

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

VOLUME 14.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 9, 1899.

NUMBER 44.

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.)

In a very small and seemingly innocent act, one may indorse a very large and very evil principle.



WHEN the secular power puts forth its hand to mold and regulate that which is religious, must not the latter necessarily become more secularized than it was before?



THERE is "manifest destiny" enough for the American Republic in Asia, amidst its gathering whirlwind of political and martial strife, if that is the kind of destiny the Republic wants. And since an evil destiny is so manifest for the Republic in such a place, it is strange that intelligent Americans should counsel such a step.



LAWs are not designed to enforce rights upon the people, but only to protect the people from molestation in enjoying their rights according to their own tastes and inclinations. Because every individual has a right to one day's rest in seven, it does not follow that this right ought to be enforced upon anyone.



NO HUMAN authority can rightfully undertake to say how any question which involves religious truth is settled, or whether it is settled or not. Every individual has an unalienable right to decide for himself what is the revealed will of God; and this right amounts to nothing if he cannot act in harmony with his belief.

WE are told that men ought to rest one day in seven; and this is true enough. We are told that if one man rests while others do business, he will suffer financial loss; and we do not deny this. But there is something more than this involved in the question of Sabbath-keeping. There is always the additional fact that Sabbath-keeping is by command of God, and this question of what God has commanded is inseparable from the subject. It is of no use to settle the other questions while this one is left unsettled; and this one can be settled for each person only by his own conscience and the Word of God. And therefore, as no human authority can settle this question, and as all other questions in Sabbath-keeping hinge upon this one, it is clear that the whole matter of Sabbath-keeping is beyond the province of human authority, and must be left for each person to settle for himself.

Two Laws and Their Operation.

THE apostle Paul, speaking as a Christian and for every Christian, to the Romans, said: "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

Paul was a transgressor—a law-breaker; inasmuch that he spoke of himself as the "chief of sinners." This is what he was when this divine law took hold of him—the law of God against whom he had transgressed. And that law set him free. This is not the way human law deals with the transgressor.

Human law, when it takes hold of the transgressor, shuts him up. It takes away his freedom. It restrains him, curtails his power. It puts a veto upon him. It is simply an acting negative, and is not meant to be anything more.

But far otherwise with the law of God, under the provisions of the gospel. In Jesus Christ, the law of God is altogether a positive force, operating upon the

transgressor not to curtail his power, not to put him under bonds or behind bars, but in the opposite direction. It is a law of liberty.

Human law contends against crime, and operates by shutting up the criminal; the divine law contends against sin, and operates by liberating the sinner.

And under the present order of things, and so long as Jesus Christ remains the Saviour of sinners, the law of God is designed to operate only in this way. When finally that law takes effect upon the transgressor, merely as a law of condemnation, it will put him forever out of existence.

Is it not evident, then, that these two laws are altogether different in nature—different in their aims, in their operation, and in the spheres to which they belong? Is it not evident that these two systems will not blend into one, and that no human power can operate them both?

This being evident, as it must be, what only could be the outcome of an effort to incorporate the Bible into the civil law of the land, and so place "all Christian institutions, usages, and customs on an undeniable legal basis" in that law? This is what the National Reform party and its numerous and powerful allies are now aiming to do, and hope to do by their proposed "Christian Amendment" to the Constitution. Can anything else than a complete miscarriage of justice result from the attempt to blend two systems of law so essentially different in character? and must not the same result ensue from any act which embodies the principle of this unnatural and really impossible union?

This is why the SENTINEL stands opposed to every scheme which would make religion or a religious institution a subject of civil legislation.

Let the Lord Decide It.

In the correspondence columns of *The Defender*, organ of the New England Sabbath Protective League, we note this from a friend of that journal:—

"My heart weeps in agony of spirit many, many times, and groans with anguish, it seems to me like as Jesus felt. The time is short and the work is great. O Lord! fight thou by thy mighty Spirit working in the hearts of the people. Make them to see, hear and understand thy Word and then repent and obey, for thy name's sake and thine own honor and glory."

We are glad to find in *The Defender* that to which we can heartily say, Amen! as we do to this. Here is a word from someone who is genuinely and deeply distressed at the sight of the immorality and wickedness that is evident on all sides, which is a feeling that does him honor, no matter if some of it is caused by what he sees of the desecration of Sunday. He honestly believes Sunday to be a sacred day and its desecration a sin, and we have no fault to find with a man for being honest

in anything. And he prays that God may counteract the abounding wickedness by his "mighty Spirit working in the hearts of the people." This is the right kind of prayer, and addressed to the right place. Friends, address your prayers to God and not to the legislatures. God is not dead. He has vastly more power than have the legislatures, and is much more likely to hear than they are; indeed, he is certain to hear every prayer made according to his will. And his will is plainly stated in his Word.

Why not let this Sunday issue be decided by an appeal to God, to whom the Sabbath day belongs? Let him settle it by working through his Spirit upon the people. The SENTINEL is in full sympathy with every prayer addressed to him to this effect.

Sabbath Keeping and Moral Courage.

"A DAY of rest and worship," says the *Ram's Horn*, "has always been conceded not as a privilege, but as a right, to be enjoyed by every individual. But the time has come when it takes moral courage to insist upon this right for one's self, and to secure it for others."

Yes; it does require moral courage to exercise the right to Sabbath rest these days; but it has always required moral courage to obey a command of the Lord, in the face of the opposition of the vast confederacy of evil that is against God. But God supplies every believer in his Word with moral courage—courage not only to keep the Sabbath, but to go to the stake, if need be. And this is why Sabbath keeping does not need to be made a matter of legislation. All anybody needs to enable him to secure his right to Sabbath observance—to his rest on the seventh day—is simple belief in the Word of the Lord; in other words, faith. No human law is needed in the matter, save such as will prevent his being molested in the enjoyment of his right. When Sabbath observance is made a subject of legislation, it is taken out of the domain of faith, of conscience and moral courage, where it belongs, and transferred to the domain of forced action, where it does not belong at all.

Clinging to Intolerance.

SPAIN appears to have learned little if anything from her late overthrow, as to the real causes of her weakness. She clings fatuously to the old church-and-state regime by which liberty has so long been repressed and manhood dwarfed within her territory. In her impaired vision the cause of her trouble takes on the appearance of the needed remedy, and seems likely to lead its victim on from bad to worse. We are told by the *Paris Journal des Débats*, speaking of the situation in Spain, that "The church, therefore, makes the following cardinal demands: Complete independence of ecclesias-

tical jurisdiction, which means that none of its members under any consideration whatever, shall be judged by secular courts; re-establishment of all clerical privileges; abolition of the legality of marriages not sanctioned by the church; non-interference of the secular authorities with any legacies or grants obtained by the church; prohibition of religious associations to non-Catholics."

This is like a drunkard trying to cure himself of delirium tremens by drinking more whiskey.

France as an Example.

"Hartford Times."

It was faith in democracy, in man, and in his destiny which enabled France to face banded Europe and carry its armies from Madrid to Moscow.—*Senator Lodge.*

Stuff! It was a love of military glory, and the foolish idea that France could conquer the whole earth, which enabled Napoleon to lead a huge French army to its destruction at Moscow. The same foolishness led to the catastrophies of 1870-71 and to the accumulation of a public debt on which the interest is over \$200,000,000 a year. As a result of the crazy notions of their superiority to all the other peoples of the world which got into the heads of Frenchmen a hundred years ago, France is to-day a decadent nation, and so will this nation be whenever it submits itself to the guidance of the glory-grabbers who are seeking high office at the hands of the American people.

