



"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, FEBRUARY 8, 1894.

NUMBER 6.

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 papacy is posing before the Government and people of the United States as the support of society and the stay of civil order.

OPPORTUNITIES are sought for and even created on every possible occasion by the dignitaries and prominent men of "the church" to proclaim her as the conservator of public order, and that there can be no assured safety without the "benign offices" of "the church."

IN taking his seat as temporary chairman of the Catholic Congress at Chicago, September 4, 1893, Morgan J. O'Brien, of the Supreme Court of New York, said:—

That the solution of the present social difficulties is to be found in the Catholic Church, we know; for as has been well said, "That church . . . is recognized as the synonym of authority, the foe to lawlessness, and the champion of law and order."

IN the same congress, September 5, Archbishop Watterson, of Columbus, said:—

If society is to be saved from a condition worse in some respects than that of pagan times, it is from the Vatican the saviour must come. . . . Leo XIII. is recalling to the minds of men those great bedrock truths on which the health and life of nations and society depend. . . . He shows that the papacy is this great social necessity, this universal moral power in the world, the bond of union and the principle of order.

THESE are only samples of what may be found in almost every Catholic speech and Catholic paper. Thus she sounds her own trumpet before her, and, in this as in other things, "Protestant" preachers and papers toot their little horns behind her, saying, "That is so." There are many examples of this, and there have been many in recent years.

FOR instance, in the *Evangelist*, of this city, a Presbyterian paper, whose editor speaks of Cardinal Gibbons as "Our Cardinal," February 9, 1888, a Presbyte-

rian D. D. of Princeton, described the papacy as—

The church of all races, ranks and classes, which gives signs of becoming American as well as Roman, and the only church fitted by its hold upon the working masses, to grapple with that labor problem before which our Protestant Christianity stands baffled to-day.

And in the *North American Review* for January, 1894, Bishop Doane, of the "Protestant" Episcopal Church, of Albany, in this State, strikes the same key to the following effect:—

The Roman Catholic Church throughout the world is really two or three absolutely distinct and different things. Whatever one may feel about the schism which it is, and the schisms it has caused; or, however deeply one may deplore the novelties with which it has overlaid the old faith (which, like all novelties, being on the top are the things most thought of and most dwelt on by her people), these are not matters for discussion here or now. In spite of these, she is to every intelligent mind an ancient and venerable portion of the Christian Church; and in her discharge of her ecclesiastical and religious duties, is to be protected and respected, teaching other Christians many lessons of devotion, consistency and courage, which we should do well to learn. Beside this, she is a factor in the lives of thousands of people, citizens of our country, who are kept from evil living by her ministrations and control; and when we consider the fact that the enormous majority of the crowded poor belong to her communion, that perhaps the most turbulent element in our citizenship owes at least a faint and nominal allegiance to her authority, that without the control of her priesthood, we should be powerless to deal, except by brute force, with great masses of the workingmen of America; we must certainly be ready to secure to her every opportunity for doing the legitimate work of a great Christian Church. Over and above this—and I say it with no unkindness—since an overwhelming proportion of the inmates of our institutions of reform consist of her people, it seems right to me, provided no money for the support of religious services come from the State funds, that her clergymen should have access to the inmates of these institutions under proper regulations. The Roman Church is also a beneficent institution, with multiplied and manifold orders and agencies of mercy and charity, in the support of which, and in their methods of administration, she is not only to be protected, but greatly admired and imitated by others.

And that such papers as the *Independent* and the *Christian at Work*, indorse it all, needs not to be proved by quotations.

THIS claim of the papacy and its admission by Protestants, is worth examination for its own sake, and more in view of the use that is made of it. When viewed in the light of facts of open every day experience, it will be seen to be as void of truth, as perfectly fraudulent, as was ever

any claim that was made by the papacy. Nor do we need to go outside of good Catholic authority for evidence to start with. In the Chicago Catholic Congress, September 6, 1893, Archbishop Ireland said:—

We say this is a glorious church of ours—as, indeed, she is—and yet what a fearfully large proportion of those so-called saloons are held by Catholics; and what a fearfully large proportion who lose in them their souls, are children of the church.

And the same day in the congress Mr. M. T. Elder read a paper, in which he stated this and more, thus:—

When I see how largely Catholicity is represented among our hoodlum element, I feel in no spread-eagle mood. When I note how few Catholics are engaged in honestly tilling the honest soil, and how many Catholics are engaged in the liquor traffic, I cannot talk buncombe to anybody.

AMEN, say we. And yet throughout that whole congress, with the exception of Mr. Elder's paper and one more, there was nothing else than one continuous stream of this same "spread-eagle" stuff and "buncombe" as to "the church" being the "champion of law and order" and "the saviour of society." And all this, too, in face of the patent and conscious fact that "Catholicity" is so "largely represented" among the "hoodlum element" of the nation; and that a "fearfully large proportion" of saloon keepers and those who patronize them are "Catholics" and "children of the church"—yes, of "this glorious church of ours."

THERE is another illustration strictly to the point, and which is fresh in the minds of all the people of the country. Everybody knows that for the greater part of the month of January, 1894, the whole executive authority of the State of Florida, from the governor down, was kept on the alert, and even the authorities of the adjoining State of Georgia—and all in vain, too—to prevent a prize fight, in which one of the principals and a majority of the trainers, etc., were "good" Catholics. And yet not a single official of the Catholic Church said a single word or did a single thing to prevent that fight, when, if any of these claims on behalf of "the church" are true, a single word from any of them could have stopped it. This is not saying that "the church" should

have come to the aid of the State of Florida. But it is to say that if she is of any kind of good to society and civil order, she ought to be able so to instruct and civilize "her children" that they would not want so much to fight that all the power of the State cannot keep them from it. It is also worth remarking in this connection that any one who will read the names in the "sporting" notes of the daily papers, or the "sporting" papers, will have no difficulty in seeing that a "fearfully large proportion" of the prize fighting element, as well as of the saloon element and the "hoodlum element" in general, are "children of the church."

THERE is another fact in illustration of the point which we are making—that the Catholic Church is not in any sense the champion of law and order—and which is late enough to bear an air of considerable "freshness." Thursday night, January 18, 1894, in Kansas City, Mo., an ex-priest was making a speech, when the meeting was broken up by a riot. As is always done in such cases, the "police," instead of quelling the riot and arresting the rioters, arrested the speaker whom the rioters had attacked. Further proceedings are clearly enough described in the following dispatch to the *Atlanta Constitution*, a Catholic paper, January 21:—

KANSAS CITY, Mo., January 20.—Had not the police authorities to-day taken extra precautions to guard the life of J. M. McNamara, the ex-Catholic priest, who lectured last Tuesday night when a riot occurred, he would probably have received rough treatment, if not lynched. At his preliminary hearing to answer to the charges of malicious libel and circulating foul and obscene literature, such a large crowd gathered that the authorities decided to transfer the hearing to the county jail, where McNamara was incarcerated. The news that the hearing was to be held there quickly spread, and a mob numbering fully 4,000 people gathered outside of the jail. A number of extra policemen were detailed to endeavor to keep the crowd in order. When McNamara was brought from his cell his countenance was very white. The court room was packed and the spectators regarded him with anything but friendly glances. When the case was called McNamara's attorneys moved for a continuance, they not having conferred with him, and it was granted, not only for this reason, but because of the threatening aspect of the mob. The hearing was set for Thursday next.

