

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST 7 1889.

NUMBER 28.

The American Sentinel.

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

EDITORS,

E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

THE object of the American Sabbath Union is thus defined by Rev. W. D. Gray, secretary of one of its auxiliaries, the Missouri Sabbath Union:

"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 of our fundamental law."

A WEEKLY day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out, and you take the rest out.—*Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, before the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor, as reported in the Journal of United Labor, November 29, 1888.*

THE following from an editorial in the *Christian Nation*, June 15, 1887, we insert exactly as it is. Comment is unnecessary:—

"When the State becomes positively Christian in Constitution, and Christian men are elected to make laws, something like this will be done! A street-car company's charter will be granted conditioned upon the running of cars free on the Sabbath for the accommodation of Christian people on errands of worship, or necessity, and of mercy, even as bridge toll is at present remitted on the Sabbath in some places. To this it will be objected that others than Christians may ride for other than Christian purposes, which is very true, but the sin will be upon their own souls. The company will suffer no hardship. The men employed will be God's messengers for good, and in that day there shall be upon bells of the horses, *Holiness unto the Lord.*"

IN 1828-29 Congress was asked to suspend the carrying of the mails upon Sunday, and the committee to which the matter was referred reported adversely to granting the prayer of the petition. One of their reasons was as follows:—

"Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. This first effort of this kind calls for the establishment of a principle which, in the opinion of the committee, would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizens. If admitted, it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All relig-

ious despotisms commence by combination and influence, and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequences."

These are true words, but they were no more true when Hon. R. W. Johnston penned them than they are now, nor were they any more applicable to the petition then before Congress than they are to the petitions of the American Sabbath Union and other bodies. That Union is an *extensive religious combination to effect a political object*, and it is dangerous.

Should Civil Law Forbid Blasphemy?

ACCORDING to Judge Cooley's definition, blasphemy is an attempt to lessen men's reverence, not only for the Deity, but for "the accepted religion" as well. But any man in this wide world has the right to lessen men's reverence for the accepted religion, if he thinks that religion to be wrong. Consequently, that which would be counted blasphemy in this country, would not be counted blasphemy in China; and that which is in the strictest accordance with the word of God and the faith of Jesus Christ here, is necessarily blasphemy in China, or in Turkey, or in Russia. A man who preaches the gospel of Jesus Christ in China commits blasphemy under this definition. He does make a willful attempt to lessen men's reverence for their accepted religion, and for the deities recognized in their religion. He has to do so, if he is ever to get them to believe in Christ and the religion of Christ. He has to bring them to the place where they will have no reverence for their deities or for their accepted religion, before they ever can accept the religion of Jesus Christ. Wherever the gospel of Jesus Christ is preached in any heathen country, it is blasphemy under this definition, because its sole object is not only to lessen men's reverence for their deities and for their accepted religion, but to turn them wholly from it.

It is so likewise in Russia. Anybody there who speaks against the accepted religion, or against the saints, or their images, is subject to the penalty of blasphemy, which is banishment for life to Siberia.

But if blasphemy be a proper subject of legislation by civil government, if it be right for a government to make itself the "defender of the faith," then it is perfectly proper for the laws of China to prohibit under whatever penalty it pleases, the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ within the Chinese dominions; because its effect is to lessen men's reverence for the deities recognized by China, and for the accepted religion of the country. And in that case there is no such thing as persecution on account of religion. The only persecutions that have ever been, were because of

men's speaking against the accepted religion. If this principle be correct, then the Roman empire did perfectly right in prohibiting under penalty of death the preaching of the religion of Jesus Christ. Whenever Paul, or any of his brethren, spoke in the Roman empire, they blasphemed, according to the Roman law. They were held as blasphemers, and were put to death under the very principle of this definition, which is the principle of the American statutes on the subject of blasphemy. The Christians had to tell the Romans that the Roman gods were no gods. And they did it with the express purpose of destroying reverence for them and for the accepted religion. Rome put them to death. And I repeat, if the principle of the American statutes against blasphemy is correct, then Rome did right.

To make this clearer, I quote a passage from the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in defense of this principle, in a decision upon this very subject, which says: "To prohibit the open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of a country, is a necessary measure to preserve the tranquillity of a government." That is precisely what the Roman empire did. Christianity did openly, publicly, and explicitly deny the popular religion of the country. It did it with intent to destroy men's reverence for the deities and the religion of that country. Rome prohibited it; and upon the principle of the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, which is the principle of American law on blasphemy, Rome did right, and Christianity was a blaspheming religion. The principle of this decision seems to be that those who represent the popular religion of a country have so little of the real virtue of the religion which they profess, that if anybody speaks against it, it is sure to rouse their combativeness to such a degree as to endanger the public tranquillity. Therefore, in order to keep civil those who represent the popular religion, the State must forbid anybody to deny that religion.

This decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania is one of the grand precedents that have been followed in all the later decisions upon this subject in the younger States; but this decision itself followed one by Chief Justice Kent of the Supreme Court of New York in 1811, in which he embodies the same principles. He defends the right of the State to punish such offenses against what he calls a Christian people, and not equally to punish like offenses against the religion of other people in this country, by the following argument:—

"Nor are we bound by any expression in the Constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Mohammed, or of the Grand Llama, and for this

plain reason: that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors."

This is only to argue that if the morality of the country were engrafted upon the religion of Mohammed or the Grand Llama, and Christians were to speak against and deny that accepted religion, it would be proper that the State should punish those Christians for so doing. If that principle be correct, then a Mohammedan country has the right to prohibit the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ within its limits.

According to these decisions, Luther and the reformers of his day were blasphemers. The reformers did hold up to ridicule and contempt the popular religion of all Europe. They did right, too; and when the State punished them, it was but carrying out the principles upheld by Chancellor Kent and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and all the other States that have legislated on the subject of religion. As we have already stated, it was upon this principle precisely that the Roman Empire forbade the preaching of the gospel of Christ. It only forbade an open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of the country, yet in forbidding that, it forbade the preaching of the gospel of Christ. But Christ sent forth his disciples to preach the gospel to every creature, and they did it in the face of the Roman law, and in opposition to the whole power of the Roman Empire; and everybody in all the world has an undeniable right to make an open, public, and explicit, denial of the popular religion of this country, or any other, if he thinks that religion to be wrong.

