



"If any Man Hear 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 22, 1894.

NUMBER 8.

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.

LAST week we examined on its merits, and in the light of indisputable historical facts, the claim that the papacy is the source and stay of civilization.

WE found that in the great and leading opportunity which she first sought and found, for the establishment of a permanent "Christian civilization," she proved herself a most deplorable failure—that, instead of purifying and enlightening anything, she corrupted and darkened everything.

WE found that the claim that is made by her, and in her behalf by "Protestants," that she civilized the barbarians who destroyed the Western Empire, is a sheer unmitigated fraud: that instead of converting them she corrupted them; and instead of aiding them in every way, she retarded them in every way. And we promised to show now what she did for those whom she could not corrupt; and what she did within her own proper sphere in the way of helping or blessing mankind.

NOR is this in any sense "threshing over old straw." As it has been authoritatively announced from the Vatican to the American people that "what 'the church' has done in the past for other nations, she will now do for the United States;" and as her "apostolic delegate" is here to guide in the doing of this, it is simply a practical object-lesson to enable the people to take a look at what she has done for other nations. And, assuredly, the time when she had the most untrammelled opportunities to do what she could or would for nations—that is the time which presents the fairest point from which to view her.

BESIDES this, as what she has done for others, she will now do for us; in looking at what she has done for others, we can find profitable lessons which will instruct

us to-day, beforehand, that we may be the better able to know what to do. In studying these things we are but studying the lessons which faithful history has taught—alas, however, too much in vain. The Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy, under Theodoric, is the nearest parallel in all history to the situation of the United States Government, as it was established, as related to the papacy. The principles upon which the government of Theodoric was conducted, are almost identical with the principles upon which the Government of the United States was founded. And what the papacy did for that nation is worth knowing, in view of the statement that what she has done for others she will do for the United States.

THEODORIC ruled Italy thirty-three years, A. D. 493-526, during which time Italy enjoyed such peace and quietness and absolute security as had never been known there before, and has never been known there since until 1870. The people of his own nation numbered two hundred thousand men, which, with the proportionate number of women and children, formed a population of nearly one million. His troops, formerly so wild and given to plunder, were restored to such discipline that in a battle in Dacia, in which they were completely victorious, "the rich spoils of the enemy lay untouched at their feet," because their leader had given no signal of pillage. When such discipline prevailed in the excitement of a victory and in an enemy's country, it is easy to understand the peaceful order that prevailed in their own new-gotten land which the Herulians had held before them.

During the ages of violence and revolution which had passed, large tracts of land in Italy had become utterly desolate and uncultivated; almost the whole of the rest was under imperfect culture; but now "agriculture revived under the shadow of peace, and the number of husbandmen multiplied by the redemption of captives;" and Italy, which had so long been fed from other countries, now actually began to export grain. Civil order was so thoroughly maintained that "the city gates were never shut either by day or by night, and the common saying that a purse of gold might be safely left in the fields, was

expressive of the conscious security of the inhabitants."* Merchants and other lovers of the blessings of peace thronged from all parts.

But not alone did civil peace reign. Above all, there was perfect freedom in the exercise of religion. In fact, the measure of civil liberty and peace always depends upon that of religious liberty. Theodoric and his people were Arians, yet, at the close of a fifty years' rule of Italy, the Ostrogoths could safely challenge their enemies to present a single authentic case in which they had ever persecuted the Catholics. Even the mother of Theodoric, and some of his favorite Goths, had embraced the Catholic faith with perfect freedom from any molestation whatever.

The separation between Church and State, between civil and religious powers, was clear and distinct. Church property was protected in common with other property, while at the same time it was taxed in common with all other property. The clergy were protected in common with all other people, and they were likewise, in common with all other people, cited before the civil courts to answer for all civil offenses. In all ecclesiastical matters they were left entirely to themselves. Even the papal elections Theodoric left entirely to themselves, and though often solicited by both parties to interfere, he refused to have anything at all to do with them, except to keep the peace, which in fact was of itself no small task. He declined even to confirm the papal elections, an office which had been exercised by Odoacer.

Nor was this merely a matter of toleration; it was in genuine recognition of the rights of conscience. In a letter to the Emperor Justin, A. D. 524, Theodoric announced the genuine principle of the rights of conscience, and the relationship that should exist between religion and the State, in the following words, worthy to be graven in letters of gold:—

To pretend to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God. By the nature of things, the power of sovereigns is confined to political government. They have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace. The most dan-

* Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxix, par. 14; and Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iii, par. 5.

gerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief. †

Similar pleas had before been made by the parties oppressed, but never before had the principle been announced by *the party in power*. The enunciation and defense of a principle by the party who holds the power to violate it, is the surest pledge that the principle is held in genuine sincerity.

The description of the state of peace and quietness in Italy above given, applies to Italy, *but not to Rome*; to the dominions of Theodoric and the Ostrogoths, but not to the city of the pope and the Catholics. In A. D. 499, there was a papal election. As there were, as usual, rival candidates—Symmachus and Laurentius—there was a civil war. “The two factions encountered with the fiercest hostility; the clergy, the Senate, and the populace were divided;” the streets of the city “ran with blood, as in the days of republican strife.” ‡

The contestants were so evenly matched, and the violent strife continued so long, that the leading men of both parties persuaded the candidates to go to Theodoric at Ravenna, and submit to his judgment their claims. Theodoric’s love of justice and of the rights of the people, readily and simply enough decided that the candidate who had the most votes should be counted elected; and if the votes were evenly divided, then the candidate who had been first ordained. Symmachus secured the office. A council was held by Symmachus, which met the first of March, 499, and passed a decree “almost in the terms of the old Roman law, severely condemning all ecclesiastical ambition, all canvassing either to obtain subscriptions, or administration of oaths, or promises, for the papacy” during the lifetime of a pope. But such election methods as these were now so prevalent that this law was of as little value in controlling the methods of the aspiring candidates for the bishopric, as in the days of the republic the same kind of laws were for the candidates to the consulship.

Laurentius, though defeated at this time, did not discontinue his efforts to obtain the office. For four years he watched for opportunities, and carried on an intrigue to displace Symmachus, and in 503 brought a series of heavy charges against him. “The accusation was brought before the judgment-seat of Theodoric, supported by certain Roman females of rank, who had been suborned, it was said, by the enemies of Symmachus. Symmachus was summoned to Ravenna and confined at Rimini,” but escaped and returned to Rome. Meantime, Laurentius had entered the city, and when Symmachus returned, “the sanguinary tumults between the two parties broke out with greater fury;” priests were slain, monasteries set on fire, and nuns treated with the utmost indignity.

The Senate petitioned Theodoric to send a visitor to judge the cause of Symmachus in the crimes laid against him. The king finding that that matter was only a church quarrel, appointed one of their own number, the bishop of Alimo, who so clearly favored Laurentius that his partisanship only made the contention worse. Again Theodoric was petitioned to interfere, but he declined to assume any jurisdiction, and told them to settle it among them-

selves; but as there was so much disturbance of the peace, and it was so long continued, Theodoric commanded them to reach some sort of settlement that would stop their fighting, and restore public order. A council was therefore called. As Symmachus was on his way to the council, “he was attacked by the adverse party; showers of stones fell around him; many presbyters and others of his followers were severely wounded; the pontiff himself only escaped under the protection of the Gothic guard,” § and took refuge in the church of St. Peter. The danger to which he was then exposed he made an excuse for not appearing at the council.