Nobody will have any difficulty in deciding who these rioters were. Everybody knows well enough that this whole mob was made up of the "children" of "this glorious church," which is confessedly so "largely represented" in the "hoodlum element" of the Nation. The despatch further states that a local paper declares that Mr. McNamara in his speech "said nothing that would warrant his arrest on the charges preferred against him." This, however, is evident enough on the face of the report.

Now, if it be in any sense true that "the Catholic Church is the foe to lawlessness," why does she not antagonize this lawlessness in her own membership? If it be in any sense true that she is "the champion of law and order," then why does she not champion law and order in her own ranks and inculcate the principles of law and order upon her own "children"? If it be in any sense true that "the solution of the present social difficulties is to be found in the Catholic Church," then why does she not solve these social difficulties that are so prevalent amongst her own people? If "it is from the Vatican that the saviour must come," who is to save society from this condition that is fast becoming worse than

pagan times, why is it that the Vatican is unable to save its own organization from this condition that is "worse in some respects than pagan times"? If she is in any sense the source of so much good to States and nations, as is proclaimed for her, then why is it that she is not the source of enough good to her own communicants to keep them from overawing the civil authorities and intimidating justice by riotous demonstrations? If it be in any sense true that the Catholic Church is "the synonym of authority," then why is it that she has not authority enough to check the native devilry of her own children?

THERE is an apparent shadow of truth in the observation, that the Catholic Church is better qualified than any other church "to grapple with" the strikes and the consequent riot and violence of "the labor problem" "by her hold upon the working masses." And this because such "a fearfully large proportion" of the strikers, with their rioting and violence, are members in good and regular standing in that church! This is the hold which she has on the working masses. But here is the question: Having such a hold upon these striking, rioting, violent masses, why is it that she cannot so control them that there will be no danger of any of this evil work, which makes the "labor problem" such a serious and dangerous question to society and to the State? Having already such a hold upon these masses, that she owns the vast majority of them, body and soul, and yet being impotent to prevent any kind of evil or violence from them, what could possibly show more plainly that all this boasting about the Catholic Church being "the champion of law and order," "the synonym of authority," the "saviour of society," etc., etc., is nothing but a downright, huge, and unconscionable fraud?

If there were any truth at all in these claims put forth in behalf of the papacy by Catholics, and sanctioned by "Protestants," it would prove itself in the quietude and peaceful demeanor of the whole body of the membership of the Catholic Church. There would not be a single saloon keeper, nor a visitor of saloons, nor a user of intoxicants, among all the vast membership of that Church; there would not be a single prize fighter, nor a single rioter, nor a single striker, nor gambler, nor any uncivil person of any kind, among all her children. Instead of this being so however, everybody knows, and facts of daily experience keep it ever within their knowledge, that the opposite is the truth of the matter, and that all these characters are found, and abide, in her communion for ever and everywhere; and that she has no power to prevent it. This is not saying that there are no characters of other kinds in her communion but these; it is only saying what everybody knows, that *these* characters are there, and she has no power to cause it to be otherwise. And that as she has no power to cause it to be otherwise; so all the claims put forth in her behalf as being the stay of civil order and the saviour of society are absolutely fraudulent.

THE plain, unvarnished truth is, that the papacy is so entirely the synonym of lawlessness, that the Word of God describes it as the "lawless one" and the very "mystery of lawlessness." It is the

corrupter of society, the disabler of States, and the weakener of nations. It never was, and never will be, and never can be, of any kind of good under the sun. That church is "Babylon the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." The Word of God says so, and it is so.

A. T. J.

Christ and the Sabbath.*

(Concluded.)

WHOSE POWER SHALL WE ACKNOWLEDGE?

IN the observance of the true Sabbath, we acknowledge the divinity, the authority, the power of God manifested in Jesus Christ,—that is to say, we acknowledge the divinity, the power, the authority of Christ. In the observance of the false Sabbath we acknowledge the pretended claim of the Catholic Church which is but the agency of Satan in this matter; we acknowledge the pretended claim and authority of the Catholic Church to the same thing. In the observance of the true Sabbath we acknowledge that our confidence for salvation is in the living God and his power manifested through Christ. In observing the false Sabbath we acknowledge that our trust and confidence for salvation are in that rival power, that rival authority. And any rival to God in Jesus Christ is simply a manifestation of the working of this spirit of Satan. It is Satan who instigates all opposition to God; it is Satan who urges every individual to reject Jesus Christ. And, in this matter of the false Sabbath, the sign of the pretended power, we see this working of Satan, who would steal away from the true God, and from Jesus Christ, in whom he is represented to the world, the homage, the worship belonging to him.

No one who observes the true Sabbath in the true meaning of it, can ever turn away from Jesus Christ. It is the constant acknowledgment of his belief in the divinity, the authority, the saving power, and saving grace of Jesus Christ. But any one who turns away from the true Sabbath, the sign of the true God in Jesus Christ, and turns to the false Sabbath, a sign of the rival power, has turned his back upon the law of God, and upon the temple of God, and worships with his face toward the east.

THE SABBATH A QUESTION OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE TRUE GOD.

It is not simply an observance of days as such, whether we shall stop work upon Saturday, or stop work upon Sunday, but the question is, What God are we to serve? In what power are we to trust? In whom are we depending for deliverance?

It is a question of allegiance to the true God, or allegiance to some rival or pretended power. That is the thing that is in Sabbath-keeping now; and all the people, everywhere, ought to know it. And they will know it; for we read: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven, and

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

earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Rev. 14:6, 7.

The highest form of worship is in obedience. To worship Him who made heaven and earth, the sea, and the fountains of waters, is to yield our obedience to him. And this message, given everywhere, calls attention to the worship of the true God, the Creator, and really contains in it the essence of Sabbath reform, in that it calls upon us to worship the true God, the Creator, by obedience to him, and that we observe the day which is a sign, or a mark, of his creative power. So when this scripture began to be proclaimed in a special manner about half a century ago, out of that grew the Sabbath reform, because the message of the Sabbath was in it. That is the sign, or the mark, of the true God, as opposed to any rival of any kind. The observance of the true Sabbath is the sign, or mark, of allegiance to the true God, the Creator of the heaven and the earth.

WHO ARE CHRISTIANS?

Those who *knowingly* choose the sign of the other power, and who by their lives testify that they accept the mark of the rival power, thereby show that Christ is not dwelling in them, with his sanctifying power, but that they are depending upon some other power for their salvation. It is therefore necessary that the truth in regard to the Sabbath should be proclaimed to all men, that everywhere there might be an understanding choice in this matter; that everywhere men might know what is the sign of the power of God in Christ to save, and might hasten to yield themselves and to put their trust and their confidence in him for salvation, that everywhere it might be proclaimed that a rival power has sought to turn men away from the true God, that a rival power has come in, with the effort to steal away the confidence of men in Jesus Christ as the only Saviour; that they might be shown who the true God is, and what his service really includes.

