

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER 25, 1889.

NUMBER 48.

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.

Please send all orders for the AMERICAN SENTINEL to our New York Office. Subscriptions can commence with the First Number in January, 1890.

Remember the Address,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

THE persecutions that have already taken place under the Sunday laws of Georgia, Tennessee, and Arkansas, give an intimation of what will result when a national Sunday law is enacted, the object of which, as Senator Blair says, is "to make efficient the Sunday-Rest laws of the States." These intimations are emphasized by the fact that leading National Reformers do not apologize for these persecutions, but uphold them as righteous acts.

Church and State.

THE Bishop of Marseilles, in France, has seen fit to issue to the clergy of his diocese a circular telling them that while the election of deputies is a political matter it is a sin to vote ill. Following this the Minister of Public Worship has issued a circular calling the attention of the French bishops to the law, and pointing out to them that priests are forbidden to interfere with political matters or to exercise pressure upon the consciences of their flocks.

To the people of the United States, born and educated under a representative form of government, the whole question of Church and State seems a very simple one. The inborn and ingrained sentiment of the American people is that elections are not matters of ethics, but matters of politics, and that if any religious teacher, no matter what he may be called, desires to take any part in them it must be as a citizen, and in no other capacity. The priest of any religion has an undoubted right to denounce a bad man who is a candidate for office, but that right depends upon his being a good citizen, not upon his holding a religious office, and his right is not superior to that of any other good citizen.

France can never be genuinely republican until the divorce between Church and State is made absolute. No matter what may be the prevailing sentiment there, whether a majority of the people be Catholic or Protestant or Israelites or agnostics, the teachers of religion, as such, have no right to interfere in any way in the elections, for to do so is to destroy the fundamental idea of popular government.—*S. F. Chronicle, Sept. 14, 1889.*

Civil Government and the Decalogue.

THE advocates of Sunday legislation are earnestly trying to find a basis for their proposed action, in the fourth commandment. It is true that that commandment says nothing about the first day, which is the only day that National Reformers would consent to have the State set apart, while it does specifically enjoin the observance of the seventh day; and it is also true that if they could find in the fourth commandment some authority for Sunday observance, that would show beyond the possibility of cavil that their movement is simply an effort to secure religious legislation; but none of these things move them. They have, however, through the kind offices of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, been brought to see that civil governments have to do only with civil matters; and, therefore, in order to have a show of reason for their work, they are claiming that there are civil elements in the ten commandments, inasmuch as some of those precepts relate to man's duty to his fellow-men.

There has been in the past a great deal of unnecessary discussion over the two tables of the decalogue. It has been rightfully claimed that with the first table of the law civil governments have nothing to do; and the National Reformers themselves more than half believe this. Mr. Crafts, who stands for the American Sabbath Union, has spent a great deal of time of late trying to readjust the tables of the law, so as to make the action of his association consistent with the principle just stated. Instead of dividing the decalogue into two tables, the first containing four commandments, and the second the last six, which is the most common division, he makes the division just after the first clause of the fourth commandment, putting the bulk of the fourth, and the last six, into the second table. Of course this is entirely arbitrary, having no authority but Mr. Crafts' assertion; but it serves to show that Mr. Crafts appreciates the truth of the statement that civil governments have of right nothing to do with the first table of the decalogue.

But that statement tells only a part of the truth, and is misleading; for the fact is that civil governments have nothing whatever to do with any of the ten commandments, whether in the first table or in the second. The discussion as to the two tables of the law is entirely unnecessary, and will be seen to be so when the character of the whole law is understood. The proposition which we lay down is this: Civil laws are not based upon, and do not derive their force from, the divine law; and civil government has nothing whatever to do with any commandment of the decalogue. This we think can readily be made to appear.

1. The law is a unit. It is, as a whole, the expression of God's will, the transcript of his

character; and therefore whatever is true of one part of the law is true of the whole.

2. The inspired declaration is that "the law is spiritual." Rom. 7:14. This is spoken, not merely of the first four commandments, but of the whole law. Let us dwell upon this point for a few moments.

While it is true that the first four commandments pertain to our duties to God exclusively, and the last six relate to duties that also affect our fellows, it is not true that there is any less morality or spirituality in the last six than in the first four. Although they define human duties, there is in them no human element. They are spiritual, and obedience to them must be spiritual. Anything else is not obedience.

Take for illustration our Saviour's comments on certain commandments, recorded in Matt. 5:20-28. In that passage we find that a word may be sufficient to constitute a violation of the sixth commandment, and that the seventh may be broken by a single look, or even a thought. It is worthy of note that the commandments whose breadth the Saviour thus indicated, are found in the second table. Now what did he do?—He simply showed what those commandments require. From his words we learn that the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," forbids malicious thoughts and words. He who indulges in these does not keep the commandment at all, although he may never have laid violent hands on any man. The commandment which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," forbids impure desires. It does not stop short of that. He who indulges in these violates the seventh commandment, although he may have lived a hermit all his life.

From the words of the apostle Paul, and the illustrative application of Jesus, we learn that the law—including every commandment—is wholly spiritual. If it is not kept spiritually, it is not kept at all. There is no such thing as degrees in the commandments, so that a man may keep them half way, and receive credit therefor, as seems to be supposed by those who talk about keeping the law outwardly. It is true that as the greater includes the less, strict compliance with the letter of the law is demanded, and is necessarily included in spiritual obedience; but the man whose apparent conformity to the law is only outward, has not yielded any obedience to it whatever. The law is wholly spiritual, wholly divine.

3. But civil government is not spiritual. No one can gainsay this proposition. Inasmuch as civil government cannot enforce spirituality, and cannot make men spiritually-minded, it has no right nor power to require spirituality. "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." A spiritual ruler justly requires spiritual obedience. He

can punish for violations of a spiritual law. But a civil ruler cannot execute spiritual law. Therefore the proposition is proved, that civil government has nothing whatever to do with spiritual law, and such a law is the decalogue. This proposition becomes self-evident as soon as one views the law of God in the light in which he himself sets it forth.

We can say, then, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction, that human laws are not based upon, and do not derive their force from, the divine law. The State rightfully makes laws against the taking of human life, but not in any sense as an enforcement of the divine commandment, or of any part of it. Does anybody suppose that a murderer who is legally hanged for his crime, will receive less punishment in the great Judgment-day than if he had escaped the civil penalty?—Of course not. Man punished him for his inhumanity; God punishes for immorality; and the sixth commandment is not human, but divine.

The great cause for confusion lies in a wrong use of terms. Like the hypocritical Pharisees of old, men have come to confound morality and respectability. A man who does nothing to shock the sensibilities of his neighbors, and who does not interfere with their rights, is called a moral man, when in fact he may be grossly immoral. He is a good citizen, but if he is not pure at heart he is not a keeper of the divine law in any sense whatever. That law is spiritual, and that which is not spiritual is not to the slightest degree obedience to it.

If National Reformers and national Sunday-law advocates had any just conception of the nature of divine law, they would cease their insane attempt to make men moral by law, or to enforce the law of God. But because they have no real knowledge of divine government, and fancy themselves competent to act as its high executive officers, they also lose sight of the prime object of civil government, and ruthlessly trample upon human right.

E. J. W.

Why We Oppose Religious Legislation.

