

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

VOLUME 15.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1900.

NUMBER 7.

*Published in the interests of Religious Liberty—Christian and Constitutional.*

*Any one receiving the American Sentinel without having ordered it may know that it is sent by some friend. Therefore those who have not ordered the Sentinel need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.*

(Entered at the New York Postoffice.)

CHRISTIAN government is government by love; civil government is government by force; hence there can be no such thing as Christian civil government.

GOVERNMENT by force represents justice, and is therefore not antichristian, for justice is not against Christianity. But government by force represents justice alone, and justice alone is not Christianity. In Christianity justice is combined with *mercy*, and "mercy rejoiceth against judgment." Christianity shows present justice satisfied by the cross of Christ, present mercy given the transgressor, and judgment delayed to a future time. To delay judgment in civil government would be to defeat civil government. Not to delay judgment for transgression in Christian government would defeat Christianity. Hence civil government cannot be Christian; neither, in its proper sphere, can it be antichristian.

CIVIL government becomes antichristian when it tries to be Christian, or when it makes a profession of religion.

WHAT is the difference, in principle, between a civil observance of a religious day (the "civil Sabbath") and a religious observance of that day? The very fact that the day is a religious day makes the observance of it a religious observance. And Sunday is, beyond all question, a religious day.

If the Sunday institution had the support of the divine law, would there be any need of the frantic call for its support by human law? Would anything upheld by Omnipotence need to be supported by the arm of man?

If "the powers that be are ordained of God," they are certainly not ordained to go contrary to the will of God. And in obedience to the will of any power, under this ordinance, the will of God must stand first.

THE whole principle underlying religious persecution is contained in the plea that religious observances ought to be enforced by the civil power.

IN the annual report of work of the New England Sabbath Protective League, we note the statement that "the League is formed for the purpose of defending the Sabbath against the persistent encroachments upon its *sacredness* by business and pleasure."

The special object of this organization is to preserve the *sacredness* of the Sabbath. The purpose of the League is therefore plainly a *religious* one.

Yet the League depends almost entirely, in its work, upon arousing public sentiment in favor of the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws.

It is plain, therefore, that the New England Sabbath Protective League is an organization which demands the use of the civil power to serve a religious purpose; which, in principle, is all that was ever done or ever could be done under a union of church and state. Such a demand is both unamerican and unchristian.

The League wants the civil power employed to preserve the (supposed) sacredness of Sunday. But how can the sacredness of anything be preserved by law? The inherent sacredness of the Sabbath was established

by its divine Author, and that cannot be affected by anything that man may do.

The only other way in which the sacredness of the Sabbath can be concerned is in the keeping of it. It is to be kept holy—or sacred. But is this anything that can be secured by human law? Can the law of man make anyone *sacredly* observe the Sabbath? And has human law any business to attempt to enforce a *sacred* observance?

Will a person observe the Sabbath *sacredly* without going to church, where no circumstances prevent him from doing so? And if a *sacred* observance of the day is to be enforced, will it not therefore be necessary to enforce attendance at church?

And in this unamerican effort to preserve Sunday sacredness by law, is there not a confession that the alleged sacredness of Sunday is more a theory than a fact, and must depend upon the outward show which the enforcement of law can produce, or fail because it has no higher source of support?

Further on in this annual report we find this quotation which has been much used in the effort to justify Sunday legislation: "The liberty of rest for each is dependent on a law of rest for all."

How can this be? What proof of it is to be found in spiritual or in natural law—in reason or in revelation?

There is a liberty of rest, and there is also a liberty of work. The same law which said, Thou shalt rest, said also, Thou shalt labor. The right of a man to labor is universally conceded to be as sacred as any other right. It is just as sacred as the right to rest. It is altogether wrong, therefore, to compel one man to stop labor, in order that *another* man may rest.

The right to labor being as sacred as the right to rest, how can it be any more true that "the liberty of rest for each is dependent on a law of rest for all," than it is true that the liberty of labor for each is dependent on a law of labor for all? Why not make one man work in order that another man may work, as well as make one man rest in order that another may rest?

One man wants to work on Sunday; another man wants to rest. Why should the man who wants to work be compelled to rest, any more than the man who wants to rest should be compelled to work?

Some one may reply, There is more to this question than the simple right of mankind to rest or to work. The duty of Sabbath observance is involved in it.

But who shall say what day of the week is the Sabbath? This is a disputed question—a point of religious controversy. Can the state settle a religious controversy and command a religious observance? Has the legislature either the qualification, or the authority to take such action?

If not—as all must agree—then what possible ground of justification can there be for compelling any

person to rest, in order that the liberty of rest may be secured to some one else?

The assertion is often heard in connection with the agitation for the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws, that the Creator ordained "one day in seven" as a day of rest. People who offer this in support of a Sunday law are not sincere; they do not believe in a one-day-in-seven law at all. What they want—and the only thing they will accept—is a *Sunday* law. The Creator did set apart one day in seven, it is true; but he did not leave any indefiniteness about it, and he did not set apart Sunday, or the first day of the week. He set apart "the seventh day," which, as the weekly cycle was fixed by that very act, must necessarily have been, and must now be, the seventh day of the week.

### Progress Toward Despotism.

DEVELOPMENTS at the seat of the national Government reveal a rapid progress along the pathway to governmental despotism.

The first great step in this direction was the adoption of the policy of foreign conquest. That policy had to be justified in some way, and in the effort to do this have been involved the further steps in the direction of repudiating the principles of free government that have since been taken.

First, it was declared that the policy of foreign conquest was upheld by the Constitution. Next, the Constitution was declared to be a very flexible instrument that could be stretched and bent so as to cover almost anything. Next it was declared that the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence were "out of date," and that while entitled to some regard as venerable documents having a historical importance, they could not be binding upon such a great and growing power as the United States has now become.

Next it was discovered that, however these doctrines might be regarded, the Government possessed certain powers which might be exercised "outside the Constitution;" and this was soon hailed as a discovery of great importance. It was soon settled, in fact, that the Constitution did not apply to territory outside the mainland of North America at all, and that in the new island possessions Congress might govern just as it pleased. And so it was considered proper to vest in one individual, for the government of this new territory, power and authority beyond any that could belong to him under the Constitution. Power and authority was vested in the Chief Executive of the United States—the President—which under the Constitution belonged to the legislative and judicial departments of the Government; and by this he was raised to a position over the new territory little if anything short of an actual dictator.

Under the Constitution, Congress alone can declare war; yet the President of the United States, without Congress, put into the field of warfare against the Filipinos a larger army than was ever before raised by the United States to contend with a foreign power.

