



"Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political."

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 3, 1893.

NUMBER 31.

## American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.  
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

THE professed Protestant Church managers of the United States, knowing and confessing that there is no command of God for Sunday observance, and not being willing plainly to acknowledge the authority of the Catholic Church, which is the original authority that has commanded it, and yet desiring to make Sunday observance universal and a national institution in the United States *as a duty toward God*, were placed in an embarrassing dilemma. They were plainly in great danger of being obliged to go back to Rome.

THEY found by experience that the people of the United States are not inclined to accept, as the will of God, the bare statement of church authorities as unquestioningly as little birds take their food. Besides this, they found a small body of Christian people scattered all over the United States, who, they have said over and over, are exceedingly active and vigorous in telling the people everywhere, not only that Sunday is not the Sabbath, but that the seventh day is; not only that there is no command of God for observing the first day of the week, but pointing always to the plain command of God—"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God"—for the observance of the seventh day of the week. These things only increased the dilemma.

WHAT should be done? What *could* be done? Well, as they knew there was no command of God to keep the first day of the week; and as it was not according to Protestant profession to practice religious observances for which there is no "Thus saith the Lord"; and above all, as it would not do for *them* to cite the authority of the Catholic Church as of obligation upon the people; to escape their predicament they did this: They took the commandment of God, which says, "The

*seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and *interpreted* it to mean "the first day is the Sabbath," that thus they might have (?) a command of God for Sunday observance. Thus they hoped to find authority by which they could require Sunday observance by the people and so be saved from going back to Rome.

BUT lo! they found that this did not deliver them from their dilemma. Besides their forgetting that to presume to interpret the Word of God, is, in itself, to set up the claim of infallibility which leads straight back to Rome anyhow, they found that when they had set the example of interpreting the commandment of God to suit themselves, the people were not slow to follow the example in interpreting *the interpretation* to suit *themselves*. Thus their effort to escape proved doubly futile: first, in that their example in interpreting the commandment was followed to their detriment; and secondly, in that they had no more power to secure the recognition of their interpretation, than they had before to secure the observance of Sunday without the interpretation—no more power to secure the observance of Sunday after forcing it into the commandment of God where it does not belong, than they had before to secure the observance of Sunday as it is, in the commandment of Rome, where it does belong. Thus their effort to escape the dilemma only increased the difficulty.

WHAT next? Oh, they would have the national Government take up the question, and indorse their side of it as correct, and thus would get the power of the Government under their control with which to enforce upon the people their interpretation of the commandment of God, and so would effect their purpose to make Sunday observance a national thing *as a duty toward God*. And they have succeeded, so far as to get the Government to adopt their interpretation of the commandment. We have given the threatening resolution with which they flooded Congress by which they required Congress to do their bidding. We need not cite that again. But it is proper to print again the result, for the very important fact which it discloses.

THE official record is as follows:—  
MR. QUAY.—On page 122, line 13, after the word "act," I move to insert:—

"And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the Sabbath-day."

The reasons for the amendment I will send to the desk to be read. The secretary will have the kindness to read from the Book of Law [this was the Bible—Ed.] I send to the desk, the part enclosed in brackets.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The part indicated will be read.

The secretary read as follows:—

"Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it."—*Congressional Record, July 10, 1892, p. 6614.*

The discussion of this motion and amendment was opened by Senator Manderson, of Nebraska, to the following effect:—

The language of this amendment is, that the Exposition shall be closed on the "Sabbath-day." I submit that if the senator from Pennsylvania desires that the Exposition shall be closed upon Sunday, this language will not necessarily meet this idea.

The word "Sabbath-day" simply means that it is a rest day, and it may be Saturday or Sunday, and it would be subject to the discretion of those who will manage this Exposition, whether they should close the Exposition on the last day of the week, in conformity with that observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists, or should close it on the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath. It certainly seems to me that this amendment should be adopted by the senator from Pennsylvania, and, if he proposes to close this Exposition, that it should be closed on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

Therefore I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I hope may be accepted by the senator from Pennsylvania, to strike out the words "Exposition on the Sabbath-day," and insert "mechanical portion of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday."—*Id., July 12, p. 6694.*

This amendment to Senator Quay's amendment, as far as it inserted "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday," in place of "the Sabbath day," was adopted, and all further proceeding was conducted upon no other basis than that "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday" is the Sabbath, and that as such its observance is due to God.

FROM this official record, it is as plain as anything can be, that the Congress of the United States (for the House not only adopted this, but on its own part, on a direct issue by a vote of one hundred and thirty-one to thirty-six decided that the seventh day is not the Sabbath, after deciding that Sunday is), in its official capacity, did adopt the interpretation which the churches had made, and did officially and by legislative action put that interpretation upon the commandment of God. Congress did define what the word "Sabbath-day" "means"; and that it "may be" one day or another, "Saturday or Sunday"; and did decide which day it should be, namely, "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday." This is as clearly an interpretation of the Bible as was ever made on earth.

AND, like all other human interpretations of the Scriptures, *it is wrong*. As witness this Word: "When the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Salome had bought sweet spices that they might come and anoint him. And *very early* in the morning, *the first day of the week*, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun."—Mark 16:1, 2. Thus the plain Word of God says that "the Sabbath was past" before the first day of the week came at all—yes, before even the "very early" part of it came. But lo! the Congress of the United States officially decides that the Sabbath *is* the first day of the week. Now, when the Word of God plainly says that the Sabbath *is past* before the first day of the week comes, and yet Congress says that the first day of the week *is* the Sabbath, which is right?

NOR is the Word of God indefinite as to what this distinction refers. Here is the Word as to that: "That day [the day of the crucifixion] was the preparation, and *the Sabbath* drew on. And the women also which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath-day *according to the commandment*. Now, upon the *first day of the week*, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared and certain others with them."—Luke 23:54-56; 24:1. Here it is plainly shown that the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment, and the first day of the week, are two separate and distinct days entirely. And yet Congress gravely defines that "the Sabbath-day" "may be one or the other"! The Word of God plainly says that the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment, is past before the first day of the week comes at all. And yet Congress declares that the first day of the week is itself the Sabbath! Which is right? Is the Lord able to say what he means? or is it essential that his commandments shall be put through a course of congressional procedure and interpretation in order that his meaning shall reach the people of the United States? And further, are not the people of the United States capable of finding out for themselves what the meaning of the Word of God is? or is it so, that it is necessary that Congress should be put between the people and God so as to insure to them the true and divine meaning of His Word?

WHETHER these questions be answered

one way or the other, it is certain that this is precisely the attitude which has been assumed by the Congress of the United States. Whatever men may believe, or whatever men may say, as to the right or the wrong of this question, there is no denying the fact that Congress has taken it upon itself to interpret the Scripture for the people of the United States. This is a fact. It has been done. *Then where is the difference between this assumption and that of the other Pope?* The Roman Pope assumes the prerogative of interpreting the Scripture for the people of the whole world. Congress has assumed the prerogative of interpreting the Scripture for the people of the United States. Where is the difference in these claims—except perhaps in this, that whereas the claim of the Roman Pope embraces the whole world, the claim of this congressional Pope embraces only the United States. And yet there is hardly room for this distinction; because this interpretation by Congress was intended to include, and to be of force upon, all the nations that took part in the World's Fair, and these were expected to be all the nations of the world. So that, practically, the two claims are so nearly alike, that it is only another illustration of the truth that there is no possibility of measuring degrees in the respective claims of rival Popes. There are no degrees in infallibility anyhow. That the Fair is not closed on Sunday out of respect to this interpretation, does not alter the fact that Congress has interpreted the commandment of God. Besides this, the decision that assured the opening of the Fair on Sunday distinctly excluded all consideration of the question on constitutional grounds.