THIS is a subject that should be clearly defined in the mind of every individual, especially of those who act as teachers either in public or private, or who have the power to influence public opinion to any degree whatever. Those who favor religious legislation very naturally imagine that opposition to their movement is actuated by selfish motives. They think that our only reason for opposing it is the fear that it will tend to inconvenience or endanger us. We say it is very natural that they should imagine that opposition to their movement is wholly selfish, because religious legislation is actuated by nothing but the most selfish motives; and those who advocate it cannot grasp the idea that there can be any action that is not selfish. To anticipate direct argument, we might call attention to the fact that their suspicion of our motives gives evidence of their real ideas of the natural results of the success of their movement. If they did not know that their movement cannot fail to result in persecution, they would not think that our sole reason for opposing it is the danger of being persecuted. But this, we may say, scarcely enters into the account at all. Our reasons for opposing religious legislation are not personal, but general, and of such a nature that we think all candid persons can appreciate them when fairly presented.

The first reason that we present—not the strongest, yet in itself amply sufficient, and one that will appeal most strongly to the largest number of people—is that religious legislation tends directly to the overthrow of civil liberty; it is based on the principle that minorities have no rights that majorities are bound to respect. As the matter of religious legislation is a live issue at the present time, we will take for our proofs and illustrations items from the working of the movement in this country.

And first it will be necessary to show that religious legislation is sought for at the present time. This we can do by the statements of those who are working for a national Sunday law. In his plea before the Knights of Labor, for help in securing a Sunday law, the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union said:—

“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. J. H. Knowles, editor of the *Pearl of Days*, said in an editorial of January 25, 1889:—

“It will become more and more apparent that the real defenders of the day are among those who regard it a divine, not merely a human institution.”

Col. Elliott F. Shepard, in accepting the presidency of the American Sabbath Union, said:—

“The work, therefore, of this society is only just begun. We do not put this work on mere human reasoning; for all that can be overthrown by human reason. We rest it directly and only on the divine commandment.”—*Pearl of Days*, January 25, 1889.

Article 3 of the constitution of the American Sabbath Union reads thus:—

“The object of this union is to preserve the Christian sabbath as a day of rest and worship.”

And finally, the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, which was so heartily indorsed by this union and by the National Reform Association, expressly declared that it should be construed—

“To secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath-day.”

This evidence might be multiplied, but it is sufficient to show that Sunday legislation is religious legislation, and nothing else. Now let us examine its nature and results.

In Prof. Herrick Johnson's address before the American Sabbath Union, on the Sunday newspaper, an address which the union circulated broadcast over the country as an official document, there are four propositions laid down, the fourth one of which, taken from an Illinois Supreme Court report, is as follows:—

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

This proposition is a sound one. We have no fault to find with it in itself, but only with the way it is applied; for the Sunday-law advocates' idea of giving people a *right* to rest on Sunday is to *compel* everybody to rest. The proposition that every individual has the right to the enjoyment of a rest on Sunday is no more self-evident than that every individual has the right *not* to rest on that day, but to rest on some other day. Both these propositions being true, it is very clearly seen that ample provision is already made against anybody being unnecessarily disturbed on his chosen day of rest. We concede that everybody who wishes to rest upon Sunday has the

right, and should be protected in the right, to do so undisturbed. But the very essence of Sunday legislation, and the only foundation upon which it rests, is the theory that those who choose to rest on any other day than Sunday have no right to the enjoyment of that rest undisturbed, and have no right to refrain from resting on Sunday.

That this is what is implied by the proposition laid down by Mr. Johnson, and indorsed by the American Sabbath Union, is clearly shown by their official statements. Thus Dr. Edwards, in an address before the National Reform Convention held in New York in 1873, having stated that the National Reform movement is opposed to atheism in the government, gave his idea of atheism as follows. Said he:—

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

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

“The Jews admit God, providence, and revelation, but reject the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ, as sheer imagination, or, worse, sheer imposture.

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

“These are all for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class.”

Here we find that when the National Reform movement shall have succeeded, the individual who does not regard Sunday will be counted as an atheist. Now listen to what Dr. Edwards said of atheists, in the same address:—

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

This is simply saying that under the National Reform régime, the man who should dare to observe another day than Sunday would be considered as having no rights whatever, and entitled to no respect. If he should dare to publicly declare his belief, his insanity would be considered dangerous, and he would be shut up.

This has been stated even more plainly in an article in the *Christian Statesman*, July 7, 1887, entitled, “The Bible in the Public Schools,” which was editorially commended as “a masterly article.” The writer said:—

“Some advanced champions for freedom of conscience and the rights of men, in Britain and the United States, cannot be accommodated. In this category must be classed agnostics, atheists, and scientific infidels. For my part, without hesitation or apology, I deny such men any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions and privileges at all.”

Now substitute in the above Mr. Edwards' definition of an atheist, and you have the simple statement that under National Reform government, people who do not observe Sunday—no matter how strictly they may observe another day of the week—will not be considered as having any claim to conscientious convictions and privileges—they will not be considered as having any rights whatever.

Now listen to another statement. It is from the *Christian Nation*, of September 15, 1886. This is one of the official organs of the National Reform Association, and therefore may be depended upon as properly representing National Reform. I read:—

"Neither does National Reform propose to deprive any citizens, without forfeiture, of any just and inalienable civil right."

But we have already shown from high authority that National Reformers consider that atheists—among whom are classed all who differ with them in religious faith, and especially those who differ with them in respect to the precise day of the week which should be observed—have no rights whatever; so that all a man will have to do to forfeit his rights in their estimation will be to disregard Sunday, or to religiously observe another day in its stead. Now, mark, according to the statement that I have just read, National Reformers deliberately propose to deprive such citizens of just and inalienable rights.

And this is just what the advocates of religious legislation will do. The success of their movement cannot fail of resulting in religious persecution. With the above deliberately-expressed intention to deprive men of just and inalienable rights, place another equally base avowal by Rev. Dr. A. D. Mayo, at the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, in 1872. After declaring that the people of the United States would acknowledge God in the Constitution, he said:—

"They will protect the rights of every citizen, and persecute no man for his religion until that religion leads him to disobey the law which expresses the will of the majority concerning the moral duty of the citizen."

Of course they will persecute. If they succeed in getting the laws that are desired, they cannot do otherwise. For the State is bound to enforce all the laws on its statute-books. If it has laws concerning religion and religious practices, it must enforce them, or else have its authority despised. But the punishment of a man because he differs with others in matters of religious faith and practice, is simply religious persecution.

Mr. Blair declared ("Senate Hearing," p. 97) that the only object of the proposed national Sunday law is to make efficient the existing Sunday laws of the States. Yet inefficient as he considers them, they have proved efficient enough in Georgia, Tennessee, and Arkansas to deprive men of property, of liberty, and, indirectly, even of life. Now listen to what Rev. J. M. Foster, district secretary of the National Reform Association, said when pressed to give his opinion of these outrages:—

"As to the alleged cases of persecution in three States, I have read the description of the cases in Arkansas, and they are not of the public-spirited class that is willing to suffer for the common good. The old man and his son of seventeen, whose horse was sold for \$27, and the man whose young wife and child died while he was in prison, brought that evil on themselves by breaking the law."—*Christian Statesman*, Oct. 10, 1839.

