

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER 18, 1889

NUMBER 34.

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 true doctrine [of Christian liberty] is not merely our right to think for ourselves, but the right of the other man to think for himself."

It was the will of Frederick the Great, that in his dominions everybody should be at liberty to "get saved after his own fashion." If all governments had ever been so wise as that of Frederick what horrors the world would have escaped.

WHEN the church leaders force upon men the observance of a day, as the Lord's day, while at the same time they themselves know and say that there is no authority from the Lord for its observance, what is that but the most arrogant assumption of power?

IN this time where there is so much clamor for legislation pledging governmental help to certain classes it would be well for all to remember the words of President Cleveland: "It is not the duty of the government to support the people; but of the people to support the government."

THE realm of civil government is that of the natural, not the supernatural relations of mankind. The worship of God is a supernatural relation, with it government can never have anything to do. Christianity is a supernatural thing; it is a supernatural gift; and with it no civil government can ever of right have anything to do.

BISHOP HEARST of the M. E. Church says that "The Germans who land on our shores do not know what the Sabbath is—they never saw it. They want to be presented with such a Sabbath as national legislation can give." But the Germans who land here, in a little while become important factors themselves in the matter of legislation, both State and national. Then will not the Sabbath that is given by legislation bear much of the blemish of those who it is confessed know not what it is? We would inquire of the Bishop and his Sunday-law co-workers, whether it would not be a good plan for the churches of this country to present to the Germans and all others such a Sabbath as the genuine religion of Christ can give? This would be an ambition worthy of their sincerest endeavors.

Our Position.

It has been our duty in our work to criticise very severely at times the actions and sayings of certain men,—churchmen, ministers of the gospel and lay workers,—and also the action of certain religious organs, in connection with the movement to secure national enforcement of Sunday observance. It has not been a pleasant task to do this, and we have not done so because of any feeling of antagonism to the individuals so criticised; much less have we done so because of any antagonism whatever to religion; but there are some who do not distinguish carefully, and there are others, we are sorry to say, who willfully misrepresent our motives. Therefore we will make a few statements.

We do not oppose this Sunday movement because we have no respect for the convictions of those who observe Sunday. Not only do we reverence the Bible, but we have respect for every man's belief concerning the Bible. We are perfectly willing to afford to every person the free privilege of believing as he chooses. Not only are we willing but we insist upon it for every person. We believe that the government must protect all. We believe that the government should protect the Sunday observer in his observance of Sunday, just the same as it protects one who observes another day of the week in his observance of that day.

It is only the unchristian methods of doing what professes to be Christian work, but which is in reality unchristian, that we oppose.

We oppose Sunday legislation not because we are not willing that people should observe Sunday if they wish to, and not because we are unwilling that the government should see that they are not interfered with in their observance of Sunday, but we oppose the Sunday movement because it is unchristian, and it is shown to be unchristian by the unchristian methods employed in its maintenance.

We have the kindest feelings for all religious people. We would grant them the same consideration in their belief and practice that we would ask them to show us. It is only when they claim as their right that which they are not willing to grant to those who differ with them that we oppose them. When they do that, they are doing just that which they would not have others do to them, and that very thing shows their movement to be unchristian, because it is contrary to the rule laid down by Christ.

Let this distinction be kept constantly in view. Anything that can be shown by argument to be right, the SENTINEL will not oppose. Nay, more; although we do not believe that Sunday has the slightest sacredness, or has any claim to respect, more than Monday or Tuesday, yet if they

will confine their advocacy of it to legitimate lines,—namely, the pulpit, the press, the Sunday-school, the family,—the SENTINEL would never say a word against them. In fact if this were so, there would be no SENTINEL.

The advocates of Sunday have the most perfect right to go anywhere or everywhere that they can secure a hearing, and speak night and day, teaching people to observe Sunday as a day of rest, appealing to their conscience and bringing arguments to bear upon them. They have a right to publish papers and circulate them everywhere, wherever they can induce people to read them. Against such work the SENTINEL would never lift its voice. But when they advocate the use of force, when they advocate measures which they would by no means consent to have carried out toward themselves were the conditions reversed, then the SENTINEL will oppose them, and it will call upon every consistent Christian to unite with it in its opposition.

We want it distinctly understood that the SENTINEL is opposed to nothing that is Christian-like. It was not started with the idea of antagonizing Christianity or any Christian movement. With doctrinal matters it has nothing to do. Its sole work is the maintenance of religious liberty of thought and action, because under such circumstances alone can true Christianity flourish. It does not claim to be the arbiter of what Christianity is, it does not presume to say what men ought to believe, or what they are to teach, or what religious customs they are to practice;—it has only to do with efforts to propagate views by methods that tend only to oppression. Who is there that cannot stand upon the same platform?

E. J. W.

The State to Let Religion Alone.

WE recently had the pleasure of listening to one of a series of talks by Bishop Vincent, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on the epistles of Paul to Timothy, and were much edified by some remarks that he made upon the first two verses of the second chapter of the first epistle, which read as follows:—

"I exhort therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty."

Said he, "We should pray for kings and those in authority—for what purpose? That the church may have power in the government? No. That our ministers may have good appointments under the government? No. That the church may have the authority of the government to carry forward its work? No. But that they may so mind their business that we may have a quiet and tranquil life. The church makes a

great mistake when it seeks to secure worldly position, and to influence temporal power."

He said that he always admired the answer that Diogenes made to Alexander, when the king visited the philosopher and asked him what he could do for him. The philosopher answered, "Stand out of the light." "Such," said he, "should be the position of the church. All that Christians should ask of the government is to let us alone, and to stand out of the way so that we may live quietly and peaceably, and carry on the work of the gospel by the power of the Spirit."

The bishop said further, "The abomination of abominations is the aspiration on the part of the church for temporal power. What the church wants is spiritual power." He then stated that the spiritual power of a church always declines in proportion as the church gains temporal power.

These are truths that have been time and again set forth in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, but we are glad to be able to present them anew from the mouth of so prominent and eminent a man as Bishop J. H. Vincent. It shows that the work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL in opposing the so-called National Reform movement, instead of being infidel or atheistic, is most truly Christian, and that the most active Christian workers,—those who have a right to that title,—promulgate the very same principles that the SENTINEL does.

While we in our work often have to make severe strictures on certain churchmen, we would not have anyone get the idea that it is because we are opposed to churches or Christianity. Our strictures upon those persons are not because we oppose whatever of true Christianity they may possess, but it is because they are doing not only unchristian but antichristian work. They are attempting to secure the very thing which Bishop Vincent says is the abomination of abominations in the church, and tends to dearth of spirituality. Therefore we may say without fear of successful contradiction that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is working for the conservation of true Christianity in this country.