AND to escape this claim and its direct consequence, was precisely the purpose which our fathers had in view when they forbade the Government to have anything to do with questions of religion or religious observances. At the very first step for religious freedom after the Declaration of Independence, which was the first step toward the result fixed in the national Constitution forbidding interference with religion, there was made this weighty statement: "*It is impossible* for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects professing the Christian faith *without erecting a claim to infallibility which would lead us back to the Church of Rome*." In this Sunday interpretation Congress did distinctly decide a question of preference between sects professing the Christian faith. Two different sects professing the Christian faith claim that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord." A greater number of sects professing the Christian faith claim that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Sabbath." And both base their claims upon the fourth commandment. Now Congress has definitely decided the question of preference in favor of the latter, and has declared that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," *is* the Sabbath of that commandment. Thus, Congress has done the very thing which our fathers forbade it to do that the people of this Nation might not be led back to Rome. Congress has done the thing which the founders of our Government declared it "*impossible*" to do, without doing that which would lead "back to the Church of Rome."

How certainly this result follows, can be seen at a glance: These professed Protestant churches had enough "influence" upon Congress to secure the decision of *this* question in their favor. And as soon as it was done they gladly and loudly proclaimed that "this settles the Sabbath question." Now, all questions between Catholics and these Protestants even, are not entirely settled. One of these, for instance, is on this very question of Sunday observance—not, indeed, *whether* it shall be observed, but *how* it shall be observed. Let this or any other question be disputed between them, and all the Catholic Church has now to do is to bring enough "influence" to bear upon Congress to get the question decided in her favor—and there you have it! the whole Nation is then delivered bodily over into subjection to Rome. And no Protestant who has had anything to do with this Sunday-law movement can ever say a word. For if the action of Congress settles a religious question when it is decided in their favor, they can never deny that such action as certainly settles a religious question when it is decided in favor of the Catholic Church. If they accept such a decision when it suits *them*, they must likewise accept such a decision when it suits the Catholics. And this other thing will as certainly come, as this has already come. And thus the Government and people of the United States will have been delivered into the hands of Rome by this blind procedure of apostate Protestantism. That which our fathers feared, and which they supposed they had forever prevented, will have come. And the first and great decisive step has been taken, in this successful demand of the churches of the United States that Congress should interpret the Scripture, decide a religious dispute, and "settle" a religious question.

THAT it may be seen how well our fathers understood this, we give just three sentences from the documents and the times of '76:—

It is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility which would lead us back to the Church of Rome.

Again:—

The impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, *setting up their own opinions* and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greater part of the world and through all times.

And again:—

To judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an unalienable right, which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated, and the Reformation from Popery carried on, can never be transferred to another.

Thus spoke Madison, Jefferson and their noble fellow-workers, at the time of the establishing of the United States Government. Upon these principles was the national Government founded. How entirely these divine principles have been forgotten both by American legislators and Protestant ecclesiastics, and how complete a revolution from these principles has been wrought, the facts presented in these notes in some measure show, and soon coming developments will fully demonstrate.

BUT even as the matter now stands,

every person in the United States is shut up to one of two things: either to assent to, or decidedly protest against, the right of Congress to interpret the Bible on this Sabbath question or any other. To assent to it, is to confess the infallibility of Congress and thus to put Congress in the place of God. To reject it, and protest against it, is to subject ourselves to the charge of "treason," "anarchy," "atheism," etc., etc.; but at the same time is to maintain the fundamental principles of the Government of the United States, the fundamental principles of the Reformation in its purity, the divine principles of Christianity itself as announced by the Lord Jesus, and the divine right of man to freedom before God. The historian of the Reformation has well said: "The establishment of a tribunal charged with the interpretation of the Bible, had terminated only in slavishly subjecting man to man in what should be most unfettered—conscience and faith."—*D'Aubigne, book XIII., chap. VI.* Revolt from this thing before, was the emancipation of mankind. This is the only course now to take to be free. They would not serve the beast. Will you now worship this wicked image of the beast? Everybody in the United States is now shut up to this decision. Which way do you decide? A. T. J.

#### Gone Over to Rome.

A REV. MR. ADAMS, of this city, a former Episcopal minister, has become a convert to the Church of Rome, and some of his friends profess to discover in his action evidence of an unsound mind. It may be so; but if by this Mr. Adams shows incipient insanity, what shall be said of the all but universal leaning of Protestants towards Rome and Romanism, evidences of which are discernible to-day on every hand?

Rome is all that she claims to be or, she is worse than nothing, as a church, and is indeed the apostate power so graphically described in Daniel and the Revelation, and for centuries regarded by Protestants as antichrist. Rome claims to be *the Church*. This unchristianizes all the "sects." If Rome is *the Church*, Protestants are no part of *the Church*. If Rome is not *the Church* her claim is blasphemous and she is antichrist.

But within the last quarter of a century a great change has taken place in the sentiment of the Protestant world. Rome is, with the masses of Protestants, no longer antichrist, but one division of the Church of Christ, and this notwithstanding the fact that she has abated nothing of her claims. Thus by admitting that Rome is Christian they unwittingly unchristianize themselves. Then, instead of it being regarded as an evidence of insanity for one to become reconciled to "the Church," should it not rather be considered the highest wisdom?—We mean from the standpoint of the milk-and-water Protestant who has already given his case away by acknowledging that Rome is Christian.

Moreover, every man recognizes the truth that the Church of Christ must have an infallible standard, an ultimate source of appeal, an end of all controversy. Protestants formerly had this in the sacred Scriptures. Catholics have it in "the Church" herself and in the Pope the head of "the Church." Now Protestants almost universally repudiate the Scriptures as the all-sufficient and infallible

guide, and must walk either in sparks of their own kindling or else turn to Rome, as Mr. Adams has done.

Mr. Adams has only followed to its logical conclusion the road that the great mass of Protestants have been traveling for years. It is the wrong road, but it is no more wrong in its termination than at its beginning. And they who are in it are Protestants only in name, whether they have the courage to travel it all the way or not. There can be no compromise between Christ and antichrist.

C. P. B.

#### Some Opinions of the Religious Press.

THE *Christian Advocate* of this city, calls the closing of the Fair on Sunday "Compulsory Right Doing," and says:—

The course of the directory has been such from the beginning that one cannot be sure that it is not now trying to hoodwink Christian people. Whatever it may hereafter do, it has broken the contract and is morally bound to pay that money back to the Government. Its past conduct affords no guarantee that it would not close for two months, to draw Christians and thereby swell its receipts, and then, feeling safe, open on the remaining Sundays.

