

AMERICAN SENTINEL

LIBERTY


TRUTH

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

VOLUME 14.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 5, 1899.

NUMBER 1.



REFORM CLERGYMAN TO MODERN LEGISLATOR: "There's a flood of immorality sweeping over the land; you must stop it by legislation!"


THAT the tide of immorality in the land is rising, is very true; but why is it true? Is it not because the great barrier against immorality has been broken down, so that it does not restrain the flood? That great barrier is the law of God, the Decalogue, which condemns evil in its very citadel—the heart. And who have attacked this barrier, to break it down before the world? Is it not the very clergymen themselves, who have been preaching that the Decalogue is abolished? Is it not the clergymen who have been preaching that the fourth commandment, which sanctifies the seventh day as the Sabbath, does not mean what it says? Is it not the clergymen who have been preaching the "higher criticism," which denies the truthfulness of Scripture and destroys its reproof and convicting force upon the carnal mind? And now, when they have done all this, by which they have made God's Word of none effect to the masses of the people, and opened the flood-gates of immorality, they declare that we must have legislation to stay the rising tide. But what will human legislation avail where the law of the Infinite has been set aside? The inadequacy of such a remedy is only faintly depicted in the illustration.

"It is time for thee, Lord, to work; for they have made void thy law." Ps. 119:126.

ALL religious legislation is an effort to stagnate the tide of religious progress.

RELIGIOUS questions pertain solely to the sphere of the individual conscience; all civil questions pertain solely to the sphere of individual rights.

THE world is not wide enough to permit of two individuals living upon its surface in peace, if one of them is a religious bigot.



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 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 Postoffice.)

America's Right to the Philippines.

THE United States Government has acquired possession of the Philippine Islands by conquest and purchase from Spain, and now considers that it has a right to do with them as it sees fit.

It obtained this right—if such it is—from Spain. But what right had Spain in the islands? Spain's rights in the Philippines were only those of the robber and freebooter. Spain took what she possessed in the islands by force, just as any highwayman takes money and other valuables from the defenseless traveler. In the courts, this style of procedure is not considered as conferring any right of possession upon the highwayman. But where the robbery is a national act, it is different.

Does the United States Government mean to indorse the acts of Spain by which that nation got possession of the Philippines? Whether it means it or not, that is just what is actually done by the United States in assuming possession of the Philippines as it has now done.

There are human beings in the Philippines—eight millions of them. These people are the natural and rightful owners of the islands. These are the people who must be dealt with in securing any just title to a single foot of land in the Philippine group.

The United States Government drove Spain out of Cuba, because, as it says, Spain was a robber and oppressor of the Cuban people, who by her cruelty and injustice had forfeited all right to the island. If Spain had a right to the possession of Cuba, the United States had no right to deprive her of it. Spain had no right in Cuba—that is true; but she had exactly as much right in Cuba as she had in the Philippines; and now the United States claims possession of the Philippines by virtue of the very thing which, in the case of Cuba, it points to as nullifying all claim to possession. This is not quite consistent to say the least.

The United States might as well be a robber itself as to take away the spoils of a robber and hold them as its own. The right of possession still remains in the one from whom the robber took them, which in this case is the Philippine people. The United States cannot afford to expand by justifying and perpetuating a robbery.

Justifying "Expansion" by the Constitution.

ADVOCATES of "expansion" justify this policy upon the ground that the national Constitution gives Congress the power "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." The Philippines, they declare, are merely territorial property, and as such, can be ruled and regulated under this constitutional provision as Congress sees fit.

But the Constitution does not authorize Congress to dispose of property acquired unjustly, nor does any such power rightfully inhere in any nation or individual. This Philippine question, however, is more than a mere question of the disposal of a certain amount of land. The chief consideration in the transaction, from the standpoint of justice, is not the disposal of the land, but the disposal of the people upon the land.

Are those people to be considered as the property of the United States, of which Congress can dispose as it sees fit? That is just what is assumed in the course which has been pursued towards them by the nations without.

Every form of government which does not recognize the rights and liberties of the people, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, assumes that the people who are governed are the property of the governing power. The government of the czar, for example, assumes the right to dispose of the people under it, and does dispose of them, as it sees fit. That is the assumption upon which every despotism is built. A government must either assume just this, or it must recognize the rights of the people, which is a recognition of their right to govern themselves. There is no middle ground. Not to recognize their rights is itself an assumption of the right to treat them as having no rights, and that is to treat them as property. And when the United States Government denies to the Philippine people the right to govern themselves, taking control over them as it does over their land, ignoring their will in the matter entirely, it thereby proclaims that it regards the people themselves as its property, in common with the land on which they live. Such treatment of the Filipinos cannot be harmonized with any other conception than that they are property, to be controlled and disposed of as one would do with any property in live animals. But this is the basis upon which the institution of negro slavery rested in the United States.

It cost this nation several billions of dollars and the lives of hundreds of thousands of its best citizens, to learn that the image of God—for all men are in his image—cannot be held and treated as the property of the United States or of any part of it. That lesson should have been well learned. And if at that fearful sacrifice it was not learned so as to be remembered, and the principles of truth and justice it emphasized are now to be re-

pu diated, what hope can remain for the nation which has been established expressly to exemplify the virtue of those principles of government before the world?

What Now Remains?

THE following from *Harper's Weekly*, of December 8, we republish as an important piece of news, as well as for the worth of the discussion itself:—

“Attorney-General Griggs is quite sure that the Constitution will have no application to the territories of the United States acquired by the war, beyond the grant to Congress to make only needful rules and regulations respecting the territory of the United States. In making these rules and regulations, according to Attorney-General Griggs, Congress is not bound by any of the limitations imposed by the Constitution upon the exercise of its power over the States.

“It is true that Congress has, in general, although not always, obeyed the Constitution in legislating for territory acquired from the original States, by conquest, or by purchase; and it has never attempted to deprive the citizens of our territories of any of the fundamental personal rights which seem to be guaranteed by the Constitution. But the time is evidently at hand when a strong party in the nation will make a point of insisting that territories may be ruled by Congress outside of the Constitution, and even against the instrument which Mr. Gladstone declared to be the most perfect of human political institutions made at a single moment.

“It is not so long ago that this great instrument, for it is very great, was established and ordained. In the life of the nation the time that has elapsed between the days of our fathers and our own days is but an instant. Times have not so changed, men have not so developed, conditions have not so revolutionized, that the essential truths of the eighteenth century have lost their character in the nineteenth. What was true as a political institution in 1789 is true to-day; and this is recognized even by those who are contending that the Constitution will not apply to the Philippines, or to Puerto Rico, or to Hawaii, although it is impossible to believe that they still recognize the truths of the Declaration of Independence.

“The theory that all governments ought to exist by the consent of the governed has been dropped, but the belief holds that the Constitution did not establish a government capable of ruling over distant territories and alien peoples. Therefore it is that Attorney-General Griggs and other expansionists take the ground that the new colonies lie outside of the Constitution, and may be ruled without regard to its provisions, whether these limit the powers of Congress, define the jurisdiction of courts, or guard the rights of the individual.

