

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1889.

NUMBER 1.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
OAKLAND, CAL.

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

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS.

J. H. WAGGONER, E. W. FARNSWORTH, DAN T. JONES.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

POSITIVE enactments against irreligion, like positive enactments against fanaticism, provoke the evil which they were designed to prevent.—George Bancroft.

THE Iowa Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to its everlasting honor, has severed all connection with the *political* workings of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and has given to the National Union the name of "The National Woman's *Political* Temperance Union." We heartily approve the action of the Iowa Union, and hope that the good work may go on until the National Woman's Political-Christian Temperance Union is destroyed or else the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is brought to the point where it will do Christian work in a Christian way, and not in a political way.

THE *American Vedette* complains of a passage in the August SENTINEL upon National Reform in the South. Well, Brother *Vedette*, we humbly make our apology for all in that which reflects upon the South. We said more than we should have said. We beg pardon. The SENTINEL never intends to be sectional in anything; but American and National, with a big N, in all things. The *Vedette* thinks that the basis of our remarks on that occasion was owing to "some noodle in Georgia or North Carolina, probably some experimental immigrant from the North, or some of our uneasy cranks who are never satisfied." The person who made the statement is Doctor Fitzgerald, of Nashville, editor of the *Advocate*, a religious paper there, and a man of more than either local or State reputation; and he spoke for the South and pledged the South to National Reform, when he said that upon which we based our item. Yet we confess we wandered somewhat from the text. Again we ask forgiveness, and we promise to stick to the text next time. We do indeed hope that the South will repudiate all efforts to swing her into the line of the National Reform wickedness.

The Illinois Sunday Convention.

THE first annual meeting of the Illinois Sunday Association was held in Farwell Hall, Chicago, November 20 and 21, 1888. This Association was organized at Elgin about the same time last year. Of that meeting we gave an account at the time. This meeting was the genuine successor of that in every way. It was addressed by Doctors Mandeville, Everts, Foster, Henson, and Herrick Johnson, of Chicago; Doctor Knowles, of New Jersey, editor of the *Pearl of Days* and secretary of the National Sunday Association; Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, and Dr. John Hall, of New York; Mitchell, of Sycamore, Ill.; Post, of Springfield, Ill.; Mills, of Wheaton; and Hon. J. C. Lord, of Elgin, Ill.

The two points that were emphasized above all others throughout the Convention were: (1) Christians do not keep Sunday as they ought; and (2) other people do not go to church as they ought.

First: In the first speech that was made, even in the opening exercises, it was said: "We remember the corporations; the great railroads which compel their men to work and so to desecrate the holy day. But we remember that back of the officers of the companies are the stockholders *who belong to the churches*, sit in the pews, and bow down and pray in the house of God—these are equally guilty."

If, then, the railroads compel their men to desecrate the day, and the owners of the railroads are church-members, then who is it but the church-members that are compelling people to desecrate the day?

Doctor Knowles said that by the influence of William E. Dodge, even after his death, the Delaware and Lackawanna Railroad Company had resisted the temptation to run trains on Sunday until the present year. But five hundred ministers met in conference in New York and used competing lines on Sunday, and by this the hands of the Sunday Observance Committee have been tied ever since. After that when the Delaware and Lackawanna directors were asked not to run Sunday trains, they replied, "How can you come to us pleading for us to run no trains on Sunday, when your preachers by the hundreds, on Sunday, use our rival lines, which do run on Sunday. If your preachers ride on Sunday trains on other roads, we cannot see why they and other people cannot ride on our trains on Sunday. And if it is all right for these other roads to run trains on Sunday, and certainly ministers of the gospel would not ride on them if it were wrong, then we cannot see how it can be such a great wrong for us to run Sunday trains."

That is a very proper answer. No wonder the Sunday Committee's hands are tied by it. And yet that very conference of five hundred preachers, assembled in New York last summer, took the first decided step toward the organization of the National Sunday Association, of which Doctor Knowles himself is secretary.

Another speaker, whose name I did not get, said that not long ago a railroad president said to him, "We get more requests for Sunday trains signed by preachers than we do from other people."

By these facts there is presented the following condition of things: (1) Church-members own the railroads; (2) preachers sign requests for Sunday trains; (3) the church-members grant the request of the preachers for Sunday trains, and the preachers ride on the Sunday trains, and other church-members go on Sunday excursions; (4) then the whole company—preachers and church-members—together petition Congress and the State Legislatures to make a law stopping all Sunday trains! That is to say, they want the Legislatures, State and National, to compel these railroad-owning church-members not to grant the request of the preachers for Sunday trains. In other words, they want the civil power to compel them all—preachers and church-members—to act as they all say that Christians ought to act. And they insist upon quoting all the time the commandment of God, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." But if they will not obey the commandment of God, which they themselves acknowledge and quote, what assurance have we that they will obey the law of Congress or State Legislature when they get it, especially as it will rest entirely with themselves to see that the law is enforced? Will they compel themselves by civil law to do what they themselves will not otherwise do?

Second: In complaint that people do not go to church, Doctor Crafts said: "The post-office is open at the very hour of church, and a man must choose between going to church and going to the post-office to get his mail."

And in the Association's address to the public it is said: "At this rate the time will come when our wage-workers will have to work seven days in a week, and the churches will be deserted. But let a law be enacted in favor of the Sabbath, and it will give back to hundreds their day of rest, and to the churches tens of thousands of attendants."

Dr. Herrick Johnson delivered an intense Philippic against the Sunday newspaper. He

said: "It creeps into our homes on Sunday. It can be put into the pocket, and taken into the parlor and read." Then he named the matter with which he says the Sunday papers is filled, "crime, scandal, gossip, news, and politics," and said: "What a *melange!* what a dish to be set down before a man before breakfast and after breakfast to prepare him for hearing the word of God. It makes it twice as hard to reach those who go to the sanctuary, and it keeps many away from the house of worship altogether. They read the paper, the time comes to go to church, but it is said, 'Here is something interesting I will read it and not go to church to-day.'" He then spoke of the *Inter-Ocean* special Sunday news train, and how the people would flock to the station to see the train, and said: "In the Sabbath lull from politics, business, etc., the people would go to church were it not for the attraction of the *Inter-Ocean* special train." And then he exclaimed, "Oh, for the breath of the Puritan! Oh, for a little of the Puritan Sabbath!"

Dr. John Hall followed this in a five minutes' speech, in which he emphasized one of Dr. Johnson's statements thus: "If the family make the Sunday paper a study, it will be difficult for them to get to the house of worship, and when there it will be harder for them to get the word of God. There is nothing better to mar worship and deaden the mind to the worship of God. And it is this sensationalism that makes up the attractions of the Sunday paper."

