


# AMERICAN SENTINEL

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

VOLUME 14.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 26, 1899.

NUMBER 4.



SOME OF THE GLORIES(?) OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM.

TO THE Filipino, it means the privilege of doing what a foreign military governor, with the advice of the papacy, tells him to do, and not only doing what he is told to do, but doing it as he is told to do it. It means for him the enjoyment(?) of what has been aptly termed "canned liberty,"—the liberty of a dominating power for a subject people—such liberty precisely as King George III. offered the American colonies. To the American workingman, on the other hand, it means heavy burdens to be borne, in the shape of bills for a great army and navy, for a larger pension list, for extensive fortifications in the new possessions, and for the cost of meddling in the political quarrels of the Eastern Hemisphere. These are some of the glories(?) of this policy, and others are set forth in this issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?"—*St. Paul.*



HE who will not stand by the Declaration of Independence, will fall by dependence upon man.



AS JESUS CHRIST never attempted to dictate to Cæsar, so must his professed representatives of this day never attempt to be dictators in politics.


ANY tyrant is willing that people should be free and happy in the way he himself prescribes.



THE despot lives by governing other people; the patriot lives by governing himself.



ONE nation cannot declare independence for another. Each nation must declare and maintain independence for itself.



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.)

## Second-Class Americans.

THE use of this ominous expression has come to be warranted, prospectively at least, by conditions which exist to-day in the United States. Upon this point the eminent scholar and deep-thinker, Carl Schurz, than whom no man better understands American institutions, in an address before the convocation of the University of Chicago, said:—

“If we do adopt such a system [the system of subjected provinces], then we shall, for the first time since the abolition of slavery, again have two kinds of Americans—Americans of the first class, who enjoy the privilege of taking part in the Government in accordance with our old constitutional principles, and Americans of the second class, who are to be ruled in a substantially arbitrary fashion by the Americans of the first class, through congressional legislation and the action of the national executive—not to speak of individual ‘masters’ arrogating to themselves powers beyond the law.

“This will be a difference no better—nay, rather somewhat worse—than that which a century and a half ago still existed between Englishmen of the first and Englishmen of the second class, the first represented by King George and the British parliament, and the second by the American colonists. This difference called forth that great pæan of human liberty, the American Declaration of Independence—a document which, I regret to say, seems, owing to the intoxication of conquest, to have lost much of its charm among some of our fellow-citizens.”

When there are Americans of the second class in Porto Rico and the Philippines, it will not be long till there will be Americans of the second class in the United States, and that too among people of Anglo-Saxon blood.

When the distinction of first class and second class is allowed among Americans upon a basis of difference in race, the like distinction will soon find a basis in differences of condition, as for instance, the difference between the man who has wealth, and the day laborer. There is too much distinction, socially and politically, made upon this basis already.

Are *you* willing to become an American of the second

class? And if not, are you willing for all Americans to be of the first class, so far as concerns their individual freedom?

## The Reason Why.

WHY is the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and why are certain people in Congress and elsewhere, making so much stir in defense of the old ideals of American government?

For answer we quote from the language used by two leading journals of this city, in support of the policy of “expansion.” Let the readers note, and remember that this represents the general sentiment of the American press.

The New York *Sun* says this:—

“The Declaration of Independence was made to suit a particular existing condition of things. . . . The proposition [that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed] was general, but the application was to a particular situation. Obviously Thomas Jefferson, the framer of the Declaration, did not intend to apply it to all people, for the social and political conditions would have made such an application absurd. The consent of the Indians as to their government had not been asked then, nor has it been asked at any time since then. The consent of the negro slaves was not asked. The consent of the people shut out from the franchise by a property qualification long existing subsequently was not asked.

“The Declaration meant simply that the colonies had become tired of the British domination, deeming it oppressive, and intended to set up a government of their own by the right of revolution. They were not laying down a principle for anybody except themselves, and they had no conception of the ‘consent of the governed’ as it is proclaimed by Mr. Bryan and the generally hypocritical gang who are sympathizing with him in the hope of cheating us out of our rightful conquests.”

This is a flat assertion of class or race superiority between man and man in respect of their rights. Let this become established American doctrine, and “rights” will mean for Americans simply such privileges as one has the *power* to get and maintain. And with this the nation with one gigantic stride will go back to the institutions of despotism.

The same day that the above was said by the *Sun*, the *New York Journal* said:—

“What our anti-expansionists mean when they speak of liberty is something quite different [from liberty under the American flag]. They mean power. They mean that unless the Filipinos have unchecked authority to run their government as they please, even if they run it to smash, they are not free.”

Liberty without power! What kind of liberty is that? Who wants that kind of liberty? And is this the ideal of liberty which is to prevail in the United States?

The veriest despotism that ever was would have been willing to allow the people under it all the liberty that

could be had apart from power. Let it retain the power, and the people might have what else they would. And when the struggle for liberty came, it was a struggle for the possession of power. Nor did any people ever count themselves free, until they possessed the power to exercise that freedom according to their own ideas of liberty.

Power is the very essence of liberty. When God gives a man liberty he gives him power; the very essence of his liberty is in the fact that he is "endued with power from on high." And people who have a form of godliness but "deny the power thereof," are set forth in Scripture (2 Tim. 3:5) as having no real godliness at all.

Liberty without power,—that is an ideal of liberty which will suit every despot well, not only in the islands of the seas and for the Filipinos, but in the United States and for American citizens.

Every free people possess the power to run their government "to smash;" they must possess it to run their government at all. The American people possess it; and the plain evidence that they do is visible in the fact that they are running it—or letting it be run—to smash with almost lightning speed.

### Who Will Stand By the Declaration of Independence?

THE *Tribune* of this city, January 9, sets forth the meaning of the Declaration of Independence, as follows:—

"It is a favorite notion now to quote the words, 'Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,' as if these embodied a law of application to all inhabitants alike. But of the men who signed the Declaration there were many who held slaves, and these slaves were governed without their consent. . . . It was never the intention to assert that the negroes or the savage race must give consent before just government should be established over them. . . .

"The Declaration of Independence was a formal notice that inhabitants of the colonies consented no longer to British rule. It declared their right to withdraw consent when government became subversive of their rights, and openly appealed to the god of battles. The consent of the governed was then withdrawn in the colonies, and from that time it was held that Great Britain had no longer just right to govern here. That is precisely the meaning of the language."

That identical argument, in substance and almost in words, was made just forty years ago. And it was as popular then as it is now. This argument was then sanctioned even by the great authority of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Forty years ago also this argument was thoroughly answered. The answer was made by Abraham Lincoln, and is good for all time. It is well that the people can have Abraham Lincoln's answer to these denials of the

Declaration that are made to-day. Read *Tribune* for Douglas, and here is Abraham Lincoln's answer to the *Tribune's* argument:—

"I think the authors of that noble instrument [the Declaration of Independence] intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness, in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal with 'certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This they said, and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth, that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant to declare simply the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.