But the question is asked at once, Are there no Christians except those who keep the seventh day? Have there not been Christians in all ages who never kept the seventh day? Are there not Christians now of every name and denomination who do not keep the seventh day?—Most certainly. Well, then, what difference does it make? and why call attention to this matter now? Notice this; it is the root of the whole matter. He is a true Christian who yields himself to God; he is a true Christian who follows all the light that God causes to shine upon his pathway. We are responsible for the use we make of the light given to us of God. Now when one is a true Christian, he has the desire, he has the disposition, to be conformed to the life of Jesus Christ, and every truth revealed to him concerning the life, the power, the work of Jesus Christ, is what he wants to know. But just as soon as the true Christian receives light which he has not known before, and refuses to obey it, that instant he ceases to be a true Christian. Just as soon as one who is a true Christian, a child of God, receives light, he welcomes that light. The disposition of heart is that he may be perfectly conformed to the image of God in Christ. But when light comes, and he refuses the light, he turns against God, and is no longer a true Christian; and although up to that moment he may have stood a justified child of God, yet

when God reveals to him more light, and says to him, "This is the way, walk ye in it," and he says, "No," just then he loses his standing as a justified child of God; just then his Christian experience stops, and it does not make any difference whether the invitation of God to him is to observe the true Sabbath in the true meaning, or whether it is some other duty presented.

Furthermore, the people who are to be prepared for the coming of Christ, who are to be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, who are to be translated without seeing death, are to have the character of Christ perfectly wrought in them, so that it shall be said of them, "And in their mouth was found no guile; for they are without fault before the throne of God." Rev. 14:5. What did Pilate say of Christ?—"I find no fault in him." What is said of the people who are ready and are translated at the second coming of Christ?—"They are without fault." That is to say, they are just like Christ; the character of Christ is wrought completely in them. But in order that this should be so, their lives must be in perfect harmony with the character of God, because Christ was a representation to the world of the character of God. He interpreted God to the world. But the law of God is a transcript of the character of God. It is a statement of what God is, and when the life of man is made in harmony with the law of God, it is then that he is without fault; it is then that he is like Christ. It is therefore necessary that the attention of the people who are to be translated should be called to the fact that in disregarding the Sabbath of the Lord they are, in that point, out of harmony with the life of Christ, and so out of harmony with the character of God; and if they are to be translated without seeing death, and if it is to be said of them that they are without fault before the throne of God, that defect in character must be remedied.

THE SABBATH CONTROVERSY.

And so just before the second coming of Christ the Sabbath truth must be preached; just before the second coming of Christ the people must be told what the meaning of Sabbath-keeping really is, and what day is the Lord's day, and that, in choosing that day, they thereby take upon themselves the mark indicating that they belong to God; that they are trusting in the power of God in Christ for salvation, as against any rival power. So arises the Sabbath controversy, the calling the attention of the nations to the fact that the seventh day is the Lord's day, the seventh day is Christ's day, the seventh day is the day that God in Christ blessed and sanctified, that it has been given as a sign of the power of God in Christ.

TO COMPEL IS SATANIC.

It is a characteristic of Satan to compel, and every effort to compel in any way the consciences of men is Satanic. Every effort to compel the consciences of men in any way, whether it be the Sabbath or any other matter at issue, is Satanic. God wins by the power of love; God leaves every one free to choose; Satan tries to compel. And every law of any kind or nature tending to control, to bind men's consciences in their relation to God, is purely Satanic. And every effort to put laws upon the statute books of this country, compelling any religious observance

whatsoever, is an effort gotten up by, controlled by, and in the interest of, Satan. Every one who by vote or by voice helps on this work of compelling the consciences of men by law, is being used as an agent of Satan. It is purely Satanic from first to last, and the results will be Satanic. That is, these efforts will end in utter ruin and destruction; they will end in the utter ruin of any church that takes hold of them; they will end in the utter ruin of any State that is controlled by them; they will end in the utter ruin of every individual who yields obedience to them.

In every country Sunday laws are coming to the front. At the present time the agitation is world-wide. Everywhere the enforcement of Sunday-keeping by law is being agitated. It is the manifestation of a rival power against Jesus Christ, and the question is for every one, To whom shall I yield my allegiance? and the mark of whose power shall I receive?

The conception of a "civil Sabbath," or the "civil side of the Sabbath," is a recent invention, adopted under the stress of the situation, in order to open the door for Sunday laws.

Every effort to compel the conscience is Satanic, and the results will be Satanic. But while there is this power now being manifested in the earth, attempting to control the consciences of men in this very matter of the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, there is an increasing power in the love of Jesus Christ, and it is drawing souls to him. It is drawing true Christians of every name and denomination to rally around the standard of Prince Immanuel. It is drawing everywhere those who hear the truth; they gladly turn to Jesus Christ and his power in salvation. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Our hope can be well founded only when it is founded in Jesus Christ. And the Sabbath of the Lord, the day instituted by Jesus Christ himself, blessed by him, sanctified by him, and hallowed by him, is the sign to every Christian of his power to save. It is the measure of his Christian experience, his growth in grace, and his knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Receive Jesus Christ, the only Saviour, and receive his Sabbath, the sign of what he is to every one who believes in him.

Proclaim Liberty Anew.

FOR twenty-five years the *Christian Statesman* labored arduously, hand-in-glove with the papacy, for "amendments to the Constitution," and religious legislation to designate us as a "Christian nation," as if religion could be legislated into human character, and consisted in empty words instead of earnest deeds.

Religion, like love or like death is a power uncontrolled by human laws.

"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God."—Which is pure religion.

"For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteous-

ness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 8:35-39; 10:3, 4.

Religion is the power of God unto salvation, the supreme spirit of love, and is superior to all written instruments; and so let it remain. Christ's gospel was a proclamation of absolute liberty. Come every one that will. Choose ye. But the perfect freedom to accept exists alone upon the same freedom to reject. Therefore the wisdom of the framers of our great Constitution should be commended, declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" showing conclusively that no State could give or force its citizens to receive its prescribed religion under penalty of imprisonment, with even the shadow of justice or of liberty of conscience.

Why do the heathen Romans rage and their people imagine a vain thing?—That Americans will become papal slaves, without liberty of conscience, or freedom of worship. Proclaim anew the law of liberty throughout the land!—*Welcome Tidings.*

The Cloven Hoof of the "Sabbath" Satan.

[The following article from the *Truth Seeker* is recommended to the careful consideration of the Boston *Investigator* and of Dr. Westbrook, late president of the American Secular Union. The "liberals" of the country are evidently getting their eyes open to the sophistry of the "civil Sabbath" plea. In this article the *Truth Seeker* errs only in applying the name "Christian" to things essentially *antichristian*. There are, properly speaking, no "Christian persecutors;" and Sunday, instead of being Christian, is essentially pagan and papal.]

