



"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, MARCH 29, 1894.

NUMBER 13.

## 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.

IN studying how best to oppose the encroachments of the papacy, it is only to state the truth to say that nothing but genuine Protestantism, consistently manifested, can ever successfully oppose the papacy in anything.

YET it is likewise only to state the truth to say that that which passes for Protestantism to-day, the average, popular, professed Protestantism of to-day, is so lacking in every essential element of true Protestantism, that it has become powerless for any purposes of opposition to the papacy, or for any other purpose that can be accomplished by Protestantism.

THE professed Protestantism of to-day calls upon Congress, and State legislatures, and the courts, to decide religious questions and controversies, and to enact laws embodying religious doctrines and enforcing church dogmas; it prosecutes at the law, fines and imprisons dissenters from the legalized doctrines; and even has gone so far as to demand of the national executive the mustering of the regular troops to enforce upon the people, at the point of the bayonet, the recognition and observance of religious dogmas and institutions. Any or all of this is anything but true Protestantism in any sense.

AT the second Diet of Spire, held in 1529, there was presented the *Protest*, which originated, and gave to those who made it, the title and name of *Protestants*. And in summarizing this protest the historian states its principles as follows:—

The principles contained in the celebrated protest of the 19th of April, 1529, constitute the *very essence of Protestantism*. Now this protest opposes *two abuses of man* in matters of faith; the *first* is the intrusion of the civil magistrate; and the *second* the arbitrary authority of the church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate, and the authority of the word

of God above the visible church. In the first place it rejects the civil power in divine things, and says with the prophets and apostles, *We must obey God rather than man*. In the presence of the crown of Charles the Fifth, it uplifts the crown of Jesus Christ.—*D'Aubigne, Hist. Ref. Book XIII., chap. VI., page 521.*

THE professed Protestants of to-day claim that Sunday is the Christian Sabbath; that it is the great charter of their religion; that it is, indeed, the very citadel of their faith. Now do they oppose the intrusion of the civil magistrate into this great question of their religion?—No, indeed. Everybody knows that so far are they from opposing any intrusion of the civil magistrate that they actually *require* the civil authority to intrude upon the discussion and decision of the question and the enactment of laws requiring its observance; and also require the courts to intrude themselves into it whenever the law is called in question; and further call upon the executive to further intrude the civil authority by exerting all the power vested in him. All this they have done and are doing before the eyes of all the people.

Now as it is the very essence of Protestantism to *oppose* the intrusion of the civil magistrate in religious things; and as these do not oppose this, it plainly follows that they are not Protestants, and that their religion and work is not that of Protestantism. As it is the very essence of Protestantism to oppose the intrusion of the civil magistrate in things religious; and as these people, professing to be Protestants, not only do not oppose it, but actually require the whole magisterial power of the State and United States Governments to intrude there; it follows that these people are not Protestants at all, and that neither their movement nor their work is Protestantism in any sense.

SECONDLY, it is the essence of Protestantism to oppose "the arbitrary authority of the Church."

Now, for the institution of Sunday or for Sunday observance, in any way, there is no authority but the arbitrary authority of the Church. Professed Protestants not only know this, but they openly say it. The American Sabbath Union itself, which is composed of the leading "Protestant"

churches, in one of its own official publications, in answer to a call for a citation to a command of God for Sunday observance, plainly says: "We admit there is no such command." The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, also, in one of its own publications, inquiring about the change of day from the seventh to the first, says that Christ "did not command it." There are other such statements also—too many to cite here. Well, then, as they know that there is no command of God for Sunday observance; and as the Church power only is that which requires its observance; this is proof in itself that the only authority for it is the arbitrary authority of the Church.

YET more than this. Even though Christ had commanded it, for the Church to require, and enforce upon men, its observance by law—this would be nothing else than to assert the arbitrary authority of the Church. *Because*, Christ himself has said, "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge [condemn] him not." As therefore Christ leaves every man free to observe his words or not, for the Church to compel any man to do it, is to put herself above Christ, and do what *he* does not do. And this, in itself, is only to assert the arbitrary authority of the Church. So that whether there be a command of God for Sunday observance or not, in this matter the result is the same; to do as the professed Protestant churches of the United States have done and are doing, in requiring Sunday observance of all by law, is nothing else than to assert the rightfulness of the arbitrary authority of the Church.

BUT it is the *essence of Protestantism* to oppose the arbitrary authority of the Church. Therefore, as the professed Protestants of the United States have not opposed the arbitrary authority of the Church in this matter of Sunday observance, it plainly follows that they are not Protestants. As it is the essence of Protestantism to oppose the arbitrary authority of the Church, and as these professed Protestants, not only do not oppose it, but actually assert it and openly maintain it, it unmistakably follows that they are not Protestants at all; and that their position

is not that of true Protestantism in any sense.

THIS proves that to oppose the Sunday institution itself, to oppose the Sunday movement in all its parts, to oppose Sunday laws in any and all their phases, to oppose and deny the right of congresses, or courts, or executives, to touch the question of Sunday observance, or any other religious question in any way, and to reject entirely the authority of any such action when it is asserted—*this* and this only is *Protestantism*. Even admitting that Sunday were the Sabbath, those who observe it can be Protestants only by opposing all intrusion of the magistrates into the question; by opposing all attempts of the Church to require its recognition or observance by law, and by asserting their own individual right to observe it as they choose, without any dictation or interference from anybody. This alone is Protestantism.

THIS is the living, present, absolute truth. There is no discount on it at all. "Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate," even though the magistrate calls himself a Christian and a Protestant, and proposes to enforce the "Christian Sabbath." "Protestantism sets the authority of the word of God above the visible Church," even though the Church calls itself Protestant. Protestantism "rejects the civil power in divine things, and says with the prophets and apostles: 'We must obey God rather than man,'" and that, too, *as God commands* it, and not as *man* commands it, nor as *man says* that God commands it. Protestantism opposes and rejects every human intrusion, whether of the magistrate or of the ecclesiastic, between the soul and Jesus Christ, and everlastingly maintains the divine right of the individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience exercised at his own free choice.

TRUE Protestantism insists that "the Bible and the Bible alone," "the written word of God," "thus saith the Lord," is the only rule of faith and the religion of Protestants. But it is the very certainty of truth that there is no Bible, no written word of God, no "thus saith the Lord," for the Sunday institution, or for Sunday observance, or for the intrusion of Cæsar—the civil power—into the things of God or of the Church; and the professed Protestants of to-day know it, and have said so over and over. Indeed, Protestantism has always known that there is no Scripture, but only Church authority, *tradition* only, for the institution of Sunday. It was exactly here that the Council of Trent drew the line between Protestantism and Catholicism, and this, too, at the expense of Protestantism, because of its inconsistency. Yet, in spite of the history and the fact, in spite of their own knowledge of the history and the fact, in spite of the Scripture, and in spite of all this inconsistency, the professed Protestantism of to-day persistently stultifies itself by violating every principle of true Protestantism and acting upon papal principles only.

HERE are some words of as much solemn weight as ever, as true to-day, and of the popular Protestantism of to-day, as they ever were at any other time:—

The Reformation was accomplished in the name of

a spiritual principle. It had proclaimed for its teacher the word of God; for salvation, faith; for king, Jesus Christ; for arms, the Holy Ghost; and had by these very means rejected all worldly elements. Rome had been established by "the law of a carnal commandment;" the Reformation, by "the power of an endless life."

The gospel of the Reformers *had nothing to do with the world and with politics*. While the Roman hierarchy had become a matter of diplomacy and a court intrigue, the Reformation was destined to exercise *no other influence over princes and people than that which proceeds from the gospel of peace*.

