

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.—Thomas Jefferson.

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER 9, 1889.

NUMBER 37.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK;
18 POST ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.

EDITORS,
E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal., for August 28, is largely devoted to refuting charges brought against it and its editors by W. F. Crafts, field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, who made an affidavit at Colorado Springs that the editors were guilty of willful and malicious falsehood and slander "by the square foot." With the SENTINEL's showing by means of *fac-similes* of letters written by Crafts to Prof. Jones, one of its editors, compared with the sworn statements of Crafts, the conclusion that the apostle of the National Sabbath law advocacy is guilty of perjury, is irresistible—*Silver Gate (San Diego), Sept. 14.*

In the *New York Observer's* notice of the death of John Bright sometime ago there occurred a statement which is worthy of preservation and of special note in this age, when the tendency is to try to elevate people in bulk. The statement is this:—

"He cared supremely for the development of individual character; he preferred the material prosperity of the people, advancing slowly by their own efforts to quicker progress by State aid."

There is probably not a National Reformer who would not agree with Mr. Bright in this. They would agree that the idea is absurd that men can be established on a higher pecuniary basis by legislation. They know well that it is individual character and energy that determine a man's standing. The State might pass a law that every individual should have a certain amount of property, and it might even distribute property so that each should have an equality, but in less time than it would take to make the distribution, some would have a great deal more, and some would have none at all.

But if this is absurd in temporal matters, how much more so in matters pertaining to morals. National Reformers would have the State pass laws to make men moral and to elevate them spiritually, when it has not power to overcome individual characteristics sufficiently to make a rich man out of a man that is poor because of a lack of energy. There is at the present day, as we have before said, a tendency to do everything in bulk. Charity is carried on by associations; and temperance work, instead of being performed by and for individuals as formerly, is now rele-

gated almost entirely to societies and political parties.

And so it is with Christian work. People are getting tired of laboring for individuals, as the Master did. To labor personally for people seems too slow, so they want to have laws passed which will gather them in by the hundreds and thousands. The natural consequence of this is to put personal labor entirely at a discount. The only kind of labor which can accomplish any real results is despised because of its humility. Let the professed Christian people of this country become infatuated with the idea of National Reform, and real Christian effort would cease at once. Fortunately there are some still who believe that the conversion of one individual is of far more value than the forced compliance of a thousand to outward forms.

Mr. Crafts and Seventh-Day Christians

Not long since a communication from Mr. Crafts in reply to a Mr. Cadman on "Cardinal Gibbons and the Sunday-Rest Bill," appeared in a morning newspaper of Chicago. In that letter Mr. Crafts states that seventh-day Christians are guilty of "slanders," "malicious misstatements and misquotations." This letter of Mr. Crafts' called out in the *Chicago Morning Times*, a letter from the Rev. J. W. Morton. Both of these letters are published in the *Sabbath Recorder* of August 15, from which we take this letter. The readers of the SENTINEL will be interested in the well put arguments of Mr. Morton:—

In your paper of the 13th inst., the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, of the "American Sabbath Union," charges seventh-day Christians with "malicious misstatements and misquotations" in reference to himself and the society he represents. As I am a Seventh-day Baptist I feel interested in this charge. I am not conscious, however, of having made any malicious statements about either him or his society, nor have I noticed anything of the kind in the *Outlook*, our denominational organ. But now that the question is up I want to call attention to a few misstatements and misquotations that Mr. Crafts and his co-workers have made. I do not say maliciously, but at least carelessly.

1. In the official notes of a hearing on the Sunday-Rest bill before Mr. Blair's committee, December 13, 1888, Mr. Crafts says of Cardinal Gibbons' letter, in the foot-note to page 18: "The letter is not equal in value to the individual signatures of the millions he represents, but no loyal Catholic priest or paper or person will oppose what has thus been indorsed." In his letter to the *Morning News* he says that it was "distinctly said" that the letter "was not equivalent to the

signatures of the whole Catholic Church, although it was hoped it would be equivalent to a negative indorsement by that church, in that the approval of the Cardinal, it was thought, would prevent opposition to the Sunday-Rest petition by any loyal Catholic." Observe the difference. In the original the statement is absolute that no loyal Catholic will oppose the Cardinal's letter. In the quotation "it was hoped" and "it was thought" that "the approval of the Cardinal" "would prevent opposition" "by any loyal Catholic." Now what is this but gross misquotation and misrepresentation?

2. In the same document (page 124) Mr. Crafts says: "It would not be reasonable for legislatures to compel the ninety-nine one-hundredths of the population who do not regard Saturday as a sacred day to stop business for the less than one per cent. who do. If this were done, the Mohammedan immigrants of the future would soon be asking for laws halting industry on their sacred Friday also." Now, here is an indirect, but none the less positive, assertion that observers of the Seventh day—Jews, seventh-day Adventists, and Seventh-day Baptists, desire the enactment of laws compelling others to keep Saturday holy. But Mr. Crafts ought to know that not one of either of these classes has ever petitioned for anything of the kind, while seventh-day Christians at least, have constantly and publicly declared their opposition to all civil Sabbath laws. Could there be a grosser misrepresentation than this? I do not say it is "malicious," but it is unjust, injurious, and unworthy of a thoughtful Christian.

3. In the same document (page 22) Mrs. J. C. Bateham, a lady thoroughly indorsed by Mr. Crafts, in speaking of the great "half-mile" petition, says: "I do not know how many of these 7,000,000 have sent their individual signatures—it is said their are millions. I do know that nearly every State and Territory is represented, and that pasted on red cloth and arranged as drapery in the Foundry church of this city, for the American Sabbath Union now in session there, the petition is over half a mile in length, much of it in double columns; and yet this wonderful petition, doubtless by many millions the largest ever presented to this or any other government, is not yet full grown." On page 24 these same 7,000,000 are said to have spoken "through their signatures." These remarks refer to what Mr. Crafts calls "our half-mile double-columned petition," which, he says, contains thousands upon thousands of individual signatures." Now Mr. Crafts must have known very well that Mrs. Bateham's estimate of the number of these signatures was enormously exaggerated—that half-mile petition, though in double columns, could not have contained more than one hundred and sixty thousand

individual signatures, allowing sixty to each foot of double column, which is a very liberal allowance, indeed. Yet he allows the statement to go unchecked that it contained "several millions" and "was by many millions the largest ever presented to this or any other government." As "field secretary" of the American Sabbath Union he ought to have corrected this egregious, published blunder long ago, but he has not.

Seventh-day Christians are not "malicious" in their opposition to Sunday laws. They are as conscientious as Mr. Crafts himself, and he would do himself a great deal more credit by practicing a little more Christian charity than by sending sworn affidavits to religious bodies for the purpose of securing the "expulsion" of members who may have trodden on his theological or political corns."

Sunday in California and New York.

MR. CRAFTS has been in California, the only State in the Union which has no Sunday law; and the people may now expect to have it held up in season and out of season as the terrible example of immorality and vice consequent upon having no Sunday law. In his speeches here he declared that the State had retrograded in religion and morals since the repeal of its Sunday laws six years ago. To be sure Mr. Crafts was not in California six years ago, or before, when they had a Sunday law, and has not been here since that time, with the exception of a few days this year; but that doesn't make any difference with him.

