

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

VOLUME 15.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 4, 1900.

NUMBER 1.

*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.)

THE conscience can acknowledge no master but God alone.



NO MORAL question can be settled by ballot, or by vote of the legislature.



ANY scheme which makes one man *morally* accountable to another man, or set of men, is popery; and no such scheme can be any better than the papacy.



THE scheme to have the Constitution "acknowledge God" is really a scheme to have that document acknowledge the theorists back of this scheme as the moral rulers of the nation.

THE agencies of the divine government are not human, but invisible spiritual agencies which proceed from the throne of God. With their appointment man can have nothing to do.

THE true acknowledgment of God is always made in the individual heart; and if God be not acknowledged in the hearts of the people, any outward acknowledgment of him is only hypocrisy and sin.



WE have been told that "this is a Christian nation;" but we have never been pointed to the time when it was

baptized, or the occasion when it was "born again," or to any evidence that it is "crucified with Christ," or that it exists to serve rather than to be served.



"GOVERNMENT of the people, by the people," is responsible alone to the people; the creature is responsible alone to its creator. God is the Creator of the people, and they are responsible to him; but directly, as individuals, and not through some creature which they may bring forth.



"THE kingdom of God is within you," said Jesus Christ; hence the throne of God is in the Christian's heart, and the voice that speaks from it is the voice of God. And any attempt to set up a national conscience over the individual conscience is an attempt to drive God from his throne in the heart, and set him upon a man-made throne in the state.

### The New Interpreters of the Constitution.

WHEN the Constitution of the United States was established, its provisions fixing the total separation between religion and the state made it essentially distinct from all views held by the Catholic Church on the subject of religion and the state. This was essentially the Protestant and Christian principle established as the fundamental and supreme law of this nation. As such the papacy looked upon it, and therefore refused to acknowledge the Government as a true government. Accordingly in the *Catholic World* of September, 1871, the leading Catholic writer in the United States at that time referred to the Constitution and Government of the United States as follows:—

"As it is interpreted by the Protestant principle, so widely diffused among us we do not accept, or hold it to be any government at all, or as cap-

able of performing any of the proper functions of government; and if it continues to be interpreted by the revolutionary principles of Protestantism, it is sure to fail. . . . Hence it is, we so often say that if the American Republic is to be sustained and preserved at all it must be by the rejection of the principle of the Reformation, and the acceptance of the Catholic principle by the American people."

In 1892—February 29—the Supreme Court by liberal quotations of Catholic documents, and other documents embodying Catholic principles, proved to its own satisfaction and accordingly unanimously announced that the establishment of the Christian religion is within the meaning of the Constitution, and that therefore this is a Christian nation. This was distinctly the interpretation of the Constitution according to the Catholic principle.

As soon as this had become known to the Catholic students of the Constitution at Rome, there was published in the United States the purpose of Pope Leo XIII. that what the church has done for other nations in the past she would now do for the United States. In order to accomplish this purpose he sent in *that same year* his personal representative to this country and set up at the capital of the nation his Apostolic Delegation. And by that personal representative of his, Pope Leo XIII. in the next year, 1893, publicly called "upon all the Catholics of America to go forward, in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth, and in the other *the Constitution of the United States*" to "bring your countrymen, *bring your country* into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness—Christ and his church."

As the Catholic Bible is the only Bible any Catholic would ever be expected by the pope to carry in one hand, so it is only the Catholic Constitution—the Constitution interpreted according to the Catholic principle—that any Catholic would ever be expected by Leo XIII. to carry in the other hand.

Accordingly in 1895 Apostolic Delegate Satolli began to practise the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States for Catholic interests, and of course only according to the Catholic principle; and, after the example set by the Supreme Court of the United States, declared that in the Constitution there "was inserted the article of separation of the state from any *religious sect*."

This bit of history is essential in order to a good understanding of the very latest move of Rome in this connection, which is as follows: In 1894 there came from Rome to Washington city a certain Monsignor Sharetti as auditor of the Apostolic Delegation then lately established there. About a month ago this Monsignor Sharetti was appointed Bishop of Havana in Cuba. And now it is announced that this man, who, so far as information goes, has been in the United States only about five years, was appointed to that bishopric

not only "on account of his knowledge of canon law," but also on account of his knowledge of "*the Constitution of the United States*, and the method of procedure in our courts"!!

And this special knowledge of his of "the Constitution of the United States, and the method of procedure in our courts" was especially in his favor in his receiving this appointment to the bishopric of Havana because of "the prominence in Havana of questions concerning the property of the Roman Catholic Church."

As Bishop of Havana, of course, Sharetti will be the principal in all questions concerning church property in all Cuba. Accordingly to him will fall most largely if not entirely the interpretation of the Constitution in all cases in which church property is involved. And thus the interpretation of the Constitution according to the Catholic principle is given a new and mighty impetus and one of the largest of fields for the exercise thereof. And since it is held that the sustainment and preservation of "the American Republic" depends upon the interpretation of the Constitution according to the Catholic principle, what a wide field is opened to Bishop Sharetti in which to show his zeal for the salvation of this nation in interpreting according to the Catholic principle the Constitution of which he is said to have such special knowledge!

And how far is this situation of Bishop Sharetti removed from a union of the Catholic Church and the nation of which the Constitution that he is to interpret is the supreme law?

And now if only there can be secured a bishop of Manila, and a bishop of Puerto Rico, each of whom like Sharetti is especially gifted in the knowledge of the Constitution of the United States so that he can readily interpret it according to the Catholic principle and can have the widest possible field for the exercise of his talent, then Rome will have her campaign so well in hand that she could very easily begin the interpretation of the Constitution in the United States itself. And since Archbishop Chapelle who is Apostate Delegate to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, has made this beginning with Sharetti, would it not rather be expected that he would follow it up in Puerto Rico and the Philippines? Indeed only a few days ago we saw the announcement in print that "the papal agents want Father McKinnon to be bishop of Manila if the consent of the pope and President McKinley can be obtained." As McKinnon is already coadjutor to the *archbishop* of Manila, his accession to the bishopric of Manila may not be very far off. And even if he should not become bishop, this could not make a great deal of difference since he is coadjutor to the archbishop and will be the principal one to deal with the American authorities. Great things are going on.

A. T. J.

NO MORTAL man has either the authority or the power to sign the name of God to anything.

## The W. C. T. U. and Sunday Laws.

THE National W. C. T. U. has now definitely put itself on record on the question of Sunday laws and Sabbath-keepers, in the following words:—

*“Resolved, That we favor the amendment of all State Sunday laws which do not contain the usual exemption for those who keep the Sabbath day.”*

This resolution was offered “as involving all necessary points, and omitting the objectionable ones,” in the following resolution, which was before the convention:—

*“Resolved, That as a National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union we protest against any such interpretation or use of any lines of our work as shall give aid or comfort to those who, through ignorance, prejudice, or malice, would enact or enforce such laws as can be made to serve the purpose of persecution, or to in any manner interfere with the most perfect liberty of conscience concerning days, or the manner of their observance.”*

Now, we wish that somebody would take this original resolution and point out the “objectionable points.”

We really desire to know what points there are in that resolution that are “objectionable;” and then to know, also, why they are “objectionable.”

As the National Union has taken this action, and so has committed itself to the consideration of this subject, it is entirely proper for them to signify the “objectionable points” in that resolution. And we now say to all the women of the N. W. C. T. U. that the columns of this paper, the AMERICAN SENTINEL, are freely open to them, in which to show these “objectionable points.”