"They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all; constantly looked to; constantly labored for; and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated; and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere.

"The assertion that 'all men are created equal,' was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration, not for *that* but for *future* use. Its authors meant it to be, as thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to all those who, in after times, might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.

"I have now briefly expressed my view of the meaning and object of that part of the Declaration of Independence which declares that 'all men are created equal.'

"Now let us hear Judge Douglas's view of the same subject, as I find it in the printed report of his late speech. Here it is:—

"No man can vindicate the character, motives, and conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country.'

"My good friends, read that carefully over some leisure hour, and ponder well upon it—see what a mere wreck—mangled ruin, it makes of our once glorious Declaration.

"They were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing

in Great Britain! Why, according to this, not only negroes, but white people outside of Great Britain and America were not spoken of in that instrument. The English, Irish, and Scotch, along with white Americans, were included to be sure; but the French, Germans, and other white people of the world are all gone to plot along with the Judge's inferior races.

"I had thought the Declaration promised something better than the condition of British subjects; but no, it only meant that we should be equal to them in their own oppressed and unequal condition! According to that, it gave no promise that, having kicked off the king and lords of Great Britain, we should not at once be saddled with a king and lords of our own in these United States.

"I had thought the Declaration contemplated the progressive improvement in the condition of all men everywhere; but no, it merely 'was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown, and dissolving their connection with the mother country.' Why, that object having been effected some eighty years ago, the Declaration is of no practical use now—mere rubbish—old wadding left to rot on the battlefield after the victory is won.

"I understand you are preparing to celebrate the 'Fourth' to-morrow week. What for? The doings of that day had no reference to the present; and quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were referred to at that day. But I suppose you will celebrate; and will even go so far as to read the Declaration. Suppose, after you read it once in the old-fashioned way, you read it once more with Judge Douglas's version. It will then run thus: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all British subjects who were on this continent eighty-one years ago, were created equal to all British subjects born and then residing in Great Britain.'

"And now I appeal to all—to Democrats as well as others—are you really willing that the Declaration shall thus be frittered away,—thus left no more at most than an interesting memorial of the dead past—thus shorn of its vitality and practical value, and left without the germ or even the suggestion of the individual rights of man in it?

"These Fourth of July gatherings I suppose have their uses. If you will indulge me, I will state what I suppose to be some of them.

"We are now a mighty nation; we are thirty, or about thirty [*now* (1899) about eighty] millions of people, and we own and inhabit about one-fifteenth part of the dry land of the whole earth. We run our memory back over the pages of history for about eighty-two [a hundred and twenty-three] years, and we discover that we were then a very small people in point of numbers, vastly inferior to what we are now, with a vastly less extent of country, with vastly less of everything we deem desirable among men; we look upon the change as exceedingly advantageous to us and to our posterity, and we fix upon something that happened away back, as in some way or other connected with this rise of prosperity.

"We find a race of men living in that day whom we claim as our fathers and grandfathers; they were iron men; they fought for the principle that they were contending for; and we understood that by what they then

did it has followed that the degree of prosperity which we now enjoy has come to us. We hold this annual celebration to remind ourselves of all the good done in this process of time, of how it was done and who did it, and how we are historically connected with it; and we go from these meetings in better humor with ourselves; we feel more attached the one to the other, and more firmly bound to the country we inhabit. In every way we are better men in the age and race and country in which we live, for these celebrations.

"But after we have done all this we have not yet reached the whole. There is something else connected with it. We have—besides these men descended by blood from our ancestors—among us, perhaps half our people, who are not descendants at all of these men; they are men who have come from Europe,—German, Irish, French, and Scandinavian,—men that have come from Europe themselves, or whose ancestors have come hither and settled here, finding themselves our equals in all things. If they look back through this history to trace their connection with those days by blood, they find they have none, they cannot carry themselves back into that glorious epoch and make themselves feel that they are a part of us; but *when they look through that old Declaration of Independence*, they find that those old men say that 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal;' and then they feel that that moral sentiment, taught in that day, evidences their relation to those men, that it is the father of all moral principle in them and that they have the right to claim it as though they were blood of the blood, and flesh of the flesh, of the men who wrote that Declaration [loud and long-continued applause]; and so they are. *That is the electric cord in that Declaration that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together; that will link those patriotic hearts as long as the love of freedom exists in the minds of men throughout the world.* [Applause.]

"Now, sirs, for the purpose of squaring things with this idea . . . that the Declaration of Independence did not mean anything at all, we have Judge Douglas giving his exposition of what the Declaration of Independence means, and we have him saying that the people of America are equal to the people of England! According to his construction, you Germans are not connected with it. Now, I ask you in all soberness, if all these things, if indulged in, if ratified, if confirmed and indorsed, if taught to our children and repeated to them, do not tend to *rub out the sentiment of liberty* in the country, and to *transform this Government into a government of some other form?*

"Those arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow,—What are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for the enslaving of the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of Kingcraft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because *the people were better off for being ridden*. That is their argument, and this argument of the judge is the same old serpent that says, You work, and I eat; you toil, and I will enjoy the fruit of it.

"Turn it in whatever way you will, whether it comes

from the mouth of a king as an excuse for enslaving the people of his country, or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent; and I hold, if that course of argumentation that is made for the purpose of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this, should be granted, it does not stop with the negro. I should like to know if, taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? If that declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book, in which we find it, and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it? If it is not true, let us tear it out! [Cries of 'No, no.'] Let us stick to it, then; let us stand firmly by it, then.

"It may be argued that there are certain conditions that make necessities and impose them upon us; and to the extent that a necessity is imposed upon a man, he must submit to it. I think that was the condition in which we found ourselves when we established this Government. We had slaves among us, we could not get our Constitution unless we permitted them to remain in slavery, we could not secure the good we did secure if we grasped for more; but having by necessity submitted to that much, it does not destroy the principle, that is, the charter of our liberties. Let that charter stand as our standard.

"My friend has said to me that I am a poor hand to quote scripture. I will try it again, however. It is said in one of the admonitions of our Lord, 'As your Father in heaven is perfect, be ye also perfect.' The Saviour, I suppose, did not expect that any human creature could be perfect as the Father in heaven; but he said, 'As your Father in heaven is perfect, be ye also perfect.' He set that up as a standard; and he who did most toward reaching that standard, attained the highest degree of moral perfection. So I say in relation to the principle that all men are created equal, let it be as nearly reached as we can. If we cannot give freedom to every creature, let us do nothing that will impose slavery upon any other creature. Let us then turn this Government back into the channel in which the framers of the Constitution originally placed it.

"I adhere to the Declaration of Independence. If Judge Douglas and his friends are not willing to stand by it, let them come up and amend it. Let them make it read that all men are created equal except negroes. Let us have it decided whether the Declaration of Independence, in this blessed year of 1858 [and 1899] shall be thus amended.

