work and making hypocrisy compulsory. When the law of Sunday rest is on the statute books and enforced it will not result in bringing people into the churches but will send them to find recreation and amusement elsewhere."

In other words, that which some of the shortsighted preachers demand that Mr. Cregier shall do for them, is something they should do for themselves. They want to leave their pulpits and let him take their places and do missionary work for them, backed by the cudgels of his police. They will accomplish more if they take Elder Waggoner's, and follow Brother Murphy's, example and try a little moral suasion. St. Paul did not ask Felix to detail a few Roman centu-

rians with swords and spears to help him in his work, but he went up and down preaching mightily, and made many converts. He did not sit still and wait for men to come to him to be convinced, but he went after them. He did not depend on militant coercion to make men good and to refrain from an indulgence of appetite.—*Chicago Tribune, Sept. 12, 1889.*

The Petition and the Inquisition.

THE supplement to the March monthly document of the American Sabbath Union was devoted to a statement of how the friends of the Sunday might co-operate with the union. Following an extract from the constitution, which states that the object of the union is "to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship," there was an earnest appeal to every individual to push the petitions for a Sunday law, making not the least abatement because Congress had adjourned. The following form of petition was suggested:—

"The undersigned organizations and adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, earnestly petition you to pass a bill forbidding in the government's mail and military service and in interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship."

We claim that this petition alone furnishes ample proof that the American Sabbath Union contemplates a union of Church and State in the fullest sense, and is providing—unconsciously it may be, but none the less surely—for the establishment of the Inquisition. Strange as it may seem to some, we find the strongest proof of this in the proposed exemption of those that observe another day.

The workers for a Sunday law lay a great deal of stress on the fact that they make such an exception. In his speech before the Senate Committee, Mr. Crafts spoke of the exception that is made to the Seventh-day Baptists by the laws of Rhode Island, allowing them to carry on public industries on the first day of the week, and said that "the tendency of Legislatures and executive officers towards those who claim to keep a Saturday Sabbath is to over-leniency rather than over-strictness."

In the same hearing Mrs. Bateham spoke of the exemption that was asked for in the petition, stating that they would like to exempt Seventh-day keepers from the penalties of the law for which they asked, providing it could be done, but that if such an exemption would work against the general enforcement of the law then they did not wish it. These statements show that they

simply regard themselves as making a great concession when they do not persecute people who rest upon Saturday. Dr. Bothwell, of Oakland, Cal., stated their feeling very well when he said:

"Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath, if they choose; but there let their privileges end. Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted to them, and then going off quietly and attending to their own business, as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors."

With these statements compare the following from the first chapter of Dr. Schaff's work on "The Progress of Religious Freedom, as Shown in the History of Toleration Acts." Says he:—

"An edict or act of toleration is a grant of the civil government, which authorizes religious societies dissenting from the State religion to worship according to the dictates of conscience without liability to persecution. Such an edict always presupposes a religion established by law and supported by the State, and the right of the State to control public worship. Toleration may proceed from necessity, or from prudence, or from indifference, or from liberality and an enlarged view of truth and right. It may be extended or withdrawn by the government; but it is usually the entering wedge for religious liberty and legal equality.

"There is a wide difference between toleration and liberty. The one is a concession, the other a right; the one is a matter of expediency, the other a principle; the one is a gift of man, the other a gift of God.

"Toleration implies more or less censure or disapproval. We tolerate or endure what we dislike or cannot prevent. The most despotic governments are tolerant towards subjects who are too numerous or too useful to be killed or exiled. Russia tolerates Romanists, Protestants, Jews, and Mohammedans; Turkey tolerates 'Christian dogs,' and likes them to prey upon each other; but woe to him in either country who apostatizes from the State religion, or attempts to induce any member of the same to apostasy. Toleration is first sought and granted as a favor, then demanded and conceded as a right, and at last spurned as an insult. In a free country nobody wants to be tolerated for his religious opinions or sacred convictions.

"Religious liberty is a natural, fundamental, and inalienable right of every man. It is founded on the sacredness of conscience, which is the voice of God in man, and above the reach and control of human authority. There is a law above all human laws. It is written, not on parchment and tables of stone, but on the heart of man by the finger of God. It is that law which commands with the categorical imperative, and which filled the philosopher Kant with ever-growing reverence and awe. 'We must obey God more than man.' He and he alone is the Author and Lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to interpose itself between them. 'Every man stands or falls to his own Lord.' Liberty of conscience requires liberty of worship as its manifestation. To grant the former and to deny the latter is to imprison conscience and to promote hypocrisy or infidelity. Religion is in its nature voluntary, and ceases to be religion in proportion as it is forced. God wants free worshipers, and no others.

"Toleration is an intermediate state between religious persecution and religious liberty. Persecution

results from the union of Church and State; toleration, from a relaxation of that union; full religious liberty and legal equality require a peaceful separation of the spiritual and secular powers."

Note particularly what he says of toleration, that it is an intermediate state between religious persecution and religious liberty. He says also that it is usually "the entering wedge for religious liberty and legal equality." This is true, providing it has been preceded by despotic intolerance. If a government has rigidly persecuted everyone who dissents from the established religion, then an act of toleration would be the entering wedge toward religious liberty—a step toward freedom; but if perfect liberty and equality have been enjoyed by the citizens of a government, then an act of toleration would be a long stride toward the taking away of religious freedom. For an act of toleration, as Dr. Schaff truly says, "Always presupposes a religion established by law and supported by the State, and the right of the State to control public worship."

The very fact of exemptions being thought of in a law—the use of the word concession and toleration—shows the existence of a despotic law; so that the more the Sunday-law advocates talk about concessions, the more they boast of their leniency, the more they press their petition for a Sunday law which shall exempt those who religiously and regularly observe another day,—the more they proclaim the fact that they are working for a State religion. Now, whenever a religion, or any form of religion, is established by the State, the Inquisition and persecution must inevitably follow. For in such a case an offense against the established religion is an offense against the State; and of course the State is bound to punish all who violate its laws. But punishment by the State for differences of opinion, or of acts in matters of religion, is persecution.

Note particularly the petition which we quoted. It provides for the exemption of those who "religiously and regularly" observe another day of the week. How, in the face of this, it is possible for the framers and advocates of that petition to claim that they are not working for a State religion, it is impossible for us to conceive. That petition lays the foundation for the Inquisition; and if a law should be passed in harmony with it, the Inquisition would have to be established. How can the State tell who do and who do not religiously observe another day? Anyone can see that the petition plans for the State to inquire, not simply into a man's religious or irreligious acts, but into the motives of his acts. Of course it is well understood that under all circumstances there are people who have a form of religion, people who do certain things professedly in the name of religion, yet from selfish motives. Now if a law is passed in accordance with this petition, the State through its officers would be obliged to inquire into the motives which prompt a man's rest upon Saturday. No individual will have any guarantee that he will remain unmolested for a week. He may be brought up at any time at the instigation of any bigot or any person who has a fancied grudge towards him, and put under examination as to whether or not he observes another day from religious motives. And the worst of it all will be that in such examination his own testimony will avail nothing. Of course those who do observe the day religiously would say so; and any who are not conscientious in their observance of the day would, in order to escape the penalty, declare that they observed it religiously. And so whether or not a person were

cleared would depend upon the testimony of men who might have bitter prejudice toward him.