THOSE who have kept themselves informed on the Sunday observance question know that nearly all the leaders in the movement are very restive when it is charged that they wish to compel the people to observe Sunday as a holy day. They make it their business to declaim against the union of Church and State and they are sharp enough to see that they will lay themselves open to the accusation of favoring such union if they advocate Sunday laws in the name of religion. They have invented several specious catchwords with which to deceive such of the people as might dangerously antagonize them should they frankly avow their purpose to make Christianity the State religion. They talk glibly and delusively of a "civil" Sabbath which shall be enforced in order to allow everybody (except preachers, church organists, sextons, ushers, choirs, *et al.*) to "rest" on Sunday, and they vary this siren's song with considerable illogical and nauseating talk about the "morality" of Sunday reverence. But this pious pretense cannot be kept up all the time; not all the Sunday worshipers can be induced to talk discreetly—some will persist in making "unguarded statements" and thereby getting the whole Sabbatarian happy family into hot water. The latest to do this are some Boston clergymen, who have assembled themselves together and adopted these resolutions:—

We, the Congregational, Baptist, and Methodist ministers of Boston and vicinity, assembled in our Monday meeting, October 2, 1893, cordially unite with the Massachusetts Sunday Protective League in the following expression:—

In view of the deplorable increase in the issue of Sunday newspapers in Boston, we are constrained to renew our earnest protest against the Sunday news-

paper, and our strong condemnation of it, as one of the chief agencies of evil in hindering our work.

Because it preoccupies the minds of its readers on the Lord's day with secular things, from the contemplation of which the higher needs of human nature and the beneficent divine requirement prompt man then to rest;

Because it thus beguiles its readers to neglect and exclude from their thought those religious considerations on which all right character depends;

Because it thus indisposes its readers for public worship in the house of God, disqualifies them for it, and detains them from it to a degree that is rapidly changing the habits of large sections of our population, far and near;

Because in thus becoming a main instrument in breaking down the habit of public worship in our land it weakens the religious restraints which are indispensable to the stability of society, and thus becomes a foe to good order and a menace to our civilization.

We look with the deepest sorrow upon the unscrupulous and unpatriotic greed, and the inhumanity, exhibited in the publication, distribution, and sale of the Sunday newspaper, trespassing upon the civic rest day of large numbers of railroad employes, newsdealers, and especially youthful carriers; and in view of the hearing now in progress before the railroad commissioners of this State in regard to special Sunday newspaper trains, we respectfully represent to that honorable board that it seems to us against public policy to grant special favor to any one line of business on Sunday.

Now, here are five reasons why these clergymen are opposed to the Sunday newspaper. Four of these reasons relate entirely to the religious aspects of the matter and only one bears upon the "rest" question. Then which is of the most importance in the eyes of the clergymen, and, consequently, which will most influence their actions in the attempt to secure the suppression by law of these papers, the religious or the secular relations of the problem? Is it not perfectly plain that the Sunday law advocates are working in the interest of religion, that they want to enforce the observance of Sunday because such observance will, in their opinion, advance the cause of religion, and that their talk about securing a day of "rest" for helpless workingmen is the sheerest humbuggery? No foe of the Sunday tyranny could have more clearly and succinctly stated the case for the opponents of Sunday laws than have these ministers in the foregoing resolutions, especially in the third and fourth. They are opposed to the Sunday paper, as they are to Sunday amusements and Sunday work, primarily and chiefly because such publications, recreations, and labor interfere with *their* work on their particular work-day. All these secular agencies help to curtail their influence and authority in the community and lessen their means of livelihood.

In the last resolution an "anchor is cast to windward;" a saving clause in regard to the "civil rest day of large numbers of railroad employes, newsdealers, and especially youthful carriers," is introduced, but it is evidently very much of an afterthought, a secondary consideration which it was necessary to recognize somewhere in order to draw, if possible, some support from the so-called laboring classes. But labor is benefited, not injured, by the Sunday paper. There are always more men than there are places, and there can be no doubt that where superstition does not dominate, a sufficient number can be found who will gladly do this Sunday work, thus giving the "week-day" employes a chance to rest. As for the "youthful carriers," meaning, without doubt, the newsboys, the Sunday paper is an immense assistance to them. Suppose that a daily journal issues one hundred thousand copies of its Sunday edition, which sells for five cents per copy, and that the newsboys get one and one-half

cents of each five paid by the reader. This gives the boys fifteen hundred dollars in wages each Sunday for the one paper of one hundred thousand circulation. Then a good portion of the remaining three and a half cents finds its way into the workingmen's pockets, being distributed in the composing room, stereotyping room, press room, paper mill, ink manufactory, and various other places. Of course much of this, in the absence of the Sunday paper, would have been drawn into the coffers of the church, but we cannot afford to weep with the ministers because of this diversion. . . . The daily newspaper proprietors are often cowardly and mean, loudly defending their own right to engage in business on Sunday, but joining with the Christian persecutors in hounding men engaged in less popular enterprises who try to earn a dollar on that day. But actions are more important than words, and hence the example of the Sunday papers is one making for the widening of the bounds of free and just action, spite of their verbal lapses at times.

The clergymen are right in their denunciation of the granting of special favors to one line of business, therefore we can never consent to give the preachers, . . . a monopoly of Sunday. Let them take their chances with men and women engaged in all other occupations. Let each person select his or her own rest days and rest weeks and rest months and rest years. The hand of the Church must be kept off the helm of State. The priests must not be permitted to subvert and degrade justice in the name of physiology. We thank the Boston ministers for letting in the light of day upon the sinister designs of their junto. It is not the rest-day but the "*Christian*" Sunday for which they clamor and scheme. We know what they want and where they are. We shall have only ourselves to blame if we are ultimately beaten.

The Maryland Court of Appeals on Sunday Laws.

THE following from the *Baltimore American* of January 24, tells the story of the Judefind case, appealed from Kent County:—

January 23, the Court of Appeals handed down a number of important opinions. The first was the now celebrated Kent County Seventh-day Adventist case, the opinion being written by Judge Boyd. John W. Judefind, a Kent County farmer who had embraced the Seventh-day Adventist faith, was arrested for husking corn on Sunday. He was fined \$5 by a magistrate, appealed to the Circuit Court, was tried before the court, convicted and fined \$5. He brought his case before the Court of Appeals by petition in the nature of a writ of error. First. That section 247 of article 27 of the code is void, because it is in violation of the first paragraph of the fourteenth article of the Constitution of the United States. Second. That said statute is void because it is in violation of article 36 of the Bill of Rights of the constitution of Maryland. Third. That the Circuit Court for Kent County had no jurisdiction to try and convict traverser, since the justice of the peace had no jurisdiction; because the warrant charged no offense under the statute, as it failed to set forth that the husking of corn on Sunday was not a work of necessity or charity; because the warrant was issued and served on Sunday; because the bond of the traverser is void, because it charges "Sabbath-breaking," and no such offense is known to the laws of this State. The attorney general moved to quash the writ of error, on the ground that no writ of error lies to this court from the decision of the Circuit Court on an appeal to it from the judgment of a justice of the peace. That motion, says the court, must prevail.

If the petitioner wanted to try the constitutionality of the law he should have applied for the writ of certiorari upon that specific ground, and this court could then have reviewed the case. Alleged defects in

warrant and bond cannot be reviewed here. Having settled the case on the ground that no writ of error lies to this court in the case, the Court of Appeals, for fear that some doubt may rest as to their views of the main issue attempted to be raised to the validity of the arrest under the constitutions of the State and the United States—the Court of Appeals says that the law complained of is not in violation of these codes of organic law. Numerous decisions sustain this view, and nature, experience, and observation suggest the propriety and necessity of one day of rest, and the day generally adopted is Sunday. There will always be differences as to how the day shall be spent, but the advantage is too apparent to doubt.