The principle of these decisions and of the civil statutes against blasphemy, is essentially a pagan principle, and not a Christian principle. It is peculiarly appropriate, therefore, that Chief Justice Kent not only cited the precedents of the church-and-state principles of the colonies and of the British Government, but appealed to the pagan governments of antiquity and the Papal institutions of modern Europe, as the basis of his decision. It is true that all these nations have set themselves up as the special guardians of their deities, and have prohibited the denial of the popular religion; and it is equally true that all these Nations have resisted every step in enlightenment and progress that has ever been made in the march of time. Every step forward in religion and in enlightenment has of necessity been taken in the face of all the opposition which these States and empires could bring to bear. But the principle of American institutions are neither pagan nor Papal. The principles of the American Constitution which forbids legislation on the subject of religion, are Christian principles. And it is strictly in order for the Supreme Courts in making decisions in behalf of what they boast of as the Christian religion, to base their decision upon something else than the course of the pagan governments of antiquity, and the Papal institutions of modern Europe. Upon such a subject one would naturally expect them to refer to the teachings of the Author of Christianity, but they have never done so, for the very good reason that the teachings of Jesus Christ are directly against their theory.

His word forbids civil government to have anything to do with what pertains to God. And instead of teaching his disciples to prosecute, to fine, and to punish by civil law those who speak against them or their religion, he says, "Love

your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." How can men be brought to respect God or Jesus Christ by civil penalties upon their bodies and goods? How can they respect the religion of men who are ready to prosecute and imprison them? Every principle of the thing is contrary both to the spirit and the letter of Christianity. The religion of Jesus Christ properly exemplified in the daily lives of those who profess it, is the best argument and the strongest defense against blasphemy, both as defined by the Scriptures and by the civil statutes.

A. T. J.

Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law.

AMONG right-minded persons there can be no question as to the right of earthly governments to exist. There is a class of persons known as "Anarchists," who deny that there is any necessity for government or law, or that one person has a right to exercise any authority over another; but these persons, true to their name, believe in nothing; had they the power, they would cast God down from the throne of the universe as readily as they would the earthly monarch from his limited dominion. With such persons we have nothing to do. It is useless to argue with those who will not admit self-evident propositions. The only argument that can effectually reach them is the strong arm of the law which they hate. Our argument shall be addressed to those who acknowledge God as the creator and the supreme ruler of the universe, and the Bible as the complete and perfect revelation of his will concerning his creatures on this earth. With such, the declaration of the prophet, that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will" (Dan. 4:25), and the statement of the apostle, that "the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1), together with many other Scripture references to earthly governments, are sufficient evidence that nations have a right to exist.

Admitting that earthly governments are in the divine order of things, the next question is, For what purpose? The word itself indicates the answer: Governments exist for the purpose of governing, or in other words, for the purpose of enforcing laws by which justice and harmony may be maintained. The apostle Peter says that governors are sent by the Lord "for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well." 1 Peter 2:13, 14. Paul says also that the ruler is God's minister to execute wrath upon them that do evil. Rom. 13:4.

The next step in the investigation would naturally be to find out what laws earthly rulers are to execute. This is plainly indicated in the text last referred to. If the ruler is a minister of God, then the laws against which he is to execute wrath, must be such laws as God can approve—they must be in perfect harmony with the laws of God. Indeed, it could not be otherwise: for since God's law is perfect (Ps. 19:7), covering in its range every act and thought (see Eccl. 12:13, 14; Heb. 4:12; Matt. 5:20-22, 27, 28), every human law must be embraced within its limits. No one can dissent from this proposition. It is one of the fundamental principles of human law, as will be seen by the following extract from Blackstone's commentaries:—

"Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws;

that is to say, that no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true, a great number of indifferent points in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty, but which are found necessary, for the benefit of society, to be restrained within certain limits. And herein it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy; for, with regard to such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to, the former. To instance in the case of murder: This is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. Those human laws that annex a punishment to it, do not at all increase its guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation, *in foro conscientiae* [in the court of conscience], to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine." —*Chitty's Blackstone, Vol. 1, p. 28.*

The State, then, according to both sacred and secular testimony, has no power to contravene the law of God; it cannot declare an act to be right or wrong, unless God's law so declares it, and in that case the innocence or guilt arising from the performance of the act, is due solely to the enactments of God's moral law, and not to the human enactment, the latter being subordinate to the former. The indifferent points, in which, as Blackstone says, human laws have their only inherent force, are such as regulate commerce, the tariff upon imported goods, etc. These are simply matters of convenience, or expediency.

These questions being settled, the last and most important one is this: How far in morals have human laws jurisdiction? or, For how much of the violation of the moral law has God ordained that earthly rulers shall be his ministers to execute wrath? The Bible, which settles every important question concerning man's duty, must also decide this. We shall find the answer in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, a portion of which must be briefly examined:

"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. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same; for he is the minister of God to thee for good." Rom. 13:1-4.

The "higher powers" do not include the *highest* power. While every soul is to be subject to earthly powers, none are absolved from allegiance to God. The service of the two will not be incompatible, so long as the earthly powers fulfill the object for which they are ordained, viz., to act as ministers for good. When they forget this, their subjects are bound to follow the example of the apostles under similar circumstances, and say, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5:29.

The verses above quoted from the thirteenth of Romans show plainly that earthly governments alone are the subject of consideration in that chapter. The following verses show, with equal clearness, the extent of their jurisdiction:

"Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love

worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13: 8-10.

"He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law," and "Love is the fulfilling of the law." What law? Why, the law concerning which earthly rulers are the ministers. The law of God is summed up in the two great commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." See Matt. 22: 36-40. The second great commandment, defining our duty to our fellow-men, is expanded into the last six precepts of the decalogue. These, with the exception of the fifth commandment, are directly quoted by Paul, thus clearly showing to what law he refers when he says, "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." To make this still more emphatic, he closes his enumeration of the commandments composing the last table of the decalogue, with the statement that "love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Now since the apostle is speaking only of earthly governments, and the duty of their subjects, we know that he who does no ill to his neighbor—loves his neighbor as himself,—has fulfilled all the law of which these earthly governments are empowered to take notice.