We believe that every thoughtful, candid individual can see that to work for this petition is to work directly for as wicked a persecution as ever existed on earth. Let those who see this point use all their energy in setting the light clearly before others, in order that they may not be deceived by the specious arguments of those who are working for the Sunday law. To every individual that petition will be presented, and many will be misled by its outward pretention to justice and of caring for the rights of a minority, unaware that in this very concession is the strongest proof of the wicked character of the proposed law.

E. J. W.

The Edmunds Resolution.

THE SENTINEL has said considerable during the past year about the proposed amendment to the national Constitution establishing instruction in the principles of the Christian religion in all the public schools in the nation. The last few numbers have contained an argument made by one of the editors of the SENTINEL before the Committee on Education and Labor in opposition to that resolution. When the next Congress shall assemble, there will be a powerful effort made to secure the introduction of a resolution embodying the doctrines proposed in that, but in what shape the matter will be presented, it is of course impossible in advance to tell. The forces are being rallied, the different views are being brought together as much as possible, and the people cannot be too wide-awake nor too diligently engaged in the study of the subject, nor can there be too prompt action in opposing the movement. The Blair resolution is not the only one that is advocated. There is another called the "Edmunds Resolution," so called because it was framed and presented by Senator Edmunds, of Vermont.

The history of the Edmunds resolution is this, to begin at the beginning of the subject: April 19, 1870, Hon. S. S. Burdette, of Missouri, proposed an amendment to the United States Constitution upon this subject, reading as follows:—

"SECTION 1. No State or municipal corporation within any State of the United States shall levy or collect any tax for the support or aid of any sectarian, denominational, or religious school or educational establishment; nor shall the legislature of any State, or the corporate authorities of any municipality within any State, appropriate any money or make any donation from the public fund or property of such State or municipality for the support or aid of any sectarian, religious, or denominational schools or educational establishments.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

It will be seen at a glance that this only prohibits State aid to denominational or religious schools or establishments. It does not prohibit sectarian, religious, or denominational instruction in the public schools. It thus missed the mark so widely that it seems not to have been taken any notice of after its introduction.

It was not long, however, before another step was taken. December 19, 1871, Hon. William M. Stewart, United States senator from Nevada, proposed an amendment to the national Constitution, reading as follows:—

"SECTION 1. There shall be maintained in each State and Territory a system of free common schools, but neither the United States nor any State, Territory, county, or municipal corporation, shall aid in the support of any schools wherein the peculiar tenets of any denomination are taught.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

This proposition seems to have excited some public discussion. It was strongly disapproved by many on the ground that such a measure was "both unnecessary and misleading"—unnecessary because no danger could arise in any State from such action; and mischievous because it would only tend to provoke a controversy which was uncalled for. Nothing seems to have come of Mr. Stewart's proposition except the discussion referred to.

Nothing more was done for four years. Then, however, December 14, 1875, Hon. James G. Blaine, then a member of the House of Representatives, proposed an amendment, as follows:

ARTICLE XVI.

"No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of a religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect, nor shall any money so raised or land so devoted be divided between religious sects or denominations."

August 4, 1876, Mr. Blaine's resolution was reported back from the Judiciary Committee with two slight additions, one, of the words "or denomination" following the word "sect" in the second clause, and the other a sentence at the end, saying, "This article shall not vest, enlarge, or diminish legislative power in Congress."

It will be seen that Mr. Blaine's resolution goes a step further than either of the ones which preceded it, in that it embodies in its first clause the substance of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting any State making any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. As for the rest of his resolution, it is in substance the same as the other two, simply saying that no public money raised by taxation or derived from public funds for the support of public schools should ever be under the control of any religious sect or divided amongst religious sects or denominations. It does not prohibit the teaching of religion in the public schools, nor does it prohibit the use of public money for the support of religious teaching in the public schools. Therefore, as for any real value in that resolution, there was none except in its first clause.

Yet, it was adopted by the House of Representatives after brief debate, by vote of 180 yeas to 7 nays, with 98 not voting. The resolution then went to the Senate, and, August 7, was referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, with several substitutes which had been offered for it. Two days later, August 9, Senator Edmunds, of the Judiciary Committee, reported back the joint resolution with an amendment which was in fact a substitute, reading as follows:—

ARTICLE XVI.

"No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under any State. No public property, and no public revenue of, nor any loan of credit by or under, the authority of the United States, or any State, Territory, district, or municipal corporation, shall be appropriated to, or made, or used for, the support of any school, educational or other institution, under the control of any religious, or anti-religious, organization, or wherein the particular creed or tenets of any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination, shall be taught. And no such particular creed or tenet shall be read or taught in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by such revenue

or loan of credit; and no such appropriation or loan of credit shall be made to any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination, or promote its interests or tenets. This article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution; and it shall not have the effect to impair rights of property already vested.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to provide for the prevention or punishment of violations of this article."

August 11 this substitute was accepted for the House resolution by a vote of 27 to 15. August 14 the substitute was brought to vote upon its adoption. The vote stood 28 yeas to 16 nays. But as it requires a majority of two-thirds to adopt such a resolution, and as the vote fell two short of being two-thirds, the resolution was lost. This is the Edmunds amendment, and this is its history. And that was the last effort to amend the Constitution until May 25, 1888, when Senator Blair introduced his. And, as stated at the beginning, the Edmunds amendment is being advocated for introduction at the next Congress as well as the Blair amendment.

We have not space here to discuss the merit of the Edmunds resolution; we can only say now that it is an excellent illustration of how not to say it, and leave the fuller discussion of it until our next.

A. T. J.

An Unimpassioned Statement of the Case.

WE commend to our readers the following candid and unimpassioned statement, by the *Signs of the Times*, of the reasons why it cannot co-operate with the Prohibition party and with the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The reasons given are sound, and the second prevails with thousands of honest people in all denominations and in all parts of the country. The *Signs* says:—

This paper has from its very inception to the present time been an advocate of the prohibition of the liquor traffic; and, knowing this, some of our friends are unable to understand why we do not support the Prohibition party; and some have gone so far as to deny that we are in favor of prohibition at all because we do not co-operate in all things with those who have taken that name. We wish now to state our position so plainly that none can fail to understand it.

There are two reasons why we cannot and do not support the Prohibition party, though we advocate prohibition. The first of these reasons is, the *Signs of the Times* is not a political nor a party paper. We advocate only principles; the support of men and measures we, from the very nature of the case, leave to papers published for that purpose. In this we do not differ materially from the majority of religious papers.

Our second reason for not supporting the Prohibition party is that, whereas it advocates prohibition, in which we believe, it also advocates some things in which we do not believe. A single plank from the platform recently adopted by some six hundred delegates of the party assembled in convention in Pittsburg, Pa., will serve as an illustration. The plank is as follows:—

"Third—The Sabbath must be preserved by the due enforcement of existing laws and the speedy enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to insure its due observance."