In interpreting these differences we must not place unreasonable constructions upon them; but a man, if he defies the law of the State, must expect to be punished. If the position of the plaintiff be correct, then the law prohibiting the sale of liquor on Sunday, etc., is unconstitutional, as would be most, if not all, of our laws concerning Sunday. The court says that Sunday has been observed as a day of rest from the foundation of the State, and cites *Kilgore vs. Mills et al.* (6 G. and J., 274, and 11, Maryland, 313) to prove the position, and it says the laws are looking to a still surer making of the day a day of rest. Writ of error quashed, with costs.

It will be seen that the court went out of its way to sustain the Sunday law of the State of Maryland. There remains but one course for Maryland Adventists, namely, to disobey the law "and quietly suffer the penalty." This is the course advised by President Fairchild in his work on moral philosophy, in such cases, and it is the course which has been pursued by the servants of God in all ages. This was the course pursued by the three Hebrews when commanded to worship the golden image in the plain of Dura. Dan. 3:1-26. The prophet Daniel pursued the same course when forbidden by royal decree to offer any petition to any god or man for thirty days, save of the king only (chapter 6); and the same course was likewise followed by the apostles when forbidden by the magistrates to speak in the name of Jesus. Acts 4 and 5. We are not to resist rulers, neither are we to obey them when to do so is to sin against God. We are to obey God and take the consequences.

Sunday Here and There.

[These items are taken from the column of "News Worth Telling" in the *Christian Statesman* of January 27, and are given just as they appeared there except that we call the pagan holiday by its proper name, "Sunday," instead of dubbing it "Sabbath," as does the *Statesman*. The Lord says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" and we are not going to say that the first day is the Sabbath. "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil."]

A COMMITTEE of five Episcopal clergymen, in Providence, R. I., was recently appointed to consider the better enforcement of the laws against the desecration of Sunday.—At the persistent solicitation of the workmen, the Holyoke paper mills have ceased to run on Sunday. The mills will stop at midnight Saturday and start at midnight Sunday.—Eight thousand candy, cigar and other stores are open in Philadelphia on Sunday. A petition signed by nine hundred voters was prepared by the Philadelphia Sabbath Association and presented to the mayor on last Friday asking that all stores, except those provided for in the act of 1794 as necessary, shall be closed on Sunday.—A canvass of the new city council of Toronto shows a majority against the resubmission of the Sunday street car question to a vote this summer.—In his address at the last annual meeting of the American Sabbath Union, Rev. Plum of Boston, charged the secularization of public thought on the Sunday question mainly upon the Sunday newspapers.—The *Congregationalist* states that the custom of giving quiet dinner parties on Sunday

evening is increasing especially in our cities. This custom must cease if the Sunday is to remain.—Comparatively few persons who break the Sunday laws are prosecuted; and yet \$1,996 were paid into the sinking fund of the Pennsylvania treasury from such fines during the year 1893. If all cases of Sunday breaking were fined, such as railroads and others, the State treasury would be filled.—The *Theocrat* of Johnstown, boldly asserts that the Sunday-travelling habit of many ministers, leading Christians, camp meeting projectors and managers, are among the chief promoters of Sunday breaking. If the religious press of our land would ring out with the clarion voice of our contemporary of the Conemaugh Valley this accusation could not long be truthfully made.—At the request of the Evangelical Alliance, all the ministers of St. Louis preached Sunday, Jan. 14, on "The Observance of the 'Lord's day' in Secular Matters." This was the result of the letter sent to the alliance by the Retail Clerk's Association concerning Sunday opening of which we made mention last week.

A Positive Force.

A WRITER in the *News* has been discussing the question, "Is Protestantism a mere negation?" The answer to such a question must depend very much upon the signification given to the term "Protestantism." If by that word is meant only what is seen in the most of that worship which differs in form from Catholicism, it may be doubtful whether it is a "mere negation" or not. Certainly a large part of it is not much more than this, and is so rapidly identifying itself with Romanism that it will soon cease to be even that. But if by that term we mean the faith of men like Luther, Wycliffe, and others who in former times earnestly contended against Rome for "the faith once delivered unto the saints," and of the few who are contending in like manner to-day, then the question may be answered with an emphatic negative. Protestantism is not a mere negation, but a positive and most powerful force.

True Protestantism is something very different from a mere denial of the errors of popery. It is a denial of those doctrines, just as truth is always a denial of error, although this is not the proper way to speak of truth. Truth comes first and error afterwards, so that error is a denial of truth, rather than truth a denial of error. And this is all error is; but truth is a positive, living force. It stands alone, beautiful and complete in itself, ignoring all error, and clothed with the power and life of Him who gave it birth.

True Protestantism is the gospel of God. It is "Protestantism" only because of the protest of the princes whose faith led them to stand out against the corrupt communion of Rome. It is a belief, a faith. It was not created by the protest of the princes, but only acquired by that a new name. It existed long before "Protestantism," as a name, was known; long before there was any occasion for such a name. It existed, indeed, from all eternity; for the gospel of God is the "everlasting gospel," being "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16; Rev. 14:6.

The only protest that is needed against Rome's errors is the proclamation of this gospel, this power of God unto salvation.

This is the most effective protest that could be made, for the straightforward proclamation of divine truth is the best barrier that can be raised across the path of the error that denies it. The worst thing that can happen for error is to be contrasted with the truth. The worst thing that can happen for popery,—the power of the pope and the priest and the virgin unto salvation,—is to be contrasted with the power of God unto salvation, which is the gospel. This gospel can be proclaimed without any reference to popery whatever, and still be just as strong and effective a protest against it.

But the adherents of the papacy wish to make it appear that Protestantism is something dependent upon popery, a mere denial of the doctrines of popery, and therefore something which could not have existed without it. They wish it to appear that popery was first, and Protestantism came after it. But it is only the name that came after it, and not the principles. Popery is the thing that denies, and not Protestantism. Gospel truth was first in the field; it was there from all eternity. It was preached to the children of Israel in the wilderness (Heb. 4:1, 2); it was preached by the apostles eighteen hundred years ago; it was preached by a faithful few in the Dark Ages; it is preached by the "remnant" of Christ's followers to-day. The gospel is not on the defensive; it does not care for popish innovations; but now, as ever, it calmly and majestically pursues its way to every nation and people and tongue, being "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

The gospel is a positive force; it is an infinite force. Popery cannot stop it, nor any other power that can be brought against it. This is the force which is in the true religion, the true Protestantism. It is a force which lives and works in individuals, in the Word of God which abides in the hearts of Christians. If your religion does not contain this force, it is not the gospel of God. If your heart does not feel this power, if your life does not manifest it, you are not yet in the way of salvation.—*Present Truth, London, Eng.*

The Sabbath That Christ Kept.

