


# AMERICAN SENTINEL



"IF ANY MAN HEAR MY WORDS, AND BELIEVE NOT, I JUDGE HIM NOT."—Jesus Christ.

ALONZO T. JONES,  
EDITOR.

NEW YORK, APRIL 1, 1897.

VOL. 12, No. 13.  
Single Copy. 3 cents.

*The American Sentinel is published in the interests of religious liberty—Christian and Constitutional.*

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.

(Entered at the New York Post-office.)

"THE kingdom of God cometh not with observation," that is, "with outward show."

These are the plain words of the Lord Jesus, whose the kingdom is, who alone knows truly what the kingdom is, who is the rightful king in that kingdom; and who alone rules in the kingdom.

Yet the efforts of the Christian Endeavorers and the National Reformers generally are solely to have "the kingdom of God" come in this nation, altogether with outward show, by outward, worldly, political, means and methods.

They propose to make Christ king and have Him reign on Capitol Hill and in every State and city in the nation. Thus they propose that the kingdom of God shall come in this land, and that the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom.

Thus it is perfectly plain to all who read, that those people do propose to have the kingdom of God come first of all with observation, with outward show. That is to say, while the Lord says that the kingdom of God cometh not with observation or outward show, these people insist that it does come and shall come with observation and outward show. In other words, what the Lord says is not so, they say is so and shall be so.

Isn't it singular that men will attempt to do a thing as Christian, which the plain word of the Author of Christianity repudiates and shows cannot possibly be done as Christian? The profession of Christianity demands loyalty to the principles announced by the Author of Christianity. Disloyalty here is antichristian.

No, no: the kingdom of God cometh not with observation or outward show. But "Behold the kingdom of God IS WITHIN YOU;" and except a man be born

again he cannot see it. For it is written, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

By this word it is again perfectly plain that the only right thing that anybody can do in behalf of the kingdom of God is to persuade men to be born again. For, it matters not how the kingdom of God may come, or when it may come, no man can ever see it for any good, no man can enter into it, unless he is born again.

What sheer fallacy it is then, what a perversion of the right way, for men to form organizations, hold monster conventions, and manipulate politics in cities, States and the nation, to get "Christians" into all the offices in order that the kingdom of God may be set up and that "Christ may reign on Capitol Hill"!

The kingdom of God comes in no such way as that. And any man who looks upon any such thing as that as the kingdom of God will be ruined by it. The kingdom of God, cometh not with observation or outward show. The kingdom of God can never be set up by men. Only He whose right it is to reign can establish his kingdom anywhere.

"The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say, Lo here, or Lo there, For behold the kingdom of God is within you." Unless a man finds the kingdom of God within him, he will never find it outside of him. Any man who does not see the kingdom of God within him will never see the kingdom of God outside of him. And "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

It is therefore conclusive that the only right endeavor that anybody can ever put forth in behalf of the kingdom of God and men's right relation thereto, is to persuade men to be born again. And by the same token it is also conclusive that the efforts of the Christian Endeavorers and other National Reformers to bring by worldly means and political methods, the kingdom of God in city, State and nation, are altogether earthly, vain, unchristian and antichristian.

"The kingdom of God is not meat and drink;" it is

not worldly honors; it is not political offices: it is not mayoralties, governorships, nor presidencies: it is not ecclesiastical combinations controlling the civil power or the civil officers: it is none of all these, nor is it anything of any likeness to all these. It is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." And "Except a man be born again he cannot see" it. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into" it.

"The kingdom of God cometh not with observation." "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

"The kingdom of God is within you." And, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

"The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." And, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

THE "Christian Citizenship" movement is the crusade of this age. This "new crusade," as some call it, is just as wild, visionary, and fanatical as those of the middle ages.—*Martinsburg, Pa., Weekly Herald.*

### The Church as a Light.

THERE can be no more important question for the Church than that of her proper attitude towards the world. This is, of course, a question that must be answered by the Word of God.

From the example of the Church to-day however, it might be concluded that the inspired Word gives no instructions upon this question which apply to the present time. For it is certain that the Church's attitude to-day, as indicated by her efforts to acquire political power and authority, and her hopes for the future in this respect, is not sanctioned by a wisdom higher than her own.

But the Scriptures of divine truth are not silent concerning the duties of the Church and of individual Christians in the midst of their worldly environment to-day. When Christian speakers and writers lament the awful depravity which civilization is unable to hide, and exhort the civil authorities to adopt measures for grappling with the moral emergencies of the times, it is not because all this iniquity was not foreseen and foretold by the Author of holy writ, and instructions given by Him for the guidance of the Church in the most critical hours of moral darkness.

The Scripture likens this period of the reign of sin and evil, to a night. Such indeed it is, with the light of righteousness so nearly obscured as it is by the black shadows of sin. But the Scriptures are full of predictions of a coming day; and even here a light shines upon the pathway of the Christian, in which he is exhorted to walk. "Thy word," says the psalmist, "is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." Ps. 119:105.

The night is not passed by the Church of God in slumber. Watchmen are upon the walls of Zion, to warn

of lurking dangers and to herald the long-looked-for dawn. In the prophecy of Isaiah an occasion comes when the inquiry is made from Zion, "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?" And the answer is returned. "The morning cometh, and also the night,"—the morning of an eternal day for the righteous, and of eternal night for the finally impenitent.

The Apostle Paul exhorts Christians to act as becomes those who have the light of divine revelation. The Church is to know the approach of the coming day. "Ye, brethren," he writes, "are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day: we are not of the night, nor of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep as do others; but let us watch and be sober. For they that sleep, sleep in the night; and they that be drunken are drunken in the night. But let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and for an helmet the hope of salvation."

It is the night of sin, and the drunkenness and revelings of those who are of the night, that we see around us to-day. The terrible depravity that is seen in society at the present time is natural enough to those who are "drunken in the night." It is only such a feature as the reign of carnality may be expected to develop before the night is ended. That night seems now to have reached its darkest hour; but the darkest hour comes just before the dawn.

The Church cannot help the fact that it is night. She cannot turn the night into day. She cannot take possession of the world, and eliminate the sin and evil which have brought night upon it. The divine Word which is her guide, nowhere instructs her to attempt such a thing. But she herself has light—the light of the Word, "that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn" (1 Peter 1:19),—and she is to reflect the light upon the pathway of those in darkness. The divine message now comes to her, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people: but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." Isa. 60:1-3.

This is a glorious privilege. It is one which the Church should eagerly embrace. But what is the Church doing? Is she appalled at the "gross darkness" which to-day covers the people? Then let her not appeal to the arm of flesh in the vain fancy that this darkness can be dispelled by civil enactments; but let her arise and flash forth the divine glory from the throne of God. That, and that alone, can dispel the darkness from the way of those who will turn and heed it.

SAYS the *New York Observer*, of March 4:—

"We have been reading the story of Jonah afresh, and are struck with the great reluctance with which the

heathen seafaring men dropped their transgressing passenger overboard. They rowed hard to bring the vessel to land, hoping to save his life. When their efforts proved futile, they let him go, but only after beseeching the Lord not to lay innocent blood upon them. But these sailors were heathen and superstitious. To-day the Christian minister can toss Jonah overboard nonchalantly, in full sight of a Christian congregation. Meanwhile, the dexterous manipulation arouses a ripple of amusement as perceptible as that which passed over the deep into which the son of Amittai was originally dropped."

And the worst of it is that this modern ecclesiastical throwing overboard of Jonah is expressive of a policy which is not limited to Jonah, but includes all manifestations of the supernatural.

---

### The Coming State Church.

In recent issues of the *Christian Statesman*, an organ of the Church party calling for religious legislation, the editor has been discussing the question of Church union in the United States. He deems such union entirely feasible on lines which he points out, and is hopeful that it may be consummated in the near future. In designating the Church as it will then be he uses the phrase, "united Church of Christ of the United States." This is the first suggestion we have noticed for a name for the coming American State Church.

In pointing out the principles upon which Church unity is to be secured, the *Statesman* observes that the Church must have "one uniform standard of practical morals," and adds that "even conceding that it may be a lower standard for the organically united Church than some portions of the divided Church would have maintained for themselves, the general gain will be incalculable." As no part of the divided Church maintains or ever has maintained any higher standard of morality than the law of God, it will, in this view, be an "incalculable" gain for the Church to adopt a lower standard than this, if thereby her divided elements can become united.

