



"IF ANY MAN HEAR MY WORDS, AND BELIEVE NOT, I JUDGE HIM NOT: FOR I CAME NOT TO JUDGE THE WORLD, BUT TO SAVE THE WORLD."

Vol. 11, No. 2.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 9, 1896.

Price, three cents.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

ALONZO T. JONES, }
CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, } EDITORS.
LEON A. SMITH, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

CONGRESS AND SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

LAST week we printed on our last page the text of the Sunday bill recently introduced into Congress by Representative Morse, of Massachusetts.

This bill is entitled, "A bill for the protection of the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia."

Such being the title of the bill, it is clear that it is one which should meet with no favor from an American Congress, for it is opposed to the very fundamental principles of free government.

The Declaration of Independence is not law in the common acceptations of that term, but the principles enunciated in it, existing as they do in the very nature of things, are superior, even to the Constitution, and by those principles that instrument must be interpreted.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," our forefathers declared, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, . . . that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

That we have not read amiss or misinterpreted the Declaration of Independence when we say that it teaches that government exists for the protection of human rights, is evident from the following words by the author of that immortal instrument, written nearly forty years later, namely, June 7, 1816:

OUR legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power; that their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us. No man has a natural right to commit aggression on the equal rights of another; and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him; every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of the society; and this is all the laws should enforce on him.*

* Works of Thomas Jefferson, vol. 7, p. 3.

This leaves no room to question Jefferson's meaning. But without these words the language of the Declaration is plain: the American doctrine as enunciated by our forefathers is that just governments exist for the purpose of protecting men in the exercise of their rights; not "for the protection of the first day of the week," or any other day of the week. But the title of this Sunday bill shows that it is designed, not to secure human rights, but to confer honor upon a day because of its religious character, something never contemplated by the founders of the Government as is witnessed not only by the Declaration of Independence, but by the First Amendment to the Constitution as well.

But it may be said that the words: "For the protection of the first day of the week," etc., really mean for the protection of people in the use of the day for the purposes specified. Not so; for the language of the act itself forbids this interpretation. The words, "The first day of the week, known as the Lord's day, set apart by general consent in accordance with divine appointment as a day of rest and worship," stamp the proposed legislation as religious, and show the purpose of the act to be, not to secure human rights, but to honor as a divine institution the particular day in question.

That the purpose of the bill is, as we have stated, to honor Sunday and to secure its religious observance is further shown by the clause exempting from its provisions "those who religiously observe Saturday." It is not enough that one simply rests on Saturday; he must "religiously observe" it, showing that the bill aims at religious observance on one day or the other.

Further, the bill assumes to settle a religious controversy by declaring that "the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day," is "set apart" "in accordance with divine appointment." The First Amendment to the Federal Constitution declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." What possible right then has the national legislature to decide that a given day is "set apart in accordance with divine appointment"? or to decree that it must be observed by refraining upon it from "any labor, except works of necessity and mercy"?

If Congress may, for the reason given, re-

quire Sunday observance, might it not also require anything else that it deems "in accordance with divine appointment"? If, as some assert, the First Amendment means no more than that Congress shall not establish any denomination as the State church, and that it shall not forbid the profession of any faith,—if the First Amendment means no more than this, we ask, might not Congress require any other religious observance as well as the observance of "the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day"? Might not the national legislature require, for instance, that all persons should profess some religion, leaving each one free to choose the particular church he would join? Or might not Congress require all within its jurisdiction to have their children christened, leaving them free to choose the particular church whose minister should administer the rite? Certainly.

But the First Amendment means more than that: it means as expressed May 26, 1797, by George Washington, the father of his country, that "the Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion;"* it means as Jefferson expressed it in 1808, that "the Government of the United States" is "interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline, or exercises."† It means, as Mr. Madison, the father of the Constitution, expressed it in 1823, "that religion is essentially distinct from civil government, and exempt from its cognizance."‡ It means, as a committee of the United States Senate expressed in 1829, that "among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has wisely withheld from our Government the power of defining the divine law. It is a right reserved to each citizen; and while he respects the rights of others, he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions."§

* Treaty with Tripoli. "American State Papers," Class I., Foreign Relations, Vol. II., p. 18.

† Works of Jefferson, vol. 5, p. 236.

‡ Writings of James Madison, vol. 3, p. 305.

§ Report of Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads communicated to the Senate Jan. 19 1829, by Hon. Richard M. Johnson. See "American State Papers," class vii., p. 225.

Such being the meaning of the First Amendment to the Constitution, will Congress reject this Sunday bill? Time alone can tell.

NUMBERS AND RIGHTS.

NUMBERS and rights sustain no relation to each other. This is contrary to the general idea; but it is nevertheless true.

Rights are God-given. As the Declaration of Independence says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." They do not pertain to men because men are associated together in large numbers; nor are they determined by that fact. The rights of man have their basis in the purpose of the Creator; and that purpose is independent of the number of those to whom it pertains.

Every individual is bound by his relation to his Creator and to his fellowmen. But his relation to his fellows is not independent of his relation to God. In other words, it is a duty which man owes to God, to love his neighbor as himself. It is a part of the law of God that a man should not steal, kill, commit adultery, bear false witness, or do anything that would invade the rights of his fellowmen. "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law."

In fulfilling the purpose of God in our creation, we must of necessity fulfill every obligation which we owe to mankind. And to fulfill that divine purpose, it is necessary that we should possess and exercise certain rights. An all-wise Creator has accordingly endowed all men with those rights; and these rights, being thus inherent in the individual, are unalienable.

The purpose of the Creator is that every being whom he has made should be upright and perfect in all his ways, a free moral agent, and should live a life of unmarred happiness. Because of the fall, this purpose can never be fully realized in this world, but it will be perfectly accomplished in the world to come.

In this world progress is made toward the attainment of this purpose by development of character. God does not want automatons, nor slaves. God would stultify his own name if he should create beings of such a nature. He could not do less than create beings of the highest and most perfect type; nor could he be satisfied with anything else. He will have no one love and serve him from fear, or because he could not do otherwise. Such a tribute would be of an inferior nature, and therefore entirely unsuitable as an offering to the infinite God.

In order that man may develop a perfect character, he must have liberty. In order that his tribute to God may be voluntary, he must have freedom of choice. Accordingly men are left free by the Creator either to love and serve him, or to ignore him and serve themselves. The devil aims to interfere with this freedom of choice and compel men to refrain from the service of God. He would make every man a slave, controlled not by his own free choice, but by the will of another who leads him about in chains. And any effort of men to deprive any of their fellowmen of this freedom of choice further than to make secure from invasion their own God-given liberty, is against the divine purpose, and in harmony with the purpose and work of the devil.

The necessity of this individual liberty to the development of noble, God-like character,

is amply and sadly illustrated by the spectacle of individual character presented among those races and classes of people which have been long the victims of oppression. We find them very largely deprived of their manhood, without that sense of honor and self-respect which shrink from acts of meanness, and with no adequate conception of moral principle as a thing of value. Lying and deception are counted as accomplishments, hypocrisy as a virtue, and vice as a legitimate pleasure. Every noble faculty is debased. It is not with such beings that God would people his world.

And in order that this shall not be, men must cherish and exercise their individual right of free choice. They must choose for themselves whom they will serve, and choose that Master who will never take from them this freedom. Development of good and noble character can take place only along the line of free individual choice.