The *New York Observer* calls it the "Failure of Sunday Opening," and says:—

Sunday opening of the World's Fair has proved a failure, and hereafter the gates will be closed on the first day of the week. The vote of the local directory, taken on Friday last, rescinding its former action, was overwhelmingly in favor of closing, standing twenty-four to four. It was a vote, however, forced by the commercial failure of Sunday opening, and in no wise a voluntary concession to the religious and law-abiding sentiment of the Nation. The directory is wholly mercenary, and in closing the Exposition on the Sabbath has regard only to the pecuniary profits of the enterprise, as it had in opening it on that day. Had open gates on the Lord's day proved remunerative, they would have remained open throughout the term of the Fair, and the laws of God, of Congress and of the directory itself have been defied and trampled on just as they have been for the past two months. They are closed solely under the compulsion of financial loss. Neither fear of God nor regards for man have influenced action in the least. The only factor to which attention has been paid was the steady diminution of receipts from Sunday admissions to a point below the actual operating expenses for the day, and the patent impossibility of making any arrangement by which attendance could be made remunerative.

The directory has been defeated and put to shame and unable to compel exhibitors to keep open their exhibits and to bear the financial loss resulting from its dishonest act, has offered the public the only reparation possible for its violation of solemn obligations and its desecration of the Sabbath day. But it has yielded only in order to make money.

The *Examiner* (Baptist) treats it as "An Instructive Failure," and thus assigns the reason of the final decision to close the gates on Sunday:—

It was confidently predicted that the opening of the gates on Sunday would result in doubling or trebling the attendance. As a matter of fact, the Sunday attendance began at a little over seventy-one thousand and had fallen to less than forty-four thousand on the last Sunday the gates were open. The plea for a Sunday opening was made in behalf of the poor workingman, but the poor workingman proved not to be so great a fool as the average Chicago newspaper takes him to be. When he goes to the Exposition he wants to see the whole show, not half the show. But the managers are powerless to give him a whole show on Sunday. A considerable part of the buildings were closed on Sunday, and in the buildings that were open a considerable part of the exhibits were covered. The poor workingman sensibly staid away from this half show, and manages to go when he can see everything.

The *Christian Statesman*, entirely unmindful of the fact that the Lord cares no more for Sunday than for any other of "the six working days" (Ezek. 46:1), hails the closing as "A Triumph of Righteousness," and exclaims:—

Hallelujah! The Lord God omnipotent reigneth!

By an overwhelming majority of the Board of Directors of the Columbian Fair it has been decided to close the gates hereafter on the Lord's day.

Our readers will agree with us that this is a triumph for righteousness such as the world has seldom witnessed. All the more significant because of the reason compelling this decision. These reasons do not appear in the resolutions adopted by the directory in their final decision. No, these officials were true to their character for evasion and insincerity to the last.

They recite in the resolution adopted in deciding to close, that the gates had been opened in response to the petitions of a large majority of the "public" and are now closed because of the disproportion between the numbers that are compelled to work seven days in the week if the Fair is kept open and the numbers attending on the Sabbath. This is simply a coward's excuse. The reasons for opening the gates were two-fold, viz., the greed of the managers for gain and a malicious intent toward the Christian religion. But no matter now—these enemies of righteousness have been put to shame before the eyes of the whole world. A more conspicuous subversion of evil designs and triumph of righteousness it is not possible to conceive. Let God have all the glory. These men made a pit and digged it deep and proposed to bury the American Sabbath out of sight, and, lo! they are fallen into it themselves. Experience is a dear school but fools will learn in no other.

While not strictly a press opinion, the following from a sermon by Joseph Cook, in Chicago, July 23, is to the point:—

Greed and the sordid avariciousness of men opened the gates of Jackson Park; the unholy and idolatrous worship of that most abject, degenerate and pitiful god, Mammon. Greed has also been the instrument by which the directors have closed the gates of the white city to-day.

And yet this closing is heralded to the world as a "great moral" victory, even as was the action of Congress in making Sunday-closing a condition of the gift of the souvenir coins; and this notwithstanding the fact that neither result is due to any higher motive than the hope of gain. Congress yielded to the demands of the churches in the first place under threat of political boycott, and the implied promise of votes if the action were taken. And now, the directors finding that there was no money in a Sunday Fair, have closed the gates for the purpose of securing the support and patronage of the Sunday people who would otherwise boycott the Fair. If this is a moral victory, then is bribery virtue and greed is godliness! C. P. B.

#### The Sphere of Civil Government.

THE Nashville *Christian Advocate*, the general organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, published an article recently in which the position was taken that "with it [the religious Sabbath] the State can have nothing to do." This statement has given offense to some of the *Advocate's* readers, and one of them takes the editor to task, as follows:—

In the *Advocate* of the 15th inst. is an editorial, "The Sabbath, Religious and Civil," against which I enter a solemn protest. . . . I am in my eighty-third year, and have been for a long time an humble member of the Methodist Church. I trust you will lose no time in correcting the impression that your editorial has made upon me and others. The general tone of the whole editorial is exceptionable, the gist of it being summed up in the following sentence: "So much for the purely religious Sabbath, with which the State has and can have nothing to do." There is not a Christian government on earth but does, and ought to, recognize the Sabbath as a holy day established as such by God himself. With the different religions the government has nothing to do. It does not claim some to be true and others false, but it does hold that the Sabbath is not only a day of rest, but a holy day; it does not consider civil contracts entered into on that day as binding and legal. Whether you intended it or not, the article in question conveys the impression that you look upon the matter of closing the Columbian Exposition solely from a civil

point of view. I consider your argument a surrender of the whole religious question.

Several paragraphs of the *Advocate's* reply are so good that we give them:—

"The question between us is, then, not whether the Sabbath should be religiously observed, but whether such observance should be enforced by the civil government. Without the slightest hesitation we say no, and this for various reasons:

"1. Civil government has a distinct sphere, that of protecting all its citizens in life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Whenever it attempts more than this it gets beyond its appointed bounds.

"2. If civil government is under obligation to support one institution of religion, as such, then is it not equally under obligation to support every other on the same ground? Granted the premises, and there is no escape from this conclusion; and yet there is no man, we suppose, who would be bold enough to insist that the conclusion is sound.

"3. Governmental support for the institutions of religion implies governmental control. The whole history of the past proves this assertion. If the Church insists on being propped up by "the powers that be," it must submit to be governed by them.

"4. Nor do the foregoing considerations present the strongest view of the case. We go still farther and declare that it is impossible for the State to enforce the religious observance of the Sabbath. Religion is essentially a thing of motives, whereas the State has to do only with outward actions. Can the State make men pray? Can the State make men worship God? Only religious men can keep the Sabbath in a religious way; and vast numbers of our citizens are not religious, and do not pretend to be.

"All these errors grow out of the mistaken notion that the State is bound to labor directly for securing every possible good thing. But the fact is that there are many good things that the State is helpless to secure and ought not to attempt. God has provided other agencies for gaining them. We fear that many believers in Christ have lost the robust faith and courage that in earlier days made their brethren 'mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds,' and are inclined to go down to a secular Egypt for the help that can come only from the living God."

#### More Sunday Closing.

In the Battle Creek, Mich., *Daily Journal*, of July 7, is the following:—

Homer is enforcing Sunday closing, an attempt having been made to prevent even milk peddlers from doing business on that day. All places of business were closed last Sunday save the drug stores and markets and these were open but a short time.