This was a plain usurpation of power, growing out of the unauthorized policy that had been adopted in dealing with the territory taken from Spain. But with this, as with every step in the departure from the former principles, vigorous and unceasing efforts have been made to fortify it and establish it as a legitimate feature of American government. It has even been proposed, under this program of government "without the Constitution," that the President shall have authority to conclude secret treaties with other nations, himself alone, or with such advice as he may choose, from his cabinet or perchance from a Catholic prelate, instead of "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," as the Constitution provides.

As was inevitable, all these steps taken for the government of foreign territory "without the Constitution," and which were in the direction of "government by a single mind"—a one-man power—have begun to react upon the government of the home territory, to which it is still admitted the Constitution applies; and steps are now being taken at Washington to strengthen the power and authority of the Chief Executive over the people of the United States.

A New Hampshire senator has moved for an amendment to the rules of the Senate, for the purpose of shutting off the privilege of speaking upon general resolutions that may be introduced. The proposed amendment provides that "All resolutions shall be referred without debate to their appropriate committees, unless the Senate by unanimous consent orders otherwise." The purpose and significance of this move are explained thus:—

"The adoption of this rule would make it impossible for any senator to speak during the morning hour upon any resolution which he might have offered, except by unanimous consent expressly granted, because any resolution offered would go without debate to the appropriate committee. The committees are in the control of the majority party in Congress, and would not report any resolution for consideration which did not support the administration. Thus, by the operation of this rule, the voice of free debate would be as completely stifled in the Senate as is the case in the House, where nothing can be considered without the previous indorsement of the committee on rules.

"The Senate, which has remained a deliberative body, where every State had the right, through its two senators, to be heard upon the general state of the country, would fall under the complete control of the men making up the majority of the committee on rules, and practically under the control of the one man who might be chairman of that committee."

It is felt by the supporters of this move that there is too much talk in the Senate in favor of political lib-

erty. A senator from South Dakota has been speaking in behalf of freedom for the people of the Philippines, and a senator from Illinois has been speaking in behalf of the Boers, and it is declared that the administration must not be subjected to such attacks. This proposed amendment to the rules will, if carried, practically shut off all speeches attacking the policy of the administration, because it will be necessary first to secure the unanimous consent of the Senate, and the Senate will never be unanimous in opposition to the policy of the President. It will consign all resolutions attacking the President's policy to committees which "are in the control of the majority party in Congress, and would not report any resolution for consideration which did not support the administration."

Thus the administration will be left practically at liberty to pursue its own policy, regardless of Congress, which is to say, regardless of the people whom Congress represents. And then, the Government will not be a government of the people *by the people*, but a government of the people by "the administration," which at least approximates to and must naturally soon result in, government by a single mind—a one-man power—a monarchy as absolute as that of Russia.

In line with all this that has been cited, is a bill that is now before Congress which provides that the President shall be given complete authority to prescribe rules of government and to appoint officials for their enforcement throughout the Philippine archipelago. The passage of this measure is looked for at an early date.

---

### The Sabbath Changed By Law in the Cook Islands.

---

THE following "Sabbath law" has, after much agitation upon the subject, been enacted by the Parliament of the Cook Islands, in the South Pacific Ocean:—

"CHRISTMAS DAY ACT, 1899.

"An act to regulate the calendar and assimilate the days of the week and months to those of other countries east of the 180th degree of longitude.

"Be it enacted by the parliament of the Cook Islands, with the approval of the British resident.

"The short title of this act shall be the 'Christmas Day Act, 1899.'

"2. The 25th and 26th of December of the New Zealand Calendar shall be observed as the Christmas day within the islands of the Cook group, and shall be treated as one day, and be called the 25th day of December, 1899. It shall further be held that the day following the said 25th shall be Tuesday, the 26th day of December.

"3. It shall not be lawful for any one to follow his or her calling or ordinary employment, or do any work for profit or reward on the Sabbath day, as fixed by this act.

"Provided always that work of an urgent nature

such as loading or unloading of vessels, shall not be deemed to be prohibited by this section.

"4. Any offense under this act may be punished by a fine of not exceeding ten shillings, or in default not exceeding three days' hard labor on the public roads."

The purpose and significance of this action are well stated by an exchange, as follows:—

"The 'Sabbath day as fixed by this act' is Sunday. The first missionaries who labored in these islands, and through whose labors the people were induced to profess Christianity, took no notice of the day line (longitude 180°), but kept on reckoning the days of the week just as they did at home. Therefore what they called the first day of the week was really the seventh day. All these many years the natives have been observing the Sabbath day, supposing that it was Sunday. But since seventh-day Christians came among them the difference has become so conspicuous that the people who believe in Sunday observance began to demand that the calendar be corrected by law and so 'assimilate the days of the week to those of other countries.' The Catholics began the agitation, and the missionaries of the London Missionary Society joined them in the effort.

"Of course this is all done in order that there may be no mistake in the matter of Sunday observance. It did not make any difference until the fact was emphasized that the day on which the people observed the Sabbath was the Sabbath of the commandment—the seventh day of the week. As long as they observed the day as Sunday, the first day of the week, it was all right; but when some began to observe it as the Sabbath of the Lord, which it really is, the importance of being like the world was suddenly appreciated. Observing the Sabbath on the seventh day was a blow to Sunday observance which the advocates of the Sunday Sabbath could not endure; hence the civil law was called in to rectify the matter, and give to the first day of the week the prominence deemed to be its due. Sunday observers often argue (when other argument fails) that it does not matter which day you keep, if you observe one day in seven; but the argument usually includes the provisos that that one day be on Sunday, and that the institution be supported by state law."

### Honest Words by the "Washington Post."

Why cannot we be honest in our utterances touching the territories we have recently acquired? Really, it would save time and trouble, to say nothing of life and treasure, to come out frankly with the announcement that we have annexed these possessions in cold blood, and that we intend to utilize them to our profit and advantage. All this talk about benevolent assimilation; all this hypocritical pretense of anxiety for the moral, social, and intellectual exaltation of the natives; all this transparent parade of responsibility and deep-seated purpose—all this deceives nobody, avails nothing, helps us not an inch in the direction of profit, dignity, and honor. We all know, down in our hearts, that these

islands, groups, etc., are important to us only in the ratio of their practical possibilities. We value them by the standard of their commercial usefulness, and by no other.—*Washington Post (D. C.), Jan. 14.*

### "The Higher Powers."

ROMANS 13:1 is often quoted to prove that all should yield implicit obedience to civil government, right or wrong. But the fact is that it teaches something very different from this, namely, that every soul should be subject to "the higher powers"—"the principalities and powers in heavenly places" (Eph. 3:10)—all of which are in turn subject to Jesus Christ. In short, Rom. 13:1 simply puts in other phrase the latter part of Acts 5:29: "We ought to obey God rather than men."