The most of the council was favorable to Symmachus and to the pretensions of the bishop of Rome at this time, and therefore were glad of any excuse that would relieve them from judging him. However, they went through the form of summoning him three times; all of which he declined. Then the council sent deputies to state to Theodoric the condition of affairs, “saying to him that the authority of the king might compel Symmachus to appear, but that the council had not such authority.” Theodoric replied that “with respect to the cause of Symmachus, he had assembled them to judge him, but yet left them at full liberty to judge him or not, providing they could by any other means put a stop to the present calamities, and restore the wished-for tranquility to the city of Rome.”

The majority of the council declared Symmachus “absolved in the sight of men, whether guilty or innocent in the sight of God,” for the reason that “no assembly of bishops has power to judge the pope; he is accountable for his actions to God alone.” ¶ They then commanded all, under penalty of excommunication, to accept this judgment, and submit to the authority of Symmachus, and acknowledge him “for lawful bishop of the holy city of Rome.”

FROM the foregoing facts as to both sides, the condition of civilization among the “barbarians” and that among the Catholics in the city of Rome, there can be no difficulty in deciding where civilization, and civil order, and peace, and good of every kind, really dwelt. All the blessings of civilization and enlightened principles were found with the “barbarians;” while the violence, the strife, and the determination to be chief, that belong to barbarians, were all found in the Catholic Church, led on by her chief leaders, and in the city of her sole possession and government. The “barbarians” gave to Italy all the blessings of enlightened civilization. The Catholic Church gave to Rome such violence, strife, and bloodshed as could hardly be outdone by barbarians. Nor was this scene in Rome merely a spasmodic affair—this had been the customary procedure in the election of a pope for more than a hundred years.

AND this barbarism of the church in Rome was only the same sort as that which prevailed in the church throughout the empire where there were no heretic “barbarians” to keep order. In the eastern part of the empire the church had everything her own way, with no “barbarian” heretics to check her barbarism anywhere, and the results were corres-

pondingly barbaric. By the council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, the faith of the world was finally “settled,” and all were forbidden, under severe penalties, “to dispute concerning the faith.” But in such barbarism as pervaded all the Catholic Church, neither “the faith,” nor laws, nor penalties were of any avail. And there were more and more violent disputes over “the faith” than there had been even before, for the monks were now the ones who took the lead in the controversies and the consequent rioting and barbarism.

In Jerusalem a certain Theodosius was at the head of the army of monks, who made him bishop, and in acts of violence, pillage, and murder, he fairly outdid the perfectly lawless bandits of the country. “The very scenes of the Saviour’s mercies ran with blood, shed in his name by his ferocious self-called disciples.” *

In Alexandria “the bishop was not only murdered in the baptistry, but his body was treated with shameless indignities, and other enormities were perpetrated which might have appalled a cannibal.” And the monkish horde then elected as bishop one of their own number, Timothy the Weasel, a disciple of Dioscorus. †

Soon there was added to all this, another point which increased the fearful warfare. In the Catholic churches it was customary to sing what was called the *Trisagion*, or *Thrice-Holy*. It was, originally, the “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts” of Isaiah vi, 3; but at the time of the council of Chalcedon, it had been changed, and was used by the council thus: “Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us.” At Antioch, in 477, a third monk, Peter the Fuller, “led a procession, chiefly of monastics, through the streets,” loudly singing the *Thrice-Holy*, with the addition, “Who was crucified for us.” It was orthodox to sing it as the council of Chalcedon had used it, with the understanding that the three “Holies” referred respectively to the three persons of the Trinity. It was heresy to sing it with the later addition.

In A. D. 511, two hordes of monks on the two sides of the question met in Constantinople. “The two black-cowled armies watched each other for several months, working in secret on their respective partisans. At length they came to a rupture. . . . The Monophysite monks in the Church of the Archangel within the palace, broke out after the ‘Thrice-Holy’ with the burden added at Antioch by Peter the Fuller, ‘who was crucified for us.’ The orthodox monks, backed by the rabble of Constantinople, endeavored to expel them from the church; they were not content with hurling curses against each other, sticks and stones began their work. There was a wild, fierce fray; the divine presence of the emperor lost its awe; he could not maintain the peace. The bishop Macedonius either took the lead, or was compelled to lead the tumult. Men, women, and children poured out from all quarters; the monks with their archimandrites at the head of the raging multitude, echoed back their religious war-cry.” ‡

These are but samples of the repeated—it might almost be said the continuous—

† Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book iii, chap. iii, par. 8, from the end.

‡ *Id.*, par. 11.

§ *Id.*, par. 14.

¶ Bower’s “History of the Popes,” Symmachus, pars. 9, 10.

* Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book iii, chap. 1, par. 5.

† *Id.* Some writers call him Timothy the Cat; but whether “weasel” or “cat,” the distinction is not material, as either fitly describes his disposition, though both would not exag-gerate it.

‡ *Id.*, par. 31.

occurrences in the cities of the East. "Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly; or where resistance was made, the two factions fighting in the streets, in the churches: cities, even the holiest places, ran with blood. . . . The hymn of the angels in heaven was the battle cry on earth, the signal of human bloodshed." §

In A. D. 512, one of these *Trisagion* riots broke out in Constantinople, because the emperor proposed to use the added clause. "Many palaces of the nobles were set on fire, the officers of the crown insulted, pillage, conflagration, violence, raged through the city." In the house of the favorite minister of the emperor there was found a monk from the country. He was accused of having suggested the use of the addition. His head was cut off, and raised high on a pole, and the whole orthodox populace marched through the streets singing the orthodox *Trisagion*, and shouting, "Behold the enemy of the Trinity." ||

THIS is enough, but it is not in vain to show the difference between barbarism and Christian civilization in the Roman Empire when the Catholic Church had everything in her own hands and was allowed to show fully what she could do. And what did she do with the Ostrogoths? Why, finding she could not corrupt them with her own barbaric religion, she secured from Justinian the armies of the Eastern Empire and swept them not only out of Italy, but out of existence. The Ostrogoths were one of the three nations that were "plucked up by the roots" to give full place to the papacy. Dan. 7:8, 20, 24, 25. And, behold, now she announces to the Government and people of the United States, that what she has done for other nations in the past she will now do for the United States. And there is not the least doubt that she will do all in her barbaric power to fulfill this avowed purpose. She will corrupt to the core the whole nation, so far as it is possible for her to do it; and such as she cannot corrupt she will do her utmost to destroy. But, thank the Lord, she cannot destroy them, for God has promised to all these "the victory over the beast and over his image and over his mark and over the number of his name"—a complete and triumphant victory over her and all her barbarism—and these shall stand on the sea of glass before the throne of God. Rev. 15:2, 3.

WHO of the American, or of the world's people, will favor Rome? Who will admit her claims? Who will sanction her pretensions? Who will yield to this mystery of lawlessness? this synonym of worse than barbarism? Who will share the perdition that must come, with the coming of this "saviour from the Vatican"? Who? It is time to decide.

A. T. J.

Roman Catholic Religious Liberty.