This scheme of Church union also includes "an oath binding to the acceptance of the supreme authority of the Scriptures in matters of discipline as well as doctrine, a high standard of practical godly living linked with a full and faithful formulation of scriptural truth, and the consequent faithful proclamation of the latter together with the faithful enforcement of the former." All of which is, in the *Statesman's* view, quite susceptible of realization.

As regards "heresy" in the Church, we learn that "She has no physical force to meet it, as the nation may meet secession and rebellion against its rightful authority. But she is endowed by her divine Head with government and discipline adequate to such an exigency in her life." It is laid down that "all who rebel against her rightful authority cut themselves off from her communion as schismatics, and are not therefore to be recognized as

any part of the visible Church of Christ. The question is not here whether those who thus resist the rightful authority of the Church may be true Christians or not. In the circumstances of this particular case it is a question of authority and insubordination."

And thus "true Christians" may be cut off as heretics and schismatics because of refusal to submit to the "rightful authority" of the Church. And such individuals may when they become numerous enough, form churches of their own, but they will still be heretics, and no part of the "true Church." It was precisely thus that the "schismatic" Protestant churches, as Rome views them, came into existence. They refused to recognize the "rightful authority" of the Church, as expressed in the decrees of church councils and of popes, and are still counted as heretics, and without the pale of the "true Church."

The *Statesman* says that "with the development of the Romish system this rightful authority of the church through anathemas and intolerance and persecution was dethroned to make way for the despotism of the 'mystery of iniquity' and 'the man of sin.' . . . But in the united Church of Christ of the United States, with principles as different from those of Romanism as light from darkness, rightful authority ought certainly to be able to maintain itself against all schism and ecclesiastical rebellion without any sacrifice of either civil or religious liberty." But it was not "through anathemas and intolerance and persecution" that the Church became what it was before the days of the Reformers, and what, as the papacy, it has since continued to be. The intolerance and persecution were but the manifestation of the change that had already taken place in the Church's character; they were the evil fruit being borne by the evil tree. The tree becomes evil before the evil fruit appears; the Church became corrupt in character before she became intolerant. And this change in her character was nothing else than a change in her principles. It was a change by which human authority was put in the place of the authority of God's Word.

And these principles laid down by the *Statesman* for the "united Church of Christ of the United States" do not differ at all from the principles of the papacy. The papacy professes to act in perfect harmony with the Word of God; and all she asks of Protestants is submission to the "rightful authority" of the "true Church." And as the "rightful authority" of the Church must prevail, it is more satisfactory to believe that in the exercise of this authority she is infallible. Hence the doctrine of papal infallibility,—a doctrine which is certainly a necessity to any system which makes the separation of "heretics" from the Church a question not of their real Christianity as determined by the written Word, but of their submission to Church "authority."

---

A VICTORY for prohibition in the city election at Moundsville, W. Va., March 11, was celebrated by the two Methodist churches in the place by a procession of

the most prominent members, headed by a brass band. The procession sang hymns and offered prayers. "The day is coming," says the *Christian Statesman*, "when such victories celebrated in some such way will be common all over the country."

But such methods of celebration will always have a flavor of politics and paganism rather than of Christianity.

---

### The Supreme Court and the Trusts.

PROBABLY no decision of the United States Supreme Court ever occasioned more agitation in the realm of business in this country than that recently given, known as the Trans-Missouri Freight Association decision, sustaining the validity of the Sherman Anti-Trust law, and applying its restrictions to agreements between railways for the purpose of fixing rates of transportation.

The Anti-Trust law upon which the decision is based specifies the following:—

"Every contract combination in the form of a trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal.

"Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments in the discretion of the court."

The Supreme Court holds that these provisions apply to agreements between railways as above described, and renders the parties thereto liable to the penalties of the law.

The importance of this decision is seemingly of great magnitude. This is evident from the fact that the business of railway transportation is the greatest of all American industries.

It must not be hastily concluded, however, that this decision constitutes a victory of the people over the trusts. Whether the railways will not find some way to evade the decision, remains to be seen. Nor can these railway trusts be properly included among those "combinations in restraint of trade," which have so arbitrarily and unjustly extracted money from the public purse. The rates of railway transportation as fixed by these associations cannot be said to have greatly exceeded the demands of equity. In support of such associations it is pointed out that before their organization, competition between the roads had resulted in an interminable series of "rate wars," which produced such a fluctuation in prices that "a merchant was afraid to order goods to-day for fear a 'cut' in the cost of transportation tomorrow would cheapen the goods and enable a local rival to undersell him." A reversion to this state of things, it is maintained, would be an injury both to the railways and the entire community.

Nevertheless it must be admitted that the principle of independent business standing and of free competition in trade is violated by these railway pools no less certainly than it is by the most oppressive trust. If this pronouncement of the Supreme Court would be construed as forming a precedent for future decisions relative to the legality of methods employed by the trusts, it might properly be regarded as a victory for the interests which stand opposed to trusts. But it remains for the courts to decide how much value, if any, this decision will have in this direction.

---

IS THAT a good law which prohibits as a crime the selling of flowers on the streets, while allowing the free sale of tobacco? Such is the Sunday law of New York City. It is one of the fruits which shows the nature of the tree that bears it.

---

### Ballot and Bullet.—No. 1.

BY H. E. GIDDINGS.

IN the *Twentieth Century Review*, No. 1, page 3, this language appears: "Thus it is that human forces are very nearly equally divided and arrayed against each other whenever the long-suffering honest half can endure abuse no longer, and call a halt for battle either by ballot or by bullet. A Christian cannot use the latter means (the bullet), however much he has been wronged, yet oftentimes he neglects the former (the ballot), however much his *fellows* have been wronged, thereby doing two contrary acts under one professional flag, with the mistaken idea that one whose citizenship is in heaven is at liberty to neglect payment of the peaceable ballot tribute due the 'powers that be' which are 'ordained of God' 'to keep people civil.'"

There are several points here employed which would have been of untold value in this most important of all times had they been treated logically instead of being carelessly thrown together, as in this quotation.

It is stated here that the Christian cannot use the bullet. This is true. The child of God is told first in the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." Christ shows the depth of this principle by saying that hatred in the heart is murder, Matt. 5:21, 22 and 1 John 3:15 and still further in Matt. 5:44, 45: "Love your enemies. bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven."

It is true that the Christian cannot employ any means to kill his fellowmen. Rom. 12:19. "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves . . . for it is written, vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."

Let us put to the test of logic the coupling of this quoted paragraph: The Christian cannot use the bullet, but is in duty bound to use the peaceable ballot.

We will start with the very genius of the ballot.

Why is it in the hands of the people? Because this is a government by the people. The ballot is the badge of sovereignty, the crown of authority with a free people. All the power is in the hands of the people and is expressed in the peaceful-looking piece of paper called the ballot.

Every particle of power ever exercised in the legitimate performance of duty in the various departments of the Government, is derived from the people by consent. This consent is expressed through the ballot.

It will perhaps seem absurd to some that there is any need of stating such a universally-conceded truth in America. So it would be if it were not largely lost sight of in essence by the people and denied in theory by illogical writers.

Many of the governed may not secure what they desire, but by the use of the ballot they consent to the decision of the majority whether it be in harmony with their desires or not. The original idea, in the minds of those noble men to whom we are most indebted for the form of our grand Government, was that all the power of the sovereign nation lay in the people and was furnished by consent to a general fund which would be employed to make every department of government effective. This power is transferred by consent, and the consent is the acceptance of the ballot.

When any person consents to submit the affairs of government to the free ballot and himself uses the ballot he is in honor bound to abide its decision. By that act he consents not only to be a submissive subject but assumes sovereignty and *contracts* to furnish so far as possible the *power* to carry out the expressed will of the people.

Again, he clothes civil officers with authority. Where does the authority originate?—With the people. Can officers exercise any authority or power not given them by those who vote?

When I commission another to act for me and the commission states in what manner he shall act, I am responsible so long as he acts within the limits of the commission. With the ballot men are commissioned to act in fulfillment of the Constitution on pain of impeachment.

The Constitution, as well as the commissioning of men to fulfill it, is but the drawing out of some of the elements in the ballot.

Then all the duties of the various departments of government in any emergency are but the unfolding of the power in the ballot. The entire Government with all its functions is in the ballot from its peaceful folding at the rural precinct through its practical unfolding in the halls of legislation and the courts of justice; and the execution of just decrees, the oath of office, and the booming of the cannon in defense of the whole.