E. J. W.

The Explanation Does Not Explain.

SINCE our publication of Cardinal Gibbons' letter to Mr. Lindsay of Baltimore, stating that in indorsing the Sunday movement last winter, he spoke only for himself and that he had neither the authority nor the intention of binding the archbishops, bishops, or the Catholic laymen of the United States, Mr. Crafts finds himself in hot water, about everywhere he goes. In the Chicago News of May 21, Mr. Edward Cadman published a communication upon which Mr. Crafts replied in the News of July 13, in which he flounders considerably. He says:—

"The American Sabbath Union, not the 'American Sunday Union,' when Cardinal Gibbons' letter was first presented at the National Sabbath Convention, distinctly said through my lips, as the letter was directed to me, that the letter (which was read in full, that each hearer might judge for himself what is meant) was not equivalent to the signature of the whole Catholic Church, although it was hoped it would be equivalent to a negative indorsement by that church in that the approval of the Cardinal, it was thought, would prevent opposition to the Sunday-rest petition by any loyal Catholic."

Yes, Mr. Crafts, on that point, said:—

"The letter is not equal in value to the individual signatures of the millions he represents, but no Cath-

olic priest or paper or person will oppose what has thus been indorsed."

But in that very statement he speaks of the millions whom the Cardinal represents when the Cardinal distinctly asserts that his action in that thing was not representative. More than this; Mr. Crafts makes the Cardinal's action a test of loyalty to every Catholic priest, paper, and person, when the Cardinal distinctly affirms that he had not the authority to make his action in that a test of the loyalty of Catholics, and that "as he had not the authority, so he had not the intention" of doing it. And still, Mr. Crafts insists that it is a test of Catholic loyalty. The fact is, his explanation is more wicked and far less excusable than his original statement.

Nor is this all. When Mrs. Bateham stood on the platform of the Foundry Methodist Church of Washington City, on the night of December 11, 1888, and spoke of the petitions with which that church was festooned, and told who were in favor of it, she distinctly said:—

"Cardinal Gibbons has indorsed for all his people."

I myself was there, within thirty feet of her, and was paying the strictest attention when she made the statement, and I wrote down the words as they fell from her lips. Mr. Crafts speaks of the explanation (which doesn't explain), which was given through his lips, but these are the words which came through *her* lips.

Yet more than this. In document No. 1, of the American Sabbath Union, issued December, 1888, after the convention was over, there is this sentence:—

"Cardinal Gibbons also sent him (Dr. Crafts) an official letter indorsing the petition on behalf of the plenary council of the Roman Catholic Church."

And also this one, which editors are asked to publish:—

"The Catholic Church has indorsed the petition through a letter of its Cardinal."

This shows that the American Sabbath Union did intentionally, and without authority, count all the Roman Catholics of the country in Cardinal Gibbons' name. It shows also that they intentionally made the Cardinal's indorsement binding even to the test of loyalty upon all the Catholics of the country, thus transcending both the authority and the intention of the Cardinal himself.

These are facts which the American Sabbath Union and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union cannot escape. Nor can they escape the just condemnation which goes with the facts. No explanation that has been, or that can be presented, will clear them. Every effort to defend their action, and every effort by explanation to shield themselves from just condemnation, only makes the matter worse. There is only one way out, and that is by open confession. Let them confess that they committed a fraud. Or, if they think that that would be too much for them, we are inclined to be charitable, let them confess that in the matter of the Roman Catholic petitions they have wholly misrepresented; then let them stop circulating the documents which contain the misrepresentation. This will clear them from any further guilt in the matter, then we will count all that in the past, and hold them no longer responsible for it, and will say no more about it. But so long as they defend their action in this matter, just so long will we see to it that the facts shall be set before the people and that the authors of the wickedness are held up to the just condemnation that belongs with the facts.

In the above extract Mr. Crafts says that at

the National Sabbath Convention at Washington, the Cardinal's letter was read in full that each hearer might judge for himself what it meant. Upon this, it must be said, to put it in the mildest possible way, that Mr. Crafts has forgotten the facts. I say again, that I was there, and was within thirty feet of Mr. Crafts when he referred to the letter; and listened carefully, hoping that the whole of the letter might be read, and was disappointed that the whole of it was not read. We therefore say upon the evidence of distinct remembrance that the letter was not read in full, because Mr. Crafts stated that it was "for the Senate Committee."

Mr. Crafts further says:—

"Another misrepresentation in the letter of Mr. Cadman is the statement that 'the admission of a single Catholic to the Union was strenuously opposed.' The fact is dishonestly withheld that it was more strenuously favored, and that a Catholic was elected as a member of the Executive Committee."

It is not in any sense a misrepresentation to say that the admission of a single Catholic to the Union was strenuously opposed. That is a positive fact. It was opposed, and that by Mr. Crafts himself. Even to the extent of trying repeatedly to adjourn the meeting, and it was only owing to the fact that it *was* more strenuously favored that even one Catholic was elected as a member of the Executive Committee. Although there isn't a great deal of credit attaching to the Union on that account, because the Catholics, according to the count, were the majority of all—7,200,000 to 5,977,693—and yet they were allowed only one member upon an Executive Committee of more than a dozen.

The American Sabbath Union had better start new, and do its work fairly.

A. T. J.

"Does it Pay?"

NOR long since, we listened to a lecture by Col. Elliott F. Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Union, on the question, "*Does the Sabbath pay?*" The lecture was notable chiefly for what the lecturer did not say, but there were one or two points which are worthy of careful attention, inasmuch as they show the principle, or rather the *lack* of *Christian* principle in this movement for the legal observance of Sunday. The whole thing is contained in the subject of the lecture, viz., "Does it pay?" We will note a few statements. Said Mr. Shepard:—

"Divine finance; what is it? The Old and the New Testament agree in contradicting Wall Street, and show that prosperity is to be found in obedience to God's commandments?"

This was the main feature of the lecture, namely the proof that more money could be made by resting on Sunday than by working upon it; and nothing but a mercenary motive was placed before the people. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Shepard said to the chairman of the meeting, "I would make some converts here to-night;" and then he proceeded to state that the railroads of the United States have suffered pecuniary loss because of their Sunday work. To emphasize this he made a little mathematical calculation to demonstrate, which we shall not try to follow; but the conclusion of which was that a manufacturer would make thirty-six per cent. more on his investment by resting on Sunday than by working on that day. Thus, while a man by working on Sunday might make fourteen per cent. on his investment, by a strict observance of the day he would make fifty per

cent. on his investment. This shows a gain of thirty-six per cent. for Sunday observance. And then the question was asked, "Which is better, for a man to work on Sunday and make fourteen per cent. or to rest on Sunday and make fifty per cent. Anyone will say the latter is better."

