

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

VOLUME 15.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 8, 1900.

NUMBER 7.

*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.)

NOTHING that is spiritual in its nature can be preserved by a carnal ordinance or commandment.



WHEN men lose sight of principles in a controversy, it is lowered to the level of personal strife; but the contest for liberty and justice can never be settled by such means.



GOD offers the Sabbath rest to all; and the person who will not take the Sabbath when it is offered to him by the Lord, will not really take it when it is accorded him by the "Christian public." If he will not accept it from the law of God, he cannot accept it from the law of man. The acceptance or refusal of the Sabbath, by any individual, must be to God and not to man.



If the Sabbath could be lost through failure of the law to enforce its observance, or by the general disregard of the people, would not the seventh-day Sabbath have been lost long ago? Yet it has not been lost; and the fact that it has survived without the support of either law or popular custom, is evidence that the Sabbath is not so perishable in its nature as some men loudly assert.



If the first-day Sabbath is as good as the seventh-day Sabbath, it, like the latter, will survive without the aid of Sabbath laws and in spite of the disregard of world-loving people. And if it is not as good as the

seventh-day institution, then plainly the latter ought to be adopted in its stead.



ONE man has the same right to "protection" in the observance of the Sabbath that another man has; the observer of the seventh day has a right to the same protection that is accorded the observer of the first day. And the first-day observer has no right to more "protection" in the observance of the Sabbath than can be justly claimed by the seventh-day observer.



THE Christian Church is in the world not to save institutions, but to save men. Christian institutions do not need saving; and if the church will devote her energies to the salvation of sinful men and women, the institutions will take care of themselves. Christian institutions do not benefit unsaved people; for only those who are Christians can appreciate them and make that use of them which their Author designed.

### Those Consecrated Fallacies.

IN the *North American Review* of December, 1899, there was published an article, entitled, "Some Consecrated Fallacies." It is exceedingly interesting to note what are *these* particular "Consecrated Fallacies."

However, in order to a clear understanding of the subject, it will be well to set down first, just what is a fallacy. The *Century Dictionary* defines it thus:—

"FALLACY: Deceptiveness; deception; deceit; deceitfulness; that which is erroneous, false, or deceptive; that which misleads; mistake."

What then are these "deceptive," "deceitful," "erroneous," "false," "misleading," and "mistaken" things that have been "consecrated;" and that so need to be exploded as to demand the publication of an

article in the leading *Review* of the Western continent? Read:—

“The framers of the Declaration of Independence were inspired by an ardent patriotism and by lofty motives, and their statements embodied a sufficient justification of the cause to which they sought to devote their countrymen; but there was no revelation of universal and eternal truth in the ‘glittering generalities’ with which they prefaced these statements. *On the contrary, they consecrated to perpetuity some of the most obvious fallacies that were ever promulgated to mislead men.*”

These “consecrated fallacies” then are to be found in the *preface* to the statements in which the framers of the Declaration embodied the justification of their cause. This confines the “consecrated fallacies” then to that part of the Declaration in which the framers set forth what *they* designated as “truths,” and which *they* declared to be “self-evident.” And that is just where this reviewer finds them; and here he goes:—

“They proclaimed it to be a self-evident truth ‘that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.’”

And he proceeds to explode these “consecrated fallacies” one by one in the following sort:—

“Whatever interpretation and exegesis may do for this declaration, in the sense in which it is commonly accepted and used in the place of argument *it is neither self-evident nor truth.* . . . Nor can any power at the command of mankind make them equal in this world or in the processes of time, whatever may be their destiny in eternity.”

“It is useless to argue around this immutable fact, or try to interpret into the Declaration a meaning which it does not contain. All men are simply not created equal *in any possible sense of the word.*”

So much for the “consecrated fallacy”—the deceitful, erroneous, misleading statement—that all men are created equal. And, of course, since that statement is not true “in any possible sense of the word,” it follows naturally enough that nobody has any rights at all. And so he writes:—

“Nor, in any strict sense of the word, can all men, or any men, be said to be endowed by their Creator with any rights whatever. . . . They [rights] are not the natural endowment, though they may be the far-off heritage, of all men.”

And all this being so, it would be simply impossible that governments should derive anything from the consent of the governed; and so, logically enough, this is another of those deceitful, erroneous, misleading statements—another of those “Consecrated Fallacies.” Accordingly of this he writes:—

“Do they arrive their just powers from the consent of the governed? Let us not be blinded by the glitter of a generality, the meaning of which is not clearly defined. . . .

“In the situation of the country as it then was, with the alternative of oppression or independence confronting them, believing the people of the colonies to be the equals of those of the mother country, and equally entitled to a voice in the government to which they were subject, they prefaced their Declaration with that sweeping and glowing utterance, which had a broad application as truth to their case; but which becomes a *delusive bundle of fallacies* when promiscuously applied to the universal state of man, and which has taken the consecration of 1776 as giving it an ‘equal date with Sinai and with Ararat.’”

As might very naturally be expected, all this repudiation of fundamental republican, and even Christian, and therefore *divine*, principle, is so laboriously worked out solely to justify this nation in the course which has been taken with the people in Cuba, and the new island possessions. But at what an enormous cost such justification is found, when it can be only by such means!

We have spoken of it as the repudiation of Christian, and therefor *divine*, principle, as well as repudiation of fundamental republican principle: and this is the truth. For is it not the statement of divine truth that “there is no respect of persons with God?” Is it not written, “If I did despise the cause of my manservant, or my maidservant, when they contended with me, what then shall I do when God riseth up? and when he visiteth, what shall I answer him? Did not he that made me, in the womb, make him?” Is it not written from God, “*Choose ye this day whom ye will serve?*”

Yet this writer in the *North American Review*, can consistently disregard all these divine statements and considerations; because he does not believe that men have been *created* at all: they have been *evolved*. Here are his words:—

“All men are simply not created equal in any possible sense of the word. . . . The creation of men has been a gradual process of *evolution*, and they have been coming into being in different parts of the earth, through long generations, with differences and inequalities which *development* has *varied* and *widened* and *not obliterated.*”

And thus by National Reformism on one hand, and evolutionism on the other, Satan has so thoroughly paved the way for the oppression of mankind, that nothing else is now thought of, no other principle is now recognized by those in places of worldly power or influence.

It is high time to say to all people everywhere, “Behold your God.”

A. T. J.

UNDER the heading, “Heaven-Sent Nations,” *The Advocate*, the leading Congregational organ of the West, observes that—

“Nothing has been more common or easy, than for nations to think that they held a commission from above. No conquest was too cruel, no crime against humanity too great, no destruction too sweeping, no

ambition too selfish, to be covered, excused or justified the claim of a divine commission."

And as regards affairs of the present day, it concludes:—

"Commerce is called civilization, conquest Christianity, stock gamblers assume the tone of piety, Wall street thanks God, politicians pretend to missionary zeal, and speculators talk of dividend-paying trade in one breath and a strategic providence in the next."

And the foundation of all this hypocrisy and delusion the idea that "this is a Christian nation."

---

### The Philippine Question in the Light of Mexican History.

MEXICO and the Philippine Islands, more especially Luzon, were once both Spanish provinces, and were ruled—as all Spanish provinces were—by the Catholic Church. Out of this similarity in point of government arose conditions from which an interesting and instructive parallel may be drawn; and such a parallel has been drawn by a writer in *The Ram's Horn*, of January 7. And that writer is John Sobieski, the Crown Prince, by birth, of the kingdom of Poland. Of his credibility as an authority upon the subject with which he deals, *the Ram's Horn* says:—

"After an honorable career as a young soldier, he went to Mexico chiefly to investigate the popular uprising which culminated first in the conquest of that country by the army of Maximilian, and later in the overthrow of that usurper. Although Sobieski was, at that time, as he had always been, a devout Catholic, he found his mother church to be the parent of every conceivable outrage against the liberty of Mexico, and he bravely took up the fight in behalf of that oppressed people. This experience qualifies him to speak with authority on the subject which he discusses; and the parallel he draws between the course of events in Mexico in the 60's and those in the Philippines in the 90's, will be found no less mournful than striking."

