

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 30, 1889.

NUMBER 40.

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.

As appears from the program, which we publish elsewhere, for the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance to be held in Boston early in December, considerable time is to be given to the discussion of the question of Sunday legislation. All of Thursday is, it seems, to be devoted to this subject, and if we mistake not, something will be said on the same subject on Wednesday and Friday evenings. We shall watch the proceedings of the Alliance with interest.

THE Catholics of New Mexico are very indignant because the new State constitution provides that public schools be maintained on a non-sectarian basis. In other words, they have got the American-Sabbath-Union ideas of religious despotism, and accordingly want their Roman creed taught in the State schools to Protestants and unbelievers alike—they certainly don't mean by "sectarian" that Protestantism shall be taught. But why don't they wait until Blair's amendment to the U. S. Constitution carries. That will inaugurate the scheme on a legal basis, under which the children will be compelled to imbibe a corrupt State religion.—*Moral and Scientific Companion.*

THE *Christian Standard* (Cincinnati) criticises the so-called American Sabbath Union thus:—

"It is unfortunate that so respectable an association, organized for the very laudable aim of securing proper Sunday observance, should have adopted a name suggestive of something both theologically and historically obsolete. It will be impossible to establish proper Sunday observance in the name or interest of Sabbatarianism, and the Union starts out heavily handicapped by its very title. Outsiders will be opposed to any Sunday legislation which is suspected of being urged in the interest of religion; while thousands of sincere Christians know that calling Sunday 'the holy Sabbath' has no warrant whatever from Christ or his apostles.

"There is nothing in the letter or spirit of Christianity which makes any honorable labor or innocent recreation of any day a sin for a Christian, or improper for an outsider. But since custom and law have united to set apart the first day of the week as a day of rest from secular employments, and since a weekly rest of this sort is good for man and beast—especially for the poor—both Christians and philanthropists may and can, might and could, unite to secure legislation and organize a public sentiment which shall enforce such an observance of Sunday as will promote all good interests. It will never be

done, however, by a 'Sabbath' Union, or 'Sabbath' Association, or 'Sabbath' anything else. It is too suggestive of church interference with matters of State, and all sorts of suspicions will scent something."

It is somewhat significant that the *Standard* does not express the opinion that "Christians and philanthropists" should unite in a demand for Sunday laws. Nobody doubts that they "can, might, and could," but the question is, Is it right for them to do it? We think not.

The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights.

In Dr. Herrick Johnson's address before the American Sabbath Union, on the Sunday newspaper, as published in the March *Monthly Document* of that association, there are four propositions laid down concerning the Sunday newspaper, the last of which we shall give special notice. Quoting from an Illinois Supreme Court Report, he says:—

"Every individual has the right to the enjoyment of the Christian Sabbath without liability to annoyance from the ordinary secular pursuits of life, except so far as they may be dictated by necessity or charity."

This proposition is self-evident, and needs no discussion. No one would uphold it more strenuously than would the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. But there are some questions that we would like to ask, to find out the idea of the Sunday-law advocates upon the subject of human rights. Suppose a man does not wish to exercise his right to rest on the first day of the week; what then? Must he be forced to exercise it? Will he be compelled to rest, whether he wishes to or not? If he is to be, then it is demonstrated that the law does not contemplate the protection of Sunday observance as a man's right, but the enforcement of it as a duty. Governments are organized for the protection of people's rights, not for the purpose of compelling them to exercise their rights, for it is considered self-evident, as a law of nature, that no man will need to be compelled to assert his own rights.

Another point that should not be passed lightly by is this: How extensive an idea of human right have these Sunday-law advocates? Do they mean to imply that every man has a right to the enjoyment of a Sabbath rest whenever he chooses to take it, and on whatever day he chooses to rest? or do they mean to limit that right to a certain day? Do they mean that every man has a right to be protected in the enjoyment of rest only on Sunday? This we should infer from the proposition, which plainly implies that a person has no right to the undisturbed enjoyment of rest on any other day. If they say that a man has a right to the undisturbed enjoyment of rest on the seventh day of the week, then they deprive themselves of all argument for a Sunday law; and if

they say that a man has not a right to rest upon Saturday, they thereby confess that their proposed law is a law against the rights of conscience; for it is well known that those people do conscientiously rest upon the seventh day. This is just what they mean.

That their movement for a National Sunday law is a movement to the effect that no one has any rights except those who keep Sunday, is evident from the following. It has been quoted many times before in the SENTINEL, and it doubtless will be quoted many times again, unless National Reform Sunday-law advocates specifically repudiate it. It is from Dr. Edwards' speech at the New York National Reform Convention. He says:—

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would a poor lunatic, for in my view he is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator."

And later he exclaims, "Tolerate atheism, sir? there is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon."

And what is Dr. Edwards' idea of an atheist? Following is his own statement, in the same lecture:—

"The atheist is a man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character.

"The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he manifests himself and his will in a revelation.

"The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or—worse—sheer imposture.

"The seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

"These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry,—the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party."

That is, the man who differs with the majority as to the exact day to be observed, the man who conscientiously observes the seventh day, because the Bible says so, instead of the first, concerning which the Bible says nothing, is classed as an atheist; and it is plainly declared that an atheist is not to be tolerated, except as a lunatic would be tolerated. A lunatic is allowed to run at

large so long as he is quiet; but as soon as his mania takes an aggressive form, he is shut up. Dr. Edwards regards the keeping of the seventh day as evidence of an unsound mind. So long as the individual should say nothing about it, he might perhaps be considered a harmless lunatic; but whenever the observer of the seventh day should begin to promulgate his faith, and openly teach others that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and persuade them to accept it, he would be raving, and, therefore, would be shut up and treated as a conspirator.

In the *Christian Statesman* of July 7, 1887, it is positively denied that atheists, among whom it will be remembered Christians who keep the seventh day are classed, have "any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions and privileges at all." Thus it is plainly seen that the success of this National Sunday-law movement means the depriving of a large number of the citizens of the United States of the rights of conscience.

Let it be understood that whatever right any man has is bestowed upon him by God himself. Human rights are not bestowed by civil government. All that civil governments are instituted for is to protect men in the enjoyment of rights which God has given them. The Declaration of Independence, which has justly been called the charter of American liberties, declares that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This means that every individual is equal, with respect to the rights with which God has endowed him. Now, while we have heard National Reformers and the president of the American Sabbath Union rail against the Constitution, we have never yet heard an American, or any other person, for that matter, find fault with the Declaration of Independence. That document voiced a truth as sure as any statement of holy writ: God has given to every man the same right; if ninety-nine per cent. of the people in any country have a certain right, the other one per cent. have the same right. But the American Sabbath Union is organized for the express purpose of protecting one class in the enjoyment of certain rights, and the depriving of another class of the same rights. In other words, it is organized for the express purpose of overthrowing the work done by the founders of this government. It is distinctively un-American. Nothing is surer than that its work is the exact opposite of the work of the immortal framers of the Declaration of Independence; and therefore since their work was to secure to this land perfect liberty, its work has for its sole object the overthrow of American liberty. It seems as though this demonstration must be clear to every individual.