“If the Constitution does not apply or does not rule, what power is the last resort? Congress undoubtedly. If Congress possess the necessary two-thirds vote to override the President, it may establish governments for those distant islands in which the executive and judicial powers of the federal authority will have no place. Even

without such a vote, its will, perhaps, must be a law; for to it alone is given the power to rule and regulate territory, and Attorney-General Griggs, and those who think as he does, may successfully contend that the President has not the power to veto an act establishing a fundamental government, or legislation of any sort, for a territory. If they are right, then it follows that taxes and imposts collected in the Philippines and in other colonies need not be uniform with those collected at home. A despotic form of government may be established within the law. Even a king may be set up if Congress thinks well of kings for distant savages. The blessings of the writ of *habeas corpus* may not be extended to our subjects. The right to trial by jury may not be granted to them. Their houses may be searched at the will of any United States official, important or petty. They may be legally arrested without warrant, their liberty and property may be taken away from them without due process of law or without just compensation. They may be denied the right to bear arms. The forms of justice common to civilized lands may be refused them, and judicial functions may be lodged in the hands of the executive.

“We do not contend that the rights which the Anglo-Saxons wrung from the king at Runnymede, and which are preserved as sacred in every American constitution, Federal and State, are to be bestowed carelessly upon barbarians; but we are simply pointing out that when our Government was formed certain rights were regarded as fundamental and essential, and an equal as well as a just rule was to be the central idea of the new republic. It is now discovered that the Constitution is incompatible with the government of colonies of savages, and naturally the effort is being made to evade or destroy it, and to place absolute power in the hands of Congress. Practically, the question, as presented by Mr. Griggs, is, Shall we beat the Constitution by interpretation, or shall we amend it frankly, if we can, and remain a constitutional power a little longer?”

When the Government of the United States reaches the point where it seriously proposes, and sets about, to govern anybody *without the Constitution* it will be *in principle* no different from Russia. All that Russia does is to govern without a constitution.

That the chief law officers of the United States should take such a position is ominous enough. Yet since the Declaration of Independence has been renounced, it is not at all surprising that the Constitution should be abandoned. These two documents belong together. And the same spirit that will set aside the Declaration of Independence, is at once ready to abandon the Constitution. The United States is fast repudiating every principle of a republican government.

Harper's Weekly, of December 24, says that the above is a mistake *as to Attorney-General Griggs*, but is all true “of many expansionists, if not of Attorney-General Griggs.” The *Weekly* was misled by an “interview published in a daily newspaper.” As this is the opinion of many expansionists, the principle is worthy of serious consideration even though the attorney-general has not so expressed himself.

The Carping Pharisee.

BY FRANCES E. BOLTON.

WHEN Jesus was with us, O do ye not ken
That it was not the common-place faction
Of work-a-day women and work-a-day men
That hindered his soul-loving action:
But a carping, dry set of cold Pharisees,
Who thought themselves wonderfully pious,
Who looked on the Saviour with jealousy's eyes,
And measured his life by their bias.

One day as the Master came on through the corn,
His disciples plucked corn grains to eat them,
And the Pharisees drew down their visage in scorn,
And with withering blame stopped to greet them.
"Behold what your followers do on this day,
It is something unquestionably awful;
For to-day is the Sabbath, and we're zealous to say,
That their actions are wholly unlawful."

And the Lord of the Sabbath who made it for man,
Cut straight to the core of their sneering,
And laid out before them God's merciful plan,
That hindered their bold interfering.
For the Sabbath was made for man's good from above,
And his action to this was a witness,
And he said, "If ye knew of God's mercy and love,
Ye'd have never laid blame on the guiltless."

And is the world rid of the cold pharisee?
Or do we still hear the old carping?
There is somebody making a dreadful tee dee
And forever and evermore harping
About what is lawful, and about what is not,
And with eyes cruel-keen in inspection,
All ready to see and to put in the stocks
Any one that he thinks in defection.

Whose day is the Lord's day? we humbly inquire.
To whom must we yield or not yield it?
If men obey not, tread it down in the mire,
Who has given you the order to shield it?
Let God guard his own; you give heed to his law,
Lest there come upon you a disaster,
And for ordering another man's servant, with awe
You hear a rebuke from the Master.

For God from Mount Sinai spake this true word,
"The seventh day thou shalt keep holy;"
But you've changed the true day, and your spirit is
stirred
'Gainst those who obey and are lowly.
Your tradition makes void God's commandment, as
when
The Saviour said, "Vain is your witness."
Know more of God's mercy and love unto men,
And you'll cease to lay blame on the guiltless.

Unconstitutional Character of Sunday Legislation.

Speech delivered by Judge Arthur, late of the Supreme Court of Washington, at a trial for violation of the Sunday law, at Centerville, Md.

UNDER the laws of Maryland, you, gentlemen of the jury, are made the judge of both the law and fact in all criminal prosecution; hence in the case at bar it is your duty, first, to determine what is the law, and next, to say by your verdict whether the proven facts bring the defendants within its penalties. I shall claim your attention while briefly presenting the law of the case, incidentally alluding to the facts only where, and in so far, as it may be necessary to carry the argument, leaving their discussion chiefly to my colleague.

If the act complained of has no direct tendency to demoralize society or disturb the good order of the State, or endanger its safety, or infringe upon the laws of morality, or injure another in his natural, civil or religious rights, and is performed in the conscientious discharge of what the individual believes to be some divinely-imposed duty, or in the exercise of some religious rite or ceremony, whether it be the performance of common labor on the first day of the week, or some other manifestation of this religious conscientiousness, it is not a proper subject for legislative interference. I maintain this as a correct statement of a principle of American jurisprudence that will in time, in my judgment, prevail in every state of this Union, if civil and religious liberty are here to find their true exponents.

I am aware the great weight of authority in this country is on the side of the proposition that legislation on the subject of Sunday observance and such like, is not an encroachment upon the constitutional rights of a citizen, but is a proper exercise by the legislature of its general police powers to preserve the health and promote the morals of the general public.

Concede that the legislature has authority under such police power to enact laws restricting the right of a citizen to perform acts of common labor whenever and to whatever extent he wishes, whenever in its judgment such legislation becomes necessary to preserve the health or promote the morals of the community, still it does not follow that if common labor is performed upon the first, or any other day of the week in the discharge of a sacred duty, conscientiously believed to be divinely imposed, and as an exercise of religious faith and worship, that such labor so performed should be comprehended by such enactment. It might come within the purview of such a law, but for its distinctive characteristic of being a religious practice, worship or homage, as variously denominated in the different constitutions of the several states. To plead and show that the work performed is of such a character is a complete answer to any prosecution under this class of laws.

It might be kept in mind, the right of a state legislature to enact laws by virtue of its general police powers does not rest upon delegated authority, but upon its

THE Constitution of the United States, or any branch of the Government, national or state, cannot take cognizance of religious questions without taking sides with one or the other opposing parties which have raised such questions, and so denying the fundamental principle of republican government.

supreme power and authority as the sovereign representative of the people, except in so far as limited by constitutional inhibition. The constitution of Maryland contains just such a constitutional limitation upon the power of the legislature to enact laws of a religious character under the guise and pretext of the exercise of general police powers, having for its sole and only purpose and object the enforced observance of the first day of the week as a religious practice and duty. The thirty-sixth section of the Declaration of Rights of the Constitution of Maryland provides: "That, as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to Him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore, no person ought by any law to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil or religious rights." And while it is not now contended that this provision restricts the authority of the legislature in the exercise of general police powers to enact laws providing stated periods of enforced rest from common labor or the ordinary business affairs of life, it is most strenuously and earnestly insisted that it is intended to be understood as providing whenever such enforced rest or idleness does violence to the religious conscience of a citizen, and interferes with the free exercise of his religious faith and profession in the way of some practice, worship, or otherwise, such laws, to that extent, are inoperative and void, whether the legislature saw fit in accordance with the spirit of the constitution to incorporate in it such exceptions or not.