We are not at all convinced that Mr. Shepard's mathematical calculations are correct, but let that pass. The question that at once arose in our mind was this: If Sunday-keeping pays pecuniarily, and if it can be demonstrated that a merchant or a manufacturer can make thirty-six per cent. more by resting on Sunday than by working, what need is there to ask the government to pass laws making it a crime for working on Sunday? Are the merchants and manufacturers in the United States so blind to their own business interests, so obtuse, so dull where dollars and cents are concerned, that they cannot be made to see the gain there is in Sunday observance? and, seeing it, would they deliberately choose a small per cent. in preference to a very large per cent? We are forced to conclude that there is either something wrong with Mr. Shepard's mathematics or with his position as president of the American Sabbath Union. But this is not the worst feature of the case.

The pernicious effect of such teaching as that of Mr. Shepard cannot be seen now, but it will be demonstrated in time. The only argument he presented in the course of the whole evening (and his discourse was on Sunday evening too) was that there would be pecuniary profit in resting on Sunday,—that Sunday-keeping would invariably bring prosperity, and that Sunday-breaking would as invariably result in financial ruin. Now any person of common sense knows that this is not so; but that is not the point. People do not always use their common sense, and that idea of Mr. Shepard's is getting to be quite common. Now couple this with another statement that he made in the same discourse. Said he, "It is useless for any one to claim that the Sabbath [by which he meant Sunday, of course] has any rights, except as they plant themselves on the divine commandment." He had already stated that the fourth commandment was the first commandment with blessing, and the only blessing that he made reference to was financial prosperity. Therefore the natural conclusion from his talk would be that the only blessing that is connected with the fourth commandment is temporal.

Still further: It is not a fact that obedience to the commandments of God will invariably bring temporal prosperity. In fact, it is most often the opposite, and has been so from time immemorial. The Psalmist recorded his feeling when he saw the prosperity of the wicked, seeing they were not in trouble as other men were, while the righteous were cast down. Everybody knows that some of the richest men in the world have been profligate, often base, grinding the poor, and have obtained their wealth by the most dishonorable methods, and have trampled upon every principle of right and justice. But let such teaching as that of Colonel Shepard become generally accepted, and what will be the result? Simply that the possession of great wealth will be taken as an expression of divine favor. The man who is enormously wealthy will be taken as a special favorite of Heaven. Let it be accepted that keeping the commandments necessarily results in worldly prosperity, while a violation of them results in embarrassment and ruin, and there can be no other conclusion but that the man who is rich is the

one who is doing right; and so people in estimating his character will not compare his life with the commandments to see if he is obeying them, but will simply measure his bank account; and no matter how vile he has been, or by what unjust methods he may have obtained his wealth, he will be considered righteous. And so we have another indisputable proof that this Sunday movement is unchristian, and tends only to immorality.

We know that in ancient times the idea prevailed that the possession of wealth was a sign of the divine blessing. This idea was firmly fixed in the minds of the ancient Pharisees. So firmly did they believe it that many of them made it the great point in their lives to get wealth, regardless of the means by which it was acquired. And while continually transgressing the divine commandment in acquiring their wealth, they would point to the possession of that wealth as the evidence that they were righteous, and that God loved them. There are Pharisees enough in the world now, but Col. Shepard and the Association to which he belongs are doing their best to make more.

E. J. W.

Religion and the Public Schools.

FEBRUARY 15, 1889, there was held a hearing before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor upon the Blair resolution, to teach the principles of the Christian religion in all the public schools of the Nation. At that time there appeared before the committee, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, of Philadelphia, corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association; Rev. James M. King, D. D., of New York, representing the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance; Rev. George K. Morris, D. D., of Philadelphia; Rev. W. M. Glasgow, of Baltimore; Rev. J. M. McCurdy, of Philadelphia; C. R. Blackall; and W. M. Morris, M. D., of Philadelphia—all these in favor of the resolution.

Again, on February 22, there was a hearing before the committee on the same resolution. At that time there appeared Rev. Dr. Philip Moxom, Rev. Dr. James B. Dunn, Rev. Dr. James M. Gray—these three being a sub-committee from the Boston Committee of one hundred; Rev. Dr. J. H. Beard, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, and others, all in favor of the resolution. Against it there were Rev. J. O. Corliss and Alonzo T. Jones, editor of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. The following is Mr. Jones' argument:—

Mr. Chairman, there is a point or two not yet touched upon which I wish to notice in the little time that I shall have. I gather from the letter from the author of this resolution to the secretary of the National Reform Association that the intention of this proposed amendment is primarily for the benefit of the State; that the object of the teaching of religion in the public schools is not to be given with the view of fitting the children for heaven, nor of making them Christians; but that it is rather and more particularly to fit them for this world and to make them good citizens; that it is not religion which needs the support of the State so much as it is the State which needs the support of religion. This is the view held, I know, by some of the principal members of the National Reform Association, as, for instance, President Julius H. Seelye and Judge M. B. Hagans. These have expressed it that it is only as a political factor, and its worth only according to its "political value," that the State proposes to secure and enforce the teaching of

religion in the public schools; that the object of the instruction is not "the spiritual welfare of the children," but "for the benefit of the State."

This argument appears very plausible, but it is utterly fallacious. The supreme difficulty with such a view is that it wholly robs religion of its divine sanctions and replaces them only with civil sanctions. It robs religion of its eternal purposes and makes it only a temporal expedient. From being a plan devised by divine wisdom to secure the eternal salvation of the soul, Christianity is, by this scheme, made a mere human device to effect a political purpose. And for the State to give legal and enforced sanction to the idea that the Christian religion and the belief and practice of its principles are only for temporal advantage, is for the State to put an immense premium upon hypocrisy. But there is entirely too much of this already. There is already entirely too much of the profession of religion for only what can be gained in this world by it politically, financially, and socially. Done voluntarily, as it now is, there is vastly too much of it; but for the State to sanction the evil principle, and promote the practice by adopting it as a system and inculcating it upon the minds of the very children as they grow up, would bring upon the country such a flood of corruption as it would be impossible for civil society to bear.

Let me not be misunderstood here. I do not mean to deny for an instant, but rather to assert forever, that the principles of the Christian religion received into the heart and carried out in the life will make good citizens always. But it is only because it derives its sanction from the divine source—because it is rooted in the very soul and nourished by the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit. This, however, the State of itself can never secure. This at once carries us into the realm of conscience, upon the plane of the spiritual, and it can be secured only by spiritual forces, none of which have ever been committed to the State, but *to the church only*.