"In his construction of the Declaration last year, he said it only meant that Americans in America were equal to Englishmen in England. Then, when I pointed out to him that by that rule he excludes the Germans, the Irish, the Portuguese, and all the other people who have come among us since the Revolution, he reconstructs his construction. In his last speech he tells it meant Europeans. I press him a little further, and ask him if it meant to include Russians in Asia; or does he mean to exclude that vast population from the principles of our Declaration of Independence? . . . Who shall say, I am the superior, and you are the inferior?"

A. T. J.

## The Great Advocate of "Expansion."

WHY is this Government in favor—as it undoubtedly is—of "expansion"?

What serious argument can be offered in its support? What argument is offered, beyond the "spread-eagle" one which boasts of the national prowess and asserts the "rights of conquest"?

Every principle of justice and sound policy, on the other hand, is against it. It repudiates the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Its most ardent friends admit this by putting forth in its defense the amazing assertion that the Declaration of Independence does not assert the right of government by the consent of the governed for all people, but only for a certain class of people—the class in power.

As regards mere business policy, it is wholly uncalled for. There is no territory to be settled and added to the Union; the Philippines and Porto Rico are already settled, and the climate shuts out the white man from any permanent occupancy. Nor is there any advantage to be reaped in trade; the Philippines are thousands of miles nearer to British shores than they are to the United States. And if there were anything to be gained in trade, it could be gained as well without military conquest, as with it.

Americans will bear all the expense of maintaining the government, and other countries will get all the trade.

A large army of men from American homes will need to be stationed in the Philippines to preserve order and hold the islands against other powers—and to sicken and die under the unhealthy climate; and a large navy will also be required for their defense; besides which, an immense sum will need to be expended in the erection of fortifications. And the money to meet the expense of all this must come out of American pockets.

How then can it be, in the face of all this, that this Government can for a moment seriously think of taking and holding the Philippines?

Let us seek for light on the point by asking who they are that favor the annexation policy.

Are they those who have the interests of republican government at heart?

Aside from the class whose judgment is dazzled by the new vision of world-wide empire, there are some who favor the policy as a means of associating America with Great Britain in military enterprise in eastern Asia. This, as Lord Salisbury remarked, would conduce materially to the advantage of Great Britain, but not to the maintenance of peace. The alliance would be one of great cost for America, to the profit of England.

But there is another power in this country in favor of American expansion, and which is working for that policy most diligently—Rome!

First, last, and always since the Philippines, Cuba,

and Porto Rico were wrested from the control of "most Catholic Spain," the papacy has been in favor of American expansion over all this territory. And in the person of Archbishop Ireland, the papacy has had opportunity to work in very close touch with the Administration.

Archbishop Ireland, Martinelli, the papal ablegate, teacher in the Catholic University at Washington, and influential members of the church, in touch with senators and representatives, are all ardent advocates of the scheme, even to the extent of working openly for the annexation of Cuba, in the face of the express promise of the Government made before all the world, to secure Cuban independence. And Cardinal Gibbons has moved to Washington for the winter, that he may the better employ all his resources in bending the Administration to this policy.

And why does Rome want annexation of this territory to the United States? Oh, she has great interests in these islands, in the shape of property taken from the natives and rightful owners by every species of robbery practiced under Spanish dominion; and she wants all this property secured to her under the new order of things. A very substantial reason in her view for favoring "expansion," truly!

Rome has robbed the people, and by this and other acts of oppression has aroused their enmity and even their hatred. In the Philippines, especially, the religious orders are held in the deepest detestation. Aguinaldo, it is reported, has released all the Spanish prisoners held there, except the friars. If the government of the islands is left to the people that inhabit them, Rome will be obliged to surrender the enormous holdings of land and other property made over to her under Spanish authority, and which rightfully belong to the people. And she wants the American Government to interpose its power and authority to prevent it.

Rome knows that this expansion scheme is contrary to the Declaration of Independence, to the Constitution, to every principle of free government, and to everything that the nation has done in behalf of downtrodden races. She knows there is no advantage in it for the American people, but only great expense and unending trouble. She knows, in short, that it is a ruinous policy for this country. Yet she asks the nation to adopt this suicidal course, in order to uphold for her, her most unjust claims in the islands lost by Spain!

This is Rome; and this is the scheme she is working to-day against the United States.

LAST spring, all over this broad land, with great enthusiasm and universal approval, the Cuban flag was displayed with the flag of the United States. Jan. 1, 1899, when the flag of the United States was run up in place of the Spanish flag in Cuba, two companies of an Indiana regiment in Cuba held in their hands little Cuban flags. For this the two whole companies were court

martialed, and sentenced to spend three days in confinement, on bread and water. The officers of the two companies petitioned that *they*, instead of the men, might be allowed to bear the penalty. Their petition was granted; and they were confined to their quarters for a week. And that is how Cuba has been made free!—*Review and Herald*.

## The Holy Spirit and Sunday.—No. 20.

BY C. H. KESLAKE.

NOTWITHSTANDING that the Pharisees claimed that it was unlawful for Christ to heal upon the Sabbath day, there is perfect harmony in the acts of Christ upon the day with the nature of the day itself.

When the foundation of the earth was laid, and the "morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy," the Sabbath was made for man. The earth and all that was in it was in perfect harmony with Him who had created it. And He had created it all by His word. So far as this earth was concerned, sin was unknown, and throughout all there was peace. The love of God was manifested in all things, and the Sabbath was its sign.

But sin entered, bringing death and woe. All the sickness and disease that ever was, was due to sin. Therefore the perfect salvation brought by Christ in the gospel included the deliverance from disease as well as from sin of all who would accept it. Thus it is said of the redeemed when they shall enter upon their eternal inheritance: "And the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick; the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." Isa. 33:24.

This being so, how natural it was for Christ in forgiving sins to also heal the sinner of his physical maladies. And it was done in precisely the same way that the world was created—by the power of his word.

To forgive a soul his sins, to cleanse him from all unrighteousness, is to bring him into harmony with God; and between that soul and God there is peace—rest. Hence Jesus says, "Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." How appropriate, therefore, it was that Christ should heal on the Sabbath day,—the day of God's rest,—the very rest promised to every sin-sick soul, and obtained in Jesus Christ.

But the real intent of the Sabbath, its beneficence and blessing, were wholly lost sight of by the Jews in the senseless and burdensome requirements which they had heaped upon the Sabbath day.

To set forth the true import of the Sabbath was to do away with the unwarranted traditions of the Pharisees; but this would be (apparently) to belittle *their* religion in the eyes of the people. But "the Word of God is not bound;" and, says Christ, "every plant which

my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."

Instead of yielding their hearts to the truth, and receiving Christ as the Son of God, they steel their hearts against him: and because he heals the sick, as at the pool of Bethesda, on the Sabbath day, they proceed at once to persecute him and seek to slay him. John 5:16.