This provision of the constitution of Maryland was expressly designed to prevent this much-abused power, with its limits undefined and uncertain, from being prostituted to the purpose of religious persecution. The fundamental error of all the adjudicated cases upholding Sunday-observance legislation, is the failure of the courts to appreciate the full force and meaning of this constitutional exception, carved out of the general police powers of the legislature, which power is alone invoked when such laws are enacted.

To the Sabbath-keeper the divine command, "Six days shalt thou labor," is mandatory, and of as much binding force on his conscience as the divine command, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" to observe both strictly is a religious practice, and an exercise of his religious faith and worship, and it would be just as consistent to say he could be compelled by command of the civil law to labor on the Sabbath in opposition to his religious convictions, as to contend he must refrain from labor on Sunday.

Would it not be an exercise of authority along exactly the same lines, if a law were enacted requiring the Sunday-keeper to do common labor or ordinary business

on Sunday against his religious convictions? Will it be contended for one moment that such a law would be constitutional? Where is the distinction between the two classes of cases? in the one you require a person to do something against his religious conscience, and in the other you require him to refrain from doing something equally against his religious conscience. Here is clearly a distinction without a difference. Nor does the constitution leave it either to the legislature or the courts to define or determine what particular acts or class of acts shall constitute religious practices or acts of worship, but itself defines the scope and limit beyond which it must not go. Whether this limit in any given case has been exceeded and the right of the State or any particular individual or class of individuals has been invaded is a question solely for judicial determination, controlled by certain fundamental principles hereafter to be alluded to.

It follows, then, that to bring the act of an individual or class of individuals, performed in the exercise of a religious practice or rite, within the penalties of the law in question, it must be charged and shown that the doing of the act disturbed the public good, peace, or safety of the State, or infringed the laws of morality, or injured the natural, civil or religious rights of another, or as contained in the act itself, was not a work of charity or necessity, none of which was shown or attempted to be shown in the case at bar.

(Concluded in next issue.)

Progress of Religious Intolerance in the United States.

THERE are many people in this country who do not know that the last twenty years of this nineteenth century have witnessed the rise and spread of religious intolerance in the United States. We wish all such might have their attention called to the following statistics on this subject, which a reader of the SENTINEL has prepared:—

- 1881.—Spasmodic attempts in various parts of California to enforce the law passed in 1861.
- 1882.—People aroused, and repeal of the California Sunday law made a political issue in State election. Repeal carried by a majority of about 17,000.
- 1883.—California Sunday law repealed.
- 1885.—Exemption clause of Arkansas Sunday law repealed.
- 1887.—Exemption clause of Arkansas Sunday law re-enacted, after twenty-one cases had been tried, which demonstrated to the people the intolerant nature of the prosecutions made possible under the law.
- 1888.—Blair Sunday Rest Bill introduced in United States Senate. Blair Educational Amendment to the Constitution, providing for teaching the Christian religion in public schools, introduced in United States Senate.

American Sabbath Union organized in Washington, D. C. Later an official of that organization stated that "the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition Party have become so entirely National Reform organizations that the regular National Reform organizations have ceased to organize local National Reform clubs as such, but work through these to spread the National Reform ideas."

R. M. King arrested in Obion County, Tenn., for doing ordinary work on Sunday. Sympathizers with the prosecution gathered in a mob on a *Sunday night*, and fired shots into a schoolhouse where Elder William Covert was preaching the doctrines held by the defendant.

1889.—The King case tried, and defendant's conviction affirmed by State Supreme Court, and appeal taken to the United States District Court.

Field Secretary of American Sabbath Union organized a branch in California, with a view to securing a State Sunday law.

Blair Sunday Rest Bill, modified with exemptions, etc., reintroduced in United States Senate.

1890.—A bill to prevent Sunday labor in the District of Columbia introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative W. C. P. Breckenridge.

1891.—Writ of *habeas corpus* in the case of R. M. King denied by Judge Hammond of the United States District Court for Tennessee; thus the State Sunday law was sustained by a Federal Court.

1892.—Bill to prohibit the sale of ice in the District of Columbia on Sunday, introduced in the Senate by Senator McMillan, and in the House by Representative Hemphill.

Decision of United States Supreme Court in Louisiana Lottery Case making Congress a censor of the press,—a blow to the First Amendment to the Constitution.

The United States Supreme Court declared that "this is a Christian nation," the foundation of the claim being laid in documents of Ferdinand and Isabella, the founders and supporters of the Spanish Inquisition and other pre-republic religious-political actions.

Congress passed the first law which virtually established the principle of Church-and-State government in the United States, namely, the appropriation of money for the Chicago Exposition conditioned on the gates being closed on Sunday.

1893.—Thirteen orderly Christian men, observers of the seventh-day Sabbath, indicted in Henry County, Tennessee, for doing ordinary work on Sunday.

Hettie Mansfield, who had kept the Sabbath "according to the commandment," was informed against by her brother for the crime of sewing on Sunday, in Queen Anne County, Maryland. In the same county Chas O. Ford was arrested and convicted of doing Sunday labor, on complaint of his brothers. See Matt. 10:21, 22, 36.

A minister and a schoolteacher, in Gainesville, Georgia, who had arranged some desks in a schoolroom on Sunday, preparatory to opening school on Monday, were convicted of violation of the Sunday law.

It was demanded of the President that Sun-

day closing of the Chicago Exposition be enforced by troops.

Y. P. S. C. E. State Convention of Ohio declared a boycott of Chicago Exposition if opened on Sunday.

1894.—A bill to protect the first day of the week was introduced in the United States Senate by Senator Gallinger. It provided for a number of exceptions, amongst others the "work of those who religiously observe Saturday."

A bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Johnson, designed "to secure to the *whole people* rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day."

A proposed amendment to the preamble of the Constitution for the purpose of formally acknowledging "the authority of Almighty God" in that instrument, was introduced in the House by Representative Morse.

By a papal rescript, the United States was declared to be a Catholic country.

1895.—Barbers' Sunday law (practically a rule of the Barbers' Union) enacted by the California Legislature. On a test case the law was subsequently declared unconstitutional.

Prof. George D. Herron, of Grinnell, Iowa, College, proclaimed his "Applied Christianity" theory from Boston to San Francisco, coming out boldly for Church and State Union, as no other man had in this country.

About thirty Christians, observers of the seventh-day Sabbath, were indicted in Rhea County, Tennessee, for laboring on Sunday. About one-third of these were imprisoned for a time.

A bill providing for the protection of Sunday as a "day of rest and worship," in the District of Columbia, was introduced in the House by Representative Morse.

1896.—The United States Supreme Court confirmed the constitutionality of the Georgia Sunday law, altho, under certain articles of the code, convicts under its penalties who should conscientiously refuse to work on the Sabbath day of the commandment, might be charged with "attempted insurrection," and suffer the penalty of death. Fines collected for the violation of this Sunday law are dedicated to the "promotion of Sabbath-schools in the country."

South Carolina makes the first amendment of the Federal Constitution a part of her Bill of Rights.

1898.—Special effort to utilize the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor throughout the country in the circulation of the literature of the Lord's Day Defense Committee.

