

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY 24, 1889.

NUMBER 26.

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.

WESTERN civilization utterly repudiates this idea [of paternal government], denies the existence of any analogy between the family and the State, and seeks to make men and not children of the people.—*Pres. George Washburn.*

THE proper object of Government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious as well as civil rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above the other, or esteem all days alike holy.—*U. S. Senate Report, 1829.*

THE doctrine which, from the very first origin of religious dissensions, has been held by all bigots of all sects, when condensed into a few words, and stripped of rhetorical disguise, is simply this: I am in the right, you are in the wrong. When you are the stronger, you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.—*Macaulay.*

KEEP it before the people, that Rev. W. D. Gray, secretary of the Missouri National Reform Convention, recently held at Sedalia, said: "I do not believe that Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and so the object of this movement is an effort to change that feature in our fundamental law." The convention did not dissent from this declaration of purpose, but elected Mr. Gray secretary of the permanent State organization.

THE National Reformers wish in a general way to deny any idea of establishing a Church and State Government. This they do because of the well-known prejudice in this country against such a policy. But neither their writers nor their public speakers are able to disguise the real character of the movement. One of the latest admissions is found in the address of Rev. T. H. Tatlow, before the Missouri Sabbath Convention: "The party of carnal policy protests, and cries out that this is uniting Church and State. The Christian replies: It is indeed a union, but limited, and applies only so far as two separate jurisdictions—the one spiritual and primary and the other secular and secondary—exercises each one its own appropriate authority, within its own individual province, to secure a two-fold good to the two-fold life of man."

This sentiment admits all that we have ever

charged against the National Reform advocates, as aiming to establish Church and State union. It admits a union, with the spiritual jurisdiction as primary, and the secular jurisdiction as secondary, each one exercising its own appropriate authority. With such a union once established, who can fail to see that the "appropriate authority" of the "primary" jurisdiction of the Government would be the supreme authority? It is about time for that party to stop denying that their aim is a union of Church and State.

Mr. Crafts and Sunday Laws.

EVERY argument which Mr. Crafts has ever attempted in favor of a National Sunday law has been repeatedly met and refuted, nevertheless he continues to deal them out to his various audiences, making no attempt to answer counter arguments except by denials, and by denouncing all those who do not agree with him in his pet schemes for religious legislation. A favorite argument with him is, that the principle opposition outside of liquor dealers comes from Seventh-day Adventists, Seventh-day Baptists, and Jews, who, he says, together form about seven-tenths of one per cent. of the population. This, to Mr. Crafts' mind, is a sufficient reason why their wishes and rights should be entirely ignored. But, with the man who loves liberty, the rights of a single individual are as sacred as the rights of any number. Neither will justice seek to invade the rights of any; but in effect Mr. Crafts insists that these people have no rights in this matter.

Mr. Crafts defines personal liberty as "the space within the circle bound on all sides simply by the rights of others." But this is not the personal liberty which he demands, or which he is willing to accord to others. He sneers at the minority who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week, and is demanding legislation which would practically compel all such to refrain from labor also upon another day, thus depriving them of one-sixth of their God-given time for earning a livelihood and a support for those who are dependent upon them. He insists that whenever one rests on Sunday, all must rest; but that this is not necessary is demonstrated by the fact that thousands of conscientious observers of the seventh day do rest absolutely from all secular labor upon Saturday, the busiest and noisiest day of the week.

The personal liberty which Mr. Crafts advocates is such personal liberty as was granted some two years since in Arkansas, when the exemption clause in the Sunday law was repealed by the Legislature of that State. Under the law as it then stood for two years, conscientious Christian men, men who would not knowingly wrong their

neighbors in any way or take a cent that did not belong to them, were fined and imprisoned for doing such ordinary and quiet labor upon the first day of the week as digging potatoes, painting buildings, and plowing in fields at a distance from any public road. The same personal liberty is also enjoyed in Georgia, where for doing any kind of labor upon the first day of the week any person may be fined and imprisoned, the fine to go to the support of the Sunday-schools. Such examples show conclusively the innate wickedness of Sunday laws.

Mr. Crafts professes to favor an exemption clause in the National Sunday law which he is demanding, but the only exemption which he is willing to grant is of persons doing ordinary labor on Sunday which will not interfere in any way with others who wish to rest upon that day. For instance, he would prohibit a seventh-day worshiper from keeping his place of business open on Sunday, because that, he says, would compel other people to keep their business places open or else they would suffer from the competition of the man who kept open on Sunday. He forgets that the seventh-day worshiper doing business on Sunday would close his store upon Saturday, which is, as every business man will testify, the best day of the week for business; but Mr. Crafts' theory is that a part cannot rest unless all do, therefore the seventh-day worshiper must close his place of business on Sunday. Following this same logic no ordinary work should be permitted upon the first day of the week, the carpenter, the bricklayer or the plumber would also be prohibited from carrying on their vocations for the same reason, and Mr. Crafts' exemptions would amount to nothing.

But seventh-day worshipers want no exemption clause. They protest against Sunday laws of all kinds for the reason that Sunday is a religious institution, and they deny the right of Government to recognize it in any manner. They object to it for the same reason that the German princes objected to the protest against the repeal of the Edict of Spire, namely, "because it concerns the glory of God and the salvation of souls, and that in such matters we ought to have regard above all to the commandments of God, who is King of kings and Lord of lords, each of us rendering him account of himself without caring the least in the world about majority or minority." And further, that to yield the individual judgment in such matters "would be to deny our Lord Jesus Christ and reject his holy word, and thus give him just reason to deny us in turn before his Father, as he has threatened."

To admit that the Government has the right to establish by law the keeping of any day, is to destroy individual responsibility to God; it is in fact to put the Government in the place of or in-

stead of God. For, if it is right that the Government should establish the observance of days, then all good citizens ought to obey the laws of the Government and observe such days; and if the Government has the right to establish the observance of a day, then it has a right to change that observance and to place it upon some other day. Would Mr. Crafts and his co-workers in the so-called National Reform movement be willing to keep Wednesday or Friday if the Government should require it? Certainly not. They would immediately insist with great vehemence that their religious liberty was infringed, but it would no more be infringed than is the liberty of the seventh-day worshiper who is also required to rest on Sunday.

But it may be urged, and it is urged, that if an exemption clause is inserted in the bill, nobody's liberty is infringed. But this cannot be admitted for a moment. If the State has a right to require the man who has no conscientious regard for any day to rest upon a certain day, then it has the same right to require the man who has a conscientious regard for one day to rest upon some other day. In matters of conscience there must be absolute equality. We cannot say that because a man is an infidel he has not as good right to his convictions, or to his doubts, if you please, as the man who is either professedly or virtually a Christian; for if the Government has a right to discriminate and to say that Christians have certain rights that non-Christians have not, it follows that the Government must decide who are Christians, and who are not Christians; but in order to arrive at such a decision, the Government must first establish a standard of Christianity, and that would be simply to establish a State religion; which is in fact the very thing the National Reformers demand. Thus, it appears, that looking at it from any standpoint whatever, Sunday laws are unjust and oppressive. They destroy personal responsibility to God, put the Government in the place of God, and infringe the personal rights of the subject.

C. P. BOLLMAN.

Another Display of Colors.