Nor is this a strained interpretation. The Scriptures plainly teach that Christ's is the higher power. Speaking by inspiration of God, as we learn from Num. 24:5-7, Balaam said: "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel! As the valleys are they spread forth, as gardens by the river's side, as the trees of lign aloes which the Lord hath planted, and as cedar trees beside the waters. He shall pour the water out of his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters, and his King shall be *higher than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted.*"

Again, in Ps. 89:27 we read these words: "I will make him my first-born *higher than the kings of the earth.*"

These texts both, beyond a doubt, refer to Christ. "Water," singular, is frequently used in the Scriptures as the symbol of divine truth. To the woman at the well, the Saviour said: "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." He would have given her the word of God, which "is living and powerful." (Heb. 4:12), and which "is spirit" and "life." John 6:63.

But "waters," plural, is used as a symbol of "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Rev. 17:15. With these facts in mind, read again Num. 24:5-7, and it will be at once apparent that the import of Balaam's prophecy is that by the pouring out of the water of life through the preaching of the divine word, God will have children in every nation; which is also plainly declared in Rev. 7:9, where in describing the throng of the redeemed, John says: "I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, stood before the throne."

Such is the kingdom of Him who is "higher than Agag"—"higher than the kings of the earth;" and whose are "the higher powers."

To the Ephesians, the apostle wrote of the power that the Father wrought in the Son "when he raised him

from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion." See Eph. 1:15-22. This authority Christ now has "as a son over his own house; which house are we."

God's people, while in the world, are not of the world, even as he is not of the world. See John 15:19. They are "strangers and pilgrims in the earth." Heb. 11:13. They are sojourners "in the land of promise as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles." Verse 9. Like Abraham, they look "for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Verse 10. They are subjects, not of earthly rulers, but of the heavenly King, for in behalf of all such it is plainly declared, "Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." Phil. 3:20, R. V.

But being subjects of the heavenly King does not exempt us from being subject to the eternal principles of justice ordained by God himself. All men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." Governments exist in the overruling providence of God to conserve these rights. Hence, Christians "must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." They must obey, "not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart."

"There is no power but of God." Said the boastful Pilate to the Saviour, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and that I have power to release thee? Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above." Thus it appears that even the power by which men commit sin is from God; hence the charge of the Lord against the children of Israel: "Thou hast made me to serve with thy sins." Isa. 43:24.

Civil government, as we now know it, was no part of God's original plan, any more than was divorce which he subsequently permitted through Moses. God designed to govern man himself through love, and that he might do this he endued him with social and moral qualities. He gave him love of order, a sense of justice, and the instinct of self preservation. These attributes in un-fallen men would make them the willing subjects of the Creator. The same attributes would lead fallen men to associate themselves together for mutual protection and cooperation, and to secure that order which men naturally desire. God is never taken by surprise. He provides before hand for every possible contingency. He provided civil government as a means whereby a race of rebels might be saved from anarchy and consequent self-destruction.

"God is love," and when in consonance with his character he cannot, because of man's sin, do for him what he otherwise would do, he does the very best thing that can be done under the circumstances. The original

law of marriage contained no provision for divorcement. Because of the hardness of their hearts Moses permitted it. "But from the beginning it was not so." Matt. 19:7, 8. The Creator himself would not compel those to live together who were not united in heart; and so the Lord through Moses permitted divorce. But this is not and never was intended for those who are truly the children of God. To permit men to put away their wives when there was no agreement in the married life, was simply the best thing that even the Creator could do for those who, because of the hardness of their hearts, were not subject to the divine marriage law.

In like manner, to permit civil government among men, was the best thing that God could do for a race that had refused his divine rule. Since men would not willingly submit themselves to their Creator in all things, as they would not yield themselves to the God of love that he might work in each one to love his neighbor as himself, they must, for the preservation of the race, be compelled to submit themselves one to another in civil things, that is, in their relations one with another. "But from the beginning it was not so."

"The powers that be are ordained of God;" that is, the genus of government is implanted in the very nature of man. It was this governing power that gave Adam such complete mastery over the beasts. And it is because some men have more of this power than others that some are natural leaders. But while God has ordained governmental power, he has no more ordained the abuse of this power than he has the abuse of any of the powers of mind and body so often misused. The misuse of any God-given power (and all our powers are God-given) is sin. And it is sin just as much in the ruler as in the subject. Even nations are subject to the supreme rule of *right*. This principle is recognized in the Declaration of Independence in the statement that the United Colonies have "full power" to do all "things which free and independent States may *of right do*."

And this higher law of right is the rule of the Christian. He asks not, What says the civil code? But, What is right? Not, What says the state? But, What says the God of heaven? Thus, always and in every place he is subject to the "higher powers," to the "principalities and powers in heavenly places." And being thus subject he wrongs no man, for he loves his neighbor as himself, and "Love is the fulfilling of the law." C. P. B.

### A Parable.

BY ROYAL HUBBELL.

A good little boy sat upon his mama's doorstep industriously powdering and sifting brick-dust with which to scour the cutlery.

This was a laudable and innocent occupation; but a big, bad boy came along, bent on mischief.

"Your dust is weak, little boy," said he; "here, take some of this black sand and mix with it; and here are some nice little sticks for you to play with."

APPLICATION:— The N. W. C. T. U. and other similar societies were using the scouring religion of Christ to cleanse rusty and spotted humanity. What could be more beautiful? But wily Satan ever on the alert says: "Oh, but your religion is too weak by itself! Here, take some of the black sand of politics and civil government and mix with it to make it strong!"

And, one of these days many innocent and undesigning people will awaken to the fact that the little fiery match-stick of sectarian hate has touched the black and white powder of politics and religion: and there will burst the bomb of religious persecution that will cripple and scar many of their brethren for whom Christ died.

---

### A Test Case in Ohio Schools.

BY ROY F. COTTRELL.

FOR several weeks an intense interest has been taken in a religious educational controversy between the teachers and the school board of New Antioch, Ohio. The opening exercises conducted by the principal consisted in Scripture reading without comment, and prayer. The assistant required her pupils to commit and recite in concert the Lord's Prayer as found in their Third Reader. The Board of Education being agnostic in sentiment, opposed this action; and, as the teachers would not yield, the matter was laid before the Court of Common Pleas. There a decision was rendered in favor of the Board; but, as the majority in the district are in sympathy with the teachers, the case has been appealed to the Circuit Court, and its verdict is now awaited. In the interim the school building has been locked against the teachers.

A weekly journal, in speaking of the bitter feeling caused by this "religious war," says: "It is simply agnosticism in the form of law vs. the Christian religion." But this conclusion neither logically nor rightfully follows. The fact that one lifts his voice against any religious exercises in the public schools, however brief or seemingly unimportant, does not place him in opposition to the Christian religion. On the contrary, the principles of true Protestantism forbid all state institutions from holding or teaching anything that favors in the least degree, any form of religion, whether Christian or pagan.