It is not too much to say that such talk is fiendish. Let no man say that persecution will not follow the passage of religious laws. It cannot be otherwise. And it will not be the vicious and depraved who will be the most active in the persecution. No; it will be the very men who are considered the guardians of public morals. Men who are personally very pleasant and amiable may make the worst sort of persecutors, when they get so blind that they can regard as a common criminal the one who disregards an unjust human law in order that he may obey a just and divine commandment. One of the strongest indictments against religious legislation is that its tendency is to transform naturally amiable men into cold-blooded demons of cruelty. Human rights are God-given; and since God

is no respecter of persons, it follows that he has given to all men the same rights; and thus the Declaration of Independence simply formulated a Heaven-born truth when it declared that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is, all men are created equal with respect to the rights with which they are endowed. Every man has a God-given right to find his pleasure, enjoy liberty, and pursue happiness in his own way. Of course it is understood that no one shall interfere with another; for all are to be equally protected; and if all are equally protected, none will be interfered with. Now it needs no argument to show that one man's violation of Sunday does not deprive another man of his privilege to rest. That ten men in any community who do not observe Sunday, do not in the slightest degree interfere with the right and liberty of the thousands of others to observe that day, is clearly shown by the fact that in scores of instances a single individual observes the seventh day regularly and strictly, and is not hampered in that observance in the least by the fact that thousands of others openly disregard it, and have no respect for his observance of it.

The proposition that every individual has the right to the enjoyment of Sunday, rightly interpreted, is only the inverse of the proposition that every individual has the right to the observance of Saturday, or of any other day, or, so far as man is concerned, of no day at all. But Sunday laws, as before stated, make no provision for the rights of any except those who observe Sunday, and deliberately propose to deprive all others of their God-given rights. As the *Christian Nation* says, they propose to deprive certain individuals of inalienable rights and privileges. Thus by their own mouth it is proved that religious legislation, as embodied in the movement of the National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union, is a direct blow at the foundation of our government, and is directly in opposition to the Declaration of Independence,—the charter of American liberty. It is un-American, and that alone should be sufficient to condemn it. The man who in a public assembly would declare that the framers and signers of the Declaration of Independence were misguided men, and that their work was a fraud, would be set down as the worst kind of an anarchist. The preacher who should make such a statement would lose his congregation. The teacher who would make such a declaration to a class would be expelled from the public schools. Yet the National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union make the same declaration no less boldly, although not in express terms. They have boldly and openly railed against the statement of the Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

We say, then, that their movement ought to be opposed, because it is of the very essence of anarchy. It does not help the matter to say that those whose rights are thus disregarded are only a few, although Sunday-law advocates think to console themselves with this idea. Thus Dr. Edwards said:—

"The parties whose conscience we are charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right; but the fact remains, and is worthy of note, that, taken all together, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship."

Almost every lecturer in behalf of Sunday legislation lays great stress upon the assertion that the observers of the seventh day "amount to but about seven-tenths of one per cent of the entire population;" and that, therefore, they are too insignificant to be noticed or to have their rights and privileges taken into account.

But right here is a principle which they overlook: It is not whether a few individuals who observe the seventh day may be ignored on that account, but whether the government can afford to disregard the rights of people simply because they are in the minority. Let the government once start upon the line of doing injustice to even a single individual, and there is no telling where it will stop. If a law may be enacted which will trample upon the rights of one individual, the same principle will allow the enactment of a law that will ignore the rights of many. If a few people may have their rights ignored because they differ with the majority as to the precise day of the week to be observed religiously, a few other people may have their rights ignored because they differ with the majority on some other subject. Moreover, majorities and minorities are subject to fluctuation. Politics are changeable, and the side which has the majority to-day may, within a year, be represented only by a feeble minority; so that if the government once starts upon a career of injustice, not a single individual will have any guarantee of safety.

We have been proceeding upon the supposition that those who observe Sunday, and those who are working for national Sunday laws, are in the majority; but this is a great mistake. The population of the United States is between 60,000,000 and 70,000,000; of this number the best statistics—those which are furnished by the religious denominations themselves—show that less than 15,000,000 are even professors of religion. Only that number of people have their names on church-books. According to the admission of leading men in this Sunday-law movement, a large per cent. of this number pay no more regard to Sunday than do non-professors. Therefore, it is self-evident that the attempt to secure Sunday laws, and to have the government enforce them, is an attempt by a very small minority to control the country.

The petition that has been presented to Congress had, according to the highest estimate of its friends, only 14,000,000 indorsers; and of this number the larger portion never saw the petition. The Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baptist Church, the Presbyterian Church North and South, and the Reformed Church, are counted as having indorsed the petition; and yet it was only a few delegates from these bodies that indorsed it; and on the strength of this so-called indorsement, the entire membership was counted, to make 6,000,000 of the 14,000,000. Leave out the vast number who had never seen the petition, and that 6,000,000 would dwindle down to a small fraction of 1,000,000. Then, notwithstanding the fact that the Presbyterian Church was counted with the other denominations—which together only made up 6,000,000 of the 14,000,000—that church appears the second time in the same list of 14,000,000, thus furnishing 700,000 more to the list, all of which should be omitted.

Then, again, a letter from Cardinal Gibbons personally indorsing the movement, was counted as adding 7,000,000 to the list, all of which should be deducted.

Then the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 200,000 strong, was added, to help swell the 14,000,000 list. But the very name of the association shows that all of its members are also members of the various Christian churches; and, therefore, they were counted in the denominations that are represented by wholesale.

Then, again, the Knights of Labor were counted over 200,000 strong, to help swell the list. But, in the first place, many of these are members of churches, and so had already appeared in the count of those churches; in the second place, of the 219,000 Knights, probably not more than 200 were present in the assembly which passed a vote favoring the petition. And, lastly, the fraud that was perpetrated in counting the entire body of the Knights of Labor as favoring the Sunday-law petition, is shown by a recent dispatch from Milwaukee to the *Chicago Tribune*. It stated that the Sunday-closing question was likely to cause a great deal of trouble to politicians in Wisconsin. It mentioned the effort that was being made by some of the churches to secure Sunday legislation, and closed thus:—

"The proposition to hold a State mass convention for the purpose of organizing all over the State, has met with a great deal of favor, and will probably be put in effect sometime during the winter. The workers are also trying to interest the Knights of Labor in the movement."

This would sound very strange in the face of the fact that it has been certified to Congress that the Knights of Labor, 219,000 strong, have already indorsed the movement, did we not already know that that representation was a base fraud.

By this brief analysis of the pretended 14,000,000-signature petition, we have shown that an exceedingly small per cent. of the population of the United States is working for Sunday laws; but there is another point which will very largely cut down even this small minority. The petition certifies that each one of its indorsers is an adult resident of the United States, twenty-one years of age, or more; yet the entire membership of all the churches was counted, although it is well known that every large denomination has a large percentage of members who are less than twenty-one years of age. That this fraudulent representation was deliberately planned is shown by the confession of the leading worker, the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union. In attempting to defend himself and his co-workers from the charge of deliberate fraud in the matter, he made the following statement under oath:—

"It is implied that some fraud was perpetrated because the whole membership of churches petitioning was given, not those above twenty-one only; but the records quoted show that there was no attempt to deceive. It is impossible to tell how many in a denomination are under twenty-one, and so the whole number is given."