"At the close of our [the American] Civil War," Mr. Sobieski begins, "I had determined to go to Mexico to fight in behalf of the republic against the so-called Emperor Maximilian. There was a great deal of sympathy at that time for Mexico, as it will be remembered our Government had never acknowledged the empire, nor received its minister, but had retained Romero, the last minister appointed by the republic."

"Not knowing Romero personally, I went to General Hancock, then the commander of the District of Columbia, to seek, through him, an interview with the Mexican minister. I was very well acquainted with General Hancock, having served with him on the plains before the war. So I went to him and told him my desire, and asked him for a letter of introduction, which he gladly granted, writing a high commendation. I easily secured an interview with the minister, who seemed to be greatly pleased at my enthusiasm, and our interview

was quite lengthy. From him I received the whole history which led up to the invasion of Mexico by the combined forces of France and Spain. And the story I now give was afterwards repeated by President Juarez in an interview which he had with some American, English, and German officers who had served the cause of Mexico in the overthrow of Maximilian."

We give a condensed statement, following, of the facts narrated by Mr. Sobieski regarding conditions in Mexico and their causes during the period of which he writes.

"The Liberal Party in Mexico had come into power upon the issue of confiscating the church property." The church had come into possession of two thirds of all Mexican real estate. The church was monarchical in her principles and was continually conspiring against the Mexican republic, causing thereby numerous revolutions.

Upon the triumph of the Liberal Party at the ballot box, the church party appealed to arms, but were as badly beaten as they had been at the polls. Their leading generals, Marion and Majir, fled from Mexico and took refuge in Europe. The Liberal Party then confiscated the entire church property in Mexico, permitting the church, however, the use of church buildings for worship.

Generals Marion and Majir proceeded to Rome and had an interview with the pope, Pius IX., and it was determined to make an appeal to the Catholic powers of Europe, to re-establish the church in Mexico. Spain was willing, but was weak. Napoleon III., emperor of France, was able, but at first not willing. But he was ambitious. So the Mexican church generals arranged an interview with the pope's representative at Paris and the empress Eugenie, and at this council it was decided to urge upon the Emperor Napoleon, as a grand idea, that he establish in Mexico an empire which should serve as a breakwater against republican ideas which were constantly flowing out from the great Republic of the Western World. Archduke Maximilian, of Austria, was to be made emperor, and the two great Catholic empires of Europe were by this lofty project to be united against the rising Protestant powers of Europe, England, and Germany.

The scheme pleased Napoleon III., who was to have the honor of founding the new Latin empire, and he heartily joined in the undertaking. The support of Spain was secured by the promise of restoration of the confiscated church property.

Next a pretext was found for making war upon Mexico. That country was heavily in debt to French, Spanish, and English subjects, and being unable upon demand to satisfy these creditors, France declared war, and sent an army and fleet to Vera Cruz. This city was bombarded and captured. The French army marched upon the capital, and after a campaign of several months, the republic was apparently conquered. The

church party assembled a congress and declared their desire that Maximilian should be emperor of Mexico. The latter replied that he "believed he had been called of God for the post," and with his wife set out for his new seat of authority. Proceeding to Rome they received instructions from the pope, and the papal blessing; thence they went to Vera Cruz, where the church party and the French soldiers received them with great demonstrations of honor. The new emperor soon found that the republic was not extinguished, as he had supposed.

A few months later, the United States, having suppressed the southern confederacy, demanded of France the withdrawal of her troops from Mexico, and France was forced to comply. Maximilian's power at once began to decline. His troops were defeated in the field and in May, 1867, he was taken prisoner and shortly afterwards put to death.

Since that time several efforts have been made by the church party to recover from this overthrow, but all have miserably failed; and Mexico meanwhile has been advancing steadily in the pathway of national progress and prosperity.

#### THE PARALLEL.

The parallel between the conditions which gave rise to the struggle for freedom in Mexico, and the conditions from which the Filipinos have been long struggling to be free—but have finally failed—we give in Mr. Sobieski's own words:—

"The condition in Mexico in 1858, has its parallel of condition of things in the Philippine Islands, especially in the island of Luzon. The Catholic Church, or more properly speaking, the priesthood and friars, have acquired from two-thirds to three-fourths of all the valuable real estate of the island. It is well remembered as it has been stated by every writer and by General Merritt, of the United States Army, that the rebellion in the Philippine Islands against Spain was more a rebellion against the monks and clergy than against the sovereignty of Spain. Indeed, the people of that island did not know much about the government of Spain. The church ruled it; they levied their taxes upon the people of that island and collected them, and it formed more than 80 per cent. of the taxes which that people had to pay. Then, in addition to this, being simply renters, they merely eked out an existence, and that was all, and could not have done that had it not been that it was a tropical climate where so little was required on which to subsist.

"The great aim of their uprising was to accomplish what had been accomplished in Mexico; to confiscate the real estate and turn it over to the government that would pass it out to the people. That property had not been acquired by the monks by purchase, but by confiscation. Whenever a man had a desirable plantation, they would trump up some charge against him, have him arrested, and, without investigation, shot; and the property was turned over to the monks. It was in this way, principally, that they had acquired their possessions.

"When the commissioners met at Paris, to make peace between this country and Spain, it will be remembered that the Philippine government, of which Aguinaldo was the head, appointed a commissioner to appear before that body and state their grievances, but the commissioners refused to listen to them, or in any way receive him.

"About this time, Archbishop Ireland, as the daily press informs us, had an interview with President McKinley, and it was there agreed that the property rights of the church or monks, should not be interfered with. Accordingly, a clause was put into the treaty that all the property rights that existed under Spain would be accordingly respected by the American Government. So the people of the Philippine Islands found that practically everything they had fought for against Spain would be lost if the American Government's supremacy was maintained. So to them it was only a question of slavery or death, and they preferred the latter.

"So this Government, by the treaty at Paris, put themselves in the same position that the Catholic Church party of Mexico occupied in 1858, and for which the Catholic powers invaded Mexico in 1861."

#### A Question of "Simple Justice."

*The Independent*, which has all along supported the present national policy of foreign conquest, now—in view of certain developments in Congress—raises the significant inquiry, "Shall simple justice be done to Porto Rico?" "Congress," it says, "is asked, by papers and persons of influence, to say to the Porto Ricans, in effect:—

"The blessings which we enjoy as a nation are not for you; they are peculiar to us. United States laws and liberties and privileges are solely for the people of the United States, and when we say 'United States' we mean continental United States. We dare not extend the Constitution and laws of this definitely bounded Continental area over any neighboring territory which is not contiguous and geographically a part of the solid earth of States and Territories. We must not cross a sea, however narrow, with our sacred Constitution and laws. They will not bear transportation. We may not carry them to Alaska or Hawaii. We dread the effect of the intervening sea upon them. We are tied to the mainland. If Manitoba were offered now, we would even be afraid of the great lakes. We must be careful, very careful, because what we do in Porto Rico will be a precedent for Hawaii, and worse still for the Philippines."