It will be said that those who are thus discriminated against and deprived of equal rights with others are only a few. Thus Dr. Edwards, in the same speech from which we have quoted, said:—

"The parties whose conscience we are thus charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right, but the fact remains, and is worthy of note, that, taken altogether, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship. They are not even as many as those among us who do not speak the English language."

Mr. Crafts, in his speech before the Senate Committee, spoke of "the one or two small sects of Christians who worship on Saturday." And after speaking of the difficulties that arise in exempting them from the penalties of the Sunday

law, contemptuously dismisses them in the following words:—

"Infinitely less harm is done by the usual policy, the only constitutional or sensible one, to let the insignificantly small minority of less than one in a hundred, whose religious convictions require them to rest on Saturday (unless their work is of a private character such as the law allows them to do on Sunday), suffer the loss of one day's wages rather than have the other ninety-nine suffer by the wrecking of the Sabbath by public business."

Many times have we heard Sunday-law lecturers pass the consideration of the fact that their law would cause seventh-day observers to suffer, with the statement that such people constitute only about seven-tenths of one per cent. of the population, and that therefore they were too insignificant to be noticed. Perhaps they may think so; but such expressions show that they do not understand what they are doing. It is not a question of whether a few people who observe Saturday will be injured or not, but whether the government can afford to adopt the principle that minorities have no rights. If that principle is adopted, it will not be limited in its application to observers of the seventh day. It may seem very fine for the majority on any question of opinion to decide that those who differ with them have no rights; but they should remember that majorities sometimes change. This question of Sunday law will determine whether a man's life or property is safe in this country. If the government lends itself to a scheme which will be unjust to a single individual, then nobody has any assurance that injustice will not be done him. If the rights of a few people may be trampled upon because they keep the seventh day, the rights of some other people may be trampled upon because they differ with the majority on some other question. If in this country the principle of trampling upon human rights is once adopted, nobody can tell where it will stop. We are not alarmists, but we have no hesitation in saying that if the government follows the course marked out for it by the American Sabbath Union, the scenes of the French Revolution will be re-enacted in this country. It cannot be otherwise. E. J. W.

What Makes Infidels.

WE fully believe the statement of the apostle, that the "carnal [or natural] mind is enmity against God," but it is nevertheless true that very many who might otherwise be converted, are led to the utter rejection of the gospel by the crimes against justice which are perpetrated in the name of Christianity. Infidelity fattens upon just such injustice and devilish wickedness as that related as follows in *Fair Play*, Valley Falls, Kansas, of a case of persecution under the Georgia Sunday law:—

"The father is in the chain-gang. He had the audacity to insult Rev. Illiterate by digging a ditch to carry off the foul water from his cellar instead of attending church on Sunday. On Monday he was arrested on complaint of the offended Sunday monopolizer, tried before a superstition-saturated magistrate, and sentenced to a year's companionship with thieves and assaulters. There is no mercy for him. He is poor and so can get no justice or favor. In vain his wife intercedes for him, in vain his children cling to papa's knees as he is driven away in disgrace. Christianity is the State religion.

"The poor mother must now toil alone to support her little ones. She can do no extra work, nor can she pay others to do it. The slime in the cellar breeds foul miasma. Sickness comes as the sequel of the violation of natural law. The little golden-haired Jessie is laid low with fever. There is no money to

get the doctor, and the distracted, overworked mother can do but little. The days drag on; the malaria-tainted blood courses in fluctuating currents through the burning body of the little sufferer; she cries piteously for 'papa,' 'papa,' and stretches her tiny hands pleadingly forth, but, woe the crimes of Christian men, he comes not, he hears not his darling's plaintive call. He sweats and groans under the lash of the heartless task-master beneath the August sun. He has wronged no man nor woman nor child, and yet his limbs wear the manacles of the felon-slave, and his baby daughter's lisping lips must close in death without the chrism of the father's kiss; the once sparkling eyes must fade into oblivion unblest by the sight of 'papa's' worshiped face.

"A fresh little grave on the hill-side, above which the crow caws ominously. A heart-broken mother who sits among her other and half-famished children in the cheerless home. An iron-weighted father who starts fitfully and murmurs brokenly in his convict's sleep upon the wet, cold ground.

"A sleek dragoon of the church who sits in his comfortable room and . . . rubs his hands in gleeful satisfaction as his imagination pictures John Clark chained in the convict camp, and he thinks how closely he and his parishioners are following in the footsteps of the 'chosen people.'

"Here in his Northern home Rev. M. A. Gault reads of this Southern murder for the church's sake, and grimly smiles as he confidentially whispers in the ear of Wilbur F. Crafts:—

"Just wait until we get the Blair bill through and many a profaner of the Sabbath on these prairies and in these valleys shall, as does John Clark, of Georgia, feel the chastening hand of the Lord's anointed. WE ARE THE LORD'S ANOINTED."

And who can wonder that infidels multiply, or blame men for being infidels, when such outrages are perpetrated in the name of Christianity?

The Merits of the Edmunds Resolution.

LAST week we gave the history of the Edmunds Resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States in regard to religion in the public schools. We had not space then to discuss it, and propose to do that now, and for the convenience of the reader we print again the resolution:—

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 or 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 sect, organization, or denomination, 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 tenets 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 to 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."

As we said of this resolution before, it is an excellent illustration of how not to say it. If it be intended to prohibit religious instruction in the public schools, it misses it. If it be intended to prohibit sectarian instruction in the public schools, it misses that. Because—

1. The second clause only prohibits the appropriation of public money for the support of schools which are under the control of any religious or

anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination. In other words, this clause prohibits the appropriation of any public money to parochial or denominational schools. But this would allow the teaching of religion in the public schools, and at the public expense. This is further proved by the last sentence of section 1, which distinctly allows the reading of the Bible in any school or institution, and the intention of those who ask that the Bible may be read in the schools is distinctly and solely for the purpose of having religion, that is, "broad, general religion," but not sectarian, taught in the schools.