Homer is about twenty-six miles from Battle Creek.

A gentleman writes from the South:—

They have closed up all places of business in Asheville, N. C., on Sunday, and have fixed the penalty for violation at \$50.

Nor is the nefarious work confined to the United States, as is shown by the following clipping from the *Port-of-Spain Gazette*, Island of Trinidad, of June 7th:—

The members of the C. E. Union will, at their next meeting, discuss the question of Sunday closing in the Island. Resolutions will be passed in regard to the movement. Friends desirous of hearing the discussion are welcome. The meeting will be held . . . on Thursday the 8th instant, at 8.00 P. M.

What is the meaning of this spontaneous out-cropping of the spirit of bigotry in so many different portions, not only on the continent, but even in the islands of the sea? Though each seems to be independent of the other, without any concerted action at all, does it not show that one and the same spirit is behind it all? And is it not the spirit which had already begun to work in Paul's day, which begets in those whom it deceives "pleasure in unrighteousness"? W. E. HOWELL.

#### Rhode Island Sunday Agitation.

THE cry for a union of religion with the civil government is becoming very widespread; being heard even in Rhode Island the State which of all the States should be the last one to seek such a union, having for its founder Roger Williams, who fled from the persecutions of the Massachusetts theocracy in the midst of winter to Providence, there to set up a government in which religious freedom might be enjoyed by all, and Church and State government might be kept forever separate. But lo! and behold, the following by the President of Brown University, a Baptist by profession, in a speech at Peace Dale, R. I., last March, reported in the *Narragansett Times*, from which we copy:—

From time immemorial we have been taught by men who meant to teach us right, a certain artificial separation between what is known as religious and what is known as secular. . . . Now I take it, that that doctrine, carried to the extreme at any rate, is prejudicial to society. It is untrue for a strictly religious point of view, and it is most deleterious from a civil and social point of view. . . . In the seventeenth century Roger Williams came to this country with these false notions, relatively false notions as compared with those they supplanted, but still false notions.

Thus President Andrews teaches that a total separation of "what is known as religious and what is known as secular, is prejudicial to society, and is untrue and wrong from a religious and social point of view." What better papal doctrine could be taught than this? Would the Pope ask anything different? Moreover he says that Roger Williams' idea of this entire separation of Church and State or "what is known as religious and what is known as secular," was wrong. That his "notions were false notions relatively false." Then here is a man coming to the front as an educationalist, a politician, and a religious teacher in this State who declares that the principle of religious liberty for which Roger Williams suffered and which he established at the risk of his own life, and for the benefit of his posterity ever after, as well as for himself, was wrong. Thus the principle laid down in the Bill of Rights of the State of Rhode Island, which reads as follows, is wrong also:—

WHEREAS, Almighty God has created the mind free, and all attempts to influence it by temporal punishment, or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness; and, WHEREAS, A principal object of our venerated ancestors, in their migration to this country and their settlement of this State, was, as they expressed it, to hold forth a lively experiment that a flourishing civil State might stand and be best maintained with full liberty in religious concerns; . . . and that every man shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and to profess, and by argument to maintain, his opinion in matters of religion; and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect his civil capacity.

And President Andrews would have a man's religious faith affect his civil capacity, because he says the teaching of Roger Williams and others was wrong on this point. Thus we see that his views of the

relation between civil government and religion when carried to their legitimate conclusions would carry him right over to the Papacy. This is all in accordance with National Reform ideas. Make the State dependent upon religion and religion upon the State.

And now along comes a petition from Protestant and Catholic clergymen asking the State to render assistance in the enforcement of a town ordinance, on religious grounds:—

The East Providence Town Council met on the afternoon of July 5, and took action on the petition from clergymen and others in relation to Sunday amusements at the shore resorts. Almost all the clergymen of the town, including Rev. Father Hart, of the Church of the Sacred Heart, were present and spoke in support of the petition against Sunday desecration. The following is the petition as presented to Mayor Potter:—

WHEREAS, During last summer at some of the shore resorts along the Providence River and elsewhere in the State, base ball games, theatrical exhibitions, Wild West shows and other performances were openly given on Sundays for pay and for profit, in open violation of the laws of Rhode Island; and

WHEREAS, Intoxicating liquor was sold in abundance upon many of the excursion steamers and at many of these shore resorts last summer, contrary to the laws of Rhode Island; and

WHEREAS, These violations of the State laws drew together on Sunday such disorderly crowds of people as to endanger the life, health and morals of our citizens, and these shore resorts thereby became schools of iniquity for the training of youths into ways of dissipation and vice; and

WHEREAS, Such unlawful conduct and proceedings are creating for this State an unenviable reputation far and wide; and

WHEREAS, Such conduct and proceedings are distasteful and offensive to the great mass of moral and law-abiding people of this State, and are not only contrary to law and tend to a contempt and violation of all law, but are subversive of all those sacred traditions and principles upon which this Nation was founded, and to which she owes much of her marvellous prosperity under the guidance of Almighty God; and

WHEREAS, It is not our intention to ask for the special enforcement of such laws as would lead to the distinctively religious observance of the day, however desirable such enforcement might be:

Therefore we, the undersigned, ministers of the various churches, and citizens of the State of Rhode Island, desiring to prevent the desecration of the Lord's day, and to hand it down inviolate to our posterity, do hereby humbly petition the Mayor and Aldermen of Providence, and the Town Councils of East Providence, Barrington, Cranston and Warwick, and the sheriffs of Providence and Kent Counties, that they will use special and extraordinary measures to prevent a repetition of the above specified illegal and vicious practices during the coming season, and the same your humble petitioners will ever pray.

That this petition is wholly in the interests of religious legislation is apparent on the face of it, although the framers of it say, "It is not our intention to ask for the special enforcement of such laws as would lead to the distinctively religious observance of the day, however desirable such enforcement might be." If this petition aimed at the well being of all the people both physically and mentally and for the safety of the State, that its inhabitants might become "law-abiding" citizens, the "schools of iniquity" be stopped, and the "health and morals" of the people be promoted, why did they not ask that the drinking saloons, Wild West shows and other things that promote these great evils be closed on other days as well as on Sundays? Is it not just as bad to get drunk on Monday and disregard the State law as on Sunday? and would not the selling of liquor which makes people disorderly, be just as bad on Wednesday as on Sunday? and if "base ball games, theatrical exhibitions, Wild West shows and other performances" are "schools of iniquity for the training of youths into the ways of dissipation and

vice" on Sunday, are they not equally as bad on other days? But oh no! the same paper which publishes the petition states that some of these ministers attend Wild West shows on other days of the week, and find no evil in them.

How does it happen that these things become so evil on Sundays, except it is a religious institution which they wish to have observed, and see no way of having it done except by appealing to the State for its observance? That this is their object they plainly state: "Therefore we, the undersigned, ministers of the various churches, and citizens of the State of Rhode Island, desiring to prevent the *desecration* of the Lord's day, and to hand it down *inviolable* to our posterity, do hereby humbly petition the mayor and aldermen of Providence . . . that they will use special and extraordinary measures to prevent the repetition of the above specified illegal and vicious practices during the coming season." No further comment is needed to show that this is a religious movement wholly, and for religious purposes, and that Protestants, so-called, have united with Catholics or rather gone over to them in asking the State to legislate upon the observance of a day which is wholly a Catholic institution. The question should arise in every mind: Whither are we drifting? and to what are we coming?  
H. J. FARMAN.