A Monument to Protestantism.

It is interesting and gratifying to know that enough of the spirit of Protestantism is left in the leading Protestant bodies of the world to carry out the project described in the following which we quote from *The Independent*:—

"A few years since a movement was started in Germany to erect at Speyer (Spires), on the Rhine, a memorial to the famous protest of the German deputies and princes presented to Charles V. in 1529 at the Diet in that city, from which the name Protestants has come. As all the Protestant denominations of every form are interested in it, it was decided to have the memorial take the form of a church. A site and plans have been selected, and the building has already progressed to the height of the roof. The style is Gothic and the material a hard, yellowish gray sandstone. There will be a hexagonal tower 300 feet high, the ground floor of which is to be a memorial hall, 35 feet in diameter and 60 feet high, with a statue of Luther surrounded by the six protesting princes, while the arms of the fourteen protesting cities will be represented on the walls. Over the entrance to the church there will be a fresco representing the delivery of the protest. The Protestant princes of

Europe have given windows and the German church choirs are donating the organ. It is expected that the church will seat 1,400 people, and that its acoustic properties will be excellent. The entire cost will be about \$500,000, and in order that American Christians may bear their share, Dr. Beyschlag is here to represent the case and receive subscriptions."

But far better than this would it be to perpetuate the memory of the famous Protest by continuing to repeat it and practise its principles wherever the opposite principles are put forward throughout the world.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN said—and the saying cannot be too often repeated these days:—

"These arguments that are made, that the inferior races are to be treated to as much freedom as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class: They always bestrode the necks of the people—not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden."

England, the United States, and the Eastern Question.

"Springfield (Mass.) Republican."

Few persons fully appreciate how deeply the United States has become involved with Great Britain through the Philippine adventure. No one who has much studied the question doubts that the British government, almost solidly backed by the British press, did everything in its power to induce the Administration to take the Philippine Islands from Spain. This phase of the treaty-making is still shrouded more or less in mystery, yet there is evidence to sustain the view that England took a very active interest in the Paris negotiations.

Months ago it was stated that a member of the American Peace Commission had intimated that strong representations had come from British quarters, urging the United States to take the whole group in order to check Germany's ambitions and prevent "a general European war,"—the menace of war being obviously a bugaboo. . . . Confirming with remarkable detail that information is the article printed in the Washington *Evening Star*, of last Thursday, the *Star* being a strong administration and imperialist paper.

The *Star's* article is headed: "A new foreign policy, this country and England to make common cause in the Orient," and its main purpose is to explain the great strengthening of the American fleet in Asiatic waters. That purpose, says the *Star*, is not to use the added naval force against the Filipinos, but to "put our hand into the (Chinese) pudding up to the armpit" in case

Russia, Germany and France should adopt a policy of aggression in the Orient. Preliminary to explaining this purpose of the large fleet under Admiral Watson, the *Star* writer naturally found it necessary to refer to and outline the beginnings of this new American policy in the Orient, and in so doing he revealed facts quite in line with the theory of British meddling at Paris. Says the *Star* writer:—

“When the question came up before the United States whether or not the cession of the Philippines should be demanded of Spain as a condition of peace, and the President was reluctant to have this country assume responsibility for possessions so remote from our shores, influences both in this country and in Great Britain, which were alive to the importance of the situation in China still to be adjusted, were exerted to bring about the acquisition of that group of islands by the United States, so as to secure to us an interest in the Orient which would at once compel and enable us to participate in the adjustment of the ‘eastern question’ which must inevitably come.

“The men in the Senate most familiar with this matter talked earnestly with the President of the importance of the Philippines to the proper protection of our interests in the Orient, and it is said that the British ambassador had a long conference with the President, during which he pointed out the danger that if we did not take the Philippines, Spain would sell them to Germany, and that a great international war might result from this disturbance of the balance of power in the Orient, and that a failure on our part to hold the islands would be unfriendly to the interests of Great Britain and be an abandonment of all ambition on our part to share in the development of Chinese trade. Prior to this the policy of the President, as imparted to Mr. Day, the head of our commission at Paris then negotiating peace, was to retain possession of but one of the islands as a naval and commercial station.”

Having started into the Philippine venture under the influence of Great Britain in part, how does the Administration find itself situated to-day? No one can dispute the fact that, so far as the Philippines are concerned, the Administration is really in the power of England. But for England’s naval support of the American programme, Germany, France, Russia, and perhaps Japan, could recognize the Filipino republic to-morrow without fear that the United States could strike back at their combined strength, and such recognition would go far to ruin the Administration’s Philippine policy. It is evident that this Administration, so long as it pursues its present Philippine policy, is under bonds to keep and even solicit England’s friendship.

The Filipino war is in reality to England’s advantage, because while it lasts her support is all the more necessary to America, which means that America must side with England elsewhere in the world. Never before in American history has a United States Government been so completely under the broad thumb of John Bull as to-day.

Inconvenience of a National Conscience.

From the “Mexican Herald.”

It is always unfortunate for man or nation earnestly wanting something not quite inside the moral pale, to have a conscience. Hence the interior debate going on at the present moment in both the United States and Great Britain regarding the righteousness of their respective “little wars.” . . .

Civilization usually “gets for’ard on a powdercart,” and strong men take what they want without setting up a parliament of debate within themselves. After they have got a Philippines or a Transvaal, they ask forgiveness, if by chance they hear they are criticised, but they continue to maintain their ground all the same.

The Boer is mostly an unpleasant and boorish primitive person, a lover of solitude in a world where we are all being jostled; the Tagal is small, ardent, and a die-in-the-last-ditch patriot, which makes his struggle for a Malay ideal of the Declaration of Independence prolonged and bloody. The m——s down Boston way assert, with all the moral rectitude of a group fed high on Emerson’s essays, that “right will prevail,” and if it doesn’t, McKinley should be impeached; but in the end we fully expect to see Uncle Sam sitting in Luzon, master of a thoroughly “licked” archipelago and waving his hand toward China and the Orient as the self-appointed redeemer of the yellow race who shall be given all the blessings of unrestricted commercial intercourse with his well-approved and trusty syndicates. And also in the long run we shall see John Bull surveying a pacified Africa from Pretoria and the Boers scanning the Old Testament for prophecies regarding the ultimate downfall of the oppressor—all the consolation (purely literary), left them.

In both cases the folly of standing on the track when the Anglo-Saxon Limited express train of civilization is under full steam will be made apparent to an awe struck world of the semi-civilized and backward whose destiny it is to be taken by the hand by the passengers on the aforesaid train and led forward to higher and better things.

The world’s progress appears to have been achieved by high handed and bold fellows who, after a conquest, slept sound o’nights. One cannot imagine the Romans pricked with conscience nor bitten by remorse after their annexations any more than the Russians are after swallowing Central Asian khanates.

And so we sit here in the American tropics, spectators of the little wars that signalize the onward march of the conquering breed that speaks the language of Rhodes, and goes forward with the machine gun and the spelling-book and the common law, a terror to the unprogressive and feeble folk who fitfully struggle, and then sullenly accept their role of second-rate consumers of manufactured goods.

American Principles Applied in Porto Rico.