But he does not find it all clear sailing in his endeavor to make capital for Sunday laws at the expense of California. At a meeting of the Congregational club in San Francisco, at which Mr. Crafts was present, the Rev. Dr. Barrows, of that city, said that what Dr. Crafts had said about the moral and religious declension in California was not true; that he had been here eight years, and that in all that time there had been a steady and constant advance in the moral and religious status, and that Dr. Crafts had been here but a few days and could not judge. He protested strongly against Dr. Crafts' carrying such a report back to the East, because it was not true. The report of the meeting continues as follows: "Dr. Williams of Tulare City indorsed Dr. Barrows' remarks. The Sabbath was as well observed in Tulare as in any city that he had ever lived in. He was certainly in favor of the workingmen having the privilege of Sunday rest, but for the churches to press Sunday observance on the State, upon religious grounds, and endeavor indirectly to compel men to go to church by strict Sunday laws, could do no good, and might do much harm to the cause of religion. Rev. Dr. Cruzan of the Third Congregational Church, San Francisco, agreed with Dr. Williams and Dr. Barrows. During his recent visit to the East he had spent a Sunday at Coney Island. There was nothing like it for immorality and dissipation on the Pacific Coast; yet this was right under the nose of Dr. Crafts when he was at home, in a State that had strict Sunday laws."

Let this be repeated everywhere Mr. Crafts goes. It comes from men who are earnest in their endeavor to get Sunday laws, but who are more interested in truth than in victory. It shows, what the *Alta California* claimed in a recent editorial, that Sunday laws are not necessary for the preservation of morality, and that California without any Sunday law is equal with, and even in ad-

vance, morally, of some States that have a stringent Sunday law.

But the point in the above quotation to which we wish to call especial attention is the charge by Dr. Williams, that Sunday laws, such as Mr. Crafts is laboring to secure, are an attempt to compel men to go to church. Mr. Crafts has complained bitterly because we have charged the same thing upon his movement. But here we have a statement to the same effect made by a minister who is engaged with him in an effort to secure a Sunday law, but, who does not believe in going to the same length. This is another demonstration that the SENTINEL has not misrepresented the Sunday-law movement. E. J. W.

"Look on this Picture, and on This."

THOSE who are advocating a Sunday-Rest law are continually classing together all who oppose it. They say that here are seventh-day Christians in company with liquor-dealers, saloon-keepers, etc., and that one is known by the company he keeps. Granted that liquor-sellers are opposed to such a law. It does not make the law right because the liquor-dealer is pursuing a disreputable business. Many of these men who favor a Sunday law are Republicans, so are many liquor-dealers; but this does not prove that the principles of Republicanism are wrong. Many Sunday-law men are Democrats; many liquor-dealers are also; but that does not prove that democracy is wrong. Many prohibitionists are Sunday-law men, but, admitting Sunday laws to be wrong, this does not prove that the principles of prohibition are wrong.

So, many liquor-dealers, and saloon-keepers, are in a certain way conjoined with Christians in opposing the principles involved in one certain law; but that does not prove that the Christians are wrong unless they indorse liquor-selling. And those Christians who oppose, especially, Sunday laws, most emphatically do not indorse the liquor trade or intemperance in any form. Their association with saloon-keepers is not association of persons or motives. It is purely accidental. Various parties are opposed to the law for various reasons. Infidels oppose it because they do not believe in the religion of those who advocate it; liquor-dealers, because it interferes with their ill-gotten gains; and Christians, because they have paramount faith in the Christian religion and in the liberty vouchsafed by that and which ought to be vouchsafed by civil government; because they believe such a law to be intrinsically wrong.

Liquor-dealers, among others, have signed the protest against Sunday laws. They did it with their own consent, of their own free will. They did so, not because they loved the class of Christians which opposed the law better than those who favored it, but because they did not like the law. Some we presume have signed it at the invitation of Christians, but they were not compelled to do. Others of the various denominations have done the same. The AMERICAN SENTINEL has labored to bring this question before all classes, in order that it might not pass Congress till all had had the opportunity, at least, to know the wrongfulness and downright wickedness of such legislation.

In contrast with the above work of the SENTINEL, note the method of the American Sabbath Union. The majority of saloon-keepers, it is safe to say, belong to the Roman Catholic Church; yet the whole membership of that church was counted

as favoring such a law on the *individual* indorsement *alone* of one member of that church. Therefore many saloon-keepers were counted, and that without even their consent. The association of liquor men with the supporters of the AMERICAN SENTINEL is purely incidental, while that of the American Sabbath Union, on *its* part, was premeditated and intentional. Not only that, but while the Sunday-law petition called for adults, twenty-one years of age or more, the children of all the great denominations, belonging to the churches, were counted with the adults. The constituency of the opposing petition will compare favorably with the constituency of the Sunday-law petition. And as far as methods in obtaining petitions are concerned, there is no comparison, but only contrast. The method of the SENTINEL has been open, ingenuous, and honest. The method of the American Sabbath Union has been secretive, ingenious, and dishonest.

Reader, "Look on this picture, and on this," and decide between. Truth and righteousness need not stoop to unjustifiable means.

M. C. WILCOX.

Some News.

THE *Denver News* says the AMERICAN SENTINEL "is doing great injury to the cause of the masses of America by discouraging the right to a day each week for worship, rest, or innocent recreation." This will be news indeed to the readers of the SENTINEL, as every intelligent reader of the SENTINEL well knows that its work is and always has been to *assert* the right of every man to these very things. What the SENTINEL denies is the right of the State or any other earthly power to compel any man to rest who does not *want* to rest, or to compel him to rest *when* he does not want to, or to compel him to rest or worship or recreate to suit the majority. The SENTINEL has never denied nor discouraged the right of any man to rest or worship or take innocent recreation when he pleases, as he pleases, and as much as he pleases; but it forever denies the right of the State to compel those who do not want to do any of these things to do them in order to please those who do want to do them. The SENTINEL denies the right of the State to rob any man of his right to follow his honest occupation at all times. It denies the wisdom of Acts which make crimes of honest occupations, and it denies the justice of any system of law that punishes the honest, industrious citizen equally with the thief and the vagabond.

Another statement of the *News* that will be equally newsy to the readers of the SENTINEL is that this paper "is doing efficient work for the enemies of all religion." Why! the SENTINEL itself is a religious paper. We know it is doing efficient work; but as for doing efficient work for the enemies of *all* religion, this is a mistake. For the true religion, the religion of Jesus Christ, the SENTINEL's sole endeavor is to do the most efficient work that it possibly can. And against every effort to support religion by the State or to enforce its sanctions or observances by civil law, the SENTINEL endeavors to do as efficient work as it possibly can. Any government which sets itself to aid, support or enforce the sanctions or observances of religion, is itself an enemy of all true religion; and he is the best friend to true religion who is most opposed to any such system. Any religious rite or institution whose observance cannot be secured without resort to the civil

power, ought not to be observed at all. Any religion that cannot sustain itself or its observances in the world without the aid of civil government is unworthy of the consideration of mankind.

As those who are working most strenuously for Sunday legislation, are doing it professedly in the Christian name; and as the movement can only do the more harm to the Christian name as it becomes the more popular and powerful; so those who most love Christ will oppose the movement most. That is what the SENTINEL opposes and this is why we oppose it. And those who know the most about true Christianity will easily understand our opposition the best. Opposition to false religion is not opposition to all religion. Opposition to false forms of the true religion is not opposition to all religion. Opposition to false methods of securing conformity to false forms of the true religion is not opposition to all religion. Opposition to false methods of securing conformity to even the true forms of the true religion, is not at all opposition to all religion. Will the *News* please note; for this is the opposition which the SENTINEL conducts.