We cannot conscientiously give our support, nor even our tacit consent, to this plank. The Sabbath is a religious institution, and its observance is an act of worship; its legal enforcement is, therefore,

the legal enforcement of religion, and that is foreign alike to the spirit of real Christianity and to our free institutions. In all matters of religion man is responsible alone to his God, and when the State attempts to interfere in any way in such matters it usurps the place and prerogatives of God. The tendency of Sunday laws is to destroy that sense of personal responsibility to God which is the basis of all true religion, and in the very nature of the case, under them, men learn to look not to God to know their duty toward him, but to the State.

Again, Sabbath laws are unjust. All do not regard the same day as sacred, nor do all agree upon the degree of sacredness which attaches to any particular day. It is manifestly unjust to compel the man who has kept Saturday, as many do, to keep Sunday also. To say the very least, the fourth commandment gives permission to all to labor six days, and certainly the man who has observed the seventh day according to the plain letter of that commandment has a divine right to work on the other six days; and not only so but he has a right to do any sort of work, or to follow any sort of business, which it would be right and proper for a Christian to do or follow upon any other day, always remembering the golden rule, to do as he would be done by. We should always be considerate of the rights and feelings of others, but this is just as obligatory upon one as upon another.

But obedience to the golden rule would defeat all Sunday laws, unless it might be useless provision requiring those to rest upon that day who want to do so. Certainly it is not doing to others as we would have them do to us, to require them to observe religious institutions in which they have no faith. If Christians, because they happen to be in the majority, have a right to require unbelievers to act one day in the week as though they believed, it follows that were the majority on the other side the unbelievers would have the right to require Christians to act, at least occasionally, as though they were infidels. But God has never given any such authority to anybody. The words of our Saviour, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's," have forever separated civil and religious duties and left the State without the vestige of an excuse for interfering in matters of religion.

The Sunday law of Pennsylvania is particularly objectionable because that under it conscientious Christian men have been, and may still be, fined and imprisoned for doing ordinary labor on the first day of the week after having religiously kept the seventh day. But the Prohibition party in that State not only favors the strict enforcement of that law, but demands the passage of still more stringent laws. Such a demand is neither Christian nor patriotic, and we certainly cannot join in it nor give it our sanction in any way. But even if the law did exempt from its provisions those who observe the day specified in the fourth commandment, we could not indorse it nor assent that it was right. It is a question which the State has no right to touch, nor can it do so without establishing a precedent most dangerous to religious liberty and to freedom of conscience. We have no quarrel with the Prohibition party so long as it confines itself to its legitimate work, and we stand aloof from that party, not that we love prohibition less, but that we love God and freedom to worship him according to the dictates of our own consciences more.

Papal Protestantism.

THE question of the Bible in the public schools has lately caused considerable discussion in Detroit. One preacher of that city, Rev. James M. Henderson, says on the subject:—

"I am in favor of introducing the Bible into the public schools. The Bible, as the standard of Protestant religion, should be retained, and Catholics whose children attend our public schools should accept our Protestant Bible. I do not believe that any Catholic is ever willing to have as the basis of the religious training of his children the Protestant Bible, but the Catholic children usually attend Catholic schools. Parents of children who do attend our public schools should accept our Protestant Bible without sectarian comment."

This shows the real purpose of the effort being made all over the land, and even in the religious attack made upon the national Constitution. It is simply to have the State establish the Protestant religion and enforce upon everybody the dictates of the Protestant church rulers.

Another preacher, Rev. Joseph W. Blanchard, sets forth the same doctrine in these words:—

"The public school should suit the majority, as this is a country where majorities rule. The majority of the people of this country are Christians, therefore the majority should rule. There ought to be Christian teaching in the public schools. The Bible should be read without note or comment, and the simple fundamental principles of Christianity taught."

It is true that he uses only the terms Christian and Christianity to describe the religious teaching which they propose to force upon others; but he means only *Protestant* Christian teaching and *Protestant* Christianity. But it might not prove so in the end. Protestants might be in the minority in a little while, then it is probable that the Roman Catholics would be in the majority—it is so already in about a dozen of the States—and if the Catholic majority should force the reading of the Catholic Bible and Catholic instruction upon all the rest of the people at the public expense, that would probably put another face upon the matter. If some way could be invented by which these particular individuals could be compelled to take some of their own medicine administered by Roman Catholics, it would be an excellent thing. It might be possible in that way to reach their reason.

Rev. F. Grenell sees the matter in a much better light, and says:—

"Right is not decided by majorities, even though the majority be right."

Yet how fast this wicked principle of majority rule in matters of religion and the conscience, is growing. But this question "is not a question of majorities or minorities, for if the conscience of the majority is to be the standard, then there is no such thing as right of conscience at all. It is against the predominance and power of majorities that the rights of conscience are protected, and have need to be." And those who call themselves Protestants are not the only people in the world who have a conscience.

A. T. J.

God Has Drawn the Line.

SECRETARIES GAULT and GRAY, of the American Sabbath Union, do not believe that as a political maxim, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." This statement is quoted and indorsed by the *Christian Statesman*, official organ of the National Reform Association. We may ask, From whom do these gentlemen believe that these powers are derived? They answer, "From God." Very well; then they must be believers in the divine right of kings and rulers,

and that whosoever rebels against governmental authority, rebels against God. If this is true, then they must believe that our government has no right to exist, for it is the outcome of a rebellion. But say they, We do not believe that the powers that be are ordained of God to such an extent that men ought never to rebel against them; but that when the power of the government is exerted unjustly men have the right to rebel. When they make this admission they surrender the whole ground, for if God has not delegated to the rulers of earth absolute power over their subjects in all things, then he has drawn the line somewhere. This he has done in the words, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's," thus reserving unto himself the things pertaining to him, and delegating to man the regulation of those things pertaining to man.

H. H. FISHER.

National Reform Infidelity.

WE have just chanced to pick up an old copy of the *Christian Statesman*, the issue of July 7, 1887, in which there is an article entitled, "The Bible in our Public Schools." This article is referred to editorially as "a masterly article;" and therefore whatever statements are contained in it may be considered as voicing the views of the *Statesman* and of its party. We have not time or space at present to review the article as a whole, but simply call attention to the following paragraph, under the sub-head, "Historical Value of the Bible." The writer says:—