"What," *The Independent* proceeds to inquire, "is the specter which these fearful souls see and shudder over as they look across the West India ferry, and the Alaskan and Hawaiian? Statehood, they say. When they come down to the ocean and see the islands marshaling as Territories for the peaceful honors of Statehood, they are choked with spasms of a sort of hydrophobia. The sight of the water is too much for them, and they turn to Congress and say: 'This is a terrible thing. Don't make a dangerous precedent! Don't let

little Porto Rico, except in chains! The nation may mad. Don't say 'Territory' to the Porto Ricans. They may call back, 'State.' Don't give them our Constitution and laws, as such, but say, 'These laws are for you, especially, as a province or dependency, or colony. They are not given to you as United States laws, but as Porto Rican laws. Take them and be happy, if you can; don't expect anything like equality, for that can never be.'"

This is certainly a strange manifestation to come at this date from *The Independent*, or from any source from which the foreign-conquest policy has derived support. *The Independent* looked over and approved the tree, and now holds up its hands almost in horror at the fruit it is beginning to bear. There was plenty of opportunity to discover at the first, from an inspection of the tree, what would be its fruit.

Right at the outset of the application of the "expansion" policy to the government of the new territory, it comes necessary for a leading advocate of that policy to raise the question whether "simple justice" shall be done to the people of a part of that territory. This, from the standpoint it has occupied, is a very damaging mission.

What is the prospective injustice which *The Independent* fears? For one thing, the answer is, Porto Rico is not to be allowed free trade with the United States. Some of the trusts in the United States are against it, and these representatives of the money power are instructing Congress how it must act in the matter. For example, "There are senators and representatives whose constituents raise tobacco and sugar, and they argue that if more tobacco and sugar are raised within the bounds of the United States, the crops will be less remunerative to them." It is now beginning to be discovered by the advocates of foreign conquest, that expansion across the sea is a different thing from the expansion of Jefferson's day, which they have persistently sought to use as a precedent.

"If Porto Rico is covered by the Constitution," says *The Independent*, "our ports and its ports will be as close to each other as the slips on either side of the Hudson River are to the ferryboats that connect New York with Jersey City." But it is proposed that a tariff barrier shall be erected between the ports of Porto Rico and those of the United States, contrary to the Constitution. So many holes have now been made in the Constitution that it has ceased to be a very efficient barrier for anything. And so "simple justice" to this role under the Constitution is denied.

*The Independent* proceeds to say that "If the United States cannot restore to Porto Ricans what it took from them, or give them an equivalent, it were better to give them over to the tender mercies of some other nation. It is a monstrous thought that we, so boastful of our free and generous spirit, should even contemplate a tariff as Senator Platt proposes. It would be a

cruelty such as Spain, selfish and oppressive as she is, never committed. We are in a fair way, if Senator Platt and some of his colleagues (we trust there are not many of them) have their will, to crush aspirations which Spain did not wholly discourage."

Then *The Independent* proceeds to notice the President's plan for the government of the island, as being "by no means a liberal one," and declares that it contrasts unfavorably with the old plan of Spain. And in all this *The Independent* is not alone, but voices the sentiments of other journals which have been and are yet ardent advocates of the new expansion doctrine of government by consent of some of the governed.

The situation is worth contemplating. Porto Rico is the very nearest of the captured islands which the Government has announced its intention of holding. And it was acquired with the least trouble. The people instantly submitted to American rule; they have been friendly and have caused no trouble. They are fairly intelligent. There was therefore every reason to expect that the United States would do the best by Porto Rico that it would do for any of its new island possessions. And yet, at the very outset of the practical application of its "benevolent" designs, it is so apparent that the Porto Ricans will not get even "simple justice," that journals which have all along supported the nation's policy are now forced to cry out against what they see taking place under it, and denounce the proposed rule as being worse than that of Spain.

Such are the firstfruits of American imperialism, as seen under the most favoring conditions. What, then, must be its final fruits?

And now that *The Independent* and other prominent journals see that the budding fruit of the tree is evil, will they be convinced that the tree itself is evil? or will they think that somehow a good tree can bear evil fruit? Will they go to the root of the matter, and renounce the evil principles from which such practices are beginning to result?

*The Independent's* query can be answered: No; Porto Rico will not get "simple justice" under the Constitution, and that for the simple reason that "simple justice" under the Constitution was denied to its people when their territory was forcibly annexed to the United States. The initial step in the matter was contrary to "simple justice," and succeeding steps that are taken can only be expected to be of the same kind.

THAT wars for conquest, that is, merely or chiefly to increase possessions, are nothing more than robbery is clear to every one but those who are to reap the benefits. The course of Christian nations through the ages, which have fought to get land or make opportunities for trade, has been as indefensible as that of those who have done so to get slaves, and down to within the memory of men now living all three were united in almost every war for conquest.—*N. Y. Christian Advocate.*

## Glimpses from Afar.

BY JOHN MCCARTHY.

ONE has only to read Catholic literature to be convinced of the truth of the extreme vanity and presumption of the papal church. Their eternal boast is, that Catholic civilization excels the Protestant civilization, in the same measure as the light of the sun supersedes that of the stars.

Right here in the Argentine Republic one has plenty of opportunities to study the veracity of this claim; and one or two proofs which we shall quote will be sufficient to show how void of truth is this Catholic boast. According to carefully-gleaned statistics, there are in the Argentine Republic, Paraguay, Bolivia, and the Chilean Republic, more than 3,500,000 Indians. Should one come in contact with these Indians—as I myself have done—he will find that 95 per cent. of them carry the scapulary—which all good Catholics carry upon their bosoms. The majority of them have been “baptized” by Catholic priests.

Eleven years ago a certain Indian tribe—very ferocious—who wandered about in the national territory of the Gran Chaco, were invited one day to a conference by an Argentine military commander. Upon the arrival of the Indians near to the military encampment, the soldiers—by order of the mayor in command—took hold of the “heathen” Indians with iron grasp, and held them thus, much against their will, while a benevolent Roman Catholic clergyman made “Christians” of them by means of the drops of “holy water” which he sprinkled upon their heads. Thus was a savage tribe “converted” to the Catholic religion in one and a half hours.

The Catholic Church for the last three hundred years has boasted of her wonderful missionary enterprises in South America. In the whole of this vast continent she has held full sway in matters of religion for three centuries and a half, since no Protestant missionary was permitted to preach in any of the South American republics, until thirty or forty years ago. Can the papal hierarchy show us an exemplary republic as the result of their absolute religious domination for the last three hundred years? Unfortunately for them they cannot. The more one penetrates into the interior provinces of this tremendous continent, where the Catholic power even now holds sway, the more ignorance, immorality, treachery, fanaticism, and bloodthirstiness will he see exhibited among the people. Sure signs are these of papal rule.

Yet the papal church desires to do for the United States what she has done for other Catholic nations. Would that Protestants would open their eyes to the falsity of the Catholic pretensions, and not be blinded by claims which cannot bear the slightest investigation.

What is more cruel, more ferocious, more abominable, than the well-known bull fight! The human mind can scarcely imagine a more barbarous exhibition than that of a bull placed in a circus, to be the victim of fiends in human form, calling themselves “toreros,” “picadores,” “banderilleros,” whose highest pleasure is found in slaughtering the poor animal by such slow and savage means, as to show that they are more brutal than the brute they have determined to kill. Yet we never hear of a bull fight in Germany, England, or any other Protestant nations; no, for such is one of the fruits of the Catholic religion. Wherever the papal reigns supreme, there you will be sure to find such fiendish exhibitions as the above.

For many years the bull fight has been prohibited in the Argentine Republic. Recently diplomatic relations were re-established between the Vatican and the Argentine government, and scarcely had the papal nuncio arrived upon our Platine shores, than a certain Spanish company began to give “exhibitions” of bull fights, in the city of Rosario, killing from two to five bulls every evening. Nearly all the secular journals clamored against such cruel exhibitions, appealing to the government to put a stop to them; but it is worth a remark, that not a single protest was raised against them by any one of the official Catholic organs of the country.