This individual freedom of choice comprises within its limits the unalienable rights of mankind. When this freedom is denied, the highest interests of the individual are attacked; and if the attack be successful, the gravest injury to mankind results.

It matters not, also, whether this freedom be denied by some individual despot, or by the doctrine that rights are determined by the judgment of majorities. The so-called "public conscience" cannot take the place of the individual conscience. The individual who surrenders his conscience surrenders his very soul. He surrenders faith; for Christian faith is not mere assent to the truth, but it is belief which is manifested by works. (See James 2: 14-20.) And with the surrender of faith, goes also the right to eternal life itself.

The doctrine of the "greatest good to the greatest number" when so applied as to demand the yielding of the individual conscience to the will of the majority, becomes but the means of erecting a despotism. The theory that the majority must rule, is a very plausible one in this day, and a correct one so far as concerns those matters in which all have a common interest, and which are subject to human control. But it does not apply within the sphere of rights. And it is a fact also that the majorities in this world are made up not of leaders, or persons of independent judgment, but of followers; so that what appears to be the judgment of the majority, is very often only the will or opinion of the few by whom the majority are led. This is especially true in matters where the people do not feel their immediate interests to be directly affected, as in questions of religion. A religious despotism can be all the more readily established by a few influential bigots because the public are generally willing to let others (their spiritual advisers) think for them in religious matters, and thus be spared the trouble of investigating and deciding for themselves. This is human nature; and the religion of human nature is popery.

The facts we have stated can be more readily perceived through an illustration. It is contended at the present time that the best interests of the largest number demand the observance of the first day of the week. In London, England, as noticed in our last issue, seventh-day observers have recently been denied the relief which might be afforded them by legislation, and which would simply have protected their rights, on the ground that they were but few in number. And in this country the plea of the same people for their right to set apart the seventh day according to the command of God, is denied on the ground that the majority think the first day is the proper one to be set apart, and the

majority must rule. Shall the individual allow the "public conscience" to guide him in such a matter? Will the "public conscience" be responsible to God for individual conduct respecting his commands? Will the doctrine of majority rule shield a person in the day of Judgment in any matter where the majority happened not to be on the side of God's law? And will the penalty of disobedience be shifted from the individual transgressor and placed upon the spectre of "the majority," or of "government"?

No; every one of us shall give an account of himself before God. The "public conscience" will afford no individual any security in that day. The doctrine that rights pertain only to numbers,—that individual freedom of choice is swallowed up in the higher interests of the community, will excuse no one for failing to make that choice and to stand by that choice which his own conscience, as educated and guided by the word of God, told him to be right, and which, firmly adhered to, would have developed in him that character which is fitted for eternity.

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers;" but let every soul also remember that "there is no power but of God," and that his relation to God is an individual relation, and that as such it demands of him the exercise of his God-given rights. And let him, as he values his eternal interests, refuse to allow that relation and those rights to be controlled by the opinion and the "conscience" of the majority. God is the great "higher power" and he alone constitutes the true "majority."

TO INCREASE CHURCH COLLECTIONS.

THE book, "Practical Christian Sociology,"¹ a late literary production, to which we have taken occasion to refer several times recently, is full of unique and striking things.

Like a true "reformer," the author of the book in question, cuts and slashes in every direction, sparing neither friend nor foe. Dividing the 19th century into three periods, of the second he says:—

The daybreak that came with that middle third of our century has already been overcast with heavy thunder clouds, especially in our own country. No doubt there has been moral progress since 1867 in the world at large, but it would be hard to prove moral progress in the United States since that date.²

Our author then enumerates the rise and development of various evils, prominent among which is "the Sunday paper, which," he says, "in most instances, is not only a sin but a crime."

Following his bill of particulars, he says:—

One reason why these evils have grown apace is because the church has not adequately recognized personal and social ethics as an integral and important part of its work. As Columbus discovered an unknown hemisphere, so we are just discovering a neglected hemisphere of social ethics. Those critics of the church are in error who assume that in British and American pulpits dogma has crowded out duty and creed has displaced conduct. All that can truly be said is that individual and social ethics have not had due emphasis in the utterances of the churches even in sermons, much less in creeds. They are a nineteenth-century development not sufficiently recognized in the eighteenth-century creeds and disciplines of our churches.³

We thank our author for the frank statement that his so-called "reforms," prominent among which is his "sabbath" crusade, are "a nineteenth-century development."

¹ By W. F. Crafts, Ph. D., published by Funk & Wagnalls, New York.

² "Christian Sociology," p. 41. Italics ours.

³ *Id.*, p. 43.

This is practically what we have been telling our author, and everybody else for years about the Sunday movement; that Christ and his apostles knew nothing of it; that the early church never kept Sunday; that it always rested upon no better authority than the edict of Constantine and the decrees of a fallen church; and that the idea of compelling its observance as the sabbath, is of very modern origin indeed. Now, Mr. Crafts acknowledges this himself. The demand that everybody shall observe Sunday as the "Christian sabbath," is only a nineteenth-century development, saving, of course, the Puritan theocracy in New England in the seventeenth century. The Puritans were something more than two centuries in advance of our author in the matter of enforced Sunday-keeping. But no matter; Mr. Crafts is quite right: it is a modern discovery—certainly much more modern than the sacred Scriptures; which accounts fully and satisfactorily for the fact that it is nowhere mentioned in the writings of apostles, prophets, or evangelists.

But notwithstanding the modern origin of these "reforms," our author sharply arraigns the whole of the modern church for failure to give them financial support. He says:—

Not one of the large denominations, so far as we know, recognizes any of the social reforms as a part of Christianity in its official schedules of benevolence. How the efficacy of other church collections is decreased by lack of adequate church support of social reforms, for example, sabbath observance! Offerings for church erection and ministerial education and home missions are of value in proportion as the people are on the sabbath free to attend the churches thus erected and hear the preachers thus educated and supported. Mr. Puddlefoot, the well-known home missionary secretary, informs me that there are in the frontier towns home missionary churches where the only man in attendance on sabbath morning is the preacher; churches where the communion has to be postponed from sabbath morning until evening, "because the deacons are all down in the mines." Surely, if only to increase the efficiency of other church benevolences, there ought to be in every church table of collections a column for sabbath reform.⁴

Our author would, with his so-called sabbath reform, very soon change all this, for he would by civil law compel those deacons to remain out of the mines on Sunday; would prohibit Sunday papers, close places of Sunday amusement, and make the day everywhere so uninteresting that the deacons and everybody else would gladly resort to the churches. Then would the people not only receive the instruction supplied by collections taken elsewhere for the support of frontier churches, but such churches would themselves have larger collections, for there would be more persons present to give. This is certainly "practical sociology," even though it be not Christian.

Then, too, with the Sunday laws of all the States put in proper working order and energetically enforced, as would be the case if our author was well supplied with collections, it would be so much easier to enforce church discipline. The worldly-minded deacons who not having the fear of the minister before their eyes go into the mines on Sunday instead of to the communion, could be persuaded by the terrors of the civil law—by fines or by imprisonment, if need be—to go to the communion on Sunday morning instead of to the mines. And though at first they might realize that it was not their choice, that they would prefer the mines and the wages there earned, they would by and by come to imagine it a matter of their own choice, and then if not before, would they be devout observers of the so-called Christian sabbath; and all owing

to the collections for so-called sabbath reform! Yes, the scheme is practical; very practical—but is it Christian?