"There is another aspect of this subject which seems to be generally overlooked, viz., *Is the use of the Bible in our public schools entirely and exclusively a religious question?*—I think not. Ought the Bible to be used as a text-book?—Most decidedly I think it ought, and for these reasons: Viewed simply as *literature* the Bible is a collection of valuable ancient manuscripts coming to us from a most respectable source—natural and national history, poetry, biography, axiomatic philosophy, etc. Are not the histories of the ancient giants and Noah, of Nimrod and of Babel, of Abraham, Jacob, David, and Daniel as good secular history as anything collected from ancient sources by Rollin, Rawlinson, and Layard? Is not the poetry of the book of Psalms, and Job, and Isaiah, quite as good as that contained in the works written by Homer and Virgil? Are not the biblical narratives associated with Nineveh, Damascus, and Memphis, with Hebron and Jerusalem, quite as valuable secular truth as anything recorded elsewhere about Sparta or Athens, Rome or Carthage? The earthquake of Lisbon was not a more real and historical event than that previous earthquake by which Korah, Dathan, and Abiram were engulfed; the volcanic overthrow of Sodom in the vale of Siddim is quite as good secular history as is the overthrow of Pompeii in the neighborhood of Mount Vesuvius; Robin Hood and his "merrie men" outlawed in the forest, or Rob Roy in his Highland cave with his classman, is a story not a whit more natural or secular than David in the cave of Adullam; the ethics of Solomon are quite as valuable in a purely terrestrial sense as anything that comes to us from Socrates or Plato; the voyages of Solomon's fleet, and the voyage of Paul from Cæsarea to Rome by way of Malta, were events quite as instructive from a secular point of view as the voyages of the ancient Argonauts, Carthaginians, or Phœnicians, or of the Puritan Pilgrims across the Atlantic. The God of Sinai is quite as respectable (and probably quite as real) as any deity of Olympus; and the religious ceremonies of the tabernacle in the wilderness, as the temple on Moriah, form as real history and quite as good secular morals as anything religious emanating either from Egypt or from regions called classic. All the biblical narratives (I wish to emphasize) are genuine secular history in these senses, viz., the events occurred on earth; the actors and writers were real men and women; those events, those facts, those literary productions, those religious ceremonies, oc-

curred during certain secular periods within certain geographical limits, and are not to be relegated to the transcendental and prehistoric regions of the legendary and mythical. Nay, I fearlessly assert that the story of Jesus of Nazareth is, in the proper sense, as good secular history as that of Julius Cæsar, or Ghengis Khan, or Napoleon; and the apostolic narrative called the Acts, as any extant chronicles of the Hierarchy or history of the Plantagenets."

Just think of it, the Bible placed on a level with secular history, and declared to be secular history! the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah compared to the overthrow of Pompeii! Robin Hood compared with David! the Proverbs of Solomon compared with the sayings of Socrates and Plato! and to crown all, the blasphemous comparison of the God of Sinai with the deities of Olympus, and he placed on a level with them! and the incomparable story of Jesus of Nazareth compared with Julius Cæsar, Ghengis Khan, and Napoleon! We say that such comparisons are simply blasphemous; and no one who has any respect for sacred history will dissent from the statement. There is no likeness whatever between the biblical narrative and the tales of secular writers, except that they were real occurrences. But this point we would emphasize, and that is that, apart from the religious features of it, the historical narrative has no point whatever. The simplest historical statements of the Old Testament were written by inspiration of God as much as the highest flights of Isaiah or Ezekiel. They are written for the spiritual encouragement and the moral upbuilding of those who read them; and they derive their whole force and importance from their religious character. To teach them as mere secular history is to lose sight of the real object of them. Nay, more, it is to lower the Bible to the level of human productions.

We know that a great deal is said about the necessity of a knowledge of Old Testament history in order to a liberal education. But we affirm that one might as well not study the Bible at all as to study it from a mere secular standpoint. The Jewish nation was not a vast one; they were, as Moses said, "the fewest of all people." Their territory was exceedingly small, and their place in the history of the world is exceedingly insignificant, if we separate it from the vital religious truths that their history is designed to convey. Looking at it from the standpoint of inspiration and religion, their history is the most important of all history; and the Bible narrative is the key which unlocks all history; and the Bible is the point from which the study of all history should begin; but divorced from religion it means nothing whatever.

It would be utterly impossible for anyone to bring a stronger charge against the movement to teach the Bible in the public schools than is afforded in the paragraph above quoted. The advocates of that movement may style its opposers infidels if they choose; but in the face of such a lowering of the divine word, and of such secularizing on the Bible, we think that all thoughtful Christians will unite with us in saying that the movement is an infidel movement from beginning to end; and that the success of the National Reform movement to have the Bible taught in the public schools would mark the inauguration of a period of infidelity that could find no parallel outside of France in the time of the revolution. In the face of articles that show such an utter ignorance of the true character of the Bible, so light a regard for it as to compare it, not simply with secular history, but with the narratives of fiction,

we think we are justified in declaring the so-called National Reform movement to be not Christian, but infidel and atheistic in its tendency. Let the National Reformers clear themselves from this charge if they can. E. J. W.

The Commonwealth of Souls!

THE *Christian Statesman* of July 4, 1889, says that:—

"The moral and religious needs of the army and navy of the United States have been brought before several church courts within a year or two, and action has been taken looking to—

"1. The appointment of chaplains in such numbers as to provide for every post occupied by troops.

"2. A movement to secure the convocation of the chaplains in annual session for conference about their work, and for devising new and improved methods.

"3. The setting apart of the Sabbath on or immediately preceding the Fourth of July as Army and Navy Day, on which one service, at least, will be held in connection with that patriotic occasion, when special prayers shall be offered, and the attention of the congregations called to the duty of the church toward the naval and military forces of the country, which are maintained for the supremacy of authority and defense of our orders, who, by the manner of life required in the service of their country, imperil both soul and body for the common good.

"4. That gambling be prohibited in the army and the navy.

"5. That the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage be prohibited.

"6. That the rights of Christian officers and men to a conscientious observance of the holy Sabbath be guaranteed against invasion by superiors in requiring any duty not exigent and unavoidable.

"7. That a commission of five, with a corresponding secretary, be appointed to co-operate with like commissions from other churches in obtaining, as soon as possible, the legislation necessary to secure the above-mentioned improvement in the moral and religious condition of our soldiers and marines; and also to act as a board to examine and recommend for appointment to the position of chaplain, such ministers as may apply for such position."

When the legislation necessary to secure all that has been adopted, then, how far will the country be from a union of Church and State? How far from a church domination in civil affairs? But beside all this, whoever before heard of any man's imperiling his soul for the public good? What good can any man do to the public by imperiling his soul ten thousand times? A man cannot do the public, nor himself, nor anyone else, any good by imperiling his soul. He can do only harm to himself, and, perhaps indirectly by his influence, to others. A man cannot imperil his soul except in the way of sin, and sin never can be for the common good, nor any other kind of good.

Sin is the only thing that can ever imperil anybody's soul. Suppose then that the commonwealth of souls were imperiled, and for the common good of souls the men in the army and navy, one and all, by some masterly stroke of sin, imperil their souls for the common good; what possible benefit could ever that be to any soul? It would only the more certainly imperil the souls of those who did it.

But all this is consistent with the National Reform idea of the oneness of moral and civil things. Civil government is for the common good. If a man can imperil his soul for the common good, it must be that the souls of men are a part of the commonwealth, and when anyone sees the commonwealth of souls in danger he shall imperil his for the common good! Did such wild nonsense ever get into the brain of anybody but a National Reformer?

A. T. J.

A Fatal Alliance.

THE zealous sectarians of Washington Territory have been unusually active in procuring signatures to petitions asking the Legislature in session at Olympia to pass laws exempting church property from taxation. This was one of the important questions before the people during our recent visit to the upper country. The position of all Jewish-American citizens on this subject is well known. They are unflinching opponents of any alliance between Church and State, since history teaches that all such alliances have been fatal to individual rights and the liberty of the people. This is strikingly illustrated in the history of Italy, of Spain, and of Mexico, and of other countries. The colonies of America under English rule give further proof of the danger of an alliance of Church and State. The dominant sect, taking advantage of this union of the civil and the ecclesiastical law, persecuted the minor sects, and did not hesitate to inflict torture upon all who dissented from the ruling sect. The colonies but followed the cruel, remorseless code of religious Europe, both before and after the Reformation.