IN "The Faith of Our Fathers," page 264, Cardinal Gibbons thus defines religious liberty:—

A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshipping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing that form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God.

But what is "a right conscience"? and

what form of religion is it which is "most in accordance with his duties to God"? Let the cardinal's own book answer:—

If, as we have seen, the church has authority from God to teach, and if she teaches nothing but the truth, is it not the duty of all Christians to hear her voice and obey her commands? She is the organ of the Holy Ghost. She is the representative of Jesus Christ, who has said to her; "He that heareth you heareth me; he that despiseth you, despiseth me." She is mistress of truth. It is the property of the human mind to embrace the truth wherever it finds it. It would, therefore, be not only an act of irreverence, but of sheer folly to disobey the voice of this ever-truthful mother.

If a citizen is bound to obey the laws of his country, though those laws may not in all respects be conformable to strict justice; if the child is bound by the natural and divine law to obey his mother, though she may sometimes err in her judgments, how much more strictly are we obliged to be docile to the teachings of the Catholic Church, our mother, whose admonitions are always just, whose precepts are immutable!—*The Faith of Our Fathers*, pages 95, 96.

In the light of this pronouncement what does the cardinal mean by "the dictates of a right conscience"?—Simply a conscience instructed by the Catholic Church. And what by "that form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God"?—The Roman Catholic religion, certainly. Then what, in reality, is his definition of religious liberty?—Simply this: "A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right to worship God according to the dictates of a conscience instructed by the Catholic Church, and of practicing the Roman Catholic religion"! And yet "Protestants" there are who believe that Cardinal Gibbons is remarkably liberal, that he is in fact a friend and defender of religious liberty! And so he is—let him define that liberty. But it is the "liberty" of the dungeon, the rack and the fagot. C. P. B.

He Agrees with the Sentinel—"But."

As the following letter is short, and we have the consent of the gentleman who sends it to make whatever use of it we see fit, we print it for comment:—

Chicago, Ill., Jan. 18, 1894.

AMERICAN SENTINEL:—A friend handed me your No. 1, Vol. 9, and I have read it with attention—agreeing most heartily with it in its decided hostility to the connection of Church and State—not only hostility to the Established Church systems in Europe, but to any movement in these highly favored free American United States which is made in harmony with the principle of such church establishments. I differ from it, however, in the leading illustration in its columns, viz.: that the seventh day is the proper religious rest day of the present dispensation, for I am persuaded that to all believers in the risen Christ by whom "life and immortality have been brought to light," the first day of the week should ever be to them the memorial day of joy and rejoicing, and especially devoted to his service. But why not regard the law of creation over all mankind as best observed by a seventh part of time for rest? And this being so, then it is but the duty of all civil governments of common sense to have a day of rest from labor and business for their people. Thus, in the year of our Lord 1894, let the law of the civil power abide by its legal day of rest. And although those who abide by "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" are "free from the law of sin and death," yet none the less as Christian citizens they may support the civil authority in secular affairs so long as it is a terror to evil doers, and a protection to well doers.

The many insidious movements towards State-churchism are to-day as cancerous to the fundamental principle of our civil government, as would be similar movements towards the restoration of slavery where local majorities prevail. The politicians of all parties should watch to defend this fundamental principle of the civil government of our country, viz.: No Church and State connection. But what can we expect of many among us who inherit the Church and State establishment principle so long dominant in Europe, and who would, if they could, welcome it here? Such are the Romanists, the Lutherans, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians who may consistently accept State favors; but look at the *Daily News Almanac* of 1893, and see many others who swallow some of the Indian

school fund. Congregationalists, Friends, Unitarians, and Methodists; all these partake; but old madam Rome got, in eight years, about a million more dollars than all others together! Rome got \$2,366,416, all other schools, institutes, and churches received only \$1,408,537. But this is only one case of grab! For the exemption of church property from taxes seems to be welcomed by all the denominations. I know of none who reject it (except a Baptist Church in Toronto). To accept exemption from taxes imposes the amount on the people; but Jesus paid taxes to the civil government and told his disciples to do so, and never accepted nor authorized his Church or apostles to take State payments. To do so is akin to the sin of Achan, who took of the accursed thing—akin to the sin of Gehazi, who disobeyed his master Elijah—akin to the sin of Judas, the covetous apostle, whose bag was probably as much in need as the sects in our country. Leprosy and death were the penalties, and so it is spiritually with churches seduced by State favors. The true bride of Christ must keep herself pure, and his soldiers must be loyal to the instructions of their divine Master, the risen Lord Jesus Christ for the conquest of the world. THOS. HODGE.

Rogers Park, Chicago.

The questions raised in this communication are interesting, and, like all questions pertaining to our duty toward God, are worthy of careful consideration.

The query, "Why not regard the law of Creation over all mankind as best observed by a seventh part of time for rest?" admits the existence of a divine law of rest; and that law is the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. But for that law man would know nothing of a seventh part of time for rest, for no people have ever had a weekly Sabbath without first having a knowledge of the divine law.

The writer does not believe that physical rest is the primary object of the Sabbath: it is memorial rather than utilitarian in character. True it "was made for man," but does that necessarily mean that it was primarily for his *physical* good? When was it made for man?—In the beginning before man stood in need of rest from wearing toil; and we learn from Isa. 66:22,23 that it will be observed by man in the redeemed state, when "there shall be no more curse," and consequently no wearing toil to render necessary stated periods of physical rest.

Regarding the Sabbath as memorial rather than economic, it is at once apparent that it necessarily attaches itself to the event of which it is a memorial. In such a case to change the day is to change the reason for its observance, and to establish another institution. Thus we have Sunday observed instead of the original Sabbath because Christ rose from the dead on that day, and not because God rested on that day from the work of creation. It is a different day, observed for a different reason; and is essentially a different institution.

But granting, for the sake of the argument only, that the Sabbath is for rest, what do we find?—A very general insistence, by those who would make it a subject of civil law, on the proposition that uniformity of observance is essential to rest; that is that all must rest at the same time. It is often expressed in this sentence: "The right of rest for one is the law of rest for all." But this most emphatically negatives the seventh-part-of-time theory; for "the law of the Lord is perfect;" and if that law was designed to give man a Sabbath for physical rest, and if uniformity be essential to such rest, the law must of necessity be definite, not only as to the exact proportion of time but as to the precise portion of time to be devoted to rest. But surely an all-wise God never left indefinite so important a matter as the definite time of the Sabbath. Viewed from either standpoint,

definite time is an essential element in the Sabbath law; and it is absolutely certain that God put it into that law, for he says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath;" and again, Moses said to the Hebrew hosts: "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath." And again at the crucifixion we have this testimony concerning the holy women that "they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment."

The second question is dependent upon the first. But in any event it would not be the duty of civil government to do more than to recognize the right of people to rest whenever they wished to do so. Any government may set apart holidays making them *dies non*, but whoever heard of an enforced holiday, other than Sunday? The Fourth of July and other days are legal holidays, but whoever heard of any one being arraigned before a police justice and fined for not observing the Fourth of July or Washington's birthday? It is only the religious idea that gives rise to laws forbidding not only work but play on Sunday. No government has a right to confiscate the time of its citizens any more than it has to confiscate their money or other property, though it may decree that at certain times men shall not be required to do business or to perform labor unless they wish to do so. But this is only to make a holiday, not a holy day. And no Sunday law advocate would be satisfied with such a law as that. It is the *day* that is to be protected, not the people.