THE spirit of Christianity is never the spirit of intolerance or of compulsion.

## Rome Unmasked in Madagascar.

THE *New York Independent*, of March 25, publishes a letter from the Rev. James Sibree, missionary of the London Missionary Society, setting forth the persecutions to which Protestants in Madagascar are now subjected under the papal regime which ensued upon the subjection of the island by the French. Mr. Sibree's letter is written from Antananarivo, the capital city. He says:—

“The Roman Catholic priests here, who are also Jesuits, have for many years past been angry and chagrined at the progress made by Protestant missions, and at the large number of their adherents. They have had perfect liberty to teach and to propagate their religion—in fact they have often obtained more favors from the former native government, in the way of getting land for their buildings, etc., than have been granted to Protestant missionaries; but they have not been able, up to very lately, to coerce the people to enter their communion. The establishment of the French power in Madagascar has, however, now given them the opportunity they have long desired, of persecuting Protestants; and they are now using it most unscrupulously.

“Not many days after the occupation of Antananarivo by the French forces (Sept. 30, 1895), a proclamation was issued by General Duchesne, assuring the Malagasy of perfect religious liberty; and this was repeated by the late Resident-General, M. Laroche, as well as by General Gallieni, the present Commander-in-Chief and acting Resident-General. But, notwithstanding these excellent and fair-sounding statements, they have in scores of villages, since the proclamation of the state of siege, become almost a dead letter. The military commandants in several districts have become facile instruments in the hands of the Jesuits in terrorizing the people. In several instances our Protestant churches have been seized and mass performed in them; the schools have in many cases been handed over *en masse* to the priests; the congregations have been brow-beaten, threatened and frightened into becoming, nominally, Roman Catholics. In very many cases they have been told by people in authority that if they continue Protestants they will be accounted as rebels. They are told that their English missionaries are enemies of France, and, therefore, all who have anything to do with them will also be reckoned as the enemies of France. Local native governors are told that while there is, of course, religious liberty for the people (!), they, as men in authority, ought to be of the same religion as the French nation; and if they stand fast, they are soon accused of disaffection, and are degraded or fined. The consequence, of course, is that numbers of them, to avert suspicion from themselves, become almost more zealous and unjust than the priests themselves, and use all their influence to coerce the people to leave the religion they have been taught.

“Accusations on the most flimsy pretenses are got up against the best men in some of the districts—pastors, evangelists and others; and they are heavily fined, imprisoned, and some are now loaded with chains, although it is perfectly certain that their Protestantism is their only offense.

“It seems now a settled principle that if the majority

of the people in a village can be brought, by any means whatever—such as those just named—to say that they are Roman Catholics, the church in the village, although built exclusively by and for a Protestant congregation, and always aided by grants from the London Missionary Society, can be taken for Roman Catholic worship, and the Protestants expelled. This has been done, and the priests are hoping by this clever contrivance that numbers of our Protestant churches will pass into their hands. And from what has been said as to the means used to terrorize the people, it will be easily seen how easy it is to get the majority of the people in a village—numbers of whom never attended any place of worship—to profess themselves to be Roman Catholics. In some villages the priest has gone from house to house with two books to write down the people's names, telling them that all written as Roman Catholics in the one will be perfectly safe, while those in the other will be exposed to all sorts of danger and suspicion. Are any words needed to explain what effect such a proceeding must have upon a large number of weak and still very ignorant people? The result has been that in large villages where, until quite lately, there has never been a single Roman Catholic, the whole congregation has been forced to say that they have *'quite voluntarily'* given up Protestantism.

"Things are even worse in the Southern province of Betsileo than here in Imèrina. Such influences have been brought to bear by the Resident there and the priests that almost all the native officers and governors have been obliged to become Catholics, while a few have made a compromise by joining the Norwegian Lutheran Mission, which is not so obnoxious to the authorities as that of the English Protestants. Another severe blow at the London Missionary Society there is the summary order given to almost all the Hova evangelists and teachers (as well as many who have nothing to do with this province) to immediately leave the work, which many of them have been engaged in for years, and to come up here to Imèrina. After only a very few days' notice, from three to five, they were obliged to sell all their property and houses, at considerable loss, and leave their people. None of the Norwegian or Roman Catholic teachers, however, have been disturbed. One English missionary has been twice turned out of his house on the excuse that it was either required for government service, or that the owner dared not let it to an English missionary. Religious liberty is at present unknown in the Betsileo province. Did space permit, every one of the statements given above could be abundantly substantiated by detailed facts and written proofs.

"It may be said, in conclusion, that some French commandants have tried loyally to act uprightly and impartially in religious matters, but many others, as already stated, have willingly or unwillingly become the tools of the Jesuits in their strenuous attempts to terrorize the Protestants into becoming Romanists."

And what Rome is in Madagascar, she is in principle, and at heart, in these United States.

THE Pope continues to feel a deep interest, as he says, in all the people of America, Protestant and Catholic alike. At an audience given March 22, in which he received and expressed himself as much pleased with the

worship of one hundred sailors of the U. S. cruiser *Sau Francisco*, he said:—

"I am pleased to grant an audience to American sailors, as a testimonial of my paternal esteem and affection for the whole American people, who are always dear to my heart and for whom I have never ceased and never shall cease to pray God, who by providential signs does now manifest and in the future will manifest His good will to America even as does His vicar. Continue your voyage. Treasure as a happy souvenir of it this audience. May God guard you amid the storms of the ocean."

### Prohibition vs. Sunday Closing.

RECENTLY a vote on the question of prohibiting liquor saloons was taken in the city of Oakland, Cal., the result being that prohibition was defeated by quite a decisive majority. An analysis of the vote, however, develops the interesting fact that prohibition would have won the day had it received the support of the vote in favor of Sunday closing. Upon this point an Oakland journal comments as follows:—

"In this election it has been demonstrated again, as it was in previous movements, that Sunday closing of saloons is not a temperance issue. The advocates of Sunday closing persistently claimed before the election that had the issue been for Sunday closing it could be carried; and now they are equally sure that it could have been carried, while the true temperance issue of closing saloons all the time was defeated. Thus they virtually concede that it was the Sunday-closing element that defeated the true temperance proposition. A committee of ladies canvassed the city before the election, and reported that over 5,000 voters were pledged to vote in favor of the proposition to close all the time; but the count of votes after the election shows that at least 1,300 of them either voted against closing or did not vote on that proposition at all.

"The campaign was carried on quite enthusiastically, yet with a stultifying reluctance expressed by every prominent speaker in the sentiment, *'This fight was forced upon us.'* They all admitted that they were prepared for a Sunday-closing campaign, and were chagrined at being obliged to contend for closing up the evil places all the time. From first to last they held up the dire results of the open saloon, yet were unsparing in their censure of the men whom they charged with having *forced* them to contend for its entire abolition. Bad as the saloon was represented to be, these professed temperance advocates emphasized their regret that the issue had not been one of compromise with the evil thing by allowing it to operate six days in the week. Thus they stultified their otherwise able efforts from beginning to end.

"The *Tribune*, which gave liberal support to the temperance cause, sums up the situation in a very logical manner, from which we take the following:—

"The fight was by no means an equal one. The liquor dealers are a strong and active body of men and have been organized for years. They have studied the art of politics and are familiar with all its methods.

The church people, on the other hand, did not organize their vote. Less than two weeks ago the matter of entirely closing the saloons was forced upon them. For four years, sustained part of the time by a sabbath-closing association of which the active Dr. Rader was the head, they have made an aggressive campaign in favor of Sunday closing. Toward this end they had labored and felt certain of success. They had thoroughly canvassed the city and a large majority were in favor of closing the open saloons on the sabbath. All the church people and the Christian Endeavorers, who represent a large body of the voters, are confident that Sunday closing would have carried by a big majority.

“Who, then, we ask, is responsible for the defeat of true temperance in Oakland?—Clearly it is the men who favor *Sunday-closing* of saloons, and of every other place of business as soon as they can stir up the intolerant sentiment to that extent. They have again demonstrated that their anti-saloon cry in the past was simply using the saloon as a fulcrum over which they could rest their lever for prying enforced Sunday observance into public favor. Our estimate of the Sunday-closing movement has been again verified, and we trust that the people who have been deceived by it heretofore will hereafter be able to view it in its true light.”