THE Chicago District Committee of the American Sabbath Union have undertaken the work of advising the Postmaster-General as to his duties. From an "open letter" of the committee to Mr. Wanamaker, we clip the following:—

We submit to your consideration the following points as some of those on which orders or recommendations from you ought to bring the postal service more fully into harmony with the proper uses of the civil Sabbath as a day on which the Government should protect its citizens against interruptions of their rest and worship:

1. No postoffice to be opened at the usual hours of worship.
2. No postal employes required to be on duty at hours that would take from them the opportunity to attend church.
3. Stamp clerks to be entirely free from Sunday work.
4. Mail bearing special delivery stamp to be uniformly held in the office as other mail, unless personally called for.
5. No mail matter except letters to be stamped or sorted on the Sabbath.
6. Any postoffice to be wholly closed on the Sabbath where a majority of the people of legal age petition for such closing.

It is not so much the language of the suggestions as the fact of their being made, to which attention is called. This "open letter" is a mild attempt to operate on the line marked out by

Rev. Sam Small, an ardent National Reformer and popular "revivalist." His idea of a Reform Government is thus expressed:—

"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."

Of course the Postmaster-General has not legislative powers, but the principle is the same. And then, as Mr. Crafts said on the occasion of the drafting of the committee's open letter, "it is a fact that the Postmaster-General has the most autocratic powers of any officer under the United States Government, and he could order the complete cessation of labor in all departments of the mail service on the Sabbath, but such an order would not be permanent as would a law of Congress." The Reformers, knowing that they have a strong sympathizer in the person of an officer holding "autocratic powers," cannot forego the experiment of trying the influence of the church. So with every favorable turn in their affairs, the real spirit of their movement becomes more and more manifest.

A Lutheran Minister on National Reform.

"WOULD the success of the National Reform movement lead to a union of Church and State?" is the title of an essay read by Rev. Carl Ackermann, before the Lutheran Conference at Loudonville, Ohio, January 15, 1889, and published by request of the Conference in the *Lutheran Standard*, Columbus, of April 27, May 4, and May 11, from which we take the following extracts which are worthy, as is indeed the entire essay, of a careful perusal:—

Both Church and State have important fields of action in the affairs of men, and both are divinely ordered. . . . God himself has instituted the powers that be. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." Rom. 13: 1; compare Prov. 8: 15, 16. The principles underlying the foundation of government are as immutable as the Almighty himself—they are the principles of right and justice, and have their origin in God. And the application of these principles defines the sphere of the State's activity. Professor Schuette in his "State, Church, and School," defines this activity as follows: "The object and duty of the State may be designated as that of protection. The Government must secure the individual subject against injury to his person, property, reputation, and business; establish the limits of free action and protect him in the enjoyment of it within the lines so marked out. It must defend him against all undue interference with the exercise of his religion and with the government of his family. It must insure to him safety and liberty of action in his social and religious connection and intercourse. . . ."

From this definition it is clear that the province of the State's activity is the defense of man in his outward relations to his fellow-man, to protect him from harm and injury which may be inflicted on him, and to demand that, in all his actions, he take cognizance of the rights and privileges of others. It takes into consideration his relation to society. . . . The work of the State is to supervise the life of citizens and to legislate and enforce those things which are necessary for up-

holding right and punishing crime."—*Rev. J. A. Scott Jr., in Christian at Work.*

"The civil law extends over the body of man, his property, and whatever is external on earth—no farther."—*Luther.*

The sphere of activity for the church is upon a different plane. She takes into consideration the spiritual wants of man. . . . For that purpose God has also given the church the necessary means. By inspiration he guided the prophets and apostles to record his holy will. And by his Spirit he makes that inspired Word a power of God to break the heart of stone and new create it unto life and immortality. But it must be proclaimed, and to proclaim and teach the Word for the above purpose, is the God-given sphere of the church's activity. Her commission was: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16: 15), and that same commission stands to-day. With the Word as the sword of the Spirit she is to do her work, and with it alone. "After that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of of preaching to save them that believe." 2. Cor. 1: 21. To the church alone belongs this office. She is to Christianize men, not by force of arms or human agencies, but by and through the Word. Force may bring forth a confession of Christianity, but only the Word can change the heart. Word and sacrament are the only means of grace, and therefore the only means which the church can and dare use in her work of grace. "Her career lies within the kingdoms of earth, but is not of them."

As already stated, then, both Church and State are of divine origin, and have at least in so far a common object that they both seek the welfare of man and the glory of God. But "one is established by God as the Creator, and is therefore pre-eminently a dominion of his creative power and of providential wisdom and goodness; the other is established by God as the Redeemer, and is therefore a kingdom in which his grace and sanctifying power especially preponderate." "The ministry of the one is to sanctify and save man in soul and body; the ministry of the other is to protect him in his outward relations, actions, possessions—to prosper him in his earthly calling."

When we come to apply these principles to the work of the National Reform Association, we are met at the outset with a denial of any intention on their part of a union of Church and State, a denial which has been reiterated time and again. . . . But let us hear what National Reformers understand by Religion and State:—

"Church and State is always an unmixed evil; but religion and State is another thing. That is a good thing—and that is what we aim to make a feature of our institutions, and we are going to have it.

"It is just possible that the outcry against Church and State may spring rather from hatred to revealed religion than from any intelligent patriotism. But where is the sign, the omen, of such Church and State mischief coming upon us? Who will begin and who will finish this union of Church and State? If you think the Roman Catholic can do it in spite of the watchfulness of Protestants; or that one Protestant sect can do it amid the jealousy of all the other sects; or that all these sects will combine to effect a joint union with the State, you have a notion of human nature different from what I have. Church and State in union, then, are forever impossible here, and were it ever so easy, we all repudiate it, on principle. There are enduring, ever valid reasons against it. But religion and State is another thing. That is possible. That is a good thing—and that is what we aim to

make a feature in our institutions."—*Dr. J. Edwards, Minutes National Convention, N. Y., 1873, pp. 59, 60.*

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights and measures, and of course, Congress establishes a standard for money, weights and measures. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion, as it already has the Oneida Community in New York, the Mormons in Utah, and the Joss House in California."—*Professor Blanchard, Minutes Pittsburg Convention, 1874, p. 71.*

"If our nation will accept God as the source of all authority, Christ Jesus as the nation's king, and his law as of supreme authority over them, its creed is orthodox."—*Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, in Christian Statesman, March 21, 1884.*

"It is the duty of the State, as such, to enter into alliance with the church of Christ, and to profess, adhere to, defend and maintain the true religion."—*J. M. Foster, in Statesman, 1884.*

"This religion as understood by Protestants, tending by its effects to make every man submitting to its influence a better husband, parent, child, neighbor, citizen and magistrate, was by the people [of Massachusetts] established as a fundamental and essential part of their Constitution, and ought, we claim, to be likewise established by the people of the United States, as a fundamental and essential part of their Constitution."—*Hon. T. H. B. Patterson, Minutes Pittsburg Convention, 1874, p. 89.*

"We want State and religion—and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of State require religion, it shall be revealed religion, the religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and Christian morality shall have in this land 'an undeniable legal basis.' We use the word religion in its proper sense, as meaning a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God."—*Dr. Edwards, Minutes New York Convention, 1873, p. 60.*

From these extracts, which might be multiplied, it is certainly clear that when, in Article II. of their Constitution, one of the chief objects of this Society is stated to be, "To secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land," nothing less can be meant than that the statutes of our Government be so amended as to insert a confession of the religion of Jesus Christ in so far as the concensus of the evangelical Christian religion will permit, and make the holy Scriptures the formal rule of civil Government; yea, that our Government "enter into an alliance with the church of Christ and profess, adhere to, defend, and maintain the true religion," and that all who will be citizens of this new commonwealth must submit to this "legalized Christianity."