An official representative of the Papacy was received at Washington by the United States Government.

Two individuals were convicted of Sunday labor in Queen Anne County, Md., not as individuals, the prosecuting attorney admitted, but as representatives of a certain religious sect. Thus the denomination as a body was condemned by the Maryland Sunday law.

The Holy Spirit and Sunday.—No. 18.

BY C. H. KESLAKE.

As we have seen, with the Sunday issue before us at this time, we are standing now just where the Reformers stood three hundred years ago.

Nor is this all. The wheels of time have been slowly yet surely revolving so that the Christian people are made to stand, in a peculiar sense, just where Christ stood over 1800 years ago.

Now that it is proposed that Sunday shall be enforced as the Sabbath day, it could not be otherwise than that a controversy should be raised as to whether Sunday is after all the "Christian Sabbath." And especially would we expect this to be so when we remember that the advocates of Sunday rest the whole question of Christianity upon the keeping of that day. The whole gospel is thus involved in the correct settlement of this Sunday question.

The purpose of the gospel is to break down sin, to destroy it in the flesh, that the whole being—body, soul, spirit—should be brought into joyful submission to God and his righteousness, and all our members be a harmonious whole in the worship of God our Creator. But it is claimed that no one worships God who does not keep Sunday; and it is further claimed, and justly too, that he who does not worship God is lost. The conclusion therefore is inevitable that he who does not keep Sunday is lost.

But is it true that he who does not keep Sunday does not worship God? With such fearful results hinging upon this question it is only natural that those advocating this idea should be asked to give scriptural evidence—a "Thus saith the Lord"—to substantiate their claim. But when this is done (and it has been done) they confess the worthlessness of their claim, by acknowledging the utter silence of the Scriptures with reference to Sunday.

This being so, as any one can see for themselves if they will search the Scriptures, the enforcement of Sunday observance simply amounts to the compulsory acceptance of man's ideas as to the sacredness of the day. While it is clear that the Bible is silent upon the subject of Sunday sacredness, its friends themselves being witnesses, it is equally clear that it teaches that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20: 8-11. It finds its origin in God, and is given to man through Jesus Christ. And throughout the Bible this day is the only recognized Sabbath. It follows therefore that not only in this matter of Sunday enforcement does it amount to the compulsory acceptance of man's idea of the Sabbath, but that it is in direct opposition to God's idea of it. The conflict then resolves itself into this: Shall God's idea of the Sabbath prevail, or shall man's?

This was the situation in the days of Christ; and the

history of our times furnishes almost an exact parallel to those days, the only exception being that the question was not then which day was the Sabbath, but how should the Sabbath be kept. The controversy now is not, how shall the Sabbath be kept, but what day is the Sabbath. In either case, however, the same principle is involved, and the same results will be reached in the end.

With reference to the Sabbath question in Christ's time, it is well known that he and the religious teachers were at variance. They both professed to keep the Sabbath, yet their acts affecting the day, and their ideas expressed both in their acts and words, were so utterly at variance, that the religious teachers did not hesitate to openly charge Christ with violating the Sabbath.

Of course it was not on this point alone that they differed. From the beginning of Christ's ministry it was shown that there was very little in common between him and the Pharisees. And it is manifest that the actions and teachings of Christ tended all the time to lead the people away from the influence of the Pharisees.


From all this it was plain enough to be seen, from their point of view, inasmuch as they were the custodians, as it were, of God's Word, and that to them was entrusted the expounding of the Word, that this man Jesus could not be the Christ of God.

Eventually the opposition of the Pharisees narrowed down to a controversy upon the question of the Sabbath. Not that they yielded, or were willing to compromise, on other points in general; but in the matter of the Sabbath in particular the conduct of Christ regarding it was such that to their mind it eclipsed everything else. Consequently the Sabbath question became the test of the Messiahship of Jesus; and upon it was made to hang the destiny of the Jewish nation.

This view of the question has not been overlooked, as indeed it could not be, by either faction in the present controversy over the Sabbath. And it is significant that those who are on the Sunday side of the argument, or to speak correctly, some of them, bluntly take the stand, as did a Baptist minister a short time ago in conversation with the writer, and without any qualification, that Christ did not keep the Sabbath, and that for that reason Christ was put to death. It is true that Christ did not keep the Sabbath *according to the Jewish idea*, and it is true that for this failure he was crucified.

In this article we have simply summarized the situation as it existed in Christ's day. But the importance of the subject demands more than a mere reference to it; and we shall therefore enlarge upon it, for the purpose of showing how this question of the Sabbath involves the sin against the Holy Ghost.

THE vital question is not, Who will haul down the flag? but, Who will haul down the principle of government by the consent of the governed, which the founders of this Republic set up?



UNLESS the State of Utah recalls Congressman Roberts, polygamist, from the seat which it has given him, in the National Legislature, a difficult as well as interesting problem will devolve upon the hands of the national authorities. Public sentiment loudly demands that he be debarred from Congress, but in what legal and constitutional way this can be done by Congress itself does not appear. The question of the personal fitness of a candidate for Congress is one left entirely to the people by whose votes he is chosen. The spectacle of the National Government disputing with a "sovereign State" over such a question, is a contingency which the framers of the Constitution did not contemplate, and for which that instrument does not provide. It was not supposed that any State would send to Congress as its representative any person whose coming would give a shock to the moral sense of the country at large.

BUT this contingency has arisen, and in it there is a most important lesson for the American people. By it their attention is again called to an evil which more than any other threatens the welfare of the nation. That evil is not polygamy,—not but that polygamy is an evil, and a very great evil; but the greater evil in the case is that of the union of church and state, of which the Mormon system is the embodiment. Utah was taken into the Union when the people of the territory pledged themselves to renounce polygamy; but Utah ought not to have been taken in until its people had pledged themselves to renounce the union of church and state. If the Mormons had renounced this, the problem of dealing with a polygamous congressman would not now be upon the hands of the American people.

POLYGAMY in Utah is a religious institution. It owes its appearance in politics solely to the fact that the Mormon Church is in politics; or, what is the same thing, that the members of the Mormon church are in politics, not forgetting their religious belief when they cast their votes. If religion in Utah had been kept out of politics, the institution of polygamy would never have found its way to a seat in the law-making assembly of the nation. It would have remained to be dealt with by the laws of Utah, or of any other state in which it might make its appearance. The purity-loving men and women of the nation would not to-day be engaged in the task of circu-

lating petitions and devising means for expelling the monstrosity of polygamy from Congress, under a pressing sense of obligation to maintain the honor and dignity of the nation.

THE lesson in this situation for the American people is that religion and politics should be kept separate. If they fail to see this lesson in it, they will miss the vital point of the whole matter; they will fail to give the evil an effective remedy. They may send Congressman Roberts back to Utah and seat an enemy of polygamy in his place; but the way will still remain open for some other religious institution just as dangerous and objectionable as polygamy, to get into the seat of national legislation. Polygamy is not by any means the only religious institution which aspires to a seat in Congress, where it would work incalculable harm to the reputation and constitution of the Government, and Mormons are not the only ones who do not forget their religion when they cast their votes. The papacy, for example, embodies a union of church and state as complete as that of Mormonism, and many times more dangerous to free government, because of its subtlety, wisdom, and strength. And there are other powerful churches in the United States which have shown that they are as ready to use political power for religious ends as are the Mormon or papal churches. The only absolute safety lies in keeping religion out of politics, and this can be done only by religious people keeping themselves out of politics, in harmony with their profession as followers of Him whose kingdom is not of this world.