A. T. J.

Religion and the Public Schools.

(Concluded.)

“If the State is to furnish education in religion, in what, I ask, shall it consist? Who shall judge and determine what is true and what false in all that claims to be religion, or even Christianity—who shall pronounce with authority of law what is to be taught as embraced within what have been styled the fundamental or elementary truths of religion—who shall declare the amount, and kind, and degree of the knowledge to be imparted?”

“These are important questions, seriously propounded and deserving of respectful answer. The gentlemen on the other side, say they limit the religious instruction demanded to what they call a ‘broad Christianity.’ I have already once or twice adverted to the term. I do not know that I understand it. If I do, it is a ‘broad’ humbug. The Christian religion is not a vain and unmeaning generality. It is a definite and positive thing. It means something or it means nothing. In my view it is a supernatural scheme of redemption—a revelation from God of his gracious purpose and plan of salvation, to a race, ‘dead in trespasses and sins,’ through the mediation and atonement of Jesus Christ, who, being God from eternity, became incarnate and by his death upon the cross became a sacrifice for sin, made expiation for it, and having risen from the grave ascended into heaven and there sitteth on the right hand of the Father to make intercession for his people. The whole character and value of it as a religion, consists altogether in being, as it claims to be, a supernatural plan of salvation from sin, otherwise irremediable. Strike out from the Bible the parts which disclose, reveal, and teach that scheme, and the rest is insignificant. And any instruction or education in religion which does not specifically teach the facts which constitute that scheme, and which cannot be stated even, except as conveying dogma, is no instruction in the Christian religion whatever—it is simply instruction in philosophy and ethics, or practical morals.

“Now, I deny the authority and the ability of civil government to decide upon questions of religious truth.

“Now, if your honors please, the truth of religion is a matter of spiritual discernment. As the apostle Paul has said: ‘But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.’ It is a matter of spiritual discernment, and I ask the question in all sobriety where, in the constitution and organization of any civil commonwealth on the earth, from the beginning to the present day, there has ever been found a body of civil legislators capable of deciding for anybody but itself what is the truth in religion.

“There is an old lesson on this subject. I find that in the trial of Jesus, as recorded in the Gospel of John, that the chief priests accused him before Pilate of blasphemy, saying: ‘We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.’ When Pilate had arraigned him; he said to him, ‘Art thou the king of the Jews? Jesus answered him, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me? Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thin own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me. What hast thou done? Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence.’ Then when the Jews found that Pilate would not take jurisdiction of the case on the charge of blasphemy, on the ground that he had made himself the Son of God, and so had violated the law of the Jewish theocracy, they charged him with treason, on the ground that he was claiming to set himself up against Cæsar as king, and when they found out that Pilate sought to release him, the Jews cried out: ‘If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar’s friend. Whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar.’

“In this colloquy between Pilate and our Lord on this point, as to his kingship, and the nature of his kingdom, Pilate said unto him: ‘Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice. Pilate said unto him, What is truth? *Then was the head of the civil State unable to comprehend*, because unable, spiritually, to see the truth, as it is in Jesus—the truth of religion.

“Let the civil authorities now as well as then, beware, when called upon by popular clamor, whether of Pharisees or priests, to pronounce upon religious truth, lest, in their necessary ignorance to discern it, they do not crucify the Lord of glory afresh! And let his disciples beware, lest, in tossing the Bible and its precious truths into the arena of political controversy, they violate that injunction and warning—‘Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.’

* * * * *

“It is said there are hundreds and thousands of children in this goodly, this Christian city, that have no chance or opportunity for being educated in what my friends on the other side call ‘the elementary truths of Christianity,’ not even a knowledge of that ‘broad Christianity,’ unless it can be given to them by a perusal every morning, by the teacher, of a few verses out of the Bible in the common school. I say, if it be so, it is a la-

mentable confession of great lack and neglect of duty, not on the part of the State, but on the part of the church, meaning by that the invisible body of true believers who are, as they believe, to create the kingdom of heaven upon earth.

“It is said they are in the by-ways, lanes, and alleys. And can they not be reached there? Cannot the church send out its ministers, or are they too busy, day after day, in their studies, preparing to dole out dogmatic theology Sunday after Sunday, to the tired ears of their wearied congregations? Cannot they send out their Sunday-school teachers? Cannot they send out their missionaries? Why the command of the Saviour was to go out into the streets and lanes of the city, and into the highways and hedges, and bring all in, bring them in to the feast which he had prepared—this feast of fat things, of goodly things. Must we say that the church has grown idle and lazy, and can only hobble on its crutches, and therefore that our school directors must set themselves up as teachers of religious truth? No! Let the church cease to depend upon any adventitious or external aids. Let it rely solely upon the omnipotent strength of the Spirit of the Lord that is in it. Let it say to the State, ‘Hands off; it is our business, it is our duty, it is our privilege to educate the children in religion and the true knowledge of godliness. Don’t let them starve on the husks of a broad Christianity. Let us give them that which is definite, and distinct, and pointed—the everlasting and saving truths of God’s immortal gospel.

“Don’t teach them, ‘Be virtuous and you shall be happy,’ but ‘believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.’ Now, I say, and I say it with all due humility, as one not called upon to instruct, but nevertheless, to say what is in me—let the church say: Here is our field; it is white to the harvest; here is our duty; here is our mission; here is our work, to evangelize, to save the lost and perishing crowd.

“Let her rise up in the full measure and majesty of her innate spiritual strength—let her gird her loins for the mighty task—let her address herself with all earnestness and heroic zeal to the great but self-rewarding labors of Christian love—let her prove herself by her works of self-denying charity, to be the true church as Jesus proved himself to the disciples of John to be the true Messiah, when he told them ‘Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see; the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up and the poor have the gospel preached to them.’ Let her organize all her forces for a more determined and closer, hand-to-hand, struggle with sin and evil, of every form, and the misery and wretchedness, of which they are the cause. Let her ministers and missionaries not only proclaim from their pulpits ‘the unsearchable riches of Christ,’ but descending among the hungry multitudes, distribute to them the precious bread of life. Let them declare to the rich, and the educated, their duties, their responsibilities, and their privileges, and lead them in person to the places where their work is to be done, and stimulate them by their example to do it. Let them inspire by their enthusiasm, and fire with their zeal, the indifferent and the slothful. Let them, by setting forth the beauty of holiness and the purity of ‘the truth as it is in Jesus,’ which is able to make us wise unto salvation, send the healthful and invigorating influences of

* * * * *

our holy religion through every social relation, and glorify the business and the pleasures of our daily and secular life, by consecrating them to the glory of our Father who is in heaven. Let them turn these streams of the pure water of life, welling up in the hearts of their followers, into the dark and pestilential receptacles, where ignorance, poverty, misery, and sin are gathered, and breed disorder and death. Then the great and the good, the noble and the wise, in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace, forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before, pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, in one grand array will meet and wrestle against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places, and shall wrestle not in vain, for they shall be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might; clad in the whole armor of God, their loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of righteousness, their feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace, and above all, taking the shield of faith wherewith they shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked, the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit. Then shall be hastened the promised time of the coming of our King, when there shall be a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness—the Holy City, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband, the tabernacle of God with men, where he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God.