---

### A Christian Government.

BY M. E. KELLOGG.

A NOTE in the *Union Signal*, organ of the W. C. T. U., says that “labor leaders, as well as our mission workers, recognize that the great stumbling block in the way of temperance reform in heathen lands, as well as in our own, is the attitude of Christian governments toward the liquor traffic.”

What is that attitude? Quite generally it is an attitude of favor and protection. Indeed, this is what the *Signal* complains of. But is such a course Christian? Is it in harmony with the teachings of Christ and the general tenor of the Scriptures?—No, indeed, it is diametrically opposed to Christianity. Drunkenness is one of the works of the flesh, and those who are devoted to it “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” The heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, inherit the kingdom; but drunkards are disqualified by spiritual law from the inheritance. The kingdoms of this world receive drunkards into the highest offices, and also make laws regulating—not preventing—the sale of liquor.

Another note in the same paper refers to “the very stronghold of the rum power—the government itself.” The government the stronghold of the rum power, and still a Christian government! When the course pursued by governments in this, as in many other things, is so contrary to Christianity, how can anyone have the effrontery to call them Christian governments? Can a man who dabbles in the liquor traffic be a Christian?—No, indeed. Neither can a government which does the same be a Christian government.

National Reformers, and the W. C. T. U., which affiliates with them, take a special delight in speaking of our

Government as though it were a person, had a conscience, and must be regarded as Christian or unchristian according to its public acts in reference to the Christian religion. If this were so, the Government should be judged Christian or unchristian by the same rule by which a man is judged, that is, its works.

Measured by this rule, can it be said that governments are Christian governments, whose actions in regard to a hundred things, including temperance, are so unchristian,—which are really great corporations for selfish purposes, which go to war for selfish ends, and which discriminate in every possible way against the people of other countries for the same selfish purpose? The idea is preposterous.

A government may through its representatives make a profession of religion; yes, of the Christian religion. But unless it were better than any existing government, it would in reality be a better representation of a slightly convicted sinner, or a backslidden professor, than it would be of a real Christian. When a government shall exist in the world for Christian purposes and Christian ends; not seeking its own but the good of others; manifesting in government affairs the same spirit that a Christian is required to manifest in his private business: which, when it is reviled, will not revile again; when it is smitten by some other nation on one government cheek, will turn the other also,—then we will “begin with more patience to the plea that there may be such a thing as a Christian government. But until that time we shall deny that such a thing as a Christian government exists.

Christianity has enough to bear from unchristian Christians, without its being compelled to sustain the shame of Christian governments, so-called, by unthinking religious enthusiasts who forget that nations, as well as men, may steal the livery of the court of heaven that they may better serve self and Satan.

---

A WRITER in the March number of *The Defender*, organ of the New England Sabbath Protective League, sees in the desecration of Sunday, the coming enslavement of all labor. He says:—

“If men must work that the proprietors of Sunday newspapers, the owners of railroads, the managers of places of amusement, liquor sellers, etc., may get rich, what is to prevent the early and complete enslavement of all labor? As sure as the sun rises in the heavens from day to day, one result of the fearful sweeping away of the anchorage of Sunday sanctity and rest now witnessed will be the compulsory labor of many helpless toilers on Sunday, when the clouds of commercial depression are again lifted.”

Nevertheless it is a fact that the hours of labor per day for most employes are much shorter now than they were a generation in the past, and the tendency of the times under the influence of the labor organizations, is toward a still further shortening of the period of daily toil. This is undeniably true, and it is a very distorted view of the situation which fails to recognize it.

## Notes of the Week.

BY JAS. T. RINGGOLD.

PROF. HUXLEY, in his address at the opening of the Johns Hopkins University some years ago, paraphrased the language of one greater than himself when he observed, "It is undoubtedly true that man shall not live by bread alone, but by ideas." It is equally true that by ideas shall man also perish. The right idea—the words that proceeded out of the mouth of the Son of man—is the salvation of the race; the wrong idea, the disregard of Him and of His teachings, is our damnation here and hereafter. Now, words are nothing in themselves. Their only value is as a means of expressing and *implying* ideas, and if, through implication, the language used by an individual suggests a wrong idea to others, it is no reason for passing it without comment, that the person himself might hesitate to put the idea more explicitly.

\* \* \*

HERE is Mr. McKinley, for instance, in his inaugural address, solemnly pledging himself to keep his "oath of office" in language which, by very strong implication, refers his official responsibility as President of the United States to Deity, instead of to the American people, who elected him to that exalted position. This is very objectionable. It is the old idea of "divine right." Kings and queens and emperors rule "by the grace of God," or, at any rate, claim that they do so in their public acts and on their coins. But the President of the United States rules by the grace of the people thereof. Mr. McKinley ought to know that his inaugural oath adds nothing whatever to the obligation which he owes to the citizens, which is that he shall faithfully execute the laws of their making. He ought to know that his punishment for malfeasance or misfeasance, if he should do anything to deserve it, will be meted out to him without the slightest reference to the question of whether or not such an oath was taken by him. He ought to know that the pledge of his address should be addressed to the people who made the President, and not to Deity, who made the man. But never was a greater blunder made than that of the poet when he said:—

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,  
The eternal years of God are hers;  
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,  
And dies amidst her worshippers."

In good growth, the vitality of error, its ability to stand what are apparently deadly wounds over and over again, is one of its most remarkable and discouraging characteristics. That old love of the union of Church and State, that old notion of something sacred about government—as purely a human institution or machine as a locomotive—repudiated and denounced by the Master nearly two thousand years ago, still lurks in men's minds, and ever and anon it finds vent in action or utterance. Mr.

McKinley talks of himself as if he were a specially appointed agent of the Creator, filling the Presidency as His representative; and the fiery young Emperor of Germany talks in the same way publicly about himself as ruler of the Fatherlands.

\* \* \*

IN a neighboring city not long ago, a case arose which strikingly illustrated the inevitable unfairness and injustice of State recognition of religion. In some of the States the appropriation of public money by the legislature or a municipality for the support of sectarian institutions is strictly prohibited by the constitution. But this occurrence happened in a State not blessed with such protection for its people. A little Jewish girl was arrested for peddling, and committed to the custody of a corporation whose affairs are conducted by the partisans of a certain form of Protestant faith, though it is professedly "non-sectarian." *Habeas corpus* proceedings were taken to get the child before a court. The testimony of the "matron" was the feature of the case which is pertinent here. This good lady averred in the most positive manner, again and again, that there was nothing "sectarian" about the institution with which she was connected. It came out, however, on cross-examination, that "prayers" were "held" therein every morning under the auspices and direction of a minister of a particular denomination of Christians; that daily instruction was given in the tenets of the same denomination; that "services" were conducted by ministers of the same every Sunday; that attendance at prayers, and instructions, and at Sunday worship was compulsory upon all inmates of the "Home;" that a Hebrew rabbi had certainly called there some years ago, but none other before or since that solitary visitor appeared had been seen within the building; that the witness "rather thought" a Catholic priest had been in her parlor on one occasion, though when this happened, or what he was doing there, she could not, for the life of her, remember; and finally, that the young girl in the case had been taken in hand as soon as she arrived, and the work of weaning her away from the religion of her fathers and making a proselyte of her had been begun at once.

\* \* \*

THE rank injustice of all this, in view of the fact that the city in which the evidence was brought out as above stated, annually appropriates a large sum of money to the institution where the girl was housed, and that a very considerable portion of this money comes directly out of the pockets of thousands of Hebrew taxpayers who are among the worthiest of the inhabitants—the cruel wrong of this whole proceeding needs no elucidation. There are no people in the world, professedly religious, who care less about proselyting than the Hebrews. On the other hand there are certainly none who are more tenacious of their own faith or more earnestly desirous that their children should ask for the old paths of



their ancestry and walk in them. It is nothing less than a high-handed outrage, to take their money and use it as a missionary fund, to pay people to turn their little ones from the faith of their race.