It is proper that they should do this, because we are concerned in it. They have adopted a resolution definitely directed to “those who keep the Sabbath day.” There are about fifty thousand of the Seventh-day Adventists, alone, besides the Seventh-day Baptists, in the United States, who are concerned in the action of the National Union in passing this resolution, and who shall be concerned in their putting the resolution into effect. And, as in their estimation, the resolution that they passed, was passed expressly in order to avoid the “objectionable points” in the resolution that was before the convention, they ought to be willing, for the sake of the many who are concerned, to state what are the “objectionable points” in the original resolution, and why we should be expected to accept the substitute, and their action in carrying it out, instead of insisting upon the principles embodied in the resolution for which the one that was adopted is the substitute. For, surely, they ought to have our co-operation in what they have adopted; and we can assure the N. W. C. T. U. that we do sincerely wish to co-operate with them in every way that is possible, and we will do so. But when a vital principle is in-

involved, then adherence to principle is of more worth than is co-operation at the expense of principle.

In the National W. C. T. U. convention the following notice was given:—

*“Madam President and Delegates: I give notice that at the next annual convention I, or some one in my place, will offer the following amendment to the constitution:—*

### “ARTICLE VI.—PLANS OF WORK.

*“Nothing shall ever be incorporated into any plan of N. W. C. T. U. work, by department or otherwise, which must of necessity become the occasion of sectarian controversy, or which can in any sense be made to interfere with perfect liberty of conscience.”*

This is the regularly established procedure in the N. W. C. T. U. in all matters pertaining to amendments to the constitution. This notice, therefore, stands as perfectly regular and strictly in order; and, as such, is before the union for consideration, through the whole year, until the next annual convention, and will then be before the convention for consideration in convention, and for the decision of the convention.

Thus, by two distinct acts—their own action as a convention, and this notice of an amendment to the constitution—the N. W. C. T. U. is committed definitely to the consideration of Sunday laws as affecting Sabbath observers, and to the consideration of their plans of work with respect to whatever may be, or may become, “the occasion of sectarian controversy, or which can in any sense be made to interfere with perfect liberty of conscience.” In other words, the N. W. C. T. U., by these two acts, is brought face to face, officially and as a body, with the question of religious liberty—the rights of conscience as involved in Sunday laws and Sabbath observance. We are glad of it. This is a good thing. It is one of the best things that has happened to the N. W. C. T. U. since about 1886, at least, if not one of the best things that ever happened to it.

THE National Union, in convention assembled, has declared itself in “favor” of “the amendment of all State Sunday laws which do not contain the usual exemption for those who keep the Sabbath day.” This action of theirs commits them to an examination of all the State Sunday laws, to discover which of them does “not contain the usual exemption for those who keep the Sabbath day;” and then, having found these, to “favor the amendment” of them.

In the nature of the case, this commits the whole National Union to the study of the question of Sunday laws and Sabbath observers. And, as there is a regularly introduced notice of an amendment, which they will be asked to adopt at the next annual convention, by which “nothing shall ever be incorporated into any plan of the N. W. C. T. U. work, by department or other-

wise, which must of necessity become the occasion of sectarian controversy, or which can in any sense be made to interfere with perfect liberty of conscience,"—this, backing up their own work to which they are committed by their own resolution, in the nature of things, requires them, in the examination of "all State Sunday laws," to consider whether there be any thing connected with these that may "become the occasion of sectarian controversy, or which can in any sense be made to interfere with perfect liberty of conscience."

Thus, by their own action *in resolution*, and by regular notice of *an amendment to their constitution*, the N. W. C. T. U. is pledged to the consideration of "perfect liberty of conscience" as connected with Sunday laws and Sabbath observers. And, in the consideration of this mighty question,—one of the most important ever known,—the most important that has ever been before the N. W. C. T. U., the AMERICAN SENTINEL can freely give, and hereby does pledge itself to give, the most hearty co-operation. And we call upon all Seventh-day Adventists in the nation to give the same co-operation in the consideration of this great question as the AMERICAN SENTINEL proposes to give. Let all "those who keep the Sabbath day" assist by all possible means—by literature, lectures, sermons, Bible instruction, social converse—in every way help, and co-operate with, the women of the N. W. C. T. U. in the consideration of this great question, which is inevitably now before them for at least a whole year.

A. T. J.

---

### How to Compel a Man to Keep the Sabbath.

BY A. F. BALLENGER.

MANY ministers are giving their whole time to the work of influencing legislators, executive officers, to make and enforce laws compelling men to observe Sunday. All this is worse than lost time. Civil law never made a Sabbath-keeper. The Sabbath law is spiritual. Civil law is not spiritual. A carnal law cannot bear spiritual fruit. There is a way to make real Sabbath-keepers out of Sabbath-breakers. Here is the way it is done.

A minister was preaching the gospel in a Maryland town. There was in the audience a very wicked man. He was a slave to tobacco and whiskey. His hair had grown gray in sin. His sins had separated him from his family, and he was living a hermit's life in a little shanty on the bay.

At the close of the gospel sermon a call was made for men and women to forsake their sinful ways and turn to the Lord. Those who desired that prayer be offered for them were asked to raise their hands. This wicked man, this Sabbath-breaker, raised his hand. When these sinners were asked to surrender all to God and kneel down and unite in prayer for the forgiveness

of sins, the wicked Sabbath-breaker knelt down. In less than five minutes the wicked Sabbath-breaker was converted into a new man. In less than five minutes the wicked Sabbath-breaker became a Sabbath-keeper. When he arose from his knees he had accepted into his life the Spirit of the great Sabbath-keeper, Jesus Christ. This wicked man did not come to the meeting expecting to become a Sabbath-keeper, but he heard the truth preached with compelling power and he yielded to its influence and became one.

After the meeting he said: "My tools were all sharpened ready to go to work to-morrow (this was Friday night) but to-morrow is the Sabbath, and I am going to keep it." This man was baptized and joined the church. He was reunited with his family, and a happy home resulted. Some weeks later an unconverted son remarked to the writer that there was a great change in their home; another unconverted boy declared that since father was converted their home was like heaven. This is the way Sabbath-keepers are made. Every other process will fail. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed can be.*" Why then attempt to compel the carnal mind to be subject to the law of God when the Spirit of God says it cannot be done? But "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," received into the heart of a Sabbath-breaker will destroy the carnal mind and set him "free from the law of sin and death" so that the "righteousness of the law" can "be fulfilled" in him. What the world needs and what Sabbath breakers need is not "the law of a carnal commandment" but "the power of an endless life,"—"the power from on high"—the Holy Spirit. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Washington, D. C.

---

### Sunday Law Decision Reversed in Pennsylvania.

Ariel, Pa., Dec. 25.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL:—In August last David Edwards caused S. B. Field, a Sabbath keeper and now a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church here to be arrested for binding and drawing oats on Sunday, a notice of which appeared in the SENTINEL, of August 17.

The justice decided against Mr. Field and fined him \$4 and costs. Mr. Field's lawyer appealed the case to the County Court. Last week the judge reversed the decision of the justice, thereby clearing Mr. Field.

A. L. COBB.

---

A NEW JERSEY judge has decided in a test case that a Sunday shave is a necessity. It is still too soon to express the hope that any judge in New Jersey or any other State will decide that the personal liberty of the American citizen is a necessity.—*N. Y. World.*

## An Interesting Case Decided.

THE Supreme Court of Iowa recently decided a very interesting case, involving the legality of Sunday contracts, and in effect affirming the right of the church to a monopoly of that day for church work.

The case in question was on this wise: A certain gentleman, whose name is of no importance in this connection, subscribed to a fund raised by a certain church in Fort Madison. But when an attempt was made to collect the subscription, he refused payment.

The grounds of this refusal to redeem his pledge were, first, that there was no consideration; second, that the contract was void because of the fact that it was made on Sunday.