Secondly, the third sentence proposes that no "particular creed or tenets shall be read or taught in any school or institution supported in whole or part by such revenue or loan of credit," that is, in any public school. Yet the section expressly grants the reading of the Bible in any school or institution. Now every sect or denomination that makes any pretension to Christianity gets its peculiar tenets from the Bible. Then, if a certain sect derives from the Bible its peculiar tenet, and the Bible is read in the public schools, assuredly that does grant the reading of that particular tenet, and the resolution distinctly allows what it pretends to prohibit.

For instance, there are two denominations in this country, which together would probably be called a sect. They are the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists. It is a distinct and peculiar tenet of these denominations that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord. This tenet is derived from the plain reading of one of the most familiar portions of the Scriptures, the ten commandments, the fourth of which distinctly says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Now how is the Bible to be read in the schools without allowing that particular tenet to be read? Shall that particular tenet be skipped in the reading of the Bible? If not, to allow the reading of the Bible will assuredly allow the reading of that particular tenet, yet the reading of any particular tenet is forbidden by the article! The article therefore contradicts itself.

Again, the doctrine of predestination, of foreordination, is a peculiar tenet of the Calvinistic creeds. They derive this from the Bible, where it reads, with other texts, that God "hath chosen us in him [Christ] before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good-pleasure of his will." And again, it speaks of Christ, who "verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you." These scriptures express the peculiar tenet of the Calvinistic creed. If the Bible be allowed to be read in the schools, that will surely allow the reading of that particular tenet, unless such portions shall be skipped to avoid reading the tenet. But to read all the Bible except these and undertake to skip them would only the more definitely direct the attention of the pupil to them, and he would read them anyhow.

Again, it is a peculiar tenet of Christianity as a whole that Jesus Christ is the Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. How shall the Bible be read without reading that peculiar tenet, the reading of which does violence to the religious convictions of the Jew, who, with the unbeliever, is taxed equally with all others for the support of the schools, and who has equal rights

in all things, in school as well as out, with all others under the government. This supreme principle of Christianity is therefore a peculiar tenet, and to allow the reading of the Bible in the public schools, as this resolution expressly does, is to allow the reading of a peculiar tenet, which the resolution expressly prohibits.

Once more. It is a peculiar tenet of the Roman Catholic faith that the Virgin Mary is so intimately connected with the divine plan of salvation as to be so entirely a part of that plan as properly to be an object of adoration. Accordingly, to the Roman Catholic the Bible reads, in the third chapter of Genesis and fifteenth verse: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie wait for her heel." The reading of this passage would be declared by every Protestant in Christendom to be the reading of a particular tenet.

But it will be said at once, by every Protestant especially, that that is not the way the Bible reads. That that is the Catholic Bible, and that it is corrupt. Oh! ah! to be sure. There is more than one kind of a Bible, then! But the Edmunds Resolution does not make any such distinction as that. It simply says: "This article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution." It does not say that this article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of King James' Version of the Bible. It simply says the Bible, and that would leave the question as to what is the Bible, to be decided by the majority in a school district, a county, or a State. If the majority are Roman Catholics, then the article could not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Roman Catholic Bible in the public schools. But to allow the reading of the Roman Catholic Bible in the public schools would be to allow the reading of that particular tenet of the Roman Catholic faith which is forbidden by this same article.

If the Mormons were in the majority, as in Utah, then the Mormon Bible would be the one allowed, but the reading of the Mormon Bible would be almost wholly the reading of particular tenets. If the Protestants were in the majority, then King James' Version of the Bible would be the one to be read, which, as we have shown, would be but to allow the reading of the peculiar tenets of the Sabbatarians, the Presbyterians, and Christianity as a whole, which the article professes to intend to prohibit.

This list of particular tenets might be traced through all the creeds, but what we have here given is sufficient to illustrate the point that we make that the Edmunds Resolution is not only vague and uncertain, but that it is plainly self-contradictory.

It may be said that it would be the office of Congress, or of the Supreme Court of the United States, to decide what is meant in the article by the term, the Bible. Then that would be only to have Congress or the Supreme Court settle by law a religious question, and to fix a standard of religion for the nation which would be inevitably the establishment of a national religion. For "wherever there is a system of religious instruction endowed and patronized by law with a preference given to it by the State over all other systems, and a preference given to its teachers over the teachers of all other forms of belief," that is a religious establishment. And that is precisely and inevitably the result of the State's undertaking to define what the Bible is.

This, again, shows that the Edmunds Resolution, although not strictly self-contradictory in its letter, is so in its spirit, because it prohibits any State from making any law respecting an establishment of religion. And as our national Constitution already prohibits the same to the national Legislature, it is properly to be presumed that the spirit of this resolution is intended to be in harmony with the first amendment. But, as we have seen, although it forbids the State to do such a thing, it inevitably involves the nation in the doing of that very thing.

There is one more point in this: Whether it be left to majorities in the school districts, the counties, or the States, or whether it be decided by Congress or the Supreme Court, what Bible it shall be which may be used in the schools, another most important question is involved. Suppose it should be decided what the evident intention is in all this work, that King James' Version, or the Protestant Bible, is the one that is meant, and that that shall be used in the schools, then every teacher would be required to read the Protestant version of the Bible as the standard of religion and as the word of God. But no Catholic nor Jew, nor one who does not believe the Bible to be the foundation of true religion, could be a teacher in the public schools. All these would be disqualified, and that would be, to all intents and purposes, the establishment of a religious test as a qualification for the office of school-teacher. But that would not only be contradictory to the sixth article of the Constitution as it is, but it would again make this proposed article self-contradictory, because its second clause says that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under any State."

These are the merits of the Edmunds Resolution, proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution. Are the people ready for it?

Next week we shall tell of some who favor it, and of some of the arguments used in favor of it.

A. T. J.

How Is This?

ON Tuesday evening, October 1, the Prohibitionists of Nashville, Tenn., met in convention to nominate a city ticket, and adopted resolutions, a part of which are as follows:—

WHEREAS, We, Prohibitionists of the city of Nashville, in convention assembled, have unshaken confidence in the wisdom of that action by which a political party has been organized for the accomplishment of an object more important than any other offered to our consideration as a free people, to wit, the prohibition of the beverage liquor traffic by State and national law, as the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors are the constant and fruitful source of physical, intellectual, and moral unsoundness, producing degradation and crime, robbing women and children, and in ways manifold and extreme perverting the blessings of free institutions,

Resolved, That the prohibition of the liquor traffic should be the dominating and dividing political issue until such prohibition shall have become the recognized and settled policy of the government.

Resolved, That the policy of prohibition, because of the scope of its economic and social relations, and the largeness of its connection with civil liberty, should be embodied in the organic law of the States and the United States, as a safeguard of enlarged social life, which is the basis of all stable and prosperous government.

Resolved, That the American Sunday, in the interest of public order and morality, should be zealously guarded, and we hereby arraign and condemn the municipal authorities of the city of Nashville for the non-enforcement of law against Sunday tipping.