\* \* \*

AND yet, this same wrong must inevitably be worked on Jews, as well as others, wherever the State undertakes to apportion the people's money among charitable institutions not absolutely and exclusively under its own control. All such establishments are sure to be run on the lines of some particular religious cult. The people in charge of them are always full of zeal, and pretty generally satisfied that their way is not only a right way, but that it is *the only* right way. The expediency, nay, the duty, of persuading and teaching others to go that way is burned into the very core of their hearts and minds. The temptation to make "converts" among the young and impressible is particularly strong. It is all right enough for religious ardor to manifest itself as long as its possessors pay out of their own pockets as they go. But it is not right that Hebrew money should be used by the State to make even nominal Christians out of Hebrew children, nor that Catholic money should be used by the State for the "conversion" of Catholic into Protestant youth nor *vice versa*. Some day the people everywhere may be aroused to the evil of this practice, and then the constitutions of all the States will put a stop to it for ever.

\* \* \*

It now appears that, after all, little Greece has been for a long time coveting Crete for herself, and not merely loving the insurgents because, like her own people, they "profess and call themselves Christians," as the Episcopalian prayer-book says. It has been discovered that the Greek Admiral perfidiously failed to communicate the offer which the Powers made through him to the Cretans to guarantee them a practical autonomy, if they would lay down their arms. And one Mr. Stillman, who was United States Consul at Canea during the insurrection on the island which lasted from 1866 to 1869, has just written a letter, in which he declares that when the natives were on the very eve of final success, in the latter year a Greek officer landed without any objection on the part of the Turks, obtained from the confiding rebels the command of their entire force, and immediately surrendered to the enemy without firing a shot! The recent treachery, added to the memory of that historic betrayal of trust, is not likely to strengthen the position of Greece before the civilized world.

\* \* \*

THE fact is that nations, like men, are prone in these days of degeneration, to the blasphemous use of Christianity's name as a portion of their capital or stock in trade—a means of worldly advancement and aggrandizement, like money, a reputation for skill in some special art, or aptitude for some particular pursuit, or line of

activity. Perhaps it is inevitable that this should be the case. Christianity, first of all, vindicates its infallible efficacy as the guide and producer of good conduct. "See how these Christians love one another," exclaim the yet unregenerate pagans, And so, in time, many come to proclaim themselves Christians, who have never really felt its magic touch on heart or mind, because the very name is associated with goodness and desert, and commands general confidence, not only among genuine Christians, but among those who doubt the gospel story. Something of this disposition to trade on the sacred name of our religion seems to have been manifested by the Greek government, if not by the people. It is probable that the attempt will fail. It ought to fail as ought every undertaking, in business or professional life, to "use the Church for a feeder."

\* \* \*

BISHOP NEWMAN, whose name has been quite frequently in the papers of late, was formerly a pastor of the Congregational Church, and was an intimate friend of General Grant. Some years ago the bishop—then a Congregational minister—was called upon to deliver a funeral sermon over the body of a distinguished and wealthy Californian's son. The young man was about eighteen when he died. He had been for some time a student at a prominent university in Germany. The bishop pronounced a glowing panegyric upon him. He credited the youth with all the virtues known to humanity, and all the brilliant qualities that mortal man could possibly possess. He waxed more and more enthusiastic and eloquent as he went on, till humanity seemed to him all too small for the mind and soul of that dead boy. And, so, he reached a height of imagination which enabled him to do what he considered justice to his subject. He actually made the claim that there was no historical parallel to the spectacle of that young man sitting under his professors, except the famous interview between a certain Child and his elders in the temple! It was soon after this marvelous oratorical flight that the Rev. Dr. Newman became a Methodist and a bishop almost simultaneously. The rich Californian's family, it is said, still remember him gratefully for his comparison of their boy to the Founder of Christianity.

\* \* \*

CANADA wanted "reciprocity" with the United States and sent two "commissioners" to Washington a short while ago to talk the matter over. According to the dispatches her position was that her agricultural products should be admitted free, in return for certain concessions on her part in favor of the products of American factories. It is stated that the commissioners were explicitly assured that the new tariff bill would provide for the "protection" of the farmers of the United States, as well as for that of the manufacturers.

\* \* \*

WITHOUT undertaking to deal with the profounder

problems of free trade and protection, the proposition may be safely laid down that the less the United States has to do with Canada in any way the better it will be for the United States, if for no other reason because religion, which every right-minded American citizen is anxious to keep out of our politics as far as possible—both for the sake of politics and for the sake of religion, be it understood—this religion is the very key-note of Canadian politics, and for a certain reason, cannot be eliminated therefrom without some drastic measure, which will not, in the nature of things, be taken for many years, if, indeed, it ever will be taken.

\* \*

THIS reason is, that when France was compelled to cede Canada to England, she stipulated in the treaty of cession that the rights and properties of the Catholic Church, as they existed at the time, should never be disturbed. It is a settled principle of what is called "International Law" that sovereign nations will disregard treaty stipulations whenever, in their judgment, their own interests require that they should do so. The only remedy the other parties to the treaty have, is to thrash the violator into a different opinion on this point. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt that England will repudiate her obligations in this regard, should she deem it advisable, in any emergency. But, meantime, there exists in Canada an established church, supported by civil taxation, active at all times in all political movements, now controlling, now influencing, now strenuously opposing governmental action, ordering voters as if they were horses to go in this direction or that, to stop, to move, to back, at its own sweet will.

\* \*

BETWEEN a country thus biased in its public course—and whether the bias is for good or for evil is no matter to us—and this free United States of ours, there is a great gulf fixed. The traces of the union of Church and State still left among us are enough for us to fight. Haply, we may never root them out of our institutions, but, at any rate, we want just as little as possible to do with a country wherein religion is a recognized factor in political life, which nobody seems seriously disposed to eliminate.

▶ ◆ ◀ ◀

THE *Christian Statesman* of March 20 makes this reference to the general "celebration" in Washington, D. C., the evening of the inauguration ball:—

"A number of visitors, whose accounts are now being published, tell of terrible scenes of dissipation in many parts of the city. . . . Hotels fitted up extra bar-rooms, and doubled and more than doubled their force of bartenders. And as the night wore on, under cover of its darkness the drunken and licentious orgies were of the most infamous character. A number of congressmen were among the worst of those who made the night hideous with their shameful rowdyism. Such occasions prove the depth of our corruption as a nation. How

much need is there to throw the salt of Christianity into the polluted mass!"

Why, we thought from the *Statesman's* standpoint, indicated by repeated assertions, that this nation is a "Christian nation," and has been so for a long time, at least since the Supreme Court decision to that effect in 1892. Does the *Statesman* mean that it is a corrupt Christian nation, so polluted that it urgently needs the "salt" of Christianity to counteract the process of decay? What kind of "Christianity" is it that needs to be sprinkled with the "salt" of Christianity?

The Scripture says that Christians are the "salt of the earth." Matt. 5:13. And the Scripture is true. As salt is sprinkled in a dish of food—a minute quantity in comparison with the mass that is seasoned—so is Christianity in the earth and in the nation. It is but a sprinkling among the people.

### Is She the Friend of Temperance?

THE *Union Signal* of March 25 makes the observation that "the Catholic church and the archdiocese of Boston, by the voice of the clergy, has announced itself the uncompromising friend of temperance." The evidence of this seems to be that "one hundred and seventy priests, headed by the venerable Archbishop Williams, was sent to the legislature of Massachusetts asking that such laws be enacted as will prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in any public park within the commonwealth."

"It is," says the *Signal*, "declared by those who know the animus of the movement that the great underlying purpose which these promoters of temperance desire to accentuate by every possible and honorable means in their power, is to manifest the attitude of the Catholic clergy on the liquor question in general, and to disabuse the minds of those who have misunderstood the spirit of the church on this matter."

We are as willing as any others to believe that the Catholic church is the "uncompromising friend of temperance," if such a belief can be based upon good evidence. But the evidence which comes to our view does not point that way. The decree promulgated on the subject by the American Catholic bishops at their last session does not forbid communicants from engaging in the liquor traffic, but warns them to "consider seriously the many and great dangers and occasions for sin with which their business is surrounded," and provides that "Should they not abandon the traffic, they must do all in their power to remove the occasion of sin from themselves as well as from selling liquor to minors, or to those who they see will abuse it." They are to "keep their shops closed on Sundays, and at no time allow on their premises the use of filthy or profane language," etc. Thus they are to be careful not to bring "the cause of religion" "into dishonor."

The saloon business in itself is not therefore viewed by

Catholic authorities as being a dishonor to their religion.