On another occasion Christ entered the synagogue, wherein was a man with a withered arm. The day was the Sabbath. "And they (the Pharisees) watched him, whether he would heal him on the Sabbath day: that they might accuse him." Mark 2:2. Christ knew that they had murder in their hearts toward him; but undaunted he asked, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day, or to do evil? to save life or to kill? But they held their peace." With this question Christ healed the man.

Determined to bring about the destruction of Christ for his alleged violation of the Sabbath, the Pharisees immediately went forth, and took counsel with the Herodians (up to this time they had hated each other) against him how they might destroy him.

In none of the instances cited above did Christ charge the Pharisees openly with purposing to kill him, although he knew it perfectly well. But in the seventh chapter of John it is recorded that he did this, and reference is made to it here because of the reply that the Pharisees made. Said Christ, "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me? The people answered and said, *Thou hast a devil: who goeth about to kill thee?*" Verses 19, 20.

Christ is here charged with having a devil. Comparing this with what is recorded in Matthew 12, we can more fully understand its significance. There we learn that Christ had wrought his miracles through the Holy Spirit. And yet the Pharisees in the hardness of their hearts attributed the work of the Holy Spirit to that of Satan. This was the sin against the Holy Ghost. See verses 24, 28, 31.

What had led them to such an awful climax? We answer: their attitude to Christ with reference to the Sabbath. Not that we claim that the miracle wrought by Christ as recorded in Matt. 12:5, and that immediately called forth the charge of the Pharisees, as stated above, was done on the Sabbath. The connection of this terrible charge of the Pharisees with their attitude toward the Sabbath is none the less real; and it was only the logical result of their position concerning the Sabbath in the premises.

As before stated, from the beginning of Christ's ministry, his teachings were at variance with those of the Pharisees; but notwithstanding this, nearly one half of his ministry was past before any open opposition against him was manifested. They were unable during that time to determine where his work would lead. But when they saw what Christ did on the Sabbath day, which was such

a flagrant violation of their idea of Sabbath-keeping, they could see that it would be utterly impossible for Christ eventually to stand with them on this point.

Christ being, as they alleged, a Sabbath-breaker, and yet doing that which was, to say the least, superhuman, they could easily come to the conclusion that "this man is not of God," that he has a devil, and through that devil did his wondrous works. And so opposing Christ in the matter of the Sabbath, they could not possibly escape attributing the work of the Holy Spirit in him to that of Satan. Hence we see that the sin against the Holy Spirit is involved in this question of the Sabbath.

---

### Grave Cause for Alarm.

BY GEO. B. WHEELER.

In the United States Senate Report on the Sunday mails, in 1829, by Hon. Richard M. Johnson, it was said:—

"All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequences." *American State Papers*, pp. 95, 111.

History testifies to the truth of this statement, and the fact that this same combination and influence is already beginning to operate upon the political institutions of the country, is certainly a grave cause for alarm. Reform societies and religious organizations are now combining for the purpose of forcing their ideas of reform upon the country, prominent amongst which is the compulsory observance of a religious institution by law,—Sunday-keeping. And not only this, but they declare their purpose to make the will of God to be done in this country, with themselves of course, as the interpreters of his will, which will make them the rulers of the country.

The Reform Bureau in Washington, aided by various religious organizations, which are supporting it, has already begun a campaign to defeat the reelection of members to Congress for the reason that they do not favor their reforms, the principal one of which instead of being a reform is a measure of absolute intolerance. Their arguments do not commend themselves to the intelligence of the committees before whom they have argued, and for that reason they are trying to force Congressmen to do, by fear of losing their positions, what their arguments fail to do.

We would warn all who value the great principles of liberty and equal rights upon which our Government was founded, to oppose this would-be religious despotism which is already beginning to act upon the political institutions of the country, before it gains sufficient headway to cause the civil power to bend under it.



SAMOA, with its continual strife and frequent attempts at revolution, is an illustration of the practical working of the plan of teaching a people self-government by holding them under military domination.

It is often asserted as an argument against self-government by semi-civilized races, that the small republics of Central and South America are almost continually in a state of revolution. We reply: Take the papacy out of those countries, and the revolutions and civil strife will vanish with it. Where the papacy is it will either dominate or make trouble.

GENERAL WOOD, commanding the American troops in Cuba, is calling for an army of 50,000 troops. The climate is so unhealthful, he says, that half the men stationed there will be sick, and 50,000 will be needed in order to have enough well men left to constitute an effective force. Query: How many lives of American citizens is it worth while to pay out in holding tropical or semi tropical countries for the sake of national "glory"?

TEN thousand Indians, it is announced, are to march from Vinita, a small town in Indian Territory, to the capital of Mexico, and settle in various localities in that country, where they have already made large purchases of land. The paper making the announcement states that "The main reason for their leaving is alleged mistreatment on the part of the United States."

This is the way savage tribes enjoy self-government under United States authority at home.

STATE SENATOR RAINES, of New York, announces that he will amend his well-known liquor law so as to prohibit the sale of liquor in the "fake" hotels to which his law gave being—and in all other hotels as well—on *Sundays*. He says it is not a measure aimed at New York City alone, but at saloons throughout the State. "I have never noticed any difference," he is quoted, "between the saloon-keepers there and those in other sections of the State. They are all anxious to make a penny, and they don't seem to care whether it is made on Sunday or on any other day. I will teach these people that there is a God in Israel."

AND Senator Raines and the people on whom he relies for support in this matter do not seem to care whether saloon-keepers "make a penny" or not by their nefarious business, so long as it is not made on Sunday. It is because they thus desecrate Sunday that they must be taught, by legislation, that Senator Raines is a god "in Israel," enthroned in the senate chamber at Albany, and that they must bow to him on Sundays or suffer the penalties of the civil law.

### Temporary Sovereignty in the Philippines.

Washington, D. C., January 14, 1899.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL: The proposition to take for the United States the sovereignty of the Philippines temporarily has been put forth by Senator Foraker as the policy of the Administration; and it is sought to secure the ratification of the proposed treaty with Spain in order to secure for us this temporary sovereignty. *Cui bono?*

Would it not, under the terms of the treaty with Spain, devolve upon us the obligation to secure to the monastic orders of those islands all the property they claim there, without regard to the rightfulness of their claims? And would not we be obliged to stipulate for the security of such claims, in case we should eventually resign the sovereignty to the natives. If we failed to do so would not the United States be bound to reimburse the monks for all monastic property which the native government might confiscate? If the monks were banished, would they not come here, and with the money paid them by this Government in pursuance of its obligation to protect their property in the Philippines, establish monasteries in these States or in Washington itself? Would they not be entitled under the treaty to do that?

I am forced to view the position of the Administration with suspicion—to regard it as a dangerous scheme in the interest of the monastic orders. We have had enough of monastic subtlety. It never brought peace to any nation. It will not bring peace to ours. It would erect a Spanish hell on the ruins of our Republic.