What tyranny and persecution followed the introduction of such a state of affairs in Massachusetts, every reader of history knows. And has man so changed that it would be less so now?

There are many who seem to think that a recognition of the Christian religion in the National Constitution is surely not to be deplored, and that is all, they say, the National Reformers want. The above extracts already disprove such claim. But they have spoken on this point also. The Rev. G. P. Stevenson, one of the inaugurators of the movement and its corresponding secretary, and with Dr. McAllister, founder and co-editor of the *Christian Statesman*, says in an editorial, June 1, 1869:—

"The design of the pending movement of National Reform is not to secure mention of God in the National Constitution merely because such mention would be decent and becoming. It is not, in the view of its most earnest supporters, to express a sentiment which the nation already feels, and to exhibit a Christian character which as a nation we already possess. The

necessity for the reform lies far deeper than such arguments would imply. The success of our cause would have a far more momentous effect. Our labors are an attempt to bring this nation into subjection to God; and the conviction that we are not as a nation in allegiance to the King of nations, but in rebellion against him and so in imminent danger of destruction, is the real impulse of the movement."

The object then is not simply the insertion of the name of God into the Constitution, but to bring the nation "into subjection to God" by force of law—of legalized Christian institutions and usages." And does not that subvert the principles enunciated above? Does it not place powers into the hands of the State which are beyond its appointed sphere? We have seen that the work of the State is to protect men in their rights, and that everything which defines their relation to their God is the work of the church. National Reformers would Christianize the land, as it were, by legal enactment (see Minutes Pittsburg Convention, 1887, etc). It would make all who would be full subjects of these United States to confess God and his Son Jesus Christ—to confess him, if not from conviction yet with the lips. The result would be, we will have a race of hypocrites, and civil rulers and magistrates who are in heart servants of Satan will become the interpreters of Scripture, and will be called upon to decide what is and what is not the religion of the Constitution. And that is one of the most objectionable features of a union of Church and State. But, say the Reformers:—

"The State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church;" and "we will not allow the civil Government to decide between the churches and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances and laws."—*Christian Statesman, Feb. 21, 1884.*

Be it so. The National Reformers will then decide what that "Constitutional religion," that "National Christianity" is, and what "Christian institutions and usages" are legalized, while judges and civil rulers will be called upon to enforce them. But when that time comes, we will have retrogressed to the period of the Dark Ages, the arrogance of the popes of those terrible days will have full sway, and no element will be lacking to a perfect union of Church and State.

How It Will Work.

THE *New Haven Register* of June 9, 1889, under the heading, "A Rational Reform Law Demanded," quotes the following little story from the current number of the pictorial *Judge*, under the caption "*Cui Bono?*"—for whose good:—

First Workingman—"Let's go to the Art Museum."
Second Workingman—"Closed on Sundays, you know."

Third Workingman—"Well, let's take a ride in the stage up Fifth Avenue."

Second Workingman—"Don't run on Sundays."

First Workingman—"Gad! then let's go in Von Bier's back door and fill up."

The *Register* remarks that "there is a deal of philosophy in this story which our good friends, the members of the Sunday Observance Club, will do well to think over." It follows with lengthy comments in a similar strain, which we have not space to quote. But the supposed incident shows very clearly one thing, and that is, that if the National Reformers cannot see how their desired Sunday law would work, others can see it, without any dimness of vision whatever. Enforced idleness upon those who have no conscience as to a day of rest, is simply enforced demoralization and crime. Unless the law to rest shall be supplemented by a law that all shall attend church, the

majority will drift into the back door of some saloon and fill up. And even if they did compulsorily attend church, there would be time enough for the saloon visitation after that. Instead of making this a Christian nation, the Sunday movement will only make it more unchristian.—*Review and Herald.*

Romanism and the Republic.

THE following is from the pen of M. Leon Borland, in the *Forum*. The statements that it contains, coming from the source they do, are worthy of more than ordinary attention:—

"Let us be Catholics," said Bossuet, "but let us be Gallicans." It is in the spirit of this great French preacher that I, a Frenchman by birth and education, would presume to offer a brief criticism upon the Roman Church and its relations to the American republic. Let us be Catholics, but let us be Americans. Is it possible to be, at the same time, loyal Roman Catholics and loyal American citizens? I believe that it is not, and shall endeavor to give the reasons underlying this belief. "If the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed, it will be by the hands of the Roman clergy." When Lafayette spoke these words there seemed to be nothing whatever in the actual state of things to give them warrant. The Roman hierarchy was very weak and very poor in these United States, and the churches were, for the most part, small missionary stations, widely scattered over an almost boundless territory. Power and influence it had none; but it had a system which Lafayette knew well, and he saw in that system a potency which made him fear for the liberties of the Nation which he had done so much to establish with his treasure and his sword.

He had seen it in his well-beloved France, as a mighty serpent, coiling itself around the national life, and choking out the liberties of the people. This monster serpent, Ultramontanism, had crawled up out of the deep, dark, Roman sea many years before, and, as in the case of the loyal Trojan priest, Laocoon, had wound itself around the Gallican priest at the altar, and was slowly, but surely, strangling the priest and his faithful children, the sons of France. No native-born American could have seen danger when Lafayette saw it. No one but a Roman Catholic, born and brought up in a Roman Catholic country, could possibly have seen any danger to the American republic in the few missionary priests whom the Roman Church had sent over to the New World in such a modest guise.

A good-natured contempt for such danger seems almost universal among the citizens of this great republic. I do not like the rôle of an alarmist, but I believe I see danger ahead, and am willing to expose myself to some ridicule in the hope of arousing my fellow-citizens to a sense of danger, which, as I believe, threatens the American Nation from the Roman Church.

Look about you and see what the few poor missionary stations, in which Lafayette saw cause for alarm, have become. Behold the innumerable churches, cathedrals, monasteries, nunneries, seminaries, colleges, and universities which cover the American continent from east to west, and from north to south. See the army of priests, bishops, archbishops, and cardinals, all thoroughly trained under the most perfect discipline, and swearing implicit obedience—to the Constitution of the American republic?—No; swearing obedi-

ence, in all things temporal and spiritual, to an Italian pontiff, who lives in Rome and issues his orders from a palace called Vatican. Leo XIII. sits in the Vatican at Rome and commands his army of priests and prelates in America and Ireland with as much absolute authority as any Cæsar ever commanded his loyal legions in their subjugation of the nations of the earth. Lafayette saw but a few straggling outposts; we see the mighty army in solid column, with banners flying, marching with firm step and steady eye, conquering and to conquer. But someone may say that they are the conservators and guardians of law and order, rather than a danger to the peace and safety of the liberties of the people. But is not this a comparative rather than a positive blessing? Is it not fair to ask why it is that the great majority of the dangerous classes are subject to the control of the Roman Church? Is it not because they are her own children, the products of her system, if not of her teaching? Examine the police record of this or any other great American city, and I think you will find that at least seventy-five per cent. of the criminals are of Roman Catholic parentage. Is it, then, unreasonable to expect from the Roman Church some restraining influence over her own followers? If, then, the non-Roman churches exercise little control over the dangerous classes, is it not because, for the most part, these classes have been born and brought up beyond the influence of their teaching?