All these statements and arguments plainly show that the secret and real object of the whole Sunday-law movement is to get the people to go to church. The Sunday train must be stopped, because the church-members ride on them and don't go to church enough. The Sunday paper must be abolished, because the people read it instead of going to church, and because those who read it and go to church too are not so well prepared to receive the preaching. But is it right for the church authorities to wield the civil power in the interests of the church? Is that a legitimate exercise of the functions of civil government? If it is, why should they stop with this? *Will* they stop with this? They will not. This is only the first step in an unlimited course of legislation in the interests of the churches and at the expense of everybody else. If these men are allowed to take the first step, they will be sure to take all the others that they want.

And how much more will satisfy them? Doctor Post seems to have given a pretty good idea of this. His address was upon "Sabbath Recreation." It was an effort to define what is proper recreation on Sunday. And after a good deal of discussion, and what he said was a careful study of the literature and history of the subject, he laid down as the sound principle the following:—

"There is no kind of recreation that is proper or profitable on Sunday outside of the home or the sanctuary."

Only let such laws be enacted as are demanded by National Reformers, laws for-

bidding any recreation "to the disturbance of others" on Sunday, then anything done on Sunday outside of the home or the sanctuary, in the neighborhood of this preacher, will disturb him, and whoever does it will be prosecuted. Dr. Herrick Johnson cried for a breath of the Puritan; it seems that Doctor Post is fully disposed to give it to him.

Doctor Everts said: "The Sabbath is the test whether a man believes in God or not. It is atheism or the Sabbath." And the secretary in his report said: "The Sabbath is the dividing line between Christianity and heathenism."

According to these propositions, therefore, to compel men to observe the Sabbath is to compel them to accept Christianity and to serve God. But such service is not the service of God, and such recognition of Christianity is not a recognition of Christianity at all.

The influences in favor of the National Sunday law reported in this Convention are the following:—

1. More than 50,000 blank petitions have been sent out to be signed.

2. The Society of Friends, of Iowa, numbering 10,500 people, has indorsed the petitions and the work.

3. The Society of Friends in Indiana, numbering 20,000 members, has done the same.

4. Ministers and churches in forty States and Territories have indorsed the petitions.

5. May 21 Senator Blair introduced a bill into the U. S. Senate providing a National Sunday law.

6. Petitions were sent to Canada, and Sir John Macdonald replied that they had introduced the matter into the Canadian Parliament.

7. The Methodist General Conference, two Presbyterian General Assemblies, and one Baptist Association, have all appointed committees for the organization of a National Sunday Union.

8. October 18 the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, "with much enthusiasm and with great applause," indorsed the petition in favor of the Blair Sunday Bill.

9. November 16 the Knights of Labor general Convention also indorsed it, and this action, said Doctor Crafts, carried the petitioners beyond the *five million* line.

With all this array in its favor, it is no wonder that Doctor Crafts reported that there is good prospect for the passage of the bill. Dr. Crafts said: "The labor unions and the churches were never before united. If the labor unions alone can get what they want, and if the churches alone can get what they want, how much more, and more easily, can this be accomplished when all these are united together."

The petitions are still being circulated and signed by the thousands. If that bill shall pass, that will show that this nation is ready and willing to commit itself to an unlimited course of religious legislation, and which can end only in the destruction of that liberty, both civil and religious, which has been our heritage for a hundred years. Are our read-

ers ready to give their influence, either by signing these petitions or otherwise, to such a work? Are our readers not rather ready to sign petitions everywhere praying the National Legislature to let religion and religious observances forever alone? A. T. J.

Principles, Not Parties.

FROM a gentleman in the State of New York, a minister of the gospel, we have received a letter inquiring into the political affiliations of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. The letter is too long to be published entire, but we will give enough of it so that the reader may have a good idea of its contents. After stating that in his section the extra SENTINEL was circulated by Republicans, as campaign literature against the Prohibition party, he says:—

"With the SENTINEL, I am uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward union of Church and State either in name or in fact. My pen and voice have been and still will be against it. I have recently lectured against the encroachments of Rome, and opposed also the legislation that fined and imprisoned your people for quietly and lawfully working on Sunday.

"But your articles in the SENTINEL, as far as I have been able to see, would lead one to infer that you are not alarmed in regard to Republicans, and their attitude on the Sunday question, but are fully awake to the tendency of Prohibitionists to link in the question with that of temperance.

"Dr. Carroll, editor of the N. Y. *Independent*, in a speech in favor of his party (anti-saloon Republican) declared that all legislation for the better observance of Sunday had come from the Republican party, and intimated that such would be the case in the future. In your article against such legislation, you say much about Senator Blair's bill, styling him a Prohibitionist, etc.

"Senator Blair is a staunch Republican, sent to the Senate by Republicans. His hope of passing his bills, and securing Sunday legislation, is in the attitude of a Republican Congress. From a Republican Congress and a Republican President, he hopes to secure what you and I denounce as a menace to religious liberty. He has no hopes of doing this inside of any other party, for he does not believe a third party can obtain control of the Government. Republicans in Congress are working together to secure legislation in the interests of Rome. Protestant Republicans are the men who to-day are the greatest plotters against religious freedom. Why, then, are you so much against Prohibitionists, but fail to say much, if anything, against the Republican party, to which Carroll, Blair, and company look for future Sunday legislation?"

We have quoted the principal part of the letter. From a perusal of the whole, it seems to us that our brother is moved quite as much by hatred of the Republican party as by desire to see justice done to the Prohibition party. As for the SENTINEL, we can say with truth that it is strictly non-partisan. It deals only with principles, and with facts as they illustrate or stand in opposition to those principles. And here we will say that the greatest fault that we have seen in the Prohibition party is the intense, bitter, and almost unreasoning partisan spirit manifested by its leaders. In the late campaign we listened to several speeches by prominent Prohibitionists, and their whole animus seemed to be hatred of the two old parties. The Prohibition journals were the same. Their whole campaign stock seemed to be vituperation and abuse of Republicans and Democrats. We are no apologist for either of the old parties, and are not claiming that much that was said against them was not true; but such political methods seem to us decidedly out of place in a party which professes to be the party of moral ideas.

Our friend charges all the alliance with Romanism upon the Republican party. This seems to us a little strange, since the Democratic party has been proverbial for years as the party that was dominated by the Catholics. President Cleveland's obsequious attention to Cardinal Gibbons is well known to all our readers; and who has forgotten the insult which his administration gave to the whole American nation, when it sent a Government vessel to meet the emissaries of the Pope, when they came on a church mission, and how the Papal flag was hoisted above the stars and stripes?