"But let them remember that to advance this glorious consummation the church must throw away the sword of civil authority which some of her too eager and impetuous sons would put into her hands; that the kingdom of her Lord is not of this world; that she must render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's; that she must not permit any unholy dalliance with the solicitations of worldly power or advantage, but keep herself unspotted from the world; that her dominion is over the minds and hearts of men, and her victory achieved with spiritual weapons alone, by appeals to their reason, to their conscience, to the highest and best in their ruined nature, to be restored by the power, not of human laws, but of the Spirit of God, and that in proportion as she becomes conscious of her origin and destiny, of the divine life she bears in her bosom, hid with Christ in God, and grows into the recognition of her mission and place in the work and history of the world and of eternity, she will dissolve all ties that bind her to secular influences and the natural sphere of human interests and actions, and establish herself firmly upon the seat of her spiritual throne, whence shall silently but most potently issue streams of truth and goodness, wisdom and love, faith and charity, into all the channels of human thought and activity, to restore upon earth the paradise of God."

PROFESSOR BLANCHARD, in Elgin Convention, said, "In this work we are undertaking for the Sabbath we are the representatives of God." W. F. Crafts, in *Christian Statesman*, July 5, 1888, said, "The preachers are the successors of the prophets." Will not these "representatives of God" be content with the use of the "sword and the bullet" in this life, or do they claim the right to inflict punishment beyond it?—*W., in Prohibition Journal.*

Sunday Observance.

THE American Sabbath Union did not have plain sailing in Los Angeles any more than in some other places in California, as is well shown by the following letter by the Rev. Thomas W. Haskins of the Episcopal Church in the Los Angeles daily *Tribune* of September 3:—

The *Tribune* yesterday morning says that all the churches of the city except the Baptist were closed last night in order to take part in the mass meeting at the Pavilion in behalf of Sunday observance. Christ Episcopal Church was not closed, and I am told that St. Paul's was not. I do not think that Epiphany or Ascension were closed. I have no authority to speak for my brethren of the Episcopal Church, but speaking only for myself I did not unite in the meeting because I could not have done so without opposing the methods to be advocated, both as wrong in themselves and ineffectual if adopted, and so stayed away.

Judging from what I have heard of the history of the movement elsewhere, opposition would not have been tolerated an instant even had I ventured to suggest it; the decree of infallibility has gone forth and now only seeks the sanction of Cæsar to force it upon the people. Straws show which way the wind blows, and the fact (if the *Tribune* report be correct) that the police were sent for to suppress the circulation of some printed matter in opposition to this movement shows its latest tyranny, under the specious plea of liberty and rest, to be developed when it shall have secured the power.

I will not allow that any Christian brother or minister of the gospel in this city or any city goes before me in sincere and unceasing endeavor to proclaim the gospel of Christ, nor minister the same when accepted, nor that any soul is straitened more than mine at the growing disregard of the Christian observance of the first day of the week, and it is very painful for me to have to differ from so many of my brethren in this latest effort to honor God's holy name. But as much as I love my brethren, I love truth more. A distinguished living divine has said that "men are so apt to settle into ruts, and think that certain things are to be taken as matters of course, that somebody needs to thrust an eternal interrogation point before them, if they are ever to stop and think at all whether the way in which things are going is the right way.

Let this letter of mine be the interrogation point as to the method of Sunday laws. That we desire all men to be Christians and acknowledge Jesus as Lord there can be no doubt; but that a single Christian will be made by the passage of a Sunday law, and its observance enforced by penalties upon an unwilling people, there is grave doubt.

There is no warrant for such a method anywhere in the New Testament. No authority, or suspicion of such authority, was given by our Lord to his church. There is not a scintilla of evidence in the New Testament or the early Fathers that the Jewish Sabbath was transferred to the first day of the week, or that the observance of the first day was based upon the fourth commandment. In the earlier and purer days of the church, when under the shadow of heathenism and the curse of persecution, there is not a thread of evidence that the Christians sought to enforce their faith or customs upon the surrounding world. The history of such efforts when they did

come in the days of weal and power ought to make every humble Christian hesitate when he looks to the civil power to protect his liberty.

We are now living under the blessings of civil and religious liberty. There is nothing whatever to hinder any Christian man or woman from honoring either the Jewish Sabbath or the first day of the week, and the law will protect him in this liberty. What more do we want? It will be time enough to file our complaint when this liberty is taken away. It is a question whether or not Christian people are not most to blame for the present observance, or non-observance, of the first day of the week, and all this fuss is nothing but a cloak of righteousness to cover nakedness in the sight of the Lord Christ. I have spoken plainly, but I asperse no man's motives. I only question his judgment in establishing the righteousness of Christ among men and bearing witness to his lordship over our hearts and lives.

THOMAS W. HASKINS.

Los Angeles, September 2.

Sunday Laws and Workingmen.

A STANDARD argument for more rigid Sunday laws in this country is that the "working people" may have a day of rest. The case is thus stated by Senator Blair, the father of the now famous Sunday-Rest bill:—

"The mass of the working people would never get Sunday rest if there had not been a law of the land that gave it to us. There is that practical fact, and we are fighting for the tired, hungry man, woman, and child all over the country who wants a chance to lie down and rest for twenty-four hours out of the whole seven days."

Just so; and "to lie down and rest for twenty-four hours" or else go to church, is about the only chance that poor people would have under the *regime* proposed by the American Sabbath Union, the W. C. T. U., and National Reformers generally. In fact, the measures which they propose and to which Senator Blair has been lending himself would of necessity discriminate against the very class which it is proposed to benefit.

Only those who live in cities can appreciate the privilege of an occasional outing in the country, or at least in some suburban park. But these *pseudo* philanthropists propose to place all such luxuries beyond the reach of the poor by stopping all public conveyances on Sunday. Now the tired son of toil, in almost any city, whenever the weather is suitable, can take his family on Sunday and by means of street cars, ferry boats, excursion steamers, or excursion trains, can in a very short time reach some park or other pleasant resort, more or less frequented, according to his tastes; and in some such place the workingman and his wife and children can spend the day more healthfully, more restfully, and more pleasantly than would be possible in the average tenement house.

But under the new order of things, to be ushered in by a national Sunday law and by more stringent State laws, such privileges can be enjoyed only by the rich. Not being dependent upon public conveyances, the wealthy can, if they choose, leave their pleasant homes and drive to the parks or into the country, and enjoy upon Sunday that which they, but not the "working people," can have the privilege of enjoying almost any day. But meanwhile the poor man and his family can literally "lie down and rest for twenty-four hours." But how many care to do

that? and how much real rest is there in it if they did, especially for the tired mother who has scarcely been out of the house for a week, and for the children who desire nothing so much as a breath of fresh air and a sight of the trees and fields?

But it is said, "Let the whole family go to church." A good suggestion certainly; but suppose they do not wish to go to church? Who has the right to so hedge them about with restrictive laws that they will be compelled either to go to church or spend the entire day at home, or on the street, or at least within easy walking distance of home? Would not the effect of such laws be to shut the tired wife and mother up at home week after week, to put the children on the streets at least one day in the week, and send the husband and father to spend the day in some secret drinking resort?