I have no reason to doubt that the great majority of Roman Catholic priests in America mean to be, and believe themselves to be, good citizens of this republic. But they belong to a system in which free agency is impossible. They are members of an army in which the strictest discipline is enforced, and the most prompt and perfect obedience is required. The commander-in-chief of this Roman army is naturally and most fittingly a Roman, not an American. What does the Pope of Rome care for the blessings of American liberty or American citizenship? The ambition of the Pope, whoever he may be, is, always has been, and ever must be, universal conquest. In taking command of the Roman Church he takes this oath. The Vatican claims absolute and supreme authority in all things temporal as well as spiritual; and every priest, bishop, archbishop, and cardinal throughout the world takes an oath of perfect submission and obedience to the Pope as the supreme lord and master of all things. This being true—and let any priest or bishop affirm that it is not—is it not quite certain that the priest, whatever his private or personal opinions and feelings may be as an American citizen, must support the church—the Ultramontane system—as against the State, at all times and under all circumstances? Witness the case of the distinguished priest, the late pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church, New York. He was not permitted even the small privilege, as an American citizen, of being present at a political meeting of which his superiors did not approve. Do we not see, then, that the personal intentions and feelings of the Roman priest, however good, count for nothing when we are considering the attitude of the Roman Church toward the State?

The American Constitution says that all men shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. The Vatican says that liberty of conscience is "a pest of all others to be most dreaded in a State." It is

hardly necessary, I imagine, for me to enlarge upon this point, as all who know anything about the Roman Church know perfectly well that "heresy," according to that church, is the greatest of all crimes, greater than murder or adultery. Free speech and a free press are also among the fundamental principles of the American republic, but nothing is more offensive to Rome. Where she has the power of control she has never tolerated, and she never will tolerate, either free speech or a free press.

The late cardinal archbishop of New York said:—

"Catholics in this republic are as strongly devoted to the sustenance and maintenance of the temporal power of the Holy Father as Catholics in any other part of the world; and if it should be necessary to prove it by acts, they are ready to do so."

This, to a Frenchman, is pretty plain English. And these bishops speak as men having authority. Is one, then, to be laughed at as an alarmist for sounding out a note of warning, when bishops and cardinals representing a vast army of millions of communicants, speak out against the Constitution of the republic in such threatening words?

The Roman Catholic vote has already become so important an element in politics as to decide the fate of parties. Every Roman Catholic is in duty bound to enter politics as a Roman Catholic, not as an American citizen. The press of this country understands perfectly well that if it would have the support of the Roman Catholics it must say nothing in criticism, but everything in praise, of the Roman Church, so that even now there is a practical restraint, if not a positive check, upon the freedom of the press.

The Roman Church claims, in fact, to be a theocracy, and, true to this idea, she enforces, when she can, obedience to her authority in all things, social, political, and economic, as well as in things religious, so-called. Has she not, within the past few weeks, asserted this political power in Ireland in the most positive and high-handed manner? Can there be any question as to the meaning of the Vatican Rescript, coming as it does in the midst of a fierce struggle of an oppressed people for political liberty?

Papal Tactics.

DOCTOR CRAFTS, field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, seems to understand the tactics of those who in past ages have been engaged in work identical with his own. He stigmatizes as "insignificant," "hair-brained," "woolly headed," "fanatics," "Saturdarians," etc., those who protest against being placed on a roll of heretics, to be punished by the civil power, simply because they will not allow him to dictate to them their religion. It was the same in the sixteenth century, during the reign of Philip II. This king "declared that he would lose a hundred thousand lives rather than see any of his dominions severed from the ancient church." "Death to heretics" was his order; and when "many nobles and citizens leagued themselves to demand a retraction of the hated edicts," the imperial council branded the petitioners as a "pack of beggars." Although the council had enough of school-boy puerility, and not too much self-respect, to call names, yet they appeared satisfied with a very limited assortment compared with the elaborate list employed by Doctor Crafts. They applied to the humble petitioners for civil and religious liberty only one epithet of opprobrium, while Mr. Crafts exhausts human lan-

guage to such a degree that he is obliged to go into the manufacturing business to supply his demand. But perhaps he can grind out "stratagems," "duplicate" the names of petitioners, and manufacture new words all at the same time, and with the same machinery. Who knows?

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

The King and His Professed Followers.

ONE of the battle-cries of the National Reformers is that Christ shall be king of the Nation. Now no one can reasonably object to Christ being king of the Nation when he himself chooses to take that position. But there is serious objection to *taking him by force* to make him king. When he was on earth, and some fanatical persons were going to forcibly make him king, he promptly repented the act by eluding their insane design. On another occasion he said, "My kingdom is not of this world;" then, either he has changed his mind or the National Reformers are chasing a phantom.

But even if Christ were a candidate for political honors in this Nation, it is evident that his self-appointed representatives are sadly misrepresenting him. He laid down as a leading principle, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them;" but the religious legislation champions propose to compel men by law to do whatsoever the Reformers would have them do. Christ taught his followers to love their enemies, but the Reformers propose to "disfranchise" and even banish those who will not eventually fall in with them. Christ has plainly intimated that hypocrites have no place in his kingdom; but the Reformers count largely for success on those office-seekers who will fall in with them when their movement becomes popular.

Then, as to the Sabbath question, over which such an ado is being made, Christ recognized the Sabbath of the commandment, and expressly disregarded the "traditions" which the National Reformers of his day had attached to it. If he were on earth to-day he would no doubt do just as he did then, for he is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever." But the Sunday-law clamorers reverse the order by ignoring the Sabbath of the commandment and setting up a traditionary institution, in support of which they ask the State to issue a counter commandment. And all this in face of their claim that the law of God must be the supreme law of the land.

Again, the apostle Paul, who had his commission direct from Christ, especially enjoins Christians "to be subject unto the powers that be;" but the National Reform party wants the powers that be to be subject to the church,—which, being interpreted, means the church of the Reformers. When Peter would defend his Master with a sword, the Lord told him to put up his sword, saying, "they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." But the National Reformers, through District Secretary M. A. Gault, declare their intention, if necessary, to use "the sword and the bullet."

Christ taught his disciples, by both precept and example, to practice self-denial for the truth's sake. But in advocating Sunday observance, the Reformers propose to help out their Sunday-keeping allies by not allowing them to lose anything on account of their faith; therefore, because they want to keep Sunday, everybody else must be made to close business. Says Rev. George S. Mott, D. D.:—

"The person who keeps the law must not be put out and disadvantaged thereby. . . . The merchant who closes his store might find that his neighbor who keeps open on Sunday was drawing away a trade which belongs to him. Now we must not permit the Sunday-keeping merchant to be the loser because he regards the law, and so must it be with all kinds of labor."

Thus it is, no matter which way we turn to view this climax of wickedness, the so-called National Reform, we find it directly antagonistic to every principle inculcated by Him whom they professedly represent, and whom they would nominally proclaim king of the Nation.