The fact of the matter is that both the old parties are like the Prohibition party, in that they favor whatever will bring them the most votes at any particular time. No man is warranted in saying that any particular party will be the party that will offer the greatest menace to religious liberty. It is highly probable that some entirely new party will be instrumental in consummating that work. We have nothing to do with parties as such. The SENTINEL has no fight against any political party. But when it sees movements on foot that tend most directly to overthrow religious liberty, it will vigorously oppose them, no matter by whom they are championed. To show that this is true, we need only say that six years ago, when the matter of a Sunday law was the only issue between the two great parties in California, we circulated hundreds of thousands of papers opposing the stand taken by the Republican party, and it was said that the work done by the publishers of the SENTINEL contributed in no small degree to the defeat of that party. When the party dropped that issue, there was no longer any necessity for opposing its work. It is not true that the Blair Bill is a Republican measure, for we know of a surety that the most vigorous opposition that it will meet in the House will be from Republicans. Moreover, we have seen Mr. Harrison's statement, signed with his own hand, to the effect that he does not favor such legislation as is proposed by Senator Blair.

We well know that Senator Blair is a Republican, but we have no evidence that his measure is a Republican measure. The readers of the SENTINEL can testify that Senator Blair's Republicanism has not prevented us from opposing his work; and we think that our action in the past is ample proof that we should pursue a like course in regard to the Republican party as a whole, if it should endorse Senator Blair's bills.

And now for a few facts to show that the Prohibition party is pre-eminently the party that is devoted to religious legislation.

1. Chairman Dickie said in answer to a question, that the disfranchisement of woman is a greater curse than all the saloons in the country. And Sam Small, secretary of the National Prohibition Convention, said: "One reason why I favor woman suffrage is because we would have more Christian voters if the women were allowed to vote." Thus it appears from the highest authority that the Prohibition party is not primarily a temper-

ance party, but is a woman suffrage party, and that for the purpose of advancing its religio-political designs.

2. In a speech in Kansas City, Sam Small, who is one of the Prohibition party leaders, said:—

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws."

Talk about the encroachments of Rome! How much better would this be? Not a bit better, but rather worse, because it would include the Catholic Church, and so to its despotism would be added that of all the other churches. For ourselves we can say that we shall never cease to antagonize any effort tending in that direction, no matter how highly "moral" the party making them may profess to be.

3. Speaking about the morality of the Prohibition party reminds us of what the *Lever* said some time ago:—

"At this point the Prohibition party stands out in bold contrast with the old parties. It recognizes the authority of God in human government, and proposes that all legislation shall be in harmony with Christian morality."

Here we see that the religious character of the Prohibition party is set forth as its great point of superiority over the old parties.

4. In the *Christian Statesman* of November 22, 1888, there appeared an editorial entitled, "Have We a Christian Party?" in which, after saying that "no one will claim that either one of the dominant parties in American politics is a Christian party," and that the character of the Prohibition party in this respect has not yet been definitely settled, it says of it:—

"We acknowledge with cheerful thankfulness the religious utterances which from time to time have appeared in its platforms. It has definitely acknowledged almighty God as the source of all power in civil Government. It has declared for the maintenance of the Christian Sabbath. Some of its State platforms have avowed the purpose of the party to be to apply the principles of the Christian religion to our whole political life, and several county platforms have made express acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations. These are new utterances in American politics. They have no precedent and no parallel in the history of parties among us. They have awakened the brightest hopes among those who feel that the question of all questions, of which the temperance question itself, in its deepest aspects, is only a part, is whether we shall maintain or shall forego our national Christianity."

This shows that the National Reform Association, of which the *Statesman* is the chief organ, looks with great expectation to the rising Prohibition party to further its aims. That its expectations are based on reason appears not only from the above, but from many other things. In last month's SENTINEL, page 94, there appeared a short article showing from the statement of an intelligent Prohibition worker that the Prohibition party is the Church and State party.

These are points enough to show that the

SENTINEL could not be true to itself if it did not antagonize, not temperance, nor Constitutional Prohibition, but that which constitutes the chief work of the nominally prohibition party. When the Republican party, or any other party, makes religion an issue, we shall oppose its work just as vigorously. We should oppose them as vigorously even if they were advocated by the church of which we are members.

E. J. W.

A National Reform Ally.

ONE of the notices recently posted up by the infamous association known as White Caps, read as follows: "God hates liars and perjurers and adulterers. The White Cappers are the Lord's chosen people to wreak his vengeance on the wicked and the unjust."

The National Reformers have in this band of midnight marauders a strong ally. The principles of the White Caps are identical with those of the National Reform Association. Both parties think that they are specially chosen of God to execute his laws, and to preserve morality. There is no difference except in their methods of work, and that is a minor matter. The White Caps have just as much reason to suppose that the Lord has called them to the work of purifying this Nation as the National Reformers have to imagine that they are the ones to conquer the world to Christ, and then to make him King over it. If the Lord calls people to a work he also tells them how to do it, so that National Reformers have no occasion to condemn the other party. As a matter of fact, neither party has any just conception whatever of God or his Government, or they would not think themselves capable of acting as his deputies in administering it. "For it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."

Freedom in Religion.

ONE fatal mistake which has contributed to support the throne of Intolerance, is to suppose that people may be made religious by force; that torturing and mangling the body may benefit the soul. To me it appears much more self-evident that if a man has not a religion of his own choice, he can have none at all. A man may be constrained to dissemble what he really is, and to affect to be what he is not; but he cannot be compelled to be a servant of God. Children in religion ought to know that God is the happy God, and that he does not admit of a miserable and slavish service; that he is a spirit, and requires to be worshiped in spirit and in truth. Whether worshiping in truth signify worshiping in sincerity, or in the simplicity of the gospel, in distinction from the complicated forms of the law, is immaterial; the human spirit, and all that can be of service to it, in the adoration of the divine Spirit, is equally beyond the sphere of violence.

To employ force in propagating religion, or maintaining it where it has been propagated, is to offer it a dishonorable and pernicious service. To attempt compelling a man to be-

come religious is itself a piece of irreligion, and the absurdity of such an attempt is as flagrant as the iniquity of it. The timid may be compelled to a feigned assumption of what they neither understand nor approve; but the judgment, the conscience, and the affections, the abodes of religion or its opposite, are not within the reach of compulsion; error and vice have retreats from which nothing but truth and grace can banish them. The conduct of the religious despot is preposterous and infamous; his machinations and efforts tend to the extinction of all which is free, noble, and ingenuous in man, and to the production of those pests to society, suspicion, servility, deceit, and hypocrisy. Even supposing the principles and tendency of a religion to be good, the imposition of it by force is adapted to produce effects the contrary of itself. But any religion which is founded in truth, and which has an intrinsic power of improving our nature and condition, must have an intrinsic hostility to bribery and compulsion. Christianity spread and triumphed, not by the physical or numerical strength of its ministers, but by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, and by the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left. The acts of faith and obedience to which the gospel calls us, are a reasonable service, to which we are to be drawn by the mercies of God, and not driven by the terrors of men.—*Clarke's History of Intolerance.*

The National Sunday Convention.