If the Reformation, having attained a certain point, became untrue to its nature, began to parley and temporize with the world, and ceased thus to follow up the spiritual principle that it had so loudly proclaimed, it was faithless to God and to itself. Henceforward its decline was at hand.

It is impossible for a society to prosper, if it be unfaithful to the principles it lays down. Having abandoned what constituted its life, it can find naught but death.

It was God's will that this great truth should be inscribed on the very threshold of the temple he was then raising in the world, and a striking contrast was to make the truth stand gloriously prominent.

One portion of the reform was to seek alliance of the world, and in this alliance find a destruction full of desolation.

Another portion looking up to God, was haughtily to reject the arm of the flesh, and by this very act of faith secure a noble victory.

If three centuries have gone astray, it is because they were unable to comprehend so holy and so solemn a lesson.—*D'Aubigne, Id., Book XIV, chap. 1.*

As the case stands to-day it is demonstrated that not only *three* centuries but *three and a half* centuries have gone astray because of their unwillingness or their inability to comprehend so holy and so solemn a lesson. And what, now, is the patent result?—Nothing short of the sheer collapse of popular Protestantism as a moral force in the world. The crowning act that demonstrated this was that procedure in 1892, by which the professed Protestantism of the United States, and of the world even, positively required, under threats of the only force at its command, the United States Government, to intrude itself into the realm of religion and conscience, to legalize the arbitrary authority of the Church, and thus to set the magistrate above the conscience and above the word of God. And this crowning act which marked the collapse of popular Protestantism was accompanied by an open confession of this collapse in the procedure by which professed Protestantism called together all the other religions of the world for the purpose of instituting a comparison among them in order to discover and formulate "a new, complete and perfect religion for all mankind." And so there met in the "World's Parliament of Religions" the three great divisions—Heathenism, Catholicism and popular Protestantism. Catholicism saw at once, and announced, "the collapse of dogmatic Protestantism," and proceeded to make the fullest use of the "opportunity" thus opened to Catholicism. By their experiences in the parliament the heathen discovered this collapse and afterward announced it to their nations, as the following report, made by the Japanese priests, who returned from the parliament, shows:—

When we received the invitation to attend the Parliament of Religions our Buddhist organizations would not send us as representatives of the sect. The great majority believed that it was a shrewd move on the part of Christians to get us there and then hold us up to ridicule or try to convert us. We accordingly went as individuals. But it was a wonderful surprise which awaited us. Our ideas were all mistaken. The parliament was called because the Western nations have come to realize the weakness and folly of Christianity and they really wished to hear from us of our religion, and to learn what the best religion is. There is no better place in the world to propagate the teachings of Buddhism than in America. During the meetings one very wealthy

man from New York became a convert of Buddhism, and was initiated into its rites. He is a man of great influence, and his conversion may be said to mean more than the conversion of ten thousand ordinary men, so we may say truthfully that we made ten thousand converts at that meeting. Christianity is merely an adornment of society in America. It is deeply believed in by very few. The great majority of Christians drink and commit various gross sins, and live very dissolute lives, although it is a very common belief and serves as a social adornment. Its lack of power proves its weakness. The meetings showed the great superiority of Buddhism over Christianity, and the mere fact of calling the meetings showed that the Americans and other Western peoples had lost their faith in Christianity and were ready to accept the teachings of our superior religion.—*New York Independent, Dec. 14, 1893, p. 15.*

And the missionary in Japan, who sends this, says that the report was received with "great applause," and that these statements "will be thoroughly believed by the masses of the people." Well, why should not the statements be believed by the masses of the people? The statements are true, and are fairly put, and a person does not need to be in Japan to discover it.

As we have said, Catholicism saw this collapse at once. Heathenism discovered it by experience in the parliament. And anybody who has carefully read the speeches made in the parliament cannot fail to see that it is so. The speeches of the heathen and of the Catholics are superior in every respect to the speeches of the representative "Protestants," and in some respects, far superior. In the speeches of the heathen and the Catholics, and especially of the heathen, there was the keen searching analysis of scholarly attainment and the sober earnestness of conviction, that will always make an impression; while the speeches of professed Protestantism were chiefly characterized by the lightness of leaves in the wind, the instability of water, and the uncertainty of the waves of the sea. All this is easily seen by a comparison of the speeches made in the parliament. And that that is precisely the measure of the effect that the speeches and proceedings had upon those who attended the parliament or who have studied the speeches, is clear to every one who has moved to any extent among the people since. Thus, by seeking the arm of the national power to hold her up, and meeting upon a common basis of inquiry both heathenism and Catholicism, popular Protestantism has openly confessed her conscious inability to stand alone and her conscious lack of Christian truth, and so has confessed her utter collapse as a moral force or as a power for good in the world.

A number of years ago a leading thinker in Europe declared in truth of Protestantism as it is in Europe, what is now equally true of Protestantism as it is in the United States: "Protestants, there are some, but Protestantism is dead." "The collapse of dogmatic Protestantism" is an accomplished fact. But Protestants will never cease out of the land, and may they increase abundantly.

A. T. J.

#### That "Atmosphere of Piety."

A WRITER in the *Catholic Mirror* of September 2, 1893, in giving a description of the World's Fair, and especially of the three Spanish caravels of Columbus, says:

Oh that the wheel of time might turn back and dip the wide world and all of the earth in that atmosphere of piety in which the rude sailors of four centuries ago were born and bred.

The pious atmosphere of those days was of such a nature that wicked men like Huss and Jerome were not allowed to

breathe out their poisonous soul-destroying errors to contaminate the purity of the hearts and minds of the people. And when they persisted in their wickedness they were not deemed fit to live, but expiated their crimes at the stake. That atmosphere of piety put such a spirit of love and gentleness in the hearts of those rude sailors that they were ready to mutiny and murder Columbus, unless he would grant their requests. Such an atmosphere proved very conducive to the life and growth of that lovely plant—the Spanish Inquisition.

What a blessed experience it would be, indeed, if the wheel of time would revolve backward and plunge the wide world once more into that pious atmosphere.

Again, in the same article, the writer says:—

Pity it is that Catholic piety is not allowed to bring its elevating influence to play on every heart.

The Inquisition made it very easy to bring the "elevating influence" of "Catholic piety" "to play on every heart." Like methods will once more produce like results. Apostate Protestantism is fast turning the wheel of time backward, and soon the wide world and all the earth will be dipped in that atmosphere of "piety" in which the rude sailors of four centuries ago were born and bred; and the elevating(?) influence of Catholic piety will soon be brought to play on every heart.

W. H. FALCONER.

#### Old and New Style.

A CORRESPONDENT sends us the following, and requests some light on the subject:—

A gentleman here asserts that when we keep the seventh day, we do not know that that is the proper Sabbath, instituted by God, because "time changes;" for instance, he says: Washington was born February 11th, 1732, but on account of the change in time since that, his birthday had to be moved ahead to the 22nd of February, or, in other words, a gain in time, in one hundred and sixty-two years, of eleven days, consequently it does not matter what day we observe, because one can not be sure of observing the right one, any way.

Will the editor of the SENTINEL please give us some light on this subject, both as to Washington's birthday and the proper day of rest. Can we know that we have the right day when we observe the seventh?

Yours open to conviction.

P. H. H.

The question is a very easy one. The year is a natural division of time measured off by the movement of the earth around the sun. It does not consist, however, of a certain number of days. The exact length of the solar year is 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 57 seconds.

The following, from "Analysis of Sacred Chronology," by S. Bliss, will make this matter clear:—

The year is the most convenient division of time. Previous to the deluge, and for a long time after, it was reckoned at three hundred and sixty days. As the sun returns annually to the same point in the heavens, it could not fail to be noticed as a natural measurement of time. The Egyptians attributed its discovery to the Phœnician, Hermes, a diligent observer of the rising and setting of the stars; but it was evidently in use before the deluge.