#### Chicago Correspondence.

##### The World's Fair Closed on Sunday.

ON Sunday, July 23, the World's Fair was closed. This time by the order of the directors; the proper authorities in charge of the Exposition and responsible for its business interests. As business men representing a business corporation, they have the right, in the interests of their corporation and its stockholders, and according to their best judgment, to close the Fair and refuse to do business on any day of the week that they see fit. The courts have upheld them in their refusal to obey the arbitrary Sunday closing provision of Congress, though on a technical plea of the bad faith of Congress and not upon the proper principle which underlies the matter,—that Congress had no right to pass the proviso, and that such legislation on its part was unconstitutional. But nevertheless the directory was absolved, legally, from following the terms of its agreement with Congress as to Sunday closing.

Now, of its own choice, it has seen fit to close the gates on Sunday. This it had the right to do as far as any principle of civil liberty in religious things is concerned. Neither Congress nor legislators nor courts have any right, nor ever have had any right, to say to any individual or any corporation or the directors of any corporation, that they shall do this or that, or not do this or that, simply and solely because of the religious idea contained in Sunday, Christmas, saint's days, or other holy days of the Church.

The condition of things, by which the directors were brought to the conclusion that it was politic and to their interest to close on Sunday, is one worthy of consideration in view of the progress which is to come in the enforcement upon the people of religious forms. The churches and religious organizations throughout the country which have set themselves to the furtherance of the enforcement of Sunday

observance and moral compulsion by law, under the advice of their leaders, disclaimed any general boycott, but nevertheless privately and quietly this boycott has been organized and pushed with energy. It is not apparent, and may never be, that by it they succeeded in reducing the general attendance upon the Fair during week days, but it is quite certain that the influence brought to bear reduced quite materially, the Sunday attendance; and not only of those who had respect for Sunday and belonged to the church-going community who might nevertheless feel themselves perfectly justifiable in attendance upon the Fair during a portion of the day, Sunday, but the general crowd which never go to church at all, but spend their Sundays in one form or another of amusement, recreation, or jollification, have evidently felt that it was particularly and peculiarly disreputable to attend the World's Fair on Sunday and so have, instead, gone with their beer kegs to the various parks and picnic places and spent their Sundays in reality in a far less reasonable and reputable way.

But still further than this, a quiet and unseen but very active influence has been brought to bear upon the exhibitors and those having charge of the different State buildings. The Keystone Drill Company of Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, having among its officers and directors a number of prominent National Reformers and members of the American Sabbath Union, took the lead in an aggressive action to secure a general covering of the individual exhibits on Sunday, and also threatened a suit on the behalf of the exhibitors themselves for the purpose of closing the World's Fair on Sunday. They claimed that they looked upon the matter from a business standpoint, and this business standpoint from which they looked upon the matter they were in a large measure responsible for themselves: they therefore knew well what they were talking about. They had assisted and made it the business of their lives for years to create as great a prejudice against the Fair as possible if it opened on Sunday, and to secure a boycott against it under such circumstances.

The Fair then being opened on Sunday, they claimed very naturally, that the very people they wanted to come to the Fair and whom they desired as customers, were staying at home because of the Sunday opening. They themselves covered their exhibits on Sunday and made a systematically organized effort to secure as many as possible who would follow their example, and boasted that three-fifths of the Exposition was covered from view, and made this as evident as possible by the publication of the names of the exhibitors who closed or covered their exhibits, filling, in one instance, more than a page of one of the large city papers. Of course, the general publication of the fact that so many exhibits were not to be seen, and that the machinery was not running, and the greater number of State buildings with closed doors made the Fair seem to the ordinary sight-seer a very poor investment for his time and money on Sunday. The closing of the State buildings was also due, in some measure, to the organized effort of these same persons.

So it will be seen, that although the directors have done that which they had a perfect right to do, and which it was perfectly proper that they should do, if they saw fit, they have been, in reality,

coerced into it by the unseen and quiet efforts of those who had sought, previously, to accomplish the same thing by law, and having failed, have accomplished it by influence and boycott.

W. H. M.

Chicago, July 24.

#### Limitations of Government.

THE theory which unites government and religion and makes the latter one of the ends to be pursued by the former, if good at all, is equally good for *all* governments—for "the powers that be" in Turkey, Japan, and China, as really as for those of the United States or England. Apply the theory in China, and it means State power employed to sustain, propagate, and enforce Buddhism and idolatry. Apply it in Turkey, and it means the same power thus employed in the interests of Mohammedanism. It so happens that the world is fruitful in religious systems; and, unless we adopt the doctrine that all these systems are equally true or equally false, the theory as thus applied, would lead to the most opposite results, and entirely confound the distinction between the true and the false. If when applied to Christianity it would promote the truth, it would, with equal certainty, promote the grossest superstition and error when applied to paganism. A change of circumstances often gives one a view of things otherwise not so readily taken.

Let us then suppose a Protestant to transfer his residence to China and to become subject to the government of that country. While at home, we will further suppose, he belonged to the class demanding that religion shall be included in the educational *régime* of the public schools, and was horrified at the idea of not having King James' version of the sacred Scriptures read in these schools for religious purposes. How does he reason when the principle comes to be applied to him in China? The Chinese Emperor agrees with him in his principle, and proposes to tax him, not to support and teach Protestant Christianity, but the religion of China, which he regards as an abominable idolatry. This would probably open his eyes to the nature of his own doctrine. Yet, if it is the right of one government to enter the province of things spiritual, and tax the people to support and propagate religion, then it is the right of all governments to do so.

The principle, if valid at all, is just as valid for paganism as it is for Christianity, for idolatry as it is for the purest worship, for the most superstitious form of Roman Catholicism as it is for the most enlightened Protestantism. No Protestant would ask for its application in any other than a Protestant country; and this is a good reason why he should not ask for it there. If it is not good in China or Catholic Spain, it is no better in the United States or England. The principle is the same, no matter to what religion it is applied, or whether pagans or Christians, Catholics or Protestants, form the majority of the people. It is the principle of State religion, good everywhere or good nowhere. If Protestants were in the minority in this country and Catholics in the majority, the former certainly would not advocate a public school system, to be supported by general taxation, in which Catholicism should be taught.

The conclusion from this line of thought

is that civil government, though the best possible machinery to secure certain ends connected with our temporal interests, is not a contrivance adapted to secure the ends that relate to our spiritual welfare. "Surely," says Macaulay, "if experience shows that a certain machine, when used to produce a certain effect, does not produce that effect once in a thousand times, but produces in the vast majority of cases an effect directly contrary, we cannot be wrong in saying it is not a machine of which the principal end is to be so used."