THE National Convention of the American Sunday Union met in the Foundry M. E. Church, Washington, D. C., December 11-13. The auditorium was draped with long strips of red cotton, on which were pasted the petitions of about fourteen millions of alleged petitioners—over six millions of Protestants, and seven million two hundred thousand Catholics—and decorated with large and handsomely-printed copies of the coat of arms of each State in the Union.

The first meeting was presided over by Mr. Elliott F. Shepard, of the New York *Mail and Express*, and was addressed by Dr. J. H. Knowles, editor of the *Pearl of Days*, and Secretary of the National Sunday Union, Mrs. Josephine C. Batcham, of the W. C. T. U., Mr. A. S. Diven, ex-Director of the Erie Railroad, and Mr. Shepard, the presiding officer.

Dr. Knowles's address was a brief account of the origin of the National Sunday Union, which was this: In 1887 Dr. W. F. Crafts suggested to Dr. Knowles that such a thing ought to be, and Dr. Knowles agreed with him. In May, 1888, Dr. Crafts addressed a memorial to the General Conference of the M. E. Church assembled in New York City, asking that body to take the initiative in the organization of a National Sunday Union. That body heartily responded, appointed a committee, and laid upon Dr. Knowles the duty of bringing the matter before other bodies.

He did so, and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church North, and of the Presbyterian Church South, the Baptist Union, the United Presbyterian Church, the Congregationalists, the Methodist Protestant Church, and fifteen others, all cordially entered into the plan of organization. In addition to these, the W. C. T. U., the National Reform Association, the Knights of Labor, and the Catholic Church as embodied in Cardinal Gibbons, are to be counted.

Mrs. Batcham pointed to the festoon of petitions and said she was reminded of the scripture which says we are "compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses," and announced that there were fourteen millions of these witnesses in the petitions hanging upon the pillars of the building. She declared that these fourteen million witnesses refuse to surrender the richest boon granted of God and our fathers. She said that undoubtedly this was the largest petition ever presented to any Government, and that it was not yet complete; for since she had come into the room she had opened one letter containing a thousand names, and another containing nine hundred, and others from colleges, seminaries, etc., containing smaller numbers. She said the Blair Sunday Bill had been specifically indorsed by hundreds of thousands; but the majority of the fourteen millions had asked in general terms for a Sunday law. Through Dr. Crafts they had secured the indorsement of two hundred and forty thousand. She stated that all the States have Sunday laws, while the nation has none, which is much needed to throw the Government on the side of the Sunday. In favor of the Sunday law she reported:—

- "1. The leaders of thought everywhere.
- "2. All Christians *except* the *very small* sect of Seventh-day Baptists.
- "3. The Roman Catholics, because Cardinal Gibbons indorsed for all his people.
- "4. The laboring classes.
- "5. Nearly all intelligent people except those who are blinded by business interests."

In opposition to it she reported:—

- "1. Sunday papers.
- "2. Railroad managers—probably.
- "3. Steamboat companies, and managers of Sunday resorts.
- "4. Saloonists and their abettors and allies.
- "5. Business men who make much money.
- "6. Seventh-day Baptists—not large in numbers."

Then she said: "In the face of this opposition, can the law be secured? Certainly it can. It would be absurd to think that fourteen millions of people could not get what they desire. Morality must be upheld. God is behind and in it all."

The object of General Diven's address was, as a railroad expert, to show the total absence of any necessity for Sunday trains. His plan is that live-stock trains shall stop over Sunday so as to allow the stock to be let out and obtain relief from the crowding of the cars. In the case of passenger trains from ocean to ocean he would have the most attractive places fitted up at the proper points where

the trains should stop over Sunday, and have the railroad companies *give* to each passenger a free ticket to hotel accommodations, meals, and the pleasures of the attractive resort. But the general did not explain just how a free ticket to an attractive resort will promote the observance of the Sabbath.

As for milk trains, he said that as a rule milk supplies were not over one hundred miles from the city; that Saturday's milk would supply on Sunday; and the whole of Sunday's milk could start after sundown and reach the cities in good time for Monday morning's delivery, for said he: "I am only contending for the suspension of trains during the *day-time* of Sunday." But he did not explain how a train is any more sinful in the *day-time* than it is in the *night-time* of the Sabbath. Mr. Diven himself, however, was willing to justify Sunday trains in the day-time "for the accommodation of church goers," but he said it had been suggested that he "had better leave out that part of his address." At this there was such a clapping of hands that he concluded that he "had better leave it out."

The chairman next introduced Dr. Crafts as pastor of the First Union Church, New York City, which he explained by saying that it was the first church organized after the union of the Old School and New School Presbyterians. Mr. Crafts gave way for a few minutes to allow Mrs. Batcham to answer a question that had been sent up. In the announcements that had been made before the meeting, it was stated that the church in which the Convention was to be held would be festooned with the names of six millions of petitioners; but at the very beginning of this, the first meeting, it was stated that there were *fourteen* millions of them. The question was how the number could have grown so much larger so suddenly. This was explained by the fact that Cardinal Gibbons had written a letter indorsing the Blair Bill, and solely upon the strength of his name seven million two hundred thousand Catholics were counted as *petitioners*.

This was not an entire answer to the question, because the Cardinal's letter did not authorize any such use of it as they had made, at least so much of it as was made public did not. The whole of the letter was not made public, because, Dr. Crafts said, it was for the Senate Committee. But so much of it as was read merely referred to the action of the Baltimore Council in commanding a stricter observance of Sunday, and said:—

"I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labor, and who are endeavoring to promote its decent and proper observance by judicious legislation."

This was all. He said, "I am happy to add *my name*," etc. He did not say that he added, or that he wished to add, seven million two hundred thousand others with his name, or in his name. But the over-weening anxiety of these *Christian*, Protestant (?) Sunday-law workers for petitions was so great that, without a twinge, they could and did multiply *one* Cath-

olic name into seven million two hundred thousand *and one*. Yet this was not so much to be wondered at, because the same principle had been acted upon before throughout the country, and when five hundred petitioners could be made out of *one* hundred, and two hundred and forty *thousand* out of two hundred and forty, it was perfectly easy and entirely consistent to make seven million two hundred thousand and one out of *one*.