In process of time it was found that the primeval year of three hundred and sixty days was shorter than the tropical year, and five additional days were intercalated, to harmonize the observance of festivals with their appropriate seasons. It was subsequently found that the solar year exceeded three hundred and sixty-five days, by about six hours, or a quarter of a day.

In the time of Julius Cæsar, owing to the irregularity with which the additional days had been intercalated, the vernal equinox, instead of falling on the 23rd of March, was dated near the middle of May. To remedy this, Cæsar formed a preparatory year of fifteen months, or four hundred and forty-five days, called "the year of confusion." It began October 3,

B. C. 46, so that the first reformed year following commenced January 1, B. C. 45. To compensate for the additional fraction of a day, he inserted a whole day every fourth year.

More accurate astronomical observations at length demonstrated that the true solar year was three hundred and sixty-five days, five hours, forty-eight minutes, and fifty-seven seconds—eleven minutes and three seconds less than the time reckoned, or one day in every one hundred and thirty years; so that in A. D. 1582 the vernal equinox was found to be on the 11th of March, having fallen back ten days. To remedy this, Pope Gregory XIII. left out ten days in October, calling the 5th the 15th of that month, making another "year of confusion." To prevent a repetition of this error, Gregory decreed that three days should be omitted in every four centuries, or that that number of years, which would otherwise be bissextile, should be reckoned as common years. This makes our year sufficiently exact for all practical purposes. Perfect accuracy, however, would require that another day be omitted in each six thousand years, and one day more at the end of one hundred and forty-four thousand.

The Gregorian calendar was not at once adopted, however, by all nations. The "Encyclopædia Britannica," says:—

In Great Britain the alteration of the style was for a long time successfully opposed by popular prejudice. The inconvenience, however, of using a different date from that employed by the greater part of Europe, in matters of history and chronology, began to be generally felt; and at length, in 1751, an act of Parliament was passed for the adoption of the new style in all public and legal transactions. The difference of the two styles, which then amounted to eleven days, was removed by ordering the day following the second of September of the year 1752 to be accounted the 14th of that month; and in order to preserve uniformity in future, the Gregorian rule of intercalation respecting the secular years was adopted.

It will be seen that this change in the calendar had no effect whatever on the weekly cycle. Russia still adheres to the Julian calendar, but has the same week as the rest of the world. The reason for this is that the week has no connection whatever with the month or with the year. It is by divine appointment.

That the week is a definite and well-known division of time, and that consequently the seventh day of the week is likewise a well-defined portion of time, is attested by all history. Indeed, few other facts are so well attested, and no other arbitrary division of time is so ancient as is the weekly cycle. Moreover, the week is at once an unimpeachable witness to the truth of the Mosaic account of creation, and an imperishable monument to the original Sabbath, the seventh day of the week.

Aside from the Bible, history furnishes no clue to the origin of the weekly cycle. Some have thought that it might have been suggested by the changes of the moon: but very unfortunately for that theory the moon does not change once in seven days but once in seven days and nine hours, as nearly as may be, hence its phases do not synchronize with the week. There is absolutely nothing in nature to suggest the septenary cycle; and so patent is this fact that the "Encyclopædia Britannica," article "Calendar," says:—

As the week forms neither an aliquot part of the year nor of the lunar month, those who reject the Mosaic recital will be at a loss, as Delambre remarks, to assign to it an origin having much semblance of probability.

The same authority, article, "Babylonia," says:—

The week of seven days was in use from an early period; indeed, the names which we still give to the days can be traced to Ancient Babylonia; and the seventh day was one of *sutum*, or rest.

This fact constitutes the week an unimpeachable witness to the truth of Genesis. But the question may be asked, How is it also an imperishable monument to the original Sabbath? The answer is easy. As the Sabbath of the fourth command-

ment is the seventh day of the week it can not be lost as long as the weekly cycle endures; and that it never has been lost, is attested by the fact that the week has always been known among almost all nations.

Rev. Thos. Hamilton, A. M., of Belfast; in his prize essay, "Our Rest," published by the Sabbath Alliance of Scotland, testifies that even the Chinese formerly had; not only the septenary division of days, but that they knew and to some extent observed the original Sabbath. Seventy-five out of one hundred and seven ancient languages, reveal a knowledge not only of the weekly cycle but of the Sabbath, the last day of that cycle. On this subject Rev. Dr. Lewis has eloquently said:—

The nations that spoke many of these languages have long since gone from the earth. But the words of their mother tongue embalm their thoughts and practices as ineffaceable and unmistakable monuments showing the identity of the week and of the Sabbath. Tides of emigration have swept hither and thither over the earth. Empires have risen, flourished, and fallen, but the week has endured, amid all convulsions and changes. . . . Philology has done for the truth concerning God's eternal Sabbath, what cuneiform inscriptions, and mummy pits, are doing for general and national history.

All of which facts support the statement, that the week is an imperishable monument to the true Sabbath.

That the week has not been lost this side of the Christian era need not even be asserted, in view of the facts already given. Even the tyro in history knows that such a thing would have been impossible. It follows, that unless we find in the Bible authority for keeping as the Sabbath a day other than the seventh day of the week, as we now have it, the claim that Sunday is the Sabbath utterly fails for want of even an excuse for ever having had an existence. C. P. B.

#### A Plea Before a Georgia Jury.

THE Roman Catholic Church claims to have attempted the change of the day of religious observance. Admissions in favor of truth from the ranks of its enemies constitute the highest kind of evidence,—therefore when Catholics themselves admit and declare their attempt to change the day, need we question their having done so? To support this Mr. McCutchen quoted from Roman Catholic publications,—"Catholic Catechism of Christian Religion," "Catholic Christian Instructed," "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," and other authorities. He then proceeded substantially as follows:—

"This is sufficient to show who attempted the change of the day, and also the purpose of the Catholics in publishing this to the world—it is to show the inconsistency of Protestants. I hold in my hand a pamphlet of thirty-two pages on this Sabbath question, recently issued by the *Catholic Mirror*, of Baltimore, Md., the whole of which is taken up in showing that the Catholics did change the day, and challenging the Protestant world to show any scriptural authority for a change. Listen to the concluding paragraphs thrown out to the Protestants:—

The Protestant world at its birth found the Christian Sabbath too strongly entrenched to run counter to its existence; it was therefore placed under the necessity of acquiescing in the arrangement, thus implying the church's right to change the day, for over 300 years. The Christian Sabbath is therefore to *this day* the acknowledged offspring of the Catholic Church, as spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.

Let us now, however, take a glance at our second proposition, with *the Bible alone* as the teacher and



guide in faith and morals. This teacher most emphatically forbids any change in the day for paramount reasons. The command calls for a "perpetual covenant." The day commanded to be kept by the teacher has never once been kept, thereby developing an apostasy from an assumedly fixed principle, as self-contradictory, self-stultifying, and consequently as suicidal as it is within the power of language to express. Nor are the limits of demoralization yet reached. Far from it. Their pretense for leaving the bosom of the Catholic Church was for apostasy from the truth as taught in the written Word. They adopted the written Word as their sole teacher, which they had no sooner done than they abandoned it promptly as these articles have abundantly proved, and by a perversity as willful as erroneous, they accept the teaching of the Catholic Church in direct opposition to the plain, unvaried and constant teaching of their sole teacher in the most essential doctrine of their religion, thereby emphasizing the situation in what may be aptly designated "a mockery, a delusion, and a snare."