But how about the spiritual life of the churches whose pews and collection boxes must be filled by means of Sunday laws? The words of our author himself, though not so designed, are well adapted to answer this question. He says:—

Christians have mostly ceased from hating each other for microscopic differences of doctrine, but Christian love seldom goes beyond its own church walls, and does not always go beyond its own hired pew. General society is, of course, more Christianized, and the quantity of Christian sociology is much greater, but the quality of it inside the church, we fear, has not improved. The heathen are not audibly exclaiming to-day, "See how these Christians love each other!" They, and the Christians also, are rather pointing to "the flagitious anarchy," the "Hadesian theology" of our sectarian conflicts, and to the well-defined Christian castes that radiate from the central high-priced pew of Deacon Dives to the inferior pews of Demas and Lazarus; the one next the pulpit and the other next to the door. Not thus were the Christian slaves and "the saints of Caesar's household" separated in the early church. There were no class churches. Christian brotherhood was not as often to-day so nominal that in the words of Prof. Ely, one would rather be a second cousin by blood than a "brother," in the general sense, even to a Christian.⁵

These facts answer the question as to the spiritual condition of the churches. "He that loveth not knoweth not God." "For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

According to our author's own representation, the church is lacking in Christian love, and is therefore without the true knowledge of God. And this is the reason why there is so much seeking after the power of organization and the power of the State. The very federations and confederacies for which Mr. Crafts is laboring are only so many efforts to supply by numbers the lack of power in the church; but the Word of the Lord is, "Say ye not, A confederacy to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread."

UTAH AS A STATE.

In view of the admission of Utah into the union of States, the following from a Newton, Kansas, correspondent of the *New York Sun*, printed in its issue of Dec. 29, is worth the attention of the American people:—

Bishop Richard W. Hart, of the Mormon Church, who has relatives in this city, has been visiting among them for a few days. He was a member of the last Territorial Legislature. He belongs to the "Order of Melchisedec," from which all bishops of the Church of the Latter Day Saints must graduate, and therefore knows something of the plans of his church for the future.

Bishop Hart is on his way to the missionary field of Georgia, where his church has been at work for some time, and where the efforts at recruiting for the Mormon faith have met with better success than in any other field in this country. To the correspondent of the *Sun* Bishop Hart talked very freely about the situation in Utah. The population of Utah contains five Mormons to one Gentile, while in thirteen of the twenty one counties there is not an official not of the Mormon faith. He declared that the belief that the church had abandoned all efforts to control the politics of the new State was a great mistake.

"Whether Democrat or Republican," said the bishop, "there will not be a State officer of other than our faith, either elective or appointive, unless the church so will it. There is not a district judge who can escape his responsibility to the Latter Day Saints, and with two exceptions there will not be a sheriff in Utah who is not of our selection."

After reference to the manner in which the church

will secure control of all the industries, such as water supplies and irrigation systems, which would be given back to "the people for whom God intended them," he touched on the subject of plural marriages. He said that through divine command President Woodruff had suspended the ordinance, but it had not been repealed. He said:—

"This subject of plural marriages is very much misunderstood. Not more than fifteen per cent. of our people have more than one wife. As a man prospers the church admonishes him to take additional wives according to his prosperity, and he obeys as a religious duty, always with the advice and full consent of his first wife. In Statehood, when we are free from Federal interference, the Temple will witness the solemnization of the marriage rites that have been suspended, as the penitentiary will no longer be filled with men for obeying God's law."

At the close of the interview the bishop said:—
"Yes, this ceremonial will be resumed; in fact, it has never been entirely suspended. I have three wives, all of whom love me. And they have persuaded me to seal another on my return next August, which I shall do."

Now that Utah has become a State, the only way Congress can deal with polygamy within its borders is by an amendment to the national Constitution. Thus the possibility of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, touching a question claimed to be one of religious belief and practice, is by no means remote. While polygamy should be dealt with solely as a practice subversive of human rights, it has in the past been treated as a thing to be suppressed on account of its immorality; and if again made a subject of legislation, in the form of a constitutional amendment, will doubtless be considered on moral grounds. Hence should such an amendment come, it is likely to involve other issues besides the suppression of polygamy.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE SALOON.

We are indebted to the Rev. A. P. Doyle, Secretary of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, for the latest presentation of the attitude of the Catholic Church towards the saloon. "Father" Doyle was one of the chief speakers at a large mass meeting held in Carnegie Music Hall, New York, Dec. 16, to create sentiment in favor of New York's Sunday "law;" and on that occasion, as reported in the *New York Christian Advocate*, he "made an address clear in statement and stirring in manner, declaring that he was there with the approval of Archbishop Corrigan, and in harmony with the legislation of the Catholic Church, enacted some years ago, and reaffirmed but a month ago—emphasizing the statement that it was since the election, at a recent synod held in this city." He then translated from the Latin the legislation referred to, as follows:—

Since such very great scandals arise from the abuse of intoxicating drink, we exhort pastors, for the love of God, to use every zeal to extirpate this vice of intemperance. In order to accomplish this end let them frequently warn liquor-sellers never to give any drink to minors or to drunkards, and let them frequently warn them also to keep their stores closed on Sunday. —*De Zelo Animarum*.

Again:—

Let the observance of the Lord's day be frequently commended. . . . And especially with fervent zeal let them prevent the opening of saloons on Sunday, and also the frequentation of the same on that day, because from this very custom so many evils arise. —*De Zelo Animarum*.

It is thus perfectly clear that the attitude of the papal church is not one of hostility to the saloon itself, but toward the intemperance which the saloon creates. She would have liquor-dealers take care to refrain from selling intoxicants to minors or to drunkards; but the liquor-seller might comply with this requirement, and still do a flourishing business.

⁴ "Practical Christian Sociology," p. 44.

⁵ "Practical Christian Sociology," p. 34.

⁶ 1 John 4: 8.

⁷ 1 John 4: 20.

⁸ Isa. 8: 12, 13.

And it is much worse to ruin young men who are not drunkards, than to sell to those who have become confirmed toppers.

Such legislation does not interfere at all with the revenue which that church derives from her communicants who are dealers in intoxicating drinks. It tends not to suppress the saloon, but rather to make it "respectable."

It allows the saloon to create the terrible thirst and craving for intoxicating drink, and then when the hapless devotee has fallen until its power over him is stronger than life itself, it forbids him any further indulgence, and leaves him to a torture of unsatisfied desire to which death would be far preferable. Such is its intent; but the wretched toper generally finds some means to satisfy his fierce craving in spite of the law's restriction. It is very much in this way that the Sunday-closing law serves the cause of temperance. It makes Sunday to the drinker either a day of unsatisfied craving, or a day on which he draws his supply of drink from his own home, instead of from the saloon.

When it is remembered that on this occasion "Father" Doyle stood on common ground with Bishop Potter, Warner Miller, and other leading Protestant speakers by whom this meeting was called, it is easy to see that such mass meetings tend really to the exaltation of Sunday rather than to the suppression of the saloon.

RELIGIO-ATHLETIC RECIPROCITY.

BY J. G. LAMSON.