With these facts before us, we deemed it our bounden duty to oppose, with all the influence at our command, the scheme of the various sects that sought to accomplish a result which we know would be a virtual union of Church and State in Washington Territory, so far as the non-taxation of church property is concerned. We delivered an address on the subject before a mixed audience in the Unitarian Church at Tacoma, which seemed to reflect the views of the liberal and enlightened portion of the community. The Unitarians and other liberal-minded Christian sects are, like ourselves, the avowed opponents of the marriage of Church and State, as are that great body of citizens who, while deeply religious by nature, are not communicants of any church. Conspicuous among our best and noblest friends at Tacoma as a resolute opponent of Church and State alliance, is Rev. Mr. Copeland, pastor of the Unitarian Church of that city. The reverend gentleman has the courage of his convictions, and on the point under discussion his intelligent congregation heartily coincide with him.

Underlying this important subject are some fundamental truths which should not be forgotten, and which, kept constantly in view, are bulwarks to strengthen citizens in their duty towards the State. Under our republican system of government the observance of religion is purely a *private act*, and the Constitution of the United States solemnly prohibits all interference on the part of the State as to the manner in which each citizen may worship according to the dictates of his conscience. All church property, under the real letter and spirit of the national Constitution, is *private property*, and should be taxed like any other private property. The church must pay for protection like the citizen. It is manifestly unjust and unconstitutional that a vast religious corporation, owning millions of dollars worth of real estate, with costly temples thereon, in the heart of great cities, should go untaxed, while the house and lot of the humble carpenter, shoemaker, tailor, or other tradesman, are taxed to the cent. In some States this crying injustice is still perpetrated in defiance of the national Constitution, but fortunately California is not burdened with this relic of barbarism still existing in other commonwealths of the Union. The American people have shattered the fetters and chains forged by

priests and kings to keep mankind in bondage of mental and moral degradation, but alas! there still exists among certain sects in this country an evil and lurking spirit that would again gladly welcome a fatal union of Church and State. To carry on a peaceful, unending war against this evil spirit of sectarian fanaticism, until it is educated to obey the civil power, is the sacred duty of all true lovers of civil and religious liberty.—*Jewish Times*.

Hear "The Church Union."

IN the August issue of the above paper we read the following: "The Russian Government seems to favor church union, and manifests the same in its own autocratic way. In that country it shall be the 'Greek' Church or nothing. No other is permitted to have a secure footing. Only the other day the Lutherans numbered many thousands (twenty, we are informed), who had long worshiped within the empire of the czar; and now they are prohibited. Their fate is, however, that of all the other evangelical people who are of a like citizenship, and who refuse to acknowledge the ecclesiastical headship of the reigning monarch.

"Whilst we do, of course, condemn this 'heroic' surgery, even in a cause the principle of which is sound—a surgery to which freemen would never submit—[Why not, if the principle be sound?] yet we have been sometimes tempted to wish that there were some authority the rational exercise of which would render impossible the further continuance of useless denominations of Christian believers, or the needless formation of new ones in the future! Meanwhile, in the absence of such a power, the appeal must be made to that piety in the churches which will not forever allow bigotry to get the better of sober thoughtfulness."

The above article, if submitted to the pope, would secure his eager approbation, and at the earliest hour possible he would be glad to favor the friends of "The Church Union" by using such "authority" as "would render impossible the further continuance" and "formation" of Protestant denominations. Then, friends, after having been forced to unite with the Roman Catholic Church, your yearning after "Church Union" would be satisfied, we presume, and perhaps you, in anticipation, date the millennium from that event. Or is it possible that we misunderstand? for another version of the above would be, that the only objection you have to the Russian tyrannical attempts at church union, "the principle of which is sound" (1?), is the accidental fact that it is the Russian Government in the enviable position of "power" and "authority," and not the supporters of "The Church Union," whoever they may be. Excuse us for misunderstanding; but you should speak plainer. Or do you find it advisable to wear the sheep's clothing? "Meanwhile," may God, in his infinite mercy, continue "the absence of such a power" from our beloved country, for its *presence* would mark his just wrath over our sins. Include this petition in your prayer, dear reader, the more so since such "piety in the churches" is already "bigotry," and not "sober thoughtfulness."—*A. M., in Lutheran Witness, Sept. 7.*

"I CHARGE thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, preach the word."

Church and State.

THE New Mexico constitutional convention, now in session at Santa Fe, has been addressed in an open letter by Archbishop Salpointe, defining the Roman Catholic position on education, and appealing to the convention to shape the new constitution in accordance with it. If the request should be acceded to, the constitution of New Mexico would be radically different from that of any existing constitution in the United States, either State or territorial, says the *Denver News*. It would be a radical innovation upon the spirit of the national organic law, and upon the practice of the respective States. The archbishop wants an association of Church and State, by which the State shall provide for religious instructions in the public schools, to be supported from the school fund, supplemented by general taxation. He cites the Canadian and European plans to illustrate his meaning. The proposition is deadly to a principle that underlies this free government, and that is essential to its perpetuity. The alliance of Church and State it contemplates is unfavorable to civil liberty and to spiritual progress. Our present system has worked for more than a century with better results than any other known to history. Would it be wise to transform the government in a matter of vital importance by borrowing an educational system from Canada or from Europe? The Canadian method has pitted one province of the dominion against the rest in a war of treasonable bigotry and religious hate. What European country do we care to select as an example in this particular? Are not the superior advantages of the United States in giving humanity a chance conceded by the oppressed of every land? Does not the flow of immigration, aggregating more than seven millions, affirmatively answer the question? Why, then, seek a radical change in the government? Will anyone question that the archbishop asks for a fundamental change? There is no better authority on this point than Judge Cooley, who, in his "Constitution Limitations," enumerates among those things which are not lawful under any of the American institutions, "the compulsory support, by taxation or otherwise, of religious instruction. Not only is no one denomination to be favored at the expense of the rest, but all support of religious instruction must be entirely voluntary."

With such a revolution backward as Archbishop Salpointe would provide for in the constitution of New Mexico, the territory would not stand one-half the chance of getting into the Union that Utah would, with polygamy in its most rampart stage; and what is more, the admission of Utah with polygamy would not involve a tithe of the danger to the nation that would be inseparable from the archbishop's proposition, should it be adopted. This country has a moral force to overcome polygamy in a single commonwealth, but the sacrifice of the public-school system in only one State, by recognizing an alliance that has proved a blighting curse to the human race, would be an entering wedge that would stimulate a controversy of the most wretched kind that can afflict a people. The archbishop's idea is imported. It is not American, but is hostile to American liberty. In the several constitutions lately adopted by the northern Territories it is not heard of.

Concessions have been made touching the public schools for nearly fifty years, and even now there is an overwhelming spirit of fairness that is

willing and anxious to protect the rights of all. But the line has been drawn against the first step that points against their disintegration and destruction. Nine-tenths of the American people will sustain our system of popular education intact, and the proportion will never be diminished. Time, progress, and civilization are all with the majority in this case.