But right here there comes in an argument presented to me by a United States Senator in this Capitol, one who is in favor of this proposed amendment, too. He was speaking in favor of the amendment. I had said that religious instruction belongs wholly to the parents and to the church—that the State cannot give it because it has not the credentials for it. He replied in these words:—

"But when the family fails and the church fails, the State *has* to do something.

"The answer to this is easy:—

(1) To the family and to the church and to these alone the Author of the Christian religion has committed the work of teaching that religion, and if these fail, the failure is complete.

(2) The statement of the Senator implies that the State is some sort of an entity so entirely distinct from the people who compose it that the State can do for the people what they cannot do for themselves. But the State is made up only of the people who compose the State. The church likewise is made up of such of these as voluntarily choose to enter her fold. To the church is committed the Spirit of God and the ministrations of the word of God, by which only the inculcation of the Christian religion can be secured. Then, the people composing the State, and the families composing the people, and the propagation of religion and the credentials for it being committed only to the family and the church, by this it is again demonstrated that

when the family and the church fail to teach the Christian religion the failure is complete.

The only thing that the State can do under such circumstances is by an exertion of power, the only means at its command, to check the tide of evil for a time, but it is only checked. It is like trying to dam up any other torrent—it may be checked for a moment, only to break its bounds and become more destructive than before. The only real remedy is to begin at the fountain and purify the heart, which can be done only by the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ; for it is only faith in him that can purify the heart and cause the fountain to send forth the sweet waters of everlasting righteousness instead of the bitter stream of evil. This work, however, is committed to the church and not to the State; to the church is given the credentials and the power for its accomplishment.

But the complaint which comes from the gentleman referred to, and which seems to be embodied in the proposed amendment, is that the church has failed to do the work which belongs only to her to do. No more stinging rebuke could be given to the professed church of Jesus Christ in the United States than is given in this despairing plea of the statesman, and no more humiliating confession ever could be made by the church than is unintentionally made by these clerical gentlemen from Boston and other places in their mission to this Capitol to-day to ask the State to undertake the task of teaching religion. Their mission here to-day, sir, is a confession that the professed church of Christ has failed to do that which God has appointed the church to do. It is a confession that the professed church has lost the power of God, the power of the Holy Ghost. It is a confession that she has proved unfaithful to her trust, and that now she wants to ease herself of the responsibility and pass it over to the State. But when they shall have gotten the State to take upon itself the work of the church, what then do they intend that the church shall do? That is the next question that arises; it is an important one, too, for the State to consider, but it is easily answered. When they once get the State to carry on and support the work of the church, the next step will be to get the State to support the church, and that in idleness, as every State has ever had to do, and will ever have to do, which takes upon itself the task of teaching religion. And this is precisely the thing that the National Reform Association, whose chief secretary stands the second time to-day in this room to plead for the adoption of this resolution, proposes that the State shall do. Rev. J. M. Foster, who has been for years a "district secretary" in active service in the work of that association, declares that among the duties which the reigning Mediator requires of nations, there is this:—

"An acknowledgment and performance of the Nation's duty to guard and protect the church—by suppressing all public violations of the moral law; by maintaining a system of public schools, indoctrinating their youth in morality and virtue; by exempting church property from taxation;" and "by providing her funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home, and in the foreign field."—*Christian Statesman, February 21, 1834.*

That is the very point to which the State will be brought as surely as it ever takes it upon itself to teach religion. Therefore, if the government of the United States wants to keep forever clear of the galling burden of a lazy, good-for-nothing church, let it keep forever clear of any attempt to teach religion.

But the statement upon which I am arguing was to the effect that if the church fails and the family fails, something must be done. Yes, it is true, something must be done; but it must be done by the church and not by the State. The church must return to her Lord. She must be endowed afresh with power from on high. Then she can take up with vigor and with prospect of assured success her long-neglected work. Let the preachers come down from their ten-thousand-dollar pulpits, lay aside their gold rings, and preach the gospel of Jesus Christ in the spirit of love of the Divine Master. Let them go to the common people, to the poor, to the outcast, the neglected, and the forsaken. If to these they go in the spirit and with the mission of the Saviour, they will be heard gladly, as was he. There is no need to complain of the wickedness of the people. This Nation is not as wicked yet as was the Roman world in the day when Christ sent forth his little band of disciples. Yet as wicked as the world then was, these few men went forth armed only with the word of God and the power of his Holy Spirit, to contend against all the wickedness of the wide world; and by their abiding faith, their unabating earnestness, and their deathless zeal, they spread abroad the honors of that name to the remotest bounds of the then known world, and brought to the knowledge of the salvation of Christ multitudes of perishing men. If that little company then could do so much and so well for the then known world, what could not this great host now do for the United States, if they would but work in the same way and by the same means. Yes, gentlemen, something must be done; but it must be done by the church;—for it never can be done by the State.

Gentlemen, it is perfectly safe to say that no more important question has ever come before your committee than is this one which is before you to-day. It is a question that is approaching a crisis in more than one of the States; and it is exceedingly important that the National Constitution and laws and government be kept on the side of right, and the constitutions, laws, and governments of the States shall be lifted to the level of the Nation. A. T. J.

[To be Continued]

Sabbath And Sunday.

THE "American Sabbath Union" wants a law enacted to enforce abstention from labor on Sunday. Though the Union itself professes to observe the day as a religious duty, in compliance with the command of the Almighty, as given through Moses, it wishes the State to command its observance as "a rest day" solely as a measure of secular policy, for the physical and moral well-being of the body of the people. Observed in this way, however, Sunday will not be a sacred day. It will merely be a holiday, and this, in fact, with very great numbers, is its significance now.

Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, in his sermons on the subject, says: "The right arm of the Union's work is to promote the religious Sabbath, the left arm is to preserve the civil Sabbath. The religious Sabbath treats Sunday work and dissipation as sins against God; the civil Sabbath considers them only as crimes against man." This is not an ingenuous way of putting the statement. It is found impossible to enforce the doctrine that non-observance of Sunday is a sin against God, and now there is an effort to gain the point through indirection, by making failure to keep Sunday as a day of rest a crime against man.

But if the State is not to enforce observance of

Sunday as a sacred day, it cannot possibly make non-observance of Sunday a crime. It can appoint Sunday as a day of weekly rest, a holiday after the manner of other holidays; but if the day of weekly rest stands on this ground it may be observed or not, as persons may or may not wish to observe it. We have now many holidays, but their observance is merely voluntary. The State, unless it forms an alliance with the church to declare non-observance of Sunday a sin against God, has no more ground for its command to men to rest on the Sunday holiday than on the Christmas holiday; and, in fact, since the requirements of modern life make it desirable, and even necessary, that many activities shall continue without interruption of holidays or rest days, the people, or a majority of them, would not want the proposed Sunday law enforced, and hence it would not be enforced. A great many persons now rest on Sundays; some rest on other days of the week, as convenience or opportunity allows; and a great many of us would rest not only one day in the week, but seven days in the week, if we could. Necessity, in one form or another, drives most of us to work and keeps us at it. From this necessity the State never can relieve us. We rest when we can, and work because we can't help it.