This thing was perfectly consistent also with the principle in another point. The petition read, "We, the undersigned, *adult* residents of the United States, *21 years of age or more*, hereby petition," etc. In counting these seven million two hundred thousand petitioners in behalf of the Sunday law, they thereby certified that all these were Catholics "21 years of age or more." But there was not a man in that Convention, and there is not a woman in the W. C. T. U., who does not know that there are not that many Catholics in the United States "21 years of age or more." They virtually certified that all the Catholics in the United States are "21 years of age or more," for they distinctly announced that "all the Roman Catholics" were petitioning for the Sunday law. But when they had virtually certified the same thing of the Protestant churches throughout the country, why should they not go on and swing in "all the Roman Catholics" in the same way? They could do the one just as honestly as they could do the other. When men and women professing themselves to be Protestant Christians will do such things as that to carry the Catholic Church with them, it is time they ceased to call themselves Protestants. And when they will do such things *for any purpose*, it is time they should cease to call themselves Christians. *Christianity means honesty.*

There was a question handed in on this, as follows: "Is it consistent with either Protestant principles or American principles to recognize the propriety of one man's absorbing into himself the personality of seven million two hundred thousand people, as you have granted to Cardinal Gibbons in this case?" The question was not even read to the audience, much less was it answered.

Mr. Shepard, the presiding officer, was the next to speak, and he was "glad to welcome the Roman Catholics in any work in which they could be induced to join." He said the fourth commandment is the first commandment with blessing, and, very truly, that it would be a blessing to everyone who would keep it. But, said he, many will ask, "How shall I find out whether I shall be blessed?" Answer: "Why, by keeping it, to be sure. Keep the Sabbath, and you will get the blessing, and you can't get it in any other way."

All this is true enough, but Mr. Shepard did not tell how this blessing can come upon those who will not keep it without being compelled to by the civil law, which they are seeking to have enacted. Can they compel men to receive the blessing of God?

The first speaker on Wednesday was Dr. Conrad, editor of the *Lutheran Observer*. His subject was, "The Reaction against the Conti-

mental Sunday." He described the Sunday in European countries, and especially in Germany. He said in Europe the Sunday afternoon and evening were devoted to the theaters, which at those times have especially attractive programs, and to the beer gardens.

Bishop Hurst, on the same subject, said that in Germany the finest theatricals are played on Sunday afternoons, and "the pastors are there with their flocks;" and there the people often meet their pastor, whom they in the forenoon had heard preach.

Dr. Fernley, Secretary of the Philadelphia Sunday Association, next spoke, and heartily wished that our National Constitution "had God, and Jesus Christ, and the Bible, in it;" and complained that our foreign population demanded a Continental Sunday instead of the American Sabbath.

The statements of these last three speakers about the Continental Sunday called out the following question:—

"The Continental countries are Roman Catholic countries. The Continental Sunday is the Roman Catholic Sunday. In the petition for this National Sunday law you have six million Protestants, and seven million two hundred thousand Catholics. Now suppose the law should be passed, would you then have a Continental Sunday or an 'American Sabbath'? In other words, can the six million Protestants compel the seven million two hundred thousand Catholics to keep Sunday in the Protestant way?"

This question was likewise neither read nor answered.

Mr. George May Powell said that in this matter of Sabbath reform "there is nothing so much needed as a better observance of the Sabbath by the ministry and the laity of the churches. When the clergy and the laity come up to the scriptural observance of the Sabbath, and not till then, will the land enjoy her Sabbaths—not till there is a reform of the evangelical clergy and laity."

All of which is true. But if the clergy and laity will not reform without the power of civil law which they themselves must enforce, how in the world shall this much desired reform ever be accomplished.

Senator Hawley, of Connecticut, was to have presided over the meeting Wednesday night, but being hindered by business at the Capitol, he sent a letter in which he expressed his indorsement of the work, and his general concurrence in it.

Congressman Dingley, of Maine, was present at this meeting, and made a speech strongly indorsing the movement, and saying that "there are few more important National questions than that which had called this assembly."

Dr. Crafts next opened the question box, and answered such questions as he could. He said: "The greatest trouble on this question in this country is in the churches and among the preachers. They do not observe the Sabbath. There are some preachers in the pulpit who do not observe it."

One question was: "In view of the large number of Catholic petitioners, why was there no Catholic elected as a member of the Executive Committee of the Union?" The

Doctor replied that a member of that church—a Mr. Hickey—had been that day chosen upon the Executive Committee. But Mr. Crafts did not tell the audience that he himself had done his best to prevent this. He did not tell how he in executive session had repeatedly tried to adjourn the meeting to defeat the election of a Catholic upon the Board. He was perfectly willing to use all the Catholics upon the strength of the Cardinal's name, but he was not willing to grant them representation on the Executive Committee. Mr. Hickey was elected, though, in spite of Dr. Craft's opposition.

In further talk Mr. Crafts exposed the spring of the whole movement by saying that "taking religion out of the day takes the rest out."

Meetings were held Thursday afternoon and evening, but there was nothing of importance said more than has been already reported in this, or in the report from the Chicago Convention. Dr. Herrick Johnson repeated his Chicago speech on the "Sunday Newspaper."

Thursday forenoon they had a second hearing before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair chairman, to present the petition of their six million Protestants and their seven-million-two-hundred-thousand-times-multiplied Cardinal. There was nothing said by them there materially in addition to what was said in Convention, except the statement of Dr. Sunderland, of Washington City—President Cleveland's pastor—who, in explaining to the Senate Committee how the change of the Sabbath came about from the seventh day to the first day of the week, declared that "Sunday is the seventh day of the Christian week!"

The managers of the movement were greatly encouraged by the work of the Convention, as they have good reason to be, and expressed themselves as very hopeful of getting the National Sunday Bill enacted into a law, and signed by President Cleveland before the expiration of the term of his office, on March 4. And it is certain that if fallacious arguments, deceptive statements, and dishonest practices can accomplish it, their hope is not groundless.

The American people not only do not half realize the danger that there is in this movement if the law should be secured, but they do not half realize the chicanery that is being employed to secure it. The greatest danger of all is that the people will not realize it till it is everlastingly too late.

A. T. J.

Washington, D. C., December 16, 1888.

Sunday-Law Arguments.

"LIBERTY of rest for each demands a law of rest for all." This is a favorite proposition among Sunday-law advocates. They tell us it is impossible for a part of the people to keep Sunday properly while the rest are pursuing their regular avocations, or indulging in pleasures and amusements.

That is to say, the Almighty has fixed things in such a way that it is impossible for one person to be a true Christian unless everybody else will be a Christian at the same time.