The plea that there was no consideration, or "value received," was swept away as a mere quibble, the court remarking that the pledge would doubtless "never have been made without sufficient consideration, whether tangible or not."

Thus far the decision of the Iowa court must commend itself to all fair-minded people as being in strict accord with the demands of justice. Contracts are frequently made and material purchased on the strength of just such subscriptions, and it is only right that men making such pledges should be required to redeem them.

But this could not be done in this case without sustaining a Sunday contract, and it was at this point that the court got tangled. The promise to pay to said fund was clearly a contract, made on Sunday. To sustain this contract upon the broad ground that all men have an inherent right to make contracts whenever they see fit, would have been to sweep away no inconsiderable part of the Iowa Sunday law.

The question was solved thus: The court said that while *an ordinary contract made on Sunday was illegal*, one to do good could not be so considered. "The custom of taking offerings on the first day of the week has existed from time immemorial, and no one has supposed this to be prohibited by statute. Otherwise the deacons or others in passing around the hat and the minister in directing this to be done are amenable to the penalties of the law. The Founder of Christianity held it to be lawful to do good on the Sabbath day."

Now while giving to the cause of God may very properly be held to be a part of divine worship, and not to be prohibited nor restricted in any way, by what right does any American court thus award to the church and to church people, to deacons, stewards, ministers, etc., a monopoly in the matter of raising funds and of making legal contracts on any day of the week, whether that day be Sunday or some other day? For if the legislature and the courts can grant such a monopoly for one day why not for more than one?

The Iowa Bill of Rights provides that "All laws of

a general nature shall have a uniform operation. The General Assembly shall not grant to any citizen or class of citizens privileges or immunities which upon the same terms shall not equally belong to all citizens."

But do not those who take up church collections, and who secure pledges for church enterprises, constitute a "class" within the meaning of the Bill of Rights? and does not the law, as interpreted by the court in question, grant to this class a privilege which does not belong equally to all citizens? It certainly does.

Suppose that the agnostics of the State of Iowa were to hold a large Sunday meeting for the purpose of raising a fund to erect a monument to the memory of the late Colonel Ingersoll, or to found a Freethought College, or to circulate the writings of Paine, Volney, *et al.*, would the courts of Iowa hold that subscriptions made to such a fund on Sunday were collectable by legal process? If so the reasons given would have to be very different from those given in the Fort Madison church case.

The decidedly religious features of this case simply emphasize the fact that notwithstanding constitutional guarantees of equal rights for all men without regard to their religious beliefs and practises, religious people have been given a monopoly of Sunday for religious purposes. This class may raise money upon that day, and for this purpose may make legal contracts; but "ordinary contracts" made upon Sunday for ordinary purposes are illegal!

This decision involves the whole question of the proper relations of church and state. The precedent established is a dangerous one. Who cannot see that the same authority that can thus favor Christianity might not with the same ease favor any particular sect to the exclusion of all other sects?

We believe that the contract in question was properly held to be legal, but not for the reasons given. The truth is that the right to make contracts is an inherent, inalienable right of which government has no just power to deprive any portion of citizens. The idea of restricting this right upon one day of each week to the churches for church purposes, is abhorrent to all correct principles of religious equality and of religious liberty. The state owes to Christianity only the same protection accorded to all men. Genuine Christianity needs no favors from civil government, nor does it ask for them. She who leans upon Cæsar's arm for support is not the bride of Christ.

C. P. B.

**The Wages of Sin.**—The story is told of a young man who was addicted to the cigarette habit. He had smoked 1,200 packages, and wrote to the manufacturers to know what they would give for the 1,200 pictures that had come with the cigarettes. The answer of the manufacturers was right to the point—"Smoke 1,200 more and we will send you a coffin."—*Bible Echo*.

## What Would Jesus Do?

BY W. N. GLENN.

THIS is the proposed motto of a proposed "United Christian Party." The name implies the purpose of such a party, even without the express design of having "Christian voters all united at the ballot box." The subject is the establishment of religious politics, or political religion. The call for the organization of such a party verbally disavows a union of church and state, but its success could mean only that, nothing less. Why would Christians seek to unite all their *force* at the ballot box (for the ballot is just so much of the *force* principle upon which civil governments are based)? Would not the purpose manifestly be to force control of political matters, hence control of the Government?

Such a party would assume to be Christian. If all Christians should sustain this party, as the call suggests, would not it be a church party? If it should succeed at the polls, would not the Government virtually pass into the hands of the church? The officers elected, if true to their pledges, would be obligated to carry out the principles—in other words, to obey the behests—of the Christian party, which party would be the church. Thus the logic of the proposed "United Christian Party" is church domination of the state, or practical church and state union.

Well, would it not be well to have the Government taken out of the hands of wicked men, mere selfish politicians? The United Christian Party proposes to put only "God-fearing men" into office; would not that be a grand consummation? Yes, this all sounds well from the rostrum, and reads well on paper; but it never can be accomplished by professed Christians organizing for power to control their fellow-men by force. Control by civil government is control by force; and the party that seeks such control cannot be a Christian party. It would only be operating under a Christian guise; its very incipency must needs be hypocrisy, and therefore it would be the most corrupt of all political parties.

As to its motto, "What Would Jesus Do?" we ask, What *did* Jesus do? At a certain time the people wanted to make him king—wanted to "take him by *force* and make him king"—the highest political position in their gift. What opportunities for reform in government and in society that position would have afforded him! Were not such reforms needed then? They certainly were. Did he accept? No; he spurned the idea, and hid himself from the temptation. Was it because he thought he could not succeed in getting the place? No; he had the power of God behind him, and could have attained to any position that it was consistent for him to hold. His mission was to "preach good tidings to the meek," to "bind up the broken-hearted," to "proclaim liberty to the captives," and the "opening

of the prison to them that are bound," to "proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God," to "comfort all that mourn," etc. Isa. 61:1-3.

Here is not one word about engaging in politics; not a word about reforming civil government or society through political methods. The only reformatory or beneficiary measures He ever suggested are comprehended in the proclamation of the gospel, by precept and example. And his word to his disciples is, "Follow me." The men who are endeavoring to form political parties for the purpose of controlling the Government are not following Christ or his apostles.

Have these professed Christians ever thought seriously of what the establishment of a Christian government means to this Government and to their work. There can be no Christian government without Christ at the head of it. He is coming to this earth to set up just such a government. But when he comes, it will be the death knell of every earthly government then in existence, no matter what its pretense may be. His kingdom is represented by the stone "cut out *without hands*" (Daniel 2) which will break in pieces every other government, and "fill the whole earth." Not one of the governments of men will be patched up by political means and made to do service as the kingdom of Christ. The prophet saw them all become "like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them."

But not only will all human governments be destroyed, but all human beings who have not the Spirit of Christ will be destroyed "by the brightness of his coming." Christ himself declared, "My kingdom is not of this world;" and men who are endeavoring to build him a worldly kingdom and to force worldly people into allegiance to it, are simply building in Christ's name a structure which, together with the builders, he will utterly repudiate and destroy at his coming.

Oakland, Cal.

---

## Providence and Imperialism.

By Thos. C. Hodgson.

IMPERIALISTS are prone to charge upon providence the responsibility of our present troubles in the East. This is an old dodge. No nation ever yet did a mean thing without blaming providence for it. Napoleon used another term but he meant the same thing when he excused all his crimes against other nations, and his own, too, under the plea of "destiny." Great statesmen are very fond of hiding behind this subterfuge.

Now if it be true that providence has ordained that the United States must become a "world power," then there is nothing for us to do but "take up the white man's burden." But one can't help wondering why providence didn't throw Canada into our lap. Since

providence made the world and fashioned the continents it would seem that it must have designed Canada for the United States, or *visa versa*; and since we have discovered so recently that the consent of the governed is not necessary, why not take over Canada? Her territory is much needed to round out our American farm.

