



"If any Man Hear My Words, and Believe not, I Judge him not: for I Came not to Judge the World, but to Save the World."

VOLUME 9.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 4, 1894.

NUMBER 1.

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.

WITH this issue the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the ninth year of its publication.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL was established to oppose all connection between religion and the State, and all interference of religious bodies or organizations with affairs of the Government, and especially to expose the mischievous designs of the National Reform combination which was organized for the sole purpose of drawing the United States Government into an establishment of religion.

THIS National Reform combination never had any other purpose, nor any other aim, than to commit the Government of the United States, by whatever means possible, to the establishment and maintenance of "Christianity" as the national religion, and to the enforcement of "Christian laws, institutions, and usages," and Sunday above all, upon all the people.

FOR twenty-four years the National Reform Association of professed Protestants, worked steadily alone, to have "the Christian religion" named and legalized as the religion of this nation. In its twenty-fifth year, 1887, it secured the alliance of the National Prohibition party, and the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and with this additional power continued its efforts for the legal recognition of the Christian religion as the national religion. In 1888 this National Reform combination secured the alliance of the American Sabbath Union representing the great "evangelical" churches of the country, and with increased power the whole combination plied their efforts upon the national Government to secure the legal recognition of the Christian religion and the setting up of Sunday as the national holy day. In 1889, the National Reform Association, through

the leadership of the American Sabbath Union, secured their long-desired "coöperation" of the Catholic Church for national Sunday observance. And in 1892 they were gratified with the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, declaring that "this is a Christian nation," thus giving national, legal recognition to the Christian religion, and this was swiftly followed by the action of Congress in which Sunday was set up as the Sabbath of the fourth commandment and of this nation, to the express exclusion of the Sabbath of the Lord.

THE aim and purpose of the National Reform combination was precisely the aim, the purpose, and the intense desire of the Church of Rome. Therefore, all these years Rome watched with interested attention the National Reform movement, and waited for that movement to grow to such a state as would be to her advantage to coöperate with. And it was not unadvisedly that in 1889 the Catholic Church joined hands with the National Reform combination, "to bring the Protestant masses over to the reverent observance of the Catholic Sunday." And it was with great gladness that she heard the supreme judicial declaration that "this is a Christian nation," with the citation of Catholic documents to prove it, and also saw Congress set up the sign of her own authority—the Sunday—as the holy day of the nation in express exclusion of the Sabbath of the Lord. It was with supreme satisfaction that she saw her own sign of her own salvation set up here by a national act as the symbol of the salvation of the nation.

IN the columns of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, from the beginning, we have told the National Reformers over and over, that in all their efforts and arguments they were but playing into the hands of Rome. As a sample of our oft-repeated words to this effect we copy the following from Vol. I, number 12 of the SENTINEL:

"Although the Catholic Church apparently takes no very active interest in this movement itself, we may rest assured that there is not a single writer, nor a single official, of the Catholic Church, from the pope to the lowest priest in America, who ever 'for an instant' loses sight of the

movement, or of the 'prescriptions' which the pope has given in view of it.

"THEN when the matter comes to the enforcement of the laws, what is to hinder the Catholics from doing it, and that, too, in the Catholic way? Every priest in the United States is sworn to root out heresy. And Monsignor Capel, in our own cities and at our very doors, defends the 'Holy Inquisition.' The refusal to observe Sunday becomes heresy that can be reached by the law, what then is to hinder the Catholics from rooting out the heresy? Certainly when the National Reformers shall have been compelled by the necessity of the situation to surrender to the Catholics, it would not be in their power, even were it in their disposition, to repeal the laws; so there would then be nothing left but the enforcement of the laws—by Catholics, if by nobody else. This view of the case alone ought to be sufficient to arouse every Protestant and every American to the most uncompromising opposition to the National Reform party.

"It is of no use for the National Reformers to say that they will not allow the Catholics to do these things. For when the National Reformers, to gain the ends which they have in view, are compelled by 'the necessities of the situation,' to unite with Rome, having, *by* the help of Rome, gained those ends, it will be impossible, *without* the help of Rome, *either* to make them effective, or to reverse them, or to hinder Rome from making them effective in her own way. When the thing is done, it will be too late to talk of not allowing this or that. The whole thing will then be sold into the hands of Rome, and there will be no remedy.

"LORD MACAULAY made no mistake when he wrote the following:—

It is impossible to deny that the polity of the Church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. . . . The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection that, among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place.—*Essays, Von Ranke.*

"And it is into the hands of this mistress of human deception and oppression that the National Reformers deliberately pro-

pose to surrender the United States Government and the American people. But just as surely as the American people allow the National Reform party, or anything else, out of seeming friendship for Christianity, or for any other reason, to do this thing, they are undone.

"We know that a good many people have regarded the AMERICAN SENTINEL as exerting itself to no purpose, because they think there is no danger of the success of National Reform. But in the National Reform party, *allied with Rome*, there is danger. Then put with this the almost universal demand for more rigorous laws, more vigorously enforced, for the stricter religious observance of Sunday—the very thing above all others at which the National Reform movement aims—the danger is increased and is imminent. In view of these facts there is great danger that through the sophistry of the National Reform arguments, the ill-informed zeal of thousands upon thousands of people who favor Sunday laws, will be induced to support the National Reform movement, and so they and the whole nation be delivered into the hands of Rome. There is danger in the National Reform movement. We know it, and by the evidences we here give in their own words, it is high time that the American people began to realize it.

"We say that if the National Reformers and the Catholics, or any others, want to keep Sunday, let them do it. But heaven forefend that they shall ever succeed in securing the laws that they ask by which they will compel others to do it. And we do most devoutly pray, God forbid that they shall ever succeed in their scheme of putting into the hands of Rome the power to enforce religious laws, and to correct heresy. God forbid that they shall ever succeed in making free America a slave to Rome.

"The success of the National Reform movement is to support Rome. How many, then, of the American people are ready to enter into the National Reform scheme?"

AND now in view of this we ask a careful consideration of the following important facts and statements: All these years, and even to the very latest document issued November, 1893, the National Reform combination has constantly presented as the basis, and the leading argument, for the governmental recognition of *their* religion, that "this country was settled by Christian men having Christian ends in view." And now that they have secured their long desired governmental recognition of "the Christian religion," the Catholic Church appropriates bodily the argument, and boldly declares that this country was first discovered and settled by *Catholic* Christian men, having *Catholic* Christian ends in view. At the late World's Congress of Religions this was made plain beyond all chance for question. In a paper read by Professor Thomas O'Gorman, of the Catholic University of Washington, D. C., it is presented more fully and compactly than in any other place we have found, and we shall therefore quote largely from it. On this point of the discovery and settlement of the country "by Christian men having Christian ends in view," he says:—

By right of discovery and possession, dating back

almost nine hundred years, America is Christian. On the waters of Lake Michigan, close to the Convent of La Rabida are moored three Spanish caravels and a little farther away one Viking ship. All three—convent, caravels, and Scandinavian craft—are evidences of an acquaintance between America and the church in times when the only Christianity in existence was Catholic. This fact is sufficient justification for a change I have allowed myself to make. In the programme, this paper has for title, "Relation of the Catholic Church to America." For wider latitude and juster account I make it "Relation of Christianity to America."