And again: If the church is so firmly set against intemperance, what is the significance of the following among the Catholic "regulations for Lent:" "Those who avail themselves of this Indult are not allowed to use flesh meat and fish at the same meal, and they are earnestly exhorted to perform some other act of mortification, such as abstinence from intoxicating liquors." It is our belief that from the standpoint of temperance, "mortification" is properly connected with indulgence in intoxicating liquors, rather than with abstinence from their use.



A CALL has been issued for a convention of the national "Good Citizen's Association," to meet in Nashville, Tenn., May 18. The call is signed by Neal Dow, Josiah Strong, George C. Lorimer, Theo. L. Cuyler, and other men of religious and political prominence, and is issued to "all lovers of liberty, prosperity, truth, righteousness, and good government." Evidently the convention should be very largely attended.



### The Fly in the Ointment.

THE following from the *Bible Echo*, Melbourne, Australia, touches upon a condition of things which has its parallel in public affairs in the United States:—

"Friday, February 5, a deputation, said to have included 'gentlemen of all shades of religious and political opinion,' waited on Cardinal Moran to request him to allow himself to be nominated as a candidate to the Federal Convention. In response the cardinal read a lengthy reply, previously prepared for the occasion, in which he signified his willingness to comply with the 'very flattering invitation.' After calling attention to the question of a constitution for the proposed Australian Commonwealth, almost the first thing in this reply the cardinal says:—

"I would wish to see inserted in the preamble to the Constitution some such clause as the following: 'Religion is the basis of our Australian Commonwealth and of its laws; and in accordance with the spirit of religion, genuine liberty of conscience is the birthright of every Australian citizen, and full and free exercise of religious worship, so far as may be consistent with public order and public morality, shall be accorded to all.'"—*Melbourne Age*, Feb. 6th, 1897.

"If men would but look beneath the surface, they could see in this proposed preamble a proposition for taking a first and long step in the backward direction. It is so worded that many doubtless will not see in it what is really there. On the face of it it may look like a very innocent, harmless, and even laudable affair. But it contains a 'dead fly' which spoils the otherwise good ointment. It declares for 'genuine liberty of conscience' and 'full and free exercise of worship so far as may be consistent with public order and public morality.' But that spoils it all. That puts liberty of conscience and freedom of worship on a variable and treacherous founda-

tion. It makes them the servants of the whims and the caprice of men. It jeopardizes their very existence at the outset.

"Public order' in Roman Catholic countries may require that every man shall uncover his head while the 'host' or the 'crucifix' is being carried by in procession. 'Public morality' even in Australia may demand that all shall observe Sunday as the Sabbath, while God says the seventh day shall be thus observed. Public order and public morality are often at low ebb and of very inferior quality. They are not the standard of order and morality for the true follower of Christ. He looks to God and His word, and not to the public, for directions in determining what are his duties and limits in religious matters, and he is bound to follow what God says, regardless of what the public may do, say, or think. Therefore we say that no man who knows the history of the past, and who desires to see true liberty of conscience preserved inviolable to the people of these colonies, can afford to consent to such a preamble as the one above proposed, being affixed to any constitution of any colony or commonwealth.

"Cardinal Moran is not the first cardinal who has had the ability by the adroit use and manipulation of language to nullify a good definition of religious liberty by a word or phrase. Cardinal Gibbons, of the United States, says:—

"A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshiping God according to the dictates of a *right* conscience.'—*Faith of Our Fathers*, page 264.

"But who is to say when a man's conscience is 'right'?" With the Catholics a man's conscience is right only when it tells him to be a Catholic, and with the Wesleyans only when it tells him to be a Wesleyan, and so on. According to this, a man in a Catholic country would enjoy religious liberty when he possessed the right to worship according to the rules and regulations of the Catholic Church.

"Here again is seen the 'saving clause' which nullifies the otherwise good statement, and in the twinkling of an eye changes the good into positive evil. Let none be deceived. The Papacy never has declared, and the Papacy never will declare, for the right of the individual to worship God according to the dictates of *his own conscience*. This would destroy the whole papal system at a stroke. It will never do it."



### An Invasion of the Liberty of the Press.

— *New York Herald*, March 22.

THE freak epidemic which has so unaccountably broken out in a number of legislatures throughout the country within a few months has brought forth nothing more ultra or uncalled for than the following bill, introduced by Senator Ellsworth at Albany:—

"No person, firm, partnership, corporation, or voluntary association shall print or publish in any newspaper, periodical, magazine, pamphlet or book, any portrait or alleged portrait of any person or individual living in this State without first having obtained his or her written consent to such printing or publication.

"The printing or publishing of the portrait or alleged

portrait of such person or individual without such consent in writing shall be a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine not less than \$1,000 and by imprisonment for not less than one year.

"This act shall take effect immediately."

This, it will be noted, is a sweeping, indiscriminate prohibition of any pictorial representation of any person in any publication without the written consent of such person. The prohibition is not restricted to private individuals; it applies equally to all public officials and public characters. It is not limited to newspapers; it extends to all classes of publications—weekly papers, monthly magazines, pamphlets and books. The penalty prescribed is as ultra and unheard of as the character of the bill. The minimum is a fine of not less than one thousand dollars in addition to imprisonment of not less than a year.

The reason or pretext offered in justification of this amazing measure is that the printing of personal portraits has been carried by certain papers to the extreme of abuse in violation of private rights. No reputable journal will defend or excuse such abuse or ask license to practice it. None will object to any well-aimed legislation to prevent or punish it. If the Ellsworth bill were of that character there would be no objection to its enactment. But so sweeping is it in scope and so tyrannical in penalty that the evil it would work would be infinitely greater than the abuse at which it is so wildly aimed. It is nothing short of an unbridled raid upon the entire illustrated press of the State and a plain violation of that principle embedded in the Constitution that "no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press."

Its intent is, and its effect would be, not discriminate regulation, but indiscriminate prohibition. It would prohibit the publication without written consent of a picture of a candidate for the presidency of the United States, if living in New York, for the governorship or for any other public office in this State. Imagine a law prohibiting the publication of a biography or the personal record, good or bad, of any candidate for official station. Such a man is a public character. The people want to know, and have a right to know, who he is and what he is, and what he looks like. It is not only the constitutional right, but also the function of the press to supply this want. To prohibit pictorial representation in such case would be as clearly beyond the power of the legislature as to prohibit any personal description or comment without written consent.

The constitutional objection to the anti-cartoon feature of the bill is not less obvious, and is even more forcible, since this is aimed at one of the most potent and legitimate journalistic agencies of modern times. The use of satire and humor as moral forces is older even than the satires of Horace or the comedies of Aristophanes. They have figured conspicuously in the literature of every country and every age as lampoons of the oibles and follies, the wrongs and abuses of the times.

The cartoon is but pictured satire and humor and has lent to the modern press which has employed it, a power for public good often surpassing that wielded by the pen.

Pictorial comment on men, measures and issues commanding public attention is, and always has been, as legitimate and secure against unwarranted legislative interference as written criticism. It is a guaranteed right of the freedom of the press. For any abuse of that right a stringent libel law affords an ample remedy. But to declare that no public character shall be cartooned without his written consent would be equivalent to declaring that no public character shall be criticised without his written consent. It would be an invasion of the liberty of the press which popular sentiment would not countenance, the Constitution warrant nor the courts uphold.

IF the courts had not shown so much readiness to defend measures which have the sanction neither of justice nor reason, there would not be so much "freak legislation" undertaken by our legislators.

### That Sunday Bill Again.

THE following Sunday-rest bill has been introduced in Congress by Mr. McMillan, in the Senate, and by Mr. Harmer, in the House:—

#### " A B I L L

"To further protect the first day of the week as a day of  
"rest in the District of Columbia.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall not be lawful for any person to keep open any place of business or maintain a stand for the sale of any article or articles of profit during Sunday, excepting vendors of books or newspapers, and apothecaries for the dispensing of medicines, and undertakers for the purpose of providing for the dead, or others for the purposes of charity or necessity; nor shall any public playing of football or baseball or any other kind of playing, sports, pastimes, or diversions, disturbing the peace and quiet of the day, be practiced by any person or persons within the District of Columbia on Sunday; nor shall any building operations or work upon railroad construction be lawful upon said day; and for any violation of this Act the person offending shall, for each offense, be liable to a fine of not less than five dollars nor more than fifty dollars, and in the case of corporations there shall be a like fine for every person employed in violation of this Act laid upon the corporation offending.