* * * * *

The Christian world has changed the sacred day, the day of rest, from Saturday to Sunday. For this change there is not even the semblance of divine authority that appears in the sanction of the Jewish Sabbath. Nowhere in the New Testament is the substitution of Sunday for Saturday as "the Sabbath" authorized or enjoined. The first day of the week or Sunday, is mentioned only eight times in the New Testament, and in none of the texts is there the least hint that the day was sacred, or was thereafter to be so considered. In one place in the New Testament mention is made of a religious meeting held on the first day of the week. But throughout the New Testament the seventh day of the week is uniformly called the Sabbath, and there is no command for the observance of the first day of the week as a holy or sacred day. The authority for such observance rests partly on a usage of the early church, but chiefly on a decree of the Emperor Constantine who, in the year 321, when that union was made between Church and State which the world has ever since been trying to sever, ordained the union of the worship of Christ with the worship of Apollo, and commanded "rest on the venerable day of the sun."

Sun worship, symbolized by the worship of Apollo as the god of the sun, was common throughout the Roman empire. The first day of the week, or Sunday, was the day devoted to this heathen worship. This form of idolatry was almost universal throughout the ancient world. In Gibbon's History, chapter 20, we read: "The devotion of Constantine was peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented by the symbols of the god of light and poetry. The unerring shafts of that deity, the brightness of his eyes, his laurel wreath, immortal beauty and elegant accomplishments, seemed to point him out as the patron of a young hero. The altars of Apollo were covered with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelary deity; and that, either waking or in a vision, he was blessed with the auspicious omens of a long and virtuous reign. The sun was universally accepted as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine."

The emperor, therefore, commanded the observance of the day devoted to the worship of the sun, not as the Sabbath, which it was not, but under its old astronomical and heathen title, *Dies Solis*, or the day of the sun, which it was. It was a

piece of statecraft, designed as a means of uniting the worship of Christ with the worship of Apollo, and Constantine stamped on his coins the name of one and the image of the other. The idea was to create harmony in the empire by making it appear that the religions differed little from each other, and were in fact essentially the same.

Historically, therefore, the observance of Sunday is an outgrowth of sun worship. Having seen the origin of the observance of the seventh day of the week as a holy day, the manner of the change from the seventh day to the first day and the reasons therefor, we may be able to get a juster estimate of the assertion that it is a sin against God to do anything on Sundays for which our ecclesiastical teachers have not granted us a dispensation. The other part of the argument, that men work too assiduously and therefore that a weekly rest day should be ordained by law, may seem to superficial observation quite another thing; but in fact it has its origin in a desire to cause the State to support the church in the claim that non-observance of Sunday is a sin against God. But for this and for their desire to have the day all their own, the ministers of our "Sabbath Union" would care little whether working people had one day's rest in the week, or not. Very probably they would even exhort us against the sin of idleness, should we propose a rest-day for ourselves.—*Portland Daily Oregonian, August 2, 1889.*

Should Civil Laws Forbid Blasphemy?

Our National Reform friend, Mr. N. R. Johnston, takes us to task for printing the article in the SENTINEL No. 28, under the above heading. He says:—

"Your editorial under this head is wrong because it is all based upon a wrong definition of blasphemy. You follow the writings of civilians who know no more than you should know—and not so much. Watson says, 'There can be no blasphemy where there is not an impious purpose to derogate from the divine Majesty and to alienate the minds of others from the love of God. The blasphemer is no other than the calumniator of almighty God.' Such an act is a most heinous sin against God, and against man, against government and against its divine author, and therefore should not be tolerated but punished."

We knew at the time that the full definition of blasphemy was not given. The object of the article was to expose the evil of that part of the definition which makes blasphemy consist of speaking against the accepted religion. For that reason we did not quote the definition in full, reserving that part of it for another article which Mr. Johnston's communication demands, but which would have appeared soon even though he had not written. We quote it from the same authority from which we quoted the other; that is, "Cooley's Constitution of Limitations." He says:—

"Blasphemy has been defined as consisting in speaking evil of the Deity with an impious purpose to derogate from the divine majesty and to alienate the minds of others from the love of God."

It is seen that this definition is in substance the same as that quoted by Mr. Johnston from Watson, and therefore the distinction which he would make between the writings of civilians and those of theologians on this point, is not valid. The later part of the definition involves the speaking against the accepted religion, because when a government forbids anybody from speaking so as to alienate the minds of others from the love and reverence of God, it has to set up some form of governmental idea of God. Such governmental idea can be only that which is held by the majority in the government. And for anybody to

speaking in such a way as to alienate the minds of those people from that governmental idea of God, is necessarily held by such government to be blasphemy. The Russian system is a case in point in which this principle appears in its perfect baldness. As it prohibits the speaking in any such way as to turn anybody's mind from the accepted religion, whoever does so is guilty of blasphemy and incurs the penalty of forfeiture of all civil rights and banishment to the most remote parts of Siberia. Any such system as that is as wicked as blasphemy itself.

Our object in this article, however, is not to defend the previous article, but to examine the merits of the other part of the definition of blasphemy not noticed in that, and that is, of its consisting in speaking with an impious purpose to derogate from the divine Majesty. We should like for our correspondent or anybody else to explain how any man's speaking against God can derogate from the divine Majesty. The majesty of Jehovah does not consist in what men give to him. He is the eternal God, and is eternal and infinite in majesty as well as in every other attribute. Then what men may or may not do cannot effect his majesty to the slightest possible degree. If all men on the earth were, to-day, to break out in the most hideous possible reviling of the Lord, that couldn't effect his majesty in the least. It would cause the further degradation of the men themselves and lessen their own dignity; but it couldn't effect the dignity of God nor degrade him. Before there ever was a man or intelligent creature God had all the majesty that he has now and all that he ever will have, and he would have had that majesty had man never been created.

The creation of all intelligent creatures was not with the proud, selfish purpose of building himself up, or of increasing his dignity; but it was out of love to them, that they might have the joy of eternal joy in his presence. And all these intelligences ever can do is either in gratitude to him to enjoy eternally the blessedness of that joy, or by sin to rob themselves of it. If any choose to rob themselves of it, as many have, that does not in the least derogate from the divine majesty. If any choose to enjoy it, as untold myriads have chosen, that does not add any to his majesty. He is the self-existing One. Complete in himself, in every perfection, and nothing ever can derogate from his divine majesty. Therefore such a definition of blasphemy expressing such an idea of the Deity as that he can be robbed of his divine majesty is in itself blasphemy.