The strange Viking boat carries the relation to a period antedating Columbus by almost five hundred years. About the year 1000, Christian colonists from Norway founded in Greenland a Christian community, which for four hundred years—that is, almost down to the days of Columbus—possessed a body of Catholic priests and a continuous line of bishops in communion with the popes of Rome. From Greenland, traders and missionaries pushed westward to the mainland. Trading posts and mission stations, if not permanent settlements, arose on the coasts of New England, and the natural products of this country found their way to Europe and even to Rome, the capital of Christendom, as payment of the Peter pence from the Catholic people of far away Greenland and Vinland. In the showcases of the Convent of La Rabida in your White City are some of the many contemporary documents which prove these facts, and imply a relation existing long before Columbus, between Rome and the land that was to become in later ages the cradle of the American Republic. For reasons, which it is not my present task to indicate, the intercourse had gradually grown intermittent and had all but ceased when Columbus appeared. At any rate, it had never dawned on the mind of Europe that the far away Scandinavian colony was in a new continent. Greenland and Vinland were supposed to be connected in some way with northern Europe, and to be a southern dip of the known continent into habitable western latitudes from uninhabitable polar regions. So much for the older acquaintance between the church and America.

AMERICA DISCOVERED BY CATHOLICS.

The Spanish convent and caravels indicate a relation that began four hundred years ago; a relation which was to Europe the revelation of a new world, what the Scandinavian relation had not been; a relation that has not ceased since, as had the Scandinavian; a relation that at first flitted like some distant dream before the eyes of Spain in the solemn halls of Salamanca, that gradually took on some faint reality beneath the walls of Granada, in the quiet port of Palos, that finally became fact on the newly-found shores of San Salvador, in the shadow of the cross raised on American soil by the successful discoverer. The books, pamphlets, lectures, and articles written in this Columbian anniversary prove beyond a candid doubt that the discovery of America was eminently a religious enterprise, and that the desire to spread Christianity was, I will not say the only, but the principal, motive that prompted the leaders engaged in that memorable venture. Before you can strip the discovery of its religious character, you must unchristen the admiral's flagship [Santa Maria] and tear from her bulwarks the painting of the patroness [the Virgin Mary], under whose auspices the gallant craft plowed her way through the terrors of the unknown ocean.

MOTIVES OF THE EARLY COLONISTS.

The inspiration that gave the Old World a new continent was also the cause of its colonization and civilization. Various popes from Alexander VII, 1493, to Leo XI, 1514, approved and legalized discovery and occupation in America. The purpose of their bulls was to prevent or settle difficulties and wars between rival claimants to the new lands. The indirect results of their intervention were of untold benefit to humanity. That intervention promoted the geographical study and knowledge of the globe, instigated Magellan's voyage around the world, created the partition of the continent, and hence also the colonial system out of which this great nation is born.

Thus the National Reformers see their fundamental argument appropriated by Rome and used to her sole advantage, and not one of them nor yet all of them together, can successfully dispute it for a moment. And so we and they see fulfilled to-day that which we have told them all the time, that in all their efforts they were but playing into the hands of Rome.

AGAIN: The National Reform combination has always made the fallacious claim that the union of *religion* and the State is not the union of *Church* and State; and *vice versa*, the separation of Church and State does not mean the separation of the State from religion. This claim the

Catholic Church now appropriates and declares:—

We may truly say that with us separation of Church and State is not separation of the nation from religion. —*Id.*

And thus again we and they see fulfilled that which we told them long ago, and repeatedly.

AGAIN: The National Reform combination has argued that Sunday laws, Thanksgiving proclamations, and other official documents of presidents and governors, laws which uphold "Christian marriage" by prohibiting polygamy, chaplains in army and navy, in Congress and legislatures, and decisions of courts that Christianity is part of the common law,—all prove that this is a Christian nation. All this also the Catholic Church has adopted as proof of *her* claims upon the nation. Professor O'Gorman continues:—

Of what I should call the State's Christianity, I give the following evidences:—

Not only does the Federal Government make Sunday a legal day of rest for all its officials, but the States have Sunday laws which do not enforce any specific worship, but do guard the day's restfulness. Moreover, certain religious holy days are made legal holidays.

Presidents and governors in official documents recognize the dependence of the nation on God and the duty of gratitude to him.

The action of Congress in regard to Mormonism is an upholding of the Christian marriage, and in all the States bigamy is a crime. Immorality is not allowed by the civil power to flaunt itself in public, but is driven to concealment, and the Decalogue, inasmuch as it relates to the social relations of man, is enforced.

Celebrations of a public and official character, sessions of State legislatures and Congress are opened with prayer. Chaplains are appointed at public expense for Congress, the army, the navy, the military and naval academies, the State legislatures and institutions.

More than once it has been decided by courts that we are a Christian people, and that Christianity is part of our unwritten law, as it is part of the common law of England.

Such, briefly, is the relation of Christianity to the American Republic, when we consider only its internal life. Are we not justified in concluding that here Christianity has added to her domain a nation which is the most active, the most progressive, and not the least intellectual in this nineteenth century!

When it is borne in mind that by the term "Christianity," Professor O'Gorman means *Catholicism* and Catholicism alone, the force of this array of National Reform "evidences" is clearly seen and appreciated.

AGAIN: The Supreme Court of the United States declared that "we are a Christian people" and that "this is a Christian nation." This the National Reform combination hailed as containing "all that the National Reform Association seeks;" and this they have been using ever since as the official and ultimate authority that must settle every question and silence every word of doubt or dissent. As proofs of its declaration that "this is a Christian nation" or that this is the meaning of the Constitution, the Supreme Court not only cited the commission of Ferdinand and Isabella to Columbus, but also "the form of oath universally prevailing;" the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath; the constitutional proviso "that the Executive shall have ten days (Sunday excepted) within which to determine whether he will approve or veto a bill," etc. This whole ground is covered in just two sentences by Professor O'Gorman with direct reference to the Constitution, as follows:—

Our political charter presupposes God and Christianity, presupposes the main facts and the past history of Christianity, and is bound to them by discovery and colonization. The oath required from all officers

of the Federal Government, the exemption of Sunday from their working days, the subscription, "In the year of our Lord" are a recognition of God and imply that the Lord Jesus Christ is the turning point of humanity, the source and beginning of a new order.

ONCE more: The Supreme Court also cited the Declaration of Independence as proof that this is a Christian nation. Professor O'Gorman follows to the same extreme, and then declares that the *Catholic Church* is the foundation of it all. Here are his words:—

Look at the fundamental articles, the formative principles of the Republic,—“All men are created equal; they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; to secure these, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” These are Christian principles asserting God, creation, the rights of the creature, and by implication the duties that are correlative to those rights. To these principles the Catholic Church gave an impregnable foundation when in the council of Trent, she defined that reason is not totally obscured, and will is not totally depraved.