Another element enters into this question, namely, the element of conscience. While very many people have no scruples about resting on Sunday, some regard the fourth commandment not only as forbidding labor on the seventh day, but as, inferentially at least, forbidding the observance of any other day in a similar manner.

Every law must show in some way the authority by which it was enacted, and this the Decalogue does only in the fourth commandment. In that precept it is declared that the Giver of the law is he who created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh. It is this fact that gives the Sabbath its memorial character. The Sabbath commandment is in fact the seal of the divine law, because it is the precept that designates the Giver of the law, and states the ground of his authority to require obedience.

In like manner the Sunday institution is the seal or mark of a rival power. It is set forth by the papacy, the "man of sin" of 2 Thess. 2:3, as the badge of his authority to command men under sin. In a Catholic catechism, called the "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," the Catholic Church asserts its power to change the divine law, in the following manner:—

Question. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

Answer. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

Q. How prove you that?

A. Because by keeping Sunday they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin; and by not keeping the rest by her commanded, they again deny, in fact, the same power.

Another Catholic "Doctrinal Catechism," offers the following as proof that Protestants are not guided by the Scriptures:—

Q. Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

A. Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority.

Q. When Protestants do profane work upon Saturday, or the seventh day of the week, do they follow the Scripture as their only rule of faith—do they find this permission clearly laid down in the sacred volume?

A. On the contrary, they have only the authority of tradition for this practice. In profaning Saturday, they violate one of God's commandments, which he has never clearly abrogated.—"Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day."

It is evident that with those who believe Sunday to be a rival of the Lord's Sabbath, the badge of papal authority, its observance would be equivalent to rendering homage to antichrist; hence their steady refusal to obey Sunday laws, and the willingness of some to suffer imprisonment, the chain-gang, and even death itself rather than to so much as appear to regard Sunday as other than a common working day. It is not as some seem to regard it, simply a matter of the choice of days, but is with many a vital question directly affecting their salvation.

C. P. B.

Are the Georgia Sunday Laws To Be Enforced?

In November last, Elder W. A. McCutchen, pastor of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Gainesville, Ga., and Professor E. C. Keck, teacher of the Seventh-day Adventist school in the same place, were arrested for working on Sunday, and brought before the Mayor's Court of the city of Gainesville. The charge made against them was that of disorderly conduct. This was because there was no local ordinance applicable to the case. The "disorderly conduct" consisted in the doing of carpenter work, on Sunday, in the Seventh-day Adventist Church building. The special work done was the making of seats for the little children who attended the school held in the same building during the week. They were convicted under this charge, in the Mayor's Court, and fined fifty dollars each, and costs. An appeal was taken to the higher court. In the meantime an indictment was found against them under the State law, and when the appeal case came up it was returned for re-appeal on technical pleas, which, although non-essential, the court saw fit to consider sufficient cause for sending the case back. This action postpones the Mayor's Court case for six months, while the trial under the indictment for the breaking of the State Sunday law comes up at the term of court beginning the third Monday in February. It is hardly possible that there is any intention of subjecting these men to two trials for the same offense, so it is reasonable to suppose that the action taken in the Mayor's Court case is for the purpose of getting that out of the way to make room for the indictment and trial under the State law. This indictment reads as follows:—

State of Georgia, Hall County. In the Superior Court of said county.

The grand jurors, selected, chosen and sworn for the County of Hall, to wit: [Here follow the names of the grand jurors].

In the name and behalf of the citizens of Georgia, charge and accuse W. A. McCutchen and E. C. Keck, of the county and State aforesaid, with the offense of misdemeanor, for that the said W. A. McCutchen and E. C. Keck on the 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-three, in the county aforesaid, with force and arms, did unlawfully then and there as a laborer, artificer,

and as workmen, work on and in the Seventh-day Adventist Church with planes, hammers, hand-saws and other tools (carpenters' tools) on said 19th day of November, 1893, the same being the Lord's day, said labor not being works of necessity or charity, contrary to the laws of said State, the good order, peace and dignity thereof.

Superior Court, said county,
January term, 1894.

That portion of the Georgia code under which this indictment is brought reads as follows:—

Section 4579. Violating Sabbath. Any tradesman, artificer, workman or laborer, or other person whatever, who shall pursue their business or work of their ordinary callings on the Lord's day (works of necessity or charity only excepted), shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction, shall be punished as prescribed in section 4310 of this code.

The punishment prescribed in this section is—

A fine not to exceed one thousand dollars, imprisonment not to exceed six months, to work in the chain-gang not to exceed twelve months, and any one or more of these punishments may be ordered, in the discretion of the judge.

These men did the work with which they are charged. They would, on no account, deny or attempt to disprove it. They are honorable, Christian men, and good citizens. They are gentlemen of education and ability. They possess by birth and heritage those finer qualities which so often characterize the gentlemen of the South,—yet a law of their State puts it within the power of the judge of the superior court of Hall County to impose upon each of them the combined penalties of one thousand dollars fine, six months' imprisonment, and twelve months in the chain-gang. Is it credible that the citizens of Hall County, of the State of Georgia, of the United States of America,—for all are implicated in the shame of this,—are blind to the iniquity of a law which makes possible such a thing as this? It makes no difference what the result of this particular case may be, whether the penalty affixed by the court in this individual instance be light or heavy, or even if on some technical ground they be allowed to go free,—the principle remains the same, and the iniquity is there, so long as the law stands. This matter is up and it will not down while time lasts.

But the end of the Georgia law on this subject has not yet been reached. If these men are convicted they become convicts, and of their disposition by the authorities the Georgia code says in section 4814:—

In all cases where persons are convicted of misdemeanor, and sentenced to work in the chain-gang on the public works, or public roads, or when such persons are confined in jail for non-payment of fines imposed for such misdemeanor, the ordinary of the county, and where there is a board of commissioners of roads and revenues of the counties, then said board of commissioners, and in those counties where there is a county judge, then the said county judge, where said conviction was had, or where such convicts may be confined, may place such convicts, in the county or elsewhere, to work upon such public works of the county, in chain-gangs, or otherwise, or hire out such convicts, upon such terms and restrictions as may subserve the ends of justice, and place such convicts under such guards as may be necessary for their safe keeping.

It will be seen that this opens a remarkable opportunity for general dealing in convict labor. That this has been fully taken advantage of is evident from the facts stated in a very thorough article on this subject, published in the *Atlanta Journal* of February 6. In this article it is stated that three companies, which mutually own stock each in the other and really form one combine, hold a contract with the State of Georgia, by which the State agrees—

to let them have all her convicts for \$25,000 a year, the companies paying all the expenses, such as food-

ing, clothing, and guarding the convicts, and also the expense incident to sickness.

These three companies are the Dade Coal Company, Penitentiary Company No. 2, and Penitentiary Company No. 3. The Chattahoochee Brick Company also owns fifty per cent. of the stock of Company No. 2, and thirty-one and a quarter per cent. of the stock of Company No. 3.