And, as there has never been a time when all the people were Christians, and never will be in this world, therefore it is certain that there never were, and never will be, any Christians, and hence nobody can be saved.

This is the logic of religious legislation. But is it true that God has so arranged matters that one man's virtue or piety depends upon that of some other man, so that he cannot serve God acceptably unless the other man does the same? Those who are clamoring for Sunday laws say, "Yes;" the apostle Paul says, "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

It is wonderful how great authorities will differ. Let National Reformers explain the cause.

A. DELOS WESCOTT.

The Amended Sunday Bill.

We have already, in two separate issues of the SENTINEL, printed and commented upon the Blair Sunday Rest Bill; but certain changes have been made in it of late, and in order that our readers may keep informed as to the spirit of Sunday legislation, we once more print the bill, together with the amended form. First, we print the bill as it is, and second, the bill with the changes desired by the "American Sabbath Union," followed by the reasons for the changes, and our comments thereon. The "Special Committee" spoken of in the title of the report consisted of Col. Elliot F. Shepard, Bishop Hurst, Dr. Sunderland, Dr. Ruskin, Dr. Knowles, Dr. Elliott, and others, with Mrs. J. Ellen Foster as legal adviser. The report is as follows:—

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CHANGES DESIRED IN THE SUNDAY REST BILL.

THE BILL AS IT IS.

In the Senate of the United States, May 21, 1888, Mr. Blair introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:—

50th Congress, 1st Session, S. 2983.

A Bill to Secure to the People the Enjoyment of the First Day of the Week Commonly known as the Lord's Day, as a Day of Rest, and to Promote its Observance as a Day of Religious Worship.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

SECTION 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided*, That whenever any letter shall relate to work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the Postmaster-General shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make

regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: *And provided further*, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.

SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, nor humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent or employe of any person or corporation, who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States, on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.

SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered, or for labor performed, or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal-routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed, so far as possible, to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.

THE BILL WITH CHANGES DESIRED BY THE AMERICAN SABBATH UNION.

(Changes indicated by full-face letters and stars.) Unanimously adopted December 12, 1888.

A Bill to Secure to the People the enjoyment of the *Lord's Day, commonly known as Sunday*, as a Day of Rest, and to *Protect* its Observance as a Day of Religious Worship.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That *on Sunday*, no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business * * * works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, *show, exhibition*, or amusement * * * *open to the public, or of a public character*, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

SEC. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of *Sunday*.

SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, * * * by the transportation of persons or property by land or water * * * on the first day of the week * * * is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent or employe of any person or corporation, who shall * violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable, or be paid for the same.

SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on *Sunday* in consequence of accident or disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the * * * transportation and delivery of *milk* before 5 A. M. and after 10 P. M. * * * shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed, so far as possible, to secure to the whole people rest from toil during *Sunday*, their mental and moral culture, and the *protection of the religious observance of the * day*.

The reasons for the changes asked are, in part, as follows:—

For religious purposes we prefer the name Lord's day or Christian Sabbath, but as Sunday is already used in National laws, we think it better to use that uniformly in this bill, with the one exception of the double name in the title.

The word "promote" in the title goes beyond what many, even your Christian citizens, believe to be the proper function of Government with reference to "religious worship," while the word "protect" (see also last line) expresses a duty which Government owes to all legitimate institutions of the people.

Experience in the courts has shown that the words "show, exhibition," should be added to the list of prohibited Sunday amusements, and the words "in public," in place of "to the disturbance of others," as the latter clause has been construed as requiring that persons living in the neighborhood of a Sunday game or show must testify that they have been disturbed, in order to a conviction, which cannot be done in some cases without personal peril.

In Section 2, we believe that the exceptions for letters relating to sickness, etc., are unnecessary in this age of the telegraph; and that they would be used by unscrupulous men in business correspondence, and that this would destroy most of the benefits of the law in its bearing on Sunday mails.

In Section 3, we believe the exceptions made would greatly interfere with the administration of the law. The exception for work of mercy and necessity is made, once for all, in the first section. The reference to "the disturbance of others" is objectionable for reasons already given, and the word "willfully" is an old offender in Sabbath legislation, and requires evidence very hard to get in regard to one's motive and knowledge of the law. In other laws it is assumed that one knows the law, and the law-making power should see that the laws are well published, and leave no room for one to escape by agnosticism.

In Section 5 (as in section 1 also), we would omit "Lord's day," and in Section 6, "Sabbath," in order to preserve uniformity in using the less religious term, Sunday.

In Section 6, we think refrigerator cars make Sunday work in transportation of perishable food, except milk, unnecessary, and the new stock cars, with provision for food and water, do the same for stock trains. So many of the State Sunday laws have proved almost useless in protecting the rights of the people to Sunday rest and undisturbed worship, by the smallness of their penalties and the largeness of their exceptions, that we covet from Congress a law that shall make itself effective by small exceptions and large penalties.

With a little care in comparison, the reader can readily see what changes have been made in the bill. We have omitted sections 4 and 5 from the revised bill, because they are the same as the corresponding sections in the original bill, with the single exception of "Sunday" being substituted for "Lord's day," in last line of section 4. We hope that everyone will study both bills thoroughly, together with the committee's reasons for the changes. Anyone can see that the changes are in the line of greater stringency. We note only the most prominent points.

1. The change from "Lord's day" to Sunday, although a proper one, is in reality no change at all, since the term "Lord's day"

is still used at the beginning, and it is expressly stated that "Sunday" is used only as a matter of custom. It is understood that it is as a religious day, indicated by the term "Lord's day" that they want the observance of the first day of the week enforced; but if the term "Sunday" is quite generally used, it will no doubt "take" better.

2. In asking for the "protection of the religious observance of the day," instead of the promotion of its observance as a day of religious worship, the committee threw a sop to those who are "on the fence" in regard to religious legislation. As it stands, it amounts to nothing; for there is not a State or Territory in the Union where any religious service held on Sunday would not be protected.

3. The most important change of all, however, is the substitution of the words "in public" instead of "to the disturbance of others," in section 1. This will certainly make the law more effective. It is obvious that if a man were to engage in work a mile from a dwelling-house, it would be quite a task for the owner of the house to convince even an ordinary jury that such labor disturbed him; but by the terms of the amended bill, the man may be convicted if he is working in a public place, provided anybody can get near enough to him to see him.