Should any of the reverend parsons, who are habituated to howl so vociferously over every real or assumed desecration of that pious fraud, the Bible Sabbath, think well of entering a protest against our logical and scriptural dissection of their mongrel pet, we can promise them that any reasonable attempt on their part to gather up the "dissecta membra" of the hybrid, and to restore to it a galvanized existence, will be met with genuine cordiality and respectful consideration on our part. But we can assure our readers that we know these reverend howlers too well to expect a solitary bark from them in this instance. And they know us too well to subject themselves to the mortification which a further dissection of this anti-scriptural question would necessarily entail. Their policy now is to "lay low," and they are sure to adopt it.

"Now, gentlemen of the jury, I don't know as it is necessary to give any further evidence along this line. The Bible shows no change whatever for the day. Historians show that human authority has changed it. It was over three hundred years this side of Christ before any authoritative change was made. Constantine, in 321 A. D., who himself did not even profess Christianity at that time, was the first to enact a law for Sunday observance.

"But there is another thing about this Sabbath question. In Ex. 31: 12, 13 it is stated by the Lord that the Sabbath is 'a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.' Verse 17 states the same thing. This point is made prominent throughout the Scriptures. See Ezek. 20:12, also verse 20, etc., etc.

"Our observance of the Sabbath is in conformity with the Scriptures and shows our allegiance to God who sanctifies. Notice the contrast. The Catholic Church has changed the day and correctly charges that professed Protestants are inconsistent in observing one of their festivals and not the rest. The change of the day is the sign the papacy presents to show its authority. One is the sign of the papacy which strives to change the law, and the other is the sign of God who made the law. Can you blame us, gentlemen of the jury, for obeying that which we regard as the sign of allegiance to the God to whom we profess allegiance? On the other hand if that is violated it will be recognizing the authority of the church, which would be irreligious and sacrilegious. That is the very same thing spoken of in the book of Revelation, chapter 14. Speaking of the beast, which all Protestant commentators agree, refers to the Roman Catholic power, it says, 'If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in

the presence of the Lamb.' Verses 9 and 10.

"Gentlemen of the jury, if I with a knowledge of the facts before me and understanding the nature of the question, should acquiesce and obey that power, and keep the first day of the week as the Sabbath, to me it would be the mark of the beast in the forehead and in the hand; in the forehead by giving consent of my mind to it against my convictions, and in the hand by a cessation of labor with it in obedience to the mandates of the papacy. So, before the God of heaven and earth I take the liberty, in his name, to obey what the Lord himself has told me in his Word. To do otherwise would be to me to receive the mark of the beast spoken of in the book of Revelation. I have already read that this change of the Sabbath is the sign or mark of the Roman power. I say to you, if she herself claims it as the mark of her power, who can say it is not? There is a mark of allegiance to the true God. It is the Sabbath,—the sign of him who justifies and sanctifies. Now which shall I carry out?

"But, gentlemen of the jury, this is not merely a question of days, it is a question of rights and religious liberty. Even if Sunday were the Lord's day, the law has no constitutional right to enforce its observance upon any one. The Sabbath is a religious thing, whether it be called so or not. It is itself based on a religious principle. Can any one say that, because it is legislated upon, it is not connected with religious sentiments? Paganism observed Sunday as an institution in honor of the sun, which they recognized as their god. It is a religious institution all the way through, and the Constitution and laws of the United States cannot make it otherwise. It seems to me clearly that it is outside the civil government to undertake to enforce it upon any one. The law has no more right to enforce the right day than the wrong one upon the people. It would not be proper to enforce it upon us even if it were the right day. A man cannot acquiesce in legislation even in favor of his own religion without yielding up religious liberty. Religious liberty consists not merely in my contending for my right to worship as I please, but in my contending for the right of others to serve God as they think right. The whole tenor of Sunday legislation shows it to be religious legislation. This law is but the continuation of that enacted in 1762 on this question, when this State was a colony and the Church and State system was practically in vogue.

"The disposition of the fines imposed for Sunday work farther shows this to be religious legislation. The law provides that all such fines '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.' Section 4581, Code of Georgia. Now notice, the fines collected for the violation of a supposed civil statute are to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying on religious instruction! Tell me, isn't that religious, in the beginning, and all the way through? Has the State any right to enact religious laws to enforce religious views upon any one? Let me refer here to the constitution of our State: 'All men have the natural and inalienable right to worship God each according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no human authority should, in any case, control or interfere with such rights of

conscience.' Article 12, Bill of Rights. Now I ask you to think of that, 'All men have a natural and inalienable right.' What is an inalienable right? It is one that cannot be alienated; it is an inherent right. It inheres in its very nature in man; and this is to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. I would also call your attention to paragraph 13, Bill of Rights:—

No inhabitant of this State shall be molested in person or property or prohibited from holding any public office or trust, on account of his religious opinion; but the right of liberty of conscience shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State.

"Has there been any witness brought forward to show that there was anything done to menace the liberties of the citizens of this State? Has any one's life been in danger? No witness has testified to anything of that kind. The law says protection shall be impartial and complete. Every man has the inalienable right to carry out the dictates of his conscience. For what purpose have you read American history, in the face of such proceedings as are presented to us here?—A jury of twelve citizens called upon to infringe upon another's liberty?

"This principle is laid down in the Bible; every citizen is in duty bound to obey the laws of his country no matter how oppressive they may be until it comes in conflict with his duty to God and his law, in which case the law-makers will have entered upon religious legislation and exceeded their authority. There is a limit to civil authority itself. God has ordained governments, it is true. He has said to be subject to the powers that be. Some have taken a very strange view of this matter. Some have argued that the scripture (Romans 13: 1) proves that we should submit to every law that may be enacted, even religious laws. But Romans 14, where it talks of matters of faith, says, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Christ also says in Matt. 22: 21: 'Render, therefore, unto Cæsar [civil government] the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's.'"

The address closed with an exceedingly effective plea for the personal and individual rights of the citizen, and with a moving presentation of the unjust character of such persecutions as this.

W. H. M.

#### Progress of the National Religion at Washington.

REPRESENTATIVE MORSE, of Massachusetts, on March 10, introduced the following bill in the House:—

#### A BILL

To protect the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on the first day of the week, known as the Lord's day, set apart by general consent in accordance with divine appointment as a day of rest and worship, it shall be unlawful to perform any labor, except works of necessity and mercy, and work by those who religiously observe Saturday, if performed in such a way as not to involve or disturb others: also to open places of business or traffic, except in the case of drug stores for the dispensing of medicines; also to make contracts or transact other commercial business; also to engage in noisy amusements or amusements for gain, or entertainments for which admittance fees are charged; also to join in public processions, except funerals, which last shall not use music; also to perform any court service, except in connection with arrests of criminals and service of process to prevent fraud.

Sec 2. That the penalty for violating any provision

of this act shall be a fine of not less than ten dollars for the first offense; for second or subsequent offenses, a fine not exceeding fifty dollars and imprisonment for not less than ten nor more than thirty days, and one year's forfeiture of license, if any is held by the offender or his employer.

SEC. 3. That this Act shall take effect upon its passage.

This is more distinctively and openly a religious bill than the measure for the enforcement of the observance of Sunday, in the District of Columbia, introduced in the previous Congresses by W. C. P. Breckinridge, of Kentucky. It would seem that the mantle of Mr. Breckinridge has fallen upon Representative Morse, for he is the only member of the House now devoting himself to the furtherance of legislative religion in Congress.

In the *Congressional Record* of March 9, containing the proceedings of the previous day, is the following discussion which arose out of an item in the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia:—

MR. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, there is one single item in this bill to which I propose to address myself, . . . On page 26 is the following item:

For one new engine-house for No. 2 company, to be located on reservation at intersection of Ohio Avenue, Thirteenth and C Streets northwest, \$12,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no earthly objection to the engine-house, or to the \$12,000 appropriated for it, but I have a serious objection to the location of this engine-house, for the reason that it wipes out the mission chapel which has been doing great good in this city. I hold in my hand the picture of this mission chapel, which cost the benevolent people of this city nearly \$5,000. I have not, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, the slightest interest in this matter except *pro bono publico*. I have no interest except such as all good and right-minded citizens should have in any benevolent work which is being done in the direction of elevating men and women in the scale of humanity, elevating men and women to a saving knowledge of God. . . . The new engine-house can be located elsewhere.