But under the treaty we should be obliged to take the sovereignty of the Philippines either permanently or temporarily. The Constitution does not empower Congress to assume sovereignty permanently, except of territory designed to be admitted into the Union as States. Sound policy forbids us to bring the Philippines into the Union upon such terms. The only rational course left, therefore, is to reject the treaty. Temporary sovereignty would prove only a cloak for fraud and an incitement to revolution at home.

JOSEPH BRADFIELD.

THE essence of true liberty is moral power.



**TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS:** There has started with the new year a great movement all over the country on the Sunday question, and an immense amount of literature in favor of Sunday laws is being placed in the hands of the people. Petitions are being circulated, and in almost every State bills for the enactment of religious laws are already under discussion. Do YOU not want to do something in this crisis to get the **SENTINEL** into the hands of the people in your community? If you do, now is the time to do it.

THE PUBLISHERS.

### American Principles Contrary to the Policy of Expansion.

*Extracts from Speech in U. S. Senate by Senator Mason, of Illinois.*

It is with the law of liberty as it is with the law of love—the more you give the more you have. Mr. President, if you, by your prejudice against me, bind me in a chain, your soul, as well as mine, feels the imprint of the bond. When Lincoln, as the instrument of God, struck the shackles from a million slaves, he struck the same shackles from your arms and from mine as well.

You cannot govern the Philippine Islands without taxing them. You have not yet their consent to tax them. You propose again to tax without representation. Look out for tea parties. Those semisocial functions are liable to occur, for Yankee Doodle and Dixie and the Star-Spangled Banner have been heard in the Archipelago.

Mr. President, in the light of the construction given to liberty by one of the distinguished Senators of this body, who has amended the Declaration of Independence in his speech here by inserting the words “some of the people,” let me read, in the light of that definition, the definition of liberty as given by Webster. Webster said:—

“There is, gentlemen, the great element of human happiness mixed up with other. We have our social affections; we have our family affections; but then we have this sentiment of our country, which imbues all our hearts and enters into all our other feelings; and this sentiment of country is an affection not only for the soil on which were we born; it not only appertains to our parents and sisters and brothers and friends, but our habits and institutions, and to the government of that country in all respects.

“We may talk of it as we please, but there is nothing that satisfies the human mind in an enlightened age unless man is governed by his own country and the institutions of his own government.”

Hear this sentence, and remember this if you forget all I shall say to day.

No matter how easy the yoke, though our dearly

beloved friends who are going to govern the Philippine may use a silken cord, a golden chain, Webster says:—

“No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power—”

And we are a foreign power so far as the Philippines are concerned; we can not speak their language; we can not read their newspapers—

“No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power—no matter how lightly it sits upon the shoulders, if it is not imposed by the voice of his own nation and of his own country, he will not, he can not, and he means not to be happy under its burden.”

No matter how easy the yoke, he means not to be happy. But, Mr. President, we are told that they can not govern themselves. Where is the student of evolution who talks like this? Where is the man who has read who does not know that all government is made to fit the people and does not rise either above or below the people themselves? Who does not know the difference between “canned liberty,” as the distinguished Speaker of the House calls it, and the genuine liberty which we enjoy?

No, no; they can not govern themselves. I was told so the other day by one of my beloved constituents, who never governs himself fifteen minutes at a time; but he was willing to take an assignment under the present Administration to govern all the Philippines at a fair salary!

Can not govern themselves! Every man who ever owned a slave always said: “Why, you poor, downtrodden slave, I own you for your own good, just to help you; I eat my bread in the sweat of your face just to keep you safe and sound from the ways of danger; and in order that I may continue to exercise this Christian duty do not let me catch you with a spelling book in your hand.”

Can not govern themselves! And we are to say that to-day to the poor, God-forsaken, downtrodden people of the Philippine Islands; and while we whisper the words of consolation into their ears that we are to give them liberty and life, we wink the other eye to the merchants of the country, and say: “We will extend commerce and sell more calico.”

But we are to exercise the right of taxation without representation. We are to govern the ad valorem and the specific duties. Ah, my friends, look out; for once the spirit of imperialism governs the poor and weak 10,000 miles away, look out that that spirit does not touch you nearer home.

When Kossuth wrote the declaration of Hungarian independence he had in mind our own Declaration of Independence. So he said here in Washington. For over one hundred years every lover of liberty has pointed to this sentence within this resolution: “All just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.”

This sentence, Mr. President, has been a pillar of fire

by night and a cloud by day to the downtrodden and oppressed all over the world. In the light of this sentence crowns have fallen to the dust and men have stood anew in their own manhood. In the light of this sentence Simon Bolivar, the liberator of South America, laid in blood and carnage the foundation stones of the South American republics. In the light of this sentence Kosciusko led his Spartan bands against the hosts of Russian and Austrian oppressors of his native Poland.

This burning sentence attracted the attention of Lafayette, across the water, and his ships set sail for our relief. In the light of this sentence Garibaldi struck down Bourbon tyranny and carved his name not only in the hearts of lovers of liberty in Italy, but all over the world. No, Mr. President, we will not amend that sentence now. We will not insert the word "some" just yet. It has passed beyond the power of this country to amend the Declaration of Independence.

We are told by others that we must govern the Philippine Islands or abandon them and turn them back to Spain. Have we got to govern or abandon Cuba? Is that an honest excuse for grabbing something in violation of the common, honest law of nations?

Let me tell you what our good friend Fox said in the English Parliament, that some of you expansionists read when you were boys and have long since forgotten. I quote his exact language, from the volume of Fox's speeches:—

"The noble lord who moved the amendment said that we were in the dilemma of conquering or abandoning America. What have been the advantages of America to this kingdom? Extent of trade, increase of commercial advantages, and a numerous people growing up in the same ideas and sentiments as ourselves. Now, sir, would those advantages accrue to us if America was conquered? Not one of them."

Let me read just a little further from what Fox said in answer to this proposition, made so far by all the people who are in favor of taking the Philippine Islands, whether the people of those islands want us to do so or not. Fox, following on in the same speech on the same day, in reply to the Crown, said:—

"Such a possession of America must be secured by a standing army—"

Is not that true here?

"and that, let me observe, must be a very considerable army."

Is not that true here? Aginaldo has 50,000 men and one climate. Mr. Fox, continuing, said:—

"Consider, sir, that that army must be cut off from the intercourse of social liberty here, and accustomed in every instance to bow down and break the spirits of men, to trample on the rights and live on the spoils cruelly wrung from the sweat and labor of their fellow-subjects. Such an army employed for such purposes, and paid by such means, for supporting such principles, would be a very proper instrument to effect points of a greater, or at least more favorite importance nearer home; points,

perhaps, very unfavorable to the liberties of this country."

Not one expansionist, not one who advocates the taking of these islands against the consent of the people, but what will tell you in the same breath, "Yes, it is going to be a great tax upon the people of the United States, but we will let the Filipinos pay that tax." They are to pay for our standing army. They are to pay the price of their own chains.