Our Saviour said, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's:" and in return Cæsar (the state) is to demand only those things which are within his sphere. Outside this, in all matters that embrace our duty to God, rights of conscience, belief, or practise, the state has no sovereignty.

But is not this "a Christian nation"? and is it not just that the majority should rule? It has been declared such by our highest judicial authority. Is not that sufficient? Let us see. Has Cæsar the power to make one individual a Christian? Has the highest earthly tribunal power to Christianize a nation? *Never*. God alone can change the heart of man, or proclaim a theocracy; and, until his Spirit operates and controls the individuals that make up our Government, it is not "a Christian nation."

Let it be granted that the majority make a profession; does this effect the principle involved?—Not at all. Given the right to favor a general form of religion and the principle is surrendered; for, that which sanctions a *general form* may with equal right sanction a *particular form* to the exclusion of all others. No person is to surrender his right to think and believe, and if a man has no faith in religion shall he be compelled to place his children in a school where religious exercises are held? And, more than this, shall his means be appropriated to support a system with which he has no sympathy?—Certainly not.

"To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical." Justice is justice; right is right; and the slightest deviation from it is wrong.

Dayton, Ohio.

---

### "They Say and Do Not."

BY B. W. MARSH.

NEVER in the history of mankind has there been such a disposition to say one thing and do another as at the present time. The sayings of the people are as directly opposite to that which is actually being done as is possible for them to be. The history of nations could be made up of violated promises and unredeemed pledges, and the Scripture that "there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land," would in this strange time seem to meet the completeness of its fulfillment. The situation as summed up by the prophet and apostle is sufficiently startling to awaken anyone who cares to lay their words alongside present-day happenings. "Ever learning and never able to come to a knowledge of the truth," says the apostle, and the prophet adds, "In transgressing and lying against the Lord, and departing away from our God, speaking oppression and revolt, *conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood*. And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter." 1 Tim. 3: 7; Isa. 59: 13, 14.

The unfulfilled promises, and broken pledges lying at the gateway of nations are sufficient comment on

this awful truth. Here is one from the Denver *Evening Post*:—

“Says Peace but Intends War. Russia’s Part in the Oriental Overture about to Begin is Very Clearly Indicated. The czar has given the most pronounced vocal assurances of his peaceable inclinations and intentions. *This was the necessary prelude.* With that assurance taken seriously nobody can look for military movements in Russia. Yet 75,000 troops have left Tiflis in Transcaucasia for Baku on the western coast of the Caspian sea. From there they will cross at once to Krasnovodsk, whence they will proceed to Kanschka, the frontier station on the borders of Afghanistan. Events rapidly transpiring there make their advance on Herat a necessity. Believing in the peaceable assurances of the czar, the British in India have of course nothing to fear, not until the Russians are massed on the Indian frontier.

“It was probably an oversight on the part of the czar that he failed to couple with his peaceable assurances a statement that Russia is not making any preparations for war. He might have said that, for it is the truth. *All preparations have already been made.* In Siberia as close to the frontier of British India as it is possible to take them without crossing the line, 250,000 troops are now assembled. Meanwhile England is calling for volunteers to go to South Africa, the regular force having been exhausted. *The British are depending on the czar’s peaceable assurances, and the czar on his army made ready for the fray.* General Yonaff, recently designated for the especially-important command of the Russian forces in the semi-Reitschensk district, has already established his headquarters in Kanschka, while the Russian squadron in Port Arthur and in the Persian gulf is increasing. It is well to bear this in mind, together with the peaceable assurances of the czar.”

And now word comes from St. Petersburg that Russian rule is about to be established in Persia through the medium of an immense loan payable in seventy-five years. The whole scheme is plain enough; Russia is forcing an outlet to the sea. If she cannot get it through the Dardanelles, she will be satisfied for the present with the Persian gulf. She assures England that she means peace, and for fear that England will interfere with her peaceful(?) intentions, she has amassed an army of 325,000 men on the Afghan and India frontier to enforce respect for her peaceful assurances while she throws her web around Persia, and presses a little closer about the Sick Man of the East. “They say and do not;” they say, “Peace, peace, when there is no peace,” and “when they shall say peace and safety, sudden destruction cometh upon them.” And who can say that the time has not come?

*Cripple Creek, Colo.*

“It doesn’t make any difference which day you observe as the Sabbath—any one day in seven—*provided* you observe the first day of the week. If you don’t observe that day we’ll lock you up.” Is not this the logic of the complete argument in behalf of Sunday?

## Constitution vs. Commerce.

THE problem with which the Government has to deal in determining the political status of the newly-acquired island territory—the conflict which is presented between “sentiment” and trade interests, between the demands of the Constitution and those of commerce—is described in this quotation from an article on “Government in Our New Possessions,” by Judge H. G. Curtis, of the Insular Commission, in *The Outlook*:—

“Free trade must, of course, follow any declaration or action which brings these islands within our boundary limits and makes them an integral part of the Union, because the Constitutional provision is imperative that rates of duty shall be uniform throughout the United States, and no duty can be charged on goods imported from any State. This includes territories and districts as well as states; otherwise we would collect in New York duties on goods from Arizona, and from New York to the District of Columbia or any other territory.

“This is one of the fundamental provisions of the Constitution. It was the leading cause for calling the Constitutional Convention; it was the only reason assigned in the ‘Virginia Resolutions’ which started the movement for a Constitution and a more perfect union. The islands of Porto Rico and the Philippines can and would supply, with their soil and cheap labor, all the sugar which the United States could consume, all the tobacco which we could use, and all the semi-tropical fruits, rice, and many other things that could find a market in the United States. All would come in competition with the products of this land, which we have so long striven to protect.

“Free from all duty or control, all our tobacco industries in eight States, all the infant and projected beet-sugar industries, and all the fruit-growing of California and Florida, would be irretrievably ruined. Is the mere sentiment of giving to these people a territorial government or legislation passed by Congress worth the injury to our own people and productions which it must entail? Are not our own people, who have made this country great, entitled to some consideration? Shall we be driven upon these rocks by the baseless cry of ‘imperialism’ or ‘militarism?’”

This only illustrates the inevitable difficulties in which the nation has become involved by the un-American policy of foreign conquest. The ship of state has to be steered between Scylla and Charybdis, and danger is discerned upon only one side of the course. There are trade evils to be encountered if the Constitution is adhered to; but all the dangers they present are as nothing to those which lie in the way of what is now described as “outside the Constitution.” Imperialism and militarism are rocks which have wrecked and are wrecking the greatest governments the earth has known. There is no safety save in a return to the former course.



NOT long ago a well-meaning critic of the AMERICAN SENTINEL took exception to some things the SENTINEL was saying of the policy of the present American administration, and in support of the objection cited the Scripture text "thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people."