The truth is, that the idea expressed in these definitions of blasphemy is wholly pagan. It is becoming only to man-made gods, as all but Jehovah have ever been. The gods of the heathen have always been only such as the heathen themselves made. When men make a god it is evident on the face of it that all the majesty which that god can ever have is such as those men can give to him. Therefore the more worshipers that god has the more majesty he has; the fewer worshipers, the less majesty; consequently, when anybody should speak against those gods in a way to lessen men's reverence for them, this was to derogate from their majesty.

If, for instance, one of these gods had fifty thousand worshipers, he had, comparatively, a good deal of majesty; but if twenty-five thousand of these worshipers should turn against him, he would only have half as much majesty as he had before; and if *all* his worshipers should desert

him he would have no majesty at all. This legal definition of blasphemy, and those who defend it, do therefore put Jehovah, the self-existent One, the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ,—they do put him upon a level with all the heathen gods as one who derives his majesty from men, and one from whose majesty the words and actions of men can derogate. And as real blasphemy is to attribute to God that which is contrary to his nature, and does not belong to him; or to deny what does; and as the legal definition of blasphemy does both of these; it is demonstrated that the legal definition of blasphemy is in itself blasphemous.

But it is asked, Did not Jehovah himself forbid blasphemy and punish it? Yes, he did and he does yet. But he never did forbid it because he is afraid he will lose some of his majesty. Not at all. He forbids it because it is sin; because it is wickedness; because it is rebellion against divine authority. And this is why it is that when civil governments undertake to punish it, they usurp the authority of God. In all the statute books on this subject it is treated as an offense against God, which only argues that the Lord is not capable of dealing with offenses against himself; that therefore the government must take it upon itself to help him. This is only again to come down to the pagan idea and put him upon a level with all the man-made gods who are incapable of dealing with offenders.

There is an old lesson upon this subject which we would sincerely commend to the careful study of judges, jurists, lawyers, and National Reformers. It is recorded in the sixth chapter of Judges. Israel had fallen into idolatry and were overrun by the Midianites. Gideon was called of the Lord to save Israel from the hand of the Midianites. The great majority of the people of his own city, and even his father, were worshipers of Baal. Gideon was directed to throw down the altar of Baal and cut down the Asherah that was by it, and build an altar unto the Lord, and take a young bullock and offer it for a burnt offering and to burn it with the wood of the Baalim which he had dethroned. And because there were so many of the idol worshipers there, he did not dare to do it in the day time and did it at night. When the people arose the next morning, and went out to worship, they found their gods were destroyed. Somebody had derogated immensely from the majesty of Baal. Such a thing as that could not be suffered. They set on foot a diligent investigation to discover the one who had so wickedly blasphemed. "And when they inquired and asked, they said, Gideon the son of Joash hath done this thing. Then the men of the city said unto Joash, bring out thy son, that he may die; because he hath cast down the altar of Baal, and because he hath cut down the grove that was by it. And Joash said unto all that stood against him, will ye plead for Baal? Will ye save him? . . . *If he be a god let him plead for himself,* because one hath cast down his altar." Joash was wise. That decision is sound. It would be well if the legislators and the judges of the different States in the United States were up to the same level and would allow that, when offenses are committed against the Lord, he is capable of dealing with those offenses himself. Let them leave such questions entirely to the Lord, and thus show that they really believe him to be what they profess to believe he is.

Civil laws against blasphemy are becoming only to pagan and papal systems; the one, hav-

ing only such gods as they make themselves, whose gods only derive their majesty from men and have only such as men give them; the other, recognizing a living and self-existent God yet usurps his authority and his prerogative. The government of the United States, with which that of all the States should be put in harmony, is distinct from both these and by its Constitution absolutely forbidding religious tests, and religious legislation, stands in harmony with the word of Jehovah, the living and true God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of sinners, whose majesty is his own, eternal and infinite, and never can be derogated from; and who can deal with offenders without any of the jury-meddling mediumship of earthly governments.

A. T. J.

The Puritan Theocracy.

MR. JOHN FISK has lately published a book on the "Beginnings of New England, or the Puritan Theocracy in its Religious and Civil Liberty." He well and abundantly shows what it would seem no one in these days should be disposed to deny, that is, that "the faults of the Puritan theocracy, which found its most complete development in Massachusetts, are so glaring that it is idle to seek to palliate or explain them away," and that the aim of the Puritans "in coming to Massachusetts was the construction of a theocratic State which should be to Christians under the New Testament dispensation all that the theocracy of Moses and Joshua and Samuel had been to the Jews in Old Testament days." Pp. vi and 146. Such truths, however, are not acceptable to some Calvinists even at this day. The *Interior* objects to this and criticises the theory. It cites the dedication of the national monument a short time ago at Plymouth, and says that in that, "no such ideas found expression or even an indorsement by implication," and that "further and more definitely the orator at the dedication took issue with the historian by declaring that these devout emigrants did not believe in a theocratic State any more than a secularized church."

The orator referred to was the Hon. W. C. P. Breckinridge, member of Congress from Kentucky and a member of the Presbyterian Church.

The *Interior* quotes from the orator the following words:—

"No historian has given to those who first suffered for the sublime truth, that human freedom was impossible except by the separation of Church and State, that place of eminence which is by right theirs. This is the truth to which the pilgrim fathers testified. This truth they first brought to America; this is their true honor; this their fadeless crown. The company 'which came over in the *Mayflower*' was of the Calvinistic Protestant Church. Its peculiarity was that it was a separatist church. It was purely English. It differed alike from the Catholic and English Church, including the Puritans in the English Church, and the difference was wide, fundamental and irreconcilable. It involved nothing less than the whole question of enforced or free religion, the difference which separated and still separates the State churches from the free. What is involved in this belief? That the Church is a voluntary, spiritual association, to be governed only by the laws of Christ, and entirely free, as church, from the domination of the State. The honor due to the Plymouth fathers is that they first brought that truth as a practical, vital principle of governmental life to this continent. It was an immense stride when this separation was won."

This may be admitted to be true as it is stated, but the difficulty with it is that even though true, as far as it goes, it tells but half of the truth. It is

true that they held that the Church is a voluntary spiritual association to be governed only by the laws of Christ and entirely free as a Church from the domination of the State. But it is *not* true that they believed or held in any way that the State should be free from the domination of the Church, and that is just what makes the half truth.

In stating a people's belief in the separation of Church and State, it is not enough to say that they do not believe in the churches being free from the domination of the State. To state the whole truth in such a case, it must be said that they do not believe in the domination of the State by the Church. There is a union of Church and State when the Church dominates the State as certainly as there is when the State dominates the Church. And in talking of a theocracy it is not at all a correct expression of a separation of Church and State to say that the Church is free from the domination of the State.