Mr. President, suppose England had accepted that advice of Fox, the great lover of liberty. They said he was America's friend. Ah, but in the light of history he was a better friend to England. If England had accepted that advice and made us their friend, the hundred years last passed would have shown a different state of affairs between England and the United States of America.

Tell me why we should adopt one plan for Cuba and another for the Philippines. Do you say, with the explosionists—I mean the expansionists—"We promised we would not steal Cuba, but we did not promise not to steal the Philippines?" Do you say, with Shylock, "It is so nominated in the bond?" You remember Jack in the Two Orphans was charged with stealing a coat. He said, "You lie; it was a cloak." Will you tell me, please, how grand larceny and criminal aggression in Cuba become high Christian civilization in the Philippines? Is there some place in the Pacific Ocean where we change the code of ethics and good morals as we change the calendar and the ship's clock in crossing?

Mr. President, we can not teach them to govern themselves. There is only one road to self-government. That is through the gate of responsibility, along the rough and rugged road of experience. You can't teach liberty and self-government with a Mauser gun. Spain has tried it for centuries; at least, with guns similar if not of the same pattern. For centuries she has been for expansion, more land, more property, more poor people she could ride over with some cheap politician with a crown on his head. Are we going to keep the crown room there that Spain occupied? Is the throne room to be kept intact for Tammany Hall or the Republican party, when we send our envoys there?

Spain is an expansionist and has been for centuries. And say, my friends, have you forgotten the first rule proved by all history, without exception, that every square inch of territory taken by force has to be held by force? Go to your children, who are in the first year of the high school, and they will tell you the rule, that in all history every square foot of ground taken by force from an alien nation has to be kept by force.

But distinguished gentlemen who claim a monopoly of patriotism, who do not seem to observe the difference between expansion and explosion, say that we who believe in getting the consent of the governed before we govern them want to give back the Philippines to Spain. Everyone who makes the statement knows that is not what we want. May I repeat the old story of Lincoln?

Driving in his carriage one day, he alighted to turn a tumblebug to his legs. Replying to the Cabinet minister within the carriage, he said: "I merely wanted to give him a show with all the other bugs of his class." He did not want to annex the bug or to tell him how to run his business. He did not seek to tax him or to tell him that he did not know how to govern his bugship. He set him along the highroad, along the line of the survival of the fittest.

Do you remember when Mexico was invaded by the French and Uncle Sam said, "Go; there is the Monroe doctrine; Mexico is covered by the shadow of its wing," and the French soldiers left, and the brave little Republic of Mexico is slowly but surely climbing the ladder to a better education, a better civilization. Ah, Mr. President, that is the expansion I believe in. That is the imperialism the fathers taught.

Gentlemen may say I belittle my own institutions. I do not. I should like to call attention to a few of the beams in the eye of the Americano that he may not stretch and break his neck reaching 10,000 miles away to find the mote in the eye of the Filipino.

Oh, but gentlemen say there is something in it. There is the sale of rum and tobacco and calico. If you want the land, there is Canada; that is nearer. Take Canada. They talk our language. But when I say that to my expansionist friend, he says, "That is different." Oh, yes; it is different, and I will tell you the difference. It is the difference between the fleet of a Victoria and the fleet of Aguinaldo. That is all the difference. There is no difference in principle, for if you have a right to take the Philippines and govern them and tax them without their consent, you have the right to take Canada.

Mr. President, who wants to govern the Philippines, let me ask in conclusion? Where is the ambitious Senator who wants to make laws at this desk to govern people 10,000 miles away? Who is the kind-hearted statesman? You can not speak their language. You do not know their schools. You can not read their newspapers. You do not know their religion. Why, I never even saw one of their newspapers. I am told there is a bogie man here who represents Aguinaldo, but I have never even seen him. I have an idea that their homes are sacred to them and that their government, like the fountain head, is what the people will make it; that it can never be better until they make it better, and that government can not be learned by inheritance any more than you can inherit a trade.

Who craves the power to make laws for men 10,000 miles away whom you never saw? Who seeks to go there as the governor? If Democracy succeeds, tell me the name of the man in this Chamber who wants to go, covered with the tinsels, the gewgaws, and flubdubs of sovereignty that come from royalty, and have the natives receive you and keep the flies off of your sacred person while you listen to the interpreter. What man

ever breathed American air in Illinois or Wisconsin who would stoop to this?

I have almost prayed for some magnetic power that I could turn the tide for the liberty of those people, for some magnetic power that I could draw you so close that I could write in living letters upon your hearts the word "liberty." Not liberty, Mr. President, for your family as I prescribe it, not liberty for me or my children by your dictation, not Austrian liberty for Hungary, not Spanish liberty for Cuba, not English liberty for the United States, aye, and not American liberty for the Philippines, but universal liberty—universal liberty for which our fathers died.

### Not Wanted in Cuba—the "American Sabbath."

A "CUBAN-AMERICAN" states in the *Sabbath Recorder* what he thinks of the "cut and dried" plan of evangelization for the Cuban people proposed by the "Protestant Alliance." He speaks, of course, not only for himself, but for the people among whom he has been raised. He says:—

"Cubans dread the incoming of Protestant sects. They wish, however, to be free from Roman Catholic Church domination, of which they are sick and suspicious. They do not ask the Protestant denominations to settle the matter in any cut-and-dried manner in which they are contemplating it in the United States. They see nothing ahead but future strife in the Church of Christ, to apportion different provinces of Cuba off to this denomination and to that. When provincial boundaries become marked by sectarian bodies, religious and civil wars will commence in earnest, and it will be with Cuba as it was with the cats of Kilkarney.

"The Cubans plead for some *one* evangelical church on the island. Something similar to the French Evangelical Church; or to what is called Old Catholicism: or, as the Swiss prefer to say, 'Christian Catholic.' Those movements in Europe which have been away from the Roman Catholic Church, while holding to the universal and unifying idea whose aim is biblical, primitive, evangelical, apostolical Christianity is what they will much more heartily accept than the absurd plan of the 'Protestant Alliance.' They recognize that the whole face of Protestantism must be reformed before it will be biblical, and care not for the mistakes of the past to be introduced into the New Cuba.

"Such statements as Dr. Plum and his compeers have made recently, in regard to the 'civil Sabbath' are looked upon with more favor in the United States than in Cuba. Cubans nor Roman Catholics in general will never accept, with any serious well wishes, any body or set of people who insist that 'we must force the blessing of the American Sabbath upon these islands recently come into our possession.' Let me hit the Rev. Dr. Plum right in the pit, together with all those who are trying 'to force' anything on Cuba contrary to clause IV. of the Joint Resolution of Congress, signed by the President and made public to the world; together with attempts to lay hands upon the God-given consciences of the Cubans.

The plan suggested in my letter to the Judson Memorial Baptist Church for a return to biblical Christianity would much more readily meet an acceptance by Cubans, than to enforce upon them what they do not believe in, the 'American Civil Sabbath.'