THE following from the pen of Mr. H. K. Carroll, LL. D., on the subject of "The Religious Question in Porto Rico," which he contributes to *The Independent*, is directly along the line of the principles discussed by the SENTINEL, and should be of interest to its readers. Mr. Carroll was lately United States Special Commissioner to Porto Rico, and the "religious question" to which he refers is that of the readjustment of church affairs in the island consequent upon the transition from Spanish and Roman Catholic rule, to American rule, which in principle is Protestant. Mr. Carroll evidently understands the bearing of American principles of government upon the religious questions which have arisen in Porto Rico, and knows how to present that which those principles demand.

Notice how, as Mr. Carroll narrates, the Catholic officials endeavored to make use of the discrepancies between the American Constitution and the American practise in the United States, to maintain the old order of things in Porto Rico. The Roman priests, for instance, might be maintained at Government expense for a time without compromising the Constitution, since here in the United States the Government indirectly contributes to the churches by allowing church property to go untaxed! This is a discrepancy in American practise, and the Roman Catholics know it, and are ready to make use of it in defense of the whole papal system.

The whole principle of church and state separation for which American free government stands, may be surrendered in one seemingly small thing in American practise; and it is the constant aim of wily Catholic prelates to get the Government, through some seemingly inconsequential act, to surrender the Protestant principle and commit itself to the Catholic principle of church and state union. In Porto Rico the Catholic officials have aimed to save enough of the papal leaven to enable them in time to again leaven the whole lump.

Mr. Carroll says:—

"The passing of the interests of the Roman Catholic Church in Porto Rico from Spanish into American ecclesiastical hands will make the solution of the religious problems before us much less difficult. Fortunately our Government is neither Catholic nor Protestant, and has no entangling alliances with either the one or the other. Its course is clearly marked out for it by the Constitution. The church must be disestablished, not because it is Catholic, but simply because it is a church. The priests must find other than public means of support, not because they are priests, but because they are ministers of religion, which must pay its own bills, whether in the United States or in Porto Rico. The administrator of that diocese (the Spanish bishop, next in rank to the governor-general, having gone to Spain when evacuation took place) understood perfectly that the connection of state and church must cease, as contrary to American ideas and principles, and pleaded simply

that support for the priests might be provided temporarily, until the transition could be made to the voluntary basis. He said the congregations had never been accustomed to contribute to the church, and the priests ought not to be compelled to leave or starve, and the influence of the church was greatly needed to conserve the morals of the people. Monsignor Perpiña argued that this might be done without compromising the Constitution of the United States, for our Government does contribute indirectly to the support of churches by allowing their property to remain untaxed. His zeal for his church was perfectly natural and perfectly proper. But the church was disestablished the moment American occupation was complete, without the issuing of any definite order. It seemed to be taken quite as a matter of course that payments to the church from the Insular Treasury should cease immediately, and cease they did, and that, too, without protest from the people against it. They were evidently ready for the change, because they understood it was according to the American plan, and they were quite anxious to become Americans and accept American institutions.

"General Brooke's first order as governor-general did not name the church; but in declaring that the existing system of laws would be retained in so far as it was not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, it virtually disestablished the church and nullified all those laws which give it exclusive privileges. The Insular Advisory Commission has brought upon itself the criticisms of the Catholic press of this country for proposing that priests and nuns be allowed to marry. It had in mind, doubtless, the provision of the civil code in the chapter on marriage, which prohibits priests and *religious* from marrying. The prohibition was a natural one under a Catholic government. The marriage of such persons would be a scandal to all good Catholics, and no government representing both church and state could tolerate it. It would bring reproach upon the state as well as upon the church. Under our system celibacy is simply a matter of church regulation. Ecclesiastical authorities can enforce it or not, as they see fit; but our Government can make no law commanding either obedience or disobedience to it. That provision of the Spanish code is, therefore, really of no effect; neither is that other provision, changed by General Henry, requiring all Catholics to be married according to the ecclesiastical form. No one can be debarred from civil marriage in Porto Rico by reason of any church connection, vocation or regulation.

"These and other religious questions are settling themselves without act of Congress or formal military order. Doubtless, in good time, measures will be taken for the revision of the codes, to bring them into harmony with American principles. But there are some important problems involving property which are not quite so easy of settlement. The cemeteries and the churches are claimed both by the church and the municipalities. How can decisions be reached which will serve the cause of both law and equity?

"The church does not claim any property right in the cemeteries. They were purchased and built, maintained and administered, by the municipalities, to which the right of title is conceded. But the church claims control over burials in these cemeteries, or at least in the consecrated portions. It bases its claims on these facts:

1. The cemeteries were intended for Catholic burials; 2, they were consecrated for that sole purpose by the ceremonies of the church; 3, the church has always, through its priests, indicated what bodies were entitled to ecclesiastical burial; 4, the municipalities have always acquiesced in this arrangement; 5, non Catholics have never with the consent of the church been buried in consecrated ground, but always outside the walls in the unconsecrated portion. The argument from these facts is, in essence, that immemorial usage constitutes a right; that what the church is called upon to consecrate it has the right to guard against desecration; that it would not have consecrated the cemeteries on any other condition.

"It must be admitted, I think, that this makes out a strong case. Let us see what considerations may be advanced upon the other side. This condition of things arose under a government under which church and state were combined. The governor general was Patrano Real, and the bishop had second place in rank in the civil administration. Municipalities were constrained to allow the participation of the church in control of burials, because of the legal position of the church. I do not say that it was necessary to put pressure on the municipalities. It was natural and customary and according to the fitness of things to have the cemeteries consecrated. But the municipalities were not at liberty to do otherwise. Now church and state are to be kept separate. What is the right of the state, and what is the right of the church, under the new conditions? If the Gordian knot cannot be united, shall it be cut?

"The cemetery is not only the place where those who die may be buried, but where they must be buried. Persons may or may not use the church while they live. They can exercise choice and stay away from it, if they prefer; but there is no choice as to burial. That is compulsory. Here is a cemetery created and maintained at the expense of all taxpayers in the district. It is admitted that the title is invested in the municipality. Can it be lawful to refuse burial to any inhabitant, simply because the parish priest will not certify that he is entitled to ecclesiastical sepulture? General Henry was satisfied that the claim of the church was good, and issued an order instructing municipalities to allow the priest to indicate those entitled to burial in consecrated ground. He also obliged the municipalities to keep the cemeteries in proper condition. This would seem to be contrary to the principle of our Constitution. If the cemeteries are civil property, should the church be allowed to intervene and forbid some to be buried within their walls? If the church, on the other hand, has the right of control over burials, over, in fact, the only use which a cemetery can have, ought it not to provide for its maintenance? In answering these questions the peculiar circumstances must be fully considered. I am not sure as to the right answer. The city receives all the burial rents and returns, which are sufficient to keep the grounds in condition. But I am doubtful of the expediency of dual control.

"A former governor-general gave permission to bury a Protestant in the cemetery at Ponce. The church opposed it, but its obstruction was overcome by force and the burial accomplished. In many cemeteries after American occupation, the rule was released, and

all bodies accompanied by the usual certificate from the municipal judge were received. A few municipalities took action, opening their cemeteries to all. There are, in some cases, separate grounds for the burial of non-Catholics; but they are commonly outside the walls and are unsightly and ineligible places. Freethinkers, Protestants, Jews and those Catholics who die without the rites of the church are shut out of the cemeteries by virtue of General Henry's order; other places must be provided for them. Thus families may be separated.