Then in his closing sentences he sums up all, covers the whole ground, and swallows up everything into the Catholic Church, as follows:—

Our roots are in the good, our up-growth must needs be toward the better. The affirmation of any one truth, logically followed out, leads to the knowledge and affirmation of all truth. The American Republic began in the affirmation of certain fundamental evident truths of reason; our dominant tendency, therefore, the law of our progression, is toward complete truth, if we but remain true to the spirit that called us into being, and still, thank God, animates our present living.

We believe that divine Providence led to the discovery of this continent and directed its settlement and guided the birth of this nation, for a new and more complete application to political society of the truths affirmed by reason and Christian revelation, for the upbuilding of a nation as great religiously as it is politically, of a nation that shall find its perfection in *Catholic Christianity*. With that freedom allowed every speaker in this parliament of religions, I affirm my sincere conviction that Catholic Christianity is the fullness of truth, natural and supernatural, rational and revealed; that Catholic Christianity is the strongest bulwark of law and order in this Republic. If ever our country should fail and fall, it is not from the Catholic Church that shall come the shout of triumph at the failure and the fall, for never has she had a fairer field of work than the United States of America.

THUS Rome sets herself forward as the end and all, and hers the prior and supreme right, in all things pertaining to this union of “religion and the State” in this “Christian nation.” And the blindness of professed Protestants and of the Supreme Court has given her the complete legal, legislative, and governmental basis for all her claims. And we say again that there is not one person in the National Reform combination, nor in the whole combination together; not one member of the Supreme Court, nor yet the whole court together; who can successfully dispute the argument or the claim Rome is now making upon the foundation which they themselves have so surely laid for her. And so we and they see fulfilled to-day before the eyes of the whole nation, that which we have all the time told them, that they were only playing into the hands of Rome. To-day Rome is profiting by that in which the National Reformers have always fondly hoped they themselves might be profited.

AND Rome knows it; and all these assumptions and logical claims from National Reform, and Supreme Court, premises, arguments, and declarations, she also backs up with the publicly announced plan of Leo XIII, with respect to the United States and through this for Europe and “all humanity,” as follows:—

In his [Pope Leo's] view, the United States has

reached the period when it becomes necessary to bring about the fusion of all the heterogeneous elements in one homogeneous and indissoluble nation. It is for this reason that the pope wants the Catholics to prove themselves the most enlightened and most devoted workers for national unity and political assimilation. . . . America feels the need of this work of internal fusion. . . . *What the church has done in the past for others, she will do for the United States.*

That is the reason the Holy See encourages the American clergy to guard jealously the solidarity, and to labor for the fusion of all the foreign and heterogeneous elements into one vast national family. . . .

Finally, Leo XIII desires to see strength in that unity. Like all intuitive souls, he hails in the united American States and in their young and flourishing church, the source of new life for Europeans. He wants America to be powerful, in order that Europe may regain strength from borrowing a rejuvenated type. Europe is closely watching the United States.

Henceforth we [Europeans] will need authors who will place themselves on this ground: “What can we borrow, and what ought we to borrow from the United States for our social, political, and ecclesiastical reorganization?” The answer depends in great measure upon the development of American destinies. If the United States succeed in solving the many problems that puzzle us, Europe will follow her example, and *this outpouring of light will mark a date in the history not only of the United States, BUT OF ALL HUMANITY.*

That is why the holy father, anxious for peace and strength, collaborates with passion in the work of consolidation and development in American affairs. According to him, the church ought to be the chosen crucible for the molding and absorption of races into one united family. And that, especially, is the reason why he labors at the codification of ecclesiastical affairs, in order that this distant member of *Christianity* may infuse new blood into the old organism.—*Letter from the Vatican to the New York Sun, July 11, 1892.*

AND this was swiftly followed by the establishment of Satolli as permanent apostolic delegate here to carry out this plan; and Satolli openly declared at the Catholic Congress in Chicago Sept. 5, 1893, not only that this is his place and work here, but commanded the Catholics of the United States to carry out this scheme. His words are as follows:—

In the name of Leo XIII, I salute the great American Republic, and I call upon the Catholics of America to go forward, in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth and in the other the Constitution of the United States.

To-day this is the duty of the Catholics: To bring into the world the fullness of supernatural truth and supernatural life. This especially is the duty of a Catholic Congress. There are the nations who have never separated from the church, but who have neglected often to apply in full degree the lessons of the gospel. *There are the nations who have gone out from the church, bringing with them many of her treasures, and because of what they have brought, shedding partial light. But cut off from the source, unless that source is again brought into close contact with them, there is danger for the future.*

Bring them in contact with their past by your action and teaching. Bring your fellow-countrymen, *bring your country into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness—Christ and his church.* And in this manner shall it come to pass the word of the psalmist shall be fulfilled: “Mercy and justice have met one another, justice and peace have kissed.” . . .

Now all these great principles have been marked out in most illuminous lines in the encyclicals of the great pontiff, Leo XIII. He has studied them. Hold fast to them as the safest anchorage, and all will be well. These several questions are studied the world over. It is well they be studied in America, for *here in America do we have more than elsewhere the key to the future.* [Applause].

Here in America you have a country blessed specially by Providence in the fertility of field and the liberty of its Constitution. [Loud applause.] Here you have a country which will repay all efforts [loud and prolonged applause] not merely tenfold, but, *aye, a hundredfold.* And this no one understands better than the immortal Leo. And he charges me, his delegate, to speak out to America words of hope and blessing, words of joy. Go forward! in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth—the Bible—and in the other the Constitution of the United States. [Tremendous applause the people rising to their feet].”

The Constitution of the United States as it was made, and as it was intended by its makers to remain, was directly opposed to every principle and every purpose of Rome. The founders of this Government said that “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.” They said further that, “it is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects which profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility which would *lead us back to the Church of Rome.*” Thus certainly did the makers of this Government intend that the people of the United States should never, by any act of the Government, be led back to the Church of Rome; and thus certainly did they intend that the Government of the United States should never touch any question of religion, and specifically “the Christian religion,” in order that their expressed purpose might prevail,—that the people should not be led back to the Church of Rome and popery.

AND that Constitution, as our fathers made it and intended it, no Catholic was ever commanded by any pope to take in one hand, with the Catholic Bible in the other. But when that Constitution was interpreted to mean that this is a Christian nation, when that Constitution was interpreted according to Rome's principles and the sign of her authority with Catholic documents was cited to support this interpretation, *then* it was, and not till then, that all Catholics were commanded to take this Catholic Constitution in one hand and the Catholic Bible in the other; and, with Satolli at their head, go forward to their “hundredfold” reward in the United States, and through this bring again “all Europe” and “all humanity” back into close contact with “the church.”