According to this article it would seem that the convicts are worked at the Dade Coal and Iron mines, and in making brick for the Chattahoochee Brick Company. But there being a glut in the brick market, and the law requiring the convicts to be kept at work, other means were taken to keep them employed, and they have been sublet to numerous individuals and corporations for different kinds of work. Some of these ventures have proved failures, entailing large losses on the original companies, while they are still bound to feed, clothe, guard, and provide medical treatment for their charge. This contract runs until 1899, and as they claim to be making continual losses, it cannot be expected that they will undertake any expense for food, clothing and medical care which they can avoid. It would seem that this system of letting and subletting, together with the present financial condition of those having control of them, would make the life and death of the Georgia convicts a matter of great uncertainty. The chain-gang and the stockade, with their accessories of bloodhounds and armed guards, and overseers vested with large authority, do not seem to be in themselves the highest development of penal methods; but when the law subjects Christian men to the possibility of all this ignominy and hardship, what can be said of the law? and is it possible that the eyes of those who are called upon to enforce such a law will not be opened to its character?

But even this is not all the possibilities of this law. Section 4821 of the code treats of insurrection, and says:—

Whenever any convict or convicts now confined or hereafter to be confined, in the penitentiary of this State, or member or members of the chain-gang now confined, or hereafter to be confined in the penitentiary of this State, or wherever else employed as such, shall be guilty of insurrection or attempt at insurrection, such convict or convicts or member or members of the chain-gang shall, upon trial and conviction in the Supreme Court of the county in which the crime is committed, be deemed guilty of a capital offense, and punished with death, or such other punishment as the judge, in his discretion, may inflict.

What is the meaning of this word "insurrection," as used here, in which one man or many may be engaged? Does it mean insubordination, refusal to obey orders? In that case what under this law may be the fate of Christian men like these now about to be put in jeopardy, when they refuse to work in the chain-gang on the "seventh day which is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God"? It is well that these things be thought of in time by those who are to assume the responsibility of them.

But still the code carries this one point farther yet:—

Section 4582. Fines for violation of the Sabbath.* All moneys arising from fines imposed for offenses, the gist of which consists in their being committed on the Sabbath* day, shall be paid to the ordinary of the county, to be by him distributed for the purpose of establishing and promoting Sabbath* schools in the county.

No language within the bounds of common restraint of expression can justly characterize the inconsistency, the reli-

gious fallacy, in this statute. Can it be that these strange survivals of mediæval error are still to remain, be cherished and enforced, as public evidence of the allegiance of the body politic to Deity? What Deity requires such service as this, from such a source? W. H. M.

Tending Romeward.

[This item which appeared in the *World* of the 5th inst., as a dispatch from Quincy, Ill., under date of February 4, needs no comment. It indicates very clearly the growing tendency in certain quarters to ape Rome.]

FATHER HUNTINGTON, of New York, came here two weeks ago to conduct a mission, which closed to-day. He claims the Episcopal Church is the true Catholic Church—the American Catholic Church—and seems to think that the confessional is necessary. He does not exact compulsory confession, but he commends and advises it and himself assumes the functions of a priest as the mediator between the sinner and his Saviour. So far only ladies have attended the confessional, and these have usually been young ones.

The introduction of the confessional has caused no little consternation among the Episcopalians. "If we are to go over to Romanism, I believe in doing it at once and being frank about it," said a member of the church. "We can get a monk from Vine Street at a moment's notice who carries a stouter flagellation cord than Father Huntington ever dare to wear. Our Catholic friends are glad to welcome us, doubtless, but if we are to be with them I want at least the credit of going frankly and fairly to them and acknowledging that they are wholly right and we are partly wrong. I am satisfied we are in danger, and I am afraid it will not wholly subside when our missionary friends have gone." A young married woman remarked: "I think it is perfectly right that we should tell our troubles and naughty deeds to some one who can sympathize with us and extend spiritual consolation. I know when we do wrong we feel better when we tell some one about it."

Churches Getting Together.

[Under the heading, "Federating the Churches," we made some mention last week of this movement. This is simply another chapter in its history as given by the *State Republican*, Lansing, Mich., February 3. We have added in brackets after the names the denomination to which the several gentlemen belong.]

THE preliminary meeting of the federate council of the churches of the city of Lansing was held last evening at St. Paul's parish rooms, and was greatly successful. A large number of the churches were represented by clerical and lay delegates.

Rev. W. H. Osborne [Episcopal], under whose influence the plan originated, called the assembly to order and stated the object of the meeting. A plan of organization was then presented and adopted similar to that which had been originally formulated by its promoter with the addition of several new articles. Under this constitution the council elected Rev. W. H. Osborne, president, and Justice P. H. Dolan [Catholic], secretary and treasurer for one year.

A committee was elected, consisting of the president, Revs. C. H. Beale [Congregationalist], H. S. Jordan [Presbyterian], Father Slattery [Catholic priest], and Justice Grant of the supreme bench, to provide a scheme of operation and plan of

action. The committee will report at the next meeting, which will be held on the first Friday in March, at 8 o'clock P. M., in St. Paul's parish rooms.

The primary object of the council, as has been previously stated in these columns, is to apply the principles of Christianity to the entire life of the city; not an interference with affairs, but an application of all that is best to the things of daily routine. It is a plan to apply the principles of Christianity to the corporate life of the city, its industries, its politics, its amusements, its everything.

Every church will have an equal representation, no matter what difference there may be in regard to the size or membership. The delegates from each church will consist of one clerical and two lay. There are some seventeen churches in the city, and should all be represented in the federate council it would make a body of fifty-one persons. Such a body of representative men from the various churches, laying aside the little differences in religious beliefs, and coming together for deliberation on the relation of the church to passing civic events, cannot but wield a great power.

"Church Unity,"—A Sign of the Times.

DR. LYMAN BEECHER is quoted as saying: "There is a state of society to be formed by an extensive combination of institutions, religious, civil, and literary, which never exists without the cooperation of an educated ministry."

Charles Beecher once said:—

Thus are the ministry of the evangelical Protestant denominations not only formed all the way up under a tremendous pressure of merely human fear, but they live, and move, and breathe, in a state of things radically corrupt, and appealing every hour to every baser element in their nature to hush up the truth and bow the knee to the power of apostasy. Was not this the way things went in Rome? *Are we not living her life over again?* And what do we see just ahead? *Another general council! A world's convention! Evangelical Alliance, and a universal creed.*

These words were written many years ago, though perhaps not from a prophetic standpoint, but reasoning from cause to effect. The Beechers saw that we were about to live over again the life of Rome; and why? because the "ministry" were living under "a tremendous pressure" of "human fear," bowing the "knee to the power of apostasy." And what have we seen since these words were spoken? A "general council," "an Evangelical Alliance," a "world's convention" in Chicago in 1893; and all we wait for is a "universal creed." It will not be long before we have this at the rate things are now moving.

In reporting a meeting of the "Churchman's Club," held in Providence, R. I., Dec. 21, 1893, the *Daily Bulletin*, of the same city, Dec. 22, gives the following noticeable heading:—

Christian Unity.—Last Night's Meeting of Churchman's Club a Notable Event.—Bishop John J. Keane [of the Catholic University at Washington], the guest of the Evening.—An Eloquent Exposition of the Tenets of the Roman Catholic Faith.—Addresses by Dr. Brown, of the Union Theological Seminary, [Presbyterian], and Dr. Anderson, of Providence, R. I., Pastor of the Central Baptist Church.