W. N. GLENN.

Consistency.

In the *Michigan Christian Advocate* for June 1, Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D. D., has an article entitled, "Petitions against National Sabbath Rest Law," in which he appears to be very much exercised in mind to think that a "thousand or less" of the seventh-day worshippers were able to secure 230,000 individual signatures to a petition against the Blair bills in about two months.

That which troubles the doctor more than anything else seems to be the foresight of the originators of this counter-petition, in furnishing it in duplicate to the Senate and House of Representatives, and in so wording it as to cover everything in the line of religious legislation for all time to come. And so the good doctor exhausts himself in vituperation and spite against "the little contingent of Seventh-day worshippers who form sevenths of one per cent. of the population," because of their diligent effort against the Blair bill.

The doctor says: "There is a question of conscience involved in this Sunday-Rest law, but it does not relate to the thousand or less of seventh-day people who would not come under its jurisdiction."

Now we would like to know what this question of conscience is, and why seventh-day people would not come under its jurisdiction. The doctor explains: "In the mail and military service and in interstate commerce, no Seventh-day worshipper can be consistently engaged." That is equivalent to saying that everybody else *can* be consistently engaged in such service. What is there about such service that makes it inconsistent for a seventh-day worshiper to engage in it?—simply this, it requires seven days' work in the week, and seventh-day worshippers are so consistent in their belief in the binding obligation of the Sabbath commandment that they will engage in service or labor of any kind only during six days in the week; while those who do engage in such service, either do not believe in the binding obligation of the Sabbath commandment, or else they are inconsistent in their profession.

The doctor proceeded to explain the question of conscience. He says, "The real question of conscience is, whether the two million of our people who are now required to do on the Sabbath, work for gain which is not in any sense work of necessity or mercy, shall be required to continue working against health and conscience, or whether by the proposed National Sunday-Rest law and the influence that would follow it, their rights of conscience and their right to rest shall be protected."

The doctor talks as if we were living in a condition of slavery. Just as though these two million men had not voluntarily placed themselves in the situations which they occupy. Every man of them, from the commander-in-chief of the army down to the third-class postmaster, used every influence at his command to secure the position

which he holds, and that, too, with a full understanding of what the duties of the situation required of him. If they had any conscientious scruples in regard to the observance of Sunday, why did they voluntarily place themselves in a situation where they could not keep it? The facts are, these men have no conscience in the matter. But Dr. Crafts says, "there is a question of conscience involved in this Sunday-Rest law," and we would particularly like to know who has this conscience. The men who require service to be performed on Sunday evidently have no conscience in the matter, and those who perform the service have none, so Dr. Crafts proposes to have Congress make a law which will give them all consciences for Sunday; and not only this, but the proposed law is to give physical health as well as consciences to those who are required to disregard a Sabbath commandment for which they now have no regard. The writer is at a loss for a term by which to designate such a performance. It does not come entirely under the head of theology, medicine, or political economy. But inasmuch as it has to do with each, he would suggest as a fitting title for the proposed law, *The Political-Theological-Psychological-Physiological-Sunday-Rest Law*.

Willis, Michigan.

EUGENE LELAND.

Nehemiah, the Tirshatha.

THE National Reform people cite the action of Nehemiah, in disallowing traffic on the Sabbath at Jerusalem, as a reason why labor and business should not be allowed on Sunday in this Nation. They say:—

"The merchants of Tyre insisted upon selling goods near the temple on the Sabbath, and Nehemiah compelled the officers of the law to do their duty and stop it. So we can compel the officers of the law to do their duty."—*Elgin Convention, 1837*.

Nehemiah lived and acted during the theocracy of ancient Israel, the only true theocracy the world ever had or ever will have. Our Reformers propose a state of things similar in its practical workings. Notice:—

"Every Government, by equitable laws, is a Government of God. A republic thus governed is of Him, through the people, and is as really a theocracy as the Commonwealth of Israel."—*Cincinnati National Reform Convention, 1872*.

Here we have it; they want a theocracy—a union of Church and State, although to a man they stoutly deny it, but they "let themselves out" now and then and stand self-convicted.

Now in working for a theocracy, and one as truly such as was "the Commonwealth of Israel," and taking up the work of Nehemiah under the ancient theocracy, we can draw our conclusions as to what they expect to do when they get things "fixed" in this Nation. Nehemiah not only compelled the keeping of the Sabbath, but instituted other reforms.

In the thirteenth chapter of the book of Nehemiah we are informed as to his work. It is recorded in verse 10 that he found that "the portions" or allowances of the Levites and singers had not been given them, so they had left their work and gone "every one to his field." Then he "contended" with the rulers and said, "Why is the house of God forsaken?" Then he has them all return and take their places, verse 11, and he arranges to have the tithe of corn, wine, and oil brought into the "treasuries" and appoints "faithful" officers to see that it is properly distributed; verses 12, 13. Nehemiah does this "for the house of God."

Now do the Reformers propose to tax the people to support the church under their theocracy? Mind you they hold up the work of Nehemiah in Sabba'h reform under the theocracy of Israel, and they tell us there will be one as "really" as was the ancient one of Israel. It will be just like it in practical working. I repeat, do they propose to tax the people to support the church should they get the power? It looks very much like it, and to make certain of it I need only to cite the reader to the *Christian Statesman*, National Reform organ, of February 21, 1884, in which Rev. J. M. Foster, one of the leading district secretaries, says, "the Nation's duty" is to provide the church "funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home and in the foreign field." These people do not want Church and State. Oh, no, not they, but they want to help themselves out of Uncle Sam's treasury to carry on their schemes, and are not willing to have church property taxed either! They want everybody taxed to support the church, but don't want the church compelled to pay its share of the public revenues. They are all *take and no give!*

Nehemiah continues his reforms, and the national schemers propose to follow on and do likewise. He found that improper marriages had been contracted. The Jews had been marrying foreigners. He shows them the wrong of this and "contended with them, and cursed them [pronounced judgment], and smote certain of them and plucked off their hair," etc. Neh. 13:25. Do our national theocrats intend to say who shall and who shall not marry? Do they mean to allow no marrying with outsiders—no marriages with any but church members? Or do they expect to compel everybody to join the church, that there be no restricted marriages? Do they mean to imitate the zeal of Nehemiah and smite and pull out the hair of those who do not choose the right kind of life partners? If so they will be vigorous reformers indeed! Do they expect to make it lively for preacher's sons who marry Ammonites and Moabites! How far away do they expect to "chase" such unlucky bridegrooms as marry "strange wives"? Neh. 13:28.

This subject should by no means be treated lightly, but with gravity and sincerity. Nehemiah was working under a divine theocracy and therefore under divine instructions. The "good hand of God was upon him" and his work was right and God approved of it. He was the Tirshatha (governor) appointed of God. The would-be Reformers are self-appointed. They can show no credentials as could Nehemiah that the hand of God is upon them for any such purpose; his frown will rather rest upon them. They are self-constituted rulers—tirshathas—of their own appointing, and they will signally fail in building up the house of God and in glorifying his name. They should remember that Nehemiah lived under the only true theocracy that ever existed, and acted as civil and religious ruler. Under the Christian dispensation Church and State are wholly separate. They should beware of building again those things that were destroyed. They should also remember particularly that the Sabbath of Nehemiah was the Sabbath of the seventh day—which they so despise—and not the first day of the week. If they propose to follow him in Sabbath reform why don't they do it?