Catholic conscience ought not to be forced. Neither should a minority, however small, be deprived of a civil right. It ought to be possible to arrange a *modus vivenda* (not for the dead who make no trouble) by which Catholics and non-Catholics shall have equal burial in municipal grounds. The graves of Catholics can be consecrated; as in the case of the Sherman family, some of whom were Catholics and some not, yet they lie peacefully side by side, with no right denied and no conscience forced. . . .

"The question of church property will have to be considered in another article."

A Politico-Religious Proclamation.

"St. Paul (Minn.) Globe."

THE closest approach which we have yet made on this side to the British state paper known as the queen's speech is furnished by the altogether remarkable Thanksgiving proclamation of President McKinley. It is a pity that it cannot be subjected to the same criticism and analysis which attend the royal pronouncement.


It is the first time that such a document has been made the vehicle for conveying to the people a glorification of the policy of a partisan administration, or that we have been asked to accept as blessings direct from heaven the consequences of a given political policy as those consequences present themselves to the eye of a President exhausting every means to perpetuate his own and his party's power. . . .

It asks this people to thank God because our national finances have been strengthened, and because those engaged "in maintaining the honor of the flag" have been spared from disaster and disease. Another cause which should bring us to our knees before the Most High, . . . is that the power of the United States is being rapidly established throughout the Eastern archipelago.

This . . . represents such a perversion of the Christian principle from which our practise of setting one day of each year aside for thanksgiving arises as to suggest thoughts of the value of religious and moral hypocrisy as a political agent.

Heaven be thanked, there are manifold blessings for which this people should approach in reverence and thankfulness the Author of all good without offending against every canon of true Christian belief by dragging the sordid concerns of partisan politics into the sanctified domain of religious duty.

THE time has come in this Republic when a resolution repeating word for word the preamble of the Declaration of Independence cannot be suffered to reach a vote in a religious denominational convention. The Universalists in Boston the other day ran away from such a resolution like mice from a terrier dog. It was "indefinitely postponed." Such incidents indicate an apostasy to the Declaration somewhere, somehow, by some one.—*Springfield Republican*.



LOUISIANA.

SOME STRAWS.

IN some parts of Louisiana the question of more stringent Sunday legislation and the carrying out of present Sunday laws, is now being agitated. In one city a Baptist minister bewailed the fact that that city is without a Sabbath, and urged that no man be voted into office who will not promise to enforce the Sunday laws. This indicates that the germ seeds of church and state alliance continues to be sown during election campaigns. What would that great Baptist, Roger Williams, say of his religious confreres were he among the living to day? What did the Authority of Christianity say with reference to his kingdom and this world? "My kingdom is not of this world." Is not Jesus Christ the same to-day as yesterday? Why will his professed ministers persist in misrepresenting him in their religious political escapades?

S. B. HORTON.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

THE Ministers' Association, of the city of Manchester, are working a plan to get the mayor of that city committed to religious legislation by declaring all "sacred concerts" held on Sunday charging an admittance "fee" to be a violation of the statute. A portion of a letter addressed by them to the mayor, is as follows:—

"The association appreciates your promise to forward us an opinion regarding the legality of Sunday concerts in general wherever an admission fee is charged. It is the opinion of some of us that a concert or any other kind of performance on Sunday which requires an admission fee, is secular; and therefore, prohibited by statute for the reason that the requirement of an admis-

sion fee places the performance on the market and stamps it a business enterprise.

"We beg to intimate to your honor that we are anxiously awaiting your promised opinion concerning this matter, hoping it will so manifestly accord with the proper understanding of the statute that it will settle this question decisively."

The pastors were evidently a little nervous over the matter, fearing that the better judgment of his honor the mayor might lead him to decide in harmony with the Bill of Rights of the State of New Hampshire, and thus thwart the plans of the association to make future use of the mayor's precedent. And so they very ingeniously intimate to him how they want him to decide; or, in other words, after asking the mayor's *opinion* of the law, they suggest to him the proper construction to place upon it; and this because it was the "*opinion of some of us*" that that was the thing to do.

Let those pastors carry their petition to God and get power from on high to reach wayward souls and no Sunday law will be needed to stop them from attending a "sacred" or any other kind of "concert."

GRANT ADKINS.

St. Johnsbury, Vt., Oct. 27.

ILLINOIS.

ELGIN.—The W. C. T. U. of this city are preparing for active reform work, and have opened a department known as the "Department for the Enforcement of Law;" which is suggestive of the doubtful nature of the reforms they have in view.

W. D. CURTIS.

INDIANA.

A MEMBER of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Indianapolis was subpoenaed to appear on Saturday as a witness in a case. She declined to go, because she observed the seventh-day Sabbath. The judge and the attorney said, "the woman must come;" but the minister of the church of which this witness was a member, explained to the court why the sister declined to come on that day. The case was put off, and a special notice was sent her, through the sheriff, to appear the next Saturday. She prayerfully left the matter in the Lord's hands, and the court finally concluded "to try the case without any compulsion."

O. S. HADLEY.

MICHIGAN.

ON Wednesday evening, October 18, one hundred persons were confirmed in the Catholic church in Lansing, Mich. Of these it was stated that twenty-five were converts from Protestantism. This is a startling testimony to the fact that when people cease to advance in religious truth, they rapidly retrograde.

C. G. HOWELL.

Pontiac, Mich.



"WE are now on friendly relations with every Power on earth," says the national Thanksgiving proclamation. That is well; but what of "our" relations with a Power beyond the earth? Are they friendly? or otherwise?

* * *

"WE believe," says the *Ram's Horn*, "in respecting the minority's rights, but not their delusions." But every man has a right to believe in a delusion. Every denomination regards some things in the beliefs of other denominations as delusions; will they therefore say that these others have no right to believe such things, and that in these beliefs they are not to be treated with respect? The Inquisition, before putting its victims to death, tried earnestly to impress upon their minds that they were guilty of entertaining awful delusions.

* * *

THE Thanksgiving proclamation issued by the governor of the "Empire State," affirms, as one reason for thanksgiving, that the nation has been performing noble deeds in the "first flush of its manhood," and makes no allusion at all to any higher power; which causes a city daily to observe that "A Thanksgiving proclamation with no reference whatever to a Supreme Being is something of a curiosity." Yet the absence of a tone of humility in some Thanksgiving proclamations this year cannot be accounted altogether strange.

* * *

In the annual address by the president of the New York State W. C. T. U., Mrs. E. A. Boole, in the State convention at Binghamton, we note the following reference to Sunday closing legislation maintained by the organization:—

"Early in the sessions of the legislature nearly a dozen bills were introduced providing for open saloons on Sunday, Sunday concerts, Sunday baseball, in fact, a wide-open Sunday. Petitions were immediately sent out by our State Corresponding Secretary, and we rejoice that all these bills were defeated."

* * *

"Still," the report continued, "there has never been a year when there has been such wholesale Sabbath desecration as this. The Sunday excursion by rail and boat, bicycle riding for pleasure, the open bar-room, the

crowds at the beaches and summer resorts, catering for the Sunday crowd, have brought to America the Continental Sunday, and even many Christian people seem to have forgotten the command, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.'"

* * *

And this is because the real source of Sunday desecration is something that legislation cannot reach; and the same is true of the source of Sabbath keeping. Legislation can control neither the one nor the other.

* * *

THE first important battle in the South African war was fought on a Sunday, and resulted in a decisive defeat for the British troops under command of General White. This, our friends who are pushing Sunday claims will say, should teach the British commander the folly of fighting on that day. But what does it teach the victorious Boers?