CHRISTIANITY is based on the redemption work of Christ. Man had broken God's law in Eden and the curse of a broken law hung over humanity. A law was made at Sinai and written on tables of stone of which God said: "Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, which if a man do he shall live in them." Man failed to obey this law so help was laid on One who was mighty and able to save to the uttermost. In the fullness of time when God's purpose had matured, which he purposed before the world began, he sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law. His office was to magnify the law and make it honorable. This he did by living a life of perfect obedience to it in every jot and tittle, and he proved it to be "holy and just and good."

Holiness is sinlessness. Sin is the transgression of the law, so holiness is perfect obedience to the law. Christ was holy and as such was acceptable to God, and as such was fitted to become a sacrifice for sin. Had Christ not obeyed the law perfectly he would have been a sinner. "The wages of sin is death." Had Christ sinned

his death could have had no redemptive power. It would have been the penalty of a broken law. It was his perfect obedience to God's law that qualified him to intercede for us. Had he broken the law in one point he would have been guilty of all. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" was a part of God's law, and the day was expressly declared to be the seventh day. We know that Christ kept the Sabbath day holy, for he declared himself to be the "Lord of the Sabbath day." Had he not done so, he would have been a sinner, not able to redeem even himself. John says, "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk even as he walked." 1 John 2:6. The 4th verse reads, "He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar and the truth is not in him." If we do not obey this Sabbath law as Christ did we are convinced of the law as transgressors. Christ said in Matt. 5:18, R.V. "Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished;" that is, not till the end of this age. The enforcement of God's law, then, is a purpose that cannot fail. Christ said on another occasion, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fail." The destruction of the material universe, then, would not thwart God's purposes, as would the failure of the least part of his moral law.

Christ's success as a redeemer depended upon his keeping the seventh day. Had he kept Sunday, as do so many of his professed followers, we would be still in our sins for the law would remain broken. He could only redeem men from the curse of the law which he obeyed himself. Christ never kept the first day of the week so that if it were possible for God to alter his Sabbath law which he made obligatory "forever," and he did alter it, we should have no mediator under the new law. Christ could be no refuge for us under a broken law which he never kept himself. That God made no change at his resurrection is proved by Christ's words in Matt. 24:20 where, in anticipation of the destruction of Jerusalem, which happened forty years afterwards, he said, "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter neither on the Sabbath day." This was spoken to a company with whom he habitually kept the Sabbath day of the fourth commandment.

THE LORD FAILED TO RESPOND.

The effort made to secure the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday was the most conspicuous and united effort ever made by Christians in the world's history, to secure divine interference in human affairs. Elijah once made an appeal to Jehovah as between God and Baal, with very decisive results. In this trial he rejected all human adjuncts; he flooded the altar with water, and at the decisive moment he appealed to the Lord God of Abraham, who sent a divine fire which licked up the sacrifice, the wood, the stones, the dust, and the water.

In this latest case of appeal to God all human adjuncts calculated to assist him were liberally added. Congress was besieged for a suitable law, as never before in its history. It was flooded with literature and correspondence. Boycotts were freely threatened against all those who did not vote according to dictation. Two million and a half of dollars, which by circumstances became five millions, were

placed before the directors as a bribe for closing. Twenty-five million, eight hundred and twenty-five thousand and eighty-six people were counted as petitioners for its closing, thus giving impetus to the threatened boycott, while eighty-seven thousand five hundred and seven were all that opposed it. The one represented united Christendom, while the other represented "a few vagabond Jews and infidels."

The millions of Christians are supposed to have prayed for its closing, and they certainly performed herculean labors for the space of two years in that interest, while nobody prayed against it.

All conventions, conferences, synods, alliances and religious gatherings of every name, enforced the threatened boycott and passed denunciatory resolutions to enforce the closing. At the least appearance of success God was given all the glory, and hallelujahs were sung in his praise. The President of the United States was called upon for armed troops to shoot down offenders. Pestilence and cyclones were invoked, and the most direful consequences were predicted in case of failure to close. "And it came to pass that there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded." Baal was as silent as he was in Elijah's day. Had there been the least sign of interference it would have been pushed to the uttermost in the interest of "the venerable day of the sun." It was not a contest between Sunday and the "Sabbath of the Lord our God," for the latter did not appear in the controversy. The name and character of God's day, given to it by the Most High, were stolen from it and attached to the false Sabbath, which its enemies would thrust into its place.

From the human standpoint it seemed impossible but that the gates should be closed, but in God's providence the failure was made signal and complete. When the case reached Judge Goggin's court it stood, two judges for a decree which would permit of closing, and one that stood opposed; the triumph was now considered as won; but, behold! the one man triumphed over the two, and the gates could not be shut. Had not Judge Goggin appeared in court that morning, the desired end would have been gained. A fit of apoplexy would have stopped him; an attack of colic, a slip on an orange peel, a sickness in his family, a slight mental influence, or if the charge of drunkenness, which was brought against him, had been true, of which there is no evidence, a little excess of drink would have hindered him from appearing. Had the gates been as signally closed as they were signally kept open, it would have been construed as a clear indorsement of Sunday as God's transferred Sabbath day. On the other hand may not the total failure of the tremendous efforts made for closing be triumphant evidence that God will not give his sanction to a day of human substitution?

Will the National Reform combination learn no lesson from all of this? They invoked the issue and called upon God for vindication. They were beaten at every point by his providence. They are not ignorant men. Their chief spokesman, W. F. Crafts, made this plain at Saratoga. He must see the fatal lapse in the logic which makes void the law of God, by putting the wild solar holiday of all paganism in the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. Is not the denun-

ciation of Christ in Matthew 15:7 of tremendous force as towards all such men? "Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophecy of you saying, this people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." In Mark 7:9, he adds, "Full well ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition."

J. W. WOOD.

Wants to Imprison and to Hang Sabbath-Keepers.

A REPRESENTATIVE of the International Religious Liberty Association sends the following to the secretary of the association:—

While working in Chattanooga, some weeks since, I became acquainted with an old journalist and ex-attorney, who, in conversation upon the Sunday movement and legislation, affirmed that Sunday laws and the rights of conscience have nothing to do with each other; but that such laws belong to the civil branch of legislation, and that all violations of Sunday laws should be punished. He further affirmed that as for himself he is in favor of punishing those who break these laws, with imprisonment in jail, and if they violate it a good deal, he would put them in the penitentiary, and for very bad offenses, he would hang them.

This man is simply more outspoken than others; thousands would say the same if they spoke their real sentiments, and other thousands will doubtless come to the same point under stress of what they will imagine are divine judgments sent on the people because of their disregard of Sunday. The Scripture says of the two-horned beast of the 13th of Revelation: "He had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." The image of the beast is apostate Protestantism dominating the civil power, and, like the beast, the papacy, its badge of authority is the false Sabbath.

They Will Not Confess: They Dare Not Deny.