Thus it is seen that Paul's argument concerning the office of civil government is confined to the last six commandments of the decalogue. But let it not be supposed that human governments can recognize all violations of even these last six commandments. Earthly governments are solely for the purpose of securing to their subjects mutual rights. So long as a man does no ill to his neighbor, the law cannot molest him. But any violation of the law of God affects the individual himself first of all. For example: Christ said that the seventh commandment may be violated by a single lustful look and evil desire; but such look and desire do not injure any one except the individual indulging in them; it is only when they result in the commission of the open act of adultery, thus injuring others besides the adulterer himself, that human governments can interfere. To God alone belongs the power to punish sins of the mind.

Of the sixth commandment we are told that whosoever hates another has violated it; but the State cannot prevent a man from hating another, nor take any notice of hatred un'til it culminates in open crime.

There are innumerable ways in which the fifth commandment may be violated, for which the civil government has neither the right nor the power to punish. Only in extreme cases can the State interfere. A man may be covetous, and yet he is not liable to punishment until his covetousness results in open theft or swindling. Yet before the act is accomplished, of which the State can take notice, a man's covetousness or lying or hatred may work great annoyance to his neighbors.

We see, then, how imperfect are human governments even within the sphere allotted to them. God alone has the power to read the heart, and he alone has the right to "bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." With matters of purely a religious nature—those which rest solely upon our relation to God, and not to our neighbor—human governments have no right to interfere. Concerning them, each individual is answerable to God alone.

E. J. W.

"Nehemiah, the Tirshatha."

TO N. J. BOWERS:—In the AMERICAN SENTINEL of July 17, I have read your article under the above heading. I am a National Reformer; but in what I am now about to write I beg leave to speak for myself only. Others may not believe as I do, and if you think my sentiments are erroneous, you must not charge my errors to them.

In common with millions of other Christians, you are in error, I think, in reference to the character of the Hebrew Civil Government, as well as in reference to what government should be now.

I ask your attention to the following propositions:—

1. The theocracy of the Hebrew commonwealth was a lawful and good government. God appointed it for the good of his chosen nation. If good then, why would not a similar theocracy be good now?

2. If there was a union between Church and State then, as you allege, and this by divine appointment too, why would not a similar union be a good thing now?

3. But there was no union of Church and State then—no union such as people generally object to now. In the Hebrew commonwealth or Nation, the two institutions, Church and State—the religious and the civil departments—there was no union. They coöperated, each in its own department. That is all. They were each independent of the other—one did not control the other. One had no power over the other, as formerly in Great Britain. The members of the church were members of the Government or State also; but that did not make a union of Church and State. The officers of the one were sometimes officers in the other; but that did not unite Church and State. President Garfield was a minister of the gospel in the Christian Church. He held two offices, one in the religious department and one in the civil. This did not unite Church and State. President Harrison is an elder in the Presbyterian Church. He holds an office in the church and another in the State or civil department. This does not make a union of Church and State. In the Legislature of California there is a Congregational minister, and a pastor of a church. I see no union of Church and State in California. Every member of the United States Senate might be a Christian and even a minister, or elder, or deacon, and still the Church and the State would be separate—no union.

There are three institutions, and probably only three, of divine appointment, viz.: the family, the church, and the State—family government, ecclesiastical government, and civil government. All the people should or may belong to all these. But this would not, does not, unite Church and State. The family would still be a separate institution; the church would still be a separate organization, and independent of the State; and the civil society or government would still be independent of the religious society, the church; no union.

4. That the Hebrew commonwealth was a theocracy is true, and rightfully. But the commonwealth of the Hebrews was also a republic. Any righteous government could be both a theocracy and a republic at the same time. All governments should be theocracies and republics, not monarchies. The government that God founded or appointed under Moses was both theocratic and republic or representative. The people afterwards clamored for a king, and God

in anger gave them Saul. Every monarchy, except it be an elective monarchy, is a usurpation. And every republic in which the authority of God is rejected, is also a usurpation.

5. Notwithstanding all that I have said, I acknowledge that in the United States such a republican theocracy, or such a theocratic republic, as there should be, would be impracticable—an utter impossibility now—but only or mainly for the reason that all the people are not of one mind or of one religion as were the Hebrews. All should be Christians; but they are not. All should be Protestants; but they are not. All should be of one mind on the subject of the Sabbath; but they are not. All should accept the law of God for the rule of action in both Church and State; but they do not. These and similar are reasons why we cannot have, what we should have, a pure republican theocracy; that is, a government in which the will of God would be the supreme law by the consent and vote of the people. No other government is lawful. In the Hebrew commonwealth or theocracy, the officers were chosen by the people, and God was the Supreme Ruler. His will was supreme; the people's will law only when in accordance with the divine will. This was God's kind of government. It was good. The same should be now, and none other. All others are usurpers. With the permission of the editors, I may yet have a few more words of criticism.

N. R. JOHNSTON.

The Republic of Israel.

THIS expression must sound strange to the ears of every reader of the Bible; but we adopt it from the National Reformers, who, in their wondrous zeal for a religious government in the United States, and in their equally wondrous determination to bend the facts of the Bible to suit their purpose, actually assert that the government of Israel, instituted at Sinai, was a republic!

We propose to show that these self-styled Reformers are in error in their theory of the kingdom of Christ, both in respect to the history and the prophecies of the Bible, and will briefly examine the subject of history, to show that they greatly err in affirming that what they seek in the United States is in conformity with the government of Israel as it existed under the immediate direction of Jehovah. A writer in the *Christian Statesman* used the following language:—

"The nation of Israel was organized at Mount Sinai, as 'the custodians of the law, liberty, and religion of mankind.' A republican form of government was given them. The three departments of government, the legislative, executive, and judicial, were substantially represented in it. Moses, as the judge or president, was the chief executive officer. The seventy elders formed the Congress of General Government. The court of the gate or civil Sanhedrim was the arbiter of justice. The heads of the tribes and princes thereof constituted the tribal or State governments. It was a representative government. The people were sovereign. They elected their rulers to represent them in office."