Since this action has been known, and since this appropriation has been passed by the committee, I have received a number of letters from distinguished persons in this city protesting against this mission station being removed or destroyed. I have one here from which I would like to read a brief extract.

Washington, D. C. February 24, 1894.  
I sincerely trust that the objectionable item in the appropriation bill will be eliminated from the same and that we may be allowed to pursue our work in this neglected section of our beautiful city unmolested, or better, helped by every influence for good that can possibly be brought to bear.  
Yours very sincerely,  
W. B. ROBINSON,  
Superintendent Bethany Mission.

HON. ELIJAH A. MORSE,  
The Shoreham, City.

Now, I do not ask for the wiping out of the appropriation. I do not ask that the engine-house shall not be built; but I ask of the committee when this item is reached to accept an amendment to locate the engine-house somewhere else. . . . This mission station which it is proposed to destroy and to wipe out is located in one of the worst sections of the city. I have attended services there myself on a Sunday night. The audience was composed largely of persons who do not go to church anywhere else. There were soldiers in the audience; I should judge there were intemperate persons, from their appearance. I know that the young men who are members of the Young Men's Christian Association, and the members of the Society of Christian Endeavor, have for twenty years been conducting services there. They hold religious services there on Friday and Sunday night and the average attendance, I am told, has been something like one hundred. On Sabbath afternoon they hold a Sunday-school, and the average attendance is one hundred fifteen.

Now, it seems to me that it would be exceedingly unwise, from the lowest standpoint of the financial aspect of the question, to blow out this light, to pull down this moral light-house, stationed in that dark place, even for so laudable a purpose as to locate an engine-house, to put out a different kind of fire. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no right to detain the House further, as the hour is late, but I simply desire to send to the clerk's desk and have read in my time a brief statement of the work of this mission, and I have also obtained from the chairman of the Committee on Printing permission to print in the *Record* a cut showing the mission building. I think that it is a very important matter to this city whether this mission is to continue or is to be wiped out.

MR. COGSWELL. Do you say that you are going to put that cut in the *Record*? . . . Do I understand my colleague has asked permission to print in the

*Record* a cut of this Bethel? I ask that question for information. If he does ask that, I object.

MR. MORSE. I will say that I propose to conform entirely to the rules of the House in regard to the matter.

MR. COGSWELL. I want to know if the gentleman has asked permission. I understood him to say so; and if so, I have the right to object.

THE CHAIRMAN. The chair has submitted no request. If the gentleman will proffer his request, the chair will submit it.

MR. COGSWELL. My colleague stated a while ago that he submitted at the same time a cut of that Bethel to put in the *Record*. That sometimes is taken here as unanimous consent.

MR. MORSE. I did not ask consent of the House to illustrate my remarks, but I asked and obtained in writing the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Printing, in conformity to the rule of the House as printed on the last page of the *Record*.

MR. COGSWELL. If he does, I object.

MR. MORSE. I will say in regard to this matter, if my colleague from Massachusetts will read the condition upon which members are allowed to illustrate their remarks in the *Record*, he will see that I have complied with those conditions and his objection does not count, and I have a right to insert the illustration in connection with my remark if I choose to do so. I think, however, I shall not insist on my right in view of the objection, as I do not want to injure the chance of success of my amendment, and I only wished to use the cut to show what a substantial chapel and mission building it was proposed to wipe out and destroy to make room for an engine-house.

MR. COGSWELL. I know that the relations existing between my colleague and the chairman of the Committee on Printing are very pleasant; but I will object to having that cut printed in the *Record*, if for no other reason, on the constitutional ground that we have no right to recognize religions or the sects thereof.

MR. KEM. That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

The *Record* of March 11 continues the subject thus:—

The clerk read as follows:—

For one new engine house for No. 2 company, to be located on reservation at intersection of Ohio Avenue, Thirteenth, and C streets northwest, \$12,000.

MR. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out the paragraph just read and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For one new engine house for No. 2 company, to be located elsewhere than on reservation at intersection of Ohio Avenue, Thirteenth, and C streets northwest, \$12,000."

MR. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, in addition to what I said the other day in support of this amendment, I desire to call attention once more to the fact that this proposed new engine house, if it is to be built at the point indicated in the bill, is to be on the present site of a mission station of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church. That chapel, called the Bethany Mission, was built upon that site twenty years ago, and has been maintained as a mission ever since that time. . . . The building cost \$4,600, which was contributed by the benevolent people of this city. A religious service is held there on every Sabbath evening, a Sabbath school on Sabbath afternoon, and a regular Friday evening meeting. . . . Many of those who attend there are people who would not go to a service anywhere else. It is an entirely benevolent and non-sectarian work.

My genial colleague from the Sixth district [Mr. Cogswell] objected the other day to a permission which the Committee on Printing had given me to print a picture of this mission house in the *Record*. . . . I believe that my colleague objected on constitutional grounds, on the ground that this was recognizing some particular sect.

Now, I find on page 36 of this bill that it appropriates \$45,700 for purely sectarian institutions, and yet, after recommending such an appropriation as that, it is proposed to wipe out this little poor lone missionary chapel! I really hope that the committee will consent to my amendment.

MR. COGSWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes me as displaying an equal mixture of audacity and unconstitutionality. [Laughter.] In the first place, the reservation to which it relates is a small one, the property of the United States, which this Bethel has occupied for twenty years free from rent, and never should have occupied at all; and now, when the Government needs the reservation as a site for a public building, the people who are interested in this Bethel, represented on this floor by my friend and colleague, Mr. Morse, come in and do what they can to deprive the Government of the possession and use of its own property, which their Bethel has had for twenty years for nothing; although, as I believe, the Government had not then, and has not to-day, the right to appropriate, or loan, or give, the use of any Government reservation or property for the benefit of any religious sect.

I do not believe that constitutionally these people

could hold the position they now occupy for a moment, and I am surprised that objection has never been raised before to their occupation of that property. So much as to the unconstitutionality of the amendment. The audacity of it is that these people, who have used this property of the United States in violation of the Constitution for twenty years, should now come in here and try to keep the Government from utilizing its own property for a site for an engine house, which is very much needed. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

MR. HULICK. Is it proposed that the Government shall take this chapel building and destroy it without making any compensation?

MR. COGSWELL. Oh, no. It is a little wooden chapel placed on posts, which the Government does not propose to touch, but simply to ask these people to move off the ground.

MR. MORSE. They have no place to move it to.

A MEMBER. Let them buy a lot, then.

MR. HULICK. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that it cost \$4,600.

MR. MORSE. It did; and they have no other place to put it.

MR. BOWERS of California. Let them buy a lot, as the colored people do.

MR. HULICK. I suppose very few members of this body know anything about that chapel, but they ought to go to church there some Sunday and find out. [Laughter.]

MR. LIVINGSTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Cogswell] whether we are not making in this bill very large appropriations for other denominational institutions?

MR. COGSWELL. In regard to that suggestion, which was made also by my colleague, I supposed that there was a difference between charity, which all religious sects cover with the mantle of their professions, and the recognition of a religious sect as such. My point is against recognizing any religious sect, which the Constitution expressly forbids.

MR. LIVINGSTON. And my point is that some of these institutions for which we appropriate are purely denominational institutions—nothing but that.

A MEMBER. What denomination is this Bethel?

MR. COGSWELL. Presbyterian.

MR. MORSE. It is nondenominational.

A MEMBER. I understood the gentleman himself to say that it belonged to the Presbyterian Church.