And now with the Catholic Bible in one hand, and the Catholic Constitution of the United States in the other, the Catholic Church steps forth and declares that *this is a Catholic Christian nation.* The arguments which the National Reformers have used all these years, to prove that this is a Christian nation, she now boldly appropriates, and says that they mean that this is a Catholic Christian nation. All the claims which the National Reform combination has presented for the governmental recognition of religion, the Catholic Church now adopts and declares as the consequence that it is governmental recognition of the Catholic religion.

AND with all this prestige and power already within her grasp she grows enthusiastic, and is now circulating official documents in the United States in which she openly announces the “collapse of Protestantism,” and her hope to “missionize” the United States “in half a decade;” and at the same time abruptly challenges all Protestants to show why they keep Sunday; and to cap it all she publishes to the people of the United States the following, which she herself pronounces “bold doctrines to preach to Americans:”—

The friends of Catholicity assure us that, as God in his providence creates a new soul for every human body that is born into the world, so the American Republic was no sooner born from the womb of time than he in like manner created a spiritual republic to be its companion, its protector, and infallible guide through all the years of its existence.

They tell us furthermore that as the soul can live without the body, but the body cannot live without the soul; so the Church can live without the Republic, but the Republic cannot live without the Church. In a word, that the Church is necessary to the Republic, and without her spiritual guidance the Republic

must inevitably fail as have all the ancient republics of history before her.

Is not this whole country stamped for a Catholic land? With the great doctor, St. Augustine, guarding the Atlantic Coast, and the heroic missionary, San Francisco, the Pacific; with the indomitable apostle, St. Paul, kindling zeal and enthusiasm in the North, and the gentle San Antonio inspiring love and peace in the South; with the Warrior King, St. Louis, in the center, and the great St. Joseph and Notre Dame, the gracious queen of heaven, hard by,—with all these powerful intercessors pleading for her, can we, I say, expect anything less than a glorious triumph for Catholicity in America?

Surely God's plans are manifest. America is the last and greatest of nations; and he means to possess her for himself. . . . The nets of St. Peter will drag this continent from ocean to ocean, till they are filled to breaking with the souls of men that shall be saved.—*The Catholic Church and the American Republic, Historically, Analytically, and Prophetically Considered, 1893, pp. 2, 3, 15, 16.*

No more proofs are needed to show that upon the basis of the arguments furnished, and the governmental action secured, by the National Reform combination, the Catholic Church now claims, and with all her native arrogance assume, actual possession of our country. With the mouths of the Protestants, and Congress, and the Supreme Court, and the Executive, completely stopped by their own arguments and actions flaunted in their faces and before the whole country, by the Catholic Church, our country to-day is practically held by the Catholic Church, and, in view of the situation as described in the quotation from No. 12, is therefore practically a Catholic country. And every man and woman who ever aided the National Reform movement, or petitioned Congress for legislation in favor of Sunday, is responsible for it.

THIS is the situation, as it really is to-day in the United States. It is precisely the situation that we have expected, and that we have said would come. We shall have yet much more to say of it: and especially of that which is certainly to come of it. For there are things all-important to come from this, just as certainly as this has come from the National Reform scheme. We knew this was certainly coming from that; and we know that these other things are as certainly coming from this. Again we bespeak a serious consideration of the points presented in this paper, and of those which will follow. For not only is the National Reform combination still going on in its blundering blindness, putting yet further power into the hands of Rome, but Rome herself is all zeal and activity to make all her power felt to the utmost.

A. T. J.

The Kingdom of God in the Earth.

WHEN God created this earth and placed man in it, it was in pursuance of his divine purpose to fill it with free moral agents loyal to their Creator. "For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens: God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the Lord; and there is none else." Isa. 45:18.

The divine plan necessarily involved human probation; and so, when God had created the world and fitted it for human habitation, he created man also and gave him dominion over the earth. The inspired record is: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all

the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1:26-28.

This dominion was, of course, to be exercised, subject to the will of God: the earth was, so to speak, to be simply one of the States of the Universe. But Adam lost his dominion by sin; and this not in the sense that it reverted to God from whom he received it, but in the sense that by his own act man exchanged the service of God for the service of Satan, and both himself and his dominion passed to the arch enemy by whom he had been overthrown. "For of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage,"* says the inspired word; and again: "Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey?"† Adam had abdicated his dominion in favor of Satan, who is, by our Lord himself, three times called "the prince of this world."‡

When man sinned and so became the servant of Satan, it was as though the British East India Company, having received in 1668 from the British Government, dominion over the presidency of Bombay, that company had, by yielding obedience to some foreign prince, transferred that authority to him. The allegiance of the company and the temporary authority over Bombay would have vested in that prince as sovereign *de facto* though not sovereign *de jure*. The traitorous act of the East India Company could not have given the foreign prince any title to the presidency of Bombay, but it would have given him the dominion, until such time as it should be wrested from him; and if, in this supposed case, the British Government had determined not to use force, but moral suasion only, and not to resume the government of the colony until such time as a sufficient number of the inhabitants returned to their allegiance to the British crown of their own free will, we would have a case as nearly as possible analogous to the rebellion of man and the giving of his dominion into the hands of Satan, a foreign prince in rebellion against God.

That the earth will be finally wrested from Satan was foretold in the curse pronounced by the Lord upon the serpent: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." This seed was Christ; for he is mentioned repeatedly in the promise to Abraham (Gen. 12:7; 13:15, etc.), and in Gal. 2:16, we are told positively that that seed is Christ; says the apostle: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

The promise made to Abraham was a promise of this earth. So far as the record in Genesis goes, it might be understood to apply only to the land of Canaan; but in Romans 4:13, we have this explicit testimony: "For the promise that he should be heir of the world, was not to Abraham

or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." This inspired commentary upon the Mosaic record is too plain to be mistaken. Coupled with the text already quoted from Galatians, it means that the world was promised to Abraham *through Christ*. "And if ye be Christ's," says the apostle, "then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3:29. So that the destruction of Satan's power and the establishment of the everlasting kingdom of God in the earth is a matter of vital interest to every child of God by faith in Christ.

But Satan's usurped dominion will not be wrested from him until by moral suasion a sufficient number of the sons and daughters of Adam to people the world have been persuaded to return to allegiance to their Creator. God will have a willing service. It is "the willing and obedient that shall eat the good of the land." God is now visiting the nations "to take out of them a people for his name." When this work shall have been accomplished—then and not till then will Christ receive at his Father's hands the kingdom, and come, crowned "King of kings and Lord of lords."

The expression just quoted from Rev. 19:16, is, by many, supposed to describe Christ at the present time; but that this is a mistake is evident from the Scriptures. In Rev. 3:21 we have this testimony: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Here are brought to view two thrones: namely, the throne of the Father and the throne of the Son. The Father's throne, the one upon which Christ now sits, is in Heb. 4:16, called, "The throne of grace;" for it is the throne from which mercy is dispensed; says the apostle: "Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

The word "therefore," in the text just quoted, suggests some special reason for coming to "the throne of grace;" it is thus stated in the preceding context: "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin." Notice, it is because we have a sympathizing High Priest upon that throne that we are exhorted to come to it boldly. Christ sits on his Father's throne as a priest. Says the apostle: "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens."* And with this agree the words of the prophet: "Thus speaketh the Lords of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord [the Father]: even he shall build the temple of the Lord [the Father]; and shall bear the glory; and shall sit and rule upon his [the Father's] throne; and he shall be a priest upon his [the Father's] throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both."† This, then, is the position of our Saviour now. He is a priest upon his Father's throne, and the counsel of peace is between them both. "For God so loved

* 2 Peter 2:19; † Rom. 6:16.