Who cares how many in a denomination are under twenty-one years of age? What has that to do with the securing of a Sunday law? The petition has nothing to do with the number in any denomination who are under twenty-one years of age, or who are over twenty-one years of age. All it has to do is with the individuals who voluntarily sign it. If those who formed and circulated the petition had been honest in their intention, the question of how many in any denomination were or were not under twenty-one years of age, would not have troubled them at all.

But they were determined to swell their list of petitioners by every means possible. They could

have *guessed* the number of church members who were above twenty-one years of age, and put that number down, and thus have presented a little more nearly the appearance of honest dealing; but they resolved to run no risk of making a mistake in number, and so put down the whole number, thus deliberately perpetrating a base fraud. It may well be said that no attempt was made to deceive, because the fraud is so transparent that no one in his senses could be deceived; but the imposition was none the less on that account.

If anyone asks what this has to do with the reasons why we oppose religious legislation, we reply that it has a great deal to do with it. Truth is never advanced by fraud; it cannot be. Truth never seeks to gain its ends by trickery, for that would defeat them. Truth has a natural and irreconcilable repugnance for error and falsehood, but wickedness can be fostered only by deceit. Therefore when any movement seeks to advance itself by any fraudulent means, there can be no better evidence that it is a wicked affair. In every age, from the time of Constantine until now, religious legislation by civil power has been built up by fraud, vindictive selfishness, and perjury.

From what has already been given, therefore, it is plainly evident that the movement in this country for a national Sunday law is a movement for religious legislation, and that this movement is a most wickedly selfish attempt on the part of a few people to get control of the government; a deliberate design to overturn the just and inalienable rights of the majority who either conscientiously differ with them, or else are indifferent; and a settled determination to persecute even to death those who do not tamely yield to their usurpation of authority. It is the worst phase of anarchy that has ever appeared in this country, and should be opposed by every true American citizen.

Another, and the chief reason why we oppose religious legislation, is that, no matter how sincere and conscientious its advocates may be, its influence can be only to bar the progress of true religion, and to propagate immorality. The proof of this is ample. We will begin with the argument for the suppression of Sunday newspapers. The *National Presbyterian*, of January, 1889, in an editorial on "The Church and the Sunday Newspaper," said:—

"The responsibility of the church for the continued existence of the Sunday newspaper is beginning to attract the attention of thoughtful men. It is a fact which it is idle to attempt to conceal, that it is sustained by the patronage of the members of the evangelical churches. It is the support given them by this class, and this alone, that makes it practicable to continue the publication of these papers. The responsibility, then, of this great and growing evil is with the church."

The *Chicago Advance* of January 24, 1889, contained an article by Rev. Geo. C. Noyes, D.D., entitled, "The Sunday Newspaper,—an Expostulation," in which it was stated:—

"If all the Christian people in the land who read or advertise in the Sunday papers were to withdraw their patronage, the publication of every one of them would cease within a month. Upon Christian people rests the responsibility of their continued publication."

The Rev. Herrick Johnson, in his published speech upon the Sunday newspaper, brings this indictment against it:—

"It is tempting hundreds and thousands to stay away from the sanctuary, and making it manifold harder for the truth to reach those who go. Ruskin

says, in view of the thronging activities of our times, the rush and rear of our busy life, the push and press and ambitions of trade, a minister on Sunday morning has just 'thirty minutes to raise the dead in. The Sunday newspaper is another huge stone laid on that sepulcher, making it just so much harder to raise the dead."

Again he says:—

"This is the fearful indictment against it, that it is keeping an army of workmen from the day of rest they ought to have. It is educating an army of newsboys to trample on the Sabbath, and so counteracting the best influences that Christian people are making to throw around them. . . . It is honeycombing society with false notions about the Sabbath; and it is deadening the spiritual sensibilities even of many of the people of God."

Now, here is an acknowledged evil in the church; professed Christian people are having their spiritual sensibilities deadened, and are openly violating their church obligations; and what is the remedy proposed? Is it a revival of religion? or increased zeal on the part of the ministry? Oh, no; it is to have the State suppress the thing which is leading them astray. What is the plan proposed to enable the minister to reach the people? Is it to ask the aid of the Holy Spirit?—Not at all; it is only to ask the aid of the State to suppress the Sunday newspaper. Thus the effect of religious legislation is to substitute the power of the State for the power of the Spirit of God. It surely can need no argument to show that the religion thus fostered will be only a hollow shell. It will be State religion, and not the religion of the Spirit of God.

The State may force people to church, and may enforce a form of religion, but the Spirit of God alone can reach the heart; and without this power an enforced form is worse than useless, since many people will trust in that form, and will rest content with that alone. It is a most humiliating confession of weakness and wickedness, when the church asks the aid of the State. Take the statements cited from the *National Presbyterian* and the *Advance*. Appeals for Sunday laws, based on such statements, amount to just this: "We have so much evil in the church—so many disorderly members—that we are unable to do anything; there are not enough conscientious members to discipline the disorderly ones, and not enough of the Spirit of God in the church to convert them; and so we must have the help of the State to enforce church discipline, and establish a form of godliness."

They do not realize that this is simply to reject God and to trust in the power of man. Says Bishop Vincent, "The church makes a great mistake when it seeks to secure worldly position, and to influence temporal power." "The abomination of abominations is the aspiration after temporal power on the part of the church. All the church wants is spiritual power, and this goes out when temporal power is invoked."

Those who appeal to the State to help the church in its struggles, should learn a lesson from Ezra. When he was on his journey from Babylon to Jerusalem to build the city, he had to pass with women and children through a hostile country. He was greatly troubled; but instead of asking the king for a troop of soldiers to protect his company, he fasted and prayed to the Lord. Says he:—

"For I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we had spoken unto the king saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him; but his power and his wrath is against all them that forsake him. So we fasted

and besought our God for this; and he was entreated for us." Ezra 8:22, 23.

The church has preached to the world about the power of God; yet, unlike Ezra, it is not ashamed to ask the world for help, instead of trusting in God. Thus they confess their lack of knowledge of God. Two great evils must result from this course: First, the world will no more believe that there is any such thing as the power of the Holy Spirit, and it will think itself supreme. Second, both the church and the world will be plunged more deeply into sin; because the church is appealing for help against an evil, to the very source of that evil. The world cannot purify the world. A worldly church cannot clear itself of worldliness by the aid of the world. Therefore Christians should oppose religious legislation for the honor of God, and for the preservation of his truth.

But I have a still stronger indictment in this line to bring against religious legislation. It is that such legislation naturally tends to the grossest immorality, and, what is worse, leads the vicious to think that they are Christians. Ground for this charge is found in the following statements. Dr. Edwards, in his New York address before referred to, said:—

"And yet another objection is that the laws of Moses will have to be re-enacted and enforced among us, and that these laws are not at all fitted to our times, our freedom, our civilization. I confess that I am not at all afraid of Moses. . . . Now, if there be anything in the laws of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out—there cannot be many of them—and we are prepared to accept them and have them re-enacted."