Resolved, That as Prohibitionists we heartily in-

dorse and support the recent protest of citizens of Nashville against Sunday tipping, and proffer cordial co-operation with them in their patriotic and lawful efforts to enforce the law against its violators, and in the enforcement of all other laws.

Our third-party friends who think that if we would demonstrate our temperance principles we should by all means support the Prohibition ticket, seek to allay our fears by saying that the Prohibition party has nothing to do with Sunday laws. We would like to have them explain this resolution, and tell us whether or not the Prohibitionists of Nashville are in harmony with the party at large.

We cannot understand how the mention of Sunday in the connection that it comes in these resolutions, has anything to do with temperance. The first resolution says that the sale of intoxicating liquors is the "source of physical, intellectual, and moral unsoundness;" that it produces degradation and crime; and therefore they believe in prohibiting it. Very good; but if they do actually believe in prohibiting it, why do they need to specify their protest against Sunday tipping, and their determination to enforce the prohibition of liquor on Sunday? If they are really Prohibitionists, as we have always understood the term, that would include the stopping of the sale of liquor on Sunday as well as on all other days. But if their movement involves something less than the complete suppression of the liquor traffic,—if, as their reference to Sunday implies, they will be at least in a measure content with the suppression of the sale of liquor on Sunday,—how can they harmonize that with the terrible arraignment of the liquor traffic in the first resolution? It seems to us that there is insincerity somewhere, or else a compounding of crime. Will some third-party friend inform us why it is necessary to specify Sunday tipping in resolutions declaiming against any sale whatever of liquor?

E. J. W.

Gathering up the Tares.

THE great burden of National Reformers seems to be to rid the earth of everyone who will not accept their theory of government. A few weeks ago Dr. A. T. Wolff, who, according to the *Christian Statesman*, "is a thorough National Reform man," delivered a lecture on "People We Can Do Without." In his list, he mentioned "grumblers," "fault-finders," and "discontented people," and also those who have no "religion in politics." That is to say, that God's great wheat-field, the world, could very well do without the tares which the enemy has sown. We are glad to say that we heartily agree with Dr. Wolff on this point, although a dispute might arise as to who constitutes the tares, should we attempt to settle it.

Having agreed with the Doctor that tares are "a nuisance, and we could well do without them," we would now like to inquire what the National Reformers propose to do with them. Rev. E. B. Graham wants to send them to some wild, desolate land, and let them stay there till they die." And Dr. Edwards declares that "atheism and Christianity cannot dwell together on the same continent."

Under the National Reform system of government, all persons who are regarded by them as tares will have to do one of two things,—they will have to pretend to be good wheat or else they will have to allow themselves to be gathered up and transferred to some other continent, and if that continent should chance also to have a "Re-

form" government, there is no telling when or where they would stop.

This question of what shall be done with the "tares" is a very important one, so important that it is asked and answered by Christ himself. He says: "The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them." Notwithstanding this plain command of Christ's, many of his professed servants have undertaken to gather up the tares and root them out, but the result has always been that they rooted out more wheat than they did tares. Millions of stalks of the choicest wheat were destroyed during the Dark Ages in the vain endeavor to pluck up the tares. "Let both grow together," says Christ, "until the harvest; and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." Again Christ says, "The harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels." Whosoever, therefore, undertakes to root up the tares is undertaking a work which belongs only to the angels, and which not even they have a right to attempt until commanded by Christ at the end of the world.

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

Sunday-Law Church Going.

IN the Missouri Sunday-law Convention Dr. Hayes, of Kansas City, made a speech in which he said:—

"It is said, 'Is not this Sunday excursion of the country, this trip to the country, is not that rest?' Now I have seen some of these trips to the country; I used to take them occasionally. I have been around considerably to picnics. I have gone to a good many Congregational picnics. Absolutely, I never went anywhere from which I came home more tired than from a Sunday-school picnic. I took my brother from Allegheny into the Rocky Mountains one summer, and we worked so hard resting that we came home absolutely worn out—both of us were absolutely worn out. If you want to see the nervous effect of a Sunday excursion out of Kansas City into a suburban town, take passage on the return home train. The men had caroused all day, letting their wives carry the baby, and if you ever saw a fagged-out set of women you will see it then. The next day as compositors in the printing office, as apprentices in the workshops, and in their blacksmith shops, and carpenter shops—these men all day were not worth much more than half a hand's wages. That is the fact about it. Why?—Because that Sunday, instead of being a day of rest and invigoration, was a day of exhaustion, of nervous exhaustion, and they came back home fagged-out. You follow that same man's brother; probably he took a good nap Sabbath morning; got up at eight o'clock; had a good, comfortable breakfast with his children; along about nine o'clock the children went to Sabbath-school; and at ten o'clock he and his wife leisurely walked down to the church, took their seat in God's house quietly, and listened to the sermon, and by and by went home and took a good comfortable dinner. Then he took a good rest in the afternoon, went to the church at night, and Monday morning that man went to his shop and took hold of the plane and was ready for work."

This contrast is no doubt correct between the man who carouses and the man who goes to church. But admitting all this to be true, then what is the object of stopping the Sunday excursion trains and street-cars, except it be to have the people go to church instead of on excursions? But will they go to church when the cars are stopped? Will not those who are given to carousing carry it on in the city instead of going to church?

It is not at all true, however, that all of the

people who go to the park and on excursions on Sunday are given to carousing.

A further point in this is the arrogant assumption of the Sunday-law clerics of power to compel everybody to conform to their views on Sunday. Because some people choose to ill-use themselves upon opportunity, therefore all opportunity to use themselves either well or ill on that day, except that of going to church, must be taken away from everybody! "It is of the essence of power that it may be exercised unwisely or abused by those to whom it is intrusted." And because some choose to abuse their rights of recreation and enjoyment, this does not in any sense justify the effort of the Sunday-law advocates to take away from others, or even these, the right to rightly use these powers. When these Sunday-law men shall have succeeded in their effort to regulate the exercise of the powers of others, what assurance have we that they themselves will not abuse the power which they propose to exercise? There is no assurance whatever that they will not, but we have the assurance of all history that they will.

More than this, there is no remedy in law for such evils. All that law can possibly do in such cases is by the exercise of restraint to check the evil for a time, and that time is only until the restraint can be cast off, or the vigilance of those who enforce the law is slacked. Then not only does the evil go on, but it goes on with accelerated force, from the fact that the victims will reimburse themselves for the deprivations which they have been forced to bear. As the Hon. Mr. McDougal told the Sunday-law preachers at Columbus, Ohio, the remedy for all these things of which they complain, lies deeper than can be reached by law, and can be effected by nothing else than the strictly remedial power of the gospel of Jesus Christ. That renews the mind, purifies the heart, and reforms the life, by implanting the abiding principle of absolute right and the love of it. If these men would employ the power of the gospel of Christ in their work, instead of the power of the civil law, they would find the results much more rapid and effective.