THE Catholic journals in the United States neither made any reply to the specific charges formulated against the Catholic hierarchy in regard to its declared claims and purposes, nor do they attempt any defense of them. It is apparently quite impossible to extract from one of them either a denial of those claims on the one hand, or an acknowledgment that they are true on the other. The fact, of course, is that the organs of the hierarchy are in a dilemma and unwilling to impale themselves on either horn of it. If they should acknowledge as church canons, for example, the following, that, (1.) "The Roman Catholic Church has the right to deprive the civil authority of the entire government of public schools; (2.) That she has the right of perpetuating the union of Church and State; (3.) That she has the right to require that the Catholic religion shall be the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all others, and (4.) That she has the right of requiring the State not to permit the free expression of opinion,"—if open acknowledgment were made of these, which are political claims of the hierarchy, by the Catholic journals, it might shock, to some extent, the sentiment of many Catholics who con-

sider themselves loyal American citizens; being themselves ignorant of the political policy and claims of the close corporation by which they are governed—the teaching church, the hierarchy. On the other hand the Catholic journals cannot deny what that hierarchy has openly proclaimed as canon law and the constitution of the papacy. They cannot be induced to respond to any challenge involving these facts, nor to admit any such information into their columns that might have the effect of opening the eyes of the millions, dupes of the hierarchy. They much prefer to remain doggedly silent, or whine for sympathy from non-Catholics quite as ignorant as millions of the hierarchy's own subjects of its aims and purposes. Rome ever wears a mask.—*American Constitution.*

Some Pennsylvania Law.

PENNSYLVANIA has a law, enacted in 1855, which provides that bequests to religious and charitable bodies shall be invalid if the will be made within a month of the decedent's death. Some time since one, John L. Knight, of Philadelphia, made a bequest to the Friendship Liberal League, and then very inconsiderately died within thirty days. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has just set the will aside on the ground that the Liberal League is to all intents and purposes the same to its members as a church, and its creed and principles the same as a religion. Hence, the law of 1855 applies to this body.

This decision seems to be all right, but the *Christian Reformer* finds fault with it, not because the Liberal League loses the bequest, but because of the ground upon which the decision was made. The *Reformer* says:—

This may be good law as far as it goes. But there are legal precedents that give a better ground for the denial of the validity of this bequest. The court incidentally referred to these grounds when it said in the present case: "Looked at from a Christian standpoint it might be said that such a bequest was irreligious and immoral, that it was unworthy to be treated as charity, and that its tendency was positively hurtful. This might be true from the point of observation occupied by an impartial humanitarian or patriot." We have not seen the dissenting opinion of Justice Dean, but we presume that he holds to the decision given by such legal authorities as Justice Sharswood, who holds that a bequest to an infidel or antichristian society is null and void because of the intrinsically immoral and hurtful character of such an organization.

We have no sympathy whatever with infidelity, but we have as little with the Christianity(?) that must be shielded behind civil statutes and be accorded special privileges to compete successfully with infidelity. A man has a right to hold and to teach any religion or no religion, and to devote his property to the promulgation of any doctrine he pleases while living, even in Pennsylvania; and having that right what kind of law is it that would deny him the right to do the same thing after death? Certainly a man ought to be permitted to dispose of his property by will in any way that he might legally and justly dispose of it during his lifetime.

C. P. B.

THE Roman Catholics have, or at least had, McNamara, the anti-Catholic lecturer in jail in Kansas City; and a popish paper suggests for him five years in the penitentiary. McNamara's offense is telling the naked truth about the confessional and the nunneries. It is not to be supposed that Rome will stand that sort of thing very much longer in this country.

Already the *Western Watchman* boasts that if such things "were printed in a newspaper the sheet would be confiscated and its publisher fined;" and when the bill introduced into the House, Dec. 13, 1893, by Mr. Hayes of Iowa, shall have become a law, everything of the kind can certainly be excluded from the United States mails. Rome is beginning to feel and exercise her power.

APROPOS of the leader in this paper on the subject of Roman Catholic lawlessness, is the following editorial note from the *Western Watchman* (popish paper published in St. Louis, Mo.):—

Mr. Tiernan wrote a very sensible letter to the Kansas City papers on the subject of the McNamara riot. He said the fellow should not be protected by the police. If the substance of his lecture were printed in a newspaper the sheet would be confiscated and its publishers fined. If it were sent through the mails the sender would be put in prison. Why should the police be detailed to protect the speaker, when the writer is clapped in prison? By all means leave the McNamaras and the Slattery's to the "small boys."

The *Watchman's* "small boys" are full-grown Roman Catholics, who generally, under the leadership of priests, resort to mob violence when anybody, especially an ex-priest or an ex-nun, goes to telling "tales out of school." These wayward "children of the church" know too much.

IN addition to the note quoted in the preceding paragraph, the *Watchman* has, in the same issue, namely January 25, an editorial of nearly a column written in defense of mob law for anti-popish lecturers. The *Watchman* says:—

Who can blame them [Roman Catholics] if they rise up to strike the blasphemer in the mouth? These miscreant travellers should not be protected. If their occupation excites to riot they should be made to choose some other calling. If they cannot be restrained by statute or ordinance let them carry their hides to the market; and if they get holed, let it be charged to the profit and loss of the business.

The editor of the *Watchman* is a Roman Catholic priest, "Rev." D. S. Phelan, a professed minister of Him, "who when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed the keeping of his soul to him who judgeth righteously." But "as the heavens are higher than the earth," so are God's ways higher than the ways of the papacy.

THERE is a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the University of this State, caused by the death of the Right Rev. Francis McNeirny, Catholic Bishop of Albany. This vacancy the legislature must fill by election, and as the place was formerly filled by a papist, some of the papers are urging that it be filled from the ranks of that communion. Touching this suggestion, the *New York Sun* (Democratic) says:—

The Republicans of the legislature are not likely to consult the *Times-Union* in filling this vacancy, though they may go to the town of Albany, where it is published, for their candidate. If they establish any religious test or condition of membership of the Board, they will be taking a new departure. The religious convictions of Regents of the University form no part of the qualifications of candidates. The old and well-established rule of filling such vacancies with reference to the question of fitness only, is a good one which cannot be departed from with safety.

This is sensible. There is no sense in the idea that a Roman Catholic should be chosen simply because a member of that church formerly held the office. Men should be chosen for civil offices without the slightest reference to their religious faith. Our laws as yet know no religious qualifications for office.

Since the foregoing was written, the fol-

lowing item from the *Albion, Nebraska, News*, has come to our notice:—

The Catholic deputy sheriff has at last been announced, and Phil Langan is the lucky man. They are surely entitled to this much recognition for electing the populist ticket last fall; in fact, it is hard to believe that they will be satisfied with so insignificant a portion.

Has it indeed come to this that the offices must be divided up among the churches?

THE *Congressional Record* of January 25, has the following, second column of page 1503:—

MR. FRYE. I introduce, by request of the officers of the National Reform movement, a proposed amendment to the Constitution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (S. R. 56) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:—

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amended form of the preamble of the Constitution of the United States be proposed for ratification by conventions in the several States; which, when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the States, shall be valid as a part of the said Constitution, namely:—

"PREAMBLE.

"We, the people of the United States, devoutly acknowledging the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and nations; grateful to him for our civil and religious liberty, and encouraged by the assurances of his Word to invoke his guidance, as a Christian nation, according to his appointed way, through Jesus Christ, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

The same joint resolution was introduced in the House on the same day by Mr. Morse of Massachusetts. It was in both cases referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Religious Liberty Library," No. 18.