N. J. BOWERS.

"God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

The Sunday Question in Cleveland.

THE Cleveland, Ohio, Secular Union has become somewhat stirred up over the Sunday question because of the efforts of the ministers in that city to enforce the observance of the day upon all classes. We have no sympathy whatever with the religious views of these secularists, but we do claim that so far as man is concerned they have as good a right to their views as anyone else; the fact of their being infidels should not place them outside the protection of the laws nor deprive them of the enjoyment of citizenship with all its privileges. Neither should a man be made an offender for a word, or for his faith.

But erroneous as are the views held by these men, they have evidently arrived at a pretty thorough understanding of this Sunday question. We quote a single paragraph from their open letter to the ministers of Cleveland. They refer these gentlemen to the fact that according to the Scriptures, Sunday is not the Sabbath, and that according to the same authority the seventh and not the first day of the week is sacred. They then say:—

"Sunday was set apart for the sabbath simply as a matter of convenience. You will not deny this, we are sure. That being admitted, then what binding force should it have on those who do not care to observe it? Is it not a direct wrong for a certain class of citizens to try to oblige other citizens to observe their religious days? Is it not a violation of individual rights for a religious sect to endeavor by law to force other sects or systems to observe their ceremonies?"

The only fault we have to find with this paragraph is the implication that if Sunday were indeed set apart by divine authority it would be proper to enforce its observance by civil law. This is a grave error. To admit that the State has a right to enforce any religious observance is to admit the whole question; for if it has a right to enforce those things which are of divine appointment it must of necessity have a right to decide what things are of divine authority. The true principle and the only tenable position is, that the State can of right have nothing whatever to do with either defining or enforcing religious duties.

National Reform in Tennessee.

OBION, OBION COUNTY, TENN., }
June 28, 1889. }

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: I send you the following copy of the steps taken against R. M. King, for working on Sunday:—

STATE OF TENNESSEE, }
Obion County. }

TO ANY LAWFUL OFFICER OF THE STATE:

W. W. Dobbins having given information on oath to me, that R. M. King did, on the 23d day of June, 1889, it being Sunday or the Sabbath-day, and in State and county as aforesaid, and District No. 9, did publicly plow in his field, in violation of the law. You are therefore hereby commanded to forthwith arrest the said R. M. King and bring him before me, or some justice of the peace for said county, to be dealt with as the law directs.

Given under my hand, this June 24, 1889.

J. A. PARKS.

STATE OF TENNESSEE, }
Obion County. }

This day personally appeared before me, J. A. Barker, an acting justice of the peace for said county, W. W. Dobbins, and made oath in due form that one R. M. King did, on the 23d day of June, 1889, it being Sunday or the Sabbath-day, in Obion County, Tennessee, District No. 9, publicly plow in his field. W. W. DOBBINS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this June 24, 1889. J. A. BARKER, J. P.

The trial is set for July 5, 1889. The recent heavy rains have placed farm crops in such a condition that farmers feel that it is necessary to work every hour they can in order to save their grain and growing crops. R. M. King is a strict observer of the seventh day of the week, and had rested on June 22 as he conscientiously believes it to be his duty to do, so on the 23d, being the first day of the week, he went quietly about his work cultivating corn. He says he was in fact very quiet; the corn was tall and he was almost hid from view, and made no disturbance whatever.

The Sunday before, one of his neighbors who makes no profession of religion cut wheat from 9 A. M. till the close of the day with a self-binder machine, with several hands, yet no one complained about it, although he had not rested the day before. Just three weeks before R. M. King did the plowing (cultivating) for which he is to be prosecuted, one of his neighbors rafted logs all day on Sunday, working seven or eight hands and making much noise. This man is a member of the Presbyterian Church in good standing, and in good worldly circumstances.

Mr. W. W. Dobbins is a member of the Methodist Church. One of his brethren drove the reaper a part of the day on the Sunday before R. M. King plowed in his field. Yet Mr. Dobbins made no complaint about a member of his own church working on Sunday. He did not complain about his Presbyterian neighbor's rafting logs on Sunday and working mules in order to get the logs to the water. These men made the usual amount of noise that teamsters make in drawing timber. The timber was not in danger of being swept away by the water, but they simply took advantage of the stage of the water in order to save time and do a big day's work. The owner of the timber told R. M. King that he worked on Sunday in order to take advantage of the water, as he desired to get the timber out before the water would fall in the bottom.

WM. COVERT.

THE *Christian Nation*, a National Reform organ published in New York City, intimates that Dr. Vincent, recently strangled to death by an apparatus for the treatment of spinal disease, with which he was experimenting, and also Mind-reader Bishop, were the victims of divine displeasure because they both experimented on Sunday. Would it not be well for the *Nation* to first show that God himself has any special regard for Sunday before jumping to the conclusion that he is sending judgment upon those who fail to observe it according to the National Reform order? And while our contemporary is about it we would like to have it account for the fact that not a few ministers have dropped dead while preaching on Sunday, and also that no longer ago than May 26, a minister was struck by lightning in his pulpit on Sunday at the New Liberty Christian Church, in Fountain County, Indiana.—*Signs of the Times*.

THE morality as derived from religion which the State needs will be best supplied by the confinement of its agency to things temporal and the entire omission on the part of any attempt to administer things spiritual. The State can do religion no favor so great as to have nothing to do with it, and itself no favor so great as to let religion alone. The moment the two are put in alliance with each other both are injured.—*Spear*.

What Is Rest?

WHAT is known as the "Sunday-rest" movement is again coming to the front, and the public may confidently expect a well-organized lobby to precipitate itself upon Congress early in the next session, and through its spokesman in the Senate, urge the passage of a rigid national law embracing its views of the proper observance of Sunday. . . .

These "Sunday-rest" advocates try very hard to avoid the charge that their movement is an attempt to secure State interference with religion, and their arguments are ingenious and plausible; but they are not likely to mislead men who are fit to represent the people. . . . The claim is made that legislative interference for the observance of Sunday would be good for the bodies and minds of the public, and that this divests it of its religious character; but so long as Sunday, the day upon which the majority of people worship God, is singled out for legislative experiment, the conviction will remain that it is an effort to connect Church and State—something that the Constitution expressly repudiates, and the past horrors of which should be a sufficient warning to intelligent people.

To restore the "Puritan Sunday" throughout the United States might have the effect of increasing church membership, but it is very doubtful if there would be a corresponding increase of sincere religion. Those who would be driven into the fold under the operation of an oppressive law would be like the conscripts forced to fight against their principles—a leaven of dissatisfaction to corrupt the entire army.

But may not the people, after all, have as just and sensible ideas of the way to worship God and regulate their own conduct on Sunday as these self-constituted guardians? There are many, possibly a large majority of the inhabitants of the United States, who sincerely believe that God is better pleased with the innocent enjoyment of his creatures, even on Sunday, than with their enforced torture, under the guise of rest and respect for the day. What is rest? Can one who is compelled to work during the week be said to rest on Sunday if he has to go unwillingly to church? . . . Do the nerves take on a healthy tone, the muscles regain their elasticity, or the mental faculties expand, because the spade or pick-axe is cast aside, or the weary toil of the counter is temporarily abandoned? There will be relaxation, of course; so there is in the unstrung bow, but unless the archer bends the latter in the opposite direction, its strength and springiness soon pass away.