Again, in the hearing on the Sunday-Rest bill before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair asked the question:—

"Suppose that human beings trying to live in accordance with the will of God, re-enact his law, and write it in their statute-books; is it wrong for society to put into its public laws the requirements of the obedience to God and his law?"—*Hearing, p. 65.*

And when this question had been answered by the statement that the effect of Sunday legislation is to call the attention of the individual to human authority, to the exclusion of the divine, Mr. Blair replied:—

"The will of God exists. He requires the observance of the seventh day, just as he prohibits murder; and as we re-enact his law in making a law and enforcing it against murder, so all the States have enacted laws against the desecration of the Sabbath, going further or not so far, according to the idea of various Legislatures."—*Id. p. 66.*

Just think of it! Re-enacting the law of God! And not simply re-enacting it, but even going farther than God, according to the State Legislatures' Was greater presumption ever dreamed of? What could more perfectly meet the description of the power that should oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped?

But listen to two more statements on the same point. In the *Christian Statesman* of May 30, 1889, Mr. Crafts said:—

"The laws of our statute-books that re-enact the seventh commandment are as distinctly biblical in their origin as the laws that re-enact a part of the fourth commandment."

And Mr. Blair, continuing his remarks before referred to, said:—

"Now the question comes right to this point: God having ordained the Sabbath, as you concede, with all religious organizations, here is the national government, which alone can make that law of God operative in this sphere of national action. Why should

not the national government, then, re-enact that conceded law of the Almighty, and make it effective?"—*Hearing, p. 66.*

Here we see an utter ignoring of the power of the Spirit of God to influence men. The national government alone able to make the law of God effective!! We have already noted the blasphemous presumption of such an idea, but now after one more citation we wish to call special attention to the result upon the people. In the *Christian Nation* of December 5, 1888, the Rev. N. M. Johnston, speaking of Christ's work on earth, said of him:—

"He healed disease; an intimation that when his gospel shall prevail, and wickedness be suppressed by law, then pestilence and disease shall be unknown."

Now note the following points:—

1. The law of God is spiritual. God requires truth in the inward parts. He has declared that outward compliance with his requirements amounts to nothing unless the service is from the heart. His word declares that hatred is murder, and that a lustful desire or look is adultery. No sign may be made that man can see, but God, who looks upon the heart, sees violation of his commandments. The Pharisees, who appeared righteous outwardly unto men, but were corrupt within, were denounced in most unmeasured terms. See Matt. 23:26-28.

2. As wickedness has to do with the heart, so has morality; and nothing but the Spirit of God can reach the heart. No law, not excepting the law of God, can put down wickedness. The only righteousness that is worthy of the name is the righteousness of faith. The apostle Paul declared that he did not want to be found at the last day having the righteousness of the law, but only with the righteousness which is by the faith of Jesus Christ.

3. Since the law of God has to do with the thoughts and intents of the heart, it is evident that no human law can enforce obedience to it, nor punish for disobedience thereof. A man may be as corrupt at heart as Satan can make him, and yet if he preserves a fair exterior, men may call him good. Therefore it follows that,

4. When the State assumes the power of re-enacting and making *effective* the laws of God, it will declare men to be moral who are grossly corrupt. And since the natural tendency of men is to self-satisfaction, the result will be to fasten men in chains of vice. It will be useless to preach the gospel to men whom a power which they are taught to believe has authority above God, has declared to be righteous. And so the so-called Christian nation will be a nation where murder, adultery, and theft will be clothed with the garb of Christianity. Thus the abettors of religious legislation take away the key of knowledge, not entering into the kingdom of God themselves, and hindering those who would.

To sum up: We oppose religious legislation by civil governments, because it is unjust, and inconsistent with that civil liberty which is inalienable and God-given. Especially is it un-American, directly subversive of that which the founders of this government fought and labored to establish and maintain. Still more do we oppose it, because it is antichristian, tending only to immorality and practical idolatry. It repudiates the power of Christ and the Holy Spirit; it treats the word of God as a common thing, subjecting it to the judgment of men and the caprices of politicians; it even denies God himself, by attributing to fallible mortals the authority which belongs to him alone.

It is, in fact, of the very essence of heathenism; for while a true theocracy is the best government that could be imagined,—God himself being ruler,—when men appoint themselves vicegerents of God, they do just what the heathen did. Therefore, we call on all true Americans—upon all lovers of the liberty bequeathed to us by our fathers in the immortal Declaration of Independence; and with a still louder call we appeal to all lovers of God, of the Bible as his inspired word, and of the pure gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, to unite with us in warning the people against this monster of injustice and mystery of iniquity—religious legislation. E. J. W.

The President or Congress?

UNDER the above heading, the *Catholic News* of December 11 gives editorial utterance to the following, which contains some good points:—

"Where does the power lie under the Constitution of the United States, in the President or in Congress? In clause after clause we find the powers of Congress expressed or restricted. As to the President, we find little. The amendments to the Constitution, among other things, exact that Congress shall make no law establishing a religion. This is definite. Then the question is whether the President can practically, without law or constitutional authority, make an established religion. Religious tests are abolished, but if the President can remove all office-holders of one religion, he violates the Constitution virtually, makes a religious test, and an established religion. Nor can the President escape responsibility by appointing a subordinate to do this work. To make an established religion it is not necessary to make the doctrines of one Protestant denomination the religion. It suffices that the mass of doctrines (including hostility to, and protest against, Catholicity) known as the Protestant religion is virtually established. This certainly has been done by Mr. Harrison so far as the Indian Department is concerned, and it is a constitutional question whether in this he does not lay himself open to impeachment. It may be said that the Protestant religion is not a recognized body of doctrines, or a sect, with government and organization. The reply is clear. This is not necessary. The term, 'the Protestant religion,' is one recognized in the statute-book and the legal decisions of nearly all the original thirteen States, and was understood perfectly by the men who framed the Constitution of the United States, and by men who called for the amendments. The first constitution of the State of South Carolina established the Protestant religion in distinct terms. No one was eligible to either House 'unless he be of the Protestant religion,' and it enacted in express terms: 'The Christian Protestant shall be deemed, and is hereby constituted and declared to be, the religion of this State.' North Carolina excluded from office every person 'who shall deny the truth of the Protestant religion.' New Hampshire required the governor and legislators to 'be of the Protestant religion.' The term was thus fully recognized and understood.

"Now, Mr. Harrison, acting through Messrs. Morgan and Dorchester, has actually made 'the Protestant religion' the religion of the United States, and made adherence to that religion a test. Both these steps are in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States, and a usurpation of powers not conferred upon him by that organic instrument. It remains to be seen whether this question shall be raised, and his conduct arraigned. If any of the patriotic feelings of our ancestors of 1789 remain, he will be called to a strict account. There must be no established religion in the United States, no religious test required of anyone fitted to hold office. The question is not a mere trifling one about one person in office or another, it touches the very essentials of the government under the Constitution of the United States."