But why pursue the subject further? The real purpose of Sunday laws is not to benefit the working people but to exalt and honor the day as a religious institution, and to compel people to attend church by closing as far as possible every avenue of pleasure. In fact this purpose has been boldly avowed more than once by the friends of Sunday laws. Sabbath-keeping is good, and religion is good, but enforced idleness is not Sabbath-keeping neither is it religion, nor is it conducive to true religion.

C. P. BOLLMAN.

The Image of the Papacy.

THE *Christian Nation* of August 14 gave a report of the Prohibition Convention for Allegheny County, Penn. The first two resolutions read as follows:—

Resolved, 1. That the prohibitionists of Allegheny County, in convention assembled, recognize the Lord Jesus Christ as the rightful sovereign of our State and Nation, in conformity with whose most holy character and will all our laws ought to be made.

Resolved, 2. That we are in favor of a most conscientious and scriptural observance of the Sabbath as absolutely essential to the welfare of society and the preservation of the State.

This goes to the full length of that the National Reformers themselves propose. To make the Saviour the sovereign of either the State or the Nation is but to make the Governor of the State or the President of the Nation only the representative, the vicegerent of Christ in the chair of State, to execute his will upon the subjects of the State or Nation. When he should speak, therefore, he would speak as the vicegerent of Christ; and for anybody to doubt would be to be damned, and for anybody to refuse assent would be to be guilty of the highest crime. Between the Papacy and such a system as that there would be not the shadow of a difference. It would be a living likeness of the Papacy itself.

The second resolution, as regards a more conscientious and scriptural observance of the Sabbath, is an excellent resolution, but when it makes the object of it only the welfare of society and the preservation of the State, it takes away from the Sabbath both its conscientious and its scriptural sanctions, and to propose the observance of the Sabbath for such an object is only to propose the violation of the Sabbath. And above all, when such observance is being secured by enforcement of law, and human law at that, the evil element in the proposition is vastly increased. Nor is the State convention much behind the Allegheny County convention in this

matter. The platform, as adopted by the State convention and reported in the *Voice* of Sept 5, "acknowledges Almighty God as the source of all power and authority in human government." The third plank declares,—"The Sabbath must be preserved by the due enforcement of existing laws, and the speedy enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to insure its due observance." It also indorses the platform of the National Prohibition Party adopted at Indianapolis, May 30, 1888. That same copy of the *Voice* advocates the abolition of the liquor traffic because it is sin and argues for prohibition upon that basis.

This is all of a piece. The Allegheny County resolutions, the State platform, and the editorial of the *Voice* are each but parts of one stupendous whole which embodies the movement to religiously amend the Constitution; turn this republic into a theocracy, after the express image of the Papacy; and to enforce the observance of the day established by that counterfeit theocracy—in fact it contains the very elements of the mystery of iniquity. Therefore the third party Prohibition party should be uncompromisingly opposed by every man who loves either Christianity or civil government.

The Sunday Question Again.

THE meetings held in this city last Sunday in the interest of the Sunday Union and addressed by Mr. Crafts, its field secretary, were not largely attended nor very enthusiastic. We attended the one held at the Methodist Church and listened to the rambling discourse, and consider that Mr. Crafts made not a single strong argument for any proposition he made. His remarks regarding the AMERICAN SENTINEL, of Oakland, were, to say the least, out of place and not in good taste. He seems to think he can dodge this issue by throwing upon the opposition the opprobrious epithet of "Seventh-day Adventists."

The statement that the opposition to the movement to make Sunday a national Sabbath by legislative enactments is almost wholly confined to the small sect called Seventh-day Adventists, and that it is a question of Saturday or Sunday Sabbath is false and dishonest in origin and purpose. Millions of American citizens who are not interested in this theological contention about which is the "authorized" Sabbath, are deeply and earnestly interested in preserving this Nation a nestor of religious toleration and liberty—the principle that makes the American flag the protector of every one in this country in the exercise of his own judgment in matters of ecclesiastical belief and religious observances, and "in worshipping God," or in not worshipping anything, "under his own vine and fig tree, according to the dictates of his own conscience," and none dare "make him afraid."

Mr. Crafts is anxious to shut up all kinds of business on Sunday so that all may have a fair and even start on Monday morning at taking in the earnings of the "poor laborers." Will Mr. Crafts and his brother priests lay off on Sunday and not take up the usual collection until Monday to give other business men a chance? This matter of spending money, by laborers, in saloons on Sunday can be readily changed in one of two ways. First, abolishing the holiday-Sunday altogether as a day of idleness and the very hot-bed of crime and harvest-day of the "Devil," and treating all days alike and treating men in the same manner on all days; or second,

employers making Monday pay-day instead of Saturday. Either of these will work like a charm.

How would it do for Mr. Crafts to take some of his own medicine? He argues that there is a natural as well as a moral reason for keeping one day in seven as a day of rest, and yet he declares that he has for some time been violating this law of nature by traveling about the country so that he spends each and every Sunday in a different city. He travels or speaks every day of the seven, and he might set a good example as well as be consistent by confining his "work" for this cause to the six working days of the week, and resting on Sunday in compliance with "the laws of nature, of morality, and of God," which he says, consecrate it to REST.—*The Silver Gate* (San Diego), August 31.

Sound Speech.

AT the Missouri State Sunday Convention last May, when the constitution was presented for adoption, the first article of which reads as follows, "The object of this association shall be to preserve the Christian Sabbath, or Lord's day, as a day of rest and worship," Elder R. C. Porter made the following speech. It is a good speech. It is not often that such speeches are made in Sunday-law Conventions:—

As a member of the convention adopting this constitution, I would like to say a word with reference to the principles that I would like to see incorporated in the constitution to be adopted. I cannot quite agree with the sentiments expressed in the first article of the constitution which has been submitted, which says that "the object of this association shall be to preserve the Christian Sabbath, or Lord's day, as a day of rest and worship." Now, in a certain sense I can quite agree with that. I am in favor of individuals who believe in the first day of the week being the Lord's day, or the Christian Sabbath, using all the influence they can from the persuasive standpoint to accomplish that object; and in that sense I can agree with it; but inasmuch as I can see that it reaches beyond that, and the object will be to enforce by law the observance of the day as a Sabbath expressed in this first article of the constitution, I could not agree with that. In the first place, one reason why I could not agree with it is from the fact that the principle underlying the object to be accomplished is not the right principle. As it is stated here in this article, it is said to be the Lord's day.

Yesterday I made a statement that we should render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's, according to the declaration of the Saviour. If it is the Lord's day, as this article of the constitution declares, we ought not to have the State to cause us to render that to Caesar. But each individual should be made to feel that it was his obligation to render it to God by persuasion, and not by force. Therefore the principle upon which we stand with reference to this subject is the principle of education and persuasion, and not to accomplish this object by force of law. I would heartily agree with the principle to persuade men, as far as in us lies, to respect God's Sabbath. There is a division among us as to which day is the Lord's day. The Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists have been referred to as standing aloof from the object of this movement. We heartily agree with the idea of each

individual doing all he can to advance the work of Sabbath reform, so that the public conscience shall be educated. Yet we do not believe in the doctrine of force and compulsory means to accomplish this object. It was stated by a gentleman, yesterday, in reply to a remark that I made, that the Sabbath was made for man, and therefore he would bring it in the province of the State to enforce its observance by the civil law. I want to say that the principle upon which I stand is this: That while the Lord said the Sabbath was made for man, he still claims it as his holy day; he gave it to man as a day of rest to be promotive of man's highest good. At the same time, he never gave to man that right to enforce its observance upon others civilly. Now, let me cite a parallel: Paul says the woman was made for man. That is true; but will any of us say that because woman was made for man, therefore it is the province of civil government to say that every man must have a wife whether he wants one or not? Every one of us would say that it was uncivil to ask a man to allow us to force him to take a wife, whether he wants to or not, because the woman was made for man. And so, it is equally true of the Sabbath. The Sabbath was made for man, to be promotive of his highest good. But while that is true, it is equally true that it would be uncivil in us to ask a man to allow us to enforce upon him by law the observance of it whether he wanted it or not.