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND, it is announced, will represent the United States at the czar's coming peace congress. A New York paper states that "Ever since his induction into office the President has been anxious to testify his appreciation of Archbishop Ireland's Republicanism, which took the form of strong interviews and speeches made during the campaign of 1896." Now the opportunity has come for him to do this, by making him the national representative at this extraordinary international gathering.

THAT this papal prelate took an active part in the political campaign of '96, on the Republican side, is well known; and doubtless he did much to put the President's party under obligation to himself. That is what papal prelates, and prelates of other churches also, go into politics for. They expect to reap a substantial advantage from it for the religious organization which they represent.

If this appointment is made, it will be an honor paid by this Government to the Catholic Church. There is nothing far-fetched about this conclusion; the truth of

it is perfectly plain. Archbishop Ireland cannot represent the United States at the peace conference, simply because he does not represent it here. He represents the papacy, and that only; and so long as he remains a prelate of that church, he can represent nothing else.

* * *

CAN any one seriously suppose that the pope would sanction for so important an office as that of archbishop, a man who would place any other interests before those of the church of which the Roman pontiff is the head? Whoever believes that Archbishop Ireland is an American citizen first and a Roman Catholic official second, is ignorant of the first principles upon which the papacy is built.

* * *

FIRST, last, and always, an archbishop of the Catholic Church represents that church and works for its advancement. And in so doing he cannot possibly represent or work for a republican government. He cannot possibly do otherwise than work directly against such a government, for the plain reason that the papacy is a system altogether contrary in character to republican government. It is a system embodying principles exactly the opposite of those announced in the Declaration of Independence and the national Constitution. It is a system which embodies a union of church and state, denies the fundamental human right of liberty of conscience, and utterly repudiates the doctrine of "government of the people, by the people, for the people," affirming in its place the doctrine of government of the people by the pope of Rome and his subordinates. It is a system which brought France to the French Revolution, and Spain to the ruin in which she lies to-day. It is a system which aims to subordinate every government to the papacy, to disintegrate every government until the power and authority of government the world over, both civil and spiritual, shall be in the hands of the pope and prelates of Rome.

* * *

FOR this system Archbishop Ireland, like every other archbishop, is diligently working. So long as he adheres to the principles of the papacy, he must work for it, for those principles do not admit of anything else. And therefore it is perfectly plain, as stated, that Archbishop Ireland cannot represent the United States Government either at home or abroad; and if in anything he does represent this Government, he does it not in the interests of this Government, but in the interests of the Catholic Church. He will represent nothing where the interests of that church are not the primary consideration.

* * *

And therefore, to make this prelate of Rome the representative of the American Republic at the international congress called by the czar, will be to honor the papacy, and in proportion as that is honored to humili-

ate the Government which stands for civil and religious freedom. Will the American people make no protest to this continued national obeisance to the papacy?

The Crime of Sunday Golf.

SEVERAL prominent citizens of Norwalk, Conn., were recently brought into court and fined each \$2 and costs, for having broken the Sunday law of that State by indulging in a game of golf.

The Sunday law was put into operation in the cases by a grand juror named Dauchy, who also conducted the prosecution. The defense was conducted by lawyer Kenealy. The spirit of the proceeding appears in the following extract from the account given by the *New York Sun*. It should be added in explanation that the Sunday law of Connecticut prohibits sport, but allows recreation. The defense, of course, naturally took advantage of this fine distinction to claim that the acts complained of were recreation, which the prosecution was obliged to disprove. We quote:—

"Kenealy then delivered an oration on the shamefulness of dragging his clients into court and branding them as criminals, because they had taken a little needed exercise on Sunday. 'It's poor business, too,' he declared. 'Towns with accessible golf links were going to have the call with New York people, and if you drive the golf players out of here they're going to go somewhere else. This job you've done is mighty small business, and it's just to gratify personal spite.'

"His long and able argument clinched lawyer Kenealy's case with the audience, and disturbed the judge somewhat, but it didn't feaze Dauchy a little bit.

"I, as a grand juror, class that golf playing as sport,' he declared, in his stiffest dignity. 'Playing golf is nothing but playing the game. It's a disgrace to have that game going on when people are going to and from church. I shall have more complaints, whichever way your honor decides, and perhaps we can reach them in some way.'

"The grand juror is under a misapprehension about this,' said Kenealy. 'He supposed a game was going on, whereas these men were only exercising.'

"Then chopping wood would be recreation?' asked the judge.

"That's a necessity,' interposed Dauchy, 'but this thing was sport; I can't see it in any other way.'

"I suppose you'd arrest a man for playing marbles or playing the piano on Sunday,' remarked Kenealy.

"Yes, that's just what I would,' exclaimed Dauchy.

"For riding a bicycle, too?"

"There's nothing in the law about bicycles; otherwise I'd had them all up long ago,' answered the grand juror, regretfully. 'I've been run down by the blamed things four times.'

"The court is of the opinion that these men went there to have sport,' decided the judge. 'I find them guilty of playing golf on Sunday, which is really sport, and fine them each \$2 and costs. I expect it will be taken up and my decision reversed. I hope it will for

the good of the town, but playing golf, it seems to me, is sport.'

"The reporter asked Grand Juror Dauchy for his definitions of the two words at issue. Here they are: 'Sport?' Why, you go out and knock balls around—I'm illustrating; that's 'sport.' 'Recreation?' Oh, you lay out in a hammock and smoke your pipe; that's 'recreation.'"

As this case illustrates, the Sunday laws are not calculated either to enforce justice or uphold the dignity of law itself.

Government Recognition of Papal Claims.

THE Indian Appropriation Bill which is now before Congress contains a paragraph which reads:—

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell the lands and properties known as the Indian School, at Clontarf, Minn., purchased by the Government from Archbishop Ireland, the proceeds of such sale to be used for the improvement of Indian schools at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior."

As Archbishop Ireland holds possession of this property only by virtue of such title as is derived from the pope through his episcopal office, which is no legal title at all, the proposition to purchase this property from "Archbishop Ireland" implies a recognition by the Government of papal claims, which are false in fact and contrary in nature to the principles of free government. In view of this the following remonstrance against it is being circulated for presentation before Congress:—

"A PETITION AND REMONSTRANCE.

"To the Senate of the United States:

"We, the subscribers, on behalf of ourselves and all other citizens of the United States who recognize and maintain the independent, inalienable, and indefeasible sovereignty of the United States, and who deny the right of any foreign prince, pope, or other potentate whatsoever to exercise sovereign powers in this country, represent that we have carefully examined the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 11,217, 55th Congress, 3rd session; and that we find in the paragraph commencing with line 8 and ending with line 13, on page 50 of said bill, the words 'purchased by the Government from Archbishop Ireland;' which words refer to certain real estate at Clontarf, Minn.

"Your petitioners submit that these words necessarily imply and actually conceal an admission of the 'Right of Investiture,' which forms an element of the political and religious supremacy claimed by the Roman pontiff since the year 1045; and that, should the Senate concur with the House in the concession of a principle so fatal to human freedom, the foundation of our Republic would be undermined. We submit that the Rev. John Ireland is not in anywise the legal trustee of the real estate of the Catholic Church in Minnesota; that he is not a corporation sole under the name and style of 'Archbishop Ireland;' that he assumes the ownership of the fee in such real estate, not by reason of any grant from the local membership of his church, but by reason of his episcopal office, conferred by a foreigner, to wit, the Roman pontiff.