If we could believe that the writer of the above was sincere, we could applaud him; but we are compelled to believe that the cause of his grievance is that President Harrison is inclined to favor the Protestant religion rather than the

Catholic. We know that there are Catholics who are really Americans, who want no establishment of religion of any kind whatever in the United States; but we are certain that no Catholic newspaper would say a word against any exaltation its church might receive at the hands of the State. But the *News* is shrewd enough to see that a union of Church and State does not necessarily imply State recognition of some one denomination. It says: "To make an established religion it is not necessary to make the doctrines of one Protestant denomination the religion. It suffices that the mass of doctrines (including hostility to and protest against Catholicity) known as the Protestant religion is virtually established." This is true. And it is just as true that the recognition of so feeble a caricature of the Christian religion as would be exhibited by such a union of Protestants and Catholics as is proposed by National Reformers and many Protestant leaders, and by the Catholic laymen's congress, would be an establishment of religion, and a violation of the Constitution.

Religious Instruction in Public Schools.

THE following from "Romanism versus the Public School System," a book written by Daniel Dorchester, D.D., and published by the Methodist Book Concern, Phillips & Hunt, New York, although directed especially against the teaching of Catholic doctrine in the public schools, applies equally well to Protestant teaching. We bespeak for it a careful reading:—

The provisions of the National and State Constitutions are such that the matter of religious exercises in the public schools is restricted within very narrow limits, specific instruction being ruled out.

The Constitution of the United States says:—

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Massachusetts says: "No subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, or for his religious profession or sentiment."

Its Bill of Rights says also: "All religious sects and denominations demeaning themselves peaceably and as good citizens of the commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law."

A statute, in the same spirit, forbids the introduction of any text-book "favoring the tenet of any particular sect of Christians." These are in harmony with the act of the people which, in 1833, finally destroyed the power of towns or the State to tax the people for the support of churches.

AN ABLE DISCUSSION.

Said Rev. A. H. Quint, D.D. (*Congregationalist*, July 26, 1888), after quoting the foregoing:—

"These provisions declare a perfect equality of religious denominations, that no one shall be put in power by law, and that no tenet of any sect shall be favored. This necessarily rules out of the schools religious instruction, if it is consistently carried out. A Romanist cannot impose his tenets upon a Protestant child, and a Protestant teacher cannot impose his tenets upon a Catholic child. A Baptist teacher cannot teach immersion, and a Congregational teacher cannot teach endless punishment. Whether we like this or not, it is the fact. No 'common law' even, no theory of some unwritten power in the State, can override the constitutional fetters which the American Revolution produced. No clearer authority is needed than that of Judge Story, in his opinion in the great *Girard* will case, where he declares this new limitation, and where he says, of the equality stated in the Pennsylvania Bill of Rights (like others), that 'the language must have been intended to extend equally

to all sects, whether they believe in Christianity or not, whether they were Jews or infidels.'

"It is the spirit of American government for the State to select and pay, from public taxes, ministers of the gospel to preach even sound doctrine, however much it might be for the public good. On the same principle, it is not for the State to employ school-teachers at the expense of the tax-payers to teach the gospel of Christ to children; and any religion less than that is not worth fighting over.

"It has been said that the State has inherent right and duty to determine what the education of children shall be. There is much truth in this, but it needs very careful limitations. Did the Protestant world approve when the Catholic authorities in Italy (if I remember), seizing from his parents the Jewish boy Mortara, educated him in the Romanist faith? The truth is, the State must insist, for its own existence and welfare in a republic, on the instruction of children in all needed branches, and for the diffusion of general intelligence as against ignorance. This grand idea demands the school system; but let it stop when it interferes with religious faiths."

From these premises Dr. Quint reasons very conclusively that—

"Any satisfactory religious instruction in public schools is absolutely impracticable, and we may as well acknowledge it. An avowedly secular system is far better for religion than a formal sham. We cannot teach the distinctive tenets of any Christian denomination. Then, without tenets, what is there to teach? Our own churches cannot consent to the Romanist papal authority as a tenet on one hand, nor to the denial of Christ's divinity on the other; and neither of these will leave the field to us, nor to all the denominations combined who hold the 'doctrines commonly called evangelical.' There is no possible common ground. Eliminate all except what all hold in common—Romanist, Protestant, indifferent, Jew, freethinker—and the remainder. Are majorities to rule? There is nothing more dangerous than majorities unfettered by constitutions.

"It may be said that we have the Bible read in schools. A law of 1855 required it, and a law of 1880 forbade any 'note or comment,' and excused from it all pupils whose parents objected to it. How much Bible is that? One teacher reads of Moses in the bulrushes and of David and Goliath; and another reads colorless psalms. Suppose the law be changed, and note and comment be made lawful—whose doctrine is to be taught by the teacher to our children?

"No. The safest way, the wisest way, is to secularize the schools. It is simply asserting the American principle, that no church or anti-church shall use for its own purpose the public schools maintained by the taxation of the people. It makes them no more irreligious than a State blacksmith shop would be. It would teach the ordinary branches at the public expense, and leave religious teaching to parents, where God himself placed it. God established the family; men established the public-school system.

"It must not be understood that secularizing the schools excludes teaching and training in the moral virtues. These lie at the basis of all beliefs or no beliefs. They enter necessarily into the government of every school, and the daily intercourse of one pupil with all other pupils. They cannot by any possibility be put out of sight. They are proper subjects of direct instruction. The Massachusetts Constitution, which prohibits so plainly the tenets of every sect and denomination, expressly directs all teachers to 'inculcate the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and frugality, honesty, and punctuality in their dealings; sincerity, good-humor, and all social affections and generous sentiments among the people.' Nor is there any doubt that this subject should be emphasized even farther than it now is."

It is plain that if all classes are to use the public school there must be no specific religious instruction. It cannot be imparted consistently with the American system of government. If religious instruction is given, it will be almost certain to savor of some particular sect; and moneys raised by taxation upon the whole people cannot be rightfully used for that purpose. Religious education must be taught elsewhere—in the church and the home. Neither the State, nor the church, nor the home singly, can do the whole work, the complete work, of education.

THE following from the *Christian Union* of December 12 will throw light upon the editorial elsewhere quoted from the *Catholic News*, and is worth reading on its own account at this time when there is a movement to give the church the chief control of the public schools:—

"If it be true, as currently reported, that the Roman Catholic hierarchy, represented by such influential dignitaries as Bishops Ireland and Riordan, and even Cardinal Gibbons, are resisting the appointment of General Morgan as Indian commissioner and Dr. Dorchester as superintendent of Indian schools, on the ground that these gentlemen are hostile to the Roman Catholic Church, and are removing from office Roman Catholic appointees, the fact furnishes another argument against the anomalous system which has grown up in the Indian Bureau of quasi-partnership between the federal government and the churches in the work of education. It makes little difference in their bearing on that system whether the charges are true or false. If they are true, that an Indian commissioner can by virtue of his office work against a particular denomination is a serious objection to the system; if they are false, the fact that he can be subjected to groundless suspicions and false accusations in the faithful discharge of his duty, and that church influence can be brought to bear for the retention in office of incompetent officials, is an equally conclusive objection to the system. The contract school system is impaled on either horn of this dilemma. That system has grown up naturally, and cannot, probably, be abolished at a blow without serious injury; but the fact that it introduces sectarian strife in political administration should be of itself enough to make our Congress resolve to provide, at the earliest possible moment, in lieu of it, a system of education wholly under federal control and maintained at federal expense, leaving the churches independent of the State, and disentangled from all alliances with it, to do their religious work without either help or hindrance from the national government."