Therefore, I say that the principle of equality of rights, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, is the true principle of civil government. Every man has an equal right to worship on any day he pleases, or not to worship, just as he pleases as far as civil government has to do with him. Still God has his claims upon him, and by and by will call him to account for his failure to render obedience to him. And yet when we undertake to say that we will help God defend by law the things that belong to God, then we make ourselves guardians of God. In Judges 6:25-32 we have an instance recorded where the people began thus to defend the things belonging to their idol god. And Joash said, "If he be a god let him plead for himself." Thus teaching the people that God was able to take care of himself. Now, it seems to me that it would be just the same way with reference to the Sabbath-day. In viewing it from this standpoint, believing, as an American citizen, I have an equal right with any other American citizen, and that no man has a right to say with reference to our obligations to God, what I or anybody else shall do; then I say we have no right to gain the object of the article set forth in this first article of the proposed constitution. I want to make this simple statement, that the rights of the minority are as sacred as those of the majority, and should be equally respected.

The only true principle of civil and religious liberty is my assertion of other people's rights, when I am in the majority as well as when I am in the minority. Thus every man has equality of rights, as is said in the Declaration of Independence, in speaking with reference to this very question, all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—untransferable rights—among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Now, I have a right to my conscientious belief; and if

I should sanction the principle of this first article in this proposed constitution, understanding that it is to be enforced by law, then I would be sanctioning the principle involved in it, which, if carried out to its logical conclusion deprives some of my fellow-citizens of equality of rights. If a man gives up his right to believe, he gives up his right to eternal life. The question is like this: If the majority have a right to decide with reference to which day is the Sabbath, then, of course, the minority must submit to the decision of the majority. But this involves a matter of conscience. Would any of my brethren here think, if the Seventh-day Adventists or Seventh-day Baptists were in the majority that they had a right to enact a law compelling all those who conscientiously believe that the first day of the week is the Sabbath to close their shops on Saturday, as Mr. Crafts said last night, the seventh-day people should be compelled to close their shops on Sunday? But an exemption clause is proposed. What is an exemption clause? It is a toleration clause. We have no right to give toleration clauses in the United States. That is an acknowledgment, if individuals are asking for it, that they have not equality of rights. We believe that we have equal rights with any citizens of the United States, as a people. We believe an infidel has equality of rights with us, and that he has the right to keep the Sabbath, or not to keep the Sabbath, so far as the State is concerned, equally with any other citizen. And so we believe we have the right to keep whichever day we want to keep, and then a right to go about our business quietly on Sunday as others have a right to do upon Saturday. Would you not think it a strange thing if Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists were trying to get a law to compel everybody to make Saturday a day of rest, lest others should disturb them in their worship?

It is claimed that these workingmen cannot have a day of rest unless there is a law to secure it to them. I am in favor of educating these men's conscience so they can have this day of rest without this law. Is it a fact that it is impossible for workingmen to have a day of rest if they want it, unless secured to them by law? I say it is not. Thousands of Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists, who are laboring men, have a day of rest every week without any law to secure it for them. And so can anyone else who sufficiently desires to. But this can be rightly accomplished only by properly educating the conscience of the laboring men. As I view it, this is the only true principle of gospel reform.

And then with reference to the statement made last night by Mr. Crafts, he spoke of Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists being associated with anarchists, infidels, and rum-sellers in opposition to the movement to secure a Sunday-Rest law, and this fact ought to convince them that they are in the wrong! Is there any weight to such an argument? We go back eighteen hundred years, and Paul, in I Corinthians 4, says that "we are counted the offscouring of all things." Then ought not Paul to have learned that he was wrong? But he did not. Our Saviour was denounced as a blasphemer and classed with thieves. Ought he not to have learned by that that he was wrong. If Mr. Crafts' argument be true he certainly should. But he did not. I want to say that when I come to look the field over, I find that the only true principle of civil government is the principle of equal

rights to all citizens. And let the gospel presented be a persuasive gospel; let it be a gospel of education, of persuasion, and of entreaty. A gospel of peace, but not a gospel of force. I want to say, my beloved fellow citizens, I believe in these principles. I want to say that I believe that the rights of conscience of the minority are as sacred as those of the majority and should be equally respected. And I believe that the statement made by our Saviour in the Golden Rule is the true teaching of the gospel with reference to our relations in civil government. This leaves out the gospel of force. Our Saviour left it out, and we should leave it out.

How He Looks at It. How do You?

At one of his public meetings in California, the following question in writing was sent up to be answered by Field Secretary Crafts: "Which do you regard as the most detrimental to California, the presence of the open saloon, or the absence of a Sunday law?"

His answer in substance was, "Both are bad. Can I decide which is the worst, theft or murder?" His idea was that the absent Sunday law is *theft* and the saloon is *murder*. Now we agree that the saloon is a murderous institution, and a cold-blooded one at that, but that the absence of a Sunday law is in any sense *theft* is too absurd for belief; and especially absurd is Mr. Crafts' reasoning (?) in proof that it is theft. Many readers of the SENTINEL have heard that famous argument, so it need not be repeated here. The field secretary thinks that between murder and theft there can be no choice as to veniality. They are both bad, and equally bad. One is no worse than the other. Then what must we understand? Just this: that the saloons of California are no more detrimental to the State than is the absence of a Sunday law. They are no worse, no more hurtful to society. Yet he publicly declares himself a prohibitionist!

This is not all. What is it that exists now that is so bad that a Sunday law would cure. O common business on Sunday and the Sunday saloon! Then honest business—the keeping open of an occasional shop and store, a farmer now and then plowing in his field, some picking of grapes and legitimate relaxation is to be ranked with the saloon and saloon-keeping! People of California will know from this on, that the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union places your honest industries, and your riding-out and your other harmless diversions, on a par with the saloon traffic! How do you like it?

N. J. BOWERS.

In the *Christian Statesman*, December 22, 1887, Wm. Smith, lawyer, Janesville, Wisconsin, says: "By putting a *God in the Constitution* plank in the Prohibition platform you rule me out of that party. I am not opposed to prohibition but I am opposed to putting God in the Constitution."

To which M. A. Gault replies, "How can you be an honest prohibitionist when you want a law with only the fallible, changing, conflicting will of the people behind it in preference to a law having behind it, first, divine authority, next human, then the hope of heaven, next the fear of hell?"

We would like to ask who will enforce such a law. We would naturally suppose that those who make the law would inflict its prescribed penalty, viz., to send men to "hell" for disobedience. —*W., in Prohibition Journal.*

Advertisements.