Properly speaking, the domination of the Church by the State is not a theocracy. A theocracy is only where the religious element dominates the civil. And when speaking of a theocracy the only correct statement of a belief in the separation of Church and State is to say that it is a belief in the total separation of religious and civil things; that the religious shall not interfere with, nor control, nor use the civil power for its own purposes in anything.

In the line of its own criticism and of the above thought of the orator, the *Interior* says:—

"The interference of a temporal ruler with spiritual matters or the holding of a church service under State authority and patronage becomes intolerable to those who have conceived the thought of worshipping God according to the dictates of their own consciences."

That is all true. And in addition to this it is also true that the interference of a spiritual ruler with civil matters, or the holding of State service under Church authority and direction, is intolerable to those who have conceived the thought of worshipping God according to the dictates of their own consciences, as well as to those who have conceived the thought of not worshipping God at all.

The truth of this whole subject is expressed in these three sentences: The State dominating religion and using religion for State purposes is the pagan idea. Religion denominating the State and using the civil power for religious purposes is the papal idea. The total clear-cut and distinct separation of religion and the State, as the United States Constitution has it, is the *Christian idea*.

A. T. J.

What Next in the Fight for Religious Liberty?

NEW and startling developments in the work of those whose efforts threaten the religious liberty of our Nation, tell us that they do not think for a moment of giving over the struggle as long as they have a single opponent in the field. They are tireless in their exertions and free with their means, to secure influence and patronage. Every expedient within their reach is being utilized to the furtherance of their ends.

First, they send a general agent into every State and Territory, to work up conventions, to which the local clergy are invited and there instructed. These, in turn, go to their respective churches, and work up the matter, by organizing local societies. The members of these societies are not only expected to sign a petition to Congress for a Sunday-Rest bill, but are also expected

to interest all others in that work by putting reading matter into their hands.

This is the work they have been engaged in since Congress adjourned last March. Their activity in the matter shows that they do not consider their cause a hopeless one, by any means. On the other hand, their earnestness means that when Congress assembles the coming winter, they intend to be fully organized for effective work, and to have many millions of petitions to Congress in behalf of a Sunday bill.

When Congress adjourned last spring, the friends of the Blair bill sent out the following: "Congress has adjourned, but not without giving the petitioners a good omen, by ordering the publication of 42,000 copies of the hearing upon it. . . . *The gathering of signatures and indorsements to the petitions should not be abated in the least.*" From this it is plain that instead of feeling that their previous work was a failure, they believe it was a success, and are working with might and main to be prepared to carry the matter through the coming session of Congress.

More than this, Mr. Crafts said in the presence of the writer this summer, that Mr. Blair had consented to revise his rest bill and make it more stringent, according to the request of the friends of the bill, and that when it came up again, it would be more in accordance with their minds. The writer also heard Mr. Blair say that all the testimony taken last winter for and against his bills would be available in the next Congress. These things are stated to show the reader that none of the friends of that measure consider the Sunday bill dead.

Many of the leading politicians of the country are of the opinion that a special session of Congress will be called next November. This is one month earlier than it usually meets. In this case, the friends of Sunday legislation will be on hand fully organized, and have a bill brought up as early in the session as they can, and then stay by to push it as fast as possible. This is the end they are working to, and the friends of religious liberty ought to be on the alert to enlighten the masses, and check as far as possible such movements.

J. O. CORLISS.

The Method of Manliness.

FRANCIS MURPHY, of Pittsburg, is one of the greatest of the temperance apostles of our day. From a recent address we quote this passage: "It is time for the church of God to pause and cease running to the Legislature to save them from their sins. Acts of the Legislature, like Moses, always die within sight of the promised land. This is an age of reason, of thought, of education. A man who doesn't drink liquor because he cannot get it does not deserve any praise. A man who does not steal because he has no opportunity deserves no praise as an honest man. Every brave man who has stood up under the sky has been developed in the face of great temptation." It is singular indeed that there should be persons of intelligence who suppose that temperance is the restraint of law, not self-control.—*Oregonian*.

THE warlike notes are not sung by Rev. M. A. Gault only. At the Washington Sunday-law Convention, Rev. T. A. Fernley exclaimed, "While there is breath in our bodies, and a drop of blood in our veins, we will never give up the Sabbath [Sunday]." And these are the professed leaders of the followers of Him who teaches all his disciples to be meek and lowly.

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.

TEN LECTURES

— ON —

NASAL CATARRH,

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of Choice Prescriptions

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and

Six Beautifully Colored Plates,

Besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs only 30 cents, and is in great demand.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

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

West Shore Railroad

N. Y. C. & H. R. R. R. Co. Lessee,

The Picturesque Route for Business and Pleasure Travel.

"SUMMER EXCURSIONS," a handsomely illustrated book, giving description of the Hudson River, Catskill Mountains, Saratoga and other New York State resorts, will be mailed on receipt of five cents in postage stamps.

For tourist books, time-tables and information regarding West Shore Railroad, call on or address H. B. JAGOE, General Eastern Passenger Agent, 363 Broadway, or

C. E. LAMBERT, General Passenger Agent, 5 Vanderbilt Ave., New York.

A POOR FOUNTAIN PEN

IS A NUISANCE;

But a Good One is a Joy For ev.r.

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.

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

National Sunday Law.

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

"Mighty Interesting Reading."

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

As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially Legislators, Lawyers, Judges, and other public men. The argument is based on scripture and history, constitution and law, showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday Bill, an analysis of the Sunday Laws and other religious legislation of the fourth century, the Sunday Law movement of the nineteenth century, the methods used in securing indorsements to the petition for the Blair Bill, and the workings of such Sunday laws as are proposed for the United States. The work contains 102 pages and will be sent postpaid on receipt of 25 cents.

Send for it! Read it! Send it to your Friends!

Address all orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

12th and Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal.

Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

Smiths' Diagram

OF PARLIAMENTARY RULES.

A lucid and interesting treatise on Parliamentary usages. By a simple map, with converging lines, it shows the relation of any one motion to every other motion, and at a glance answers over five hundred questions in regard to parliamentary matters. A very ingenious and useful arrangement.

The N. Y. Independent says: "Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules" is an admirably ingenious simplification of the confused matter of parliamentary practice. Mr. U. Smith has put more of the essence of parliamentary practice into small space and lucid order than we find in any other manual."

Breast-pocket size, 34 pages, bound in muslin. Price, 50 cents. Send for a copy.

Pacific Press Publishing Company, OAKLAND, CAL.

NEW NUMBERS OF

The Sentinel Library.

We are pleased to announce the following new numbers in the SENTINEL LIBRARY.