But alas! These shrewd statesmen have discovered that providence always takes the side of the heaviest guns. If England were only as weak and decrepid as Spain how soon would Canada be ours, and that, too, in the interests of humanity, and for their good as well as ours! Modern statesmanship is about as hard to understand as "the ways of providence." "Be not deceived," we have as much human nature in us as any other nation. We have more of the spirit of aggrandizement than earlier nations ever had, and when we want to extend our dominion it is not hard to find a pretext for jumping upon some weak and helpless people.

That we should go half way around the globe to pounce upon a people that never injured us, nor gave us the slightest pretext for invading their territory, is so preposterous on its face that it is not strange we should seek to saddle the responsibility entirely on providence.

---

### Servitude Under Our Flag.

*New York "World."*

HAWAII is now a part of the United States. The Constitution of the United States forbids "slavery or involuntary servitude, except for crime," in any territory controlled by this country.

Yet in Hawaii there are 100,000 men held in involuntary servitude, and the act annexing the islands provided for a continuation of this unlawful condition of things.

The American Federation of Labor in session at Detroit has entered protest by unanimous vote. Its action is timely and necessary. If it were true, as asserted, that the Hawaiian sugar plantations cannot be successfully worked without some form of slave labor, then the Hawaiian sugar plantations should be left to grow up in weeds.

No "interest" on the face of the earth can compensate for slavery. No consideration of gain can justify or excuse involuntary servitude. Better a wilderness anywhere than a land fructified by the sweat of slaves.

But it is not true that the sugar plantations cannot be cultivated without slave labor. The like was said of our Southern cotton fields. Yet never in the history of slavery did those fields produce more than one-half the cotton crop that they now yield from free labor every year.

Our first national duty is to make an end of the bondage of men wherever our flag floats, whether in Hawaii or Sulu.

### Christmas and "Peace on Earth."

*"The Union Signal," Dec. 1899.*

TO-DAY, the two nations representing the highest type of civilization, the two nations to whom have been granted such marvelous opportunities for knowing and applying the principles of Christianity, are each engaged in an aggressive war; a war with a people weaker than themselves; a war for the extension of territory and the acquisition of material gain. Surely there must be an undertone of irony as well as of woe in the Christmas carols of both England and America in this year of our Lord, 1899.

But the red-handed war upon the field of battle is not the only warfare which is being carried on in our nation and throughout the world. Indeed, there is a profound sense in which that may be called a "peaceful war" when it is compared with the industrial and economic warfare in which well nigh every human being, wittingly or unwittingly, is compelled to take a part.

Think of the cornering of industries in the hands of the few while thousands trained to gain a livelihood by means of those industries are persistently kept out of work. See how the very first right which each human being should be able to claim—the right to work—is denied to multitudes, lest through "over-production" there should be a lessening of the enormous receipts of the few. We starve in this country because of "over-production!" Is not that the devil's own logic?

Read a paragraph or two gleaned almost at random from some of the leading papers of the land: "Gatling guns are the means to cure striking mobs." "The simplest plan, probably, when one is not a member of the Humane Society, is to put strychnine or arsenic in the provision furnished to tramps. This is a warning to other tramps to keep out of the neighborhood."


"If workingmen have no vote they might be amenable to the teachings of the times."

"There seems to be but one remedy and it must come—change of ownership of the soil and a creation of class land-owners on the one hand and of tenant farmers on the other—something similar to what existed in the older countries of Europe."

And this in Christian America! And this in "God's last experiment with humanity!" And this in "the land of the free!" Surely to one who has eyes to see and ears to hear, the Christmas chimes must often sound like a great wail rising from the depths of a sorely disappointed humanity. They must mean the crying of Peace, Peace, when there is *no peace*.

---

CINCINNATI reports an order from Manila for twenty car-loads of beer. The consignee, a Manila saloon-keeper, and a firm believer in the necessity of "expansion," says he has a demand for eight car-loads a week.



THE New York Sabbath Committee are determined to punish people in this city who violate the Sunday law by giving theatrical exhibitions.

\* \* \*

BECAUSE an opera house which had recently been rebuilt in Newark, N. Y., was to be opened Thursday evening, on which evening the usual church prayer meetings are conducted in that town, the proprietor of the opera house was severely scored by a Newark clergyman from his pulpit, as having given "an affront to the Christian churches of this village."

\* \* \*

This is treating the theater as a rival of the church; but a church which is in a condition to suffer from the rivalry of a worldly institution, is certainly not in the right condition spiritually. The opera house, considered with reference to the exhibitions usually given, is against the church all the time, just as all worldliness is against the church; and if church members go to the opera on an evening when no church services are held, it is just as bad as regards their efficiency as Christian workers as if they went on prayer meeting evening. If church members lose from their hearts the vital power of godliness, at any time during the week, they are unfitted for efficiency in the church to which they belong, and their connection with it is only a hindrance rather than a help.

\* \* \*

When a church has reason to fear the rivalry of worldly show-giving institutions, it is evidence that the church is on a worldly level. On the high plane of spirituality no worldly institution can be planted; and while the church remains on that plane, as it is her high privilege constantly to do, attractions will be offered her adherents with which worldly allurements have no power at all to compete.

\* \* \*

THE Secretary of the Treasury was quoted recently as saying, when asked for an explanation of some financial dealings between himself as agent of the Government and a certain bank, that it was wholly a matter between the Government and the bank, and did not concern the people at all. If this is so, then it must be that the Government has come to be something apart and

distinct from the people, so that the concern of the one is not the concern of the other; and it is time for a new definition of government in the United States.

\* \* \*

THE "understanding" between England and the United States, in which it appears Germany also has some interest, has been gravely guaranteed by its projectors to insure the peace of the world. Yet now, only a few weeks after this bombastic announcement, England finds herself facing the grave possibility of the breaking up of her empire, and the precipitation of world-wide war. The spectacle of two nations grasping hands to insure the world's peace, while both are engaged in war and one is even fighting to maintain her place as a world power, is a curious spectacle, and one which well illustrates the folly of human wisdom.

\* \* \*

RECENTLY there was a convention of the Catholic Knights of Ohio in Delaware, O., at which a "ringing speech," says the *Catholic Mirror*, was made by Bishop Horstmann. The purport of the bishop's speech was that Catholics in America ought to unite to secure greater prominence in politics. At the same time he said, "We thank God that we are the only church that has kept out of politics."

\* \* \*

He pointed to the record made by four leading Catholics in the German parliament: "Why—those four men brought Bismarck with all his blood and iron down to their feet (applause). They stirred up all Germany; and you know to-day that King William has to hold out his hand to the Catholic Centrum, or otherwise he cannot hold his power. They thought the last election would settle it, but the Catholics sent back not only their own power but increased it by ten. They have now a surplus of one hundred and thirteen, and nothing can be done without their consent. That is what united Catholic Germany can do."

\* \* \*

And the like of this is just what the bishop wants "united Catholic America" to do in the United States. And yet the Catholic Church would not for anything go into politics! He even "told President McKinley once that if a priest should preach politics he would be signing his own death warrant!"

\* \* \*

And this conception of the nature of politics and of what constitutes going into politics, is not at all confined to this bishop or to the Catholic Church. It is a Catholic conception that has come to be generally held by Protestants. But the truth is that any church goes into politics just to the extent that its members go into politics; for in politics a church member is not separated from his religion.



THE *Catholic Mirror* mentions that this question is being agitated in ecclesiastical circles in Hawaii: "When the United States absorbs a smaller State, as it absorbed or annexed Hawaii, does a church existing in the smaller State necessarily become a branch of or a part of a similar ecclesiastical organization in the larger or absorbing dominion?" And the *Mirror* inquires, "If so, is not this dangerously akin to the pernicious doctrine of the union of church and state?"