The education and civilization developed by the gospel is of a different character; it exalts the citizen of a nation by uprooting from their hearts all debasing and sanguinary inclinations. They who learn in the school of Jesus can have no pleasure in exhibitionary cruelty such as I have mentioned. Hence we see the difference between the Protestant civilization and education, and that of the Catholic Church. We leave you to judge, dear reader, which of the two disputants present the best results.

*Buenos Ayres, Argentina.*

## The Truth About Army Chaplains.

*From “The Lutheran Witness.”*

THE agitation for more army chaplains is to fore again. Here is what one of our exchanges has to say about the matter:—

“That the chaplaincy is not what it ought to be, has been evident for years to those who are conversant with the subject. What has been done by Congress in instituting it was merely a small concession to the religious sentiment of the nation. It is not the result of a careful and studied effort to provide for the moral and religious improvement of the army. It is the result of a half-silly half policy; a regard on the one hand for an extravagant interpretation of the doctrine of the divorce of church and state, and, on the other, an acknowledgment of the fact that the American people are Christian; that, as such, there should be some recognition of it

government institutions. The idea of an army without a chaplain would be an anomaly among Christian and civilized nations. But the policy has been 'the less, the better;' and, consequently, while there have been some one hundred posts within the United States occupied by the troops, there have been only from thirty to thirty-four chaplains. As chaplains do not travel from post to post, but are confined in their ministrations to the garrison to which they are assigned, two-thirds of the occupied posts have been, and are, to day, without chaplains."

The truth about the whole matter is this: Congress has no business supplying the army with chaplains. It must be evident that it could not at all do without discriminating against the religious belief of the one or the other. The churches, however, are free to place chaplains at these posts, at their own expense, and it is their business to do so. The church and not the state, is bound to provide for the spiritual welfare of our soldiers.

### Revolution in the United States.

*New York "World," Feb. 2.*

WHEN members of the Kentucky Legislature sought to enter the State Capitol yesterday they found their entrance barred by bayonets. The State militia, under orders of Governor Taylor, not only prevented their entrance to the legislative halls, but threatened them with arrest if they sought to assemble elsewhere in the city.

This is in the simplest terms executive usurpation supported by military power. It is the act of a dictator, not of a governor. It is what happened in France under Louis Napoleon. It is a repetition of frequent history in the revolutionary Central and South American states. But it is a startling innovation in one of the United States. The dispersion of a sovereign legislative body by executive proclamation, and the substitution of the militia for the legislature or the courts in settling a disputed election, is a strange sight in our land since the close of the war.

Government by bayonets rather than ballots—the rule of force instead of the rule of law—is revolution, by whatever official practised, by whatever party sustained.

If assassination and usurpation shall be permitted to achieve their objects in this case, not much imagination is required to see what a few regiments of Federal soldiers might do in Washington under the orders of a President who announced his determination, as Governor Taylor did yesterday, to "stick even if he precipitated a bloody war."

The whole deplorable affair illustrates the dangerous tendencies and natural results of the new policy of militarism—of "bending" the organic law—of government "outside the Constitution."

### Eternal Vigilance the Price of Liberty.

*By William Lloyd Garrison.*

Men think because from bloody war and strife  
Freedom emerges with triumphant feet,  
Mounting the throne of Justice for her seat,  
Her reign of glory holds a lasting life,  
Never illusion with more danger rife!  
Lulled to repose, for rest and sleep are sweet,  
She dreams, while back, with stealthy foot steps fleet,  
Oppression rushes with its murderous knife.

With Washington to guide, what need to guard?  
Answer, thou civil war from slavery's womb!  
With Lincoln in the firmament enstarred,  
Has not the vanquished monster found its tomb?  
Feigned its insensibility; unslain,  
Behold it rising to its prey again!

### Do We Need More Holidays?

*Lynn Roby Meekins, in the "Saturday Evening Post."*

A BILL in the present Congress provides that the twelfth day of February, the birthday of Lincoln, and the second day of April, the birthday of Jefferson, be made holidays.

Why? There are at present in this country twenty-nine holidays. Most of them are local. There is no national holiday; even the Fourth of July is not a day of rest by act of Congress. Although the President proclaims a day of Thanksgiving, it does not become a legal holiday in any State unless there is a law for it. But in spite of the complications of the question, there seem to be liberal cessations from toil. The Sundays yield fifty-two days of rest; the Saturday half-holidays twenty six days more. This makes seventy-eight days. Then each State has its own legal holidays, and often each city has its special days of observance. For instance, Massachusetts observes April 19 as Patriots' Day. Utah has July 24 as Pioneers' Day. Vermont has August 16 as the Bennington Battle Day. California has September 9 as Admission Day. So it goes all over the country. When we take all these holidays and combine the statistics we find that they amount on an average to about ninety days or more—practically one-fourth of the year. This new bill would add a second holiday in February, the shortest month of the year. Twelve of the States already have holidays in April, so that the new bill would also place a second holiday in that month. We are in favor of holidays, of course, and wish we could crowd the calendar with them. But it may be well not to rush toward the conditions that exist in Russia and some other countries, where there are so many holidays that the people who want to work have scarcely time or the opportunity to get up in the world.



THE old frigate "Constitution," renowned for its exploits early in the century, is to be put into condition for some kind of service again, at a cost of \$100,000. But it will cost much more than that to put the Constitution itself again into serviceable condition.

\* \* \*

As is indicated by the course of events in the South African war, there is a difference between fighting for empire and a queen, and fighting for home and independence. Great Britain's hopes of winning in the contest are based upon her ability to overwhelm the Boers with the force of superior numbers.

\* \* \*

THERE is, it is said, a strong feeling in many minds in Great Britain against the war, and many more who favor the continuance of the war believe that too great a cost has already been paid for all the advantages to be gained. It is probable that had this cost been anticipated at the outset, the war would not have been undertaken. But having been begun, it must go on now to the bitter end, even though the people pushing it regret that it was ever undertaken and realize that no possible gain can ever compensate for the terrible cost. And why?—The answer is, National pride! To stop the war now, would be humiliating to that pride, and that can never be allowed. Therefore the slaughter must go on! No matter how many people are killed—how much property wasted—no matter how many men are mutilated and maimed for life, how many women are made widows and little children orphans, no matter how much suffering is entailed,—the national pride must be maintained! And such is the attitude of a reputed "Christian" nation!

\* \* \*

Imagine a Christian who would insist that whatever else might happen, his personal pride must not receive any hurt! That individual's Christianity would be of the same kind as is possessed by a "Christian nation."

\* \* \*

Pride—national or individual—and Christianity, are strangers to each other. Pride and God are enemies. No man can be a Christian who is not willing to humble himself, to confess his error when he is in the

wrong. The Almighty dwells with him that is of "a humble and contrite heart." But the proud heart, or the proud nation, God will not suffer. The popular idea of Christianity as belonging to a nation, or government, of this day, is a theory which is completely exploded and dissipated by the obtruding fact of national pride.

\* \* \*

At this writing there is civil war in Kentucky, in the very center of the United States. The governor-elect, Goebel, lies dangerously wounded by the bullet of an assassin, fired from a window of the executive mansion. Governor Taylor, who claims to have been re-elected, has assembled the State militia about the capital to prevent the session of the legislature, and by proclamation has adjourned that body to meet in a town where only his partisans would be free to act. The legislature, which is in favor of Goebel, are trying to find a place of assembly, but are kept back by the State troops. Meanwhile, Governor elect Goebel has been sworn in, and has issued a proclamation directing the militia to disperse. Thus there are two rival governments in the State, one supported by the legislature, the courts, and the constitution, and the other by the bullets and bayonets of the troops. It is hoped the situation can be overcome without bloodshed; but all parties are armed in anticipation of an outbreak which will bring the full realities of civil war.