No. 16. A Lutheran View of the National Reform Movement. Price 3 cents.

No. 17. Religion and the Public Schools. Price 4 cents.

No. 18. The National Sunday Law. Price 25 cents.

Sample copies of the above sent postpaid on receipt of price.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 Bond St., N. Y.

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. Fiftyth 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.

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

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER 18, 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 have some contributions on hand, which will appear in course of time. That the SENTINEL is too small for the demand upon its columns, is the apology we have to offer to our contributors. We trust it may be otherwise in the near future. But that matter rests somewhat with its patrons.

THE president of the American Sabbath Union, Elliott F. Shepard, insists properly enough that if men will keep the Sabbath they will get a blessing. And he also insists that all who do not keep it must be compelled to keep it by a National Sunday law. But will people get that blessing who will not keep it without being compelled to? In other words can you force the blessing of God upon men? and that by civil law?

THERE is a great cry now by Protestants against the Roman Catholic demand for public money for sectarian use; but the example was first set by Protestants, and Rome is not only quick to learn, but she never forgets. Now, the Protestants are about to set the example of having legislation enforcing the observance of church institutions; and as with the other, so with this, the Roman Catholic power will be quick to learn the trick, and will carry it to an extent little dreamed of by those professed Protestants who demand the evil example that shall be set.

Two evenings after Mr. Shepard delivered his lecture entitled, "Does the Sabbath pay?" in which he set before the people the pecuniary advantages of Sunday rest, stating that the manufacturer who closed his business on Sunday would make thirty-six per cent. more than the one who worked, we heard the manager of a small railroad say before the same audience that the lecturer had converted him, and that the preceding Sunday was the last Sunday that trains would run on his road. At this the congregation applauded immoderately, and we, remembering the inducements that the redoubtable Colonel had set forth, could only think of the words of an ancient writer: "Men will praise thee when thou doest well to thyself."

THURSDAY night and Friday, August 15, 16, there was held in San Francisco a convention to organize a Sunday-law Union for Northern California auxiliary to the National Sunday-law Union. As usual in these meetings great sympathy was professed for the workingman. The workingman was mentioned often. The kind of Sabbath that the workingman needs, was the subject of one of the principal speeches. Yet for all this there was not a workingman there as delegate or as representative from anywhere. There was not a workingman to make a speech in all the convention. There was not a workingman made a member of the Executive Committee, which was large. The only interest the workingmen showed in the convention was to send letters telling the

managers that the Sunday-law crusade is "only an effort of their preachers to fill their pews." It seems strange that a movement that is so universally favored by the workingmen as the Sunday-law managers would have it to be believed this is, should be so doubted and scouted by the workingmen as this is. In other words the facts prove that on this point the claim of the Sunday-law managers is a fraud.

At the Washington City Sunday-law convention last winter, Dr. Conrad said that "thirteen years ago Berlin had 800,000 inhabitants, now it has double that number, yet only one church has been built in that time, and that is the only church built there in fifty years. The Church has lost her power over the people. Many, though confirmed in the Church, are freethinkers in religion, and as citizens are Socialists." This is a lesson worth the learning by those statesmen (?) who want religion forced by law into the public schools for the benefit of the State. Such a thing is a damage both to religion and the State.

ONE or two statements which we recently took down from the lips of Mr. Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Union, should be preserved for future reference. One of them was this: "It is useless for anyone to claim that the Sabbath has any rights except as they place themselves on the divine commandment." This is true in itself. We believe it. We believe that the only basis for Sabbath keeping is the fourth commandment, and that outside of that there is no authority for it. But the fourth commandment does not authorize human governments to make laws enjoining Sabbath observance; and when Colonel Shepard advocates a law compelling Sunday observance, he is doing one of two things; he is either taking himself entirely away from the divine commandment, or he is advocating the putting of the government in the place of God, and making it execute the divine decrees. This is in fact just what he is doing; and by this statement he shows that the Sunday movement is first and last a religious movement, and a movement for the securing of governmental aid to advance certain theories of religion. In other words, he is working for a movement to secure a union of Church and State.

Another thing which Mr. Shepard said, should be remembered, so that he and his fellow-workers may be confronted with it. Said he, "Governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. God is the only lawgiver. His laws are made clear and plain in his word, so that all nations may know what are the laws which God ordained to be kept."

This statement coming from the chief officer of the American Sabbath Union shows that that association is identical with the National Reform Association, though they have different officers, and different names, and their constitutions are differently worded; the object for which they work is the same, and they are to all intents and purposes one party. It shows that they are working for a theocracy, and that they wish to have the officers of the government stand as the exponents of the divine will. We have no objection to a theocracy, if God himself is the governor, but we would have most serious objections to self-appointed vicegerents of God. Mr. Shepard's statement shows that he and those allied with him in his work are disloyal to the government of the United States. They are at heart traitors.

They traduce the Constitution of the United States, and openly flaunt their disrespect for it.

We are glad that there are still some in this country who are loyal citizens,—men and women who honor the great charter of American liberty,—for we know that with all such people self-styled national reformers can find no sympathy.

THE American Sabbath Union says, "There is rest more in employment than in idleness." This is true, because true rest is only change of occupation. But the work of the Union is to secure a national law by which people shall be compelled to be idle on Sunday. Then, when they shall have secured the national power to compel all people to be idle, what employment shall the government give to these so that they may have a proper and profitable rest? The only proper employment for the Sabbath and the only kind contemplated by the Author of the Sabbath, is the worship, and holy thought and meditation upon the works, of God. But how is the government to furnish such employment as that? The simple and easy answer is, that it cannot furnish it at all. It is impossible for any but God to furnish it.

Government is founded in consent. Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. In this consent men surrender certain natural rights in order more fully to secure these and others. A just equivalent is justly expected in every such surrender, and without such an equivalent the surrender is void. Now, in the enactment of a Sunday law, the government obliges every man to surrender his right to engage in proper and profitable employment one-seventh part of his time. In other words, the government asks that men shall surrender one-seventh of their income, and for what equivalent? Idleness, and that only. But idleness is no equivalent whatever. Therefore, in the enactment of Sunday laws the government requires the citizen to surrender certain rights for which he receives no equivalent whatever. Consequently the surrender is in itself void, and for the government to insist upon and force the surrender is tyranny.

Thus, clearly, it is demonstrated that the enactment of Sunday laws is directly subversive of the most sacred principles of American institutions,—the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, which consent must be met by an equivalent. It is not therefore in the least to be wondered at that the workers for a national Sunday law should declare the object of that movement to be "to change that feature in our fundamental law." That is the logic of the movement. And then they will call it the "American Sabbath"! The fact is, it is un-American in its very inception.

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.