It is a "notable event," as the paper states, when "high dignitaries of such differing creeds as the Roman Catholic, Baptist and Presbyterian" come together to discuss "Christian unity," and that upon a Catholic basis and led by a Catholic bishop who talks to them over an hour, "holding the attention of the club

* The Supreme Court of Georgia has held the first day of the week to be the Sabbath in that State.

without a break by his impressive delivery and eloquent word-painting;" setting before them the Catholic idea of "church unity." The most notable event to us is President Gardner's statement of the purpose of the Churchman's Club, which is made up of "Episcopalian laymen, for the purpose of developing Christian fellowship . . . in our and other churches;" and of the object of that night's meeting, he said, "We hope to hear a perfectly free and frank statement of their views, given without restraint. . . . We feel that soft words and flattery will be of no interest to us who desire to know the true way to Christian unity." And they got their "desire" clear and plain from a Catholic standpoint, "the true way to [Catholic] Christian unity," as we shall see. Bishop Clark said:—

We are most grateful to these gentlemen who have come here to speak to us to-night, and upon whom we have no claim except that we are workers in a common cause, . . . toward Christian unity.

So the bishop considers himself with the other so-called Protestant churches to be "laborers" with the Catholic Church in a "common cause toward Christian unity." And as the Catholic Church boasts that she never changes, and they are looking to her to "know the true way to Christian unity," what kind of a unity will they get?—A Roman Catholic unity and none other.

And this is just what the Catholic bishop gave them. After telling them in a very pretty way Christ's desire for unity in the Church, and how Paul labored to this end, he set forth Peter as the rock upon which the Church was built instead of Christ, thus making Peter the foundation of the Church; and Rome, the supreme see, "the see of Peter," from which descended an apostolic line of popes, who were the head of the Church and the center around which all unity exists. As long as all acknowledged the headship at Rome things went smoothly on until, as the bishop says, the East separated from the West because the Church would not recognize Constantinople as the second see instead of Alexandria, which the see of Peter refused to do; and so a division occurred. "Then," said the bishop, "in the sixteenth century, was started a movement by priests. They said that the episcopate of Rome was not essential to the church. Not only two sacraments did they deny, but the presence of the body in the Eucharist. England believed otherwise. Henry VIII. won his title 'Defender of the Faith,' for writing in defense of the seven sacraments against Luther and Calvin. . . . Here is the condition of things in the world to-day. From the separations of Germany, Switzerland and England, there have arisen the many various bodies that are such a cause of grief to the mother church."

It is plain to be seen that what is "such a cause of grief to the mother church," is the separation of the East from the West, and the work of Luther and Calvin which resulted in so many throwing off the Roman yoke and becoming free men and women in the Lord Jesus Christ, acknowledging him to be their head instead of the pope of Rome. How much Rome has grieved over this and is now making pathetic cry in the ears of Protestants, at their demand too! And how long will it be before the daughters will return to the mother, and this Scripture be fulfilled—"And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him [the papal beast], whose names are not written in the book of life

of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world"? Rev. 13:8. Is there not a need for some one to be proclaiming the three messages of Rev. 14:6-12? which is the preaching of the "everlasting gospel," Jesus Christ and him crucified, the power of God" and "the wisdom of God." The only "name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Why does not the Churchman's Club go to Jesus Christ and the Bible to learn the true way to Christian unity instead of bowing "the knee to the power of apostacy" and going to Rome to "know the true way to Christian unity"? Is not all the world and worldly churches going after the beast, when they call for a World's Columbian Exposition of Religions, and a Catholic cardinal with other leading Catholic dignitaries taking the leading part in the deliberations of the gathering? Does not this show that all the world is going after the beast, and that too, at the instigation of the churches, as they call for State and national legislation in matters of religion? Surely "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." And the Lord says, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." H. J. FARMAN.

Church in Politics.

MEMBERS of churches and Christian societies are uniting for political action. This spring candidates for election or reelection will have to reckon on the votes controlled by the Christian citizenship campaign movement as well as those of the Democrats and Republicans. While the greater part of these votes will be drawn from the Republican and Democratic parties they will be used solidly for the candidates the movement decides to support.

The movement is now well started, and March 4 will see from three hundred to five hundred meetings in its behalf being held in the various churches of the city. For about three weeks the idea has been talked over among the leaders of the different Christian societies. They have become convinced that the only way to secure good officials and good government is to elect clean men for the offices. Campaign promises, they declare, have been tried and found wanting. The people who are interested in the movement also claim that the only way to make the politician feel the power of the Christian organizations is through the ballot, and they intend to proceed in that direction until a radical change has been worked in municipal affairs.

Edwin D. Wheelock, well known in temperance and religious circles, is one of the prime movers in the organization of the Christian citizenship campaign. He has been working for some time and now reports that about thirty thousand votes would attest to the power of the movement next spring. "It is not our intention," said Mr. Wheelock, "to form a new party. We simply organize to stimulate and educate the public conscience in such matters. We understand that no results can be obtained by simply talking. Politicians understand that talk does not put votes into the ballot-box, so before election they smile at what we say and after elec-

tion do what they please. We vote for them just the same. The united young people's societies will be the working force of the new movement. At the present time the Christian Endeavor societies, the Epworth League, the Baptist Young People's Union and the Young People's Christian Union have promised to join the movement heart and soul. We have not heard from the Young Men's Christian Association or the St. Andrew Brotherhood, but we believe they will assist us. We muster about thirty thousand members, and I believe that when these begin to work in their homes the number of votes controlled will be much larger.

"We will open the campaign on Sunday, March 4. On that night politics will be the theme of from three hundred to five hundred prayer meetings which are held in this city. It will be the biggest meeting of its kind ever held. Probably more people that night will hear the plans of the Christian citizen campaign than ever a political speaker addressed in one meeting. The following week probably one hundred meetings will be held in different parts of the city. Professors Small, Henderson and Bemis have already promised to take the stump for the campaign. They will be assisted by a large number of students who are interested in the movement. In addition J. G. Wooley and W. T. Mills will make a large number of addresses.

"The glee clubs from the different organizations which have joined the movement will make the meetings the more attractive with their music.

"While a great deal of work will be done at the public meetings I dare say the most effective efforts will be made at home. Wives and daughters will enlist their husbands and brothers in behalf of the reputable candidates. I believe a promise, even a political one, which is made to a wife or sister is much more liable to be kept than if it is made to some stranger. It is from this fact that we believe our strength will be greater than the number of those actually taking part in the movement.

"After next spring and after the Christian campaign has been tried we will aspire to greater things. We aim, in time, to exterminate the saloon, to prevent the election of corrupt candidates and the enactment of corrupt laws. We want trusty officers to purify and elevate the elective franchise, and to preserve the American Sabbath. These things cannot be secured except through the ballot, and we have made the first step in that direction."—*Chicago Record, Feb. 3.*

"Go," said the emperor to his courier, "and direct that all those who hold beliefs at variance with the State be thrown into prison. And, by the way, stop at the treasury department on your way out and instruct my chancellor of the exchequer that the new issue of coins be stamped with the image of Liberty, that thus we may please the populace."—*Kate Field's Washington*. Query: Did Miss Field have in mind when she wrote this, the religious bigotry and intolerance manifesting itself in this country and to which the Government is lending itself, while at the same time professing to conserve the very liberty of conscience which it is certainly using its influence to destroy; and that at the behest of a small proportion of the people, who, however, assumes to be *the populace*?