We are now dealing with facts—facts of history—facts important in their relation to the question at issue, and it is, therefore, our duty to characterize statements in correct terms. The above extract is worse than a mere "fancy sketch;" it is a shameful perversion of the history given in the Bible. We have seldom seen so much assumption in so little space, as the above paragraph contains.

1. When Israel was called out of Egypt, the government under which they were led was a

theocracy, pure and simple. And everyone knows that a theocracy is the very opposite of a republic.

2. There was no legislative department in the government. A republic was well described by President Lincoln, as a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." But no such government was instituted at Sinai, or at any other place or time, for Israel. Even Moses, the highest among them, was not a legislator; *Moses never made any laws*. He enforced that, and that only, which he received directly from the Lord.

3. The seventy elders were not legislators; they never made any laws. They did not constitute a "Congress" in any sense in which that word is used in a republic or in any representative government. The *Statesman* and its correspondents can only make these assertions good by pointing to the act by which they were constituted a legislative body, or pointing to some law which they enacted. This they cannot do. But by their failure to do this they will stand convicted of misrepresenting the Bible to serve the purpose of their worldly ambition. There is not a Sunday-school scholar in the land, of intelligence and study, who does not know that God alone gave laws to Israel, which Moses and the seventy elders were to enforce and administer, with the explicit direction to add nothing to them, nor take anything from them.

4. The patriarchal system existed to the time of the exode. "Elders" were aged men, heads of families or tribes. The father of the family was priest and ruler, no matter how old his sons might be nor how numerous their families. And his prerogative descended to the first-born. This order continued until the Lord chose one family to serve as priests for the Nation. At first elders were such in this sense only.

5. The Lord directed that seventy "from the elders" be selected by Moses—not making or to make them elders, but—because they were elders. The word of the Lord was as follows:—

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them; and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with thee there; and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone." "And the Lord came down in a cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders; and it came to pass, that, when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease." Num. 11:16, 17, 25.

6. The assertion that "the people were sovereign" is false even to an absurdity. They possessed no sovereignty in the government in any respect whatever. Neither the people, nor Moses, nor the seventy, were consulted in regard to the laws they were to obey, or to the penalties to be enforced. They entered into covenant with God to be his people and to obey him, but God conferred no legislative power upon any of them.

7. Although the government was a theocracy, under the immediate and sole direction of God, the religious and civil elements were kept distinct, the priests having no inheritance with the tribes, and all but those designated by the Lord as priests being ineligible to the priesthood. All

religious rites being ordered by the Lord, the civil rulers had no authority to control them, or interfere in their performance. The prophets through whom the Lord directed the affairs of the Government, might or might not be priests. Sometimes this office was given to women. All was ordered of the Lord, and the people had no voice in any of these matters.

The people finally demanded a king, not to better their government, but to be as the nations around them. Though the Lord listened to their request, the thing displeased him. He said it was equivalent to rejecting him as their ruler. He gave them a king, but he reserved to himself the right to choose the king for them. Even in this they were not consulted. Saul was chosen of the Lord and anointed before the people knew anything about him. He was rejected—not by the people, but by the Lord—and David was chosen and anointed in like manner, without the knowledge of the people. And the powers of the king were so limited by the rules and laws which were given to them, that Israel was once sorely afflicted because King David presumed to take a census of the people without consulting the Lord!

9. The religious rites of Israel were mostly types, not models to be followed by future governments. And no government could adopt them as models without denying the priesthood of Christ, the antitype.

And now, reader, we leave it to you to judge in this matter. Was there any semblance of a republic in the government of Israel, in any period of its history? Are not the Amendmentists guilty of deception in trying to palm off such statements as those we have quoted, as historical truths of the Bible? We have claimed, and we insist, that their movement contemplates an entire change in the structure of our Government. It is impossible to carry their plans into effect, and retain the republican features of our Government. The rights of certain classes of citizens will be ruthlessly trampled under foot as surely as they succeed in changing the Constitution as they desire and intend to do.

But one other feature of their contemplated work will now be noticed. It is closely related to the subject herein considered. By them it is termed "Bible legislation." We quote again the words of a writer in the *Statesman*:—

"But the changes will come gradually, and probably only after the whole framework of Bible legislation has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens generally."

What is meant by "Bible legislation"? Nothing else but legislation upon the Bible and its teachings. This writer says that "the chief discussions and final decisions of most points will be developed in the churches." But we deny the right of Congress, Legislatures, Courts, lawyers, and also of the churches, to legislate concerning the doctrines and duties contained in the Bible. When they propose to do this, we ask them to show their credentials. Who gives them authority to enter upon any such work? Was this the province of the "Congress" of Israel, to "legislate" concerning what God commanded them to do and to teach? Where is the evidence? Such power was never committed even to the apostles of Christ. They taught that which they received by revelation; and they taught that at the death of the testator the covenant was ratified, and nothing could thereafter be added to it.

Their office was neither legislative nor executive, but ministerial. But certain ones are now dissatisfied with the heavenly calling of "ambassadors for Christ;" they choose rather to be self-appointed legislators and executives; they aspire to a position to which God never appointed mortal man.

Now, no one can legislate upon a matter which is above his authority; and he who legislates upon the Bible, and declares *authoritatively* what man may and may not do in regard to the word of God, and how man must and must not receive its precepts, truly exalts himself above the word of the Most High. Jehovah has magnified his word above all his name (Ps. 138:2), and his righteous justice will not long suffer such an insult to his authority.—*J. H. Waggoner, 1886.*

A Milwaukee Pastor on Sunday Laws.