Rest means change, as well as relaxation. Those who advocate Government interference with Sunday can rest whenever they please. They are not confined to one day in the week, but can vary their pursuits and pleasures to suit their whims or necessities, and they are unable to appreciate the longing of the hard-worked toiler for one day in seven when he can do as he pleases without the intervention of bosses and superintendents, or the equally irksome provisions of a tyrannical law, provided he does not interfere with the rights and privileges of his neighbor. To suppose that God grudges him his rest or his innocent enjoyment is to deny the attributes of the Most High. The man who goes to church on Sunday morning is none the worse for rational enjoyment in the afternoon and evening, and whether he is or not, the Government has nothing whatever to do with it.—*Sedalia, Mo., Bazoo, June 23, 1889*.

Advertisements.

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

Civil Government and Religion.

BY A. T. JONES,

One of the Editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain and Forcible.

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

"CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION"

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

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

THE YO SEMITE VALLEY,
BIG TREE GROVES, Etc.

"In the Heart of the Sierras"

Is the only book ever issued which in any way does justice to this wonderful Valley and its surroundings. The

FULL-PAGE ARTOTYPES

Are the most charmingly characteristic of any illustrations ever produced, and are perfectly true to life, having been photographed direct from nature.

THE WONDERFUL YO SEMITE

Is here presented in all its beauty and majesty. The book is just the thing for agents to handle, and good reliable agents are wanted everywhere to introduce this book. Our outfit is perfection itself and our terms to agents are VERY LIBERAL. Send for circulars and full particulars. Address,

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

The Teachers' Outlook.

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

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

ANOTHER AND VERY IMPORTANT FEATURE of the magazine will be that all teachers and students are invited to join its circle of writers, out of which it proposes to draw its corps of future contributors. On this point it has some original plans of mutual helpfulness to carry out.

WANTED, ESPECIALLY—Writers of short, realistic stories, and articles on natural history and social science, from the Pacific Coast. Terms given in OUTLOOK. Sample copies 20 cts. None free.

A POOR FOUNTAIN PEN

IS A NUISANCE;

But a Good One is a Joy Forever.

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

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

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

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

Or 43 Bond St., N. Y. Oakland, Cal.

NOW READY!

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW.

We do not mean that a National Sunday Law is now ready, but that a treatise under this name, prepared by Alonzo T. Jones, is now ready for circulation.

This pamphlet contains the arguments 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, Dec. 13, 1888.

Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"MIGHTY INTERESTING READING,"

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

The following specimen page from the book shows some of the questions and answers, and every page of the book is replete with sound arguments by Mr. Jones.

60 THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW.

Senator Palmer.—Do you suppose they intended there a practical theocracy?

Mr. Jones.—I do, sir; but let me read further, and you will get their own words.

Senator Blair.—If these women are trying to overthrow the institutions of the country, and are about to establish a sacerdotal State, we ought to know it.

Mr. Jones.—That is true, and that is why I am speaking here; we want the nation to know it.

Senator Blair.—These women need looking after, I admit.

Mr. Jones.—They do in that respect, and there are many men concerned in the same business.

Senator Blair.—Otherwise it would not be dangerous.

Mr. Jones.—It would be dangerous anyway. A theocratical theory of government is dangerous anywhere. It is antichristian, as well as contrary to right and the principles of justice.

Senator Blair.—Do you suppose that the government of heaven is a theocracy?

Mr. Jones.—Yes, sir; but a civil government—a government of earth—is not.

Senator Blair.—Then why is it dangerous?

Mr. Jones.—Governments of earth are not dangerous when properly controlled.

Senator Blair.—They only say that a true theocracy is yet to come. A millennium is supposed to be coming; perhaps they have reference to a millennium that we have not yet got, so that they will wait some years before they get it.

Mr. Jones.—But I am going to read what kind of laws they propose to make to bring in the millennium.

Senator Blair.—So far as you have read, you have not touched the question; for they say a true theocracy

Page 60, "National Sunday Law."

As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is

Based on Scripture and History, Constitution and Law,

Showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the Sunday-law movement of the fourth century, the Sunday-law movement of the nineteenth century, the methods used in securing endorsements to the petition for the Blair bill, and the workings of such Sunday laws as are proposed for the United States.

The work contains one hundred and ninety-two pages. Price, 25 cents. Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

1050 Castro St., Oakland, Cal.; 43 Bond St., New York.

BURTON'S IMPROVED DRENCHING BIT.
It saves struggling and fighting by giving the horse a steady grip.
You have the satisfaction of knowing that they have taken the dose to the last drop. Our pens are only used when it can be done by anyone who can put on a bridle. It is simple, strong, durable and intemperate. Will last a lifetime. Every veterinary surgeon and horse-keeper needs one. Price, 25 cents. Full particulars, 25 cents. Sent anywhere in U. S. or Canada on receipt of price.
W. H. MARCH, REIN BURTON CO.,

PHOTOGRAPH ALBUMS.
Large variety in Flush and Morocco bindings. Prices low for first-class goods. Terms to agents, and catalogue, sent on application.
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

SOCIAL PURITY. A vigorous and stirring address on SOCIAL PURITY by J. H. KELLOGG, M. D., SUPERINTENDENT OF THE LARGEST MEDICAL AND SURGICAL SANITARIUM IN THE WORLD. Fifth edition. Fiftieth thousand. Also contains a "Talk to Girls," by Mrs. E. E. KELLOGG, A. M., Associate Superintendent of Social Purity Department of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. This talk is full of helpful suggestions to mothers and their daughters respecting the means of promoting the development of a higher type of womanhood in the rising generation of girls. A copy should be placed in the hands of every man, woman and youth. 64 large octavo pages. Price, 15 cents; 20 copies, post-paid, \$2.25. Address: PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING Co., Oakland, Cal.

SOME Desirable and Valuable New Books.

In the Following List of Miscellaneous Books will be Found Something to Interest all. We Furnish them Post-paid at the

PUBLISHERS' PRICES.

- Lives of the Fathers, Farrar, 2 vols., cloth.....\$5.00
- Life of Christ, Farrar, cloth..... 1.00
- The Messages of the Books, Farrar, cloth..... 3.50
- History of the Interpretation, Farrar, cloth, 3.50
- Life of St. Paul, Farrar..... 1.50
- Syriac New Testament..... 2.50
- Heads and Faces and How to Study Them, cloth..... 1.00
- Hours with the Bible, Geikie, 6 vols. in 3, cloth..... 4.50
- Holy Land and the Bible, Geikie, 2 vols..... 5.00
- How We Got Our Bible, cloth..... 1.60
- 100,000 Synonyms and Antonyms, cloth..... 1.00
- Life of Christ for the Young, Geikie, cloth... 1.50
- The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life, paper..... 50
- The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life, cloth..... 75
- The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life, cloth, gilt edges..... 1.00

ADDRESS,

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,

OAKLAND, CAL.,

Or, 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

G. H. KRIECHBAUM,

DENTIST,

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

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

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

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

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

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

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

Orders can be filled for back numbers at any time and in any quantity desired, as each number is printed from electrotype plates. Liberal discount when ordered in quantities. Address,

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

GOLDEN GRAINS: A SERIES OF TEN BOOKS FOR CHILDREN.