Rome's New Policy.

WHOSE freedom of speech would Rome defend at the point of the bayonet? Her own, or yours? What does the history to which Father Nugent's Des Moines letter (referred to by the writer in these columns last week) calls our attention to, reveal to us on this point? Those who dare raise their voice against her doctrines are the special objects of her vengeance and wrath. She has no quarter for them. Their liberty is nothing. "Crucify them! crucify them!" is her verdict if she has the power, and to-day she is ready to repeat the dark scenes of the past. She is only biding her time; she molds public opinion; she educates, by intrigue and deception, till all opponents are won over to believe that after all the Catholic Church is really much better than it has been represented to be. Then, when everything is in her power, the majority in submission to her will, then the few who dare to think for themselves shall feel her power and know her wrath against the Daniels of the world.

Another point worthy of note in that letter of the Des Moines priest, referred to last week, is in relation to the revelations Mrs. Slattery would make to ladies only, concerning the evils of Catholicism toward the women who come within its power. He does not deny anything, but with quiet keen shrewdness turns the edge of the question of importance in these words:—

We don't know anything about the story Mrs. Slattery has to tell the ladies. All we can gather is that it is not fit for the ears of horrid men. It is only fit to drip silently into the chaste ear of the gentle fair sex. Well, all we can say on that point, in the words of Artemus Ward, is "Let her drip." It is not likely that Mrs. Slattery can drip anything into the modern woman's ears that has not been dripped there before. This is especially true of the class of women who patronize the religious variety shows.

And so, through fear of hearing something that would defile them, something that would shock their refinement, the women of our country should never know anything about the treatment their sisters receive who are within the confines of the convents and nunneries of the Catholic Church. Neither should they know anything about the confessional, or its possibilities for evil, unless they first by solemn vow join heart and soul to the church while yet ignorant of everything, and then learn after it is too late of the terrible things of which they might have been told by those who dare, at the risk of their lives, show what they have experienced and seen.

In the following words he tells everybody what he wants:—

We want the Catholics of this city to compel Mr. and Mrs. Slattery to give their lectures and sell their books in a perfect tempest of peace.

Father Nugent thinks that violence and mobbing of these expositors of Romish designs only tends to advertise them and their work, and he says it gives them all the success they have. And so the best policy is to ask the people everywhere to go and hear all they want to of the vile stuff they have to offer; and so on this he turns these words:—

I want them to hear how men talk who leave our church, and I want them to ask themselves if they feel morally better for what they have heard.

Now we would not say that the matter is presented just as it should be by these ex-priests and others; but this we do know the nation ought to know, and be aroused mightily too, by truths which these men are able to tell the people. But by such

side thrusts as the above, thousands will be turned away without giving the matter one serious thought. However, eternal destinies hinge on a knowledge and action based on the facts in the case.

The condition of such countries as Mexico, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and other countries under the influence of Rome is well-known, and it is a fact that these countries stand low in the educational scale; even the simple arts of reading and writing are unknown to a very large per cent. of their inhabitants. Yet the Catholic Church would pose before the more advanced portion of the civilized world as the special defender of liberty, the teacher of all knowledge, the source of all progress. The last few years have been notably significant in this direction. During the year 1893, the Catholic Church has appeared to advantage in the world-wide gatherings in connection with the World's Fair, and the World's Congress of Religions, as well as in several other lines of less importance. The writer of this Des Moines letter follows in the same line, and his utterances on this point are well worth careful consideration. He says:—

If there is any one thing more than another that we plume ourselves on, it is the matter of intelligence. We endeavor to make the world and ourselves believe that we are readers and thinkers.

If this were a fact of the entire church as a whole, and so in its individual members, why is it necessary to "endeavor" to make the world and themselves believe it? Why is it not apparent to all careful observers of the condition of mankind? Why are not the countries I have already named as being generally unable to read and write, rising to the higher branches of education which are considered as entirely indispensable in Protestant countries? If the church plumes itself on intelligence, why does it not assume the neglected responsibility of educating the masses in these countries, instead of trying to tear down the best educational system on earth, or subverting it from its designed good to all people? Why has she stood deliberately against all free and liberal education, until she has seen that enlightenment was destined to come to the minds of all, in spite of her bitterest opposition? Why has she all at once championed the rising sentiment, and turned squarely from her course of centuries? Why does she unblushingly tell the world that she is the cause of all the good that is seen? Protestants, beware! there is a deeply hidden purpose in this movement. Again I quote:—

The Catholic Church of Rome, just as she stands to-day, is the greatest fact or the greatest humbug in the world's history. . . . It is the moral and civil duty of every intelligent, thinking person to examine the question and see whether she is a fact or a humbug.

Truly every Protestant ought to examine this question, and ought to especially when Rome invites him to. Every Protestant ought to know just what kind of a fact the Catholic Church is in history. He ought to study until he has an intelligent knowledge of what the church has been in the past, and just what she is to-day. "Rome never changes." But in the significant words of another the truth is stated thus:—

A day of great intellectual darkness has been shown to be favorable to the success of popery. It will yet be demonstrated that a day of great intellectual light is equally favorable for its success.

In no country on earth has she made such progress as here in America; and in no country on earth has knowledge been

so generally diffused. Rome has never favored this, but instead has opposed till it was apparent that it was a losing game and then she turns around and says coolly, that it is her effort and labor that have given the present greatness to this nation, and that she is really the very head of all intellectual progress. Are Protestants ready to accept this as a fact? or can they discern a purpose in it? The real condition of affairs is well illustrated in the work of the secret service detective. He spies out his man, but wants positive evidence against him. And how does he get it? He simply assumes any character, or follows any course of action, that will lead his man to act out just what he is. He will often invite him where an opportunity is given him to do the very things of which he wishes to have positive evidence against him, and then all at once throws off his assumed character and confronts his prisoner as an officer of the law, ready to execute justice and punish him for his crimes. He only acted the part of the criminal to get the other man in his power, then he throws off his cloak and takes his man. Just so the Catholic Church is doing to-day with Protestants. She stands as the defender of the Constitution, as the educator of the people, as the champion of liberty, and as the highest type of all that is good among mortals. Protestants will know and feel her power when it is too late; they are playing into her hands in every direction; and the only rescue even now is for the individual through true Protestantism as revealed in Jesus Christ and his righteousness. This is wholly of faith; while the Catholic idea of salvation is wholly of works. After it is too late, Protestants will know how great a fact the Catholic Church is in the present, even if they do not investigate her history. And then, too, they will learn how great a humbug she is as a dependence for salvation for which men seek.

C. F. WILCOX.

SOME VALUABLE BOOKS FOR YOUNG MEN.

We have secured the following books which we can recommend, not only as unobjectionable but as highly beneficial reading for young men:—

Moral Muscle and How to Use It, by FREDERICK ATKINS. A Brotherly Chat with Young Men.