\* \* \*

It is amusing to note how both the Catholics and the National Reformers hold the union of church and state to be "pernicious" when it is something else than the union they are working to secure.

---

### Subsidizing the Church of Rome.

---

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL: I inclose a copy\* of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States determining the law of eleemosynary corporations and sectarian appropriations. I wish to call special attention to the sentence, "All that can be said of the corporation itself is that it has been incorporated by an act of Congress, and for its legal powers and duties that act must be *exclusively* referred to." And again, "In respect too, of its creation, organization, management, and ownership of property, it is an ordinary private corporation, whose rights are determinable by the law of the land, and the religious opinions of whose members are not subjects of inquiry."

This shows how wise President Madison was in refusing his assent to a bill making a church an ordinary private corporation. He used the veto power to defeat a bill to incorporate a church in this district on two grounds:—

1. "Because the bill exceeds the rightful authority to which governments are limited by the essential distinction between civil and religious functions, and violates in particular the article of the Constitution of the United States which declares that '*Congress shall make no law respecting a religious establishment.*'"

2. "Because the bill vests in the said incorporated church an authority to provide for the support of the poor and the education of the poor children of the same; an authority which, being altogether superfluous if the provision is to be the result of pious charity, would be a precedent for giving to religious societies, as such, a legal agency in carrying into effect a civil and public duty."

One week afterward another bill was vetoed by him. The latter provided "that there be reserved the quantity of five acres of land, including Salem meeting-house, in the Mississippi Territory, for the use of the Baptist

Church at said meeting-house." He refused to approve it: "Because the said bill, in reserving a parcel of land of the United States for the use of said Baptist Church, comprises a principle and precedent for the appropriation of funds of the United States, for the use and support of religious societies, contrary to the Article of the Constitution which declares that '*Congress shall make no law respecting a religious establishment.*'"

These two cases of contemporaneous construction of the Constitution by the very man who wrote the First Amendment are only casually referred to by the Supreme Court, and then only as if they were the effusions of an ignoramus; for the court says that the phrase "a law respecting a religious establishment" is not synonymous with that used in the Constitution, which prohibits the passage of a law "respecting an establishment of religion." But clearly the men who framed the Constitution regarded it as synonymous. Many of them were in Congress when Mr. Madison's veto messages were discussed and sustained by that body; and no such criticism as that now made by the Supreme Court was made by any one at that time. They supposed the First Amendment to prohibit all interference or meddling with religion, either in the abstract or in the concrete. Alexander Hamilton had defined the phrase "an established religion," to be "one with regard to the *support* of which the law is active and provident;" and the only difference between an established religion and an establishment of religion is a mere participial difference, referable only to the category of time, and not to substance, or quantity, or quality, or place, or action, or passion, or possession.

There is no logical opposition between the two phrases at all. If framed into propositions they would stand opposed neither as contraries, subcontraries, contradictories, nor subalterns. There was no "established religion" of the United States when the First Amendment was passed by the First Congress; and that body, supported by the whole American people, solemnly determined that there should be no "establishment of religion" *in futuro*.

The first great struggle between political parties after the adoption of the Constitution arose over the construction of the First Amendment, in consequence of the alien and sedition laws. This struggle gave rise to the Virginia Resolutions, written by Mr. Madison in 1798, in defense of the freedom of conscience and of the press. Then the attack had been made on the freedom of the press, but it was declared that the freedom of conscience was equally endangered, and hence the whole nation was aroused. Sections 6 and 7 of these resolutions show conclusively that the State and people of Virginia never could have intended to delegate to Congress the right to take money from any citizen of that State to be applied in the propagation of opinions which he disbelieved; and that they were determined to maintain the rights guaranteed by the First Amend-

---

\*For the text of this decision see p. 10.

ment at all hazards. These two sections are as follows:—

“6. That this State, having by its convention which ratified the Federal Constitution, expressly declared that, among other essential rights, ‘the liberty of conscience and the press cannot be canceled, abridged, restrained, or modified by any authority of the United States,’ and from its extreme anxiety to guard these rights from every possible attack of sophistry and ambition—having, with other States, recommended an amendment for that purpose, which amendment was in due time annexed to the Constitution—it would mark a reproachful inconsistency and criminal degeneracy if an indifference were now shown to the most palpable violation of one of the rights thus declared and secured, and to the establishment of a precedent which may be fatal to the other.

“7. That the good people of this Commonwealth having ever felt, and continuing to feel, the most sincere affection for their brethren of the other States, the truest anxiety for establishing and perpetuating the union of all, and the most scrupulous fidelity to that Constitution, which is the pledge of mutual friendship and the instrument of mutual happiness, the General Assembly doth solemnly appeal to the like dispositions in the other States, in confidence that they will concur with this Commonwealth in declaring, as it does hereby declare, that the acts aforesaid are unconstitutional, and that the necessary and proper measures will be taken by each for co-operation with this State in maintaining unimpaired the authorities, rights, and liberties reserved to the States respectively or to the people.”

Now, if the Constitution is to be construed and administered at all times according to its meaning and intention when it was framed and adopted, where is the justification for acts which violate the freedom of conscience by taxing the people of the several States—compelling them to furnish contributions of money—for the propagation of the religious opinions of the church of Rome? Let the advocates of popery and arbitrary power answer this. Let them say whether the policy of subsidizing the church of Rome does, or does not, subvert both the general principles of free government and the particular organization and mandatory inhibition of the Federal Constitution? But are we subsidizing that church? Let us see.

In his history of the Catholic Church in America (p. 489), O’Gorman says:—

“A complete history of the religious orders would be of the highest value, for *their history is the history of Catholic education and charities. Our parochial schools, colleges, academies, and charitable institutions are in their hands.*” If this be true, is not a subsidy to the institutions owned and conducted by these orders unconstitutional? Are not all contracts made by the Government with them or their representatives unconstitutional? Do they not compel men to make contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which they disbelieve? And are they not therefore sinful and tyrannical? Jefferson spoke of taxation for such pur-

poses as “unrighteous compulsion,” and as “spiritual tyranny” (*1 Jeff. Works, pp. 36-37*).

I may supply other contemporaneous authorities in a future article. For the present I close.

JOSEPH BRADFIELD.

### Text of Supreme Court Decision Regarding Sectarian Appropriations.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 76.—OCTOBER TERM, 1899.

Joseph Bradfield, Appellant,	} Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.
vs. Ellis H. Roberts, Treasurer of the United States.	

[December 4, 1899.]

This is a suit in equity, brought by the appellant to enjoin the defendant from paying any moneys to the directors of Providence Hospital, in the city of Washington, under an agreement entered into between the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the directors of the hospital, by virtue of the authority of an act of Congress, because of the alleged invalidity of the agreement for the reasons stated in the bill of complaint. In that bill complainant represents that he is a citizen and taxpayer of the United States and a resident of the District of Columbia, that the defendant is the Treasurer of the United States, and the object of the suit is to enjoin him from paying to or on account of Providence Hospital, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, any moneys belonging to the United States, by virtue of a contract between the Surgeon-General of the Army and the directors of that hospital, or by virtue of an agreement between the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and such directors, under the authority of an appropriation contained in the sundry civil appropriation bill for the District of Columbia, approved June 4, 1897.