\* \* \*

There is talk of the possible need of Government troops to deal with the situation; but the Washington authorities deprecate such an idea, and no Government troops will be sent until it becomes evident that the State cannot preserve order and republican government by the means at its command. And yet these same Washington authorities have deemed it necessary to send troops to the other side of the earth—to the far-off island of Luzon—on the plea that the people there do not know how to govern themselves, and are not entitled to have a chance to show whether they can govern themselves or not. If there must be a protectorate over the people of a foreign land to preserve order and keep them from fighting each other, why not a protectorate over the State of Kentucky for the same reason?

\* \* \*

It makes no difference what white men may do—how much ignorance, barbarity, or general disregard of civilization they may display—so far as concerns their right to govern themselves. That right is not yet called in question, in America, where white men are concerned. Yet if the principles which defend human rights are set aside on account of another race of men, it cannot be long before the rights of white men are subverted by the same influences. For all human rights stand upon one and the same foundation.



THE debate in Congress on the Philippine question has reached a stage where the upholders of the doctrine of government by the consent of the governed are openly and violently denounced by their fellow congressmen as traitors. This was the charge hurled at Senator Pettigrew of South Dakota, by a Senator from New Jersey, during a discussion of a resolution introduced by the former bearing on the Philippine policy. It was, say the press dispatches, "the most violent debate of the session so far on the Philippine question."

\* \* \*

A statement made by the New Jersey Senator in connection with his charge of treason against his colleague from South Dakota, is worthy of note. He said that he had opposed the acquisition of the Philippines until the Paris treaty with Spain was made and ratified, and then he had thrown aside his "private views," and acquiesced in the result that had been reached. "I saw the flag attacked, and after that with me it was the country and the flag, right or wrong." (Italics ours.)

This senator seems to forget that the United States flag was not always the flag of *this country*.

\* \* \*

Back in 1775, the flag of the country was the flag of Great Britain, and when that flag was attacked there were men who were filled with horror. And if this senator, and others of like mind, had been living then, holding the sentiment of "the country and the flag, right or wrong," upon which side in the Revolutionary struggle would they necessarily have stood?

\* \* \*

The revolt against the British flag was not because the flag was not good enough, but because it stood for wrong. The United States flag came into existence solely because the American colonists would not stand for "their country right or wrong." America was then a part of the British Empire. The American colonists revolted against the British government because it was in the wrong, and they would stand *only for the right*.

\* \* \*

Only by a repudiation, on their part, of the sentiment "my country right or wrong" did the American flag come into existence; and only upon that ground is such a flag necessary. If that ground is to be abandoned, there is no longer any need of the flag. "Old Glory" with its stars and stripes, came into being as the symbol of the only government on earth that was founded upon just principles—the only government on earth that was *in the right*. For a government that was in the wrong, no new flag would have been necessary; indeed, no new government would have been established if no one had cared about the right or wrong of the controversy with Great Britain. The stars and stripes symbolized a new government that arose solely upon the issue of the right versus the wrong in the British policy.

But now, in the opinion of American statesmen, it is not necessary to care about the right or wrong of the Government's position; the Government is simply to be sustained, right or wrong. If it is in the wrong, it is to be supported and established in that course; it is to be pushed along on the *wrong* road! And such is conceived to be the duty of a statesman!

\* \* \*

Where is a nation going to when it is on the wrong road?—to happiness? to prosperity? to peace? Or to disaster?

\* \* \*

There is a God in the universe who is always and unswervingly for the right, and against everything that is wrong; and in his hands the nations are as "the small dust of the balance." And when a nation is in the wrong, can it prevail against him? Has it come to be wisdom for a government to fight against God?

\* \* \*

"The country and the flag, right or wrong," is a sentiment consistent only with the idea that there is no God of right and justice in the universe. And even then—were the claims of the atheist to be admitted—it is a sentiment opposed to the lesson of all history, that when a nation gets on the wrong road, it is on the road to its end.

### The Sword and the Bible.

QUITE recently a newspaper reporter interviewed the author of "In His Steps," or "What would Jesus Do?" and secured from him an expression of opinion upon the retention of the Philippine Islands by this Government. The gentleman referred to is reported to have said:—

"I am sorry that the sword and the Bible must go hand in hand, so to speak, to Christianize a barbarous people. I wish the Bible could go alone, but it seems impossible. The humanizing influence of Christian teachings make me an advocate of American rule in the Philippines."

This is too bad, but the world had a right to expect better things of Mr. Sheldon; but he is not alone in holding and expressing such opinions. Probably a majority of the clergy of this country share, to some extent at least, this view. So important does it seem to them that the Bible shall go to all nations, that go it must even if has to be shot into their homes and hearts by Gatling guns and cannon.

But the great trouble is that no nation ever yet received the *Bible* in any such way. Such methods give an entirely erroneous idea of the Bible and what it teaches. Semi-civilized peoples may possibly accept it perforce; or as being superior in some way to that which they have previously held; but with it they receive the

war spirit by which it was forced upon them, and never get the real spirit of the Bible at all.

Christianity is a stench in the nostrils of millions of people to-day, simply because they associate it with unjust wars of conquest. The Bible might better never go at all than to go as the companion or even as the camp-follower of the sword. The only sword the Christian is authorized to use is the sword of the Spirit. And where that has been the only weapon bloodless victories have been won for the Prince of Peace. Better, a thousand times that the soldier of the cross fall at his post of duty, bearing only the Word of God, panoplied only with the armor of heaven, than that the heathen should fall before carnal weapons in the hands of men bearing the Christian name, but knowing nothing by a living experience of the Spirit of Christ. War is utterly incompatible with genuine Christianity, for to every one of his followers Christ says: "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Not *by* the sword, as is sometimes quoted. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink," is the gospel rule. Christ did not abrogate the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill;" and the wholesale killing of men in war is simply wholesale violation of the divinelaw. Let not murderers nor companions of murderers carry the Bible either to the Philippines, or any where else. "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord." C. P. BOLLMAN.

---

### Sunday-Law Crusade News.

---

#### CONNECTICUT.

*Blue Law Invoked to Stop Recreation on Lake Whitney Near New Haven.*

NEW HAVEN, CONN., Jan. 28.—The town officials of Hamden, a suburb near this city, to-day resurrected a Blue Law to put a stop to Sunday skating on Lake Whitney, and there was a clash between the town constables and the several hundred skaters there, among whom were a number of Yale students. The sport has been permitted every Sunday up to to-day. The constables undertook to drive the skaters from the lake, but the officials found themselves in such a hopeless minority that they gave it up. Now the people who were interfered with intend, if possible, to invoke by way of retaliation another Blue Law that makes it illegal for the Hamden milkmen to deliver milk on Sunday in this city.

---

#### OHIO.

*Toledo Clergymen Waiting for More "Ammunition."*

TOLEDO, Jan. 29 —Worsted in their battle against the Sunday theaters, the Toledo clergymen do not propose to abandon the fight. At next Sunday's services the congregations in all Protestant churches repre-

sented in the Pastors' Union will be asked for contributions to the Sunday law enforcement fund. It is proposed not to strike a blow until the fund is ample to meet the expenses of a crusade against both the Sunday theater and the Sunday saloon.

---

#### MARYLAND.

*Blue Sunday in Baltimore.*

*All "Unnecessary" Business Suspended and Antiquated Laws Enforced.*

BALTIMORE, MD., Jan. 28 —To-day was blue Sunday in Baltimore. For the first time in many years the Sunday Blue Laws of Maryland, which in various forms have been upon the statute books for two centuries, were rigorously and relentlessly enforced. The police force of Baltimore patrolled the town from Canton to Carroll and from Locust Point to Waverly in search of violators. Newsdealers, newsboys, milkmen, icemen, druggists for prescriptions only and proprietors of lunch rooms alone were exempt. All other varieties of merchants who were found selling their wares between midnight and midnight will be called upon within a few days to appear before the Grand Jury.