"This is positively the best book for young men that we have seen. It looks the facts of young men's lives full in the face, and proclaims the gospel of industry, perseverance, self-control, and manly Christianity. We can certify that no one will find it stupid."—*St. Andrews Cross*.

First Battles and How to Fight Them, by F. A. ATKINS. Friendly Chats with Young Men.

"It is true in substance, attractive in its style, and admirable in its spirit. I heartily commend this little volume."—*Rev. John Hall, D.D.*

The Spiritual Athlete and How He Trains, by W. A. BODELL. Introduction by REV. B. FAY MILLS.

A work for young men, pithy, pointed and practical. "Its power and value lie in the consistent carrying out of the comparison between physical and spiritual training."—*The Independent*.

Brave and True, by J. THAIN DAVIDSON. Talks to Young Men.

"This is one of the books the wide distribution of which cannot be too greatly desired."—*Presbyterian Journal*.

Each of these books is complete in itself, and so can be sold separately at fifty cents each; but as they are all about equally good, and desiring to encourage the dissemination of such literature, we offer the four for \$1.75. They are all bound alike, and put up in a neat box present a very attractive appearance. They will form a valuable addition to any young man's or youth's library.

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



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 22, 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.

THE *Western Watchman* says that out of a total population of 95,000 in the Sandwich Islands 24,000 are Catholics.

THE *Catholic Standard* remarks that "the *Independent* takes to itself entirely too much concern for affairs Roman." Is this, then, the reward of the *Independent's* flattery of the Romish hierarchy in America? Fate is indeed sometimes cruel.

SOME have written us saying that the two articles which appeared recently in the SENTINEL, "The Limits of Civil Authority from the Standpoint of Natural Right," and "The Limits of Civil Authority from the Standpoint of Divine Obligation," ought to be printed in tract form. They have been. No. 13 of the *Religious Liberty Library* contains in a single tract the two articles.

A FOOT note on Rev. 13:18, in the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures, says: "Six hundred sixty-six. The numeral letters of his name shall make up this number." The pope styles himself, "The Vicar of the Son of God," which title he wears in Latin upon his miter: "*Vicarius Filii Dei.*" The numerical value of these letters is exactly 666; *v* being formerly the same as *v*.

THE hearing on the proposed "Christian" amendment before the House Committee on the Judiciary, will be held March 6, instead of March 13, as stated last week. Our representative in Washington was informed by the secretary of the committee that the hearing would be March 13, but it seems it has been definitely fixed for another date. We do not know what step will be taken, if any, by opposers of the amendment to defeat it.

It is said that "republics are ungrateful;" but be that as it may, Roman Catholics certainly are: for, notwithstanding all that the National Reformers have done for Romanism in this country, the *Catholic Standard* says:—

If the meddlesome Protestant ministers who are bothering poor congressmen in Washington about having an amendment adopted, putting God into the Constitution, were to put more of His principles into their sermons and lives, it would be better for themselves, their congregations, if they have any worth talking about, and the country at large.

If that is not base ingratitude what is it? It is almost as unkind as to remind "Protestants," and Rome is not backward about doing that, that aside from popish tradition there is absolutely no authority

for Sunday-keeping. It would seem that so far as Rome's appreciation is concerned, National Reformers have "labored in vain and brought forth for trouble."

As noted in these columns last week, McNamara, the anti-Catholic lecturer and agitator, has been sentenced to one year's imprisonment and to pay a fine of \$500. The *Western Watchman* (Catholic) says:—

He will get more of the same medicine before the Missouri courts get through with him. We are glad to think that the jury that convicted the arch-slenderer was composed exclusively of Protestants. Father Dalton deserves the thanks of every Catholic in the country for having sent the arch-scoundrel, McNamara, to jail.

We do not know all the facts in this case, but on the face of it it appears to be an outrage on free-speech. The fact that the jury was composed of "Protestants" is no guarantee that justice was done. There are "Protestants" and Protestants. A jury of the former would be no better than a jury of Catholics, if as good, for "corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

It was a rather ludicrous blunder into which Senator Voorhees fell, recently, in an attempt to gain a little cheap favor with the Catholics. The facts are thus stated in a Washington dispatch of February 8:—

Senator Voorhees made a bad break to-day, which is exciting a great deal of amusement. He made the motion that the Senate adjourn until Mouday, and gave as his reason that to-morrow will be Good Friday, "yesterday was Ash Wednesday," he said, "and there is no reason why we should not observe Good Friday." None of the senators appeared to know that Voorhees was wrong, and the motion prevailed.

Of course such a blunder was the occasion of general newspaper comment, but the following editorial note from the *Philadelphia Times* of the 9th inst., is about as pertinent as anything that we have seen:—

The Senate, it appears, is not well up in the ecclesiastical calendar. Having read in yesterday's papers that the day before was Ash Wednesday, the Senate, on motion of Mr. Voorhees, adjourned over to-day in order to observe Good Friday! No doubt a Lent of four days instead of forty would be widely popular, especially among young people, but it may be questioned whether a decree of the Senate would be sufficient to effect this reform.

Of course this action of the Senate can have no effect on the Lenten season in this case; but suppose there were a division of opinion in this matter and likewise in practice, and suppose that the adjournment had been had with special reference to committing the Government to one side of the controversy; it at once becomes apparent how improper such action would be. And yet that is exactly what was done a few months ago in the matter of the Sunday controversy. Congress conditioned an appropriation upon the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, for the express purpose of committing the Government to the cause of Sunday sacredness. The time long since foretold by the Na-

tional Reformers has come when politicians are tumbling over each other in their haste to secure front seats in the "reform" car, and some ludicrous, and even disgusting, sights will certainly be witnessed.

UNDER date of February 11, the United Press correspondent in Rome sent out this dispatch:—

The opposition to Archbishop Satolli, Apostolic Delegate to the Catholic Church in the United States, is ended. The pope was inflexible, and declared that he always would support Archbishop Satolli to accentuate his American policy.

American Catholics may not like Satolli, that is, they may, and we believe, do, object to being ruled absolutely by an imported Italian ecclesiastic, but they will submit. Rome brooks no independence.

THE *Lutheran Standard* thus states the position of Lutherans on the school question:—

It should be distinctly understood that the Lutheran Church does not make any demands upon the State for any support for her parochial schools. There is no opposition to the public schools from the ranks of the Lutheran Church. We recognize their necessity, and when we can do no better we use the advantages they afford. When, however, we can give our children a Christian training by establishing and supporting a Christian school, no one in this land of the free has any right to forbid it. Any interference on the part of the State would be in violation of the national Constitution.

This is the correct position. The church that occupies it stands on solid ground.

A COLPORTERS' school and Bible institute lately held by Seventh-day Adventists at Atlanta, Ga., was attended by more than one hundred and sixty missionary workers from every State south of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi. Five colporters were in attendance who walked from two hundred to two hundred and sixty miles that they might receive the benefit of the meeting. All whose fields of labor were such that they could avail themselves of transportation by any of the lines of the Richmond and Danville systems were given the most liberal rates possible and treated with the utmost courtesy by the officials of that road. The uniform kindness and consideration met with by this people in the matter of railroad transportation is in marked contrast with the suspicion, prejudice and persecution which they so often have to meet among the community at large.

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.			