Complainant further alleged in his bill:—

“That the said Providence Hospital is a private eleemosynary corporation, and that to the best of complainant’s knowledge and belief it is composed of members of a monastic order or sisterhood of the Roman Catholic Church, and is conducted under the auspices of said church; that the title to its property is vested in the ‘Sisters of Charity of Emmitsburg, Maryland;’ that it was incorporated by a special act of Congress approved April 8, 1864, whereby, in addition to the usual powers of bodies corporate and politic, it was invested specially with ‘full power and all the rights of opening and keeping a hospital in the city of Washington for the care of such sick and invalid persons as may place themselves under the treatment and care of said corporation.’

“That in view of the sectarian character of said Providence Hospital and the specific and limited object

of its creation, the said contract between the same and the Surgeon-General of the Army and also the said agreement between the same and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are unauthorized by law, and, moreover, involve a principle and a precedent for the appropriation of the funds of the United States for the use and support of religious societies, contrary to the article of the Constitution which declares that Congress shall make no law respecting a religious establishment, and also a precedent for giving to religious societies a legal agency in carrying into effect a public and civil duty which would, if once established, speedily obliterate the essential distinction between civil and religious functions.

"That the complainant and all other citizens and taxpayers of the United States are injured by reason of the said contract and the said agreement, in virtue whereof the public funds are being used and pledged for the advancement and support of a private and sectarian corporation, and that they will suffer irreparable damage if the same are allowed to be carried into full effect by means of payments made through or by the said defendant out of the Treasury of the United States, contrary to the Constitution and declared policy of the Government."

The defendant demurred to the bill on the ground that the complainant had not in and by his bill shown any right or title to maintain the same; also upon the further ground that the complainant had not stated such a case as entitled him to the relief thereby prayed or any relief as against the defendant.

Complainant joined issue upon the demurrer, and at a term of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia the demurrer was overruled and the injunction granted as prayed for. Upon appeal to the Court of Appeals of the District the judgment was reversed, and the case remanded to the Supreme Court, with directions to dismiss the bill. Whereupon the complainant appealed to this court.

Mr. Justice Peckham, after stating the facts, delivered the opinion of the Court.

Passing the various objections made to the maintenance of this suit on account of an alleged defect of parties, and also in regard to the character in which the complainant sues, merely that of a citizen and taxpayer of the United States and a resident of the District of Columbia, we come to the main question as to the validity of the agreement between the Commissioners of the District and the directors of the hospital, founded upon the appropriation contained in the act of Congress, the contention being that the agreement if carried out would result in an appropriation by Congress of money to a religious society, thereby violating the constitutional provision which forbids Congress from passing any law respecting an establishment of religion. (Art. I. of the Amendments to Constitution.)

The appropriation is to be found in the general appropriation act for the government of the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1897. (29 Stat. 665,

679.) It reads: "For two isolated buildings, to be constructed, in the discretion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on the grounds of two hospitals, and to be operated as a part of such hospital, thirty thousand dollars." Acting under the authority of this appropriation the Commissioners entered into the agreement in question. . . .

The act shows that the individuals named therein and their successors in office were incorporated under the name of "The Directors of Providence Hospital," with power to receive, hold, and convey personal and real property, as provided in its first section. By the second section the corporation was granted "full power and all the rights of opening and keeping a hospital in the city of Washington for the care of such sick and invalid persons as may place themselves under the treatment and care of the said corporation." The third section gave it full power to make such by-laws, rules, and regulations that might be necessary for the general accomplishment of the objects of the hospital, not inconsistent with the laws in force in the District of Columbia. Nothing is said about religion or about the religious faith of the incorporators of this institution in the act of incorporation. It is simply the ordinary case of the incorporation of a hospital for the purposes for which such an institution is generally conducted. It is claimed that the allegation in the complainant's bill, that the said "Providence Hospital is a private eleemosynary corporation, and that to the best of complainant's knowledge and belief it is composed of members of a monastic order or sisterhood of the Roman Catholic Church, and is conducted under the auspices of said church; that the title to its property is vested in the Sisters of Charity of Emmitsburg, Maryland," renders the agreement void for the reason therein stated, which is that Congress has no power to make "a law respecting a religious establishment," a phrase which is not synonymous with that used in the Constitution, which prohibits the passage of a law "respecting an establishment of religion."

If we were to assume, for the purpose of this question only, that under this appropriation an agreement with a religious corporation of the tenor of this agreement would be invalid, as resulting indirectly in the passage of an act respecting an establishment of religion, we are unable to see that the complainant is his bill shows that the corporation is of the kind described, but on the contrary he has clearly shown that it is not.

The above mentioned allegations in the complainant's bill do not change the legal character of the corporation or render it on that account a religious or sectarian body. Assuming that the hospital is a private eleemosynary corporation, the fact that its members, according to the belief of the complainant, are members of a monastic order or sisterhood of the Roman Catholic Church, and the further fact that the hospital is conducted under the auspices of said church,

are wholly immaterial, as is also the allegation regarding the title to its property. The statute provides as to its property and makes no provision for its being held by any one other than itself. The facts above stated do not in the least change the legal character of the hospital, or make a religious corporation out of a purely secular one as constituted by the law of its being. Whether the individuals who compose the corporation under its charter happen to be all Roman Catholics, or all Methodists, or Presbyterians, or Unitarians, or members of any other religious organization, or of no organization at all, is of not the slightest consequence with reference to the law of its incorporation, nor can the individual beliefs upon religious matters of the various incorporators be inquired into. Nor is it material that the hospital may be conducted under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church. To be conducted under the auspices is to be conducted under the influence or patronage of that church. The meaning of the allegation is that the church exercises great and perhaps controlling influence over the management of the hospital. It must, however, be managed pursuant to the law of its being.

That the influence of any particular church may be powerful over the members of a non-sectarian and secular corporation, incorporated for a certain defined purpose and with clearly stated powers, is surely not sufficient to convert such a corporation into a religious or sectarian body. That fact does not alter the legal character of the corporation, which is incorporated under an act of Congress, and its powers, duties and character are to be solely measured by the charter under which it alone has any legal existence. There is no allegation that its hospital work is confined to members of that church or that in its management the hospital has been conducted so as to violate its charter in the smallest degree. It is simply the case of a secular corporation being managed by people who hold to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, but who nevertheless are managing the corporation according to the law under which it exists.

The charter itself does not limit the exercise of its corporate powers to the members of any particular religious denomination, but on the contrary those powers are to be exercised in favor of any one seeking the ministrations of that kind of an institution. All that can be said of the corporation itself is that it has been incorporated by an act of Congress, and for its legal powers and duties that act must be exclusively referred to.

As stated in the opinion of the Court of Appeals, this corporation "is not declared the trustee of any church or religious society. Its property is to be acquired in its own name and for its own purposes; that property and its business are to be managed in its own way, subject to no visitation, supervision, or control by any ecclesiastical authority whatever, but only to

that of the government which created it. In respect then to its creation, organization, management and ownership of property it is an ordinary private corporation whose rights are determinable by the law of the land, and the religious opinions of whose members are not subjects of inquiry." . . .

The act of Congress, however, shows there is nothing sectarian in the corporation, and "the specific and limited object of its creation" is the opening and keeping a hospital in the city of Washington for the care of such sick and invalid persons as may place themselves under the treatment and care of the corporation. To make the agreement was within the discretion of the Commissioners, and was a fair exercise thereof.

The right reserved in the third section of the charter to amend, alter or repeal the act leaves full power in Congress to remedy any abuse of the charter privileges.

Without adverting to any other objections to the maintenance of this suit, it is plain that complainant wholly fails to set forth a cause of action, and the bill was properly dismissed by the Court of Appeals, and its decree will, therefore, be

*Affirmed.*

---

### Already They Ask for a Million Dollars.

---

THE SENTINEL some time ago called attention to the probability of a demand for indemnity by the Catholic Church upon the Government, for damage to church property caused by the war in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. From the following, which appeared in the *Pittsburg Catholic*, of November 29, it appears that this demand has begun to be made:—

"The church authorities, represented in this country by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Chapelle, the papal delegates to the Philippines, have taken steps to get pay from the United States Government for the damages done church property by American troops in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. They have retained Dr. Jose Ignacio Rodriguez, of Washington, to represent the church.