A. T. J.

Avoiding the Appearance of Church and State.

MRS. BATEHAM, the representative of the National Woman's Christian Union before the Senate Committee, in the hearing on the Sunday-Rest bill, said that it was the desire of that organization, that "promote" in the title of the bill should be changed to "protect." This was asked, she said, "so that it should have no appearance of what all Americans object to, any union of Church and State."

It seems to be the motto of every organization that is working for a Sunday law, to avoid all appearances of their real object. The National Reform Association, and all who affiliate with them, know that every true American is opposed to any union of Church and State, and if the real inwardness of their movement should come to the surface, their object would be defeated. So of course they must deny all charges of working to unite the Church with the State. They say, "We are opposed to any union of Church and State." How are they opposed?

In this way: They do not design that any one denomination shall make use of the civil power to further its own sectarian aims, or have them favored in any way by it; but they are in favor

of a union of the churches on what they claim to be the fundamental principles of religion, or Christianity, and in favor of a union of this union with the State. In other words, they are in favor of the union of *Churches* and the State.

In order to successfully disguise designs they claim that they only wish to enact a Sunday law on civil grounds, and that more as a sanitary regulation than for any other purpose. They very well know that if they should plead for it to be enforced as a religious institution, the whole scheme would be defeated, for the people are radically opposed to such legislation. But everyone who is working for the Sunday law from a civil standpoint, ought to know that the Sunday is an ecclesiastical institution, and that to enforce an ecclesiastical institution by civil power is a union of Church and State, whether it be done to "promote," or "protect," the observance of the day as a day of religious worship or not.

Every little while this National Reform wolf, clothed in sheep-skin, is disclosed to those who are watching the movement. In a paper before the Senate hearing entitled, "The Relation of Sunday Amusements to Sunday Work," Mr. Crafts said: "Casting out religion from the Sabbath they cast out rest." Now if they want Sunday enforced as a day of physical rest, and cannot get the rest without religion, and have to call on the civil power to enforce the rest, what else is it but the State enforcing religion by law? And what would you call that but a union of Church and State? E. HILLIARD.

Duluth, Minn.

Sunday-Law-Logic.

Of all that passes for logic the Sunday-law arguments excel in contradictory assertions; notice some of the inconsistencies:—

1. They claim, as stated above, that protection is their object, and yet offer a bill enforcing the day upon all, containing no provision for its real protection.

2. They explicitly claim that they are trying to secure merely a civil Sabbath, but their own bill squarely contradicts them by saying, "the religious observance of the day."

3. That bill is upheld on a health basis, but the "religious observance" clause proves them guilty of deception.

4. Then the bill is to close the saloons, but the same "religious" specification, together with the entire absence of any mention of liquors or saloons, condemns that claim; the bill pays no attention to liquor; its hold is upon every individual in the land; it is easier to close every saloon in America forever than to pass this religious bill, but they would rather have the bill and bid the liquor traffic Godspeed.

5. After disclaiming any intention of enforcing Sunday as a religious day, they appeal to the church to support the fourth commandment; here is another inconsistency—that commandment sanctifies the seventh day; everybody knows that Sunday is the first, and sanctified nowhere in the Bible.

6. They wish to put this government's laws on a Christian basis, when Christ commanded that civil and divine homage be paid to separate powers.—*Moral and Scientific Companion.*

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

Evangelical Alliance.

The following is the program of subjects for the national meeting of the Evangelical Alliance at Boston, December 4 to 6:—

Opening Address, Welcome Address, From Washington to Boston, Devotional Exercises, The Needs of the City, The Needs of the Rural Districts, The Mountain Whites of the South, General Discussion, Needs of the Times and the Alliance Methods, Christian Co-operation in Awakening and Directing the Moral Sentiment of the Community, General Discussion, Christian Co-operation in Relation to Moral Legislation, (a) Its Enactment, (b) Its Enforcement, The Need of Permeating Our Developing Civilization with the Spirit of Christ, Christianity and the State, Our Debt and Duty to the Immigrant Population, French Canadians in the United States, Slavonic Populations in the United States, Arousing and Training the Activity of the Laity, Need of an Enthusiasm for Humanity on the Part of the Churches, Need of Personal Contact between Christians and Non-church-goers.

The invitation to attend is extended to all who are interested. Ministerial associations, colleges, and theological seminaries are especially invited to send representatives.

Cardinal Gibbons Heard from Again.

IN their blind zeal for a Sunday law the American Sunday Union and Woman's Christian Temperance Union cannot see that they are just playing into the hands of Rome. What a glorious victory they thought they had when Cardinal Gibbons indorsed their Sunday-Rest bill, and yet it was just what Pope Leo XIII. exhorted all his subjects to do in his Encyclical published in 1885. We will quote:—

"All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert the utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usage of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled to the principles of the true church."

But says one, "What has this Sunday law to do with modeling legislation to the principles of the Catholic Church?" We answer, "Very much." Sunday as a day of rest is not based upon the law of God, and is purely a traditional observance, and an institution of the Roman Catholic Church. After having read a copy of Cardinal Gibbons' letter indorsing the Sunday-Rest bill, the writer wrote to the Cardinal in regard to his position on the Sunday institution and received the following reply:—

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,
408 N. Charles St.,
Baltimore, Md., Oct. 3, 1889.

DEAR MR. FRANKE: At the request of His Eminence the Cardinal, I write to assure you that you are correct in your assertion that Protestants in observing the Sunday are following, not the *Bible*, which they take as their only rule of action, but the *tradition* of the church. I defy them to point out to me the word *Sunday* in the Bible; if it is not to be found there, and it cannot be, then it is not the Bible which they follow in this particular instance, but tradition, and in this they flatly contradict themselves.

The Catholic Church changed the day of rest from the last to the first day of the week, because the most memorable of Christ's works were accomplished on Sunday. It is needless for me to enter into any elaborate proof of the matter. They cannot prove their point from Scripture; therefore, if sincere, they must

acknowledge that they draw their observance of the Sunday from tradition, and are therefore weekly contradicting themselves. Yours very sincerely,

M. A. REARDON.

The reader will notice here that Cardinal Gibbons, in indorsing the Sunday-Rest bill, virtually consented to force Protestants to weekly contradict themselves, and was perfectly consistent with Pope Leo's Encyclical.