The learned essayist might justly have said that it is not a machine properly adapted to this end at all. The notorious and world-wide failures of civil government to make itself useful in the department of things spiritual, when attempting to manage and conduct them, furnish the most complete demonstration that, however useful it may be elsewhere, it is not suited to this purpose. A sledge-hammer is a very good instrument with which to break a rock, but a very poor tool with which to mend a watch or perform a delicate operation in surgery. So civil government is a very good agency within certain limits and for certain objects; but beyond these limits and objects it has no function to perform, and when its powers are extended beyond them they are found in practice to be immensely more injurious than beneficial to the very interests they seek to serve.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D.*

#### No Shaving on Sunday.

It is not a little remarkable that within the last few months there has been a wonderful awakening on the part of professed Christian people all over the world to the fact that Sunday observance as practiced in former years is falling into disrepute. It seems that they can begin to read, as it were, the "handwriting on the wall" of the sanctity of Sunday, if things continue to go as they are going. They do not, as a rule, appeal to the foundation of the Sabbath—the fourth commandment—as a basis for requiring its observance, for, as they too well know, according to that, Sunday is not the Sabbath. There is not a scintilla of evidence between the lids of the Bible showing that it is a sacred day or that it has any claims upon mankind to be observed as the Sabbath. Knowing this, they appeal to the civil law for its enforced observance, and to hide the real motive behind the movement, the plea is set up that the Sunday laws are asked in deference to "the poor working-men." And now we see some of the labor organizations coming forward and demanding law requiring Sunday rest upon the part of all. And why? It is not because the individuals composing them can not rest on Sunday if they wish, for they can. But it is that those who want to keep Sunday may not lose anything by the patronage received by some one else who does not care to observe the day, and would otherwise labor on that day. Supreme selfishness is at the bottom of the whole thing.

The barbers all over the country are agitating this matter, and are meeting with more or less success. Two years ago a vigorous effort was made by the boss barbers in Kansas City to close the shops on Sunday, but they failed because no jury in a justice court would declare that shaving and the work of a barber is not a necessity on Sunday as well as any other day.

But the Sunday-closers have not wearied, and in a case that has been before the courts for some time, and finally taken to the Court of Appeals in that State, they secured a favorable decision from Judge Dill, he holding that under the revised statutes of Missouri, that "a party may shave himself as he would take a bath or wash his face, and it would not be understood as labor; but when the barber opens up his shop and there follows his usual worldly employment, it is quite a different matter."

On this rendering, the barbers have declared the operation of barber shops on Sunday a violation of law, and have therefore issued an order to the effect that henceforth no barber shop belonging to the Barber's Union shall be open on Sunday, and that any shop outside the union over which they do not have direct control, will be prosecuted, to which work the prosecuting attorney of the city has pledged his best efforts. Thus it is demonstrated again that Sunday laws are secured at the instance of certain ones that they may domineer over others. And so the work moves on. The lines seem to be drawing closer and closer, and out of it all can come but one result, religious intolerance and persecution.

W. E. CORNELL.

#### Conversion by Bullets.

THE justification of Mr. Fleming, the British magistrate at Rangoon, who ordered soldiers to fire into a body of Mohammedans, who had only assembled to sacrifice a cow in honor of one of their religious festivals, does not appear from the dispatches. It is no doubt British policy to keep down the people of India as a precaution for the safety of the comparatively small English garrisons, but Mr. Fleming will have a hard time convincing any one that he did right in forbidding the sacrifice of the cow. He saved the cow's life, but many human beings were sacrificed.—*Kansas City Times.*

#### Law and Religion.

[The following paragraphs are from an article in the *Tennessee Methodist*, by Bishop Haygood, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. It is true that the Bishop does not yet see every man clearly, but he certainly has caught a glimpse of principles which, if fully recognized, would free him completely from the fetters of governmental religion.]

PAUL "appealed to Cæsar" in a case involving his rights as a Roman citizen; he did not appeal to Cæsar to settle by an imperial decree any doctrine of law or morals.

A great question has been pending for some weeks before high courts, on the question of "Sunday opening" of the World's Fair in Chicago. The first decision was, as it seemed, favorable to Sabbath observance. The telegrams of the week tell us that the Court of Appeals, Chief Justice Fuller presiding, "has decided unanimously in favor of Sunday opening." This sort of statement is misleading and framed in the interest of the Philistines. The Associated Press is given to this kind of deviltry. The court of Appeals did not say it favored Sunday opening; it really delivered no opinion whatever upon the Sabbath question. The court simply affirmed that, under the law, it had no authority to close the gates on the Sabbath day. The court inter-

preted the law; it decided no question concerning religion or morals.

As it seems to this writer, to denounce Chief Justice Fuller, or the United States Court, would be a silly thing. The court is under oath to interpret the law of the land, and not the Word of God. It would be very unfair to say that the court sets itself against the Christian Sabbath, when it simply affirmed that it had no authority, under the law, to close the gates of the big show upon the Sabbath day. It is true that the Philistines will take comfort from this decision, but it should be remembered that the court interpreted the law; it makes no contribution to the anti-Sabbath argument.

It is not the business of a court to make law; its function is the interpretation of law. If the people do not like their laws, they have this remedy: they can change them.

But it is well worth considering, whether the Christian doctrine concerning the Lord's day, can be set up and maintained by the civil law or the secular courts. I offer no opinion as to the right of government to pass laws concerning the Sabbath, and make no argument on that subject. In most of the States of the Union, Cæsar has decreed abstention from ordinary labor on the Sabbath day. . . .

It may be, that we have trusted overmuch in the law of the land to secure moral results, and not enough in the power of the truth of God that alone makes free the soul of man.

Possibly, if we had expended as much force in teaching the truth of the Bible on the Sabbath question as we have exerted in seeking decrees from the civil courts, we might have had by this time more Sabbath observance. In the long run, nothing secures conformity to the laws of God, except teaching the people the laws of God. Moral reforms always move upon the lines of moral teaching. The principle applies to many other than the Sabbath question.

EVERY wise statesman can see that political religion confronts us to-day with the same threatening dangers that slavery formerly did. To prevent such a result in time, is the better and wiser way. Not a single principle of pure religion can ever be enforced by law. No orthodox preacher ever made a speech, whether called a "prayer," a discourse or an oration, without filling it with the namby-pamby and sentimental platitudes of his "faith." These inflictions have been borne so long and so patiently, that they have become a divine right, against which it is almost blasphemy, to kick, or to utter different views. It is enough to say to any patriot, that any political question which involves such serious and threatening results as the enforcement of political religion by law, as now confronts us, requires no apology for its timely warnings.—*S. C. Adams, in Statesman, Salem, Oregon.*

CONSTITUTIONS are made, not to be overriden by the majority, but for the protection of the minority. The minority has rights which the majority is bound to respect; and constitutions are largely for the purpose of defining and protecting those rights.

O  
U  
R  
**PRISON LIGHT** Wants active agents everywhere. Good pay. 15c. Trial year. Indorsed by SENTINEL. Particulars free. MYERS, PRISON LIGHT, Newfaun, Vt.

# THE BATTLE CREEK SANITARIUM HEALTH FOODS.

For more than six years the Battle Creek Sanitarium has maintained a Health Food Department, at first for the benefit of its patients and patrons, later, and for more than a dozen years, with increased facilities, to supply the general public. Within the last year **More than 150 Tons** of the following named foods have been manufactured and sold:—

- Oatmeal Biscuit,
- Medium Oatmeal Crackers,
- Fruit Crackers,
- Plain Oatmeal Crackers,
- No. 1 Graham Crackers,
- No. 2 Graham Crackers,
- Plain Graham Crackers (Dyspeptic),
- Wheat Granola,
- Whole Wheat Wafers,
- Gluten Biscuit, No. 1,
- Gluten Biscuit, No. 2,
- Rye Wafers,
- Carbon Crackers,
- Avenola,
- Granola,
- White Crackers,
- Gluten Wafers,
- Infants' Food.