‡ John 12:31; 14:30; and 16:11.

* Heb. 8:1.

† Zach. 6:12, 13.

the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16.

But when Christ takes his own throne, then shall be fulfilled his own words: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt. 25:31-34 and 41.

Human probation continues only so long as Christ sits as a priest upon his Father's throne. When he leaves that throne the decree goes forth: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still."† And immediately follow the words, "And, behold, I come quickly." Our Lord likened himself to a nobleman going "into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return."§ And immediately following the return comes the reckoning with the servants—that is, the final judgment. With this also agree Ps. 2:7-9: "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

It is true that Christ is now a king, and that he reigns over the kingdom of grace, perfecting, through the ministry of his word, subjects for his future glorious kingdom; but it is not true that he has yet taken possession of the territory of that glorious and eternal kingdom, or that he now reigns "King of kings and Lord of lords." He now sits as a priest upon his Father's throne, winning, by his mercy and matchless charms, willing subjects for his future glorious kingdom, which is, ere long, to be established in this earth, now sin-cursed; but which, renewed and purged of all trace of sin by the fires of God's justice, is to "rejoice and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon; they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God."

May God hasten the day!

C. P. B.

What Should He Ask?

ISAAC BAKER, of Kent Island, Md., now in jail at Centreville, in that State, for plowing in his own field on Sunday, has received a letter from a lawyer of the city of Baltimore, addressed to him at the Centreville jail, from which the following is a paragraph:—

Some friend has sent me a pamphlet, "Our Answer," from which I learn of your incarceration for the maintenance of what to you is a religious principle. While differing widely from your religious views, I hold sacredly the creed enunciated by our forefathers in the bill of rights that no person ought, by any law,

to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or his religious practice, provided, his religious practice does not render it impossible for others to enjoy the same privilege in differing practices. So long as the old law stands in our statute books, so long will it be the duty of judge and jury to enforce the law, but the law itself is a blot on the face of the nineteenth century, and should be repealed. From what I learn of Governor Brown I believe that a pardon would follow a presentation of the facts to him, and if you deem it proper to take such a course I shall be glad to do what I can to insure the success of an application by obtaining signatures, and otherwise, and to extend the same offer in regard to any attempt made to repeal or modify the law which bears so hardly upon you. With sincere sympathy for you and all other men who suffer rather than yield where religious principle is involved,
I am, truly yours,

Such expressions as these are evidence of the views held by the thoughtful and unprejudiced. It would be a question what plea Mr. Baker could make to Governor Brown. He is no subject for executive clemency. He has done no wrong, and is not in the wrong,—he has been wronged. The great State of Maryland has done to him, an humble but worthy citizen, a foul injustice. What can he ask of the State of Maryland, if anything? Could he, in justice to himself and the principle for which he stands, ask of the State of Maryland, for himself, anything less than a remission of his fine and a full reimbursement for the loss of time and the expense to which he has been put; leaving upon the records, credited against the State, the ineffaceable history of his imprisonment, as an indelible warning against further judicial and legislative disgrace? Could Isaac Baker ask anything less than this for himself? Certainly not. And for all his fellow citizens he could ask nothing less than an unconditional repeal of all religious laws in his State.
W. H. M.

Where is the Limit of Civil Authority?

Is civil authority supreme and universal, or is its jurisdiction modified and limited? If the authority of civil law is not unlimited, what is it which limits that authority, and where are the boundaries set?

To understand the scope of the authority of the State it is necessary to ask what the State is and by what process it becomes of authority? Primarily the people are the State, and it is through their action that the whole people are united into one body politic constituting a State and collectively taking the name of a nation. If this action is not taken by the people there is no organized body politic and consequently no State, and no civil authority. In such a case there would be no authoritative law except the word of each patriarch requiring the obedience of his immediate family. This is the primitive and natural condition, and may exist, even has existed, where there is a considerable population. When alliances are made for the purpose of mutual protection, or convenience, or for the carrying out of individual schemes of aggrandizement, the people must either make the alliance of their own authority or acknowledge its effect and agree to submit. Whatever the form of human government, the people are the first factor. As by the exercise of the capacities and abilities which God has given them they provide for themselves in all other ways, so also they take thought, by civil organization, to care for and protect themselves in the different exigencies of social and civil life. Whatever the form of government, then, those who administer it do so

by the choice or the sufferance of the governed. Every other theory of the authority of the governing over the governed is but an after-thought of those who rule, and born of a desire to usurp and permanently retain the place of authority.

Then those who administer the government are bound by the restrictions placed upon them by the body politic which delegated to them the authority which they possess; neither can they have any more authority than that given them by those whom they represent, and in case there are no specified or constitutional limitations, the stream of power cannot rise higher than its source, and the constituted authorities cannot possess higher or greater power than was possessed primarily by those from whom they received it.

There then is the limit of civil authority. Precisely that just and equitable right in reference to his fellow which was every man's prerogative to enforce against his neighbor if there were no government, exactly that, and no more, the constituted authorities have the right and duty of enforcement as between man and man throughout the body politic. Beyond this human government cannot rightfully go. So simple and easily found are the limits of civil authority. Human authority can not be supreme or universal. Man is a finite being, and can dominate nothing but what is temporal. His authority then is limited by his mortality and its boundaries are set within that finite limit. Every voice of human command which strives to assert its authority beyond that limit is but the echo of a futile blasphemy.
W. H. M.

Christ and the Sabbath.*

THE MEMORIAL OF GOD'S POWER.

WE have also a sign of the power of God pledged to us for redemption. That sign God himself has set up as a reminder to all the human family that they might remember him, that they might remember his power, that they might remember that his creative power has been pledged for salvation. This sign is as old as the exhibition of the power, and it is worth while to notice that this sign is referred to again and again as a continual reminder of the power of God. Three or four scriptures will bring these things together, that we may see this fact.

In the first chapter of Genesis we have a record of the creative power of God as manifested through Jesus Christ. At the close of the work we read, beginning with the first verse of the second chapter: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made. And he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." Remember that it was Christ through whom this power was manifested. Remember, therefore, that it was Christ who rested, and by whom this blessing was pronounced upon this day. Turning over now to the time when Christ spoke to the people from Mount Sinai, and when he rehearsed in their presence the ten commandments, we find this statement concerning this same day: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the

*From No. 14, of the *Religious Liberty Library*, by Prof. W. W. Prescott.

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 maidservant, 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 seventh day, and hallowed it."