"SECTION 2. That it shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for labor on the first day of the week that the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as a day of rest, and that the labor complained of was done in such a manner as not to interrupt or disturb other persons in observing the first day of the week as a day of rest. This Act shall not be construed to prevent the sale of refreshments other than malt or spirituous

liquors, or to prevent the sale of malt and spirituous liquors as now provided for by law, or tobacco, cigars, railroad and steamboat tickets, or the collection and delivery of baggage."

It cannot be pretended that this is merely a "civil Sunday" bill, designed to release the laboring classes from the bondage of Sunday toil. Washington is not a city in which a case can be made out for a Sunday bill upon this ground. The bill is plainly religious in character. Any doubt upon this point would be removed by observing that the bill prohibits everything that would disturb "the peace and quiet of the day." Rest for the laboring men or for any others, possibly excepting invalids, is not dependent upon "the peace and quiet" of the day, so far as these would be affected by the pursuit of ordinary occupations and pleasures.

The bill asks Congress to legislate to uphold the Church dogma of Sunday sacredness,—to recognize Sunday as the weekly Sabbath. That is its real intent, and if this was plainly stated in its title, it would not in the least change its character.

THE *Boston Post* makes note in the following of the insufficiency of legislation to secure what is sought by the advocates of compulsory Sunday rest:—

"Without entering upon a discussion of the question whether it is possible to regulate by law the conduct of citizens on Sunday further than it is now regulated, the broader question forces itself upon consideration, whether the freest liberty of the individual does not assure the best and wisest observance of Sunday. The Sabbath, by the command delivered to Moses,—and which on the highest authority was 'made for man,'—is essentially a day of rest. Unnecessary labor is forbidden, in order that the opportunity for rest may not be interfered with. But rest means one thing for some men and altogether another thing for others.

"There is the consideration, of course, of the cultivation of man's spiritual nature. The Sabbath pause in secular occupation has from the first been held to be properly devoted to this purpose. It is the day on which men are free to give thought to things above the sordid occupation of bread winning. But can this be aided by law? The utmost that can be accomplished by authority is to secure to those who are spiritually disposed the free enjoyment of the opportunity afforded by the day of rest, undisturbed by the interference of others.

"This the laws undertake to do. And when this is done, all the rest is the work of individual effort,—the rendering attractive of church services, the collection of children into Sunday schools, the inspiration of higher thoughts by visitation and ministrations among the lowly."

And it is pertinent to add that "the free enjoyment of the opportunity afforded by the day of rest, undisturbed by the interference of others," is secured by the laws against disturbing religious meetings, independently of any special legislation for Sunday. It is every man's privilege to rest on Sunday and worship on that day if he chooses, and also to worship at any other time that

he may choose; for worship should certainly not be confined to one day in the week. And in this he will be protected from disturbance, whether at the Sunday morning service or at the Wednesday evening prayer-meeting. One law covers both occasions, and it is just as reasonable that a law should be framed especially for the prayer-meeting, as that one should be framed especially for worship on Sunday.

The Christian will worship God on all days and keep the rest day He has instituted, independently of human ordinances or regulations; and the person who will not do this is not a Christian, and cannot be made such by the passage of any law.

WHAT would seem to be one of the most puzzling questions developed within recent times, is that of the significance of the phrase "entering politics" or other equivalent expressions. During the Presidential campaign the preachers in hundreds of pulpits all over the land were preaching politics with all their power, yet we were assured that they had not gone into politics. A minister may exhort his congregation to a certain course of political action, even instructing them how to cast their vote, and yet keep, in his own view at least, outside of politics. The point was well illustrated by this statement made by Cardinal Moran, in accepting an invitation to be nominated as a member of the forthcoming Australian Convention:—

"It is not my intention on the present occasion, or at any future time, to enter the arena of politics."

Upon this an exchange remarks:—

"This is indeed a queer statement for a man to make who has just signified his intention of accepting a nomination to a political position if offered him. A man might as well talk of going to war and not entering the army, of going into a house and not entering it, or of baking and selling bread and not entering the bakers' trade, as to talk of standing for an election by the people to a position in civil government and not entering politics. To declare otherwise is to trifle with language and stultify reason. This statement, however, may serve to explain how some men can demand religious legislation and yet assert that Church and State are not thereby united; and how they can advocate religious intolerance and oppression and at the same time declare they are not in favor of religious persecution."

A BILL was introduced in the Michigan legislature, March 4, "To prohibit the opening or keeping open of photographic galleries or studios on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, for the purpose of carrying on or engaging in the art or calling of photography, or in any work pertaining to the art or calling of a photographer on said first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." The bill exempts "persons who conscientiously believe the seventh day of the week should be observed as the Sabbath, and who actually refrain from secular business on that day."

Inasmuch as this State already has a statute forbidding secular business on the first day of the week, this proposed legislation seems superfluous from any standpoint that can be taken. And if it is contended that no law of the State now covers the business of photography, the bill is from this view open to the charge of being class legislation, which has recently defeated certain Sunday bills in other States.

Above and beyond these considerations, of course, is the great fact that this and all other human sabbath laws interfere with the Creator's ordinance of Sabbath observance, and therefore can have no binding force upon any individual.

A HEARING was given March 16 by a joint committee of the Senate and House of Connecticut, on the Sunday bill recently introduced in the legislature of that State. This bill was drawn up by a committee of Congregational ministers of Connecticut, and greatly widens the application and increases the penalty of the existing law. At the hearing a number of Congregational preachers appeared and championed the measure, and two seventh-day observers and a lawyer spoke against it. The latter said that the history of religious legislation in the State was: "First, 'You must go to *my* church, or I will imprison you, or hang you, or banish you.' When that had grown unpopular, it was: 'You must go to *some* church, or I will imprison you or fine you.' And now, it is: 'If you don't go to some church, you shan't go anywhere else or do anything else.'" It was also shown by the opposition that the power of State legislatures could not do more than convert one half of a man, and only the outside half at that; and thus pharisees and hypocrites could be made to corrupt and curse the church, but no true Christians.

The impression of those present at the hearing was that the bill would not be favorably reported.

THE success of Satolli as papal ablegate to the United States, has encouraged the pope to try the same plan for the settlement of the church difficulties in Canada. Mgr. Del Val has been charged with the task, and has been invested with the fullest ecclesiastical powers, even to the extent of deposing bishops who may refuse to accept his decisions. It is learned that the forty-five Catholic members of the Senate and Commons, including M. Laurier and all the Catholic members of the government, signed a petition to the pope, asking him to send a delegate to settle the Manitoba school question, thus binding themselves to abide by his decision. A prominent Catholic churchman in London, Ont., which city the papal delegate has lately visited, states that Mgr. Del Val will ascertain just how much concession to the Catholics premier Greenway is willing to make, and that he will state to the premier what is the exact, irreducible minimum of the demands of the Church. He hopes that the maximum of the government's concessions will so nearly tally with

the minimum of the Church's demands, that a basis will be established for a settlement of the issues between Church and State.

PROBABLY no great event of history ever had more causes assigned for it than the fall of the empire of Rome. The latest of these, and probably the most unique, is given in an article published in the *New York Journal* of March 28, in defense of Sunday, by the pastor of St. Luke's Episcopal church, Brooklyn. "When Cicero and Cataline and their compeers," he says, "came to distrust the general religious doctrines, Rome began to totter. A country run without God will sooner or later be run to destruction."

In other words, the "general religious doctrines," even be they such as prevailed in the empire of Rome, must be profoundly revered as the first essential toward the successful running of the country. It must not be run "without god," though the god recognized in its affairs may be the embodiment of no more truth, right, and justice than were the gods of Rome. By this doctrine Sunday observance is easily sustained as essential to the preservation of the Government; and it requires some such doctrine as this to afford Sunday the needed support.

THE question whether this shall become a full sectarian nation or not, must be answered by courageous statesmanship, or in blood and tears. It must be answered speedily.—*Martinsburg, Pa., Weekly Herald.*

#### TO OUR PATRONS:

1. Write names plainly.
2. Remit by P. O. Money Order, or Express Order, or by Bank Draft on New York. Personal checks are not desired.
3. Make all Orders and Drafts payable to Pacific Press Publishing Co., not to the editor or any other individual.
4. We will receive Postage Stamp in small quantities and any kind of good money. Defaced coins will not be taken. If paper money or coin is sent, register the letter.



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

Published Weekly by Pacific Press Publishing Co.