## Granola, The Gem of Health Foods.

Our Granola, which has now been manufactured by us for nearly seventeen years, is unquestionably the finest health food ever devised, and is greatly superior to any of the numerous imitations to which its success has given rise.

We are constantly improving our foods, and adding to our list as the result of experimental researches conducted in the Sanitarium Laboratory of Hygiene and our Experimental Kitchen. For the latest descriptive circular and price list, address,

**SANITARIUM HEALTH FOOD CO., Battle Creek, Mich**

**TO THE PUBLIC:** This certifies that the Battle Creek Sanitarium Health Foods, manufactured by the Sanitarium under the name of the Sanitarium Food Company, are made under my direction and supervision, and that Granola and the other special foods manufactured by this company, are not made or sold by any other firm or person except their duly authorized agents.

**J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.**

Our goods are shipped to every part of the world—to Australia, New Zealand, India, Persia, and other foreign countries, as well as to all parts of the United States; and in every instance they have demonstrated their wonderful keeping properties. The following are a few of the hundreds of testimonials received from persons who have for years made use of our foods.

I have for three years used the "Health Foods" in my family, and can heartily recommend them, both for purity and health-giving properties.

**MICHIGAN.**  
C. F. PORTER, D. D. S.

Your "Health Foods" are the wonder of the nineteenth century. I have used Granola but a short time, but have already experienced relief from indigestion and acid, or flatulent dyspepsia. I also find the Zwiebach nourishing and toothsome.

**INDIANA.**  
D. M. KAUFFMAN.

I have personally tested your excellent food known as Granola. It is highly pleasing to the taste, easy of digestion, and the most nutritive cereal production with which I am acquainted.

**INDIANA.**  
DR. R. W. BULA.

Your Granola is the best selling invalid food I have ever handled. I have already sold nearly two thousand pounds.

**NEW YORK.**  
A. J. BROUGHTON.

We have used your "Health Foods" in our family for three years, and can not get along without them. Having been troubled with dyspepsia and chronic inflammation of the stomach, I find that your Granola, Avenola, Wheatena, and Gluten are the only foods that I can eat with safety.

**CONNECTICUT.**  
WM. M. MERWIN.

Our baby is a testimonial to Sanitarium food. She is ten months old, weighs twenty-eight pounds, and is as ruddy and healthy a specimen as can be seen. She has actually gained flesh while cutting her last two teeth. Her flesh is firm and sound, and she is very strong.

**OHIO.**  
FRED. L. ROSEMOND.

We have twins, and the little fellows are thriving nicely. The food agrees with them perfectly, and I have recommended it to many who are bringing up babies "by hand."

**MINNESOTA.**  
D. W. McCOURT.

## CHEAP TEN DAY EXCURSIONS TO THE WORLD'S FAIR.

What the West Shore Railroad Has Done. THE DAYS ON WHICH THE SPECIALS WILL RUN. FOR some time past the management of the West Shore Railroad has been anticipating the time when all classes of people who desire to visit the World's Fair at the least possible expense, with the greatest amount of comfort, can do so.

To this end their entire passenger equipment has been rebuilt, newly upholstered, fitted with toilet service, high back easy seats, etc., bringing their cars up to the highest standard, and rendering travel by the West Shore both comfortable and enjoyable.

The World's Fair special trains will be equipped with every modern appliance, and tickets are now on sale by such trains to Chicago and return for one fare for the round trip, being valid for ten days.

It will be impossible to find a better route to the World's Fair or one where every detail as to the comfort of the excursionists has been so thoroughly considered.

If our readers miss the great Fair and a trip over the West Shore Railroad, regret will long linger on their minds.

The dates on which these low rate tickets are valid are as follows: Wednesday, July 26; Tuesday, August 1st; Monday, August 7th; and Saturday, August 19th.

A list of excursions for the balance of August, September and October will be published later.

## HEALTH, PLEASURE, and BUSINESS

Travel via. the famous Trunk Line and Picturesque

### West Shore Railroad.

Magnificent new Parlor Car Service from Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York, to and from the Catskills, Saratoga, Lake George, and the Adirondacks.

Wagner Buffet Sleeping Cars on fast express trains between New York, Kingston, Albany, Utica, Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Toronto, Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago.

### Excellent Service to the World's Fair.

N. B.—Send six cent stamp for copy of Summer Excursion Book, containing list of summer hotels and boarding houses in the Catskills and along the line of our connections.

For tickets, time tables and information, apply to any West Shore ticket agent, or to

H. B. JAGOE, G. E. P. A. 363 BROADWAY, N. Y.  
A. A. SMITH, N. E. P. A. 300 WASHINGTON ST. BOSTON, MASS.  
E. J. WEEKS, G. A. BUFFALO, NEW YORK.  
F. J. WOLFE, G. A. ALBANY, NEW YORK.

C. E. LAMBERT, Gen'l Passenger Agent. 5 Vanderbilt Ave. New York City.

**EAGLE BRAND**

THE

**BEST ROOFING**

Is unequalled for House, Barn, Factory, or Out-Buildings, and costs half the price of shingles, tin or iron. It is ready for use, and easily applied by any one. Send stamp for samples, and state size of roof. Address,

**EXCELSIOR PAINT AND ROOFING CO.,**  
DEPT. 9, 155 DUANE STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

**TEN LECTURES ON NASAL CATARRH;**  
Its Nature, Causes, Prevention, and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye, and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS.

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and **six beautifully colored plates**, besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health, and disease. This little work costs **only 75 cents**, bound in cloth, and is in great demand.

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY.**  
12th & Castro Streets, OAKLAND, CAL. | 48 Bond Street, NEW YORK.

## THE MEDICAL MISSIONARY.

J. H. KELLOGG, M. D., Editor.

A twenty-four page monthly journal, devoted to the various phases of medical missionary and benevolent work. It contains each month also articles of general interest on mission fields, and items of missionary intelligence. Each number is illustrated.

Published by the S. D. A. Medical Missionary and Benevolent Association.

Price **25 cents** per year.

Address Medical Missionary, Battle Creek, Mich.

## FATHERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY E. J. WAGGONER.

History repeats itself, because human nature is the same in all ages of the world. Hence, he who would know

### HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE

must know how errors have developed in the past. The "Fathers of the Catholic Church" shows the condition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, briefly states the principles of ancient heathen philosophy, and shows how the adoption of these principles by prominent men in the church, and the incautious lowering of the standard of pure Christianity, developed the Papacy, which was simply a new phase of paganism. The chapter on

### SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY.


is alone worth the price of the book. Fine English cloth, substantially bound, contains about 400 pages, and will be sent post-paid for \$1.00.

## SMITH'S DICTIONARY of the BIBLE.

EDITED BY WM. SMITH, LL. D.

COMPRISING ITS ANTIQUITIES, BIOGRAPHY, GEOGRAPHY, AND NATURAL HISTORY.