* * *

"IN time of peace I am for the Administration when it is right; in time of war I am for the Administration, right or wrong."—*Chaplain Mailley, of the First Nebraska Regiment.*

"Some one," remarks *The Independent*, "wants to know if this utterance is compatible with Christian ethics." To which that journal answers: "Of course not. The last sentence is utterly, totally, irretrievably wrong. If Mr. Atkinson or the Reverend This or That believes the policy or conduct of war by the Administration to be wrong, he has no business to go to war, and he has no business to help the Administration. That ought to have been settled long ago in the history of this country."

* * *

A REPORT from South America says that a change in the marriage laws in Bolivia and Ecuador, where Roman Catholic rule has been longest undisturbed, is confidently looked for from the next congress. Up to the present time no marriages in those countries were legal except those performed by the priests; and as the priests would not marry any who were not Catholics, Protestants and other non-Catholics were obliged either to abstain from matrimony, or to place themselves before the public in much the same position that Mr. Roberts, of Utah, now occupies before the American people. The law made them criminals, and the church declared them adulterers; and in this way a very decided stigma was placed upon Protestantism. And this is what the Catholic Church everywhere says of Protestants everywhere.

* * *

WE have received a copy of the *Blue Ridge Baptist*, which claims to be the "only paper of its character pub-

lished in Southwest Virginia." Among some "distinctive Baptist marks" to which it calls attention we note these two:—

"1. The Bible is the sole and sufficient rule in all matters of religion—to the exclusion of human tradition."

* * *

If the *Baptist* holds to this principle, what course must it be expected to pursue in view of the fact that the Bible declares the seventh day to be the Sabbath, sets the Sabbath law in the bosom of the unchangeable Decalogue, nowhere says that any other day is the Sabbath, and that tradition alone does assert that Sunday ought to be kept as a sacred day?

* * *

"2. God has given to every man the right to interpret Scripture for himself, and therefore man is responsible to God and God alone for his faith and practise."

Yes; God has given every man the right to interpret Scripture for himself; but this is not saying that it is right for any man to do this. And plainly, it is not right; for no man is qualified to be an interpreter of Scripture, and a man can only involve himself in error when he attempts to do it. If a man is to have a human interpretation of Scripture, he might as well take that which has been furnished by the popes and the church councils and "fathers." But he does not want his own or any other human interpretation. He does not want any "private interpretation," which every human interpretation of Scripture must. He wants an interpretation by God's interpreter—the Holy Spirit. Only such an interpretation is authoritative and safe. And this he can have through the gift of the Holy Spirit, upon terms which are too plainly set forth to be missed by any Bible reader.

* * *

PRESS dispatches state that "a definite understanding has been reached between Great Britain and the United States and China," by which the United States will support Great Britain in her policy in China. This is understood by the governments of Europe, and they will formally request the United States "to select some specific part or portion of China as its base of commerce," to which it is to restrict its efforts to develop trade. "Great Britain," we are further told, "is very desirous that the United States should suggest a desire for a part in and a portion of the Yangtse-kiang Valley," where England's hold "is maintained in face of the opposition of combined Europe."

* * *

This news is sufficiently instructive and suggestive, but only what was to be expected in the natural course of events to which the existing national policy has given

rise. The United States will make no long stop at the Philippines on its way to the territorial and commercial riches of the Orient; and when it stands on the Asiatic mainland facing "combined Europe," the American people will be told that they are still paying only the costs of "legitimate expansion."

* * *

"His speeches against 'imperialism' all over the country are liberally interlarded with quotations from the addresses of Lincoln," says the *Chicago Times-Herald*, of a man whose attitude it strongly condemns. But what about the speeches of those who favor "expansion"—how much use have they for anything contained in Lincoln's addresses? If any of their speeches have been interlarded with quotations from him, we have failed thus far to hear of it in a single instance. And why is this so?

* * *

ALL the Roman Catholic churches in the Milwaukee diocese have been notified to arrange for the incorporation of the parishes, and as soon as they are incorporated and ready to receive property it will be deeded to them by Archbishop Katzer. This is to escape paying taxes on church property held by the archbishop, which by a recent court decision would be necessary. The archbishop held a large amount of property in the name of the church, for which he claimed exemption from taxation. But the Supreme Court of Wisconsin recently declared church property of this nature held by an archbishop was taxable. The Catholic Church, of course, does not mean to pay taxes if it can be avoided; in which respect that church is much like other churches.

* * *

It is proposed to prepare and present to Congress, before the close of the year, a petition signed by as many names as can be secured in a vigorous canvass throughout the country, to read as follows:—

"PATRIOT'S PLEDGE

"TO DEFEND THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AT THE POLLS.

"We, the undersigned voters, pledge ourselves to each other and to the American people to subordinate all other political issues, in 1900, to preservation of the free popular government founded by Washington and saved by Lincoln; to oppose at all costs the degradation of this democratic republic into a military empire; and to cast our ballots in favor of only such party platform and candidates as shall be thoroughly loyal to the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the equal rights of all mankind."

* * *

GENERAL Joseph Wheeler, who attained great popularity in the late Cuban campaign, writes from the Philippines to a relative in Nashville, Tenn., this statement

which bears upon the question of the disposition to be made of church property in those islands:—

"I have now seen much of the country and the people in that part of Luzon for about fifty miles north of Manila. In every town there is a magnificent stone church and a convent or monastery. The insurgents have a great antipathy to the priesthood or friars and they have dismantled many of the churches. The value of the church and monastery of a town seems to be equal in many cases to the value of all the other buildings in the town. The more I talk to the people the more I am convinced that the insurgents are actuated, in a measure, by a spirit of communism, and in their talks, their most serious objection to the church seems to be the fact that ecclesiastical organizations own so much of the property, and one of Aguinaldo's most earnest demands is that the church's property be confiscated."

* * *

WHILE the nation is bestowing so much honor on Admiral Dewey, it is interesting by way of contrast to note that the first man who ever became conspicuous in American naval history, John Paul Jones, lies in a grave the location of which the American nation does not even know.

* * *

In capturing the British ship "Serapis" with his ship the "Bon Homme Richard," which was in every way inferior to that of his adversary, and which was so much damaged in the fight that it sank down after the engagement, John Paul Jones achieved a much greater feat than did Dewey at Manila,—greater probably than any other mentioned in American naval annals. Yet not only is his grave unknown, but it appears probable that actual dishonor is joined with oblivion over his remains. A leading journal of this city says:—

"The place of his burial cannot now be determined, although a thorough investigation of the records has been made. It was thought that he was buried in Picpus Cemetery, Paris, where the remains of Lafayette lie, but it has been determined positively that such was not the case. A more likely supposition is that advanced by Mr. Henry Vignaud, of the American Embassy at Paris, who investigated the case, that, owing to the custom prevailing at the time of Jones's burial, the remains were deposited in a rented grave for a term of years, and upon the expiration of the lease the bones were thrown into the potter's field."

* * *

CAPTAIN LEARY, naval governor of Guam, the largest island of the Ladrone group, has found it necessary to the establishment of his authority in the island, to expel from it all but one of the seven Catholic friars who had practical control of affairs under the Spanish regime. In a report to Washington Captain Leary states that the friars resisted every decree and effort at reform, no matter of what character, and he was forced to

adopt heroic measures to establish American authority. Archbishop Chapelle, the Vatican's delegate to the islands, says the *World*, "is understood to view the action of Captain Leary with great disfavor," and "expressed the opinion that it was an outrage," as no doubt it was from the Catholic point of view.