"Dr. Rodriguez, who already represents Cubans and Spanish who have claims against this Government for millions on account of the Spanish war and the Cuban insurrection that preceded it, has had a number of interviews with Secretary Root, with whom he has filed several dozen separate claims.

"Secretary Root, it is asserted, agrees with Dr. Rodriguez, that this Government is liable for the damages caused either by the few acts of vandalism and the many acts of occupation of convents and hospitals which have been done by direction of American officers.

"Dr. Rodriguez will present a claim for rent for the occupation by American troops of a convent in Havana. The soldiers have been using this building, which, under the terms of the treaty of peace, is the property of the congregation which supports it, for many months without paying rent.

"There is a question whether the debts so contracted

will have to be paid by this Government or by the Cuban republic which is to be organized.

"There is no question but that the occupation of the churches in Puerto Rico and the Philippines will have to be paid for. These islands are United States territory, to all intents and purposes, and there is no dispute but that if American troops should occupy a church in one of the States of the Union, the United States would have to pay the owners for it. The question will probably be referred to in Secretary Root's report with a recommendation that the court of claims be given jurisdiction to decide what shall be a just compensation. The claims filed amount to more than \$1,000,000."

**The Crusade for Sunday Closing.**

THE *New York Journal*, of December 18, gave this summary of the situation as regards the Sunday-closing crusade in this vicinity:—

"The Sunday atmosphere in the country about this city is rapidly assuming the hue of the sky. Blue laws are being revived everywhere.

"Up in Mount Vernon the Christian Endeavorers are active. Chief of Police Foley announces that in deference to them he will endeavor to close Mount Vernon as tight as a drum on Sunday.

"Men with thirsts in Mount Vernon yesterday were compelled to suffer or come to New York for alleviation. Relays of Christian Endeavorers watched the saloons with eagle eyes and none dared open a door. The police paid attention to merchants of Hebrew faith who contend that since they observe Saturday as their Sabbath they may do business in their stores on Sunday.

"Morris Greenwald is one of these. He was behind his counter yesterday morning when Policeman Gilroy, in plain clothes, entered and purchased an umbrella. The scandalized Gilroy immediately arrested Greenwald. Policeman Masterson bought a necktie of Jacob Federman and arrested him for violation of the Sunday law. Two other merchants were arrested. . . .

"New Haven, which has hitherto been as cheerful a place to spend Sunday in as any Connecticut town can be, slipped back to the Blue Law observance of 200 years ago yesterday. The city was like a cemetery. Not a store nor a barber shop was open. The merchants and barbers have decided to make the place so blue on Sundays that the people will rise up and clamor greedily for a change of color. The only diverting incidents of the day were furnished by barbers who skulked through the streets carrying suspicious looking bags containing the necessaries for shaving the visage of their customers at their own homes.

"Paterson, N. J., was closed up so tight that trains passed through with a hollow rumble as if running over a covered bridge. Paterson has been closed up for several Sundays. An effort has been made to open the barber shops, and Recorder Senior will decide to-day the delicate question of the necessity of a Sunday shave. There is no precedent on the New Jersey statute books.

"In case the decision of the Recorder is against the barbers, who are fighting for open shops, they threaten

to enforce every provision of the New Jersey blue laws. Under these a Patersonian who walks or rides or whistles or sings or kisses his wife on Sunday is guilty of a crime.

"Ice cream and candy stores in Englewood, N. J., which have been closed on Sundays for some time, were open yesterday. The crusade against them was dropped because of its unpopularity."

A MOVEMENT for Sunday closing is reported under way in Chicago. The *News*, of that city, observes that "Chicago has an unenviable fame as regards its observance—or rather, lack of observance—of Sunday;" and it is equally indisputable that Chicago's reputation as regards morality is not an enviable one. But no city ever falls so low in the moral scale as to be beyond the reach of a Sunday closing movement.

The movement seems to be proceeding along purely selfish lines, and hence does not call for any profession of regard for the religious welfare of the inhabitants. It is a matter of business between the associations of grocers, butchers, bakers, etc. The clerks in grocers' and butchers' shops have to work early and late through the week, and Sunday work in addition to this is too much; so these associations are going to settle the matter of Sunday work by voluntary agreement in favor of Sunday closing. If any members refuse to close on that day, they will—according to precedent—be prosecuted under the Sunday law; not because of any religious regard for the day, but because such action is considered unfair to the others and a proper cause of discipline by the trade unions.

Very much of the sentiment for Sunday closing rests upon this basis; but it works to the same end as that sought by those who would unite church and state.

**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.**

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

ADDRESS,

**AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
39 Bond St., New York.**



NEW YORK, JANUARY 4, 1900.

We print several somewhat lengthy articles this week, but the information they give is of more than usual importance.

How to make men Sabbath-keepers, is a problem many would-be reformers in this country are trying to solve by legislation and vigilance societies. Read the solution presented on page 4 of this issue.

Just now Sunday laws do not seem to be very popular in England. Several London hair dressers were recently prosecuted under the old Sunday law of Charles II., and were fined by the magistrate one penny each without costs.

The year 1900 has been designated by the pope a year of jubilee, in token of which it was ushered in by midnight masses in the Catholic churches. No doubt it will be a favorable year for the papacy, but we feel safe in predicting that it will be anything but a year of jubilee for the world.

As most readers of the SENTINEL are probably aware, there is nothing to mark the first day of January as the time of the beginning of a new year, save that then the sun begins to rise daily higher in the heavens—a fact which plainly shows the connection of this division of time with the pagan idolatry of sun worship.

The London *Daily Mail*, in a reference to the ill fortune of the British arms in South Africa, mentions that "More than one correspondent traces our recent reverses to the fact that the engagements were begun by us on Sunday."

But if this proves anything for the

British with regard to the rightfulness of Sunday fighting, what does it prove for the Boers who won the victories? And besides, with the history of the Spanish-American war fresh in mind, in which the English-speaking race won brilliant victories on Sunday, can the English commanders be blamed for regarding Sunday as an opportune day for beginning a battle?

"This shows," remarks an English exchange, "the folly of trying to prove a thing evil by certain results. The only standard of right and wrong is God's Word."

That "expansion" has opened a wide field for the papacy, in which to conduct operations for strengthening her hold on the United States, is one of the plainest facts that enter into the present outlook for this country. The papacy is given the opportunity of presenting many claims upon the United States, the recognition of which by this Government must do much to strengthen her authority, and to establish a more intimate and cordial relationship between this country and the Vatican. And meanwhile the United States, by the action of its executive and judicial departments of government, is giving Rome every encouragement to present all her claims with boldness.

Recently an examination of cigarettes was made by a sanitary commission in London, to determine whether they contained opium, phosphorus, mercury, arsenic, or other unsuspected poison which might account for the deadly results known to follow the smoking of cigarettes in many instances. The result of the investigation, as announced by *The Lancet*, was that the cigarettes were exonerated as giving no fair ground for "an allegation of the presence of a substance producing injury to health." And yet there is scarcely a more deadly poison known than oil of nicotine, which is produced wholly from tobacco, of which all cigarettes are

composed. Strange that the sanitary experts did not think of hunting for this poison.