### Lese Majesty and Lese Puritanism.

"New York Journal."

ARE you not filled with a noble scorn for the German nation, which without serious protest allows a man to be jailed for criticising the Kaiser?

Don't you despise a country that tolerates such attacks on liberty? . . . Are you not outraged at such German submission?

You are?

All right. Then what do you suppose a sensible German thinks of a nation where a man is arrested for drinking a glass of beer on Sunday?

What do you suppose the Frenchman thinks of a land that forbids a man with his family to sit and listen to good music and drink whenever he likes?


Don't you think a Chinaman would lean back and laugh until his queue-tip touched the ground at sight of an American arrested for playing golf on one of the seven days?

There are funny things in Germany, kind friends, and in Timbuctoo there are some odd sights. But we still hold the record here with our modern nonsense grafted on to the stupidity of the Puritans.

AN exchange says: "The Roman Catholic priests at Ponce, Porto Rico, have issued a proclamation directing their people not to go near Protestants, nor to receive presents from them, and forbidding them to enter the houses of Protestants. The priests denounce as illegal marriages performed by others than themselves. General Henry, the military commander of the island, has notified the alcalde, or mayor, of Ponce, to inform the priests that they must stop issuing such disquieting proclamations, and that the denouncing of religious denominations will not be tolerated. The alcalde is further instructed to tell the priests that if the action complained of is persisted in, the military will put an end to it."

THE United States should not undertake to govern the Eastern Hemisphere till it displays more proficiency in transacting the business already on its hands in the Western Hemisphere.—*Dr. Chas. H. Parkhurst.*

THE first man, Adam, never complained about the Sabbath or failed to observe it on the ground that it was not specified as being the seventh day of the week.



### Modern Samaritans.

(Concluded.)

HISTORY tells us that the name of this little village which formerly rejected our Saviour was En-Gannim, now called by the Arabs "Jenin," and containing a population of about 2,000 souls, of whom the greater part are, to-day, Moslems. Since their rejection of Christ, they have drifted still farther and farther away from the true Light, until midnight darkness now surrounds them.

In the days of Christ the inhabitants of this town were looking for the Messiah, just as were the Jews. The latter had rejected him because he did not appear in the glory and splendor that they had supposed he would assume; and the Samaritans would have none of him because he did not worship in Mount Gerizim; so, on this his last recorded journey in this poor world which he came to redeem with the price of his blood, they too, refused to acknowledge him.

But now, let us consider the conduct of the apostles James and John. To our astonishment we see that gentle, loving disciple, he who leaned upon the breast of his Master, and into whose care that Master shortly afterward committed his beloved mother,—we see him, with his kindly eyes now burning with anger, and his soft voice harsh with rage, ask of his gentle Master whose name was "Love," a strange question:—

"Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them even as Elias did?" Why did they refer to Elijah?—"O," they reason: "Elijah was a good man, surely we cannot go wrong if we follow his example. Let us in this one instance step aside from our usual methods and practice the gospel of *force*. Although ordinarily our Master is mild and gentle toward all, though his language has ever been that of love, still this is a notable exception. He is going now, as we believe, down to Jerusalem to be crowned, and to manifest his power. What an excellent opportunity is this for a beginning to be made! We are anxious to make an example of these ungodly Samaritans. Give us the liberty, Lord, *bid us!*"

Trembling with excitement, and with hands raised high to heaven, awaiting the word of the Master, the impetuous disciples stood before the meek-faced man of Nazareth. What a moment! Little did those hard-

hearted Samaritans realize that one brief word from the lips of him whom they had refused to receive would seal their destiny. How they would have trembled had they heard the fearful question fall from the eager lips of the zealous disciples! But had they known the character of Him to whom the question was put, there would have been no need to tremble. But they did not know him; if they had, they would not have refused him entrance. Neither are his own followers acquainted with him; else would this disposition to avenge an insult never have made itself manifest by their savage question.

Listen! The Master speaks. That same voice low and sweet, which a little later bade the impetuous Peter put up his sword into its place, is making reply. Raising his sacred hand toward the men eagerly awaiting permission to call down the vengeance of God upon their enemies, he sadly answers:—

“Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.”

What a rebuke upon any who would so far forget their Master and his teachings, as to think for a moment to employ *force* in matters of conscience! These Samaritans had insulted the Christ; and so the disciples proposed at once to *force* an acknowledgment of his supremacy and power. But oh, those blessed hands were never raised to avenge himself or to call down fire upon any. They were never raised to heaven save to bring healing and blessing upon the poor ungrateful sons and daughters of men.

Shall we—you and I, reader—follow his example?

MRS. L. D. AVERY-STUTTLE.

**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.

*Dear Reader:* If the SENTINEL comes to you each week wrapped singly and your address on the wrapper, it means that no one else is receiving the paper at your post-office. Are you satisfied to be the only reader of the SENTINEL in your community?

**THE SIMPLICITY VAPORIZER**

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

D. F. Mansfield, Conklin, Mich., writes: I received the Vaporizer and am well satisfied. It is helping my cough, and I will recommend it to others.

**Have YOU Read This?**

DID we never tell you that Miles’ Pocket Dictionary, the “New Webster,” is based upon the great “WEBSTER’S INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY?”—That it has a double index by which any desired word is found in a moment of time?—That it is the only abridged dictionary that gives the full pronunciation of words? (This book tells all that can be told about the writing and the speaking of the words, a marvelous fact!)—That it has a device, called the “Columbian Word-Builder,” that doubles the capacity of the book, making it contain more words than any other dictionary short of an unabridged?


The largest abridged dictionary published, is it? Indeed it is. It has 45,800 words. Yes, sir, 45,800! But listen! This little book, of vest-pocket size, is not only the handiest and most complete, but it actually embodies four other books, all of which are characterized by the same elements of completeness; viz: a “Pronouncing and Statistical Gazetteer of the World;” a “Rapid Calculator and Compendium of Business and Social Forms;” a “Parliamentary Manual,” based on Roberts’ and Cushing’s; and a “Letter Writer and Literary Guide.” It is a complete library of five pocket reference books bound in one volume and weighs only two ounces.

Say, did you know it is almost a sin not to own this most wonderful literary, social and business help, when it can be had, **bound in cloth, for only 25 cents, and for 50 cents in leather,** gilt edged and gold embossed? (Extra morocco, Calendar, Memorandum, and Stamp-Holder, 60 cents.) 600,000, and more, sold and everybody pleased and more than pleased. Your money back if you are not fully satisfied. Send price for a copy at once, and terms to agents. You can easily sell dozens of copies to your neighbors and friends. “I sold 50 in one day and have averaged 25 a day for several weeks at a time.” J. J. K. Write to-day.

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

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


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



Is what the  
 "Christian Work"  
 (New York City)  
 says of our  
 —NEW BOOK—

**LOOKING UNTO JESUS.**


The object of this book is to teach us to look unto Jesus from every scriptural point of view. It treats especially of the **present** position and work of our Lord in the Heavenly Sanctuary—a theme of interest to every Christian.