Each little book or pamphlet contains thirty-two pages of carefully selected stories. The following are the titles: Robin's Judgment Book; Annie's Savings' Box; Always the Bible; The Sisters' Lesson; The Hard Way; The Schoolboy's Dinner; Seven Times; The Wicket Gate; The Sensitive Plant; The Two Gardens. The whole set of ten books, over 300 pages, will be sent post-paid for 50 cents. Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY 24, 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.

WE publish in this number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL an article entitled, "A Lutheran Minister on National Reform," for which we ask a careful reading. The article consists of extracts from an essay read before the Lutheran Conference at Loudonville, Ohio, January 15. It is well worthy of a careful perusal. We will send the entire essay in pamphlet form to any address, post-paid for 3 cents.

THE *American Catholic News*, published in New York, accuses Col. Elliott F. Shepard of hypocrisy in the matter of Sunday-keeping as follows:—

"He [Col. Shepard] owns the Fifth Avenue stages and has refused to run them on Sunday on the ground of his unwillingness to 'desecrate the Sabbath.' It is now known that the editor of that sycophantic sheet [the *Mail and Express*] also owns the stages that run in Central Park, and not only does he run these on Sunday, but also the Fifth Avenue stages, too. The truth is that there is no money in running the Fifth Avenue stages on Sunday; so they are employed in Central Park, where the demand on 'the day of rest' is greater than the stages run there on week days can accommodate."

THE following item from the South Bend (Ind.) *Tribune* of June 1, is a suggestive commentary on Sunday laws, and on the claim of W. F. Crafts and his co-workers that the laboring men are clamoring for permission to rest on Sunday:—

"The agreement among the barbers of Indianapolis to test the Sunday law was begun last Sunday by the keeping open of the Bates House tonsorial rooms, and barber Knox was promptly arrested. Tobacco stands in this State are allowed to keep open under a Supreme Court decision that tobacco is a necessity, and the barbers believe that, if their case is properly presented, a favorable decision will be rendered. The saloons were all closed Sunday, but the drug stores were open and whisky can be bought by the quart at most of them."

And what a victory for temperance it must be to have saloons closed and drug stores selling liquor by the quart! Great is Sunday; and past finding out are Sunday laws!

MR. CRAFTS, the field secretary of the so-called American Sabbath Union, is still swinging around the circle in the interests of National Reform, and as he goes is strewing his inuendoes and misrepresentations everywhere. In his recent visit to Denver, in the interests of his so-called reform, he attempted to carry things with a high hand. We are informed that he was very much incensed because the AMERICAN SENTINEL was distributed very extensively in that city while he was there. A number of copies of the SENTINEL were given out from the office of the leading paper in Denver, and Mr. Crafts learning of this fact went to the office and secured an interview with the proprietor, demanding that no more papers should be circulated from that office. The proprietor of the paper very properly refused to be dictated to in such

a matter, and the circulation of the SENTINEL continued. We do not wonder that Mr. Crafts writhed under it, for the number of the SENTINEL which was circulated on that occasion contained arguments which Mr. Crafts did not care to encounter, and which he is entirely unable to answer.

REV. A. FASANOTTI, D. D., a Catholic priest of San Francisco, recently delivered a sermon on the subject of Sunday picnics. He stated, among other things, that his church did not object to picnics being held on Sunday, provided the parties "attend divine service before departing on the trip." Just so; and this same principle is largely responsible for the efforts being made at present by the National Reformers. It is not, after all, the sanctity of the Sunday Sabbath which they so much desire to bring about, as it is a desire to fill the pews of their churches. They greatly lament the fact that Sunday is being so universally "desecrated," but the principal reason for their grief is not because the sacredness, as they term it, of Sunday, is being violated, but it is because this so-called desecration draws the multitudes away from the church, and for this reason they say that it must be stopped.

REV. WILBUR F. CRAFTS, field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, says that "the assaults of intemperance upon liberty and the home, call for national constitutional prohibition." (*Herald of Reform, Cleveland, Ohio, June 15.*) And Elliott F. Shepard, president of that union, says that "constitutions are not made for such purposes and they cannot be used in that way without bringing our system of government under written constitutions into inefficiency and trouble." (*New York Mail and Express, June 21.*) These eminent reformists (?) are, however, agreed that Congress should recognize Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, and enforce its observance by adequate penalties. The demand for religious legislation is, it seems, common ground upon which prohibitionists and anti-prohibitionists can meet and unite.

"MY name is Legion, for we are many." Truly this may be said of Mr. Crafts' Sabbath. He wants a "civil Sabbath," an "American Sabbath," a "Christian Sabbath," and "the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans," whichever he thinks will best suit the ever-varying circumstances of his campaign. We have not been able to quite understand the variation in definition, inasmuch as he wants them all on Sunday, until explained by placing the Missouri and Minnesota conventions side by side. In Missouri, Mr. Crafts said he was advocating an American, rather than a Christian, Sabbath; and when they organized their State branch of the American Sabbath Union, they adopted the following as the first article of its constitution:—

"The object of this Association shall be to preserve the Christian Sabbath, or Lord's day, as a day of rest and worship."

But in Minnesota he advocated a Christian Sabbath, and declared that the convention was a "State Convention of those who represent the Christian Sabbath." So the first section of the constitution of the permanent State organization was made to read as follows:—

"The object of this Association shall be to preserve the Christian Sabbath, or Lord's day, as a day of rest and worship."

We are glad this matter has been made plain,

so the people may understand just what the Reformers mean when they present the various features of their chameleon Sabbath. There is nothing like having all these obscure points well defined. It is fair to presume, however, that Mr. Crafts' doctrine of the "ideal Sabbath of the Puritans" expresses the design of the above-quoted sections when fully carried out.

Fair Play, a paper published in Valley Falls, Kansas, refers to the Blair Sunday-Rest bill and the Blair Educational Amendment bill, as "Christian bills," but why, we are unable to say. Certain it is that we have repeatedly shown that these measures are the very opposite of Christian. Christianity teaches that men should render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's. The Blair Sunday-Rest bill, should it become a law, would require men to render unto Cæsar that which is God's. Again, Christianity teaches individual responsibility to God, and that man owes the highest duty to God. The Blair Educational Amendment, which provides that the principles of the Christian religion shall be taught in the public schools, would destroy that responsibility and place the Government in the place of God; because if the principles of the Christian religion should be taught in the public schools, the Government must define what are the principles of the Christian religion. And, if we recognize the State as having the right to decide this question for us, we virtually agree to stand by that decision. That is, we agree to accept as Christianity whatever the State may declare to be such. And to agree to such a thing is simply to deny the authority of God and of his word, and to apostatize from the true Christian faith. Every good citizen will obey every law of the State which does not interfere in any way with his duties to God; but no Christian can yield obedience to the State in matters which pertain alone to his duty to God. The apostles taught that we should be subject to the powers that be, but when arraigned before the magistrates and commanded not to teach any more in the name of Jesus, they said, "whether it be right to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye, but we cannot but speak the things which we have heard." The Blair bills are not Christian but anti-Christian, for the reason that they are subversive of the very principles of Christianity.

LET the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established and the foundation laid for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the dissolving scourge of the fairest portions of the Old World.—*U. S. Senate Report, 1829.*

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.