Cigar dealers, grocers, bootblacks, fruit dealers, soda water dealers, ice cream men, confectioners and stationers, who for years have made no distinction between Sunday and any other day, were compelled to close their establishments all day. A number of storekeepers placed amusing signs in their windows. One cigar store had a large decorated sign reading: "This is hypocrite day; you must buy Bibles, and not cigars." In another store yesterday was a sign, "Proclamation—Renewal of the Blue Laws. We close on Sunday. Buy your supplies to-day." In one of the large drug stores there was a sign on the cigar case saying: "Nothing doing." It is thought that the law will be made so ridiculous that it will be repealed.

---

*THE BALTIMORE MINISTERIAL UNION GIVE THANKS FOR THE CRUSADE.*

BALTIMORE, Jan. 29.—The ridicule called forth by yesterday's enforcement of the antiquated Blue Laws was reflected in to-day's meeting of the Ministerial Union. The discussion was started by a resolution offered by the Rev. Dr. Julius E. Grammar, that "This association hails with gratitude to the Almighty the action which has been taken by the municipal authorities of this city for the more sacred observance of the Lord's day."

The Rev. C. E. Guthrie was not enthusiastic. He said the Sunday newspaper, the cab driver, and the soda fountain, to which the police had generally devoted their energies, were not the issues. He suggested that the old law might be modified.

Then there was a motion to include the mayor and police commissioners in the vote of thanks, but some did not think the police commissioners deserved to be included, while others thought they would be justified in feeling insulted if they were not. Dr. Grammer suggested that they settle it by just "thanking God." This was done amid laughter.

The foregoing are press statements taken from New York City dailies.

---

### "Outside the Constitution."

---

*New York "World."*

THE decision of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee to devise a plan for governing Porto Rico and later the Philippines "outside the Constitution," is not surprising. It is a perfectly logical if not indeed a necessary next step in the policy of imperialism.

Having permitted the President to wage a war "outside the Constitution," and to recognize slavery and involuntary servitude in our new possessions, also "outside the Constitution," why should there be any hesitation in imposing a tariff upon imports from and exports into those possessions in disregard of the Constitution?

To be sure, it may seem hard to our people that after expending \$150,000,000 in a war with Spain, and as much more in Mr. McKinley's war in the China Sea, with Porto Rican and the Philippine commerce held up as a compensation, they should now be called upon to pay a tariff duty on the products of our "spoils of victory." It may seem rather inconsistent likewise to the negroes, mongrels and "yellow bellies" whom we are annexing to find themselves taxed without representation.

But when the Government goes "outside the Constitution" and the Declaration of Independence is treated as obsolete sentimentality, there is no telling what may happen.

---

COLOSSAL crosses are to be erected, in this last year of the 19th century, on nineteen mountain peaks of Italy, to commemorate each century. The Rome branch of a Catholic international committee has undertaken the work, the idea being that this will be a way of showing "homage to Jesus the Redeemer."

---

THE "Christian newspaper" enterprise entered into by the *Topeka Daily Capital* and the Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, is already the subject of considerable adverse criticism. The following, for example, is offered by the *Springfield Republican*:—

"Rev. Mr. Sheldon is to be given opportunity to show how a Christian newspaper should be made. The

first move in the new departure is to raise the price of the *Capital* from 10 cents to 25 cents for the week. That is business, as is the whole proceeding on the part of the ownership of the *Capital*. The free advertisement which it has already secured can scarcely be estimated in dollars. On the minister's part we assume that his undertaking is a conscientious effort to instruct newspaperdom and the world.

"It is decidedly worth noting that Rev. Mr. Sheldon, in his elucidation of the proposition, 'What would Jesus do?' is to continue the *Capital's* Sunday edition. 'He confesses that he has found by examination that the Sunday newspaper is so powerful an instrument for instruction and enlightenment that it would be wrong and foolish to discontinue it.' This concession comes from one who 'has always denounced Sunday newspapers as evils which should not be tolerated.' . . .

"Now we are to see how really Christian Editor Pro Tem Sheldon is going to be. We find him quoted to this effect:—

"I am sorry to say that the sword and the Bible must go hand in hand, so to speak, to Christianize a barbarous people. I wish the Bible could do it alone, but this seems impossible. The humanizing influence of Christian teachings makes me an advocate of American rule in the Philippines."

"That does not appear to us to be what Jesus, the Prince of Peace, would have said in the present national emergency: but perhaps Rev. Mr. Sheldon will not say that from the editorial chair."

---

### Sunday Legislation Gaining Ground in Europe.

---

*From "The Ram's Horn."*

IT is evident that the movement in behalf of Sabbath observance [Sunday legislation] is progressing far more rapidly in European countries than it is in North America. According to a recent address on this subject, on the part of Dr. Cunningham, of Edinburgh, it appears that while the sanctity of the Sabbath in the countries in which it has been most strictly observed for generations, has declined in the public regard, continental countries, where the continental Sunday has been the synonym of license, are giving more heed to the observance of the sacred day than hitherto. In 1890 the International Conference on Labor, at Berlin, discussed the subject, and legislation was enacted two years later, prohibiting the opening of shops on Sunday, and in 1895 the employment of operatives in enterprises on the first day of the week was forbidden.

Those who recall what a strife over this question was made in Chicago at the building and opening of the World's Fair, may be surprised to learn that the workmen employed on the Paris Exposition buildings are guaranteed exemption from Sunday labor, and this has been done by special legislation. It is quite significant to observe, by the way, that a large movement on behalf of Sabbath observance which is now going on in Chicago, is not being fostered by the churches, as might

naturally be supposed, but by the labor unions who, on behalf of retail clerks, are strenuously suing for a day of rest on Sunday. Already, in consequence of this effort, nearly all of the retail shops have been closed, and so successful has been the effort that an attack has been made against the Sunday drug store. It is possible that Chicago, which has been known far and wide for its open Sunday, may vie with Toronto as the model city of Sabbath observance.

THE *Ram's Horn*, (Chicago), from which we quote elsewhere in this issue, says:—

“It will certainly be unwelcome truth to many, as it should be to all, if it can be proved that our country has become the unconscious or the conscious agent for perpetuating ecclesiastical tyranny in the Orient. Those who would be quick to deny this inference, should reflect that the charge is supported by many of our military commanders who have fought there during the past year.”

And in support of these words it adds:—

“Do we take counsel of our fears in writing the above? Let our readers take up once more their daily papers of recent date and they will read an uncensored dispatch from the Philippines to the effect that in the city of Manila a paper established at the instance of President Schurman, of Cornell University, to cause a sentiment for American annexation, had been suspended for this reason: It seems that a fund of money has been raised for charity purposes, and sent over to the priests for distribution. This paper, called *The American*, criticised the manner in which it had been distributed. The editor was informed that it must retract that article, as no criticism of the church would be permitted. We do not know whether the criticism was just or unjust, but the editor refused to retract, and suspended publication, declaring in good conscience, he could not retract. From which we infer that the old Spanish regulations concerning free speech and a free press, have been re-established and enforced under our own Government.”

### The Bible Trust.

A NEW YORK daily says:—

“THE announcement that the Bible publishers of the country had followed the fashion and formed a trust still left it an open question how the Bible readers would be affected by the change. Mr. Archbold, of the Standard Oil Trust, kindly explained to the public at the Alumni Association dinner of Syracuse University on Friday that trusts are “a necessary evolution of the times,” that they reduce cost, improve quality, increase wages, please both the producer and consumer and minister to the happiness and prosperity of the country.