How is this, Brother Crafts? do you believe what Cardinal Gibbons and the 7,200,000 Catholics have to say? If not, why not?

We would suggest that the American Sunday Union pin a copy of this letter to the one received by Mr. Crafts indorsing the Rest bill, and keep it for reference.

Mrs. Bateham, and National Reformers, please make a note of this. E. E. FRANKE.

How Do the Methods Compare?

COMPLAINT has been made by friends of the Sunday-law petitions that those who circulated the petition against all Sunday laws, have obtained signatures by misrepresentations, or, in other words, have beguiled the unwary. That the individuals signed it is not denied, but it is claimed that they were unduly influenced; they were told that the petition was all right, or that it was what it was not, and so were induced to sign it.

That there have been such instances as this may be true, as claimed, but all who obtained even one signature on a false representation of the object of the petition, did so contrary to the instructions of those at the head of the work. But there is not one single individual who signed the petition against Sunday laws and legislation tending to union of Church and State, but what had the right and privilege of knowing just what the petition was, and what was its object, before he attached to it his name. He alone is responsible for signing the petition. We do not by this excuse wrong methods of obtaining signatures. Wrong is not right nor ever will be. God forbid that evil should be done that good may follow. But this is true, that even though it be admitted that wrong methods were used, the individual had the right and privilege of knowing what he was signing. The wording of the petition was in no way obscure or ambiguous.

But admitting that wrong methods were used in circulating the counter-petitions to Sunday laws, contrary to instructions, which is the worse method that or to write the names of men, women, and children, or their equivalent, and count them all as favoring the Sunday-rest-law petition, when many of them did not know that the petition was being circulated, or what it was, and others were opposed to it. In the anti-Sunday-law petition all whose names appear had both the right and privilege, at the worst, of knowing what they were giving their influence for; in the Sunday-law petitions they had the right but were not granted the privilege. A few church members voted for a whole church, oftentimes when members of the church were opposed to the Sunday law. Representative bodies as regards *denominational* work indorsed these petitions for thousands whom they did not represent on this question any more than on the tariff question. Ministers in these various denominations have openly opposed the Sunday-law petitions, and thousands of intelligent members have, knowing what they were doing, signed the opposing petition. Many times minorities indorsed the Sunday-law petition for majorities, the vote being put at some evening prayer-meeting when but few were present.

We might continue this much farther, but this is sufficient for a comparison of the two methods of obtaining petitions to the respective sides of Sunday legislation. Further investigation will show more favorably for the anti-Sunday-law petition. Which is the better way, to grant American citizens who have the right, the privilege of knowing to what they are giving their influence, or not even to permit the right or privilege of knowing? Which is the more American? Which is the more Christian? How do the methods compare?

After all, are not the friends of the Sunday law magnifying, before the public, very small matters, at the worst, in order to hide their own abnormal and unfair methods?—*Signs of the Times.*

A Quaker View of National Reform.

As our readers are well aware, the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, and also the Blair resolution for the amendment to the Constitution, are dead; but the agitation which gave rise to them is not dead, hence the following article from the *Friends' Intelligencer and Journal* (Philadelphia) is not out of season, though written while these measures were still before Congress. We would commend the article especially to those who imagine that only infidels and liquor sellers oppose Sunday laws, and remind them that Friends are neither one nor the other, but very worthy Christian people. We print the article entire, as follows:—

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Realizing the full force of this statement, and feeling that there is great need for the guardians of that priceless boon to mankind, "liberty of conscience," to be on the alert, we desire in as few words as possible to call the attention of Friends to a threatened danger.

A bill to regulate the strict observance of the first day of the week as the Sabbath-day, has been introduced into the United States Senate, by Senator Blair, and an effort is also being made to make it compulsory to teach "the principles of the Christian religion" in the public schools. This is to be accomplished by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the object being to make our nation "a Christian nation" by a union of the Church and State.

A petition, signed by a million and a half of names, urging the passage of the bill, has also been presented, and we are informed that the friends of this legislation are exceedingly active in its behalf. It is warmly advocated by men and women of high position and great influence, who, undoubtedly, have the welfare of the human race at heart; but, as is so often the case, their zeal has outrun their judgment, and one might almost say, their Christianity; for where the spirit of intolerance is, there the Spirit of Christ cannot dwell, neither is it with those who, arrogate to themselves infallibility.

There are several religious sects who honestly believe (and who would uphold their belief with their lives), that it is required of them to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath-day. Now, shall these Christians, professing the name of Christ, obey the mandates of self-righteous men who presume to say, "This day shalt thou keep"? or shall they obey the "voice" within their own souls?

The advocates of this bill say, "Obey this law

which we have made," and think by this means to build up a Christian nation.

Will any forced observance of moral law be accepted of God, or accounted unto the doer for righteousness? The temple was built of free-will offerings only. Can we raise up a nation of Christians by simply compelling an outward semblance of religion?

We might say, There is nothing to prevent anyone from keeping the seventh day if they want to do so, but we must remember that their pecuniary circumstances may not be such as to permit them to observe *both* days as days of rest.

Again, one might suppose that the clause, "to the disturbance of others," so limited the operation of the law as to render it less harmful; but when we remember the bitter persecution of Friends for acts in themselves quiet and peaceable, we cannot doubt that very many religious fanatics will be very easily disturbed by any observance of the day not strictly in accord with their views.

In regard to the other point, it would at first seem as though we could all unite on a willingness to have the *principles* of the Christian religion taught in the public schools. But who is to decide precisely what constitutes the essentials of the Christian religion or its principles?

The highest civil tribunal is the Supreme Court. Can that body decide the question so as to satisfy the Catholic and the Protestant, or even the various sects among the latter? An attempt to unite the Church and State has always proved disastrous. Turn back the pages of history and we shall find that the bloodiest wars that have stained our annals, were waged in support of religious belief. Recall what the early Friends suffered, comparatively a short time ago, in order to maintain "liberty of conscience."

The spirit of intolerance is only sleeping. Would we, as Friends, be satisfied to have any body of men decide what our children should be taught as "the Christian religion"? Many of the warmest advocates of these measures utter the most severe denunciations of all religions not in harmony with their own, showing a spirit that would crucify the Christ within their brother's soul, while professing to follow his voice speaking in their own. "Woe unto you, hypocrites!"

It was through the influence of a Friend that liberty of conscience was secured by the Constitution, and they have always stood foremost in the fight when it has been assailed, and we take this means of calling everyone to the duty of the hour, reminding one and all that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

While using every effort to prevent the taking of this step in the wrong direction, we would not be understood as denouncing, personally, the author of the measure, or the signers of the petitions, or their motives; but even great and good men make very grave mistakes, and it is the duty of each one of us to guard with exceeding care this priceless gift of God unto the children of men, both from the attack of enemies and the harmful abuse of *overzealous* friends.