MR. COGSWELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, that Bethel ought not to stand there a minute longer. We have no right to let it be there, and never had.

MR. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, I only want to remark, in addition to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Cogswell] has said, that if this amendment prevails it will entail an additional expense on the Government of perhaps \$20,000. While the existing engine house in that district is absolutely out of condition for further use as an engine house, it can be given to this congregation and they can use it, at a comparatively small cost for repairs, as a meeting house, and I understand that the Commissioners are ready and willing to give them the use of the engine house for that purpose.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. Morse, the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

MR. MORSE. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 3, noes 60.

MR. MORSE. No quorum, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum being made, the Chair will appoint to act as tellers the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Compton] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse].

The committee divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 1—

MR. MORSE (pending the completion of the count by tellers). Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum. I move to strike out the last word of the paragraph, however, in order to say a word in regard to an understanding that I have with the gentleman in charge of this bill. I tried as hard as I could to hear what the gentleman from Maryland was saying awhile ago, but I was unable to do so. He now tells me that he stated that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, since this matter has been agitated, have said that they would give this mission the use of the old engine house to repair and fix up for the purposes of their mission. With that understanding, and only about fifty gentlemen have voted, and there is undoubtedly no quorum in the city this afternoon, so that it would delay the public business to insist upon the point, I have withdrawn the point of no quorum; but I desire these remarks to go into the *Record*, and I will call the attention of the Commissioners of the District to this understanding, namely, that the Bethany Mission, conducted by the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, is to have the old engine house to fix up to use for the purposes of their mission, such as they have conducted for the last twenty years.

In the *Record* of March 13, the subject is again continued:—

MR. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the *Record*. On Saturday we passed the district appro-

priation bill containing an appropriation of \$45,700 for charitable institutions, a part at least of which was for sectarian institutions, and in the same bill we wiped out one poor little Protestant mission chapel standing on Government land. I offered an amendment in relation to that chapel which was rejected, and the vote by which my amendment was rejected is not correctly stated in the *Record*, probably through inadvertence. On page 3460 appears the following:—

MR. MORSE. I ask for a division.  
The committee divided, and there were—ayes 3, noes 60.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there were 6 ayes that I saw, namely, Messrs. Grow, Springer, Blair, Hudson, Livingston, and Morse, and perhaps more I did not see. There was only about a third of a quorum present and three hundred members of the House were absent.

THE SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The correction will be made.

It is not until the next day that the matter receives its final quietus, when the matter of Mr. Morse's correction was called up and discussed at some length. This motion then prevailed:—

MR. SIMPSON. I move to strike out the whole correction, inasmuch as it reflects on every member of this House, charging us with having voted an appropriation for sectarian purposes. I think for that reason the motion to strike out the whole correction should be agreed to.

This was what was finally done and the whole correction eliminated from the *Record*. But as will be seen by those who read these extracts, the discussion will serve to point several morals quite sharply.

These are some of the appropriations made:—

For the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish, maintenance, \$1,181.

For the German Orphan Asylum, maintenance, \$1,181.

For the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children, maintenance, including its care of colored foundlings, \$7,680.

For St. Ann's Infant Asylum, maintenance, \$3,840.

For St. Joseph's Asylum, maintenance, \$1,181.

For the Association for Works of Mercy, maintenance, \$1,181.

For House of Good Shepherd, maintenance, \$4,773.

For the Industrial Home School, maintenance, \$7,680.

For St. Rose's Industrial School, maintenance, \$2,953.

Some of these names point their own moral. The sensitiveness to the accusation of appropriating for sectarian religious purposes, combined with the willingness to appropriate for charitable religion in general, is noticeable.

The shrewd attempt of Mr. Morse to advertise the names of those who voted with him, to his religious constituency, is also to be noted, as well as the determination on the part of others that this should not be done. Truly the "national irreligion" is making very much the same progress in Congress that it is in the courts and municipal ordinances of the country at large.

There are two distinctively religious measures now before congressional committees, *viz.*: The religious amendment to the Constitution, and the Sunday law for the District of Columbia. It is understood that Mr. Blair, now in the House, will soon reintroduce his famous bill for a "national Sunday law." W. H. M.

Washington, D. C.

### Jesuitism; Our Great Danger.

THE society of Jesuits, one of the most celebrated orders of the Roman Catholic Church, was founded by Ignatius Loyola in 1540. The reigning pope, Paul III., immediately by his bull, sanctioned the institution. The following is a copy of the Jesuit oath:—

I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the archangel, the blessed St. John the Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the saints and the sacred host of heaven, and to you my ghostly father,

do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that his holiness pope — is Christ's Vicar-General, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his holiness by Jesus Christ, *he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, States, commonwealths, and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed;* therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine and his holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical or Protestant authority whatsoever, especially against the *new pretended authority* and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother church of Rome. *I do renounce and disown my allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or State, named Protestants, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers.* I do further declare the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and other Protestants, *to be damnable, and those to be damned* who will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist, and advise all, or any of his holiness' agents in any place wherever I shall be; *and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrines, and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise.* I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed to assume any religion heretical, for the propagation of the mother church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels, as they entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstances whatsoever, but shall execute all which shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you my ghostly father, or by any of this sacred convent. All which, I, A. B., do swear by the blessed Trinity and blessed sacrament, which I am now to receive, to perform and on my part to keep inviolably; and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions to keep this my oath. In testimony whereof, I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the Eucharist, and witness the same further with my hand and seal, in the face of this holy covenant, this — day — An. Dom., etc.—*Papal Rome As It Is, pp. 223-225.*

It will be seen that these minions of the papacy are the sworn enemies of every government on earth save that of the pope only; and that to effect the objects of their order they will not hesitate to profess any Protestant or heathen faith under the sun. They will obtrude themselves into public schools as teachers; and upon the rostrum as lecturers, and preachers, assuming for the occasion a sacerdotal or citizen's garb.

Says the "Religious Encyclopædia":—

Their Christianity, chameleon-like, readily assumed the color of every religion where it happened to be introduced. They freely permitted their converts to retain a full proportion of the old superstitions, and suppressed, without hesitation, any point in the new faith which was likely to bear hard on their prejudices or propensities. They proceeded to still greater lengths; and besides suppressing the truths of revelation, devised the most absurd falsehoods, to be used for attracting disciples, or even to be taught as parts of Christianity. One of them in India produced a pedigree to prove his own descent from Brahma; and another in America assured a native chief that Christ had been a valiant and victorious warrior, who, in the space of three years, had scalped an incredible number of men, women and children.—*P. 689.*

Says Giustiniani, who was a convert from Jesuitism:—

He is a monarchist in Austria, a revolutionist in France, an autocrat in Italy, and a republican in the United States.—*Papal Rome As It Is, p. 219.*

In Rome they are not only the chief counselors of every project, but the executors of every plan framed by the secret council of the Vatican.—*Id., p. 218.*

The United States is the fruitful field of the Jesuits. Already they control all the principal cities of the country. They have also organized many Roman Catholic military societies, ostensibly as United States militia, and they are officered by some of the most skillful generals of the country.

And what constitutes the greatest source of danger to the country is that Protestants look upon the growing power of the papacy with stolid indifference. Says Chiniquy:—

The Americans, with few exceptions, do not pay any attention to the dark cloud which is rising at their

horizon, from Rome. Though that cloud is filled with rivers of tears and blood, they let it grow and rise without even caring how they will escape from the impending hurricane.—*Fifty Years in Rome, p. 671.*

There will be an awakening in this country by and by, but it will come too late to save the nation. Only the few who are forewarned will escape the fearful consequences of the general disregard of Jesuitical intrigue. A. SMITH.