\* \* \*

This only illustrates the necessity for such a publication as the SENTINEL is designed to be. There is no "ruler" of the American people. This is a government of the people by the people. But there are powerful forces actively at work in the Government which if not checked must very soon result in creating a ruler for the people and turn this Republic into a monarchy. There are those in high political office who are willing to assume and accept power to which they have no right, and make themselves actual rulers of the people if the people are not vigilant to preserve their rights.

\* \* \*

And right at this time, when vigilance and a clear discernment of the situation are so much needed, there are many who, like our critic, have the idea that to criticise the acts of the administration is to speak evil of the ruler of the people. That is just why it is necessary to call attention to the departure from republican principles in the Government. The SENTINEL is only pointing out that there is no "ruler" of the American people, and ought to be none; and if the people would view what it says in the proper light, they would be aroused to prevent the consummation of the monarchical movement that is in progress. But if already they have the idea that the Executive at Washington is a ruler of the people instead of their servant, what hope can there be for the maintenance of free government unless they can be aroused to their error?

\* \* \*

There are, and should be, rulers of the American people, but no ruler; there should be government "by the people" of the people, but no government of the people by one man, or by any scheme which does not allow full popular representation.

\* \* \*

NEGOTIATIONS which have been in progress for some time, with Great Britain, in respect to rights claimed by

the latter touching the prospective Nicaragua Canal, have been concluded, and the United States is to build and operate the canal. But it is realized that the canal must be fortified to guard American interests in case of war with a naval power; and this question will receive the attention of the Government. And now an engineer who has been connected with the preliminary work already done comes forward and says the best way would be for the United States to annex Nicaragua and Costa Rica; and then "we would be able to do whatever we wished regarding the canal." This is very suggestive of more "expansion."

\* \* \*

A CORRESPONDENT inquires how we can know which day is the seventh day commanded to be observed as the Sabbath. "Unless a record of the seventh day has been kept from creation down," he says, "no one can tell when the seventh day comes round."

\* \* \*

There are several proofs by which our friend can determine just when the seventh day comes round.

\* \* \*

First, the seventh day is the day immediately preceding the first day of the week. We never heard that anybody had any trouble in locating the first day of the week; and as the indefiniteness of the seventh day is always asserted as an argument for the observance of the first day, the latter is conceded to be a definitely-located day, and from this as a basis the seventh day may be found, as stated.

\* \* \*

But if our inquirer does not make his statement in behalf of Sunday, but believes the first day to be as indefinite as the seventh day, then we can cite him to the fact that not only has a record of the original seventh day been kept from creation down, but the seventh day itself has been so kept.

\* \* \*

The original seventh day was the seventh day from the beginning of creation; and the setting apart of that day as the Sabbath for mankind, made the week. The weekly cycle of time has existed from Adam's day to our own.

\* \* \*

The Creator blessed and sanctified (set apart) the original seventh day, and his law declares, "the seventh day"—the one he blessed and sanctified—"is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and commands "in it thou shalt not do any work." If the original seventh day were to become lost, this part of the divine law would fail, because men could not remember to keep holy a Sabbath day which they had lost track of and could not find; and

God would be unjust in requiring of mankind something they could not perform. If there were any possibility of his Sabbath day becoming lost, that possibility would no doubt have been in the mind of the Creator when he ordained the Sabbath, and he would have taken measures for its preservation. So to question whether the seventh day has been lost or not, is really to question whether the purpose of God in giving the Sabbath has failed or not, which is to question whether God is omniscient and omnipotent, or is no real God at all.

\* \* \*

The Creator pointed out the Sabbath day to the Jews shortly after they left Egypt; and as he certainly knew which day was the seventh day, it is certain the Jews at that time knew when the seventh day "came round." And they began as a nation to observe the Sabbath at that time, and have continued its observance from that day to this. So our inquirer has only to make note of the day observed by the Jews, to know just what day is the seventh day commanded by the Creator.

\* \* \*

Finally, it is recorded of the holy women who came to the sepulchre of Jesus to anoint his body, that they "returned and prepared sweet spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." And the next day, when they came again to the sepulchre, was "the first day of the week." So the Sabbath day according to the commandment—which was the day God sanctified and blessed at creation—is located at the time of the resurrection of Christ as being the day immediately preceding the "first day of the week." And the first day of the week has certainly not been lost since that time.

\* \* \*

There has never, indeed, been any occasion in the history of the world for the week to get lost. From earliest times, its different days were dedicated to the different heathen gods, from the sun to saturn, and they were as prominent in the transactions of the world anciently as they are to-day. They could no more get lost anciently than they can to-day.

\* \* \*

Both the heathen world and the people of God have preserved the week, with its seventh day, from earliest times down to the present; and their records agree to-day, and always have agreed. So it is absolutely beyond question that the seventh day of our week and the seventh day of creation week are one and the same day.

\* \* \*

THE controversy in the public schools at Piermont, N. Y., growing out of the attempt to compel attendance of the children at religious exercises, which was opposed by Catholic parents, has been settled by the following decision rendered by State Superintendent Skinner:—

"It is a violation of the school law to compel chil-

dren to attend religious services after the hour of school opening, and the reading of the Bible in the public schools is also prohibited. As far back as 1838 the superintendent of common schools laid down this decision: 'Neither the common school system nor any other social system can be maintained unless the conscientious views of all are equally respected.'"

\* \* \*

A PROPOSED law for the control of religious associations in Japan has been presented to the Japanese House of Peers, and from present indications it is thought likely that it will be passed. The proposed measure is interesting in that it puts Christian churches on the same plane as regards rights and privileges that is occupied by Buddhist societies and temples. No taxes are to be levied on "buildings and premises used for propagating religion or performing services," or on "buildings established within such premises for the residence of teachers of religion." This is substantially the same as the provision of American law against the taxation of church property.

\* \* \*

"The only point against which reasonable objection can be raised," says an American religious journal, is the following:—

"No *kyoshi* [teacher of religion] can give public expression to his opinions on political affairs, or engage in any movement of a political character."

This has called out a protest from a number of Japanese Christians.

\* \* \*

Such a provision is, of course, an unjustifiable restriction upon personal liberty, yet it shows how keenly the Japanese government appreciates the truth that political measures starting from religious sources are likely to be productive of harm; and also that—sad to say—a profession of Christianity is no guaranty that an individual or an organization of men will not work against the government or try to manipulate politics so as to place their religion in a position of political advantage.

\* \* \*

A PARTIAL report which has been made by the Philippine Commission, affirms that independence is not desired by the more intelligent classes in the islands. It does pronounce, however, in favor of leaving the question of title to property claimed by the religious orders to be settled by the courts of justice, and even suggests the propriety of dividing this property up into small parcels, to be sold to the people. Meanwhile a new Philippine Commission, with a United States Circuit judge at its head, has been appointed by the President, the special mission of which, it is said, will be the establishment of a civil government for the islands.