THE extent to which ministers of the gospel will go to fill their pews, and the part they will take in order to get rid of any rival or competition against their attendance, is well illustrated by a dispatch in the *New York World* under date of Nov. 25. It seems that the University of Rochester football eleven were to play the Hamilton College team Thanksgiving day. It was the idea of the ministers to have services on that day in accordance with the President's proclamation. That was all right. But the football game was of so much more interest to the people than some sermon at the same hour that the ministers were afraid of losing their congregations entirely. They protested against the game at that hour, asking that it be postponed until the afternoon. Finally terms were affected "by sending out letters to all the prominent city ministers asking that if the game were deferred until after the services, the ministers next Sunday and Thanksgiving day would announce the game from the pulpits and urge attendance as a matter of reciprocity for the action of the students." We are informed that the ministers complied and gave their indorsements to the change, and thus the pulpit is made the bulletin board of the football games.

"FOR THE SALOON'S SAKE."

At a large mass-meeting held in Carnegie Music Hall, New York, Dec. 16, at which Bishop Potter presided, in support of the law closing the saloons on Sunday, the Rev. A. P. Doyle, Catholic, made (as reported) this remarkable utterance: "If there were no other argument, I would ask to have the saloon closed on Sunday for the saloon's sake. If it should be permitted to go on for ten years corrupting and debauching seven days in the

week, the citizens would rise up in their might and crush it."

We could ask for no more pointed corroboration than this of the SENTINEL'S oft-made declaration, that the Sunday (saloon) law tends to the perpetuity of the saloon, by investing it with a degree of respectability. If in ten years the saloon could be crushed by public indignation, through allowing it to remain open seven days in the week, that fact would constitute the strongest argument in favor of an open saloon on the first as well as on the remaining days of the week. But the Rev. Mr. Doyle, who is secretary of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, wants Sunday closing of the saloon "for the saloon's sake."

Lest it should be thought that no speaker making such an utterance could have any considerable influence at such a meeting, it should be mentioned that the Rev. W. H. P. Faunce, a prominent Baptist clergyman of this city, was introduced after "Father" Doyle, and in opening his speech said: "I am proud to follow a Catholic priest, even at a distance, in this cause so dear to us both."

It is evident that Sunday keeping is fast coming to be the popularly recognized badge of respectability; and when the saloon dutifully keeps Sunday, it too will become, in a measure at least, "respectable." But any Christian may well doubt the respectability of any plane upon which he and the saloon can stand together. A saloon can keep Sunday; but no saloon ever did or can keep God's Sabbath.

SABBATH-KEEPING AND SUNDAY-KEEPING.

THERE is a wide difference between Sabbath-keeping and Sunday-keeping. Sunday-keeping can be enforced by human law. Sabbath-keeping cannot be so enforced, but must be wholly a voluntary act.

Among believers in Sunday observance, we find no harmony of conception as to what that observance should be, or what is the foundation upon which it rests. The Methodists, the Catholics, the Disciples, the Lutherans, all differ from one another in their observance of the day, and in their theories of the proper basis of its observance. Nor does unity of belief and practice exist throughout each separate denomination; but clergymen of the same church give expression to widely differing views upon the subject. All this is in itself conclusive evidence that Sunday sanctity and Sunday observance have their origin in the conceptions of the human mind.

The Sunday rest day being a creation of man, it must be enforced, if at all, by human legislation. But this ignoble origin is fatal to any conception of it as a sacred day; for man, being fallen and sinful himself, cannot make anything sacred. Being dependent himself for holiness, as all creatures are, upon the Lord, he cannot impart holiness to anything. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one."

"There is none good but one, that is, God." All goodness, all holiness, is from God,—a manifestation of the one Being who, in and of himself, is good and holy. Whatever is good and holy upon earth, is made so by the presence of God's Spirit. Only that is sacred or holy which God thus makes holy; and God has never made holy the first day of the week. Hence, however men may speak of it, it is not and cannot be a sacred day.

Sunday observance being dependent upon human precept and legislation, cannot be a moral act; for morality is a condition of the heart, and the heart is not reached by human legislation. Only God's precepts and law can

so affect the heart as to produce moral action; and no precept or command of God enjoins Sunday observance. The saloon is made to keep Sunday, yet it continues to be a saloon. Sunday observance does not affect its character; it is the same evil thing, the same curse to humanity that it was when it was open seven days in the week. And just so with animate things. The worst sinner on earth may rest on Sunday and even attend public worship, because the "law" commands him to do so, and be a sinner still. The worst hypocrite on earth can be in outward acts a pious man. The Scriptures tell us of "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." He can put on a pious exterior, but he is the devil still.

But not so with the Sabbath and law of God. Nothing evil can keep that law; for that cannot be kept by a mere outward conformity with its demands. That law reaches the thoughts and motives of the heart. It forbids all evil thoughts, calling some of them murder, others adultery, and others covetousness. It commands the Sabbath to be kept not only by outward forms, but by making it a delight, "not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words." Isa. 58:13, 14. It commands the worship of God, not only in the letter of outward forms, but "in spirit and in truth." John 4:24. No sinner can keep the Sabbath until he is first made free from sin and thus changed into a righteous person.

Such is the difference between Sunday-keeping and Sabbath-keeping; between compliance with the legislation of man, and with the law of God. It is Sabbath-keeping and not Sunday-keeping that separates us from the company of all that is evil. No human precept, custom, or legislation, can effect this separation, but only that Word which is the basis of faith.

THE "CORPORATION CONSCIENCE."

IN the *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 14, Mr. Charles Roads, chairman of the Philadelphia "good citizenship committee," makes some true observations concerning the "corporation conscience." Sir Edward Coke's remark, "Corporations have no souls, has," he says, "served as soporific to many moral convictions. But neither the human law nor God will stop to deal with that abstraction, the corporation. They will arrest and punish the men who compose it. What transparent folly to imagine that God will be confused by the intricacies of constitution and by-laws of business associations in getting at guilty souls!"

It is strange that this same writer, and those for whom he speaks through the above named journal, cannot see that what is true of corporations with their constitutions and by-laws, in this respect, is true also of civil government, with its constitution and by-laws. In the Day of Judgment God will not deal with civil government, but with individuals. Mr. Roads and the *Christian Statesman* party are zealous advocates of a scheme which is to "put God in the Constitution," by so amending the preamble to that venerable document as to place within it a "suitable acknowledgment" of Jesus Christ as the nation's king, and of his revealed will as the source of all rightful authority in civil affairs. In this he and they proceed upon the theory—exactly contrary to the language above quoted—that some virtue can attach to a national profession of religion through the Constitution. But if

an individual cannot shirk responsibility for a wrong act because done by a corporation, neither can he derive any moral advantage from an acknowledgment of God which pertains to the constitution of civil government.

The propriety of such a governmental profession of Christianity rests upon the assumption that civil government is an entity possessing moral accountability. But that which can have a moral character must possess a conscience; and if civil government has a conscience, it must be true (which Mr. Roads denies) that a corporation has one also.

In civil government it is proper to use compulsion. The national Constitution is the fundamental law of the land, in which all acquiesce, either willingly or by compulsion. What is done in its name is done in their name and by their voice. A constitutional acknowledgment of God and profession of acquiescence in his revealed will would be no less the act, volunteered or forced, of every citizen. But a forced acknowledgment and profession of Christ is hypocrisy and sin. And as but few people in this nation, comparatively, are Christians, such an acknowledgment as is proposed would but constitute a colossal monument of hypocrisy and sin. Yet these men are determined that the Constitution shall "acknowledge" God, even if it has to tell a colossal falsehood to do it.