But who was it that created all things?—It was Christ. Who was it that rested at the close of the creative work?—It was Christ. Who was it that pronounced the blessing upon this day?—It was Christ. Who was it that rehearsed this fact at Sinai, and gave as a reason for the rest that he created the heaven and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh?—It was Christ. Who was it, then, that pronounced a blessing upon the day, and hallowed it, and sanctified it?—It was Christ. And for what purpose was it?—It was as a reminder of the power of God manifested through Christ in creation, that we might be comforted, that we might be encouraged, as we remember that the same power which wrought through Christ in the creation of the heaven and the earth is pledged to work through Christ for our re-creation. It is to point out in a more definite way than we learn from the material universe the redemptive work of Christ.

It should appear very plainly, as it does in the Scriptures, that the Sabbath idea is to reveal Christ to the world, Christ in creation, and so Christ in redemption. It is for this reason that the Saviour said, in Mark 2:28, "Therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath day." Most certainly, because it was *his* day. So most appropriate it is that, in Rev. 1:10, John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Most appropriate. This day is to remind us of the creative work of Christ, of the rest of Christ, of the power of Christ in re-creation, that is, in redemption. The Sabbath idea, the Sabbath institution, is to point out Christ to us, to reveal his power to us, and is designed to be an encouragement to every believer in Christ.

SPIRITUAL REST.

It is important to notice what was done to this day. The record in the second chapter of Genesis, which is the first mention that we have of the Sabbath, says, "He rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." It is apparent to your minds at once that the Creator of the ends of the earth, who never wearies, and who never is faint, did not rest on that first seventh day because he had wearied himself in the work of creation. Said Christ to the woman of Samaria, "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." God being spirit, his rest must be spiritual rest. And that is a matter of no small importance, because we overlook the whole idea of the Sabbath when we take it to mean a day of physical rest. Who rested on that day?—Christ, who was the agent in creation, rested on that day. Because he was tired?—Not in any sense. It was a spiritual rest. He rested and was refreshed. He took delight in viewing the works which he had made. That was the rest. Sabbath means rest, and from the very nature of the institution of the Sabbath, it means spiritual rest. Observe the practical application of that idea. If physical rest is the only idea of the Sabbath, man can rest on one

day just as well as another. He can do more; he can divide up his rest during the several days of the week, and he can rest three or four hours each day, as may suit him. He may rest rainy days and work sunshiny days if he pleases, if physical rest is the only idea of the Sabbath.

Let it be understood that refraining from work is not Sabbath keeping. It may be Sunday keeping; it may be Saturday keeping; it may be Friday keeping; it may be Monday keeping, but it is not Sabbath keeping. It is not Sabbath keeping, because the idea of Sabbath is spiritual rest. And in no other way can the Sabbath be kept than as a spiritual rest. It will therefore be seen at once that all theories of Sabbath keeping which rest upon the idea of physical recuperation, are good for nothing. It is true that man can enforce abstinence from labor, but he cannot enforce Sabbath keeping. A man may be forced to refrain from physical work; he may be kept in idleness, but no one can enforce Sabbath keeping. It is a spiritual thing entirely. You will also see the consequence that grows out of this, and that is that *all* human devices, *all* human power to compel rest, with the idea of keeping the Sabbath, are wholly wrong.

Many a man who has tried to keep the Sabbath, has been unable to keep it; many a man who has longed to keep the Sabbath, has not kept it. He has refrained from work on the Sabbath day, but he has not kept the Sabbath. We shall see plainly why, as we proceed. Think of the impossibility, nay, more, think of the wickedness, of trying to compel a man to do what he himself cannot do if he wants to; trying to compel a man to do that which he himself has tried to do, perhaps for years, and has been unable to do. There must be something more than human power, there must be the power of God in Sabbath keeping. We shall see that more plainly as we go on.

(To be continued.)

"Are We Cherishing a Viper?"

UNDER the heading given above, the *Christian Statesman* of October 23, arraigns the papacy as—

the most powerful organized enemy civil liberty has ever contended against. . . . There is not an offense against human rights and liberties but may be justly charged against the papacy. . . . By her half-heathenish system of Christianity she has held the millions under her authority in the greatest darkness, mental and spiritual. . . . The papacy has not changed. She cannot change. . . . She is so constructed that she must insist on absolute supremacy over men and nations. . . . What is the purpose of this representative of the pope among us? We know he has no sympathy with free government. . . . The government that is warning the papacy is warning a viper that will some day sting it to the heart. . . . Let the American people say to this foe of human liberty, "Hands off!"

Would that all could read the character and aims of the papacy as the *Statesman* has presented it. Her history for a thousand years is before us, written in the blood of the saints. And just as surely as "the fundamental doctrines of her system forbid" that she change, just so surely is she to-day insisting upon "absolute supremacy over men and nations." And in order to gain this she is looking to and silently taking captive this boasted land of liberty in which we are living. A correspondent of the *New York Sun*, of July 11, 1892, stated that Pope Leo XIII. "hails in the united American States and

in their young and flourishing church the source of a new life for Europeans."

In the *Catholic Mirror*, of September 30, 1893, a European writer, in an article entitled, "Leo and Cardinal Gibbons," states that—

in Europe they say of Cardinal Gibbons as they say of Cardinal Manning. . . . He is for many, a religion; for all, a representative man. . . . At a time when Europe is being transformed, when she is seeking eagerly for examples to imitate and models to copy, this vision is fruitful. From the Catholic point of view, this communion exercises a salutary influence. Is not Catholicity a perpetual communion, and must we not glean the golden ears from all lands? The church is a veritable ocean, with its flux and reflux renewing life at each instant. Cardinal Gibbons is for us all a power and model. The Americans will never forget (and especially in the crisis through which they are passing), that Europe has its eyes fixed upon them, and that they have a mission to fulfill. In 1830 we passed the British Channel; since the affairs of the Knights of Labor, we pass the ocean. This is why the feast of the cardinal will be a feast for us all.

In the next paragraph the writer states that above all it will be a Roman feast, and that the cardinal is one of those rare ones that understand the pontiff and his profound designs, and then exclaims, "Thus the triumph of Rome is about to become absolute."

In the *Mirror* of September 16, the papal ablegate, Satolli, said that "here in America is the key to the future," and that the pope had especially charged him to speak words of hope, of blessing and encouragement. But the worst of it all is that professed Protestants to-day are doing all in their power to bring this very thing about. And just as surely as Judas Iscariot was guilty when he asked the question, "Is it I?"—is the *Statesman* guilty of the very thing it asks. The editors of the *Statesman* may not realize it,—we do not believe Judas did,—until, like him, they will see at last the fatal step when it is forever too late. Does not the *Statesman*, which claims to read the character and aims of the papacy, know the means that was employed in the past by this power to gain this supremacy? And cannot its editors see that the very means is being employed to-day to restore power to her again, when she will say, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow"? We not only have it upon the pages of history as clear as the noon day sun, but we have the unerring word of God that it was done and will be done again.