We submit that to allow such a claim by a legal enactment would be a repudiation of the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, and a full recognition of the doctrine of the 'divine right' of the Roman pontiff to superintend the secular affairs of the United States. We submit that this is a dangerous doctrine; that when the minds of men are once erroneously persuaded to admit the spiritual and political supremacy of one man, their opinions are thorns in their sides, never suffering them to take rest until they have brought their speculations into practice; leading them every day forth by the hand into other more dangerous opinions, sometimes entirely contrary to their first pretended meanings. So that, what will grow out of such errors as go masked under the cloak of divine authority, it is impossible to foresee, till time has brought forth the natural fruits of such unfortunate opinions. For which cause it behooves every nation to entertain toward such opinions, and toward every practice derived from them, an attitude of fear and jealousy, beyond all apparent causes of fear. We submit that if archbishops are to be recognized as the owners of real estate by virtue of their episcopal office, our Government would become the patron of a particular sect of Christians, and the archbishops of that sect would become the officers of the United States, endowed with estates in land and with titles of nobility; contrary to that provision of our Constitution which declares that 'No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States.'

"We, therefore, pray that the word 'archbishop' may be stricken out of said bill; and in support of this prayer we refer to the Memorial and Remonstrance written by James Madison respecting the union of church and state, making the same a part of this remonstrance, basing our opposition to the union of church and state upon the arguments therein set forth by the great historian of the Constitution and author of the First Amendment."


THE policy announced as that to be followed by the Government in dealing with the Filipinos, if the treaty of peace with Spain is ratified by the Senate, contains among its provisions the following:—

"Third—The United States is to take the Filipinos under its care; to teach them the principles of republican institutions; instil into them love for liberty and free institutions."

But already the Filipinos have so much love for liberty that there is sharp friction between them and the United States authorities, over the question of whether they shall govern themselves, or be governed by a foreign power some thousands of miles distant across the sea.

To teach the Filipinos love for liberty and free government by denying to them the liberty of self-government which they crave, is a procedure resting on a singular sort of logic, to say the least.

THE tendency of human nature to religious persecution was shown in the first recorded instance of human crime—the murder of Abel by Cain, "because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous."



The War of Principle.—No. 13.

“CECIL, we must not be too hard upon men who persecute others. Right in connection with Stephen’s martyrdom, we have an example of a man who was honestly in the wrong, and who verily believed that he was doing God service in haling men and women to prison.”

“I rather think he had his eyes partly opened that day. How could he have looked on the death of Stephen and remained a persecutor?”

“And yet, Cecil, it was not Stephen’s death that opened his eyes; for we read that in the great persecution that broke out in Jerusalem, Saul entered into every house to find heretics. It worked good for the cause of truth; for it sent Christ’s followers abroad to proclaim his power. The power was made manifest in miracles, in the casting out of devils, in the healing of the sick, and in the great joy among the people. Even this exhibition failed to convince Saul, and breathing out slaughter, he went to the high priest for letters to authorize him to go to Damascus, to hunt out heretics and bring them bound to Jerusalem for punishment.”

“That is so, Aleck. How hard it seems for me to truly take in the thought that divine illumination is essential to know and sustain truth.”

“Well, let’s study Saul’s change of mind. It ought to give us great courage; for God is no respecter of persons, and can as marvelously illuminate our darkness as he did Saul’s. If a miracle is necessary, we will have a miracle. How was Paul converted?”

“Just before he reached Damascus, a great light shined on him from heaven. He fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying, ‘Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?’”

“What a question that was, Cecil. Christ suffers with his followers. In his ministry he had spoken of the poor, the outcast, the stranger, the sick, and the prisoner, and had said, ‘Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.’ But Christ knew Saul’s ignorance of this fact. How many who to-day are unkind, uncharitable, or even cruel are as ignorant as he, as to where their cruelty reaches. What answer had Saul for this question?”

“Who art thou, Lord?”

“How pathetic that is! But the darkness was then to be dispelled. The honest questioner will always have

the true answer. ‘I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest; it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.’”

“It must be hard to be so set against men. I know I have never yet said a sharp word or done an unkind thing to another that has not pierced my own soul. How the grief is accounted for on the ground that it not only wounds the human soul; but pierces the breast of Christ. Sin does become exceeding sinful.”

“How did Saul receive this revelation?”

“He trembled, and was astonished, and asked, ‘Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?’ That was the first time, I imagine, that he felt his insufficiency or asked anything of divine wisdom.”

“God gave him time to realize his weakness. For three days he was sightless. For three days he fasted and prayed. God worked in his soul, as he says, mightily. Human strength was weakness. God connected him to himself, and he who had come to Damascus with credentials from men, was now to be ordained of God to oppose the power he had sought, to be a chosen vessel to reveal Christ to the world! What a change! Cecil, we need the spirit of Stephen. One at least who consented to his death shared the answer to his prayer. Now God would bring him among his people. How did they receive him?”

“Ananias was at first very fearful, so were the other apostles; but God did not leave them to their human and natural conclusions. Saul was not yet ready for the great work for which he was chosen. He had seen a great light, he had realized his sinfulness and weakness; but he had not yet received the Holy Ghost. This was to come to him through the ministry of Ananias. Through him he received his sight and was filled with the Holy Ghost.”

“The same change is seen in him then as in the apostles. The people are astonished, dismayed; for Saul the persecutor is Paul the mighty advocate of truth.”

“How about his former friends now?”

“They were gone,” said Cecil. “In fact it was not long before they took counsel to kill him, and would have accomplished their purpose if the disciples had not planned his rescue in letting him down over the wall in a basket. But Saul had a peculiar experience in suffering. He was cast out by the Jews then, and the followers of Christ would not receive him. He had a dose of his own medicine to take the first thing.”

“Surely; for God said he was called not only to believe but to suffer. He said, ‘I will show him how great things he must suffer for my sake.’”

“Aleck, this has been a great lesson to me. I realize more and more how much I need the Spirit of Christ. Christ himself prayed for his murderers, as Stephen for his, and yet I am ready to be indignant and even vindictive to those who wrong me or others. The change must come to me that came to the early followers of Christ, or I am none of his.”

Studies in French History.—53.

"THESE *lettres de cachet* were the most unjust, unreasonable, and cruel documents," began Professor Carman, "that can be imagined. They were really letters sealed with the king's seal, ordering the imprisonment of any person who had been unfortunate enough to gain the displeasure of some rich man who had, or could procure, with money, influence enough to obtain one. Then the proud possessor of this unholy document could imprison any man who had offended him; or whom he wished, from any other motive, to get rid of."

"I believe that is giving altogether too much power to any man," said Joe Palmeter. "He might be tempted to abuse such a power as that, and make a tyrant of himself."

"This is precisely what was done, Joseph."

"When were these documents first made use of?" asked Edna Phillips, producing her note book.

"By Louis XI., toward the close of the fifteenth century."

"Why, I don't see but any man if he was only rich enough could get as many as he liked of these letters, and imprison just as many people as he chose," said Charlie.

"You are right, Charlie; in fact history states that one of the ministers of Louis XIV. gave them away, by the thousand. You see he wanted to be praised and flattered by the rich,—he wanted to be popular.