THIS important number of the *Library* is now ready. It is entitled "Christ and the Sabbath: or Christ's Faithfulness in Sabbath-keeping," being substantially the same matter as appeared in the November *Home Missionary*, as a sermon by Elder A. T. Jones, at the Lansing, Mich., camp meeting. It has been revised and very much improved, some important additions being made. It presents a striking parallel between the course of the Pharisees and Herodians in accusing, persecuting, and even killing Christ, for not keeping the Sabbath according to their own ideas, and the course pursued by the "Pharisees and Herodians" of our own day against those who follow Christ's example.

This is an excellent number to follow up Nos. 14, 15, and 16. "Christ and the Sabbath" shows what the true Sabbath is; "Rome's Challenge" shows what the spurious Sabbath is; "Our Answer" shows our attitude during the contest between the true and the spurious Sabbaths; and No. 18 sets forth Christ as our example in continuing faithful to the true Sabbath, and shows that since Jesus was persecuted for Sabbath-breaking when he was Sabbath-keeping, so when we are persecuted for Sabbath-breaking when we are Sabbath-keeping, we are in "most blessed company."

Will every Sabbath-keeper show his faithfulness by giving this number of the *Library* at least as wide a circulation as any previous number? Thirty-two pages, price 4 cents; fifty for \$1.00.

Orders can be filled at once by the Pacific Press, 43 Bond Street, New York.



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 8, 1894.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

NEW YORK CITY has \$55,588,725 worth of untaxed church property.

THE *Methodist Protestant* defends the persecution of Adventists in the interests of a legal Sunday. It is evident that the *Protestant(?)* feels the weakness of its cause else it would not appeal to civil law. Only the weak want help.

WE learn from the *Review and Herald*, of Battle Creek, Mich., that W. A. McCutchen and Elmer C. Keck, the Seventh-day Adventist minister and teacher, fined \$50 each, and costs, some weeks ago, in Gainesville, Ga., for Sunday work, have been indicted for the same offense, by the grand jury and will be tried the last week in February.

AN exchange asks: "What is Roman Catholicism?" Let the Scriptures answer: "That man of sin," the "Son of perdition," "That wicked," "The beast," "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." Such is Roman Catholicism. And yet it is no worse than the so-called Protestantism that indorses its principles and apes its methods. The papal beast and his image finally share the same fate: "These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone."

DECEMBER 29, Mr. Crafts, late of the so-called *Christian Statesman*, lectured before the Baltimore Ministerial Union on his favorite theme, *i. e.*, how to make people keep Sunday. After enumerating the difficulties encountered in enforcing the "civil" Sunday, Mr. Crafts said that in the State of Maryland, a new element has arisen, namely, human sympathy for those who have been imprisoned for working on Sunday. He then ridiculed this sympathy and tried (with poor success, however, be it said to the credit of his audience), to provoke a laugh at the expense of the recently imprisoned men. But he seemed to stand in awe of the milk of human kindness, and so told his hearers how it could be effectually dried up. His plan to overcome this dangerous element, human sympathy, is to have each minister "write personally to his representative" in the legislature protesting against any repeal or modification of the Maryland Sunday law. "Write!" "write!" "WRITE!" says this modern inquisitor general, who, while professing to deprecate the prosecution of Sabbath-keepers

for private Sunday work, covertly aids and abets it. Maryland Sabbath-keepers have nothing to hope from man, but *Deo adjuvante, non timendum*. The injunction of our Saviour is to the point: "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."

THE *Christian Intelligencer* thinks that the worst enemies of Sunday are those who invoke the civil law against observers of the Sabbath. It says:—

The worst enemies of a day of rest and worship are those who enforce the penalties of the civil law against persons who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week, and therefore pursue their ordinary vocations on the first day. So long as such persons do not hinder others from enjoying the rest and privilege of Sunday, they are entitled to pursue their own chosen course without let or hindrance.

Surely they are; but are they entitled to pursue their own course any more than are others who "do not hinder others from enjoying the rest and privilege of Sunday"? Is not the whole system of Sunday legislation at fault? Is it a correct principle that requires a man to have some religion before he can do as he pleases so long as he does not hinder others from enjoying like liberty?

THE *Christian Advocate* and the *Examiner*, two religious weeklies of this city are before us, both bearing date of February 1. The *Advocate* complains that lynchings are becoming common in the North; and the *Examiner* finds fault because the governor of Florida did not override the order of the courts of that State and prevent the recent prize fight. We have nothing but detestation for prize fights. They are disgraceful and degrading; but is their influence as pernicious and as far-reaching as would be the example of a governor himself overriding the law and usurping powers not given him by the laws which he is sworn to uphold and to administer? Certainly not; and yet the *Examiner* says of such cases:—

What a State needs is a governor of the Andrew Jackson type who is capable of making and enforcing his own laws for about fifteen minutes. If Governor Mitchell had had the nerve to send his militia to the spot, arrest the fighters in the act and land them in jail, it would go hard with the State of Florida if its lawyers could not afterwards find law enough to justify his action.

No State needs anything of the kind. Prize fights are evil, and it is anything but creditable to our civilization that public exhibitions of that kind are possible; but better a thousand acts of brutality than one of usurpation. Cannot the religious press see that in advocating usurpation by the State it is inciting mob violence by the people? If executive officers may make law in emergencies, what wonder if the people do the same thing when by some startling crime their feelings are outraged.

THE *Independent* is out with another apology for Rome, based, this time, upon the opinions expressed by the Catholic press on the school question. "The *Pilot*, of Boston," says the *Independent*, "which is edited with great intelligence and with much of the spirit of New England's fairness, says that the letters which we have printed [the letters from the Catholic bishops] are fairly representative of the whole church." As stated by us last week, of these thirty letters only one expressed unqualified disapproval of the proposed Roman Catholic raid on the public school funds; two are indefinite; six are clearly evasive; while all the other twenty-one are in favor of it—some with conditions and others rabidly and unconditionally. And one of these gives the words of Cardinal Gibbons that: "This [Catholic] education our children cannot have in the public schools, therefore we wish to have our own schools; and as we cannot, without the help of the State, we desire a share of the public school fund to enable us to have such schools."

Yes, these letters are doubtless, as the *Pilot* confesses, "fairly representative of the whole [papal] church;" yet some how or other the *Independent* evolves from them the remarkable conclusion that it is "right in interpreting them as showing that the Catholics do not propose to overthrow the public school system." The *Independent* is a remarkable paper indeed.

THE Roman Catholic press is well pleased with the *Independent*, of this city, because it has been rubbing the papal fur the right way. Sycophancy is always well-pleasing to Rome. Centuries ago inspiration said of this wicked power: "Through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by prosperity shall destroy many." But at last "he shall be broken without hand;" for he shall be "cast alive into the lake burning with fire and brimstone."

As noted elsewhere in this paper, the *Congregationalist* thinks that the custom of giving quiet dinner parties on Sunday evening must cease if the "Sabbath" is to be preserved. This shows the extent to which the Sunday movement is to be carried; spies must intrude into the very homes of the people, in the interest of this pagan-papal day that is to be crammed down the throats of everybody by the National Reform combination backed up by the civil law.

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.			