"In the movement now in progress in this country to secure for the institutions and usages of the Church the support of the State, Protestants are following in the steps of the papacy; nay, more, they are opening the door for popery to regain in Protestant America the supremacy she has lost in the Old World. And that which gives greater significance to this movement is the fact that the principal object contemplated is the enforcement of Sunday observance, a custom which originated with Rome, and which she claims as the sign of her authority." In this movement the *Christian Statesman* has been engaged ever since it has had an existence. What is the use of arraigning the papacy when at the same time those who make the arraignment are doing the very thing that will bring the papacy into power again? Has not the *Statesman* said that Protestants would gladly join hands with papists if they would cooperate in resisting the progress of political atheism? And did not the *Statesman* state in the very issue in which this power was arraigned that in the congresses to celebrate 1900 A. D. Liberals and Catholics could unite without

embarrassment? Tell us, if the Catholic Church has not changed and cannot change, how this church is going to unite in these congresses unless there is that there which is distinctly Catholic? Whenever Catholics have been invited to take part in such gatherings have they compromised any principle in so doing? Never! Cardinal Gibbons, when he was invited to make the opening prayer at the Parliament of Religions, said, "I followed the Catholic form, and stipulated that I should do so in advance. I could not have done otherwise, because there was a principle involved." But in what thing will Catholics cooperate with non-Catholics? In the Baltimore meeting of Catholic laymen it was said, "We should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance." Why will they do this? Will they violate any principle in so doing? Read this statement from the *Mirror* of September 23, 1893:—

The Christian Sabbath is therefore to this day the acknowledged offspring of the Catholic Church as spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.

This statement occurs in a series of articles that appeared in the *Catholic Mirror* last September, in which it was shown conclusively that "the claims of Protestantism to any part therein [that is, in Sunday as a Christian institution] proved to be groundless, self-contradictory, and suicidal."

Thus it is seen that this very institution that professed Protestantism is cherishing so dearly is an institution of the papacy and they do not deny it. And as we see the Government "warming" this child of the papacy because of the demands of the Church people for the furtherance of their aims, we say to the *Statesman* again, "Thou hast said," when it did say, "The Government that is warming the papacy is warming a viper that will some day sting it to the heart," and "let the American people say to this foe of human liberty, 'hands off!'" R. D. HOTTEL.

More Antagonistic Societies.

AN organization known as "The Society of Liberty and Loyalty" is coming into prominence in the city of Denver, Colo., "called into existence by the growth of the American Protective Association," the purpose of which is stated to be "diametrically opposite to that of the proscriptive order." "The intention," says the *Rocky Mountain News*, "is to centralize the American idea of freedom and equal rights to all," in opposition to "the un-American idea of bigotry masquerading under the name of religion." If, by "the American idea of freedom and equal rights to all" is meant the idea which prevailed in forming the Constitution of the United States, the "intention" is a good one; but it cannot possibly be carried out by taking and keeping an oath to uphold the laws of Colorado, as each member of this society is required to do, or by pursuing a course based upon the first principle in the declaration of principles set forth by the society, as will appear from further consideration. What was once "the American idea of freedom and equal rights to all" is fast becoming "the un-American idea of bigotry masquerading under the name of religion"—"National Reform,"—from which the laws of even Colorado itself are not free. It is not to be supposed the American Protective Association will

claim for itself perfection; but even granting that it were as bad as this new-fangled thing would make it appear, it can hardly be believed that its openly avowed hostility to the Catholics in political circles is more dangerous to "freedom and equal rights to all," than is the result of the insinuating methods used by the National Reform Association.

Now, as the National Reformers themselves assert, nearly every State in the Union has a law forbidding common labor on Sunday. The work of National Reformers is to enforce these laws, which is nothing less than abridging the freedom and equal rights of those whose religious belief leads them to observe another day of the week than the first. And the president of this new sort of liberty and loyalty is himself a zealous advocate of Sunday laws.

The first article in the declaration of principles of the Society of Liberty and Loyalty, is as follows:—

We believe that all persons should be protected in their right to worship God after the dictates of their own conscience, as long as that worship is not in the nature of a violation of the Constitution and laws of the land.

If the Society of Liberty and Loyalty would eliminate the last clause of this article,—which limits man's right to worship God after the dictates of his own conscience, to its *not conflicting with the laws of the land*,—every liberty-loving citizen could subscribe to it; for this right does not depend upon the Constitution and laws of the land, and the only limitation it has is to respect the same right in others. If the laws themselves proscribe the freedom and equal rights of citizens, they ought not to be supported. And, since laws do exist abridging the freedom and equal rights of citizens, as before proved, the Society of Liberty and Loyalty, by subscribing to the first article of their declaration of principles, bind themselves to do just the opposite of what is avowed to be their intention to do.

Again, in the first paragraph of the oath, the members swear to uphold by word and act the laws of Colorado. One of the laws of this State reads:—

Any person who shall hereafter knowingly disturb the peace and good order of society, by labor or amusement, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday (works of necessity and charity excepted), shall be fined, on conviction thereof, in any sum not exceeding fifty dollars.

By upholding this law the Society of Liberty and Loyalty gives support to "bigotry masquerading under the name of religion," to oppose which is the stated intention of its founders. The intention may be sincere, and is certainly commendable; but the intenders either are not aware of the existence of such a law on the statute book of their State, or else entirely ignore it. Whichever it be, both the declaration of principles and the oath are inconsistent with the published intention of the society, and are weak weapons with which to oppose "bigotry masquerading under the name of religion."

The Society of Liberty and Loyalty needs to revise its declaration of principles and to stand on a broader platform before it can hope to oppose successfully the American Protective Association or any similar organization.

W. E. HOWELL.

Religion and the Public Schools.

IF the State provides any education, it must be secular only. If the people are taxed for public schools, the instruction in them must be wholly secular. The *Boston Congregationalist* expresses the hope that "the religious character of the nation will rise to so high a level that it will be felt to be necessary that every child in the land should be impressed, as an essential part of his education, with a sense of his personal responsibility to God and the supreme importance of obedience to God." It thinks, apparently, that when that elevation is reached no one will object to religious education in the public schools. But what is this "personal responsibility" and in what consists this "obedience"? The answer involves the differences which divide opinions variously and radically. They are the differences which separate Protestantism from Roman Catholicism, and split up Protestantism into so many opposing camps. Every church exists simply because it believes that obedience to God requires its specific doctrine.

Hence the public school system cannot continue except as a purely secular system. It cannot undertake to settle the vexed question of what obedience to God is. It must steer clear of all religious disputes, and to do so it must steer clear of religion altogether. The more earnest the religious convictions of people are, the more impossible is it for them to agree on an eclectic religious education. Each party wants nothing except its own understanding of obedience to God inculcated.—*New York Sun*.

Sunday Organization in India.

THERE is in India an organization known as the "Lord's Day Union," the object of which is to further in all practicable ways the observance of Sunday as a day of rest. It seeks to prevent all unnecessary labor on that day, having, of course, as an ultimate object the use of the Sabbath in a Christian way. It is a striking fact that applications are now coming for membership in this society from large numbers of non-Christian natives, so that the society is seriously perplexed. Of course it would like the aid of all men of all faiths in the prevention of unnecessary toil on the Lord's day, and yet it cannot afford to lose its distinctive Christian character as basing its obligation to observe the day upon divine authority. But it is a significant fact that Hindus and Mohammedans and Parsees recognize so clearly the value of the Christian Sabbath.—*Missionary Herald*.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET.