ADVERTISING RATES made known on application. No advertisements of patent medicines, novelties, cigars, tobacco, liquors, novels or anything of a trivial, intemperate, immoral or impure nature accepted. We reserve the right to reject ANY advertisement.

THE WHITE IS KING!

Always in the Lead.
New Improvements!
New Woodwork!
The Best to Use, The Best to Sell.
White Sewing Machine Co.,
108 & 110 POST ST., S. F.
F. S. PRESCOTT, Gen. Man'r.

PACIFIC Business College,
320 Post St., S. F.
Life Scholarship, \$75
Send for Catalogue.

MORAL AND SCIENTIFIC COMPANION, Florence, Arizona, illustrated, wide-awake; 25c per year. Ads 1c. per word.

THE
Dallas Weekly News.

The Leading Weekly of the Southwest;
12 Pages, 72 Columns.
Contains Farm News, Stock News, General News, in fact, all the news. Ladies' and Children's Special Departments. Fine Premium List.
A PICTURE FREE OF CHARGE.
All those subscribing for one year prior to Oct. 1, 1889, will receive free of charge a copy of the celebrated picture entitled "The Horse Fair." Terms, \$1.25 a year, cash in advance. Address,
A. H. BELO & Co., Publishers,
Dallas, Texas.
Sample Copies Free to any Address.

West Shore Railroad

N. Y. C. & H. R. R. R. Co. Lessee,
The Picturesque Route for Business and Pleasure Travel.
"SUMMER EXCURSIONS," a handsomely illustrated book, giving description of the Hudson River, Catskill Mountains, Saratoga and other New York State resorts, will be mailed on receipt of five cents in postage stamps.
For tourist books, time-tables and information regarding West Shore Railroad, call on or address
H. B. JAGOE, General Eastern Passenger Agent, 363 Broadway, or
C. E. LAMBERT, General Passenger Agent, 5 Vanderbilt Ave., New York.

A \$70 SEWING MACHINE

FOR
\$50.00.
A new "NEW HOME" sewing machine, six drawer, latest improved attachments, new style woodwork, complete, FOR SALE FOR \$50.
THE MACHINE HAS NEVER BEEN USED.
Now is Your Chance to Get a Good Machine Cheap. Address,
S. N. CURTISS,
Box 1534. Oakland, Cal.

SAN FRANCISCO
Business COLLEGE,
MURPHY BUILDING, MARKET ST.
LIFE SCHOLARSHIP \$75.
Monthly Tuition, \$12.50.

WILLFUL AND MALICIOUS SLANDER!

© Rev. W. F. Crafts

Against the

Editors of the American Sentinel.

The SENTINEL LIBRARY No. 19 contains the

AFFIDAVIT OF W. F. CRAFTS,

Charging the Editors of the American Sentinel with

"Willful and Malicious Slander,"

THE DEFENSE of Prof. A. T. Jones and Dr. E. J. Waggoner,

TOGETHER WITH

FAC-SIMILES OF MR. CRAFTS' LETTERS, and * * * *

* * * THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION.

THIS IS A SPICY NUMBER,

AND ADVANCE ORDERS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED FOR HUNDREDS OF COPIES.

Mr. Crafts' charges have been published to the world through the secular press and the special documents of the American Sabbath Union, and a copy of this Defense should be placed in the hands of everyone who has read his charges.

His own letters prove that he has sworn to that which is not true.

THE PAMPHLET CONTAINS 80 PAGES. PRICE 10 CENTS.

Send on your orders. Address,

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,

43 Bond St., N. Y.

OAKLAND, CAL.

THE
National Sunday Law

Argument by Alonzo T. Jones, in behalf of the rights of American citizens, and in opposition to the Blair Sunday-Rest Bill, which Mr. Jones presented before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, December 13, 1888. Mr. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"Mighty Interesting Reading."
And Mr. Jones's comments will make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruptions, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments.

As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially Legislators, Lawyers, Judges, and other public men. The argument is based on scripture and history, constitution and law, showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday Bill, an analysis of the Sunday Laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the Sunday Law movement of the nineteenth century, the methods used in securing indorsements to the petition for the Blair Bill, and the workings of such Sunday laws as are proposed for the United States. The work contains 192 pages and will be sent postpaid on receipt of 25 cents.

Send for it! Read it! Send it to your Friends!
Address all orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
12th and Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal.
Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

Charles Dickens'

Complete Works in 15 Volumes with
THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN
— ONE YEAR FOR ONLY —
Two Dollars.

Sir Walter Scott's

Complete Works in 12 Volumes with
THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN
— ONE YEAR FOR ONLY —
Two Dollars.

THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN offers to subscribers as a premium their choice of either the complete works of Charles Dickens or Sir Walter Scott for two dollars. The books are all beautifully printed and substantially bound in paper covers. Every subscriber to THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN also receives the Newspaper Library—six volumes. Thus for two dollars the subscriber may get twenty-one volumes of standard books, and THE WEEKLY WISCONSIN one year. Nothing equal to it was ever offered to the public before. Address,

CRAMER, AIKENS & CRAMER,
Milwaukee, Wis.

* * THE BEST * *
Duplicating Inks

FOR USE WITH
"CYCLOSTYLE," "MIMEOGRAPH," "COPYGRAPH,"
OR ANY
Duplicating Process in which a Stencil is Used, are the
CELEBRATED "REDDING INKS."
They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog
the Stencil, and are in Every Way
A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done with these Inks.
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
Oakland, Cal.
Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

Civil Government and Religion.

BY A. T. JONES
One of the Editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain and Forcible.

This important work shows clearly the relation that should exist between Church and State at the present time, as proven by the Bible and history of the past twenty-five centuries.

"CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION"
Is a pamphlet of 176 large octavo pages. Price 25 cents. Millions of copies should be placed in the hands of thinking people AT ONCE. It clearly defines what position we, as American citizens, should sustain toward the effort now on foot to secure religious legislation. Address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
12th and Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal.
Or 43 Bond Street, New York.

TEN LECTURES
— ON —
NASAL CATARRH,

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of Choice Prescriptions

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,
Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and

Six Beautifully Colored Plates,
Besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs **only 30 cents**, and is in great demand.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
Or 43 Bond St., N. Y. Oakland, Cal.

Smith's Diagram OF PARLIAMENTARY RULES.

A lucid and interesting treatise on Parliamentary usages. By a simple map, with converging lines, it shows the relation of any one motion to every other motion, and at a glance answers over five hundred questions in regard to parliamentary matters. A very ingenious and useful arrangement. The N. Y. Independent says: "Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules" is an admirably ingenious simplification of the confused matter of parliamentary practice. Mr. U. Smith has put more of the essence of parliamentary practice into small space and lucid order than we find in any other manual. Breast-pocket size, 34 pages, bound in muslin. Price, 50 cents. Send for a copy.

Pacific Press Publishing Company,
OAKLAND, CAL.

SOCIAL PURITY. A vigorous and stirring address on SOCIAL PURITY by J. H. KELLOGG, M. D., SUPERINTENDENT OF THE LARGEST MEDICAL AND SURGICAL SANITARIUM IN THE WORLD. Fifth edition. Fiftieth thousand. Also contains a "Talk to Girls," by Mrs. E. E. KELLOGG, A. M., Associate Superintendent of Social Purity Department of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. This talk is full of helpful suggestions to mothers and their daughters respecting the means of promoting the development of a higher type of womanhood in the rising generation of girls. A copy should be placed in the hands of every man, woman and youth. 64 large octavo pages. Price, 15 cents; 20 copies, post-paid, \$2.25. Address: PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER 9, 1889.