ACCORDING to the *Milwaukee Sentinel* of June 17, Rev. T. D. Forbush, one of the pastors of that city, in his sermon on the previous day, discussed the "Sabbath Question," and in the course of his remarks said some very good things. The reader will observe that in paragraphs which we quote from the published report of this sermon the term "Sabbatarian" is applied to those who advocate stringent Sunday observance; but according to lexicographers the term is properly applied only to those who observe the seventh day. We make this explanation so that none may misunderstand Mr. Forbush's meaning. He said:—

"It has long been the desire of the Sabbatarians in some way to make Sabbath observance compulsory; there is a movement looking to the union eventually of Church and State, and a young man was imported here last Sunday to teach the principles of this movement. The Sabbatarians believe that because a thing seems to them to be desired it should be enforced by statute, an idea that has been held by fanatics for a long time, and who seek to make people miserable by revamping old-time laws that caused infinite misery in their time. The movement, I am sorry to say, has found the W. C. T. U. willing to stand sponsor to it. I consider the W. C. T. U. a grand order, but I regret that it should join in the Sabbatarian movement and seek to maintain moral and religious ideas by the power of the State.

"It is safer to follow the counsel of Madison and Jefferson and Washington and Franklin in such things than that of Miss Willard and Mrs. Livermore. The Government has covenanted never to interfere in man's belief, and to force the views of some men on others is to go contrary to the republican form of government. The Sabbatarians hold that Sunday is for religion, and that deviation from that idea is sin. The Rev. Mr. Crafts said that the movement's work was as two arms. The right arm was the desire for Sabbath observance for religion's sake; the left, its observance for the benefit of the people in a secular way. However, the movement puts its left arm forward. It is ready to tell the people what they shall not do as a duty to the State, but not quite ready to say what they must do for religion. It is clear that when by the left arm they have restricted Sunday conduct, the right arm would come forward and enforce conformity to their ideas of worship. The spirit that begins by prohibiting will end by proscribing."

Then, continuing, Mr. Forbush said:—

"Do not think that I hold Sunday lightly. I believe in it as a day when care can be laid aside;

I believe in it as a day of thoughtful worship. Mankind would lose vastly by losing its rest-day. Those who do not try to keep it are robbing themselves of part of their strength. . . . But while I believe in it as a civil day and a religious day, I cannot believe in trying to force men to observe it. It is humanity's day, and men ought to be able to observe it as they think best, so they do not annoy others. The Sabbatharians are trying to force the views of the majority on the minority. I do not think I have a right to force my skeptical neighbor to accept my ideas any more than he has a right to force his on me. But I have a right to try to convince him. When Christians resort to compulsion they are on dangerous ground. First it will be 'Thou shalt not work on this day; thou shalt not play, nor walk;' and then it is not a long step to say, 'Thou shalt go to church' under pains and penalties. It is always well to put ourselves in a neighbor's place and treat him as we would be treated."

Colonel Shepard on Religious Legislation.

WHATEVER may be the opinions and object of his co-workers in behalf of a National Sunday-Rest law, Col. Elliott F. Shepard, president of the so-called American Sabbath Union, does not hesitate to base the movement squarely upon the fourth commandment as he understands it. In a recent address before the Kings County (N. Y.) Sabbath Association, Mr. Shepard said:—

"The Sabbath question is to be viewed first from the divine side. . . . Now, what is the law of the Lord respecting the Sabbath-day?" He then quoted the fourth commandment, and after making some statements in regard to the change of the day, he continued to argue at length for its religious observance. In this connection he denounced in strong terms the "anti-Sabbath Pope." He did not, however, explain how it comes that the Pope is "anti-Sabbath," in the sense of being opposed to Sunday-keeping. If he will examine Catholic catechisms, he will find that Sunday-keeping is enjoined upon all Catholics; that they are all expected to attend religious services on Sunday, and to spend the rest of the day in reading religious books. That they do not do so is not the fault of the Pope, and it comes with rather bad grace for Mr. Shepard to accuse that dignitary of being opposed to Sunday, when the Pope himself poses as the defender of Sunday, and when the association of which Mr. Shepard is president counts the entire Catholic population of the United States as being petitioners in favor of the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, which he heartily endorses.

But Mr. Shepard not only advocated laws for the religious observance of Sunday, but he went so far as to advocate the legal enforcement of the entire decalogue. He said: "Now let me illustrate for one moment as to the third commandment, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.'" A great many of the States, he said, had passed laws against blasphemy, and that was all right. "If this principle had been observed," he remarked, "we would never have known or heard of the abominable idolatry in our country known as Mormonism. The very foundation of that religion is, that a man can take the name of God in vain. It soon becomes nothing for him to say the Lord God says through him do so-and-so."

Mr. Shepard's idea seems to be that this country should have a law forbidding any to set up the claim of being a prophet, and of saying that the Lord has authorized him to speak in any way. Of course, it is blasphemy for any man to set up a false claim of being divinely inspired. But does Mr. Shepard really think that such claims should be forbidden by law? So it seems from his words. The plan laid down in the Scriptures for determining such claims is, "To the law and to the testimony. If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." But this test, we understand, is to be applied by each individual for himself, and not by the State or by courts erected by the State.

There is one feature of Mormonism with which it is certainly right that the civil law should deal, namely, polygamy. That is not merely a question of religious belief but of civil practice. It is a matter which concerns not simply a single individual who may marry more than one wife, or even the several wives which one man may have; but it goes farther than that, and it is proper that the Government should forbid it, not because it is immoral, but because it is uncivil. But to pass a law that would cause the courts to say that certain language is blasphemous, or that any man is a blasphemer because he professes to speak in the name of the Lord, would be simply to establish in this country a religious despotism.

However, Mr. Shepard is consistent in this, that he insists that a man has no right to make a difference in the commandments. He says: "The keeping of the ten commandments is simply obeying God, and so, of course, when you break one commandment you break them all. The ten commandments are like a beautiful prism that reflects the image of the Creator, and when you have broken it, the image and reflection are gone. When the spirit of disobedience has crept in and gone to work, you may break the ninth, or seventh, or all the commandments together, just as you please." Mr. Shepard's idea seems to be that it is the prerogative of civil government to require man to keep the law of God, but we would like to know how he would compel men to keep the tenth commandment. It says, "Thou shalt not covet." Or even how he would enforce, by civil law, the sixth or seventh commandments as such.