## An Infant Republic's Address to the United States.

THE following is an extract from what is described by London newspapers as a remarkable document emanating from the office of the Secretary of State at Pretoria, capital of the Transvaal Republic, dated December 16, 1899. It is an appeal to the great powers of the world against being starved into submission by Great Britain, but seems especially addressed to the United States, of which power it says:—

"Since, in 1870, the President of the United States acknowledged our republic as a sovereign state, Americans have flocked here in numbers. In every instance the hand of fellowship has been extended to them. Not a single case of disagreement is on record, but with the first war note of the oppressor we are informed that America is acting in league with the enemy. If our sister republic has no sympathy with us, if the boasted condescension of the British is to be preferred to sincerity and truth, we will no longer believe in the justice and integrity of the American nation, and her profession of Christianity we will consider empty sound."

### Sunday Closing News.

#### MISSOURI.

A FRIEND in Quenweg, Mo., sends us the following newspaper reports of a crusade for the enforcement of the Sunday law against saloons, in Jasper County and vicinity:—

"Jasper County was drier yesterday than the worst prohibition town in Kansas. From Central City to astute Carthage not a drop of liquor was sold over the bar. Even in Webb City and Cartersville, where for years the saloon men knew no Sunday, the mandates of the law were respected. Joplin saloon men were given a tip last Saturday, so it is said, that Prosecuting Attorney Shannon had made up his mind to prosecute any further violations of the Sunday-closing law, and inasmuch as the officers had been kind enough to put the saloon-keepers on their guard, the latter readily took the hint. Of course the saloon men do not like it, but they must stand for it. Sunday has always been counted as the biggest day for the liquor business in Joplin, and if the closing is to be made permanent, some of the numerous places will be obliged to close up!"

"Prosecuting Attorney H. L. Shannon is arranging to file information against ten or a dozen Joplin liquor license holders who failed to close their saloons last Sunday in compliance with an order from the attorney in question. Delay is necessitated in filing the information by the difficulty in ascertaining just who is proprietor of each saloon. The records must be consulted.

"Joplin's saloons closed up on Sunday of their own accord, just before the grand jury went into session, and this fact was perhaps responsible for their not getting the notification to close at the same time Carter-

ville was notified which caused some complaint at the latter place. Now, however, several Joplin saloons still open Sundays, and will be proceeded against.

"Webb City saloons have been kept closed on Sundays of late by the city authorities, though at one time it was so generally recognized that her saloons kept open anyway that the city added \$10 to the regular monthly license of \$50 for Sunday opening."

### "Joining Hands."

LAST Sunday morning "Father" McGrath, a Roman Catholic of this city, with his flock was admitted to the Lafayette Ave. Baptist Church, and later in the forenoon to the Episcopal Guild Hall. In both places he conducted the regular service of his church. Altar boys were in attendance to chant and perform their part, and full mass was said. Mr. McGrath was deeply moved by the "Christianity" manifested by these Protestants toward him and his people. Well, what is Protestantism here now anyway?

ADDIE BOWEN.

Buffalo, N. Y., Jan. 12, 1900.

### The Decay of the Republic.

THE CONTRAST OF TO-DAY WITH THE FIRST QUARTER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, AS SEEN BY AN OBSERVER OF FOUR SCORE YEARS.

Highland Park, Ill., Jan. 25, 1900.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL:

Your little paper, the SENTINEL, is the most pithy, forceful and cogent publication that comes to my table among more than a dozen prints of the day. I read it for the comfort and consolation it gives me by calling my mind back to the halcyon days of boyhood, of the first quarter of this waning century, when patriotism was not measured by dollars, nor love of liberty a grinning pretense; in fact, to the days when the great American Republic was buoyant with hope and growth, and monarchists and imperialists were not suspected to have a habitat within our national limits. But alas, as I enter my four score years and calmly wait my sunset whose rays are wrapped in drifts of lurid smoke, I rather court the hour, than dread the moment's pain, of ceasing to look on our decaying Republic. Already it has passed beyond reclaim. Would that I had gone before my eyes had looked upon power and dominion as paramount to individual liberty!

Webster prayed that his dying eyes might not look upon a dis severed union; but little did he then pause to reflect that "union," power and dominion are and always have been the basis of human bondage and individual servitude. We slaughtered half a million of our people, destroyed twelve billion dollars worth of prop

erty, starved and maimed more than half a million more, in a four years' domestic war, all for the "union," which is now only another term for "dominion." To do that we raised, equipped, and educated three millions of soldiers, and by so doing laid the foundation for an imperial military monarchy, which is as firmly buttressed on wealth and military power and a military spirit of our people, as is the empire of any nation on earth. We cannot turn back, we cannot change a destiny, which we have, for forty years, almost unanimously acquiesced in, however much parties or individuals may have differed at intervals as to methods.

Therefore let me say, your golden words of wisdom, which fill your every issue of the SENTINEL are wasted on noxious air. Individual liberty must become a myth save as to our rulers; not of the populace, nor need it be, for the populace have had their day, and have proved to be both ignorant, criminal and corruptible.

I read your most excellent paper, however, for *auld lang syne*, and then file it in our little city library, where I hope it meets the eyes of many of our people. It will at least serve to show how far we have *already drifted* from the moorings our grandsires marked for our safety.

COL. P. T. TURNLEY.

### Points Worth Considering.

LAYING aside all points in the recent disturbances among nations which are being used as political schemes, every candid mind must admit there are some things in connection with these wars that are well worth studying. There are lessons to be learned from them. For instance, Why did the rebellion in the United States continue on for four long, weary years? How came it that the war with Spain ended so quickly? Why is it that the Philippine question is not settled at once,—a great nation at war with a small island power? How does it happen that the Boers in South Africa can cause such a mighty nation as England so much trouble? No human mind can answer these questions correctly, unaided by the Word of God. Suppositions can be advanced as to varying conditions and circumstances of contending armies, but these are not *reasons*.

God loves one nation the same as another, so far as the *people* are concerned, for he "hath made of *one* blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts 17: 26. With him these nations are not some great cumbersome affairs. "Behold, the *nations* [not one] are as a drop in a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance." Isa. 40: 15. And still further, he permits them to develop so far, and when they reach certain limits, they must *stop*. There is a Power above, which ordains decrees, and well is it that nations do not try to go past their decreed boundaries. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men

for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the *bounds* of their habitation."

All this is that men should "seek the Lord," "feel after him," and "find him." This principle has run through all human history. A nation became corrupt through sin, even to the chosen nation of Israel (for God is no respecter of nations), and then some other nation with less corruption was raised up to punish and subdue the offending one. Then it often occurred that this instrument would become exalted, taking all glory to itself, until it reached its limit before the Supreme Ruler, and then the history would be repeated. All these changes were permitted to come to cause men to think about God, and "feel after him," and all who did so truly, found him, and were saved from earth's wreck.