* * *

"Is it not surprising," asks the *Ram's Horn*, that "if, as the Secretary of War says, 9,999,000 of the superstitious 10,000,000 population of the Philippines are our true and good friends," "they do not show their appreciation of our civilizing administration of their affairs, by purchasing our goods to a greater extent than \$404,171 during a whole half year?"

* * *

"In other words, while we have been supporting an army in the Philippines for the chief purpose of opening trade (and securing the Roman Catholic Church in its ownership of lands in jeopardy) at a cost of four or five million dollars a month, our enterprising merchants have only been able to sell goods at the rate of \$65,000, on which the monthly profit could scarcely be more than \$10,000. In other words, while we are making a little over \$100,000 a year in our export trade in the Philippines, which is an annual income of about a tenth of a cent for each of our population, we are spending, safely, \$50,000,000 a year for the purpose of proving to those obtuse heathen that we are determined to civilize them."

* * *

It further appears from the Treasury Report, says the *Ram's Horn*, that "of the total merchandise shipped there by us in a single month, nearly one fourth of it, measured by money value, consisted of Alcoholic liquors."

* * *

ONE question that is before the Vatican for settlement, says an English Catholic authority, is whether "absolution" given by telephone, is valid. As the pope recently decided that his blessing received by biograph was as potent as when received in the accustomed way, it would seem that absolution by telephone might be allowed.

* * *

SPEAKING of the question whether the "open door" policy of England or the "shut door" policy of Russia is to prevail in China, Mr. William Durban, who has traveled extensively in Asia, says in *The Outlook*:—

"The English mind is wedded to the doctrine of the 'open door,' and the Russian to that of the 'closed door,' but these doctrines, unfortunately, cannot be carried into practise without interference with the people who happen to live behind the door. England can keep the

door open only by controlling those behind it, and Russia can keep it shut only by asserting her paramount claim within the door. Herein lies the world's approaching trouble. Many countries will be drawn into the conflict which is coming."

And for what is the United States now preparing but to be drawn into that conflict?

* * *

THE *Union Signal* says that "If the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church follows the lead of the Rock River Conference it will be about as difficult for a Methodist in good standing to be elected mayor in one of our large cities as for a camel to go through a needle's eye. The Rock River Conference introduced a resolution memorializing the supreme body to make it an offense for a Methodist to grant a license for a saloon. The resolution evoked a long and spirited debate, but was adopted by a large majority."

* * *

It will be a good deal better to command as little prospect of election to public office as the camel has of going through a needle's eye, than to become mayor of a city by sanctioning the saloon.

Notes from the Church Congress.

"THE Sunday Question" was one of the subjects considered at the Church Congress, held at St. Paul, Minn. As might naturally be expected, the speakers took widely-different views of the subject. The audience was estimated as about 500. Rev. C. Fair, of Omaha, advocated a strict observance of the Sabbath (meaning Sunday) and lamented the disregard of the day. Rev. H. Tatlock urged that if Sunday observance was to be the rule among working men, they should not be enslaved the rest of the week. W. S. Rainsford, D. D., of New York, said that a wise spiritual policy followed by the church would spiritualize the times. But Mr. Warner, D. D., of New Orleans, was the only man that seemed to have noticed the true principle of the thing; and he, of course, declared that there should be no more legislation for Sunday than for any other questions suggested by the Decalogue; and admitted that there was no special sacredness in the day called Sunday. With consistency, therefore, he contended that recreation on Sunday was laudable. He gave a thrust by saying: "That there is a laxity from Puritan methods of Sunday keeping is acknowledged, and by some of us, with great joy. The painful rigidity of a mechanical observance of twenty-four hours is mercifully relaxing."

A notable feature of the occasion was the total absence of any Scripture for Sunday sacredness. One speaker did refer to the sacred Word by saying that

"There are two hundred passages in Holy Scripture bearing upon one day in seven as a day of rest and worship," and so turned his remarks as to imply the idea that all these testimonies were in favor of Sunday, which is not the truth, as he must know. He then asked: "Is all this Scripture merely dead history? or is the principle it contains a living issue, a social problem and a high religious duty? What was given in Eden must not be lost in America."

Of course this Scripture is not a dead history. It does contain a principle,—a living principle—and embraces a living issue. It will soon become one of the issues of the times. Let every soul study those Scriptures for himself, as before God.

H. F. PHELPS.

St. Paul, Minn.

Sunday Closing Notes.

EIGHT Ypsilanti, Mich., saloon-keepers were recently indicted for Sunday opening, and fined \$15 each.

THE Lord's Day Alliance of Canada has brought an action against a Toronto restaurant keeper for selling ice cream on Sunday.

THE City Council of Redwood Falls, Minn., has passed an ordinance to remove all screens or other obstructions to the public view in saloons on Sundays.

RECENTLY in Louisville, Ky., three hundred Christian Endeavorers, in an enthusiastic union meeting, unanimously resolved to unite with the other religious forces of the city in favor of closing the saloons and places of business on Sunday. The crusade will be a vigorous one.

THE city council of Columbus, O., lately impeached and removed from the office of director of public safety, Joseph W. Dusenberry; largely on account of his connection with the violation of the Sunday laws by the managers of the Olentangy Park Casino, of which he is part owner.

The Saloons Keep Sunday in Sioux City.

A DISPATCH from this Iowa city, dated October 29, says: "For the first time in years the saloon business was absolutely closed up over Sunday to-day. Under the old prohibition regime the liquor resorts ran constantly, either surreptitiously or with the authorities' connivance. When the mulct law went into effect they were at first permitted to run only Sunday forenoons. Soon the same liberty was permitted for the rest of the day.

"A month or two ago the Sioux City Ministerial Association protested vigorously against the condition. It was not expected their action would receive much attention, but last week, to every one's surprise, the Local Retail Liquor Dealers' Association adopted resolutions asking the enforcement of the law and pledging the members to aid the police in carrying out the work. The administration granted the request, and to-day drinks were to be had only at the local clubs.

"The regulation is also being enforced against pharmacies, and for a day, at least, the town has been almost entirely dry."

The Sioux City Ministerial Association and the Local Retail Liquor Dealers' Association, it will be noticed, stand on common ground in the matter of Sunday closing. But is this fact complimentary to either the Ministerial Association or to Sunday?

The Terms of an Interesting Treaty.

The full terms of the treaty or compact between the United States Government and the Sultan of Sulu, by which human slavery is again instituted in territory subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, have been made public, and are worthy of note. In substance they are as follows.

DICTATED BY THE UNITED STATES.

1. The United States guarantees protection to the Government of the Sultan as it now exists.

2. The United States agrees that all trade and domestic products of the archipelago, when carried on by the Sultan or the Moro people under the flag of the United States, is to be free, unlimited and undutiable.

3. The Sultan is allowed to communicate direct with the Military Governor of the Philippines at Manila in making complaint, protest or recommendation concerning the acts of United States officers representing American authority at Jolo. (The principal town and seat of the Sultan's Government.)

4. The United States agrees to the preservation of existing social conditions on condition that every person held in bondage or ownership under grant of the Sultan, or by individual purchase, shall be entitled to his liberty upon the payment of \$20 (American money) to the crown.