The contest that has been plainly outlined on the school question involves alienations and antagonisms among the people of a common country, who have hitherto lived happily together and enjoyed a degree of prosperity unequalled in the annals of time. Under our common schools peoples of many nations and various creeds have become Americans, brothers in patriotism, sincerely respecting each other's religious convictions, but free from the most pitiable sentiment that ever dishonored manhood,—religious bigotry and narrow intolerance. Moreover, under this system, all forms of religion have evinced a vitality that they possess nowhere else. But the mandate has gone forth that there must be strife. It is due to a force that in the interest of society has been repeatedly suppressed by leading nations, and that was once distinguished as a danger by the papal authority, a proposition that lasted for nearly forty years. The same force now controls the destinies of the church, and in undertaking to stem the tide of intellectual progress it has shattered Catholicism in Europe, aggravated the causes that turned Italy against the Vatican, and nearly finished the process of making France infidel. It now assumes to revolutionize this government by a union of Church and State for educational purposes, a step in the direction of ecclesiastical ascendancy.—*Hoof and Horn, the Stockman's Journal of Arizona.*

The Sunday Question.

OPPOSITION to evil institutions because of their evil effects is, we think, a justifiable procedure; but opposition to one institution in the spirit of rivalry for the purpose of proselyting to another, is on a par with the act of one individual trying to gain by causing another individual to lose—attempting to climb up by pulling others down. But the phase of this subject which should stir to vigilance every truly American citizen is the movement back of, and principal to, this Sunday reconnoissance, the Sunday-law movement being but the thin end of the union-of-State-and-Church wedge that is thus insidiously trying to get vantage-ground in the nation; a wedge that if allowed to enter in the least will split wide open this Union and baptize our now glorious country in the blood of civil war once more, as surely as Americans love liberty as much as they love life!

The reason given by Dr. Crafts for closing theaters and saloons may be a good basis for ecclesiastical law governing the church membership, but, as a reason for State interference, it is naught. To enact and enforce laws that have as their only or their chief object, directly or indirectly, proselytism, is to unite the functions of Church and State, making the latter subservient to the former at that, which is contrary to the principles of this republic and the spirit of this nation. If attendance at theaters and saloons on Sunday are crimes as man against man, then abate them by law for *that* reason; if the theaters and saloons are simply successful rivals of the churches, that is the church's, and not the State's affair, and they should compete with these counter-attractions as best they can.

Rev. W. D. Gray, secretary of the Missouri Sabbath Union, an auxiliary of the American Sabbath Union, defines the object of this organization as follows:—

"I do not believe that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and so the object of this movement [to secure Sunday legislation] is an effort to *change that feature of the fundamental law!*"

Is this not striking at the vitals of the republic? Is there no impending danger to our country when within is a powerful national association with auxiliaries in nearly every State plotting and working, confessedly, to "change that feature of the fundamental law" which constitutes this a free country? Destroy the American principle of "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and the chief corner-stone of the republic is destroyed, and in its place substituted the chief corner-stone of monarchism, viz., "the divine right of kings;" and our hundred years' "experiment" will have proved a failure, to the great delectation of the monarchists who have been prophesying that result, and the hopes of liberty-loving people everywhere will be blasted.

Anarchism may threaten us, but compared with the insidious National Reform foe, anarchism is simply limputian. "No danger!" say many; but well do we remember the same delusive assurance in 1860-61!

Let everyone who has at heart the perpetuity of the basic principles of our government, and the liberties they vouchsafe alike to all loyal citizens, beware of being entrapped by this "Sabbath union" scheme of the State-church party. Investigate thoroughly before signing any petition, however innocent it may appear at a first superficial view. Remember that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."—*Silver Gate, August 24.*

Will They Compromise?

THE *California Prohibitionist* argues thus in favor of a Sunday law:—

"To Prohibitionists, especially, should it commend itself, inasmuch as it grants us one-seventh of what we are after, and puts in our hands the necessary legal appliances for enforcement. That this is a great gain over the unrestricted reign of the saloon, not only in its direct results, but also in its indirect influence, as an example of the benefits of prohibition, admits of no question. We do not contend that Sunday prohibition and Sunday rest is the end for which we should strive; but if we can secure it incidentally, we believe it will hasten the day of our final victory, and so prove a blessed factor in the advancement of sobriety and good government."

We do not see how Prohibitionists can take such ground as this. They very properly oppose high license on the ground that it is a compromise measure. Is not Sunday closing the same? There is scarcely an argument used against high license which cannot be urged with equal force against Sunday closing of saloons. When it has once been introduced, those liquor sellers who are able to remain in the business are all in favor of high license because it gives them a monopoly of the business, and already some saloon men have declared in favor of Sunday closing, for the reason that it gives them a day off each week without materially reducing their receipts. The most of those who want to drink on Sunday will procure their liquor on Saturday if they know that they cannot get it on Sunday, and we would not be surprised to see ere long many of the liquor men wheeling into line for a Sunday law. Indeed, this has already been foreshadowed by the sug-

gestion made in a Sunday-law convention in San Francisco, that the saloon keeper should "have a chance to rest on the Sabbath."

Certainly, why not? And we have seen it plainly stated by at least one Prohibitionist in a so-called Prohibition paper, that if the saloons would close on Sunday it would be about all that could be reasonably asked.

A Peculiar Sabbath.

W. F. CRAFTS, field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, who is traveling about the country establishing auxiliary State unions, has again visited Omaha to see what progress the society he established here two months ago is making. At the only meeting held by that organization, Bishop Worthington was elected temporary chairman and T. H. Taylor secretary. Since then the society has slept the sleep of the just.

The national union has been in operation two years, and Mr. Crafts prides himself in having started auxiliary societies in nearly every State in the country. Some of the alleged evils he is fighting are the running of Sunday trains, and the issuing of wicked Sunday-morning papers.

Mr. Crafts endeavored to infuse a little life into the local organization at the Y. M. C. A. rooms at 3 P. M., and this evening he will deliver a lecture at the same place on the proper observance of the Christian Sabbath. No admission fee will be charged, but a collection will be taken up.—*Omaha Bee, Sept. 25, 1889.*

IN discussing the Sunday-law question the *California Prohibitionist* says:—

"That the provisions of the proposed law may not oppress any who conscientiously and honestly observe another day of the week as a day of rest, all such are to be excepted from its application. Under these circumstances it would certainly seem as though the movement were worthy of the support and cooperation of all good citizens."

This is only to say that those who observe a day other than Sunday should join those who observe that day in forcing it upon those who have no religious regard for any day. But that would only be to violate the golden rule, for no man would wish to have another compel him to keep a day which he did not wish to observe and for which he had no feelings of reverence. The seventh-day observer who admits for a moment the propriety of a Sunday law with an exemption clause in his favor grants, though it may be unwittingly, the right of the State to legislate upon the subject, and in so admitting gives his case away, for it is as plain as the noonday sun that if the State has the right to coerce the unbeliever and compel him to keep Sunday, it has the same right to require the same thing of the Jew and the seventh-day Christian.