### The Progress of Religious Legislation at Washington.

THE *Washington Post*, of March 21, under the head of "Capitol Chat," has the following paragraph:—

Thousands of petitions have come through the mails within the last fortnight from religious societies and others interested asking that favorable action be taken upon the joint resolution now before the House Judiciary Committee to insert the name of the Deity in the Federal Constitution. Some of the petitions are several yards long and all are numerously signed. They come principally from the States of Ohio and Pennsylvania. They are addressed to the two Houses of Congress.

The committee has decided that it will not give a hearing to persons who desire to oppose the resolution, but it is generally understood that the resolution will be reported adversely, although it was at first intended to take no action on it whatever, but to permit it to slumber in the committee.

This is the most pronounced expression in reference to the attitude of the Judiciary Committee as to the religious amendment to the Constitution, and the action that the committee proposes to take, which has yet been given out. The interpolation into the preamble of the Constitution, which is sought, is so palpably in antagonism to the First Amendment and so clearly a reversion to a Church and State polity that it seems astonishing that any man possessing sufficient intelligence to reach and retain a seat in Congress could be found willing to offer, much less champion, such a bill. But the measure is known to actually have its supporters, to the number of two at least, even in the House Judiciary Committee itself. Thus, however ignominious a fate may befall this amendment now, this fact is vividly suggestive as to what may be the success eventually of this long-sought treason to both government and religion.

Mr. Morse's bill, "to protect the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia," it is understood, will be referred by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, in whose hands it now is, to the District Commissioners for their action thereupon. It is not known yet what the views of the commissioners are upon the matter. Mr. Douglas, who was an outspoken and rabid legal and political religionist, is no longer a member of the board. Had such a measure been presented to the commissioners while he was one of them it would have been perfectly certain what the recommendation would have been. In fact he once embodied in an annual report to the President, regarding district affairs, a suggestion as to the enactment of just such a law for the district.

The fact that the House Committee makes this disposition of the bill argues nothing decisive in reference to it either way, but shows that the committee dislikes to assume the responsibility of definite action either way, and wishes to share the onus of whatever is done in regard to it jointly with the commissioners, or perhaps shoulder upon them the entire responsibility of the decision.

The bill is openly and professedly reli-



gious in its character, not striving to conceal itself under the mask of a civil measure as was the case when presented in different form, to previous Congresses. No commissioner, committeeman, or congressman, can mistake the purpose of this bill. Every one who favors it will be openly taking his place among those who favor legislation by Congress upon religious subjects, and the establishment of religion by congressional decree.

W. H. M.

Washington, D. C.

### Defend the Constitution.

ONCE more an effort is made to turn the Constitution of the United States into a religious creed. From time to time attempts have been made to introduce the name of God. They have been wisely defeated on the ground that the Constitution is a political, not a religious, document, and it is not the work of our legislators to define their religious opinions, or those of their constituents, in that instrument. But now the attempt is made not only to introduce a declaration of faith in God, but also of faith in Jesus Christ and the Bible. The resolution introduced by Mr. Morse of Massachusetts into the House of Representatives and by Mr. Frye of Maine into the Senate proposes to insert in the preamble of the national Constitution the following declaration:—

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 liberties, and encouraged by the assurance of his Word to invoke his guidance as a Christian nation, according to his appointed way by Jesus Christ our Lord.

The proposition is a most extraordinary one. Not only God, but the Bible and Jesus Christ, are to be introduced into the Constitution of a Government which is not founded on a theocracy or upon Jesus Christ or the Bible, but upon the equal political rights of men of all races and all religious faiths. It is a bit of evangelical cant, which is a direct attack upon the American principle of the separation of Church and State.

This pious attempt to adulterate the Constitution with evangelical theology will not strengthen, but weaken it. Let this precedent be accepted, and there is no telling where it will stop. Once introduce God, Christ, and the Bible, and then the next step, perhaps, would be to introduce the Trinity, the doctrine of the resurrection, and everlasting punishment. Then it would be necessary to include the miracles of Jesus, Samson, and Moses, and the dogma that the world was made in six days; and by and by the Nicene Creed or the Westminster Catechism might follow.

It may be perfectly true that the great majority of the people of the United States believe in God and the Bible as a divine revelation, and Jesus Christ as a divine being; but this does not furnish the slightest reason why the Constitution of the United States should be turned into a religious creed, in direct contempt of the religious beliefs of Jews and Unitarians and Universalists, and many other Christians, who do not accept the orthodox creed, and who do not believe in excluding from political fellowship naturalized citizens, whether Buddhists, Mohammedans, Brahmans, Shintoists, or what not, who call God by some other name, who regard Jesus Christ as a man, and who revere as sacred some other book. Mr. Morse and

Mr. Frye were not sent to Congress as evangelists, and the resolution they have introduced is nothing more nor less than an invasion of the Constitution and an attack upon the liberties of the American people. Let the Constitution be defended against such mistaken friends.—*Christian Register, March 15.*

**SIBERIA AND THE NIHILISTS.**—Why Kennan went to Siberia. By William Jackson Armstrong. This is one of the most intensely interesting and thoroughly reliable contributions to literature on Russia and the Nihilists ever published. Everybody should read this book, because no one can be intelligent upon the subject of which it treats without familiarity with its contents. 160 pages, paper covers, 25 cents.

**THE NEW BIBLE ATLAS AND GAZETTEER,** with 16 colored maps by W. and A. Keith Johnson, and a very elaborate gazetteer, giving information about nearly every place which is marked upon the maps, with scripture references. 4to, cloth, \$1.50.

**MEMOIRS OF EDWIN BAINBRIDGE.**—The subject of this memoir is the young English tourist who met his death at the dreadful volcanic eruption of Tarawera, New Zealand, on the 10th of June, 1886. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

**WILLIAM CAREY, the Shoemaker who became a Missionary**—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**JOHN GRIFFITH, Founder of the Hankow Mission, Central China**—By William Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**THOMAS J. COMBER, Missionary Pioneer to the Congo**—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, price, 75 cents.

**JAMES CHALMERS, Missionary and Explorer of Raratonga and New Guinea**—By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**ROBERT MORRISON, the Pioneer of Chinese Missions**—By Wm. J. Townsend, Sec. Methodist New Connexion Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**THE POCKET ATLAS OF THE WORLD**—A comprehensive and popular series of maps, illustrating physical and political geography, with geographical statistical notes, 54 double maps, cloth, \$1.00.

**SAMUEL CROWTHER, the Slave Boy who became Bishop of the Niger**—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson." 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**GINN'S CLASSICAL ATLAS**—4to, cloth, \$2.50. This work contains 23 colored maps, which were projected and executed by the late A. Keith Johnson, with a complete index.

**JOHN BRIGHT, the Man of the People**—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson," "Samuel Crowther," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

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

**HENRY M. STANLEY, the African Explorer**—By Arther Montefiore, F. R. G. S. Brought down to 1889. 12mo. 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**FAVORITE BIBLE STORIES FOR THE YOUNG**—With numerous illustrations. 16mo, handsomely illuminated board covers, 50 cents.; cloth extra, 75 cents.

**MISSIONARY LADIES IN FOREIGN LANDS**—By Mrs. E. R. Pilman, author of "Heroines of the Mission fields," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

**JOHN WILLIAMS, the Martyr of Erromanga**—By Rev. J. J. Ellis. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

**BISHOP PATTERSON, the Martyr of Melanesia**—By Jesse Page. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

### BOOKS FOR LITTLE ONES.

We are pleased to say to our many friends who have asked us in regard to books for little ones that **BIBLE PICTURES AND STORIES,** AND ITS COMPANION,

Little Folks' Bible Gallery,

contain the most perfect and complete outfit of Bible illustrations and stories that we have been able to find. We can recommend them, or either one, to every one desirous of obtaining something good as a gift for a child. Size 7 x 9 inches, 96 pages each; 44 full-page pictures in one, 45 in the other.