COMMON LAW IN ENGLISH DECISIONS.

[By Addison Blakely, Ph. D., Lecturer in Political Science and History, University of Chicago.]

From time immemorial, English law—both British and American—has been governed by certain rules of construction, or rules of reason, which apply to and control each and every statute that forms a part of our code of law. These rules are part of the common law and are held to be prior to and over all other law of whatever description or kind.

By means of this common law-theory of construction, statutes are in fact abrogated, even where the legal power to abrogate is denied positively and in toto by the legislative power. "It appears in our books," says Lord Coke, "that in many cases the common law will control acts of Parliament, and sometimes adjudge them to be utterly void. For when an act of Parliament is against common right and reason, or repugnant, or impossible to be performed, the common law will control it and adjudge such act to be void."

Perhaps a better idea of the common law can be got by quoting from the decisions contrasting it with statute and custom-law,—the remainder of the law of the land. The common law is that part of natural right having the sanction of the State or receiving the recognition of sovereignty. Custom law is that body of customs of the people not contrary to the expressed will or welfare of the State. Statute law is that body of law declared by the legislative agent of the State—usually by the executive head or by some representative body, as a legislature.

In all of these decisions the common law is set forth as practical justice, or natural right, as understood and sanctioned by the State. "Bills of Rights," "Declarations of Rights," and similar titles, are merely variations of declarations of the common law or the old "Folc-right"—the fundamental rights of the people. We see, therefore, why persecution has never had a legitimate place in the common law of the English peoples, and the ground for the declaration of the Supreme Court of New York that "all prohibitions of

ordinary business on Sunday, with us, come from the statute"

Fortescue, therefore, makes the following decisions of law:—

All human laws are either
The law of nature,¹
Customs, or
Statutes, which are also called constitutions.

But the two former, when they are reduced into writing, and made public by a sufficient authority of the prince, and commanded to be observed, they then pass into the nature of, and are accepted as constitutions or statutes, and in virtue of such promulgation and command, oblige the subject to the observance of them under a greater penalty than they otherwise could do. . . . If, therefore, under these three distinctions of the law of nature, customs, and statutes, I shall prove the law of England eminent to excel, then I shall have evinced it to be good and effectual for the government of that kingdom. . . . The laws of England, as far as they agree with, and are deduced from, the law of nature, are neither better nor worse, in their decisions, than the laws of all other States or kingdoms in similar cases. For, as the philosopher (Aristotle) says in the fifth of his *Ethics*, "The law of nature is the same, and has the same force all the world over."²

"Ley temporal," says Coke, "consisteth of three parts, viz. :—

First, on the common law, expressed in our bookes of law, and judicially records;
Secondly, on statutes contained in acts and records of Parliament; and,
Thirdly, on customs grounded on reason, and used time out of minde;
And the construction and determination of these doe belong to the judges of the realme.³

In the preface to Hughe's edition of Horne's "Mirroure of Justices,"⁴ we find a like distinction made. "The temporal laws of this kingdom," says the writer, "may be divided into three parts:—

First, the general or common law;
Secondly, the customary law;
Thirdly, statute or parliament laws.
The common law is nothing else but pure and tried reason (*responsa prudentum*).
The customary laws are certain ancient customs grounded upon reason, which abridge the course of the common law.

In Sir Thomas Harde's reports of cases adjudged in the Court of Exchequer (1658), the same characterization of the law is given. On page 140 we read:—

The words *per legem terrae* (the law of the land) signifie,
Common law,
Customary law, and
Statute law.

Whatever positive laws are contrary to this law of nature and reason, they are void in themselves.⁵

In fact, Brownlow's reports make the sweeping assertion that all of the common-law judges and writers, without exception, regarded the law as being of this threefold character. In reporting the case of *Rowles vs. Mason*,⁶ Brownlow says:—

Coke, chief justice, agreed, and he said that Fortes-

cue and Littl-ton and all others agreed, that the law consists of three parts,

First, common law;
Secondly, statute law, which corrects, abridges, and explains the common law;
The third, custom, which takes away the common law (*i. e.*, the change of custom modifies the law; for *ex facto jus oritur*.—Out of the fact the law arises: so, when the facts are different, the law itself is different; *Cessante ratione legis, cessat ipse lex*.—When the reason for the law ceases, the law itself ceases*).

But the common law corrects, allows and disallows both statute law and custom: for if there be repugnancy in statute or unreasonableness in custom, the common law disallows it or rejects it, as it appears by Dr. Bonham's case, and in 8 Coke 27, Henry VI. annuity.

And elsewhere Coke says: "Customes et usages. Consuetudo (custom) is one of the main triangles of the lawes of England; those lawes being divided into common law, statute law, and custome."⁷

FOR THE TRUTH'S SAKE.

BY W. A. COLCORD.

To be loyal to the truth under all circumstances has ever cost a sacrifice. It cost Abel his life. It made Noah a very unpopular man. It cast Jeremiah in the dungeon; Shadrach, Me-hach and Abed-nego in the fiery furnace, and Daniel into the lion's den. It crucified the Lord of glory, stoned Stephen, and in the ages that followed led a mighty host to a martyr's death.

"Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution," says Paul. And Paul's career, after he became a follower of Christ, testified to the truthfulness of his statement. His godly life in Christ Jesus caused him to be stoned, beaten with many stripes, placed in the stocks, imprisoned, and finally to be beheaded. For some time before his death, he was a prisoner in Rome. In this condition he wrote some of his epistles.

To lead a godly life through faith in Jesus, which, by the way, is the only way in which a godly life can be led, means to be loyal to the truth; to have the moral courage to stand by the truth at whatever cost; to be faithful unto death. And what is the truth? Said Christ: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." Then to be loyal to the truth means to be loyal to the word of God. This is what costs. This is what demands integrity, self-denial, and thorough consecration to God. This is what brings persecution for righteousness' (right doings') sake.

And here is where so many fail. They are not true to the word. Describing the stony-ground hearer, Christ said: "He that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it; yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended." The tribulation and persecution arise because of the word. Satan is the enemy of the word: for it is God's word, and he is the enemy of God. He therefore persecutes all who strictly adhere to it.

It was because of Paul's faith in the word that the Jew; persecuted him. To Felix he

¹ It (the term "law of nature") is not used among them that be learned in the lawes of England to reason what thing is commanded or prohibited by the law of nature and what not: but al ye reasoning in that behalfe is vnder this manner:

"As when anything is grounded vpon the law of nature, they say that reason will that such a thinge bee done: and if it be prohibited by the law of nature, they say it is against reason, or that reason will not suffer it to be done." St. Germain's "Doctor and Student," 11. 12 (London, "newlie corrected and imprinted with newe additions," 1580).

Coke makes this same division of the law, as does Fortescue, but substitutes common law for law of nature, and cites Fortescue as authority, showing that he regards common law, as he says, "properly so-called;" the same as what Bracton, Fortescue, and the other earlier writers of both England and Rome regarded as the law of nature, insofar as such law is recognized and sanctioned by the State.

² Fortescue's "De Laudibus Legum Angliae," chapters 15, 16.

³ "Coke's Institutes," book III, folio 344.

⁴ "The Mirroure of Justices," written originally in the Old French, long before the Conquest. London, 1768.