4. Notice the radical change made in section 2. As amended, it is most sweeping, allowing of no exception. The mail is not to be carried at all on Sunday, even in case of sickness and death, lest some "unscrupulous" person should mention business on that day. If the mail is not carried, of course that will make him a good man! It is no concern of ours how they propose to carry out this law, but we can't help wondering what they will do when Sunday comes, and a train carrying the mail is on the way, say from Chicago to New Orleans. The train is owned by a corporation, and is not in a part of the country "subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States," and therefore could not be forced to lie over. The only way out of the difficulty, under the provision of this bill, would be to dump all the mail out at the nearest station, and let it lie there till Sunday was past.

This, however, would not be done. What would be done would be the passing of laws by the several States, forbidding all labor within their jurisdiction, and it is this for which these zealous people are scheming. This United States law is designed as a precedent, and as a lever with which to secure the religious observance of Sunday by all the people in the United States, whether they are religious or not.

5. We wish to call special attention, also, to the last sentence of the "reason for the changes asked." It says: "So many of the State Sunday laws have proved almost useless in protecting the rights of the people to Sunday rest, and undisturbed worship, by the smallness of their penalties and the largeness of their exceptions, that we covet from Congress a law that shall make itself effective by small exceptions and large penalties." There the real spirit of the dragon exhibits itself. In that simple statement is compressed a world of bigotry and animosity. History has abundantly shown that the bitterness and hate which bigoted men feel toward those who differ with them in religious opinion, are the

worst of all. It is very natural for a bigoted man to imagine that when his views are not respected it is a direct insult to the Lord, and that he is the divinely appointed agent to punish all such offenses. The spirit of the statement which we have just quoted is this: "We want things fixed so that those who do not believe as we do can be fully within our power, so that we can wreak on them all the hatred which we feel for them."

We speak strongly, because the case demands it. We do not speak thus in order to arouse a feeling against those who are engineering this thing, but that all who read it may be led to examine the matter for themselves more closely, that they may see the wickedness of the whole business, and may protest. Petitions against tampering with the Constitution, and dabbling in religious legislation, have been sent far and wide, and we believe that it will be seen that there are many thousands of people in the United States who are not willing to forge chains with which to bind themselves, nor to lend themselves to the work of binding others. No scheme more iniquitous, nor more opposed to the spirit of the gospel of Christ, was ever set on foot in this country.

E. J. W.

Our Position Again Stated.

THERE has just come to our notice a circular letter designed to arouse those whom it reaches, to oppose Sunday legislation. It has evidently been used by the one who got it up, to introduce the AMERICAN SENTINEL; but the SENTINEL feels constrained to utter its most emphatic disapproval of the argument used. After mentioning the National Reform Association, and its allies, the Prohibition party and the Woman's (Political) Christian Temperance Union, the writer says:—

"The above statements clearly show how these three bodies of active workers are rapidly making their cause one, and while we are made glad to see the cause of temperance advancing, it saddens us to see this Sunday movement brought into it. If Sunday sanctity were established by divine authority, it would be different. But since it is a usurper, and has only the authority of man for its establishment, we must raise our voice against it, and call the attention of all to the fact that God asks no one to do such a work as is proposed for Sunday."

We wish to say for the SENTINEL that it would make no difference if the Sunday were sanctioned by divine authority in the plainest terms. The SENTINEL is opposed to legislation upon matters of religion, no matter how well established those matters may be by divine authority. Such legislation is wrong, it is wicked. It is directly opposed to the spirit of the gospel, and to that rule which says, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." We know full well that Sunday observance has no sanction in the Bible, but our opposition to Sunday laws does not rest upon that basis.

We believe in one God, the Creator of the heavens and the earth. We believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, the divine Word that was made flesh and dwelt among us, "who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." We believe in baptism "for the remission of sins," and in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, by which believers may "show the Lord's death till he come." We hold these truths in common

with the great body of professed Christians, and they are most clearly revealed in the inspired Scriptures; but we would resist with all our might any attempt to enforce the belief or practice of these truths upon unwilling men. The more we love these truths, the more strenuously would we oppose any legislation in regard to them, because we do not desire to see them profaned, and because we do not like to see men made hypocrites.

There is no professed Christian who would for a moment sanction such a thing as the dragging of an infidel into the church, and compelling him to join in the celebration of the communion. Some churches admit only those of their own belief, and none think of asking any who do not love the Lord Jesus Christ. But it is just as proper to legislate in behalf of one religious custom as for another. Indeed, if the principle of religious legislation be admitted at all, it must be applied to everything; so that, if the religious observance of Sunday should be enforced, the observance of the Lord's Supper ought likewise to be enforced. Mr. Cook says that "the privilege of rest for each is the law of rest for all." Just as consistently might it be said, "The privilege of communion for each is the law of communion for all," and so make a law requiring everybody to join in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

It seems as though anybody could see that if civil Governments have a duty in respect to one religious institution, they have the same duty in regard to all; and it seems, also, that all might see the inconsistency and the wickedness of such legislation. It always has, and always will, lead to endless persecution and the manufacture of hypocrites. The Lord does not ask men to help him in the administration of his laws. He says, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." The Spirit of the Lord is the only power that can make men truly religious. The civil power can only make them (in some instances) act as if they were religious. But when men are truly religious they will act so; and when they are not, it is no credit to them, and is not desired by the Lord, that they should act as if they were.

E. J. W.

VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM.

PACKAGE NO. 1, 184 PAGES, 20 CENTS.

This package contains thirteen tracts treating upon the various phases of the National Reform movement, as follows:—

No.	PAGES.
1. Religious Legislation,.....	8
2. Religious Liberty,.....	8
3. National Reform and the Rights of Conscience,.....	16
4. The American Papacy,.....	16
5. Bold and Base Avowal,.....	16
6. National Reform is Church and State,.....	16
7. Purity of National Religion,.....	8
8. The Salem Witchcraft,.....	8
9. What Think Ye of Christ?,.....	8
10. National Reformed Constitution and the American Hierarchy,.....	24
11. The Republic of Israel,.....	8
12. National Reformed Presbyterianism,.....	32
13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity,.....	16

The above package will be sent post-paid to any address for twenty cents.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

REDEEMER AND REDEEMED;

—OR—
The Plan of Redemption through Christ.

BY ELDER JAMES WHITE.

The plan of salvation, concisely presented as revealed by the Scriptures. Paper covers, forty-eight pages, sent post-paid for ten cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1889.

ENOUGH live, interesting matter for another number of the SENTINEL has been crowded out of this issue by matter that had to go in. The pressure upon our columns makes us begin to think that some change will have to be made sometime. We hope it may come soon in the shape of more frequent publication.

WE send this number of the SENTINEL to several thousand people who are not subscribers. To such we say, Read it carefully, and see if you have not a duty in the matter of helping to circulate it, and thus warn your friends of dangers of which they may be entirely unconscious. The SENTINEL ought to have a regular list of a quarter of a million before the close of this volume.