“Accordingly we had reason to expect, and there were those who hoped against hope, that the Bible Trust would furnish a practical illustration of the benevolent side of this much-mooted question. Alas for the vanity

of human expectations! The report that the trust is complete and in good working order is promptly followed by the official announcement of an advance in the price of Bibles of the old quality. The way to a knowledge of revealed truth is made harder by 15 to 20 per cent. This is disappointing, but it might be worse. Let us be duly thankful that the trust merely publishes the Bible and does not edit and expurgate it to give us a revised trust version of the good book. The commandments “Thou shalt not steal,” “Thou shalt not covet,” still hold their places in the table of the Law, and the Golden Rule irradiates the New Testament.”

### Prayer for Conquest.

NO “CHRISTIAN nation” ever acknowledges itself to be in the wrong. It sets apart days of fasting and prayer, for seeking the divine aid, not on the ground that its attitude in the crisis that has been reached may be a wrong one, nor as implying a willingness to take the opposite attitude should the divine guidance that is sought point that way; but only to ask for divine assistance in executing what it has set out to accomplish and is determined to do if possible. The “Christian nation” treats the deity as an ally, not as a sovereign. If the cause in which the divine aid is invoked does not succeed, it is accepted as a chastisement for past sins, never as an indication that the cause itself did not deserve to succeed. The “humiliation” of the nation never reaches the point of an admission of fallibility in judgment and a desire to turn from and make reparation for a wrong course of action which it may be pursuing at the time.

Just now, as an illustration, we have before us the spectacle of two “Christian nations” fighting each other in South Africa, and each at the same time earnestly invoking the divine assistance to crown the efforts of its armies with victory. They did not ask God to determine for them, before the war begun, whether they should fight or not, nor do they now cease fighting to seek for divine enlightenment as to whether the war shall be continued. One of them at least—Great Britain—is praying for a speedy termination of hostilities, when it is in her own power to terminate the war at once, by being willing to give up the idea of dominating a foreign people. But it would be almost “treason” to assert that such a concession is in harmony with the divine mind.

We find in the *N. Y. Sun*, of January 23, the following pertinent observations upon this subject, under the heading “Fighting and Praying”:—

“The Metropolitan, or presiding prelate, of the Canadian branch of the Church of England has appointed the second Sunday in February, or February 11, ‘as a day of special supplications for the happy ending of the South African War.’ Meantime General Buller is fighting to bring it to a conclusion favorable to the British,

or the ending for which, of course, the Canadian Anglicans will pray, since upon the success or failure of his present movement the issue of the whole contest depends. That question, too, is likely to be settled one way or the other before the Canadians begin to send up their supplications two weeks from next Sunday.

"Whether, then, that day of prayer is to be for them a day of thanksgiving or of humiliation depends on the soldiers, the guns, and the strategy of General Buller, and the event will be no more influenced by the divine overruling than are any other human happenings. This we do not say in any spirit depreciative of the office and importance of prayer, but simply because it is a fact.

"While the Canadians are praying in thanksgiving or in penitential sorrow and distress, the Boers will be praying to the same overruling Providence, but the event which would bring rejoicing to the Canadians and for which they would render praise to God as the Author of their good fortune or the outcome which would fill their hearts with grief as chastisement administered by God in the inscrutable ways of his providence, would be interpreted in exactly the other way by the Boers. They are people with a faith in divine Providence and in the actual interference of God in human affairs which exceeds in its completeness the faith of most Christians of this day whether in Canada or elsewhere in Christendom. As they rest in the intervals of battle they sing hymns of praise to God and offer prayers to him in a spirit of subjection to the Divine will. . . .

"In South Africa each side is fighting to the death to attain the blessing or ward off the punishment, yet that this war can come to a happy ending at any time the contestants may choose is as certain as that it need never have occurred. The British can end it any day by following the example and precedent of Gladstone in the Boer War of 1881. President Kruger can close it by appealing for terms to England. Is it not therefore presumptuous for either side to make supplication to God to bring to an end a conflict whose conclusion is wholly within the ability and option of contestants each fighting for his own advantage, when both are straining every nerve to settle it for themselves and when neither will settle it except under the compulsion of earthly circumstances which each is doing his best to control by purely human means and instruments?

"Victory over the Boers would bring to Great Britain no glory and would leave for the empire an almost endless problem of extreme difficulty in South Africa, requiring for its treatment the maintenance of a large and costly army of occupation for many years to come. Thus, it may be that there would be more danger and sorrow for Great Britain in victory than in defeat.

"If, then, our Canadian neighbors would recognize and bow before an overruling Providence let them pray to God for peace, simply leaving it for Omniscience to determine where the happiness in peace lies, according to the judgment of the wisdom to which a thousand years are but as yesterday and as a watch in the night."

# THE PERIL OF THE REPUBLIC.

BY PROF. P. T. MAGAN.

In this work the author shows how the United States of America is now on the very threshold of an apostasy from the principles of a true republic, and how already there has been congressional legislation, executive action, and judicial decision committing this government to principles opposed to Protestantism. This is **MOST IMPORTANT HISTORY**, and if you would know all about it you must read this book. Nowhere else is this history given.

The following are a few of the chapter headings:—

A NATION'S BIRTHRIGHT,  
A WAR FOR HUMANITY'S SAKE,  
AMERICAN IMPERIALISM,  
MANIFEST DESTINY,  
AMITY OR ARMAGEDDON.

"The Peril of the Republic of the United States of America" is just from the press, contains 11 chapters, 196 pages, (size 6 1/2 x 8 inches), and is handsomely and durably bound in red cloth. Price \$1.00. Address

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

39 Bond St., New York City.

Or, Oakland, Cal.  
Kansas City, Mo.

## PAGAN COUNTERFEITS

in the Christian church  
By C. A. S. TEMPLE.

A vivid presentation of the pagan festivals, rites, and usages which the author finds in the Christian churches of to-day, together with two chapters on Freemasonry, which ought to be read by every Mason who professes to be a Christian. 187 pages, paper covers. Price 25 cents. Address House nearest to you.

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.

Have you a fountain pen? If not, turn to p. 95.

# THIS "OXFORD" BIBLE FOR \$1.50.

So many people are asking for "nice, large type" in a Bible, small enough to be conveniently carried, that we are led to offer this one. See how large and clear the type is, and the Bible is only  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4} \times 1\frac{1}{4}$  inches in size.

It contains the necessary "Helps," such as Dictionary of Proper Names, Subject Index, Concordance, 15 Maps, etc., over 300 pages in all, being those portions of the Helps which are most used.

*Of Christ's kingdom.*

PSALMS.

*The church's confidence in God.*

of the ivory palaces, whereby they have made thee glad.

9<sup>a</sup> Kings' daughters were among thy honourable women: <sup>b</sup>upon thy right hand did stand the queen in

<sup>2</sup> Heb. an high place for us.

<sup>a</sup> Cant. 6. 8.

<sup>b</sup> 1 K. n. 2. 19.

<sup>c</sup> Pa. G. 5.

7 The LORD of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is <sup>2</sup>our refuge. Selah.

8 <sup>c</sup>Come, behold the works of the LORD, what desolations he hath

Specimen of type in our Style C-1 Bible.

The binding is French Morocco, Divinity Circuit Style (see cut), round corners, red under gold edges, and cover is **linen lined**, thus making a neat, durable, convenient, but inexpensive Bible.


**Note the Price, \$1.50, postpaid.**

Our order number for this Bible is C-1. We have better bindings at \$1.75, \$2.75, \$3.50 and \$4.00.