It is evident God had lessons for the North as well as the South in the war of 1861-65. Slavery was an awful crime, and one charged against the whole nation.

Perhaps the long dark history of Spain in religious bigotry and intolerance against the pure principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ had something to do in deciding the late war between her and the United States.

But the principle of righteousness possibly is upon the other side in the contest, either in the far East or West, in the Philippine struggle. At least it will be well to ponder carefully the history of the past before concluding that because a nation is right once or twice, it cannot but be right always. It does not count with God that a larger number stand upon one side in the contest, if the minority are in the right. God is in the *right*, and those who are in the *right* are on the side of *power*. This same principle enters into all struggles whether present or past.

The war in South Africa seems to illustrate this same principle. It is a wonder to all the world how such a small republic can hold out in the awful struggle with a great world power. But in it all is God's lesson. And may he grant that every honest soul shall learn the lesson, and feel after the Lord, and find him. He is "not far from every one of us."

The gospel of Christ is not bound by national prejudices, or opinions, or boundaries. The invitation to life is extended to every nation alike, to "every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."

Reader, are you pondering these things in the light of God's Word? Are you feeling after your God in these troublous times?

T. E. BOWEN.

### Smoking Stunts the Growth of Boys.

WHATEVER difference of opinion there may be upon the advisability of smoking for men, there is none as to its pernicious effect upon boys. It affects the action of the heart and reduces the capacity of the lungs. Young men who are being trained for athletics are not per-

mitted to smoke by their trainers because, as they say, "It is bad for the wind." The argument that will appeal most forcibly to your boy is that smoking will stunt his growth. It has been proved that youthful smokers are shorter and weigh less than their comrades who do not smoke. Cigarettes are particularly injurious. Nicotine, the active principle in tobacco, is said by chemists to be, next to prussic acid, the most rapidly fatal poison known. The tender tissues of a growing boy cannot absorb even a very small quantity of it without most injurious results.—February *Ladies' Home Journal*.

---

### Paving the Way for Despotism.

#### THE FRUIT OF THE NEW DOCTRINE OF GOVERNMENT "OUTSIDE THE CONSTITUTION."

*"Springfield Republican."*

THE Senate committee on Porto Rico goes the full measure of the unconstitutional demands of the imperialist policy. It not only denies that the Federal Constitution is binding upon Congress in tax and tariff legislation for this and the other island dependencies; it denies that the Constitution is binding upon Congress in any particular where the territory of the United States, outside of the States within the Union, is concerned. For the majority of the committee say:—

"It is within our discretion to make the inhabitants of Porto Rico citizens of the United States or not; so it is within the power and discretion of Congress to make the inhabitants of the Philippines and other islands we may acquire citizens, or withhold that quality from them. It is also within the power of Congress to regulate and restrict and prohibit, if thought advisable, the passing of the inhabitants of the Philippines or other islands from their country into ours, or to prevent the products of their labor from coming into unjust competition with the labor of this country."

The sweeping and revolutionary nature of this contention will best appear by referring to the constitutional rule of citizenship. The Fourteenth Amendment provides that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States." But the committee say that persons born in Porto Rico or the Philippines, even though subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, are not citizens, and cannot be citizens until Congress chooses to confer that quality upon them.

Then it follows of course that when the Constitution provides that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude "shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction," it is within the power of Congress to establish slavery in Porto Rico or the Philippines or not, just as it chooses. For if the constitutional law of citizenship does not extend to all places subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, the con-

stitutional law of slavery does not extend any further. And if the people of the islands are not or are not to become citizens of the United States, what is or will be their status? What are they? To what power do they owe allegiance? And if to the United States, does our claim to their allegiance carry with it no reciprocal obligation in conferring the rights and privileges of citizenship? They would seem, according to the committee, to be political non-descripts—mere ciphers in the affairs of nations. They are political slaves and might almost as well be made industrial slaves, and it is accordingly meet that the Thirteenth or Slavery Amendment should be abrogated along with the Citizenship Amendment.

The Constitution again provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of press or speech. But as the Constitution is not binding on Congress when the territories are concerned, Congress can make what religious or newspaper laws it pleases in the territories. Congress is prohibited conditionally from passing bills of attainder or ex-post facto laws; but if the Senate committee is right it can pass all such bills and laws it pleases in the case of the territories. It can grant titles of nobility in the territories. It can, in short, do anything. It is bound by no restrictions. The fundamental law of the nation is suspended when it comes to the territories, and Congress is so far the most absolute despot that ever ruled—entirely without any responsibility to the subject people over which it exercises an unrepresentative sway.

This is the very flower and essence of imperialism. It only remains to be asked how long the Constitution is likely to remain binding upon Congress in the case of interstate legislation after it has so lightly been tossed aside in relation to all other territory coming within the jurisdiction of the United States.

---

### A Fitting Simile.

HERE is a paragraph from a report of the recent assault on Ladysmith:—

"The men on both sides are reported to have fought like demons, the horror and bewilderment of the scene presenting a picture without parallel in the experience of those who took part in the encounter."

The expression used, "fought like demons," is a well-known one in the description of battles. It is very appropriate, too; but if, as we are continually assured, war is consistent with Christianity, and is even at times a part of Christianity, why do we not sometimes hear of men "fighting like angels"? Surely this ought to be the case when two "Christian nations" engage in war. Ah, everybody knows that there is nothing angelic about war, and it is only Jesuitical casuistry that

enables anybody to reconcile it with Christianity.—*London Present Truth.*

THE new political phrase "outside the Constitution" is descriptive of a vast region which American statesmen have not yet explored,—a sea upon which they are without chart or compass. The Constitution is the chart upon which is marked the only known way of safety in American government.

In carnal warfare the soldier aims to take others' lives and save his own. In Christian warfare the soldier gives his own life to save others.

## Bound Volumes for 1899.

The questions that have through the past year stirred to its very depths the spiritual and political life of this nation, and the relationship which the AMERICAN SENTINEL has sustained to these questions, makes the bound volume for 1899 a very valuable book. To the student of the great question of human rights it is a necessity.

Our prices are as formerly: In cloth, with leather back and corners, \$2.50; in heavy manila paper cover, \$1.50. These prices include postage.

Those who desire to secure copies should send in their orders at once.

### 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.

## AGENTS WANTED NOW!

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

### A Dictionary in Your Vest Pocket.

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



Contains:

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

**45,800 Words.**

YOU NEED A  
DICTIONARY

OF THIS KIND.

Send to us at once for it.

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

## THE PERIL OF THE REPUBLIC.

BY PROF. P. T. MAGAN.

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

The following are a few of the chapter headings:—

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

"The Peril of the Republic of the United States of America" is just from the press, contains 11 chapters, 196 pages, (size 6½ x 8 inches), and is handsomely and durably bound in red cloth. Price \$1.00. Address

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,  
39 Bond St., New York City.  
Or, Oakland, Cal.  
Kansas City, Mo.