THERE is merit in the order of the Secretary of the Navy that hereafter when the flag of the nation is raised at morn and lowered at sunset in the nation, the representatives of the navy present shall face the colors and salute, and if bands are on the ships they shall greet the flag with the music of national airs. These ceremonials are disciplinary, will daily renew the sentiment of the flag, and impress more and more deeply respect for the symbol of our liberties. It must have, also, an impressive effect upon lookers-on. It is a simple and proper observance, and that the salutation to the flag should have so fallen into disuse as to necessitate this new order, proves the need for it.—*Sacramento Daily Record-Union.*

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.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

They perfectly secure pen in the pocket, so that it cannot fall when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.



- PRICES. No. 1, Russia Leather, for 2 pens, 10c. No. 2, " " " 8 " 15c. No. 3, " " metal back, 2 pens, 15c. No. 4, Russia Leather, metal back, 8 pens, 20c. No. 5, Seal Skin, for 2 pens, 15c. No. 6, " " " 8 " 25c. No. 7, Russia Leather, for 4 pens, 25c. Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets SUPERIOR IN EVERY PARTICULAR to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices. Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

PACIFIC Business College, 320 Post St., S. F. Life Scholarship, \$75. Send for Catalogue.

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

Dallas Weekly News.

The Leading Weekly of the Southwest; 12 Pages, 72 Columns. Contains Farm News, Stock News, General News, in fact, all the news. Ladies' and Children's Special Departments. Free Premium List. A PICTURE FREE OF CHARGE. All those subscribing for one year prior to Oct. 1, 1889, will receive free of charge a copy of the celebrated picture entitled "The Horse Fair." Terms, \$1.25 a year; cash in advance. Address, A. H. BELO & Co., Publishers, Dallas, Texas. Sample Copies Free to any Address.

West Shore Railroad N. Y. C. & H. R. R. Co. 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.

A \$70 SEWING MACHINE FOR \$50.00. A new "NEW HOME" sewing machine, six drawer, latest improved attachments, new style woodwork, complete, FOR SALE FOR \$50. THE MACHINE HAS NEVER BEEN USED. Now is Your Chance to Get a Good Machine Cheap. Address, S. N. CURTISS, Box 1584. Oakland, Cal.

SAN FRANCISCO Business COLLEGE, MURPHY BUILDING, MARKET ST. LITE SCHOOL BUILDING, 215 S. MARKET ST. Monthly Tuition, \$12.00.

THE National Sunday Law

Argument by Alonzo T. Jones, in behalf of the rights of American citizens, and in opposition to the Blair Sunday-Rest Bill, which Mr. Jones presented before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, December 13, 1888. Mr. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

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

As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially Legislators, Lawyers, Judges, and other public men. The argument is based on scripture and history, constitution and law, showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday Bill, an analysis of the Sunday Laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the Sunday Law movement of the fourth century, the Sunday Law movement of the nineteenth century, the methods used in securing indorsements to the petition for the Blair Bill, and the workings of such Sunday laws as are proposed for the United States. The work contains 192 pages and will be sent postpaid on receipt of 25 cents.

Send for it! Read it! Send it to your Friends! Address all orders to PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 12th and Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal. Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

Charles Dickens' THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN - ONE YEAR FOR ONLY - Two Dollars.

Sir Walter Scott's THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN - ONE YEAR FOR ONLY - Two Dollars.

THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN offers to subscribers as a premium their choice of either the complete works of Charles Dickens or Sir Walter Scott for two dollars. The books are all beautifully printed and substantially bound in paper covers. Every subscriber to THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN also receives the Newspaper Library—six volumes. Thus for two dollars the subscriber may get twenty-one volumes of standard books, and THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN one year. Nothing equal to it was ever offered to the public before. Address, CRAMER, AIKENS & CRAMER, Milwaukee, Wis.



9 Cords in 10 HOURS. Runs Easy. NO BACKACHE. BY ONE MAN. Write for descriptive catalogue containing testimonials from hundreds of people who have saved from 4 to 9 cords daily. 25,000 now successfully used. Agency can be had where there is a vacancy. A NEW INVENTION for filing saws sent free with each machine, by the use of this tool everybody can file their own saws now and do it better than the greatest expert can without it. Adapted to all cross-cut saws. Every one who owns a saw should have one. Ask your dealers or write FOLDING SAWING MACHINE CO., 508 to 511 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill.

THE WHOLE WORLD WILL SOON TAKE THE NEW YORK WORLD.

Table showing circulation growth from 1882 to 1888, comparing The World and The New York World.

BURIED CITIES RECOVERED;

OR, Explorations in Bible Lands.

BY REV. FRANK S. DEHASS, D. D. (Late U. S. Consul at Jerusalem.)

THE LATEST! THE MOST AUTHENTIC! THE MOST READABLE BOOK PUBLISHED ON EGYPT, PALESTINE AND THE ORIENT!

A BOOK FOR EVERY CHRISTIAN. THE FULFILLMENT OF ANCIENT PROPHECIES AS SHOWN BY THE LIGHT OF MODERN DISCOVERIES; A CORROBORATED HISTORY OF THE BIBLE FOUND WRITTEN ON STONE; THE ATHEIST AND SKEPTIC DEFEATED ON THEIR OWN GROUND.

NEARLY 200 ILLUSTRATIONS FROM ORIGINAL PHOTOGRAPHS AND SKETCHES.

Fine Paper, Neat Binding, Clear and Beautiful Type.

The book is octavo in size, has over 600 pages, and contains nearly 200 beautiful illustrations. The paper and type were especially selected to meet the requirements of this work, while the binding is both ornate and at the same time most substantial.

The illustrations are nearly all either sketched or photographed from life, and in their preparation for the press the most artistic processes known to the trade have been employed.

- Fine English Cloth, Black and Gold Stamp on Side and Back, Sprinkled Edges, \$3 50
Fine English Cloth, Black and Gold Stamp on Side and Back, Gilt Edges, 4 00
Fine French Turkey Morocco, Full Gilt Sides and Edges 6 00

We will send books postpaid, at above prices where we have no agent. Agents of ability can coin money in the sale of this book. Send \$1.50 for prospectus, outfit, and terms to agents to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Or 43 Bond Street, New York. OAKLAND, CAL.

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.

Civil Government and Religion.

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

Scriptural, Logical, Plain and Forcible.

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

"CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION" Is a pamphlet of 176 large octavo pages. Price 25 cents. Millions of copies should be placed in the hands of thinking people AT ONCE. It clearly defines what position we, as American citizens, should sustain toward the effort now on foot to secure religious legislation. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 12th and Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal. Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

THE WHITE IS KING!

Always in the Lead. New Improvements! New Woodwork! The Best to Use, The Best to Sell. White Sewing Machine Co., 108 & 110 POST ST., S. F. F. S. PRESCOTT, Gen. Man'r.

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, 16 cents; 20 copies, post-paid, \$2.25. Address: PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER 23, 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 *California Prohibitionist*, August 1, very wisely says:—

"If Cincinnati wants to settle the contest with the saloon in the easiest manner, let her close the saloons every day in the week as well as Sunday. There is no sense in allowing the traffic six days in which to get up muscle with which to fight the law on the seventh."