**The India Paper Edition** bound in genuine levant Morocco, the best and most durable binding for continuous use, costs at our reduced rate \$7.25. Write us about anything you need in Bibles. Address

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

39 Bond St., New York, N. Y.



## THE MARKED NEW TESTAMENT.

For Missions and Mission Workers, the object being to call the reader's attention to certain texts marked in red or black ink in facsimile of hand-markings. There are 225 marked verses, bearing on the subject of salvation through Christ, including repentance, faith, obedience, etc. Size  $5\frac{3}{8} \times 5\frac{3}{8}$  inches. Cloth, cut flush. **Price 15 Cents**, with discount when ordered in quantity.

## BLACK BEAUTY.


By Annie Sewell. A story of a horse which will teach young and old much about the proper care and treatment of dumb animals. Size  $4\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$  inches, 252 pages, with illustrations, neat cloth binding beautifully stamped in gold and colored inks. **Price 40 cts.**

Address,

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

## "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 eather, is almost as durable, and may be washed the same as oilcloth. **Price 60 cents postpaid.**

**GOOD AGENTS WANTED.**

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,  
39 BOND ST., NEW YORK CITY.

## HEALTH

How to Find It When It's Lost.

How to Keep It When It's Found.

By B. Franklin Richards.

Says the author in his Preface, "This is supposed to be an enlightened age, when experience and knowledge with regard to the body and its diseases have been accumulated by professional men everywhere, yet disorders of the stomach have steadily increased in variety and virulence until nearly every person has, to a greater or less extent, come under its influence.

With a desire to drop some hint or suggestion that will prove beneficial to those who are now suffering, or who may hereafter suffer, . . . the author sends forth these humble words of warning."

"HEALTH" contains 11 chapters, 222 pages, and is bound in dark green cloth. **Price, - - - One Dollar.**

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,  
39 BOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

OAKLAND, CAL.,  
KANSAS CITY, MO.

# A Unique Pen==THE "POST."

## Being the ONLY SELF-FILLING AND SELF-CLEANING

pen manufactured in the world, the "Post Fountain Pen" stands pre-eminently alone. No need of inky fingers; no need of bothersome fillers. You can cleanse and refill the "Post," without either of these adjuncts, in less than ten seconds.

The unsolicited testimonial of one of our subscribers is to the point. He says:—

"There is nothing so near to success as success itself. Such is the 'Post,' the acme, the climax of inventive genius."

Another of our subscribers who has already taken advantage of this offer and who again sends in for pen and paper, says:—

"I must say that the 'Post Fountain Pen' is the best fountain pen I ever used. It is a wonder."



As an incentive to an aggressive work in behalf of the Sentinel, we offer—by SPECIAL AGREEMENT WITH THE PATENTEE—to send the American Sentinel for one year and the Post Fountain Pen, postpaid, for - - - - - **\$2.50.**




In ordering state kind of pen desired—medium or fine.



### Six Cardinal Points

Peculiar to the  
**"POST:"**

- Self-Filling,
- Self-Cleaning,
- Simplicity,
- Durability,
- Reliability,
- No Leaking.



## A Unique Journal== The AMERICAN SENTINEL.

A staunch defender of the true principles of religious liberty. The AMERICAN SENTINEL is unique in that it is the only paper published in the United States devoted specifically and aggressively to the work of making known the principles of religious liberty—Christian and Constitutional—from the standpoint of truth.

There is right now an urgent call and a ripe field for every power and every agency that will stand for the right.

*The American Sentinel should be in the home of every American citizen.*

In connection with the SENTINEL we offer the "Post" Fountain Pen. They both stand on their merits. The price of the pen alone is \$3.00. It cannot be purchased for less anywhere. The price of the SENTINEL is \$1.00 per year.

Do you appreciate liberty of conscience? Do you desire to acquaint your friends with the movements that are seeking to destroy this God-given right? Secure their subscription, the SENTINEL will do the rest.

Do 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.

Address

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



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 8, 1900.

If the minority of people who observe the seventh day do not need to be protected in their Sabbath observance, why is it necessary to protect the majority who observe the first day?

THE Sabbath is declared in Scripture to be a "sign" between God and his chosen people, given that they may know that it is the Lord God who sanctifies them. Eze. 20:12, 20. This being so, what business has a State legislature, or other body of men, to attempt to place this sign upon unsanctified people, by enacting and enforcing Sabbath laws?

THE law of Christ cannot be applied to civil governments, because the law of Christ is *not force*; that is, it is not and cannot be turned into, civil force. The law of Christ is the law of love; and a civil government knows nothing about love. Civil government stands for justice, and justice neither loves nor hates. The law of Christ was made—so far as this world is concerned—for human beings only.

WHAT can be more natural than for a "Christian nation" to believe itself commissioned by the Author of Christianity to do missionary work? since all Christians are naturally missionaries. And as a nation must make its authority respected wherever it goes, and to do this must employ an army and navy, it follows very naturally that the army and navy come into use as missionary agencies, and bullets and shells are deemed essential in fulfilling a commission from the Lord. The "Christian nation" idea is the starting point, and the slaughter of human beings created in the image

of God, is the termination. And it is all logical enough, *if that idea is correct*. But is it correct?

IN Washington's and Jefferson's day, it was asserted that "all men are created equal," and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights;" and these statements were put forth as *self-evident truths*. But *now* such journals as the *North American Review* come forward and declare that these same statements are among the "*most obvious fallacies*." How times have changed!

LET men behave themselves as individuals, and the government will behave itself, without any attempt to make it conform to a moral law. But let men misbehave as individuals, and the government which they administer will misbehave itself, in spite of any and all moral laws to which it may profess to conform. The righteousness of a nation is not a governmental, but an individual, matter.

It is a curious idea which some people have, who want to see society reformed by law, that a law of the State, or of the United States, can make unchristian people "respect Christians and the day set apart for their observance." As anybody must know, people who are not Christians do not see any use in Christian doctrines and institutions; and many of this class are outspoken opposers of Christianity, believing its doctrines and practises to be founded upon error and productive of harm to mankind. They have no respect for them whatever. And yet the professors of Christianity propose to compel these people by law to observe a (professedly) Christian institution—Sunday—in order to secure their respect for it and for Christian people! What can the result be but to intensify their disrespect and dislike, and to strengthen the barrier between them

and Christianity? People can come to God only by being drawn; but laws do not draw people; they drive them. The Lord draws people to himself by "cords of love;" but some modern reformers intend to drive people to him by the lash of legal force and penalties. The more they drive the people, the further will both they and the people get from the Lord.

NOTICE how, as brought out in the article "Those Consecrated Fallacies," on another page, the idea that men have come upon the earth by evolution goes hand in hand with the idea that men were never endowed with any rights, and therefore that it is nonsense to say that the purpose of civil governments among men is to preserve their "unalienable rights." The doctrine of the Declaration of Independence was enunciated from the standpoint of Christianity, and from that standpoint it still holds good. The doctrines of atheism well serve the purposes of despotism.

"Do we need more holidays?" inquires a writer in the *Philadelphia Saturday Evening Post*, in view of the fact that a bill is before Congress for making two new holidays, one in February and one in April. Then he proceeds to note that there are already twenty-nine holidays in the year, besides fifty-two Sundays and the Saturday half-holidays; and his conclusion is that while he would like to "crowd the calendar with them," it would "be well not to rush toward the conditions that exist in Russia and some other countries, where there are so many holidays that people who want to work have scarcely time or opportunity to get up in the world."

We should say so! Let a country crowd its calendar full of holidays, and it will speedily approximate to the condition of lands that have long been dominated by the papacy. People in this age of the world need plenty of time to work, both to enable them to prosper in business and to keep them out of mischief. The country has too many holidays already.