# GENUINE "OXFORD" BIBLE \$1.50.

Bibles have recently advanced in price, especially the cheaper styles, but for the present we offer this Bible at the old reduced price.

So many people are asking for "nice, large type" in a Bible small enough to be conveniently carried, that we are led to offer this one. Notice how large and clear the type is, and the size is only 5½x7¾x1¼ inches.

It contains all the really necessary "Helps," such as Dictionary of Proper Names, Subject Index, Concordance, 15 Maps, etc., over 300 pages in all, but not so much useless matter as to make the book too thick and heavy.

*Of Christ's kingdom.*

PSALMS.

*The church's confidence in God.*

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

9. "Kings' daughters were among thy honourable women: upon thy right hand did stand the queen in

<sup>2</sup> Heb. an high place for us.  
<sup>a</sup> Cant. 6. 8.  
<sup>b</sup> 1 Kin. 2. 19.  
<sup>c</sup> Ps. 66. 5.

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

8 "Come, behold the works of the LORD, what desolations he hath

Specimen of type in our Style C-1 Bible.

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

**Our Price Still \$1.50, Postpaid.**

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

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

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,  
39 Bond St., New York, N. Y.



## THE MARKED NEW TESTAMENT.

For Missions and Mission Workers, the object being to call the reader's attention to certain texts marked in red or black ink in facsimile of hand-markings. There are 225 marked verses, bearing on the subject of salvation through Christ; including repentance, faith, obedience, etc. Size 5½ x 5½ inches. Cloth, cut flush. Price 15 Cents, with discount when ordered in quantity.


## BLACK BEAUTY.

By Annie Sewell. A story of a horse which will teach young and old much about the proper care and treatment of dumb animals. Size 4¼ x 6½ inches, 252 pages, with illustrations, neat cloth binding beautifully stamped in gold and colored inks. Price 40 cts.

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

## "A FRIEND IN THE KITCHEN."

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



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

Its 400 recipes are interspersed with short talks on foods and food combinations and other items of

practical value and importance to every housewife, as well as to those who wish to study the subject of diet for their own benefit.

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

**GOOD AGENTS WANTED.**

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

## HEALTH

How to Find It When It's Lost.

How to Keep It When It's Found.

By B. Franklin Richards.

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

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

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

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

OAKLAND, CAL.  
KANSAS CITY, MO.

# A Unique Pen==THE "POST."

Being the ONLY  
SELF-FILLING AND SELF-CLEANING

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

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

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

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

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



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




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



**Six Cardinal Points**  
Peculiar to the  
**"POST:"**

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



A  
Unique  
Journal==  
The  
AMERICAN  
SENTINEL.

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

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

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

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

The price of the SENTINEL is \$1.00 per year.

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

Do you want a really reliable pen? Now is your chance. If desired we will send the SENTINEL to one address and the pen to another.

Address

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



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1900.

THE Sunday laws of the States all recognize that it is necessary to do some work on Sunday, and provide an exemption for such work, often specifying work which is necessary only to avoid some pecuniary loss. But if it is a necessity that people should be saved from pecuniary loss, is it also a necessity that the people have the right to choose their own hours of rest, labor, and recreation? Are the natural rights of the people as much of a necessity to them as is something that can be represented in dollars and cents? The SENTINEL contends that nothing can be more of a necessity to the people than that they be allowed to enjoy their natural rights and liberties.

IF England were a Christian nation, would she be more aroused over the fact that a republic in South Africa opposes the march of her empire through that continent than over the fact that many millions of her subjects in India are stricken with famine, suffering from hunger and disease,—men, women, and little children wasting to skeletons—who must perish unless some friendly hand is reached out to help them? Would England now be spending her millions and taxing all her mighty resources to conquer a foreign people and deny to them the right of self-government, instead of to relieve the dreadful distress of human beings in India who look to her for help, if she were truly a Christian nation? Who can answer this question in the affirmative?

How TRUE was the prophecy of Thomas Jefferson, the great American advocate and exponent of natural rights, concerning the survival of the rights of the American people:

“From the conclusion of this war [the Revolution] we shall be going down hill. It will not then be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and their rights disregarded. They will forget themselves but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion.”—*Notes on Virginia, Query XVII.*

Is it not true that the people have “forgotten themselves but in the sole faculty of making money?” Are they not careless of their rights, save such rights as are concerned with money-getting—is not money-getting, with the vast majority, the one all-absorbing craze? And how far off can we be from the convulsion which Jefferson foresaw?

WHAT is more tiresome than to spend a whole day doing nothing? What is more taxing on the nerves than a whole day of compulsory idleness? And yet this is the remedy proposed for the weariness that comes from the week of labor, by the people who advocate Sunday laws. For those people, as is well known, want to forbid both labor and recreation on the day they believe to be the Christian Sabbath. They themselves can find congenial occupation in going to church on Sunday, and they would go to church and observe the day without any Sunday law. But people who do not want to go to church, and do not have a religious regard for the day, can only be made more weary than ever by being forcibly shut off from the avenues of exercise and recreation they would naturally choose—compelled to loaf through the daylight hours of the Sunday Sabbath. To call this a remedy for weariness is truly a mockery.

THE governmental authorities in the Cook Islands have recently, by law, changed the Sabbath observed there from the seventh to the first day of the week. Previous to this, everybody had been observing the seventh day and working on the first day, even those people who believed in Sunday observance and by whose efforts the change to Sunday was brought about. But now, people in the islands who believe in observing the seventh day, are to be punished by fine or hard labor for continuing to do what all the people were doing only a short time before, and what had always been done since the islands were first discovered. (See p. 99.) This is the spirit of all Sunday legislation.

THE imposition of a tariff upon Porto Rican products, now that the island belongs to the United States, is clearly contrary to the Constitution, and is vigorously denounced by American journals, even by those which have favored the policy by which Porto Rico became United States property. *The Evening Post*, of this city, says this proposed measure will be “an act of unparalleled and shameful cruelty,” “so cruel, so heartless, so charged with disaster and starvation for 1,000,000 human beings, that to adopt it would entitle Spain, or Russia, or even Turkey, to send missionaries to us.” And *The Independent*, as we mentioned last week, condemns it in terms hardly less strong.

But what else was to be expected? The imperial policy is a heartless policy; and why should any one who advocates it be surprised that heartless measures should be the outcome? It is all only what is demanded by the “interests of trade,” and these interests are in most governments the controlling force to-day.

LOOKING at Kentucky, the country is admonished, or should be, that it is time to talk more softly about the virtue and necessity of Anglo-Saxon civilization, for other people afar off who do not know how to govern themselves, and might get into a family quarrel if left alone.