"A FEW years ago," says the *Press and Horticulturist*, of Riverside, this State, "we fought a hard fight to prevent the abrogation of the State Sunday law, largely, it is true, because it gave us the only State restriction of the liquor traffic which we had. It was lost, mainly through the failure of radical temperance people to see the practical value of the law as a temperance measure, and no party can afford to champion its restoration, in view of that experience."

Probably the reason why "radical temperance people" failed "to see the value" of the California Sunday law "as a temperance measure," was that it had no value in that direction. And yet with characteristic consistency, some of those same "radical temperance people" accuse us of being in league not only with the saloons, but with every other evil, because we oppose Sunday laws.

Government of Switzerland.

"THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF SWITZERLAND; AN ESSAY ON THE CONSTITUTION," by Bernard Moses, Ph.D., professor of history and political economy, University of California. Pacific Press Publishing Co., San Francisco and Oakland, Cal., 43 Bond Street, New York, 48 Paternoster Row, London, Eng.

What true patriotic American ought not to be interested in the little federation of Central Europe, which, amid the imperialism of medieval ages, and the revolutions of later times, maintained the principles of liberty,—principles trammled, it is true, by the tenacious traditions of past ages, and a perverted religion, but ever growing brighter and clearer as we near the present. Professor Moses has portrayed these gradual steps of emancipation in a clear and graphic style. His analysis of the Swiss Government, of its advantages and disadvantages, its various steps toward its present form as compared with American republics, are lucid and striking. The chapter headings will give something of an idea of the scope of the work: Antecedents of Swiss Federalism, Distribution of Power, The Legislature, The Executive, The Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Internal Relations, The Army and the Finances, Rights and Privileges, The Common Prosperity. These features are all made more striking by comparing them with those of other republics, notably our own. It is an excellent treatise and text-book upon a subject, and concerning a country, which ought to be much better known. The book is comprehensive, concise, clear, and interesting, and deserves a wide circulation. 12mo., cloth, price \$1.50.

Advertisements.

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

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

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

Send for Catalogue.

HEALDSBURG COLLEGE
HEALDSBURG, CAL.

A MODEL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.

Four courses of instruction, classical, scientific, biblical, and normal; also preparatory instruction given in a primary and grammar course.

Instruction thorough and practical, not only in the collegiate course but especially so in the preparatory courses.

Discipline rigid, yet parental, combined with strong moral and religious influence.

Expenses moderate. The whole cost to the student for tuition, board, lodging, lights, washing—all expenses except for books and clothes, from \$18 to \$20 per month of four weeks.

Spring term begins Wednesday, January 1, 1890.

For descriptive catalogue and further information, address the principal,

W. C. GRAINGER, Healdsburg, Cal.

Fresno and Merced County Lands
TO RENT AND FOR SALE.

75,000 Acres of Wheat and Sugar Beet Land in the above Counties, to rent for a term of years. Also

100,000 Acres of fine Raisin, Fruit, Alfalfa, and Sugar Beet Land, with water for irrigation, for sale in tracts of from 20 acres to large tracts suitable for Colony purposes.

For particulars, apply to

E. B. PERRIN,

402 Kearny Street,

San Francisco, - Cal.

"The Ideal" Account and Memorandum Book, and Business Guide (Copyrighted).

SPECIAL FEATURES: Fully and plainly specified accounts; silicate slates—for both slate and lead-pencil, contains slate-pencil and lead-pencil (with eraser); a printed washing list—on silicate (very convenient); business and legal forms, etc., etc. 150 pages, 3 1/2 x 5 1/2 inches. Substantially bound, in full Russia only.

Price, only \$1.00, post-paid. To book dealers, \$6.00 per set (8), express paid. Strictly first-class, very popular. A handsome and useful holiday present. Order at once of the publisher,

A. L. ANTHONY, Yountville, Cal.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL
AND TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, devoted to the dissemination of true temperance principles, and instruction in the art of preserving health. It is emphatically

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE,

Containing what everybody wants to know, and is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is unlimited, embracing everything that in any way affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and housekeepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by all. Price, \$1.00 per year, or with the 200-page premium book—"Practical Manual of Hygiene and Temperance," containing household and cooking recipes—post-paid for \$1.40.

Address,

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL,
OAKLAND, CAL.



BY ONE MAN. Write for descriptive catalogue containing testimonials from hundreds of people who have saved from 4 to 9 cords daily. 25,000 now successfully used. Agency can be had where there is a vacancy. A NEW INVENTION for filing saws sent free with each machine, by the use of this tool everybody can file their own saws now and do it better than the greatest expert can without it. Adapted to all cross-cut saws. Every one who owns a saw should have one. Ask your dealers or write FOLDING SAWING MACHINE CO., 808 to 811 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill.

THE

AMERICAN SENTINEL
FOR 1890.

WITH the beginning of the new year, the AMERICAN SENTINEL will enter upon its fifth year of publication. IT STANDS ALONE—the only journal of its class—in that it is exclusively devoted to the defense of Civil and Religious Liberty in the United States. During the past year, when the advocates of religious censorship attempted to force their measures through Congress, it was the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and its representatives who stood foremost in exposing the iniquity of that scheme. When, after the adjournment of Congress, the Sunday-Law apostle canvassed the country to organize afresh for this winter's campaign in Washington, it was the AMERICAN SENTINEL that faithfully warned the people of what was comprehended in the success of his mission.

As the work of the SENTINEL is

NATIONAL IN ITS CHARACTER,

And the bulk of population and seat of government are upon the Atlantic side of the continent, it has become necessary to *remove the office of publication nearer the base of operations.* Beginning with the new volume, the Editorial and Business Rooms will be at *No. 43 Bond Street, New York City.*

The new location will add much to the facilities for prompt and perfect "Sentinel" service. From here the editors can at short notice attend important meetings, and receive early reports of political and religious operations bearing upon the issues discussed in the columns of the paper. Being near the Capital, a close watch can be kept upon Congressional proceedings, and comments regarding the same may be given to the readers of the SENTINEL, at a much earlier date than heretofore.

As the pressure for religious legislation and church prestige in the government increases throughout the country, it will become more and more necessary for those who are set for the defense of the Constitution, to keep vigilant watch in different parts of the country. Arrangements will be made to have every effort of the National Reform Party, the America Sabbath Union, and kindred enemies of freedom of conscience, closely scrutinized, that the public may be at least fairly warned as to the real character of their work.

The work of the SENTINEL, in the past has made for it many firm friends in every political party, and in nearly every religious faith, who have had their eyes opened to the meaning of the so-called "National Reform" movement, and of the growing Sunday-law craze. These will co-operate at every possible opportunity with the SENTINEL'S good work, and keep the publishers posted in regard to their various localities.

With the experience and prestige of four years active campaign, and the increased facilities of the new base of publication; with a thorough knowledge of the logical outcome of every species of Church and State Union; and with a firm determination to follow up and expose the enemies of civil and religious liberty to the people; the publishers have no hesitancy in promising that the AMERICAN SENTINEL will grow more interesting and more valuable, as time further develops the importance of its mission and the necessity for its existence.

TERMS FOR 1890.

- Single copy, per year, postpaid.....\$1.00
- In clubs of ten or more copies to one address..... 75
- To foreign countries, single subscription..... 5s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

43 Bond Street, New York City.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER 25, 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.