"But one of the cruelest and most inhuman schemes during the reign of Louis XV. was called the 'famine-bargain,' which forbade any Frenchman selling his grain to any other country. So you will readily see that after a while the French merchants would become so overstocked that the price of grain would go down very low. Then the Abbé Terray, the originator of this wicked scheme, bought large quantities of grain,—all he could get,—and shipped it to other countries, even using for the purpose ships which belonged to the government."

"I suppose all he had to do then was to wait until France needed some of the grain back again," smiled practical Jack.

"Certainly; then he had it shipped again to the country and sold it at his own figures—which on account of the great need of the people, he could force them to pay."

"But," said Julia March, "I don't see why King Louis ever allowed such a thing, unless it was of some private interest to him."

"Precisely; it was of the greatest personal interest to him, for he shared the profits arising from this wicked scheme. Of course no one dared say very much, or utter any protest for fear of imprisonment by a *lettre de cachet*."

"Louis XV. must have been an extremely selfish man!" exclaimed Milly Brown.

"He was selfish and cruel, Milly, and it is recorded

of him that he admitted that he did not care what became of his country when he was gone. So you see he was anything but a patriot. As long as they did not trouble him, he was perfectly willing that those about him, his favorites, should do anything they liked, and spend the people's money like water—and this the selfish and grasping Countess Du Barry and others of his favorites did, with ever-increasing prodigality. But it was still the same old story,—only it was yearly getting worse, as that horrible period of blood and war, the French Revolution, drew near. The poor people were so taxed that life was only barely supported. They were forced by law to buy a certain amount of salt, only for the bare purpose of compelling them to pay the tax thereon. Then, too, the farmers were obliged to leave their crops to spoil in the fields, while they were hurried off to attend to the king's highway."

"Didn't France have any one to whom she could appeal at all?" asked Max Smith.

"Yes; there were the courts at law, and they did all they could for their unhappy country. But Louis, finding that they were standing in the way of his personal pleasure, declared these courts to be abolished. So nothing was left between the people and utter ruin, but a cruel and eminently selfish man—their once loved but now abhorred and hated king."

"Why, I had forgotten that they ever loved him," said Fred Green.

"Yes, they did once," said Edna, "when they named him the 'Well Beloved,' and feared he would die, after a great victory over the English."

"Yes, Edna; but this was when he had not fully developed those cruel and selfish traits in his nature, which after a while began to show themselves; and so now, instead of fearing the king would die, they only rejoiced openly when they heard that he was sick of small-pox, and only feared he would recover."

"Dear me!" said Milly Brown, "did he really die of that awful disease? I wonder who ever took care of him, seeing everybody hated him.

"Not everybody, Milly; for in spite of his wicked life, he had some very devoted and faithful daughters. They took care of him constantly, until he died,—although history states that they had never had the disease themselves. It is refreshing, indeed, to find once in a while that the black pages of history are relieved and illuminated, as it were, by such deeds of unselfishness and devotion as this."

"Please tell me something about the funeral, and what the people said when they found he was really dead," asked Jennie Jacobs.

"O, my child," replied the teacher, smiling. "There wasn't any funeral at all, even if he were a king. And not only this, but his coffin was made too small for him, by mistake, and they did not trouble to get another, but tumbled the poor old king in, and hurried him away to his burial, with the horses actually galloping. As for the

ATTENTION

To the laws of health is a most important duty. "Guide for Nut Cookery" will tell you how to prepare over 600 healthful and palatable dishes without the aid of animal fats. Can be successfully made in any ordinary kitchen. A boon to every person troubled with stomach disorders. Handsomely illuminated oilcloth covers, \$1.00, postpaid. Place your order at once. Books will be ready for delivery about Jan. 5, 1899.

Joseph Lambert & Co.,
Battle Creek, Mich.

THE SIMPLICITY VAPORIZER

is A GENUINE VAPORIZER, not an ordinary atomizer. It converts medicines into vapor, thus every passage of the respiratory organs is reached and the disease SPEEDILY RELIEVED. Treatment by this method for CATARRH, BRONCHITIS, COUGHS, COLDS, ASTHMA, and all diseases of the Respiratory Organs is recommended by eminent physicians. Sent with medicine postpaid on receipt of \$1.50. Mention disease. Satisfaction guaranteed. A. MALLET, 39 Bond St., N. Y.




MAKING HOME HAPPY

A CHARMING VOLUME FOR YOUNG AND OLD.

What is more desirable than a happy home—the foundation of all society?



This work pictures the relations that should exist, and the influence that should be exerted, to form the highest ideal of the family and home.



Contains 17 Chapters, 206 Pages, with original illustrations.

AGENTS WANTED.

Where there is no agent the book will be sent, postpaid, on receipt of price.

Cloth Cover, - - - .50
Paper " - - - .25

ADDRESS
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
39 Bond St., New York.
Kansas City, Mo. Oakland, Cal.

SEND FOR CATALOG OF OUR PUBLICATIONS if you have any idea of purchasing.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
39 Bond St., New York.

OUR LATEST PRODUCTION:

**THE DESIRE
* * OF AGES.**

Interesting and Instructive. The manuscript for this book has been under preparation by the author, Mrs. E. G. WHITE, for the last ten years, and it is sufficient to say that it is one of the most important and attractive of all her numerous works. Present demands bespeak for it an extensive circulation.

A Work of Art. The publishers have done all in their power to make this the finest book of the kind ever published. Some of the best artists in the country have been employed for more than two years, at a cost of several thousand dollars.

Of Practical Value. For years inquiries have been received in reference to this book, and we are now ready to announce its date of publication as November 1.

Send in Your Orders AT ONCE.

PRICE, POSTPAID:

Cloth, - - -	Marble Edge, - - -	\$3.50
Cloth, - - -	Gilt " - - -	4.25
Library, - - -	Marble " - - -	5.00
Full Morocco - - -	Gilt " - - -	7.00

ADDRESS

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
39 Bond Street, New York City.
Kansas City, Mo. Oakland, Cal.

The TWO Of Great Importance to Every American Citizen.
REPUBLICS.

By ALONZO T. JONES.

A COMPARATIVE
HISTORY OF THE TWO GREATEST
REPUBLICS,

Rome AND THE United States

The study of years and elaboration of many volumes, are presented in a concise and pleasing manner. In reviewing the history of the Roman Republic, the rocks upon which she stranded have been clearly pointed out. It contrasts the principles underlying enforced religious observances, with the true principles of

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM FOR EVERY MAN.

which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The "Two Republics" comprises 896 octavo pages, and is printed from clear, new electrotypes, on fine, tinted paper, beautifully and substantially bound, and is illustrated with 67 full-page engravings. The work is furnished in the following styles of binding:—

Thin paper edition, plain edges . . .	\$1.85
Cloth, marbled edges, - - - -	2.50
" Gilt edges, - - - -	3.00

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

Oakland, Cal.

Kansas City, Mo.

Books We Can Recommend.

SAVONAROLA

A graphic account of the life and martyrdom of this wonderful preacher of Florence; also a sketch of his times. An inspiring book for young readers, and one that will be read again and again.



Cloth 60c.;

JOHN OF WYCLIFFE



The life of this greatest of "the reformers" before the Reformation" is one of intense interest, and is here told in such a way as to inspire the reader to cultivate his opportunities and economize his time.

Cloth, 60c.


MARTIN LUTHER

A most readable story of the life of this greatest reformer, at home, at the university, as a monk, as a priest, at Rome, at the Diet of Worms, and the closing scenes of his career. Illustrated.