Cloth edition, beautifully bound in buckram, cover printed in four colors, postpaid, \$1.00  
 Presentation edition, gold side stamp, gold edges, a very acceptable present, postpaid, \$1.50

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

**A Good Representative**



Is wanted in every vicinity to sell the Holiday Edition of "Battle Hymn of the Kingdom."

The subject matter of this booklet is a beautiful poem by Frances Eugenia Bolton. It is appropriately illustrated with fifteen original half-tone engravings of extraordinary merit. The cover design is worked in gold, silver, and green, and will especially recommend the volume to purchasers of gift books.

It is printed on heavy enameled paper and bound in cloth with gilt top, 50c postpaid, or \$25.00 per 100 not prepaid.  
 Trade edition, printed on thinner paper and bound in leatherette, 25c each postpaid.

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

**OUR LATEST PRODUCTION:**

**THE DESIRE  
 \* \* OF AGES.**

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

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

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

**Send in Your Orders AT ONCE.**

**PRICE, POSTPAID:**

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

**ADDRESS**

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

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

By ALONZO T. JONES.

**A COMPARATIVE  
 HISTORY OF THE TWO GREATEST  
 REPUBLICS,**

**Rome AND THE United States**

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

**RELIGIOUS FREEDOM FOR EVERY MAN,**

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

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

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

Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

# Books We Can Recommend.

## SAVONAROLA

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

Cloth 60c.



## JOHN OF WYCLIFFE

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

Cloth, 60c.



## MARTIN LUTHER


A most readable story of the life of this greatest reformer, at home, at the university, as a monk, as a priest, at Rome, at the Diet of Worms, and the closing scenes of his career. Illustrated. Cloth, 60c.



## POLITICAL SPEECHES AND DEBATES

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


Cloth, \$1.75.



## PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

Size, 6 1/2 x 4 1/2 inches, 495 pages, 6 illustrations. The story of both Christian and his wife. An attractive edition of this immortal classic.

Price, 40c.



## LEFT WITH A TRUST

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


Illustrated, cloth, 60c.



## JACK THE CONQUEROR

### And Other Stories

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



## GOLDEN GRAINS

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




## THOUGHTS FROM THE MOUNT OF BLESSING

An exposition of the Sermon on the Mount.

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

—Baptist Union.

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




## MAKING HOME HAPPY

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

## NATIVE LIFE IN INDIA

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


Cloth, 60c.



## AMONG THE NORTHERN ICEBERGS

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


Cloth, 60c.



## LIFE ON THE KONGO

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

Illustrated, cloth, 60c.



## TWO CANNIBAL ARCHIPELAGOS

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



## STORY OF REDEMPTION

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

Cloth, with gilt edges, \$1.25.

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,**

KANSAS CITY, MO.  
OAKLAND, CAL.

39 Bond Street, New York City.



NEW YORK, JANUARY 26, 1899.

A RECENT Sunday law decision at Newark, N. J., by Judge McCarter, affirms the legality of Sunday fines.

IN his speech in Congress from which we quote in this issue, Senator Mason correctly defined the advocates of American imperialism as men who "cannot tell the difference between expansion and explosion." See page 57.

THIS issue of the SENTINEL contains two articles of unusual length. They are given space because they are of unusual interest and value. Don't skip them. They treat on a subject concerning which you positively cannot afford to be ignorant.

THE lightest and most volatile of all substances—hydrogen—has been forced at the dictate of modern science to assume liquid form, at a temperature the lowest ever measured by man. The air in a closed tube dipped into the liquid is immediately frozen, securing a more perfect vacuum than is possible by any other means.

THE plea that a people cannot govern themselves is the tyrant's justification of his usurpation of power. Christianity affirms the right and the duty of every man to govern himself; and to say that a people cannot govern themselves is therefore to deny the truth of Christianity. A people who have had little contact with civilization may not be able to govern themselves in the complex fashion of "highly civilized" nations, but their government will be no less self-government because it must needs be simple. Very much that pertains to "advanced" civilization might be dispensed with vastly to the profit of the losers. Even the beasts and birds of the forest have the capacity

to govern themselves according to their natures, and are a good deal happier and better off in doing so than when under the control of man.

SCARCELY a day passes without the announcement of the consolidation of business enterprises in a certain line of industry, into a "trust," the object in every case being, of course, to control the output of the goods, and through that to dictate the price to the people. All restrict the sphere of individual enterprise, and by this interfere with individual independence. All are essentially bad; but the worst one of all is the religious trust, which aims to freeze out and stamp out by legislation every religion except its own.

BY a decision of Attorney-General Van Deventer, of the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., Archbishop Ireland has secured title to 20,000 acres of land along the line of the St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Manitoba railway. The archbishop claimed 34,000 acres, but the settlers on the land were in some cases able to prove a better title thereto than that of the Catholic official; hence will not be molested. Other settlers will contest the archbishop's claim.

WHAT difference does it make to me," some one may ask, "what policy is pursued by the Government in dealing with the Philippines or other islands taken from Spain? What has that to do with American government at home?" This question is answered by American history, and quite recent history, too. There was a time not very far back when the American Government denied the rights of a semi-civilized class in this country, as it is now disposed to deny the rights of a like class under its authority across the sea. That was something which for a long time didn't seem to concern the interests of white men particularly, but a time came when white men saw that it did concern them personally, and that in the most serious way. The prin-

ciples of free government were denied, and because of it hundreds of thousands of white men in America laid down their lives on the battle-field and in military hospitals and prisons. That was what national repudiation of republican principles meant to American citizens forty years ago; and we may be assured the like thing has no less serious import for American people to-day.

WE have failed as a nation to live up to the high ideal of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence, as shown by various practices, institutions, laws, and court decisions contrary to this ideal, which mark the nation's history from 1776 to 1899. Therefore let us throw that ideal aside altogether and set up a different one with which these failings can be harmonized(!) This is the sum and substance of one of the main arguments put forth in favor of imperialism.

WE do not know that the language which we quote in this issue from the *New York Sun*, on the meaning of the Declaration of Independence, was written by a Jesuit. But we do know that the papacy has a controlling hand upon the press almost everywhere in this country, and that the sentiments in question are just such as a Jesuit would express.

ACCORDING to statements made by Rev. Mr. Diaz, recently, before a committee of the U. S. Senate, Cuba was taxed between \$1,500,000 and \$2,000,000 annually under Spanish rule for the support of the Catholic Church. No wonder Archbishop Ireland and the papal hierarchy in general do not relish the idea of a Cuban republic.

WE have still a supply of Nos. 1, 2, and 3 on hand. These are excellent papers for missionary work, and can be had in bulk at the rate of one cent per copy. We will address wrappers and mail to individuals at the rate of one and a quarter cents per copy. Send in your orders.