NOTE.—No papers are sent by the publishers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to people who have not subscribed for it. If the SENTINEL comes to one who has not subscribed for it, he may know that it is sent him by some friend, and that he will not be called upon by the publishers to pay for the same.

As the present volume of the AMERICAN SENTINEL is to consist of only 48 numbers, we will print no paper next week.

“OFFICE is opportunity,” is the motto displayed on the letter-heads used by the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union. This is but another version of the standard political maxim, “To the victors belong the spoils.” The constant display of this avowal may be taken as a declaration that the union seeks political power, and if successful will not be slow to use it for the furtherance of its schemes. A country that is fully awake to the value of liberty, will be slow to place official “opportunity” in the hands of a party of religionists whose aims are expressed by such mercenary sentiments.

In the *Lutheran Observer* of August 9, Rev. Mr. Crafts has an article on the equity of Sunday laws, in which, speaking of exemption, he says:—

“The only law that can either be justified or maintained in practice is a law which impartially forbids, in rich and poor, all forms of Sunday work that are not works of mercy or necessity.”

And yet Mr. Crafts, as field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, is asking people to sign a petition to Congress praying for the passage of a law which shall exempt, so far as ordinary private work is concerned, all who religiously keep another day of the week as the Sabbath. Therefore, according to his own words, Mr. Crafts is asking Congress to pass a law which can be neither justified nor maintained. Is it such a law as this that the American Sabbath Union really desires? or is it the object of the Union to secure general assent to the principle of Sunday legislation, and then secure the repeal of the exemption clause.

THE *Nation*, not the *Christian Nation*, says:—

“There is more happiness, better order and less crime among the poorer people of New York since cheap Sunday excursions enabled them to take a trip up the river or down the harbor, than when necessity kept them cooped up through the day in tenement houses.”

There is not the least doubt but that this is true. And yet the Sunday-law workers propose to stop every kind of excursion or journeying on Sunday, especially with the poorer people, because the rich can afford to own their own carriages and can take a ride or drive as they please. But under the proposed Sunday-law system all the poorer people will be “cooped up” through the whole day in their crowded tenement houses and narrow streets and alleys; which shows clearly enough that the Sunday-law movement instead of being a movement in favor of the poorer people is a direct discrimination against them.

Again the *Nation* says:—

“The most rigid Sabbatarian with the most violent prejudices against Sunday concerts for example only needs to view the wonderful spectacle presented in Central Park on Sunday afternoon in mid-summer to

feel—and confess if he is honest—that he has not understood what he has been talking about in his ignorance.”

Yes, he will, if he is honest; but there is the rub. It is very seldom that Sunday-law bigotry ever becomes honest enough to make such a confession as that, because it is not against any essential evil in those concerts that the complaint is made, but solely as the Kings County Sunday-law Association said, that they are afraid that “the churches will be depopulated.” And to the Sunday-law churchman that fearful alternative turns everything that is done on Sunday into the blackest of crimes.

THE spirit of “National Reform” sometimes comes to the surface in a garb that is simply appalling. It would be some relief, when an occasional individual of the more rabid type assures the public that he only speaks for himself in his ultra utterances, were it not for the fact that these expressions of sentiment are never disclaimed by any of the party. The clamor of the more outspoken in this “reform” movement for laws that will disfranchise, socially ostracise, banish, and even put to death opponents, has never yet been disowned by any organ or representative of the National Reform Association. The appeal for a theocratic government, a *counterfeit* of the government of ancient Israel, reveals an inward vindictiveness on the part of some otherwise meek-appearing men that seem almost incredible. But, as “out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh,” we are compelled to believe the evidence. So that, when one openly advocates human laws that will put to death his Sabbath-breaking neighbor, and will put to death the blasphemer, we naturally infer that he longs to see that extreme penalty executed. And this in the name of Christianity!

TUESDAY evening, August 27, A. T. J. of the SENTINEL made a speech at Los Angeles on the subject of the National Sunday law. The meeting was advertised in such a way that it was not definitely known whether the speech was to be for or against Sunday laws. And as a result about one-third of the audience turned out to be Sunday-law advocates. The speaker had not proceeded far before these discovered that he was opposed to Sunday laws. As soon as that was discovered several of the Sunday-law partisans began to interrupt with questions. When the questions were answered they continued the interruptions with counter-arguments. Not content with this they made an effort to take the floor—as many as three on their feet at once and others talking from their seats, calling the speaker an infidel and whatsoever else they pleased. They seemed to be in a mood to continue this courtesy indefinitely, when a gentleman rose and said to them that as they professed to be Christians and as the Christian spirit is one of meekness and gentleness, it would be well for them to show enough of that spirit to keep still until the speaker, whose the meeting was, should have finished his speech; then in a proper way ask whatever questions they chose. Those who were standing were finally persuaded to take their seats, but even then they would not keep still, though after that no more than one at a time was on his feet.

On the following Sunday night there was a meeting at the same hall under the auspices of the American Sabbath Union in favor of Sunday laws. Two or three men stood just outside of the doors with copies of the AMERICAN SENTI-

NEL to give to whoever wanted them. As soon as this was discovered by the managers of the meeting the police were sent for to stop it. The police came and ordered them away. They obeyed orders and went down to the street, but that did not satisfy these Sunday-law lovers of liberty. They wanted them turned away from there, but could not accomplish that.

These facts show plainly enough the spirit that characterizes the Sunday-law movement, and how much liberty there will be to the people when the managers of that movement succeed in getting their spirit embodied in a law to be enforced according to their own will.

WE object to Sunday laws not because they require the observance of that particular day but because of the principle involved. Disguise their motive as they may, the fact remains that the great majority of those who desire such laws make the demand because they regard Sunday as a sacred day. Therefore the passage of a Sunday law is State interference in religious matters and involves the judicial decision of religious questions. There are in every State, and indeed in almost every neighborhood, three classes, namely, (1) Christians who regard Sunday religiously, (2) Christians who do not regard Sunday but who do regard the seventh day, and (3) non-religious persons who regard all days alike. Sunday laws necessarily discriminate between these classes. If, as is sometimes the case, the seventh-day Christians are exempted from the provisions of the law, then it is a fact that they are favored above others simply because they are Christians. They are granted certain privileges on account of their religion, and that is contrary to the spirit of American institutions. If they are not exempted and are required to obey the law and refrain from Sunday work they are deprived of one-sixth of their God-given time for conscience' sake. But in any event the non-religious are forced to observe to some extent a religious institution in which they have no faith. Sunday laws are wrong, they work hardship and injustice, they tend to destroy free voluntary service to God, thus making hypocrites; for these and similar reasons we oppose and would oppose all such measures.

THE Rev. Mr. Carroll of the Central Methodist Church, Stockton, in his sermon last Sunday took a very radical stand for a minister of his denomination. In speaking of a national Sunday law he maintained that the mixture of religion and government had resulted in evil from the time of Constantine down to the Puritans; that freedom of conscience and its exercise was guaranteed by the Constitution. The Rev. Mr. Carroll is an American and believes in American institutions.—*From the Los Angeles Tribune.*

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, - - - \$1.00

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, each, - - - 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.