THE theological faculty of the University of Giessen has conferred on Prince Bismarck the title of Doctor of Divinity! Just what moved them to do this we do not know, but we imagine that it was because they are tinctured with the National Reform idea that men may go up to the polls to worship God. When politics and religion are one, we can see no incongruity in making every statesman a Doctor of Divinity.

THE members of the "National Sabbath Union," with true National Reform generosity, made General Harrison one of the vice-presidents of their association, at the late meeting in Washington. Of course Mr. Harrison didn't know anything about the transaction, but that made no difference. Honors are easy among those people, and they willingly bestow them upon both living and dead. Unlike Shakespeare, they think that there is a great deal in a name.

WITH this issue the AMERICAN SENTINEL begins its fourth volume. It has been prospered in the three years that it has been published, beyond our most sanguine expectations, and has the brightest prospects for the future. No one who is not watching the movement of things can have any real conception of the wide field open before the SENTINEL, and of the necessity for it. New phases of the National Reform work are constantly developing, and the SENTINEL intends to keep its eye upon them all and continue to sound the alarm.

ONE of our Hibernian police was taking in a refractory prisoner, whom he had pounded until he was out of breath, and then attempted to reason with him as follows: "It is not because I hates you I bates you, but because I have the authority to do so."—*Life*.

The above note is commended to the attention of those who call themselves National Reformers, who profess that if they only get the power they will not harm a single individual who conscientiously differs with them. No doubt they are sincere in their asseverations; at least we are willing to give them credit for being sincere. But they seem to have as little knowledge of human nature as they have of the gospel. The Irishman

"clothed with a little brief authority," was a different man from the Irishman with no power at all. We prefer to keep the club out of the hands of the National Reformers, both because we know how power affects even those with the best of intentions, and because, from the spirit that many of them have already shown toward "dissenters," we feel sure that they could not say, with the Irishman, "It is not because I hates you I bates you."

THE *Christian Nation* kindly informs us that the SENTINEL would not oppose National Reform principles "if it understood them." The fact is, though, that we do understand them. And that is why we are so much opposed to the whole National Reform scheme. Those who do not understand its principles are the ones who do not oppose National Reform. Everybody who understands it is opposed to it; and the better they understand it the more decidedly are they opposed to it.

ANOTHER evidence, or rather admission, that all Sunday legislation is religious legislation, is found in the remarks of Dr. Goodwin, of Chicago, in presenting to the ministers' meeting the resolutions prepared by Dr. Herrick Johnson in regard to Sunday newspapers and Sunday observance. The Doctor said that "to strike at the Christian Sabbath is to strike at the very corner-stone of all our Christian institutions." Therefore a law in favor of Sunday, the so-called Christian Sabbath, is a law in favor of the Christian religion; and since no open law breaker can hope to be elected to public office, it follows that the enactment of Sunday laws is squarely opposed to that part of the Constitution of the United States which says that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

THE *Christian Nation* that was issued the day before Thanksgiving said that for the first time in the history of the day the Catholics would join in the observance of Thanksgiving. It adds: "Official circulars were sent out to this effect, and of course it was not done without the knowledge and consent of the Pope. This event is worth considering. What does it mean?"

It is indeed worth considering; but few of those who consider it will realize what it means. It means a coming together of Protestant and Catholic. It means that the time is fast approaching when the Catholic Church will be generally considered as the true church of Christ, and the honored mother of the Protestant churches of Christendom. It means, in short, the approach of the time when there will be no Protestant churches, except perhaps in name, and when it will be thought heretical to speak against the Catholic Church, and when the Reformation will be called a burst of fanaticism.

At the last meeting of the Monday Congregational Club, in San Francisco, one of the ministers read a paper entitled, "Why the Masses Do Not Attend the Churches." Among the principal reasons he cited "the unfortunate circumstance of our having no Sunday law." "People," said he, "go to saloons, and engage in gambling and lottery schemes, instead of going to church."

The gentleman doubtless revealed more than he intended to. He showed clearly the one real object of all Sunday legislation, namely, to fill up the empty churches. Men may talk as much as they please about Sunday laws being mere "police regulations," intended for the physical good of the people;

but we well know, what they cannot always keep concealed, that they are for no other purpose than to compel people to listen to preaching which has lost its power to draw them. They assure us that they have no idea of compelling anybody to keep Sunday, or to attend church against his will; but their assertion is not in harmony with reason. Does anybody need to be told that when they have passed a Sunday law in order to fill up their empty churches, they will enforce not only the letter but the spirit of that law, and compel attendance on church service, when it is not done voluntarily? We trow not.

This matter of Sunday laws is now a live issue. In many State Legislatures, as well as in Congress, organized and persistent efforts will be made this winter to secure the passage of such laws; and the friends of religious freedom should be on the alert.

SOME people seem to think that the reason why the Roman Catholic Church is dangerous is because of its false doctrines, and that its advances politically should be repelled on this ground. A greater mistake could not be made. The only danger from Catholicism is in its having political power at all. It was this that made it Catholic in the first place, and corrupted its doctrines. Let the great churches of this country "come together harmoniously and issue their edict," to be obeyed by the legislative powers, as Mr. Sam Small desires, and we should have a condition of things as bad as when Papal Rome ruled Europe. Their doctrines and professions might be as pure as that of the apostles, but that would not lessen the ill effects of their combining to direct legislation. Their doctrines would soon be corrupt enough to suit the enemy of all righteousness, and we should have an American Catholic Church. Let it be understood and remembered that a church exercising civil power is what constitutes the Papacy, no matter what nor where the church is.

Sample Copies.

THIS issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL is sent to many names as a free sample copy of the paper. If you like it, and believe in religious liberty, send 50 cents for the SENTINEL one year. Or, if you will send us two new yearly subscribers, at 50 cents each, we will send you the paper one year free. Clubs of 5 or more names at the rate of 30 cents per year.

Bound Volumes of the American Sentinel.

HERE is something that every Bible student, every student of history, every lover of religious liberty, and every American citizen, should have; and we have reduced the price so that it is within the reach of all. Buy it, read it, study it. Place a copy in every free library and public reading-room in the United States.

We can furnish Vol. 1 (1886), Vol. 2 (1887), and Vol. 3 (1888), of the AMERICAN SENTINEL bound in strong paper covers, with index, at sixty cents per volume, post-paid. The first two volumes bound in one, in cloth, with index and gilt title, for \$1.50 post-paid; the three years' papers all bound in one cloth volume, with index and "Extra," or special campaign number, for \$2.25, post-paid. Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, 1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

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 five or more copies, per year, each, - - - .75

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - - - 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.