True, we have laws against murder, and against adultery, but the sixth and seventh commandments are vastly more than any civil enactment can possibly be. As magnified by the Saviour, hatred is a violation of the sixth commandment, and lust is a violation of the seventh. Now if a law is going to be enforced by civil government, the man who has murder or lust in his heart must be punished just the same as though he had committed the overt act to which these feeling would naturally lead. But how is any court or jury to determine a man's feelings? They can arrive at it only in one way, namely, by forcing from the individual a confession by means of torture. It may be said that this will never be done. Probably not, but it shows just how impossible it is for men to enforce the decalogue as such. The law of God is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart, and can be administered only by Him who reads the heart. And thus again it appears that to carry out the ideas set forth by the speakers of this Kings County convention, would be to establish in this country a religious despotism.—*Signs of the Times.*

Why Must All Rest?

THE crude ideas which some people have of civil and religious liberty are well illustrated by the following extracts from an editorial article in the *Golden Censer*, a paper which is lending its influence to the iniquitous schemes of the National Reformers. It says:—

"It is a strange sight to witness some good Christians opposing this reform. They are few, but very urgent. We believe they are mistaken in their fears, and thus we have charity for them. If it were, as they believe, a first step straight towards the union of Church and State, they would have fair reason for their opposition; but it is not so. . . .

"The State does not make a religious Sabbath at all; it recognizes that a rest-day in the seven is a physical and moral necessity, and so ordains the day commonly called Sunday to be that rest-day, because that is the overwhelming choice of its citizens. It protects that day from intrusion by avaricious persons, but does not in any sense require any man to be religious, or to do worship on that day; it only says he shall not do ordinary secular work on that day, or disturb its quiet, because it would tend to destroy the rest-day for the people at large. . . . We must have a rest-day; and it must be a uniform day among all trades, or it cannot be maintained at all, in the very nature of the case; and the minority should cheerfully yield the choice of which day it shall be, to the majority. While we mean to fully protect Jew and Adventist and Baptist, and every other, who religiously has another Sabbath than Sunday, securing to him the utmost freedom of conscience, and protecting him in his place and act of worship, yet the State can have but the one day of the seven as a civil rest-day, and it must fully protect that one from violation by anybody, whatever be his belief or unbelief."

Certainly, as explained by its friends, the proposed Sunday law is a very innocent thing; it won't hurt anybody; its only for the health of the working people, and the minority must submit for the good of the majority who want to rest on Sunday. Of course! This is the theory; but what are the facts? In Arkansas they had a Sunday law which prohibited "ordinary secular labor" upon Sunday in order that the general rest might not be disturbed, and that saloons might be closed; but while no saloons were closed, and while, as a general thing, the day was no more quiet than before the law was passed, good Christian men, peaceable, and good citizens, honest, and industrious, were arrested and fined, one for painting the back end of a building, another for plowing half a mile from any road and from any house, another for digging potatoes for his dinner, and another for mending his wagon-brake in order that he might start early the next morning on a journey. These men observed the seventh day, and felt that they had a God-given right to work upon the other six days of the week, and in doing so they disturbed no one, but they were arrested and fined nevertheless, just as men have been arrested and fined under similar circumstances in several other States. But in the face of scores of such cases, we are gravely told that all are to be allowed the greatest freedom of conscience, and to be fully protected!

But why are these people thus compelled to rest absolutely on Sunday? Not for their health, for they rest upon Saturday. Not that others may rest, for such labor does not require that others labor also. Not that worship may not be disturbed, for such labor makes little or no noise, and does not disturb anybody in any proper sense. It follows that it is simply and only because others regard the day as sacred and want to compel all to act as though they had a similar regard for it. If such compulsion is not an infringement of the rights which a just government ought to guarantee to every citizen, we would like to know what would be.

Organized Injustice.

IN Calvin Townsend's "Shorter Course in Civil Government," we find the following under the head of "Political Maxims":—

"That government under which the rights of all persons are not equally protected, is organized injustice."

No truer or more important principle of government was ever stated than is found in these words. According to this principle, however, the American Sabbath Union has been constituted for the express purpose of establishing organized injustice throughout this Nation. For they do intend to secure better protection of the rights of some people than of others; and not only this but they propose to give better protection to the strong than they do to the weak, to the majority than they do to the minority. It will be conceded by everyone, except an intolerant bigot, that:—

1. Every human being is directly and personally accountable to God.

2. This being the case he ought to serve God as he believes God requires.

3. Therefore each person has the inalienable right to choose his own religion.

Says Dr. Philip Schaff:—

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

From this it follows that every person has the inherent civil right to observe any day of the week he may choose as a day of religious worship. And from the principle laid down by Mr. Townsend, it also follows that each person should be equally protected with all others in the right to observe the day of his choice. Now the American Sabbath Union claims that it is impossible for a person to strictly and religiously observe the day of his choice unless there is a law to prohibit all labor on that day. They say that if some people are working while others are resting the latter are disturbed by the former, and so those who do not want to rest ought to be made to rest in order that the others may not be disturbed.

At the present time, there are two days of each week that are observed in this country as the Sabbath—the seventh day, or Saturday, and the first day, or Sunday. It follows, therefore, from the premises of the American Sabbath Union, that upon the first and seventh days of each week all secular labor should be prohibited by law in order that the whole people may be protected in their religious rights.

Is it this for which the Union is working? Not at all. They propose to entirely ignore the right of seventh-day people to be protected from "disturbance," and only ask for a law to protect Sunday-keepers. This shows the inherent selfishness of their scheme. It shows that instead of following Christ's golden rule, they have made a

rule of their own to follow, an iron rule of organized injustice and religious tyranny.

If the doctrine of "liberty of rest for each demands a law of rest for all," it is just as true upon Saturday as it is upon Sunday; and we would like to see the "strategic" officers of the American Sabbath Union undertake to change this conclusion by the construction of an argument more intellectual in substance and logical in form than the ordinary Pharisaical sneer.