5. For governing his subjects and preserving the peace, in accordance with the instructions from the Military Governor of the islands, the Sultan is to receive the equivalent of \$500 American money per month; his three chief advisers to receive \$75 a month, and three secondary advisers \$60 a month; the Sultan's secretary, \$50 per month; the keeper of his household, known as Raja Mura (keeper of the royal harem), \$40 per month, and Serif Saguin (assistant keeper), \$15 per month.

The United States agrees not to sell any part of the archipelago to any foreign power without the consent of the Sultan and his Government.

DICTATED BY THE SULTAN OF SULU AND HIS ADVISERS.

1. Hadgi Mohamad Womolol Kiran, on behalf of

the Sultanate of Sulu, agrees to maintain absolute peace among his subjects and to punish, with the assistance of the United States Government, all hostile acts against the sovereignty of the latter Government.

2. The Sultan and his Government agree to the second article dictated by the United States.

3. The Sultan agrees to the third article dictated by the United States.

4. The Sultan agrees to make no change concerning the government of his people without proper consultation and the approval of the United States; as also the article defining the rights of bondmen to purchase their freedom.

5. The Sultan accepts on behalf of himself and his subordinates the salary to be paid him and them by the United States Government by an authorized agent of the United States, on the first day of each and every month, so long as the treaty shall remain in effect.

6. The Sultan agrees not to sell, dispose of, or lease any part of the archipelago over which he rules to any foreign power without the consent of the United States.

Slavery has existed in Sulu for three hundred years Spain countenanced it, and the Sultan of Sulu would not agree to any treaty which would limit his hereditary privileges. "As a concession, however," (this is published as the statement of a member of the President's Cabinet) "he agreed to the incorporation of an article in the treaty permitting the slaves to purchase their freedom for \$20 a head, to be paid to him. As there are about 75,000 slaves in his domain, the Administration professes to hope that he will be tempted by the opportunity to realize a large revenue of 'head money' through slaves taking advantage of the President's beneficence. But no provision was incorporated providing for any tribunal nor other means of determining when a slave could take advantage of this privilege."

The treaty is signed by General Otis, on behalf of the United States, and Hadgi Mohamad Womolol Kiran and six of his chief datos (or advisers).

Salient Events Characterizing the Philippine Policy.

1. IN April, 1898, the United States began war with Spain for the avowed purpose of liberating the people of Cuba. Congress passed a resolution declaring that "the people of Cuba are and of right ought to be, free and independent."

2. When Commodore Dewey was ordered to Manila, with his ships of war, the American consul-general at Singapore informed the State Department at Washington that he had conferred with General Aguinaldo, who was then at Singapore, as to securing the co-operation of the Philippine insurgents in fighting the Spanish forces; also that he had telegraphed to Commodore Dewey that Aguinaldo was willing to come to Hong

Kong (where Dewey was stationed with his fleet) to arrange with the latter for "general co-operation, if desired;" to which Dewey had replied, "Tell Aguinaldo come soon as possible."

3. Aguinaldo came to Hong Kong, the conference was held, Dewey sailed to attack the Spanish fleet in Manila harbor, and Aguinaldo was taken to Manila on an American ship of war.

4. The Philippine forces under Aguinaldo were supplied with arms by Commodore Dewey, and co-operated with the American forces in the capture of Manila.

5. The Filipino junta at Hong Kong, moved by this conference with Aguinaldo held at the request of United States officers, issued a proclamation to their people in Luzon which said: "Compatriots, divine Providence is about to place independence within our reach. The Americans, not from any mercenary motives, but for the sake of humanity, have considered it opportune to extend their protecting mantle to our beloved country. Where you see the American flag flying, assemble in mass. They are our redeemers."

6. July 5, 1898, Brigadier-General Thomas Anderson, then in command of the United States troops, wrote to Aguinaldo: "General, I have the honor to inform you that the United States of America, whose land forces I have the honor to command in this vicinity, being at war with the kingdom of Spain, has entire sympathy and most friendly sentiments for the native people of the Philippine Islands. For these reasons I desire to have the most amicable relations with you, and to have you and your people co-operate with us in military operations against the Spanish forces."

7. Immediately after the capture of Manila, the Filipino forces were ordered by the American commander to withdraw from the city and its suburbs. A request from Aguinaldo for an interview with General Merritt was refused; and the Filipino representatives were rigidly excluded at Washington and at Paris from any participation in the making of the treaty with Spain.

8. At this time there was established a Filipino government at Malolos, which controlled the territory of Luzon outside of the city and suburbs of Manila. This government was admitted by an American official who went to Malolos to have a well-organized and ably-conducted executive, and a popular assembly, or congress, which would compare favorably with the parliament of Japan.

9. December 21, 1898, President McKinley issued his "benevolent assimilation" proclamation, by which the American commander at Manila was directed to extend the military government of the United States over the entire Philippine archipelago, subduing by force of arms any who might resist. This was before the treaty with Spain had become valid by ratification in the American Senate.

10. Early in February, 1899, several Filipino soldiers entered the American lines, for what purpose is not

known. An American sentry fired upon them and killed one of them. The Filipino outposts returned the fire, and a general engagement ensued between the opposing lines of the two armies. At this time many Filipino officers, including Aguinaldo's private secretary, were in Manila at the theaters and cafés.

11. The following day Aguinaldo sent an officer under a flag of truce to General Otis, to declare that the fighting had been unauthorized by the Filipino leader, that he desired it stopped, and that to this end he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies. This proposition General Otis curtly refused, and gave Aguinaldo no alternative but to continue to fight or surrender. Since that date the fighting has been going on almost daily, with repeated overtures by the Filipinos for peace, and continued refusal by the United States to accept any terms short of full and unconditional surrender.

A Card.

To all interested in carrying the gospel of Jesus Christ to the inhabitants of other lands and who desire to assist in supporting missionaries already placed and others who may engage in the work, the opportunity is given to make an offering to the Foreign Mission Board of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

Such donations should be sent to the FOREIGN MISSION BOARD, 150 Nassau Street, New York.

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 Stamps 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.

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

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 fact.

ORGAN OF THE

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY.

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

ADDRESS,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,
39 Bond St., New York.

READY OCTOBER 30.

TRADE EDITION, PRICE \$1.50. "Desire of Ages."

In answer to an urgent demand we have gotten out an edition of "Desire of Ages" without illustrations, in small compass, on light paper, for the convenient use of those who want to carry a copy with them when traveling. There is also a class who do not feel that they can afford to pay \$3.50 for the beautiful subscription edition. To all these this plain edition will appeal.

It contains all the text of the subscription edition, including General and Scriptural Indexes and Appendix, but no illustrations except the frontispiece.

THE TRADE EDITION is 5½x7½ inches in size, and contains 1042 pages.


PRICES:

Cloth, - - - - \$1.50
Full leather, round corners, - - - 2.00

Ready October 30.

"A FRIEND IN THE KITCHEN."

WE have no apology to offer in bringing to the attention of our readers a cook book discarding an article of diet which is everywhere known to contain disease-producing germs, often of a most virulent type.



While "A Friend in the Kitchen" contains no flesh food recipes, it does contain an abundance of that which is most palatable and wholesome, and it also tells how the foods may be prepared in the best possible way.

Its 400 recipes are interspersed with short talks on foods and food combinations and other items of practical value and importance to every housewife, as well as to those who wish to study the subject of diet for their own benefit.

Remember it contains about 400 carefully tested recipes. The binding is a new preparation resembling leather, is almost as durable, and may be washed the same as colcloth. Price 60 cents postpaid.

Address

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


Kansas City, Mo.
Oakland, Cal.