Price, \$2.00.



This work contains every name in the Bible respecting which anything can be said; over 500 engravings, and is a complete guide to the pronunciation and signification of scriptural names; the solution of difficulties of interpretation, authority and harmony; also a history and description of Biblical customs, manners, events, places, persons, animals, plants, minerals, etc., and comprises a most complete encyclopedia of Biblical information.

**CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE**—A dictionary, and alphabetical index to the Bible. Cloth, \$1.25. Sheep, \$2.50.

Address all Orders to **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,** 12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL. | 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, AUGUST 3, 1893

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample Copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

At Porthcawl, a Welsh watering place, a house owner only rents on condition that his tenants shall "draw no water from the pumps on Sunday."

THE saying that "the majority should rule" is true only of those matters which come properly within the sphere of civil government. But religious questions are outside that sphere, not by constitutional guarantee, merely, but by the law of our being which makes us individually responsible to the Creator.

IT is now charged that the Mormons have raised a fund of \$1,000,000, with which they propose to buy Statehood for Utah. Well, why not? The other National Reformers less than a year ago induced Congress to engage in wholesale bribery of the Columbian Exposition in the interests of Sunday sacredness; if now the Mormons bribe Congress, who can condemn them? Not the Sunday boomers, surely.

THE closing of the World's Fair is at last an accomplished fact; but from a moral standpoint it is a barren victory to the churches that worked so hard for it. It is true that they now try to make it appear that the failure of Sunday-closing is an evidence of the great regard that the masses have for Sunday; but it is nothing of the kind. By threats of political boycott and by tricks unworthy of any but ward politicians, the Sunday managers secured the closing of such a large part of the Fair that few cared to go on Sunday; and thus by their own act they made impossible a free expression of the sentiments of the people regarding the day. Had the Fair been opened on Sundays just as on other days, and had no special influence been brought to bear on exhibitors to induce them to cover their exhibits on that day, and then the people had refused to attend in paying numbers, it would indeed have been evidence of great popular regard for Sunday; but under the conditions created for the occasion it proves nothing, except that people do not propose to pay full price for less than half a show.

THE *Moon*, a newspaper printed in Battle Creek, Mich., has in its issue of July 19, this item of news:—

The Second Baptist Church of Battle Creek will hold a jubilee meeting on the fair grounds in Marshall next Sunday, for the benefit of the new

church. The meetings will begin at 10 o'clock A. M. The best musical talent will be present. There will be plantation melodies and songs and instrumental music. The sermon on "A Damned Hot Day" will be preached at 2:30 o'clock P. M. Admission ten cents.

The *Moon* makes no comment, and it seems that none is needed. Such things make it very apparent that regard for Sunday as a sacred day is not in all the thoughts of the Sunday church managers; they know that it is no better than any other day; what they want is a monopoly of the day for their own purposes. If the World's Fair was filling their coffers, they would to a man be clamoring for Sunday opening, and instead of preaching about a single profanely hot day, they would be denouncing against all who opposed them the terrors of an uncomfortably warm "orthodox" eternity.

THE *Ranch*, Pueblo, Col., publishes the following "prayer," delivered by Chaplain Peck, of the Colorado Senate, at the opening of that body, January 6:—

We pray for the Republican majority. Upon it rests the responsibility of the legislation that shall pass this house. Grant wisdom unto these men sent up by the people to make laws for the commonwealth. May they profit by the experience of the past and learn wisdom from the records of the last legislature, for if they do not make a better record than it made they will not have a majority of even one at the next election. And thou hast taught us to pray for our enemies. We pray for these democrats and populists. They wanted all the offices, but the republicans were one too many for them, and they got none. It was a bitter pill for them to swallow. Now we pray that they may have grace and resignation to endure their disappointment and keep sweet. Finally, we pray that the house now being organized and all the offices distributed, these men may forget party lines and legislate for the benefit and happiness of the whole people. Bless them day by day, and may they work as in thy immediate presence. We ask it in Christ's name. Amen.

The *Ranch* very properly says of this "prayer" that—

The spirit of levity that characterizes it goes better with a low comedy than a Christian minister in the midst of an intelligent and God-fearing people. The fact that the audience at its conclusion laughed and wildly cheered is evidence of the influence it had for evil.

Our contemporary's concluding comment, which we adopt, is: "We give the prayer in full, to show our readers how just is the disgust we feel."

The American Sabbath Union held its annual mid-summer meeting July 23 and 24. Rev. Dr. George S. Mott, acting president of the American Sabbath Union, presided. Addresses were made by Dr. Mott, Rev. J. H. Knowles, Anthony Comstock, and others. After saying that the glory of Sunday closing of the Fair belonged to the Lord, Secretary Knowles proceeded to give it to the American Sabbath Union. In outlining future work Mr. Knowles said:—

A rare opportunity is afforded to circulate Sabbath literature during the World's Fair. The American Sabbath Union proposes to do this work as the funds are provided for the purpose, and de-

sires to avail itself of the present interest in the Sabbath question to organize a Sabbath association in every State and territory.

At the outset of his remarks, Anthony Comstock said: "The question before us to-night is, 'Who is upon the Lord's side?'" And to assist in determining this question Mr. Comstock and his co-workers want the power of the civil law so that they can force men to be on the Lord's (?) side. Don't they know that the Lord has no more interest in Sunday than in any other day of the week? that he himself has declared that "the seventh day is the Sabbath"?

THE lie that the Seventh-day Adventists are parties to the Clingman suit to compel the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday has been again revived in Chicago. Seventh-day Adventists defend themselves in the courts when haled before them by others, but they never appeal to civil rulers to compel a course of action in accordance with their ideas. The managers of the Fair have decided to close it on Sunday for reasons which are satisfactory to them, and the Adventists do not regard it as any of their business. They would no more try to compel the opening of the Fair on Sunday by law than they would invoke the same power to close it on the Sabbath.

THE spirit of religious persecution is not dead, but the light of these years withers it when public opinion is focused upon it. If the religious people who clamor for stricter legislation against Sabbath-keepers had their way the Middle Ages would hasten back to smother the world. As it is, such efforts serve to hasten the final downfall of all such unchristian and bigoted persecutions.—*Sabbath Recorder*.

BEFORE Christianity can have practically as the National Reformers demand that it shall have, "an undeniable legal basis" in this country, it must be defined; that is, it must be decided what constitutes Christianity; and that definition will be the national creed just as the Nicene creed was the creed of Rome.

"WHY Adventists Work on Sunday," No. 55 of the *Sentinel Library*, is a 4-page tract, setting forth briefly but clearly the reasons of Seventh-day Adventists for refusing to keep Sunday even when not to do so involves civil penalties. This tract should have a wide circulation wherever this question is being agitated. Price ½ cent.

#### 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.

Single copy, per year, - - - \$1.00.

In clubs of	5 to 24 copies to one address, per year,	- - -	90c
"	25 to 99 " " " " " "	- - -	80c
"	100 to 249 " " " " " "	- - -	75c
"	250 to 499 " " " " " "	- - -	70c
"	500 to 999 " " " " " "	- - -	65c
"	1000 or more " " " " " "	- - -	60c
To foreign countries in Postal Union,		- - -	5 shillings

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
43 Bond Street, New York City.