After January 1, 1890, this paper will be published at 43 Bond Street, New York City. Our exchanges, advertisers, and correspondents will please make a note of this fact, and send all papers and direct all correspondence, to reach us after December 15, to our new address.

A STATE Sunday convention was held in Cleveland, O., December 16 and 17, by the Cleveland Ministers' Union and the Ohio Sabbath Union. It is significant that in the program Mrs. Bateham's address was preceded by an address by the editor of the *Catholic Universe*, on "Roman Catholic Co-operation in the Sunday-Rest Movement."

A WASHINGTON dispatch of December 4 says:—

"Senator Cockrell to-day presented a memorial of citizens of Ralls and Pike Counties, Missouri, remonstrating against the passage of any bill for the observance of Sunday or any other religious institution or rite, and also against any amendment to the Constitution providing for religious instruction in the public schools. It prays that the government be kept strictly secular, and that Church and State be entirely separate."

Those Missouri people give evidence of a just conception of what civil government should be.

To enforce upon men the laws of Christian morality is nothing else than an attempt to compel them to be Christians, and does in fact compel them to be hypocrites. It will be seen at once that this will be but to invade the rights of conscience, and this, one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association declares, civil power has the right to do. Rev. David Gregg, D.D., now pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, a vice-president of the National Reform Association, plainly declared in the *Christian Statesman* of June 5, 1884, that the civil power "has the right to command the consciences of men."

"Every sin, secret or public, against God, is a sin against our country, and is high treason against the State."—*Christian Statesman*, August 9, 1888.

Every sin, whether "secret or public," being "high treason" against the State, the State must punish it, even secret sin. But how shall the State discover secret sins except by an Inquisition? This again confirms the logic of the theoretical theory of earthly government—that the Inquisition is the inevitable consequence. And so far as the National Reformers are concerned, it is certain that they are ready to use the power which they are doing their best to secure.

A CALL has been issued for a conference on "the Christian Principles of Civil Government," to be held in Cincinnati, January 21, 22, 1890. The call states that it is the imperative duty of Christians and patriots to "band themselves together to banish vice and immorality from our land." It also says that the enemy is coming in like a flood, and that "it is high time to lift up a standard against him." Our Bible says that

when the enemy comes in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him; but National Reformers arrogate to themselves, and to civil law, the offices and power of the Spirit of God. The call is issued by a large number of ministers, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union will co-operate. Among the subjects to be discussed are "The Limitations of Personal Liberty," "The Civil Sabbath," "The Sunday Newspaper," "The Sabbath Movement in Cincinnati," "The Sabbath and the Laboring Man," "The Place of the Bible in Civil Laws," "The Moral Legislation Needed in Ohio," and "The Moral Accountability of Nations."

THE effort to secure a national Sunday law which will result in the revival of the methods of the Inquisition, is gaining strength. Although the Blair Sunday-Rest bill died with the last Congress, the work of circulating Sunday-law petitions has been pushed with redoubled energy. The advocates of the movement are more thoroughly organized than ever, and opposition has tended only to make them more determined and more unscrupulous, although more discreet in their methods. If the present Congress does not witness the passage of a Sunday bill more stringent, yet more plausibly worded, than that introduced by Senator Blair, it will not be from lack of determination on the part of the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and allied organizations.

IN the *Christian at Work's* report of the late meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, we find the following:—

"Beginning with the first great need of the city, 'religious awakening,' Professor Ely, in a most admirably classified address, spoke at length on what he called a 'Renaissance of Nationalism.' 'The government,' he said, 'is a God-given agency for which we must work, and through which we must work, if ever we are to regenerate mankind. Of all the work that has been done, of all that can be done, for the elevation of humanity, the most successful work is legislative work.'"

This is a speech to fill the heart of the National Reformer with delight. The *Christian Nation* has told about *suppressing wickedness by law*, and now we are told about *regenerating humanity by law*. What use such folks have for the Bible we cannot see, for it knows of no means of regeneration except the Spirit of God. And yet National Reformers call themselves Christian, and their work a Christian reform!

SENATOR BLAIR is on hand with his little grist of bills for Congress. On the 9th inst., he introduced a bill "to secure to the people the privileges of rest and religious worship, free from disturbance by others, on the first day of the week." We quote from the newspaper report. It will be noticed that this bill was introduced the same day that the American Sabbath Union met in its first annual convention in New York. It is fair to suppose that the bill which Mr. Blair introduced is one which had received the approval of his employers, and that they will lobby for it without any mental reservation. If the above quotation gives the substance of the bill, it is a most hypocritical fraud; for there is not a man who does not know that in this country every man has the privilege of resting and worshiping on the first day of the week if he wishes to. Mr. Blair seems to be thoroughly imbued with the medieval idea that government is only for the majority.

THE Rev. Dr. Dorchester, from whose book, "Romanism versus the Public-School System," we have quoted at length elsewhere in this paper, says (p. 227) that if all classes are to use the public schools, several conditions must be observed, among which he cites the following:—

"There must be no religious instruction in them. If attempted it will be likely to savor of some particular sect. To attempt it would be inconsistent with the American system of government, and perilous to the successful administration of the school system. A purely secular basis is the only basis on which all citizens can unite. Then no one's doctrines are assailed or slurred. There is abundant opportunity for parents, Sunday-schools, and churches, to look after the religious education, the public school occupying only about one-sixth of the hours of the year. The public school can succeed only on a completely non-sectarian absolutely secular basis. On any other plan it is doomed."

According to this, and it cannot be denied, Senator Blair, although the professed friend of education, is working for the overthrow of our public-school system. This is a fact, although he is doubtless sincere in his work. The country has less to fear from plotting Jesuits than from professed Protestant National Reformers.

IN the Elgin Convention, November 8, 1887, Dr Mandeville said on the subject of Sunday laws:—

"When the church of God awakes and does its duty on one side, and the State on the other, we shall have no further trouble in this matter."

Yes, we remember how it was before when the Church and the State were united. The gentle Albigenes in Southern France greatly disturbed the church. But the church was wide-awake, for Innocent III. was pope. Philip Augustus was king of France; and the church awoke the State with the cry, "Up, most Christian king! up, and aid us in our work of vengeance!" And thus, with the energy of the pope on one side, and of Philip on the other, the soldiers of Philip marched down upon the Albigenes, and swept them from the earth. And as "the church did its duty on one side and the State on the other," there was no further trouble in that matter.

THE *American Sentinel*, published weekly by the Pacific Press Publishing Co., Oakland, Cal., \$1.00 a year, is doing good service in opposing those narrow-minded advocates of the union of Church and State.—*Wauseon, O., Republican*.

Bound Volumes of the Sentinel.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL for 1889 can now be obtained neatly bound in a cloth volume, with leather back and corners, for \$2.50, post-paid; bound in heavy paper, for \$1.50, post-paid.

Are You Going East?

If so, you will find it to your advantage to write to or call on B. R. Nordyke, Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., about routes, tickets, etc.

Parties are being formed to go East nearly every week. He has through car arrangements, and excellent accommodations for the traveling public. His next parties for Chicago and New York will leave San Francisco and Oakland, Cal., December 26 and 31.

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 uncomproisingly 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,
43 Bond St., NEW YORK.