The idea that the kingdom of God is to be set up on the earth through the agency of earthly governments, is a strange as well as a dangerous delusion. Several portions of Scripture speak very plainly upon this point. One is the prophecy of Daniel 2, in which a stone (the kingdom of God) smites the great image (earthly kingdoms) upon the feet and sweeps the whole image away like chaff, and becomes in its place a mountain filling the whole earth. Another is the prophecy of Revelation 19, which portrays the coming of Christ to the earth to set up his kingdom, and declares that at that time the kings of the earth and their armies will be gathered together to make war against him, and will be overcome and slain. The prophecy of Psalms 2 is equally plain: "Thou [Christ] shalt rule them [the heathen and uttermost parts of the earth] with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

A rude ending it is to the dream of world-wide peace and righteousness to be established by the "benevolent assimilation" of the earth by the "Christian" nations; but it is what time is destined to bring forth, as certainly as that the Word of God is true. And as this is the truth, to entertain the other and more popular view is to follow a delusion which leads only toward destruction.


By the seizure of several flour-laden ships whose cargoes were thought to be destined for the Transvaal, on the ground that food stuff intended for one of two belligerents may be regarded by the other as "contraband of war," Great Britain has established a precedent which threatens no power so much as herself; since in a European war she would have to depend almost wholly upon America for supplies of food.

# The King of Fountain Pens.

## THE POST.

There are fountain pens and FOUNTAIN PENS, but the POST FOUNTAIN PEN leads them all, being the only self-filling and self-cleaning pen manufactured in the world.

No More Inky Fingers.



No More Bothersome Fillers.



Filling the "Post."

All you have to do to fill the "Post" is to dip the nib into the ink bottle, draw out the plunger, and the pen is ready for use.



Cleaning the "Post."

It can be done in five seconds. Dip the pen in a glass of water and work the plunger backward and forward a few times.

The prominent men and women whose testimonials are given herewith witness to the merits of the "Post."

**General Lew Wallace**, Author of "Ben Hur," says: "I have tried every pen of the kind on the market, and now unhesitatingly give the preference to the Post. It not only feeds itself with less care, but has the immeasurable advantage of re-supply without inking the fingers. I do all my work with it."

**Dr. Josiah Strong**, than whom few men are better known in America, says: "A perfect fountain pen at last! I have hunted for it upwards of twenty years. I have tried many, and I can assure you they have *tried* me. I have had little satisfaction even from the best, but the *Post* leaves nothing to be desired. I am delighted with it."

**Dr. Lyman Abbott**, editor of "The Outlook," and until recently pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., says: "To me it is a great advantage to have a fountain pen which requires no filler and can be filled at any time, and at any inkstand, without the possibility of inky fingers or blotted paper or desk."

**Hon. Alva Adams**, Governor of Colorado, writes: "The Post pen is an ideal fountain pen. . . . It requires little more trouble to replenish than to dip an ordinary pen in an inkstand."

**Commander Booth Tucker** says: "I have used fountain pens for the last ten years, almost every description, and have no hesitation in saying in my opinion the Post is the best."

**Ira D. Sankey**, the world's great singing evangelist, writes: "I have used the Post pen for some time and have had great satisfaction with its use. It never fails or gets cranky. One can at least have clean hands by using the Post, whatever the heart may be."

**Hon. Luther Laffin Mills**, Chicago's celebrated criminal lawyer, writes: "Your Post Fountain Pen is the best I have ever used—simple, reliable, durable—and I thank you for having brought it to my notice."

The price of the "Post" is **\$3.00**. It cannot be purchased under this price anywhere. The patentee has a settled understanding with the trade and agents that \$3.00 shall be the minimum price at which it retails. But by a **Special Agreement** we are in a position to make the following

## Remarkable Offer.

We will send the Post Fountain Pen, postpaid, and the American Sentinel one year for . . . . . **\$2.50**

If you want a really reliable pen, now is your chance. If desired, we will send the "Sentinel" to one address and the pen to another. *In ordering, state kind of pen desired—medium or fine.*

Address **AMERICAN SENTINEL,**  
39 Bond St., New York City



NEW YORK, JANUARY 4, 1900.

We print several somewhat lengthy articles this week, but the information they give is of more than usual importance.

How to make men Sabbath-keepers, is a problem many would-be reformers in this country are trying to solve by legislation and vigilance societies. Read the solution presented on page 4 of this issue.

Just now Sunday laws do not seem to be very popular in England. Several London hair dressers were recently prosecuted under the old Sunday law of Charles II., and were fined by the magistrate one penny each without costs.

The year 1900 has been designated by the pope a year of jubilee, in token of which it was ushered in by midnight masses in the Catholic churches. No doubt it will be a favorable year for the papacy, but we feel safe in predicting that it will be anything but a year of jubilee for the world.

As most readers of the SENTINEL are probably aware, there is nothing to mark the first day of January as the time of the beginning of a new year, save that then the sun begins to rise daily higher in the heavens—a fact which plainly shows the connection of this division of time with the pagan idolatry of sun worship.

The London *Daily Mail*, in a reference to the ill fortune of the British arms in South Africa, mentions that "More than one correspondent traces our recent reverses to the fact that the engagements were begun by us on Sunday."

But if this proves anything for the

British with regard to the rightfulness of Sunday fighting, what does it prove for the Boers who won the victories? And besides, with the history of the Spanish-American war fresh in mind, in which the English-speaking race won brilliant victories on Sunday, can the English commanders be blamed for regarding Sunday as an opportune day for beginning a battle?

"This shows," remarks an English exchange, "the folly of trying to prove a thing evil by certain results. The only standard of right and wrong is God's Word."

That "expansion" has opened a wide field for the papacy, in which to conduct operations for strengthening her hold on the United States, is one of the plainest facts that enter into the present outlook for this country. The papacy is given the opportunity of presenting many claims upon the United States, the recognition of which by this Government must do much to strengthen her authority, and to establish a more intimate and cordial relationship between this country and the Vatican. And meanwhile the United States, by the action of its executive and judicial departments of government, is giving Rome every encouragement to present all her claims with boldness.

RECENTLY an examination of cigarettes was made by a sanitary commission in London, to determine whether they contained opium, phosphorus, mercury, arsenic, or other unsuspected poison which might account for the deadly results known to follow the smoking of cigarettes in many instances. The result of the investigation, as announced by *The Lancet*, was that the cigarettes were exonerated as giving no fair ground for "an allegation of the presence of a substance producing injury to health." And yet there is scarcely a more deadly poison known than oil of nicotine, which is produced wholly from tobacco, of which all cigarettes are

composed. Strange that the sanitary experts did not think of hunting for this poison.

THE idea that the kingdom of God is to be set up on the earth through the agency of earthly governments, is a strange as well as a dangerous delusion. Several portions of Scripture speak very plainly upon this point. One is the prophecy of Daniel 2, in which a stone (the kingdom of God) smites the great image (earthly kingdoms) upon the feet and sweeps the whole image away like chaff, and becomes in its place a mountain filling the whole earth. Another is the prophecy of Revelation 19, which portrays the coming of Christ to the earth to set up his kingdom, and declares that at that time the kings of the earth and their armies will be gathered together to make war against him, and will be overcome and slain. The prophecy of Psalms 2 is equally plain: "Thou [Christ] shalt rule them [the heathen and uttermost parts of the earth] with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

A rude ending it is to the dream of world-wide peace and righteousness to be established by the "benevolent assimilation" of the earth by the "Christian" nations; but it is what time is destined to bring forth, as certainly as that the Word of God is true. And as this is the truth, to entertain the other and more popular view is to follow a delusion which leads only toward destruction.

By the seizure of several flour-laden ships whose cargoes were thought to be destined for the Transvaal, on the ground that food stuff intended for one of two belligerents may be regarded by the other as "contraband of war," Great Britain has established a precedent which threatens no power so much as herself; since in a European war she would have to depend almost wholly upon America for supplies of food.