⁵ Per Chief-Justice Widdrington. See also Rawlett vs. the Attorney-General, same report, page 466, where it is maintained "that an act of Parliament, that should take it (natural justice) away would be void in itself; as is said in 'Doctor and Student.'"

⁶ Brownlow and Goldesborough reports, 197, 198.

⁷ Coke's Institutes, 110 b. These quotations might be extended indefinitely, but I have given enough here to establish beyond the possibility of a successful contradiction the threefold character and source of law. I might quote Holland, whose excellent work is recently from the press (fourth edition, Oxford, 1888), to show that this conception of the nature of law still obtains among political scientists as well as among the lawyers. In his chapter on the sources of law, he speaks of "the mutual relations of (1) customary, (2) judge-made, and (3) statute law;"—the very same divisions given by the older lawyers substituting "judge-made" law, for Fortescue's term "law of nature." St. Germain's "law of reason," and Coke's "common law." Whatever the term, it is the bench's conception of legal justice arising out of the related facts.

said: "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, *believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets.*" The unbelieving Jews professed to believe the law and the prophets, but they did not; for had they done so, they would have believed in Jesus.

It was because of their fidelity to the word of God that so many suffered death at the hands of papal Rome during the days of her power and supremacy. Like the Jews, this church has professed to be the guardian of, and believer in the word; but it has not been, else it would not have destroyed those, like the Waldenses and Albigenses, who believed in it, and persecuted those who sought to give it to the people in a tongue in which they could understand it.

If any would know why there is so little persecution among the many millions of professed Christians of to-day, the answer is at hand. It is because there is so little strict adherence to the plain teaching of the Word of God. Another has well said: "Let there be a revival of the faith and power of the early church, and the spirit of persecution will be revived, and the fires of persecution will be rekindled." Let men do what God has said, and they will soon feel the hand of persecution, for the devil is not dead.

THE PERSECUTION OF THE RUSSIAN QUAKERS.

[Review of Reviews for December.]

IN the *Contemporary Review* Count Tolstoi tells in brief the story of the persecution which has befallen the Dookhobortzy, who may be described as a kind of Russian Quakers, and who are now being harried by the Russian government because they refuse to bear arms. The following is the substance of the story which Count Tolstoi has to tell:—

"The Dookhobortzy settled in the Caucasus have been subjected to cruel persecutions by the Russian authorities; and these persecutions, described in the report of one who made inquiries on the spot, are now, at this moment, happening. These Dookhobortzy were beaten, whipped, and ridden down; Cossacks were quartered upon them in 'executions,' who, it is proved, allowed themselves every license with these people; and everything they did was with the consent of their officers. Those men who had refused military service were tortured, in body and in mind; and it is entirely true that a prosperous population, who by tens of years of hard toil had created their own prosperity, were expelled from their homes and settled, without land and without means of subsistence, in the Georgian villages.

"The cause of these persecutions is, that for certain reasons three-fourths of the Dookhobortzy (that is about 15,000 people, their whole population being about 20,000) have this year returned with renewed force and earnestness to their former Christian profession, and have resolved to comply in practice with Christ's law of non-resistance to evil by violence. This decision has caused them, on one hand, to destroy all their weapons, which are considered so needful in the Caucasus, thus renouncing the principle of fighting, and putting themselves at the mercy of every marauder; and, on the other hand, to refuse, under all circumstances, participation in acts of force which may be demanded from them by the government; which means that they must refuse service in the army or elsewhere that violence is used. The government could

not permit such a desertion of the duties established by law on the part of so many thousands of people, and a struggle broke out. The government demands compliance with its requirements; the Dookhobortzy do not obey.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF IT.

[The Star, London, Dec. 3, 1895.]

THE *Present Truth* is the organ of the International Tract Society, Limited, which is one of the publishing branches of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, which holds that the true Sabbath is Saturday, the seventh day of the week, and not Sunday, the first. The *Present Truth* people, therefore, rest on Saturday and work on Sunday. Now the Factory Act forbids the employment of women and young persons on Sunday, and the only exemption which it dispenses is in the case of Jews, who are passed over if they sign a special exemption form. The *Present Truth* conscientiously objected to sign this Jewish exemption form because it is Christian and not Jewish, and for six years the factory inspectors let it print in peace, recognizing the patent fact that it kept the law in spirit if not in letter. The other day, however, some new broom came along, and swept the *Present Truth* before a magistrate, who fined it. It having refused to pay the fines, the bailiffs descended on it, confiscated all they could lay their hands on, including the engine; wherefore the *Present Truth* is like soon to be the *Past Truth*. This is about the savagest instance we ever saw of the injustice of justice, and we hope that Sir Matthew White Ridley will make restitution as swiftly as may be.

SUNDAY AND THE SALOONS.

THE German-Americans of this city, have, it is said, "hit upon a solution of the Sunday excise question that meets the approval of the special committee of the Chamber of Commerce, Dr. Parkhurst, Carl Schurz, Oswald Ottendorfer, and Rev. Dr. Rainsford. The plan, according to the *World* of the 2nd inst., is to amend the present Sunday excise law, by adding:—

In cities of the first and second class the proprietor of a restaurant who has been duly licensed to sell strong or spirituous liquors, wines, ale or beer may sell on Sunday to his guests such beverages to be drunk by the purchasers on the licensed premises with their meals, but not at or in front of the bar, and he may also sell beer, ale and mineral waters to be drunk off the licensed premises on Sunday from 12 to 2 o'clock in the afternoon and from 6 to 8 o'clock in the evening.

This gives every saloon-keeper who is willing to serve his customers with something to eat, the right to sell upon Sunday, and allows beer to be sold within certain hours to be taken away and consumed elsewhere. It remains to be seen how well this will satisfy friends of Sunday sacredness.

Restricting the sale of liquor to certain hours upon Sunday does indeed make a legal distinction between that and other days of the week, but is it such a distinction as will fully satisfy those who are determined to exalt Sunday as the Sabbath. It will perhaps be remembered by our readers that in a sermon preached in Grace Church, this city, by Wm. R. Huntington, D. D., and published in the *Pulpit* for October, that gentleman said:—

Some are under the impression, naturally enough, but most erroneously, that it is the so-called "temper-

ance question" with which we are called to deal. Others are persuaded that the principle at stake is the all-important one of the supremacy of law, the duty of the sworn officers of the State to enforce the State's decree. But this latter question has for the moment, at any rate, thank God, been set at rest. We are no longer pestered by the vicious proposition that laws are enacted rather with a view to silencing the murmurs of the good, than for the purpose of restraining the passions of the bad.

Equally evident is it, when we look facts in the face, that it is not the temperance question which is now at stake, for no one can pretend that even the complete suppression of the sale of intoxicants, if confined to a single day of the week, could settle that. Temperance legislation, if it would be properly so-called, must aim at covering all days.

No, the question really at the fore is the Sunday question. An attack is making upon the immunities of the weekly rest, as those immunities have been defined by usage and by public law. It so happens that in this particular case the hostile movement has sprung up in the quarter known as "the liquor interest," and that is what is confusing people's minds; but there are other points of the compass from which the assault might just as naturally have come. The simple truth of the matter is that Sunday is all the while in the position of a beleaguered fortress.