The fact that seventh-day observers are in the minority, has nothing to do with this question. The doctrine that the majority should be better protected than the minority, that the strong should be better protected than the weak, is simply barbarous. It is on the principle that might makes right. That was the principle on which the Jews crucified Christ. If a lion and a lamb were about to come in contact, which do you think would stand in the greater need of protection? "The lamb," you say; very well, the lamb is the minority; the lion is the majority. There is not much danger that the lamb will devour the lion, but there is great danger that the lion will devour the lamb.

God is no respecter of persons, but the American Sabbath Union is a respecter of the class that is rich in numbers and clothed in the garments of power. Their conclusions are based upon no general principles which they are willing to apply to all classes alike, unless it is this one, that "wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to" salvation, and all should be compelled to "go in thereat." Their sole object is to establish "organized injustice" and subvert the United States Constitution, which declares that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

IN more than one hundred years of its existence no attempt has ever been made to have this Government officially recognize any religious denomination or sect, and the precedent would be a dangerous one to establish. Suppose, for instance, that W. A. Amaker, who is a Presbyterian, should succeed in having all work stopped in our post-offices on Sundays during his administration of the Post-office Department. So far all right, but now suppose that in the unexpected upheaval of politics he should be succeeded by a Hebrew, or a Seventh-day Adventist, both of which sects regard Saturday as the Sabbath-day, and that he should insist on having all post-office work stopped on his Sabbath. Then what a row we should have! Church and State both have important functions to perform in this as well as every other country, but let us keep them separate and distinct, for if history teaches anything it is the utter futility of successfully uniting the two.—*Tulare Free Press.*

A MAN cannot publish a Sunday newspaper in Arkansas without rendering himself liable to imprisonment, or the payment of a fine. Such is the law. The use of the shot-gun is, however, still fashionable. It was in this State that the Seventh-day Baptists were so shamefully persecuted a few years ago, for insisting upon the right, under the Constitution, of working six days in the week, and resting on the only day declared in the Bible to be sacred time. It is a little surprising that the National Reform Association does not remove its headquarters to Arkansas.—*Denison, Texas, Gazetteer.*

Not Awakened to the Danger.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, published at Oakland, California, carries as its motto, "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political." Those who have read the writings of that time-honored "Father of Democracy," will recognize the above as the language of Thomas Jefferson. But we are drifting away from the teachings of the fathers of this republic as surely and serenely as the waters of Niagara, in its upper course, drift toward their terrible plunge at the dread cataract. The surface looks smooth, and the prophets of Mammon are singing siren songs of peace, and telling the people that a political millennium is about to dawn upon us, when every baleful force of society points to the fact that a political and religious despotism may be reared upon the ruins of our free Government unless the people are wise enough to check the insidious influences that will bring it about. Already gold buys the highest offices in the gift of the people; great corporations buy State Legislatures, bribe the judges of our highest courts and even Congress itself.

There is another danger, to which most people are not awakened, which the SENTINEL combats with vigor and ability, the union of Church and State. Not an absolute union as in many of the old countries, but a *quasi* union, that will act as an entering wedge which shall open the way to put every man's conscience into the keeping of the law,—the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, which many able Christians are opposing because of the danger of the precedent. We do not wish to return to the persecutions of the Inquisition, to the cruelties of Cromwell, nor the no less barbarous persecutions of the Puritans against those who did not adhere to their religious faith. The history of religious wars and persecutions in all ages, should warn us of the danger of taking a single step towards opening a door, that, like Pandora's box, may let loose a multitude of evils to afflict mankind and curse the earth.

Our Constitution is broad enough; its foundation is firm, and we need no laws to force upon us the religious beliefs or creeds of others. We have yet the liberty to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience; our civilization is essentially Christian in its nature, and that church which would endeavor to fasten any law upon us, affecting religious belief, has a zeal not according to knowledge. We commend the work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. It is *American*. It upholds the principles for which our forefathers fought, and warns the people who would regulate the religious faith of the people by statute or Constitutional law, that they are treading on dangerous ground. A yoke of bondage is none the easier to bear, that it is placed upon the people in the name of religion. Of the great religious persecutions of the past, which have caused rivers of blood to flow, none were begun without an abiding faith in those who instigated them that they were doing the will of God. Let the American people, then, be content with their Constitution, nor attempt an innovation which can do no possible good, but may bring upon us woes equal to the seven plagues of Egypt.—*Humboldt Daily Standard, July 9, 1889.*

SAID the apostle Paul to the Corinthians: "Not that we have dominion [lordship] over your faith, but are helpers of your joy; for by faith ye stand." 2 Cor. 1:24.

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

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

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.

THE GRANDEST BOOK

ON THE

GRANDEST SUBJECT!

And Within the Reach of All.

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

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS



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

The Yo Semite Valley

AND BIG TREE GROVES OF CALIFORNIA.

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

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

OVER ONE HUNDRED ILLUSTRATIONS

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

PRICE, \$1.50 PER COPY.

Read what Others Say of it:

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

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

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

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

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

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

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.
Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

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..... 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 1/4 inches). Each number will contain from 8 to 56 pages, and will have a neatly engraved cover design. Price, 75 cents per year of 25 numbers. The following numbers are now ready:—

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

Orders can be filled for back numbers at any time and in any quantity desired, as each number is printed from electrotypes 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.,

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST 7, 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.

A NATIONAL Reformer very innocently asks, "If a theocracy was a good thing for the children of Israel, why would a theocracy not be a good thing for us now?" We answer: For the simple reason that while the Jewish theocracy was established by God, any so-called theocracy that might be set up now, would be simply man-made; and instead of God being the ruler, men would rule in the name of God. In short, such a government would be nothing more nor less than an image to the Papacy. The Pope poses as the Vicar of the Son of God; he is described by the apostle (2 Thess. 2:4) as sitting "in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," and this is just what any man must do who attempts to put into practical operation the theocratic theory of government.