AGENTS WANTED NOW!

You can make Money selling
THE NEW
WEBSTER DICTIONARY
AND
COMPLETE VEST-POCKET LIBRARY!

A Dictionary in Your Vest Pocket.

Absolutely Full Pronunciation; Synonyms; Plural Forms; Compound Words; 5,000 Difficult Words; Proper Names; Large Cities; Business Forms; Punctuation; Postal Regulations; etc., etc.



Contains:

1. A Dictionary.
2. A Gazetteer.
3. Manual of Parliamentary Rules.
4. Expert Calculator.
5. Literary Guide.

45,800 Words.

YOU NEED A
DICTIONARY!


OF THIS KIND.

Send to us at once for it.

Cloth, red edges, indexed, 25c. Morocco, gold edges, indexed, 50c.
Extra Morocco, gold edges, indexed, 60c.

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

Jesus Died for You.



This is the title of the new number (No. 63) of the APPLES OF GOLD LIBRARY written by Mrs. Luella L. Harmon. It is a Christ-filled appeal to sinners to yield themselves to Him who died for them. It is well calculated to soften and subdue hearts, and to do good wherever circulated.

Price, 50 cents per hundred.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
39 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
18 W. 5th St., Kansas City, Mo. Oakland, California.

Some Bible Bargains!

As we go over our Bible stock we find some shelf worn copies which have been used as samples, or been handled so that they are not new and perfect copies. In most cases the Bibles are perfect except for a little rubbed or worn appearance of the cover. Of some of the following there are only single copies, so *order at once*, giving first and second choice.

The following are all "self-pronouncing" and in a unique manner show at a glance both the authorized and revised versions. Printed in large, clear type, with references.

Style H. Bound in full imitation morocco, divinity circuit, leather lined, gilt edges, over 350 pages teachers helps and maps. Price, \$2.00.

Style I. Same as above, but contains no helps except concordance and maps. Price, \$1.85.

Style J. Same as Style H, but without helps or maps. Price, \$1.75.

THIS ADVERTISEMENT WILL NOT APPEAR AGAIN.

If you want any of these, write to-day or you may be too late.

Address only

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

A Great Paper.

Under date of
NOVEMBER 29, 1899,
the

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

will issue a **double number special**, to be called the
"WORLD'S HARVEST NUMBER"

(32 pages and cover), handsomely illustrated. It will contain matter depicting in startling though truthful words the striking signs of the times in which we live, from **TWENTY DIFFERENT STANDPOINTS**, by **AS MANY ABLE WRITERS**, some of whom are of world-wide repute. All this in addition to editorials, original poems, original music, and miscellaneous matter—as much in quantity, and far better in quality, than the average \$1.00 book.

Ready after November 1. Single copy, 10 cents; five to twenty copies, 5 cents each; twenty-five copies and over, 4 cents each.

Address, **Signs of the Times,**
Oakland, Cal.

Do not fail to secure a copy. It will be worth many times its cost.

Two Important Sabbath Tracts.

In these days when there is so much agitation in regard to the Sabbath it is important to understand the question in all its bearings. The two new treatises announced below will be read with much interest.

SHOULD NOT CHRISTIANS KEEP THE SABBATH?

Some unanswerable arguments in reply to Rev. R. A. Torry's pamphlet entitled "Ought Christians to Keep the Sabbath?"

WORDS OF TRUTH, No. 20.
Price \$2.00 per hundred.

THE SEAL OF GOD AND ITS COUNTERFEIT.

A clear, concise, and scriptural argument showing what is God's seal and what is its counterfeit.

Bible Students' Library, No. 157.
32 Pages, Illustrated.
\$2.00 per hundred.

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



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 9, 1899.

AS BETWEEN Sunday work and Sunday idleness, is there any question as to which will be the more productive of crime?



THE man who cannot get to church because a Sunday newspaper is thrown in his direction, will certainly never get far in the direction of heaven until he becomes better fitted to overcome spiritual obstacles. But a Sunday law will not qualify him in this respect.



WASHINGTON warned the nation against foreign entanglements; Jefferson wrote that all men are created equal and have the same unalienable rights; Abraham Lincoln said that no man was good enough to govern another man without that other's consent, and that the doing of such a thing was despotism. It is not strange therefore that the advocates of foreign conquest, in their efforts to justify the same, never quote from these American authorities.



HAVING inspected an advance copy of the World's Harvest Number of the *Signs of the Times*, we know that it cannot be too highly recommended for the instructive and timely matter it contains, and that no one who peruses it will be disappointed in its contents. It is certain to exceed your expectations. We believe it can be sold readily by almost anyone, and we hope it will have as wide a circulation as it deserves. See notice on p. 703.



THE command to keep the Sabbath is a command to sanctify *one* day of the week, and cannot therefore be kept by sanctifying *two* days

of the week. Conscience tells an individual that he should sanctify—or set apart—a certain day of the week, by resting from his work, and the law, perchance, says that he must rest on a different day. Either, then, he must disregard the Sabbath command by sanctifying two days of the week, or he must disregard his conscience by sanctifying a day he believes to be the wrong one, or he must disregard the law of the land. Which shall he do?



THE Supreme Court of Georgia, in a decision upon the case of Mr. A. J. Waters, of Gainesville, convicted for working on Sunday, sustained the verdict of the lower court from which the appeal was taken; thus upholding the Sunday law of that State. We learn, however, that a petition for pardon was circulated in Gainesville and liberally indorsed by the citizens; and when this was brought before Governor Candler, the latter promptly granted the pardon. We do not believe the people of the State of Georgia who knew of this case wanted to see Mr. Waters go to the chain-gang for an act in which he was conscientious, and to which objection could be taken only on religious grounds. And while they felt bound to uphold the Sunday law (though it is only justice that can truly bind us), we believe the majority of them view this termination of the case with satisfaction.



AS THE SENTINEL has much to say against the reform ideas of certain religious or semi-religious societies, large and small, which have now become quite numerous in the land, we wish to say also that its columns are open to representatives of these organizations for the presentation of their side of the questions discussed, and we shall be pleased if any of them will avail themselves of this offer, in the interests of truth, stipulating only that they be able to state their views clearly and concisely, and within the limits of space

which the SENTINEL can afford to give. And we will be governed by the same rules in replying. We challenge no one, but we wish to be fair with all whose ideas we condemn, and to show that we are contending not for our own advantage, but for the truth.



THE *St. Paul Globe* (Minn.) complains (see p. 694) that the President in his Thanksgiving proclamation has mixed his politics with religion. It is evident that he has; but is this anything strange? As President of the United States, Mr. McKinley is purely a *political* figure. And when, as such, he issues a *religious* proclamation, what is to be expected but that in it politics and religion will get mixed together? And of course the President cannot be blamed for putting his own politics in, in preference to the politics of others.



WE are told that "a degradation of morals usually follows a profanation of the Sabbath day." One would get the idea from this that the profanation of the Sabbath is the cause of the degradation of morals, instead of being as it really is, an effect of that degradation. There must first be a degradation of morals before there can be an immoral act; and therefore the profanation of the Sabbath, which is an immoral act, is not the source of the evil; and to reach that source the reformer must go back of Sabbath desecration.



THE effect of religious legislation upon the dissenter is to force him either to give up his own religion, or to practise two religions at once.



RELIGIOUS legislation and religious liberty may be likened to the lion and the lamb,—they cannot lie down together.



THE law of God operates upon the heart through love; the law of man operates through fear.