This is a plain statement of the plain truth. Doubtless in the minds of some the question is one of excise, but the rallying cry of the so-called reformers in the last campaign was the preservation of the "Christian sabbath." This was made one of the planks in the platform of one of the great political parties, and upon that platform it went to the people and was victorious; not indeed in the city but in the State as a whole. The issue is therefore clearly the maintenance of Sunday as a religious institution; and inasmuch as its friends claim that it should be enforced by civil law, it is difficult to see how they can consistently consent to the proposed amendment to the excise law. Those who do not believe that Sunday is a proper subject of legislation and hold that the liquor traffic should be prohibited on all days simply because it is a menace to life and property, and because it burdens the State with the support of criminals and insane people, will watch with interest the fight which is now sure to ensue between the advocates of Sunday selling and those who demand prohibition on Sunday only.

THAT the prosecution of seventh-day observers for Sunday work is not prompted by zeal for "the law," but by personal animosity, is shown by the display of this spirit on the part of the prosecutors in nearly every case. Either there is some feeling of personal spite, or a marked opposition of religious views, behind the proceedings in almost every instance. Wise legislation will cut off, rather than provide, opportunities for the exercise of the baser instincts of human nature to the harm of good and honest citizens.

WHAT is the meaning of the warlike spirit which, in the guise of patriotism, is giving rise to the formation of "Boys' Brigades" and the like? Is this one of the evidences that we are a "Christian nation"? Is Christ the prince of war, as well as of peace? He cannot be both, for the terms are contradictory; and we know that he is the "prince of peace." The prince of war is a very different being.

PROSECUTION of the Adventists is wrong. By love, not the sword, or jail, God intends to conquer the world, and the very semblance of oppression against the weak savors of the reign of terror and religious fanaticism of the Dark Ages.—*Union Republican, Winston, N. C., Aug. 8.*

IN THE GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.

The Standard Dictionary is Now an Authority in All the Departments at Washington and in Canada.

ALTHOUGH the new Standard Dictionary has been published scarcely a year, it has been in use for several months in all the departments of the United States Government at Washington, and also of the Dominion of Canada. The feeling of Government experts toward it is truly expressed by A. G. Wilkinson, principal examiner in the United States Patent Office, and formerly professor of languages in the University of Missouri. He says:—

The Standard Dictionary is so vastly superior that I can hardly say enough in its praise. It is the most perfect dictionary ever made in any language.

Prof. A. H. Sayce, the eminent philologist, Oxford University, England, says:—

The Standard Dictionary is truly magnificent, and worthy of the great continent which produced it. It is more than complete. It is certain to supersede all other dictionaries of the English language.

Prof. J. E. Sandys, Cambridge University, England, says:—

It is an admirable work, and deserves to become famous on both sides of the Atlantic.

Hon. E. J. Phelps, Professor of law in Yale University, ex-Minister to Great Britain, says:—

The work is extremely well done throughout. For general and practical purposes it is the best American dictionary now available.

Prof. N. S. Shaler, Harvard University, says:—

The Standard Dictionary will remain an enduring monument to the labor of its editors.

J. W. Bashford, President of Ohio Wesleyan University, says:—

I say more emphatically than ever before that it is by far the best dictionary in the English language.

It is safe to say that no one will make a mistake in buying the Standard.

Address,
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY,
30 Lafayette Place, New York.

THE RIGHTS of the PEOPLE

Or Civil Government and Religion

By Alonzo T. Jones.

An Up-to-Date Pamphlet on the Principles of Religious Liberty.

This book cannot fail to be of great value to all in the study of the series of S. S. Lessons on Religious Liberty for the last three months of 1895. It was not written to go with these lessons, but it is fortunate and timely that it should be published at this time.

“THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE” contains fifteen chapters, the following being a portion of the chapter headings:—

Christianity and the Roman Empire—What is due to God and What to Caesar—The Powers That Be—How the United State Became a Christian Nation—What is the Nation?—Who Made the Nation?—Religious Right in the United States—Religious Right Invaded—The People's Right of Appeal—National Precedent on Right of Appeal—Sunday-law Movement in the Fourth Century and Its Parallel in the Nineteenth—Will the People Assert and Maintain Their Rights?—Religious Rights in the States.

In the four appendixes to the book are given the Declaration of Independence—The Constitution of the United States—The Dred Scott Decision, and the “Christian Nation” Decision.

This is a book of permanent value for reference and study and one that all should possess. It contains 384 pages with several illustrations, is issued as No. 32 of the Religious Liberty Library, and is bound in paper covers. Price 40 cents.

A Finer Edition on laid paper is also ready. It is neatly bound in cloth. Price One Dollar.

Address all orders to
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO., 43 Bond St., New York
18 W. Fifth St., Kansas City, Mo.
12th & Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal.

Waterman's * Ideal
* Fountain * Pen

Claims first attention, as it certainly is

The Best Fountain Pen on the Market.

Other makes may be good, but the WATERMAN IS THE BEST. Some points of excellence are:—

The fine quality of the gold pens;

The reliability of its feed, which has stood a ten years' test;

The absence of any portion of the feed on the top of the pen point, whereby it is left untrammelled and acts with all the ease and grace of any first-class gold pen.



Among those who use the Waterman Pen are:—

REV. LYMAN ABBOTT, Editor “Christian Union,” New York. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, Pres. N. Y. C. & H. R. R. Co. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, Hawarden, England. JOHN WANAMAKER, Ex-Postmaster General. And thousands of others whose judgment may safely be trusted, all of whom with one consent pronounce the Waterman

“THE BEST FOUNTAIN PEN.”

Among the many excellent features of this pen, to some of which we call attention, stands one of no mean value, and that is the shape of the holder. There is, in the new style, no prominent collar or shoulder to come in contact with the fingers when writing, but the holder has the pleasing touch of any ordinary good pen holder.

The Waterman makes a most acceptable present to a parent, to a brother, to a sister, to a friend, to anybody and will be SENT AT OUR RISK to any address in America on receipt of price.

In ordering state what kind of a pen you like best. Whether stiff or flexible, fine or coarse, etc.

SATISFACTION GUARANTEED.

No. 12. Ladies' size. [Small] \$2.50. No. 14. Gentlemen's size - - \$4.00.
“ 13. “ “ 3.50. “ 15. “ [Large] 5.00.
No. 16. [Very large] - - - - - \$6.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 Bond Street, New York City.

: : B I B L E S

BAGSTER'S - COMPREHENSIVE - TEACHERS' - BIBLE.

Emerald Type. Size—8½ x 5½ x 1¼ inches.

Swedish Morocco, improved divinity circuit, leather lined to edge, round corners, red under gold edges, with Illustrations, 14 Maps, Concordance, Helps, etc. Post paid, \$5.00

GENUINE : OXFORD : TEACHERS' : BIBLES.

Minion Type. Size—5 x 7¼ inches.

Fine Levant Morocco (brown), divinity circuit, calf lined, round corners, gold edges, Maps, Concordance, and many other valuable helps. Post paid, \$5.00

LARGE . TYPE . BIBLES

FOR THOSE WITH POOR EYESIGHT.

French Morocco, limp covers, round corners, side and back title in gold, gilt edges, Family Register and Maps. Post paid, \$2.00

ADDRESS,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

KANSAS CITY, MO. OAKLAND, CAL.



The Cyclone Still Whirls!

Sweeping Everything Clean Before It!

SEE WHAT THE PEOPLE SAY!