ORGAN OF THE  
International Religious Liberty Association.

Single Copy,	Per Year,	-	-	-	-	\$1.00.
"	"	Six months,	-	-	-	.50.
"	"	Three "	-	-	-	.25.

ADDRESS. AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
39 Bond Street, New York



# The Stomach: Its Disorders and How to Cure Them.

By J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE BATTLE CREEK (MICH.) SANITARIUM.

This book presents in a nutshell what every person ought to know about the stomach, its functions in health, the symptoms produced by disease, and the best methods of cure. The long experience of the already well-known author in the treatment of stomach disorders, in his supervision of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, makes this a work of inestimable value, not only for the sick but those who desire to keep well.

**THE FOLLOWING ARE LEADING CHAPTER HEADINGS:**

The Organs of Digestion.	The Maladies of the Modern Stomach,
The Systematic Treatment of Indigestion,	Foods, The Digestive Fluids
Important and New Discoveries Relating to Digestion,	Treatment of Dis-
Bemidies for the Home Treatment of Dyspepsia,	pepsia,
General View of the Digestive Process,	The Symptoms Dyspepsia,
Quacks and Nostrums.	

The work is illustrated with more than one hundred and thirty cuts, including eleven full-page plates, three colored plates, etc.

This work ought to be in the hands of every dyspeptic.

PRICE, Cloth, \$1.50. - - Half Binding, \$2.00.

MODERN MEDICINE PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
Battle Creek, Mich.

## That "Superb" Bible.

Dodgeville, Wis.

AMERICAN SENTINEL, New York City:

The Bible came to hand all right. To say that I am pleased with it will but faintly describe my feelings. It would take too much space to enumerate its many points of excellence; so I will sum it all up in the one word "superb."

There are so many "aids to the study of the Scriptures," and they are so helpful and just what I have been wishing for since I became a "Bible Christian."

Friends and neighbors all say, "I wish I had one like it," and "So cheap." Our seventeen-year-old daughter is about to start out to obtain subscriptions for the SENTINEL, as she wishes for one "just like it."

Please accept my warmest thanks, and believe me to be,  
Ever sincerely yours,

R. G. W. COLLINS.

[See advertisement on last page.]

ASSUREDLY you would like to read the story of Saul against David with the psalms which David then composed, set exactly in the places where they occurred in the story. Wouldn't you now? Well, just buy a copy of that fine book, "The Empires of the Bible," and on pages 161-172 you have the whole story just as it occurred and each psalm in its place in the story. Many, many other such interesting things are in that book too; and it costs only \$1.50.

## The Rights of the People, or Civil Government and Religion.

By ALONZO T. JONES.

**THIS IS ONE OF THE VERY BEST BOOKS THAT HAS  
EVER BEEN WRITTEN ON THE RELATION OF  
THE CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND  
RELIGION.**



It shows how Christianity advanced in the Roman Empire, not only without the aid of the State, but in the face of the bitterest opposition from the State; it discusses what the Christian should render to God, and what to the State, and how the powers that be are ordained of God. The book then takes up the history and principles of the movement so active now in the United States, looking toward having the Church try to regulate and cleanse politics, and shows what will be the certain results of following the policy advocated by some of these church men. No matter what your views upon this question, you cannot afford to miss reading this book.

Cloth, 378 pp., \$1.00.  
Paper Covers, .40.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
Bond Street, New York City, N. Y.

Kansas City, Mo.

Oakland, Cal.

## Political Speeches and Debates

—OF—

ABRAHAM LINCOLN and STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS,

Containing all the important speeches of "The Giants" from 1854 to 1861, giving a fair and FULL HISTORY OF THE SLAVERY QUESTION, and the great constitutional questions involved therein, from the beginning of the nation to the outbreak of the Civil War. An attack was then being made upon the Declaration of Independence and the National Constitution. To-day another attack is being made upon these same charters of our liberties. The history made just previous to the Civil War forms a most vital part of the national annals, and should, in itself, warrant the study of those times. But in view of the present attack upon the Constitution, this subject becomes one of the greatest importance to every thinking individual. The work contains 555 pages, printed from new, clear type, with numerous full-page half-tone illustrations, including portraits of Lincoln and Douglas.

Bound in Buckram, price, \$1.75.  
" " " gilt edges, price, 2.25.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,  
39 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Kansas City, Mo.

Oakland, Cal.,

**THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW.** Arguments in behalf of the rights of American citizens, presented by A. T. Jones in opposition to the Blair Sunday Rest Bill. A thorough catechism upon the subject of Church and State. 192 pages..... \$0.25  
Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,  
39 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY.  
Kansas City, Mo. Oakland, Cal.

# \$7.00 WORTH FOR \$3.50.

We propose to make it possible for each and everyone to be the possessor of


## A First-Class High Grade Bible.

The book we offer has large clear type (see specimen) and is what is known as the  
**AMERICAN OXFORD SELF-PRONOUNCING REFERENCE TEACHERS' BIBLE,**

Bourgois Type, Bound in Imperial Seal Leather, Divinity Circuit, Extra Linen Lined to Edge. Round Corners. Red Under Gold Edges, Silk Headband, Silk Marker, Binding of the Best Quality.

<i>They that sealed the covenant.</i>	NEHEMIAH, X.	<i>The points of the covenant.</i>
gavest before them, neither turned they from their wicked works.	B. C. 445.	25 Rē'hūm, Hā-shāb'nah, Mā-a-sē'-jah,
36 Behold, <sup>d</sup> we are servants this day, and for the land that thou gavest unto our fathers to eat the fruit thereof and the good thereof, behold, we are servants in it:	<sup>d</sup> Deut. 28. <sup>48</sup> Ezra 9. 9.	26 And Ā-hī'jah, Hā'nān, Ā'nān, 27 Mā'l'uch, Hā'rim, Bā'a-nah.
37 And <sup>e</sup> it yieldeth much increase	<sup>e</sup> Deut. 28. <sup>23 51</sup>	28 ¶ <sup>e</sup> And the rest of the people, the priests, the Lē'vites, the porters, the singers, the Nēth'i-nims, <sup>f</sup> and all they that had separated themselves

SPECIMEN OF TYPE.



OUR PREMIUM BIBLE CLOSED.

## REGULAR PRICE, \$6.00

With this book reading is made easy. No more stumbling over the hard words. All proper names are divided into syllables, and the accent and diacritical marks render their accurate pronunciation a simple matter. With a little study of the Key to Pronunciation to be found in every copy of this Bible, the reader loses all fear of the long, hard names of Scripture, and pronounces them with ease.

## WITH SENTINEL, ONE YEAR \$3.50

As is indicated by the name, this is a teachers' Bible. It contains fifteen pages of illustrations and diagrams, copious helps of the latest revision, Bible index, concordance, dictionary of Scripture proper names with their pronunciation and meaning, and many other excellent features.

### WHAT THEY SAY OF IT.

Wabash, Ind., Oct. 14, 1896.  
AMERICAN SENTINEL: My Bible received this day, for which accept thanks. I am very well pleased. I think I have just what I need in the way of a Bible. It is not only a teacher's Bible, but also the very best for a student.

Yours truly,

T. M. MORRIS.

San Francisco, Cal., Dec. 15, 1896.  
AMERICAN SENTINEL: I received my Bible, and am very much pleased with it. It is a first-class Bible; just what it is claimed to be.

MRS. E. F. NOBLE.

Brattleboro, Vt. Nov. 22, 1896.  
AM very much pleased with it.

MRS. E. C. MILLARD.

Graettinger, Iowa, Nov. 30, 1896.  
WE are all more than pleased with the Bible in every way. As a book it is thoroughly well made and elegant in all its parts. As a Bible the self-pronunciation is a new feature, and this is only one of its many excellencies. The type is a great delight to me.

MRS. S. M. OLESEN.

It is only by special arrangement with the publishers of this Bible that we are able to make this

## UNPRECEDENTED OFFER.

**REMEMBER, the price of this Bible is \$6.00. Anyone, OLD OR NEW SUBSCRIBER, sending us \$3.50 will receive this Bible postpaid, and the Sentinel one year.**

We will GIVE one of these Superb Bibles for SEVEN new names at the regular subscription price, \$7.00.

For 25 cents extra we will mark on the Bible in gold letters any name desired.

Address all orders to **AMERICAN SENTINEL,**  
39 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.