Cloth, 60c.



POLITICAL SPEECHES AND DEBATES




A reproduction of the principal speeches and debates of Abraham Lincoln during the years 1854-1861, together with those of his political antagonist, Stephen A. Douglas. A fascinating volume of over 550 large pages.

Cloth, \$1.75.


PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

Size, 6½x4¼ inches, 495 pages, 6 illustrations. The story of both Christian and his wife. An attractive edition of this immortal classic.

Price, 40c.



LEFT WITH A TRUST




Contains two good stories, the first being of the struggles of a family, the head of which having gone, according to baby Phil, "Away 'cross the big sea, and perhaps he'd tumble out of the ship and get drowned." The second tells of the faithful efforts of a boy to support his sister and widowed mother.

Illustrated, cloth, 60c.

JACK THE CONQUEROR And Other Stories

The first and longest story is that of ten-year-old poverty-stricken Jack Harold. His father and mother were both dead, and his aunt would not allow him to go to school. How his ambition was aroused, etc. Well illustrated, cloth, 60c.



GOLDEN GRAINS



A series of pamphlets, containing 320 pages and 45 beautiful stories for children. Following are some of the titles: "Joe Benton's Coal Yard," "This Hand Never Struck Me," "The Burnt Composition," "The Wanderer's Prayer," "The First Lie," "The Tempting Gloves," "Tom's Revenge." Complete set for 25c, postpaid.


THOUGHTS FROM THE MOUNT OF BLESSING

An exposition of the Sermon on the Mount.

"It can by no means be read with profit at one sitting, but is a book for time of meditation, as its title indicates."

—Baptist Union.

Contains 209 pages, 18 half-tone engravings, is bound in cloth at 75c, and half-calf at \$1.00.




MAKING HOME HAPPY

An entertaining story of how an unhappy home was made and kept happy, together with the influence it had over other homes. Contains 203 pages; cloth 50c.


NATIVE LIFE IN INDIA

The author, Rev. Henry Rice, spent eighteen years in India, and has written a most interesting description of the social and religious characteristics of the Hindus. The book is illustrated with twelve native drawings.

Cloth, 60c.



AMONG THE NORTHERN ICEBERGS




An account of the expeditions sent in search of the North Pole by the United States and England. It is written in narrative style and is intensely interesting. Its illustrations are of northern scenes and incidents, and are very good.

Cloth, 60c.

LIFE ON THE KONGO

A comprehensive history of that portion of Africa drained by the Kongo and its tributaries, together with numerous missionary incidents and experiences. The author, Rev. Holman Bentley, writes from personal observation, and gives much interesting information concerning this much-talked-of country.

Illustrated, cloth, 60c.



TWO CANNIBAL ARCHIPELAGOES



Here John Williams, Rev. G. N. Gordon and wife, J. D. Gordon, and others met death at the hands of the natives. Here dwell the Rubiana people, whose mania is the collection of human heads. Even here, this book informs us, the Gospel has made progress. This is illustrated by two scenes in one village—one as the missionaries found it, the other after its inhabitants had received Christianity. Cloth, 60c.

STORY OF REDEMPTION


A book well calculated to show forth the love of Christ, and to draw the reader into a closer connection with Him. Contains 237 pages, 68 engravings, four of which are three-color half-tones.

Cloth, with gilt edges, \$1.25.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

KANSAS CITY, MO.
OAKLAND, CAL.

39 Bond Street, New York City.



NEW YORK, JANUARY 5, 1899.

WE are not going to boast to our readers about what the SENTINEL is going to print that will interest them during 1899. All we say now is, Watch and see.

THE Government has dispossessed Spain from the Philippines, but the islands are still held by the pope, through his priests. And the pope does not intend to be dispossessed.

BABYLON, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome, all present examples of national expansion. But their expansion abroad only made them weak at home, and brought them to their final overthrow.

IT is decided that the standing army of the United States shall be increased from 25,000 to 100,000 men. For a Christian nation, this increase in its fighting department appears to be quite adequate.

DO YOU think there is no cause for the stir some people are making in defense of religious liberty in the United States? Read the AMERICAN SENTINEL for 1899, and then see if your views on this point have not been materially changed.

A PRESS dispatch dated at Washington, December 25, says that it is "the President's desire to see Archbishop Chappelle appointed papal delegate to the island of Cuba. The President was anxious to have the interests of the Catholic Church in Cuba looked after on behalf of the pope by a cleric who would understand American motives and institutions." The President's wish in this matter was communicated to the pope through Archbishop Ireland, and the pope, it is asserted, has ac-

ceded to the request. The pope has no official directly accredited to this Government, but this fact seems not to hinder him greatly in conducting negotiations with it.

AN Italian writer who has been making an estimate of what a general European war would cost to-day, fixes the amount at \$8,735,600,000 per year. Even at peace, Europe to-day pays over one billions dollars yearly for the maintenance of her armies and navies.

CARDINAL GIBBONS, in behalf of the papacy, has petitioned Congress, says a Washington dispatch, asking that the question of the contract school system be reopened, and that "Congress again go over the whole subject of Indian education." To be plain, he simply asks that Congress resume the policy of appropriating public money to support Catholic Indian schools.

IN Philadelphia recently twelve barbers were arrested and fined for doing business on Sunday, the fine in each case being \$4. They were convicted under the old Sunday law of Pennsylvania, which, as the court was reminded by the attorney for the defense, prohibited paid choirs in churches; street railway service on Sundays, etc. The agitation for Sunday enforcement is daily becoming more general, and no "law" is too obsolete or too contrary to modern enlightenment and progress to be overlooked as an instrument for furthering the cause.

AS a result of a war which has been waged against Sunday barbering in Fort Scott, Kans., says the Louisville *Evening Post*, one of the city aldermen has proposed in the city council for enactment the following ordinance:—

"It shall be unlawful for any person within this city to work, act, or be engaged on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a barber, manager of baths, employé in a

railway shop, butcher, preacher receiving compensation for his services, baker, saloon man, motorman on a street car, confectioner, news dealer, bootblack, hack or carriage driver for pay, electrician, printer or newspaper editor, proofreader, reporter, or a domestic servant."

It is hardly likely that this proposed ordinance will receive the support of the Fort Scott clergy.

DO YOU believe in religious liberty? Do you believe in religious liberty for others as well as for yourself? Do you prize such liberty enough to make any effort to help preserve it? Do you prize it enough so that it is a matter of interest to you to keep track of the efforts being made in this land for its overthrow? If you can answer these questions in the affirmative, what reason can you give for not being a reader of the AMERICAN SENTINEL during 1899?

TO THE editor of an Italian political journal, Philippe Tonelli, who acts also as correspondent for a New York paper, the pope, in a recent interview, expressed his hope of seeing America "enter entire into the bosom of the Catholic Church," and added, "It is marching into it with rapid strides." Think of that, friends of American liberty! And the pope did not make that statement at random. He had reliable data to back it up; that is certain.

ON another page we print a brief summary of events showing the development of religious intolerance in this country during the last few years. The facts given are such as should be known and kept in mind by every American citizen. They remind us that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

IN this issue we give the first part of an argument on the unconstitutional character of Sunday laws, made recently by Judge Arthur, late of the Supreme Court of Washington. It ought to be read and pondered by every judge, lawyer, and legislator in the United States.