No one could be more desirous than we to see the day when Christ shall rule the world, but this proposed step is a retrograde movement, and when one of its supporters would say, "The government has the right to command the consciences of men," it is full time to call a halt.

This is the first step. The second will be to secure the erasure of the word *principles*; and the

next, the insertion of the name of that religion holding the balance of power.

Ah, Friends, it would be impossible to fully comprehend the danger until we are caught within its toils.

May our Father in Heaven guide and protect us.

Look Not to Civil Laws.

THE "Sunday observance" movement inaugurated last Sunday evening in this city, bids fair to bring in contact the positive and negative opinions of a common people, and to bring upon true Christianity an influence more antagonistic and baneful than infidelity itself. It has been clearly demonstrated that no amount of law can compel a change of convictions firmly imbedded in the mind of the average American. If moral suasion and precept has no influence on his habits, which are not against the laws of the land, to use coercion would be fatal to any possibility of success, and engender the most radical views and influence in the opposite extreme. "Christians" will do well to remember that their fight in this matter is not conducted against ignorant and superstitious foreigners, but against an intelligent and comparatively well-educated people—a people capable of forming an opinion based upon sound sense and justice, and who will not permit dictation from an egotistical and warped minority.

The element conspicuous in this movement are favored by wealth, position, or business, and can go to the beach on week-days, or can afford to remain there during the entire season. They do not lose their position or the pay for a day while there, as do those who may go Sunday and against whom they declare war. A man's right, moral and physical, to go about on Sunday, cannot be successfully combated. Any religious movement to suppress an inherent right in the non-church-goer will not meet defeat, but will bring about legislation in retaliation detrimental to the church and its interests and from which it will never recover.

Custom has favored Sunday as a day for religious observance, but there is no biblical law for it, nor is there anything said relative to its observance, as many would have us suppose.

"Christians" declare that Sunday is a day of rest and quiet; yet they raise more bedlam by the clanging of their bells from five to eleven o'clock in the morning, and by their bass drum parades, than do all the people who visit the beaches and whom they have disturbed from their sleep on the only morning in the week in which they are able to rest, and virtually driven them from home to escape from their noise and confusion.

"Brethren," attend to your legitimate business; continue your work of Christianity as your Master began it, and when you begin to feel that you require aid from the civil authorities, know that your faith has weakened and that there is something radically defective in your own composition and with your personal religion.—*A. G. J., in Los Angeles Tribune, Sept. 5.*

CHRIST'S kingdom is not of this world. The church is not a Police Board, nor Cæsar's lieutenant, but a saviour of lost sinners. Its simple, sole, glorious mission is to bring sinners to Jesus by preaching the gospel to them with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven.—*St. Louis Observer.*

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.

A \$65.00 Sewing Machine! For \$18.00. Black Walnut Furniture Cover, Drop Leaf, 5 Drawers and Full Set of Attachments. Warranted.

9 Cords in 10 HOURS. Runs Easy. NO BACKACHE. FOLDED. BY ONE MAN. Write for descriptive catalogue containing testimonials from hundreds of people who have saved from 4 to 9 cords daily.

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.

WEBSTER UNABRIDGED DICTIONARY. A LIBRARY IN ITSELF. 3000 more Words and nearly 2000 more Illustrations than any other American Dictionary.

SAN FRANCISCO Business COLLEGE, MURPHY BUILDING, MARKET ST. LIFE SCHOLARSHIP, \$75. Monthly Tuition, \$12.50.

EMPLOYMENT and FREE HOMES. For information of all States and Territories, with Beautiful Engravings of the most interesting scenery and the various Industries of all Sections, send 10 Cents for copy of THE WESTERN WORLD, Illustrated.

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.

"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.

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

Charles Dickens' Complete Works in 15 Volumes with THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN - ONE YEAR FOR ONLY - Two Dollars.

Sir Walter Scott's Complete Works in 12 Volumes with THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN - ONE YEAR FOR ONLY - Two Dollars.

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

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.

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.

Cram's Superior Maps. WANTED.—SALESMEN for Cram's Superior U. S. and World Map, State Maps, Charts, etc. They sell rapidly because the people need them, want them and will have them. Commission very liberal. For terms and territory, address their general agent, A. K. ATTEBERRY, KEENVILLE, ILLINOIS.

THE WHOLE WORLD WILL SOON TAKE THE NEW YORK WORLD. How Its Circulation Has Grown: r882... 8,151,157. r883... 12,242,548. r884... 28,519,785. r885... 51,241,367. r886... 70,126,041. r887... 83,389,828. r888... 104,473,650. This equals one-fourteenth the combined circulation of all the 1,423 Daily Newspapers of the United States at last report, which was 1,481,844,000. THE WORLD alone... 104,473,650.

The Weekly World IS THE BEST and BIGGEST NEWSPAPER on the North American Continent. 12 Large Pages and 84 Long Columns. A POPULAR BOOK. Published and Given with Each Issue of the Weekly Edition. (Latest Issues) May 1—A Voyage to Mars. Greg. May 8—Hoop-la. Winter. May 15—His Fatal Success. Malcolm Bell. May 22—The Dream Woman. Wilkie Collins. May 29—'Twas in Trafalgar's Bay. Besant. June 5—A Yankee Lucille. Wm. E. Penny. June 12—A Queen Amongst Women. Braehme. June 19—A Strange Secret. Sylvanus Cobb, Jr. June 26—John Jago's Ghost. Wilkie Collins. July 3—A Man of Honor. J. S. Winter. July 10—The Case of Mr. Lucreft. W. Besant. July 17—A Troublesome Girl. The Duchess. July 24—He Loved and Rode Away. Riddell. July 31—Harvest. J. S. Winter. Aug. 7—Blind Love. Wilkie Collins. Aug. 14—Mystery of Central Park. Nellie Bly. Aug. 21—Sir Percival. Dora Thorne. Sept. 4—Fair but False. The Duchess. Sept. 11—A Passive Crime. The Duchess. Sept. 18—Antou Malissof. Greville. One Year (52 numbers), \$1; 6 Months (26 numbers), 50c.; 3 Months (13 numbers), 25c. Try a subscription for three months. Agents wanted at every post-office. Address, THE WORLD, 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. Fifty 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, OCTOBER 30, 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.

SOMEONE has sent us a copy of *Hoof and Horn*, date of September 12, marked, "Please return." We will do so if the friend who sent it will drop us a card giving his address.