THE New York *Churchman* says that "it is remarkable that the clergy of the various religious bodies take so small a part in political concerns, for in other free countries they are conspicuous in such affairs. It is stated that parliamentary government was an invention of theologians, the first truly representative imperial parliament that ever met having been the Church Parliament at Nicaea." Just so; and the decrees of that "representative imperial parliament" were enforced by the civil power, and those who refused to assent to its dogmas were banished. If the *Churchman* can point to nothing any more creditable to the clergy than their part in the Council of Nicaea, those who love liberty of conscience will be likely to conclude that the less ministers, as such, have to do with politics the better.

NATIONAL REFORM District Secretary J. M. Foster says:—

"The same cry that aroused the Crusaders in the eleventh century to rescue the holy sepulcher from the hands of the infidel, will awake the hosts of Immanuel to rescue this land from the powers of the world, and incorporate it in the city of God."—*Christian Statesman*, June 2, 1887.

We have an idea that that is just about the straight truth in the matter, as it will be when National Reform gets to its full tide of progress. Then, as like causes produce like effects, we may expect to see again enacted some of the fanatical scenes of the crusades. Says Waddington: "The Crusaders exclaimed, 'It is the will of God!' and in that fancied behest, the fiercest brutalities which the world ever beheld, sought—not palliation, but—honor and the crown of eternal reward."

THE question of Sunday marriages has been before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and that tribunal has decided that a marriage solemnized on Sunday is null and void! Such a law may be in the interests of Sunday sanctity, but it certainly will not tend to protect young marriageable females. Any lecherous wretch who wants to accomplish the ruin of some confiding girl, in Pennsylvania, need no longer take his chances on prosecution for seduction; he can

just get her to consent to a marriage on Sunday, and then when his lust is satiated, he can cast her off like an unclean thing. Anyone at all conversant with legal matters can readily see how such a decision will work untold injustice to hundreds of innocent women and children; but what of that, so long as Sunday is protected? This decision may be law, but it is not equity. It is, however, another illustration of the wickedness of Sunday laws.

THE following item from the *Denver News* shows how little the great subject of religious liberty is understood in these days:—

"If the importance of perpetuating one day's rest in seven is conceded, and to save this rest to the industrial masses it is necessary to legalize a day, the fact that such law would occasion inconvenience to a minority does not necessarily imply injustice to the latter. Such concessions are in harmony with a principle that is essential to the existence of society."

But such a law would occasion more than "inconvenience" to a minority; in several States such laws have occasioned persecution to "a minority." An instance of this kind was given in these columns last week, under the heading, "Practical Workings of a Sunday Law." Disguise it as they will, the fact remains that Sunday laws are demanded because so many regard the day as sacred, and when they secure a law which makes such a thing possible, they will use it to oppress those who teach and practice differently from themselves. The ostensible reason urged for Sunday laws is, to secure a day of rest for working men; the real reason is, the religious character of the day.

LET no reader of the AMERICAN SENTINEL forget that, in a speech before the recent Missouri Sabbath Convention at Sedalia, Rev. W. D. Gray 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."

We have been charged with being unfair because we have treated the work of the American Sabbath Union as being identical with the work of the National Reform Association, but we submit if everything we have ever said to that effect is not fully justified by these words of Mr. Gray. It may be claimed that Mr. Gray did not properly state the object of the American Sabbath Union, but we believe that when these words were uttered the field secretary of that Union was present, and not only offered no protest but permitted Mr. Gray to be chosen secretary of the permanent State organization.

NATIONAL Reformers are wont to insist that they are opposed to the union of Church and State, and, allowing them to define the term, we suppose that they are, for they say that such a union consists in a union of some particular sect and the State. This they are opposed to, but, say they, "We want a union of religion and the State." This is simply making a distinction without a difference, for when the State adopts a religion, somebody must decide what that religion is, and the tenets thus decided upon become the State creed, or the State religion. When Constantine made Christianity the religion of the Roman Empire, a council was called to decide what was entitled to be recognized as Christianity, and then that which was thus recognized by the council received the protection of Rome, while everything else was outlawed. And just so

it would be in this country if Christianity were declared to be the religion of the United States or of any State, some authority would have to say what constitutes Christianity, and everything outside of that would be outside of the law. And this is just what the National Reformers are seeking to bring about.

In its issue of May 16, the *Christian Statesman* waxes very indignant over what it terms "an act of unspeakable impudence," which consisted in offering to President Harrison a goblet full of American wine from a float representing the liquor interest, and which took part in the industrial parade of New York on the occasion of the recent centennial exhibition there. We do not intend to condone such an offense as this, for, apart from its moral aspect, it was certainly in violation of all rules of good taste; but the point which most forcibly impressed us in the *Statesman's* account was the manner in which it referred to the "effrontery of the liquor industry."

The *Statesman* is very actively engaged in the movement to suppress the Sunday saloon. In fact, this is one of the great sources of evil in our country, according to the statements of National Reformers, in whose interests the *Statesman* is published. Shut up the saloon on Sunday, they say, so the Sabbath can be observed and people can have an opportunity to attend church, etc.

By taking such a position as this they tacitly admit that the saloon is evil only on Sunday. No amount of argument can dodge this conclusion. If the saloon is evil, and only evil, and if the liquor interest of the country is a gigantic source of wrong, then why shut up the saloons on Sunday any more than on any other day? Wrong is wrong, no matter upon what day it is committed; but the *Statesman*, in taking the position it has in the past on the Sunday saloon question, virtually admits that the business of saloon-keeping is just as legitimate and honorable upon the other days of the week as any other business that could be mentioned. If this is the case (a point which we by no means admit, but which would be plainly proven by the *Statesman's* logic), then it certainly is very much out of place for the *Statesman* to sneer at the "liquor industry" of America. Consistency, though a jewel, is conspicuous chiefly on account of its absence in such a course as this.

THE same cause which restrained the vigor, polluted the character of the church; for, being unable immediately to repress its own spiritual weapons, the violent animosities of its ministers, and impatient of the gradual influence of time and reason, in a dark and disastrous moment it had recourse to that temporal sword which was not intended for its service, and which it has never yet employed without disgrace or without impunity.—*Waddington*.

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.