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

It perfectly secures pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it can not fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

No. 1.	Russia leather, for 2 pens	10c.
No. 2.	" " " 3 "	15c.
No. 3.	Sealskin, " 2 "	15c.
No. 4.	" " " 3 "	25c.
No. 5.	Russia leather, for 4 "	25c.
No. 6.	Sealskin, " 4 "	40c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices.

Pacific Press,
Address 43 Bond Street, New York City.

PRISON LIGHT Wants active agents everywhere. Good pay. 15c. Trial year. Indorsed by SENTINEL. Particulars free. MYERS, PRISON LIGHT, Newfane, Vt.



NEW YORK, JANUARY 4, 1894.

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.

OUR new motto, the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world," expresses a truth which, if understood, would at once and forever settle the question of the duty of the minister of Christ. "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord."

THE pope has complained in a personal letter to the czar that in several districts of Russia the Orthodox inhabitants are maltreating Catholics. It is said that in the event of the pope's remonstrance proving ineffectual he will publish a statement on the subject, probably in the form of an appeal to the Christian sentiment of the world. We do not remember that anything of the kind was ever done by any pope when "heretics" were being maltreated by Catholics. It makes a vast difference to "his holiness" (?) whose ox is gored.

"THE compulsory submission of Archbishop Corrigan," says the *Converted Catholic*, "to the authority of Monsignor Satolli, the papal delegate, is the most striking manifestation of the power of the Roman Church in this country that has yet appeared." It is nothing of the kind; the most striking manifestation of that power is in the truckling of so-called Protestants to the papacy. Rome might reasonably be expected to rule her own, even in America. It is the homage of her professed opponents that is a matter of astonishment.

Two of the three Seventh-day Adventists imprisoned in Queen Anne's County, Md., for exercising their God-given right to work on Sunday, have been released. One, because his son, who was also the complaining witness, paid the fine; the other, at the expiration of thirty days. But one, Mr. Isaac Baker, is still in prison. Under date of December 18, he writes:—

Centerville Jail, Dec. 18, 1893.

I am still rejoicing in the blessed promises of the gospel, and when I received notice that I must remain in jail thirty days longer, deprived of civil liberty and separated from my dear wife and children, I just said, "Lord, thou knowest best!" I am daily asking God to lead me; and I know that he is leading me; and I am willing to follow.

This man is as he says deprived of civil liberty, but it is impossible to deprive a Christian of liberty in Christ. Such an one can say, even in prison, "I walk at

liberty; for I seek thy precepts." The "glorious liberty of the children of God" is a thousand times better than any liberty that governments can give or take away. The Saviour's counsel is: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Few men have been called upon to endure more suffering unjustly than was the Apostle Paul, but he wrote "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us."

A LONDON paper notes the fact that in a recent election in New Zealand the women, who by the way voted for the first time, cast their ballots, as a rule, for the candidate professing Christianity. Our English contemporary remarks that "many people will doubtless hail this as a wonderful addition to the cause of Christianity, but thoughtful ones will see in it a special bid in favor of hypocrisy. When a profession of Christianity is generally considered essential to public office, every political hack in the world will at once profess Christianity, and will shout himself hoarse in his anxiety to demonstrate the strength of his profession."

THE following dispatch is somewhat old for news, but serves just as well to point a moral:—

NEW HOPE, Pa., Nov. 30.—Mrs. Merrick, the teacher of the public school at New Hope, decided a few days ago that all of her pupils must commit to memory and recite at the devotional exercises upon the opening of the school, a verse from the Bible. The order awakened bitter opposition from the parents of the Catholic children, but the schoolmistress was firm, and told the children that they would have to commit the verses or remain after school hours until they did so. The dissenters finally submitted. It is now rumored that the priest in charge of the parish will open a parochial school in the parish church.

Suppose the position of the parties to this contest were reversed, and the Catholics were in the majority in the district and the teacher were a Catholic, and the devotional exercises were such as to be objectionable to the Protestants,—would the principles be changed? Would it then become wrong for the teacher to remain "firm"?

THE *Examiner* (Baptist), of this city, has, in its issue of Dec. 14, 1893, a communication from J. Heinrichs, a missionary in Vinukonda, Kistna District, India, in which that gentleman defends the principle of State aid to missions. He says:—

Some of us hold that, disunited as the Baptist denomination is from the recognized State religion, and carrying an education for its own sake, we have a right to be aided by grants from government, its supervision and educational ideals, as far as it is willing to help us in our philanthropic effort.

And this is exactly what the Romanists claim here, namely, that they have a right to be aided by grants from government; and every Baptist is up in arms against

it. Consistency has indeed become a jewel by its rarity, among modern Protestants so-called.

THE *Christian Statesman* recently volunteered this bit of pertinent advice to the papacy:—

If you want to practice your religion in peace in this land, and persuade the people that you mean well for all, then you must, somehow, get your fingers out of the politics of the country, and do as other denominations of Christians are doing—attend to your own business, and not try to overturn the sacred institutions cemented with patriot blood and tears. We very much fear you are making trouble for yourself and for the country. It is with the utmost sincerity we give you this pointer and suggest that you stop and think.

This is good advice, and is quoted by the *Truth Seeker*, of this city, with this comment, equally as pertinent as the advice itself:—

Suppose, Doctors Crafts and McCrory, editors of the *Christian Statesman* and physicians in ordinary to his holiness the pope, that you take a little of your excellent medicine yourselves. It is good medicine, we'll guarantee that, and you need not fear to administer big doses of it to the National Reform and Sabbath Observance associations. Begin the treatment right now; get your fingers out of the politics of the country, and do as only two denominations of Christians—the Adventists and Unitarians—are doing—attend to your own business, and not try to overturn the sacred secular institutions cemented with patriot blood and tears. We are sure you are making trouble for yourselves and for the country. It is with the utmost sincerity that we give you this pointer and suggest that you stop and think.

Good as it is, this advice is wasted on the *Statesman*. Its editors have scented blood and have tasted political power, and they will not pause to consider the evil of their ways. "Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone."

IN the English Parliament recently, Mr. Thomas Sexton, anti-Parnellite questioned the Government as to the alleged discrimination on religious grounds in selecting jurors in Ireland. Mr. James Bryce answered that the Government had never instructed the Crown solicitors to ascertain the religious belief of jurors. Mr. Sexton said the answer was unsatisfactory, and gave notice that he would move that instruction be given to the Crown solicitors to stop the practice of challenging jurors on account of their religious belief. It is thus that these questions supposed to be long since buried once and forever are being revived.

SUBSCRIBE for the AMERICAN SENTINEL at once, and get the forthcoming articles on the Roman Catholic question.

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.			