THE *Silver Gate*, an excellent little paper published in San Diego, this State, and from which we have several times quoted, is no more, having given place to a seven-column quarto, the *San Diego County Reporter*. The former publisher has taken in two partners, thus forming the firm of Davis, Vestal & Peebles, editors and proprietors of the new paper. They announce that all patrons of the *Silver Gate* (subscribers and advertisers) will be served with the *Reporter* in future.

We wish the new paper success, and hope that it will be as sound on the question of the proper relation of Church and State as was its predecessor.

POSSIBLY we are too sanguine, but a recent advertisement which appeared in an Eastern religious journal has suggested to us a new solution of the much-vexed Sunday-rest question. Those who are foremost in agitating for a national Sabbath law claim that what they want is a general Sunday rest. Now as the advertisement to which we refer says that "Sapolio used every week-day gives rest on Sunday," it might not be amiss for the American Sabbath Union, National Reform Association, *et al.*, to do a little missionary work with this wonderful cleansing compound. It could certainly do no harm to try it, and if the experiment should prove successful they would not be under the necessity of again troubling Congress about the matter.

In a recent communication to the *Christian Statesman* one of the National Reform secretaries says:—

"This country was settled by Christian men who believed in keeping the first day of the week as the Sabbath. It was by them incorporated in our civil institutions as a part of the common law of the land. Our Seventh-day brethren came here with this understanding. There was an unwritten agreement between them and this government when they came here that they would abstain from common labor on the first day of the week. It may be a cross for them, but they cannot charge us with oppressing their consciences. When they came they agreed to respect our consciences so far as to abstain from common labor on the Lord's day."

Then the Quakers and Baptists that were whipped and hanged in Massachusetts had no just cause of complaint. The Puritans came there and established their religion by law, and when the Quakers and Baptists came among them it was with the tacit understanding that they would obey the laws of the colony; when any violated the law, and thus the tacit agreement, they forfeited all their rights, and were properly punished. Do the National Reformers believe it? If not, why not? Such arguments would justify all the persecution which the world has ever seen. To see such things in a paper

calling itself *Christian* is enough to make one feel that the history of the Dark Ages has been written in vain.

REV. J. M. FOSTER, one of the district secretaries of the National Reform Association, has written a letter to the *Christian Nation* in which he attempts to justify the persecution of Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists under color of the Arkansas Sunday law some three years ago. He says: "The old man and his son of seventeen whose horse was sold for \$27, and the man whose young wife and child died while he was in prison, brought that evil on themselves by breaking the law." Certainly they did; and so did the Christians in the days of pagan and papal persecution bring all the trouble on themselves "by breaking the law." Is it any wonder that infidels abound when men professing to be ministers of Christ boldly defend such wicked cruelty in the name of religion? Secretary Foster and men of his ilk lack only the power to make them persecute as cruelly and as wickedly as did the Spanish Inquisitors.

SOME idea of the magnitude of the work done during the past few months in the interests of Sunday legislation may be gathered from the following item of news, which we take from the *Cynosure*:—

"Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, has traversed thirty-four States and Territories in his transcontinental tour, lecturing in the chief cities and organizing Sabbath Associations and Sunday Closing Leagues in States, counties, and cities. Three years ago but two States were organized, namely, Maryland and New Jersey. There were also city organizations in Philadelphia, New York and Chicago. When the American Sabbath Union began its work at the opening of this year, there had been added to the list of organized States, Illinois, Iowa, Dakota, and Kentucky. The American Sabbath Union's field secretary has since assisted in organizing Ohio, Virginia, Missouri, Minnesota, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Washington, California, New Mexico, and Kansas, besides two county and ten city associations. He has also arranged conventions for organization in Louisiana, Arkansas, Wisconsin, Utah, Oregon, and Arizona, besides several counties."

The advocates of Sunday laws are terribly in earnest, and those who suppose that they are only a lot of "cranks," with no hopes or prospects of success, certainly have given the matter very little attention. Bigots many of them may be, but they are neither fools nor sluggards, and they mean to succeed.

THE advocates of Sunday laws are not noted for consistency. Thus Doctor Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, argues as follows, that none should insist upon keeping the seventh day:—

"Now, let us look at the impracticability of the question raised here and see where this matter of conscience rests. It is now half-past ten in Chicago. It is half-past eleven here (Washington, D. C.). If one of the Seventh-day Baptists should start west from Chicago to go around the world, always keeping each successive seventh day, when he got back to Chicago he would be keeping Friday instead of Saturday as the Sabbath; and another Seventh-day Baptist who went the other way around the world would be keeping Sunday instead of Saturday for the Sabbath when he got back. That is what comes of making a fetish of the letter."

But how is it that this has no effect on Sunday? Mr. Johnson professes to believe that it is a sin to work on any part of Sunday, but how can that be if it is impossible to keep track of the day? Or does he wish to be understood as holding that, whereas Sunday can be identified the world over, the day immediately preceding it

cannot be? Such a cavil might to some minds have considerable weight, as against the obligation to keep any day, but to us it seems to be out of the question that any rigid Sunday-keeper can honestly use it.

A LETTER from a friend now in Rome informs us that he has visited all the principal churches on Sunday, and was surprised to find but a few women and the priests and attendants present. He says that when the pope ruled they were crowded. In this connection we take from a Roman paper the words of a priest, giving evidence that the Roman machine has but little honor in its home. Father Phelan, of the St. Louis *Watchman*, writing from Rome, says:—

"Three-fourths of the people of Rome do not go to church on Sunday. They are on a vacation. Under the popes they were not only obliged to go to church but had to go to holy communion once a year. . . . The old families are true to the core. The little shop-keepers talk of the 'good old days under the popes,' and wonder if they will ever return. Rome had 165,000 people under papal rule; now she has about 400,000. The majority of the present population is anti-papal."

It is not strange that Mr. Pecci is anxious to emigrate to some land where his corporation is doing business after the old style.—*Western American*.

A CORRESPONDENT asks us to give the numerical strength of the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. This we cannot do with any great accuracy. The so-called Sabbath Union "was," in the words of Senator Blair, "officially constituted by official action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Home Missionary Society of the Baptist Church, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (North and South), and the Synod of the Reformed Church, five denominations, whose membership together is 5,977,693. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union numbered, a year ago, 185,521; but the number of National Reformers we cannot give; they are, however, included almost wholly in the American Sabbath Union. Of course it must be borne in mind that very many of the 5,977,693 persons belonging to the five denominations forming the American Sabbath Union, are under the age of twenty-one years.

Another fact to be remembered is that the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union are also very largely members of those five churches. Indeed, the real working strength of the three bodies, namely, the so-called Sabbath Union, the National Reform Association, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is very much smaller than it appears to be; but the leaders are energetic, and are sparing neither time nor means to secure official recognition of Sunday by the general government.

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.