MESSERS. COON BROS.: I consider the “Cyclone Washer” far superior to any other washing machine before the public. It washes thoroughly, quickly, and does not wear out the clothes. It saves time, money, strength, and patience. I hope it may find its way into many homes. Milton Junc., Wis., Nov. 6, 1895. MRS. O. A. JOHNSON.

MESSERS. COON BROS.: I take pleasure in recommending the Cyclone Washer. It is, without exception, the best washing machine that I ever saw. It does the work the quickest, easiest and best, without injury to the clothes, white or colored. My husband has purchased one, and I am truly thankful, for I consider it a household treasure. Beaver Dam, Wis., Oct. 19, 1895. Yours respectfully, MRS. E. P. CADY.

MESSERS. COON BROS.: Your Cyclone Washer seems to be the machine of all. It washes thoroughly, quickly, and easily, and without wearing the clothes as is proven by the fact that black clothes can be washed in the suds after white ones and receive no lint. In fact it does all that is claimed for it. Beaver Dam, Wis., October 16, 1895. Very respectfully, MRS. N. E. ALLEN.



No. JANUARY 9, 1896.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

No less than five proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States are now claiming the attention of Congress.

DAVID J. BREWER, of Kansas, associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and head of the Venezuelan commission, is spoken of as a possible presidential candidate for 1896. Justice Brewer wrote the "Christian nation" decision of February, 1892.

It was hoped that the great "Christian" powers of the world would intervene to stop the fearful butchery of helpless and innocent people by the Turks in Armenia; but now, behold, these "Christian" nations are stripping for a fight among themselves, over a dispute arising from greed; and the Turk is left to continue his bloody work unchecked.

THE bestowal of the cardinal's beretta upon Archbishop Satolli, comes just in good time to place him among the number of promising candidates for the successorship of Pope Leo. Satolli has made a close study of American ideas and institutions, to discover how they may be best made to serve the interests of the papal church. In the "chair of St. Peter" he would all but constitute an American pope.

THE article, "Utah as a State," printed on another page, shows how completely the civil power in Utah is now in the hands of the Mormon Church. The union of Church and State in Utah is, according to the words of the Mormon bishop there quoted, about as complete as was ever any such union of which history speaks; and it will be strange if a striking object lesson on the evil of Church and State union is not soon given the people of this Republic.

THE spirit of religious intolerance is at work in South Carolina, as witnessed by the following from a letter by a minister in that State:—

Mr. Robert Miller, of Chick's Springs, who became a Seventh day Adventist last summer, and is a prominent farmer of that place, has been watched by several of his neighbors while he was picking cotton back in his field on Sunday. The watchers stole around in the woods where they could see him, but supposed he could not see them. But they were noticed nevertheless, and when spoken to, ran away. They said they would take the law, and if that did not stop Miller's working, they would take the law in their own hands and stop him that way.

The letter further states that Mr. Miller

was in the back field where no one could possibly be disturbed by his work unless he went back there on purpose to be disturbed.

Another man, Mr. Guinn, a shoemaker, has also been threatened with arrest for continuing his work on Sunday. Is it not strange that individuals who profess to be Christians—and some of these watchers were church members—should think that they were manifesting or exercising the Spirit of Christ in such work?

THE "German-American Citizens' Union" of New York, "is," says the *World*, of June 5, "about to precipitate the Sunday-opening question into politics in a way that is bound to hurt some one." It will shortly submit a bill to the Albany legislature, accompanied by "a carload of petitions," asking that at an election to be held in the spring there shall be submitted to the people of cities of the first class a measure permitting the sale of food, milk and beverages on Sunday during certain hours. The hours described are from 7 to 9 A. M. for food and milk, and after 4 P. M. for beverages. Failing to get what they demand from the legislature, they will form themselves into a political body, and organize similar bodies throughout the State, with the avowed purpose of placing New York State in the Democratic ranks at the presidential election next fall.

THE Chicago *Inter-Ocean*, in its issue of Dec. 5, 1895, in an editorial entitled, "Trades Unions and Sunday Laws," after stating that several influences have been combined to oppose the enforcement of the Barbers' Sunday Rest bill, says:—

The labor unions are strong enough to win in this contest for a weekly holiday, and they will win if they stand united. For even if the Cody law be held unconstitutional, it is within the power of the unions to induce the next legislature to enact a measure of like purpose, but of far wider scope. And thus it may be that those who now conspire to prevent a hard-worked and not too well paid class of men from enjoying a Sunday rest may succeed in forcing the enactment of a law that will make Sunday a holiday of universal obligation.

It is not difficult to see what the plan of these advocates of Sunday laws is in regard to those who oppose their wishes in any degree. If these fellows, say they, do not quit opposing our law relative to Sunday, we will make a law that will compel everybody to keep Sunday.

THE *Monitor* (Roman Catholic) of San Francisco, feeling aggrieved that we apply Rev. 13:18 to the Papacy, attempted to break the force of the application some weeks since by a display of cheap wit with which the editor seems to have been highly pleased, for he thus refers to the matter again in the *Monitor* of the 7th ult.:—

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL which is edited by anti-christ or what is the same thing Kalbinios P. Bolman, whose name is the number of the beast has published the programme which Providence is to follow during the years to come. First Dan. 11:45 makes it certain that the Turk is to be driven from Europe. The date

is fixed by the following simple process: Multiply the digits in the number of the verse, 45 and you have the result 20. Multiply 20 by the number of the chapter 11 and you have 220. As there are two figures namely 11 and 45 add 2 to the total and you have 222. Subtract 222 from the number of the beast 666 and the remainder is 444. This is the number of years the Turk is to rule in Constantinople; but as he began to reign there in 1453 he must cease to reign in 1897. So according to Calvin P. Bollman the Turk will be driven out of Europe the year after next. Thanks.

This is a deliberate misrepresentation for the purpose of making us appear ridiculous. Neither the SENTINEL nor any of its editors ever made any such calculation or arrived at any such conclusion. We believe however that Dan. 11:45 applies to the Turkish government, which when driven from Europe will establish itself temporarily at Jerusalem; and this will be one of the closing scenes of earth's history, but we have never made any attempt to fix the year in which this is to occur. Has the *Monitor* a special dispensation or an indulgence from the pope to violate with impunity the eighth (according to Rome's enumeration) commandment?

IN a recent article in the *Suwanee Review*, Mr. B. J. Ramage sums up a discussion of Sunday legislation in these words:—

The more one examines the ground on which American Sunday legislation is based the more irresistible becomes the conclusion that it is a physical and moral rather than a religious ground.

It would be difficult to imagine how Mr. Ramage comes to such a conclusion were it not that he gives a clue to the mental process by which it is reached, thus: "With our theory of government such statutes could have no other basis." His reasoning amounts to this: Sunday statutes exist and are upheld; they cannot be sustained under our form of government on religious grounds, therefore they rest upon civil grounds. But such reasoning proves nothing. It is true that he asserts that the "laws" "simply create a holiday." But this is not the fact. The "laws" of the various States recognize Sunday not as a holiday but as a holy day. Laws setting apart certain days as holidays simply suspend public business but never forbid the carrying on of industrial or mercantile pursuits. Sunday "laws" invariably prohibit labor and business, and generally with such exceptions only as make it certain that the intent of the legislators is to recognize the supposed sacred character of the day. Whenever Sunday is placed upon an equality and only upon an equality with holidays, can it be consistently claimed that the statutes requiring its observance simply create a holiday?

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and is therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single copy, per year, - - - \$1.00.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.