THE Omaha, Neb., *Bee*, of September 25, has this item:—

"Rev. Wilbur Crafts, of New York, the traveling secretary of the New York branch of the Y. M. C. A., is in the city, and it was announced that he would deliver lectures yesterday afternoon and evening on the subject of 'Sabbath Observance.' In both the afternoon and evening the attendance was so light that it was deemed best to postpone the lecture indefinitely, which was done."

REFERRING to the efforts of Italy to curb church interference in political matters, the *Catholic Review* says:—

"The new code consists of over four hundred articles, divided into three books, of which the only important ones are those which refer to the clergy and the church. These are intended to muzzle effectively the mouths of priests and bishops, and because of their sacerdotal powers deprive them of their rights as men and citizens. The code will do this very nicely, and the clergy will not even enjoy the melancholy French privilege of writing letters. This gives immense satisfaction to the devil and the sectarian press of America, who cannot see with what success this code will one day be turned against themselves."

This shows something of the feeling which exists in Italy; and it also shows that it has grown out of the principle of ecclesiastical interference in politics—the very evil which is being so assiduously cultivated by so-called Protestants at the present time in our own country.

REFERRING to the Sunday-law agitation, the *California Prohibitionist* says:—

"It must be borne in mind that this is not a religious movement in itself, or disposed to establish a union of Church and State. It simply recognizes a benign natural law that one rest day in seven is necessary to the highest welfare of body and mind, and seeks to bring the laws of the State into harmony with the natural law; not in order primarily that the cause of religion may be advanced, but that the citizen may be protected in his rights to a weekly cessation from his life of toil, and that the character and power of his citizenship may be improved and strengthened by a regular day for recreation and self-improvement. The idea is that the State shall simply command a day of cessation from all public works except those of mercy and necessity. The manner in which the day shall be spent aside from the matter of labor, is to be left entirely to the individual conscience."

If it be indeed true that this is not a religious movement, how comes it that the prime movers in it are religionists? When have ministers as a class ever originated any movement in the interests of either labor or health? Disguise the fact as they may, it is none the less true that with the prime movers for Sunday legislation the religious charter of the day is the mainspring of action. What they want is not a day for rec-

reation in the general acceptance of the word, but for religion; they think and say that when all the ordinary avenues of business and pleasure shall have been closed, the people will, to use their own words, "naturally gravitate toward the churches."

THE *Advance* of August 29 says:—

"It will doubtless be a surprise to most of our readers to learn what immense sums the Roman Catholics have been drawing from the national government for their Indian schools. The whole amount received by the Congregationalists for their schools among the Indians the past year was about \$23,000. But the following figures, taken from the *Dakota Catholic*, show how much the Roman Catholics have received since 1884: 1884, \$65,220; 1885, \$113,614; 1886, \$148,744; 1887, \$214,760; 1888, \$244,677; 1889, \$344,545; and this coming year they expect to draw \$431,930. What would be the effect should the government wholly withhold its appropriations from all mission schools? This need not imply any hindrance put in the way of religious schools and missions sustained by the churches, nor that the government would be under any sort of obligation to employ as agents and teachers of Indians men and women who have no religion, or none to speak of."

The suggestions so cautiously made by the *Advance*, that it would be better for the government to withhold all appropriations from mission schools, is a good one. The effect would be that the Indians would get much more and better religious instruction than they do now. The best thing the government could do for the Indians would be to teach them the arts of civilization, and allow those who have a real burden for their spiritual welfare to teach them Christianity.

A MAN named Conklin, whose arrest in Forsyth County, Ga., on a charge of Sabbath breaking, was noted recently in *Freethought*, has just been tried, found guilty, and fined \$25 and costs, which amount in all to \$46.80. Conklin's offense was cutting wood on Sunday to cook a meal of victuals with. It was shown at this trial that all the people of that section are accustomed to work up their wood as they use it, on Sunday or any other day, but Conklin is a Seventh-day Adventist. He observes Saturday religiously, and the neighbors thought that he was trying to displace the Sabbath of their forefathers, and therefore informed upon him and had him arrested. Conklin is described as a good and industrious citizen, who pays his honest debts and is respected by all as a man. It seems that works of necessity are allowable on Sunday in Georgia; that Conklin performed no other work than such as was admitted by all to be necessary, but the State's attorneys took a purely religious view of the matter, and prosecuted him, not so much for his offense against the State as for being a Seventh-day Adventist.—*Freethought*.

THE *Christian Statesman*, of September 12, refers with the highest approbation to the published report of the suppression of a base-ball game at Hamilton, Ohio, on Sunday, August 25. It says, "The good example should be widely published and everywhere imitated." We should like for some of the people who favor such actions as this to point out what there is about a base-ball game that is uncivil on Sunday any more than on any other day. No one pretends that the playing of a game of base-ball is uncivil in any sense. It cannot be shown that it is in any way uncivil on Sunday, and it is not because of any incivility in it that they propose to suppress it on Sunday. Nor is this all; the playing of

base-ball is not even irreligious. It is true that men who are not religious play base-ball. It is equally true that men who are religious, and strictly so, can play base-ball and still be religious. Then it is not because the playing of base-ball is either uncivil or irreligious that they propose to suppress it on Sunday; it is solely because Sunday is held by certain people to be a religious day, and that it is to be devoted to religious exercises; and as the playing of base-ball is not a religious exercise, therefore it is not consistent with the religious observance of a day. Consequently the only purpose of the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws is to enforce the observance of it as a religious day. It is to compel people who are not religious to pay religious tribute to those who pretend to be religious. But if the government is to do this in one thing when it is demanded, why not in everything else as it may be demanded, and have a thorough-going union of Church and State at once. That will be the inevitable outcome of a national Sunday law.

THERE is a conflict of opinion in this country as to whether the Sunday sermon or the Sunday newspaper is the most conducive to the mental health of the public, and as to which in the end will illustrate the inexorable law of "the survival of the fittest." As to the survival features of the question, I think the sermon and the Sunday newspaper are here to stay, at least so long as in either case the thing is a paying speculation. The serious phase of the subject is that the preachers are attempting to suppress the Sunday paper on purely religious grounds, that is, that its publication is an enemy of the Christian Sabbath, because thousands find pleasure in reading the Sunday editions instead of going to church. The editors of the secular press think they have as much right to deliver their papers on Sunday as the preachers have to deliver their sermons. This is a matter of greater importance to all classes and all sects than it seems on its face, for the reason that if the ministers should succeed in suppressing Sunday newspapers, the suppression of other great public necessities would follow, as, for instance, the street-cars, cable lines, ferry-boats, etc.—*Jewish Times and Observer*.

LAST April the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union wrote to the *Chicago Advance* these words:—

"The only defensible and practicable Sabbath reform is that which uncompromisingly agitates for an impartial suppression of all Sunday work for gain, save works of real necessity and mercy."

Yet the American Sabbath Union is asking for a law which shall exempt, so far as ordinary work is concerned, those who observe a day other than Sunday. Is it not then, according to its field secretary, asking for a law which is both indefensible and impracticable?

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.