Price \$1 each, or both together, post-paid, \$1.75.

Order of PACIFIC PRESS,

43 Bond Street, New York City  
Or Oakland, Cal.



**CAN I OBTAIN A PATENT?** For a prompt answer and an honest opinion, write to MUNN & CO., who have had nearly fifty years' experience in the patent business. Communications strictly confidential. A Handbook of Information concerning Patents and how to obtain them sent free. Also a catalogue of mechanical and scientific books sent free. Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice in the Scientific American, and thus are brought widely before the public without cost to the inventor. This splendid paper, issued weekly, elegantly illustrated, has by far the largest circulation of any scientific work in the world. \$3 a year. Sample copies sent free. Building Edition, monthly, \$2.50 a year. Single copies, 25 cents. Every number contains beautiful plates, in colors, and photographs of new houses, with plans, enabling builders to show the latest designs and secure contracts. MUNN & CO., NEW YORK, 361 BROADWAY.

### The Grand Trunk Railway OF CANADA

AND THE

#### Chicago & Grand Trunk Railway

Form the GREAT THROUGH LINE to all Points in the West,

AND OFFER TO THE TRAVELING PUBLIC THE ADVANTAGE OF THROUGH TRAINS WITHOUT TRANSFER, AND A VIEW OF

#### THE ST. CLAIR TUNNEL,

"THE LINK THAT BINDS TWO GREAT NATIONS."

It is the greatest submarine tunnel in the world, extending from Port Huron, Mich., under the St. Clair River to Sarnia, Ontario, and connecting the Grand Trunk Railway System of Canada with the Chicago & Grand Trunk Railway. It has just been completed at a cost of \$2,700,000.

The tunnel proper is a continuous iron tube, nineteen feet and ten inches in diameter, and 6025 feet, or more than a mile, long. The length of the approaches, in addition to the tunnel proper, is 5603 feet, making all told a little over two miles.

Trains of the Grand Trunk and Chicago & Grand Trunk Railways are hauled through this tunnel by engines specially constructed for the purpose. They are said to be the largest engines in the world. The entire weight of the engine and tender rests upon ten drive-wheels. The weight of one of these monster engines in actual service is found to be approximately one hundred tons.

N. J. POWER, W. E. DAVIS,  
G. P. A. Grand Trunk Ry., G. P. & T. A. C. & G. T. Ry.,  
MONTREAL, CANADA. CHICAGO, ILL.

FRANK P. DWYER,  
Eastern Passenger Agent, G. T. Ry.,  
271 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY.



NEW YORK, MARCH 29, 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 president of a college in Kentucky says: "I am a reader of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and I feel deeply interested in its work. The questions treated are all-important to every true lover of liberty, and I certainly recommend it to all good American citizens."

A CATHOLIC paper states that "twenty-three converts to the Catholic faith were received into the church recently as a result of a mission of one week given to the men in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Fifth avenue, in this city. A still more remarkable result followed a recent mission [revival] in the Church of St. Francis Xavier, in West Sixteenth Street, where the number of converts was over seventy."

THE work of deluging Congress with petitions in favor of the so-called Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States has begun. These petitions will doubtless be poured in much as were the petitions for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, and when names have been exhausted some scheme will be devised whereby the same petitioners can be counted again, and even several times over if necessary. As in the case of the Fair the end will be held to justify the means.

In a recent pastoral letter Bishop Mesmer, of Wisconsin, says:—

It is humiliating to see how frequently a Catholic Church appears to be erected solely for the purpose of drawing customers to the saloon next door. I hope the laws of the land will eventually stop this evil.

What a commentary is this on the boast of the Catholic Church that she is the support of society and the stay of civil order! Here is one of her own bishops lamenting the fact that it so frequently happens that Catholic churches are simply feeders to saloons; and having no power to prevent this, he hopes "the laws of the land will eventually stop the evil."

SOME one has sent us a newspaper clipping which says that "Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court teaches a Bible class in the First Congregational Church of Washington." Well, that is all right. Justice Brewer in his capacity as a citizen has an inalienable right to have and to teach any religion he pleases. It is only when in his capacity as judge he subverts the Constitution of the United States, virtually nullifying the First Amendment, that we criticise him.

Neither the AMERICAN SENTINEL nor anybody else has anything to do with Justice Brewer's personal relations to God, nor with his manner or place of worship. These are his own concern.

A GEORGIA attorney is credited with this utterance in one of the Adventist Sunday cases:—

They are teaching here that the Roman Catholic Church established Sunday. I don't care how we got Sunday as the Sabbath day. We got it and incorporated it in the statute book of Georgia. If it came from the Catholic Church, it is all right; if it came from the devil, it is all right.

In other words, "might makes right," and if any man doubts it and dissents practically, put him in jail or send him to the chain-gang. The Adventists, be it remembered, do not object to others keeping Sunday; they only ask that they be not required to keep it, because to keep it is to render homage to antichrist.

It is stated that the proposed "Christian" amendment to the Constitution will not be reported, for some time at least, to the House by the committee to which it was committed. It is probable that no action whatever will be taken in the Senate, at least not at present. But what is the difference? The proposed change in the Constitution was virtually made Feb. 29, 1892, by the Supreme Court, and Congress has already enacted legislation in harmony with the opinion of the dictum of the court, namely, that "this is a Christian nation." This was one of the chief reasons urged why Congress should acknowledge Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, which it did in the World's Fair legislation. The only practical purpose that the National Reform movement can now serve is to blind people to the truth that the principles of our Government have been already subverted. While National Reformers clamor for a change in the Constitution, Congress and the courts go right along trenching upon the most sacred rights of the people, in defiance of the Constitution as it reads, but in perfect harmony with that which Justice Brewer, speaking for the Supreme Court, says it means.

THE following note from the New York *Independent*, of March 22, reveals the hollow mockery of much that passes for Christianity in these days of sham and hypocrisy:—

The suit for breach of promise brought in Washington against the most distinguished member of Congress from Kentucky opens to the whole country a very sad chapter in the life of one who has been a great favorite both in political and ecclesiastical life. Colonel Breckinridge, it seems, does not deny his long-continued criminal relations with the prosecutrix, only that he had ever promised to marry her, and he seems to see no great shame in his sin, and he expects that all this exposure will not interfere at all with his triumphant re-election. He may be right in his anticipation, but we cannot do less than express our astonishment and pain, and our hope that his sin will not be ignored or condoned by the representatives of

the church of which he has been such a shining light. And we must also express our detestation of the excuses made in his behalf by his personal friends, one of them a clergyman of fame. Such excuses would undermine the whole structure of social morality, by teaching that a man has no power of self-restraint.

Mr. Breckinridge, it will be remembered, was the father of the Breckinridge Sunday bill, and an ardent champion of governmental religion in all the various forms in which it has yet been exhibited in this country. We do not rejoice in his downfall, but trust that it may enable some hitherto charmed by the siren song of National Reform, to see that morality and religion to be of any value must be a personal matter, a force in the individual life; and that unless it does reside in the individual all religious profession, whether by the individual or the nation, is only mockery.

RECENTLY the House of the Massachusetts Legislature passed an act abolishing the annual State fast-day on the ground that it had become a meaningless farce. But to this view of the case Rev. J. M. Foster objects. In a communication to the *Christian Cynosure*, he says:—

After the war the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution were adopted, making the black man forever free and conferring the rights of citizenship. But these amendments have been inoperative. Caste and race prejudice in the South have deprived our colored citizens of their constitutional rights. The question now is, Shall these amendments be repealed, or enforced? . . . Our Government ought to have the power to punish these outrages against the colored people of the South. There is a missing link in the United States Constitution. We need a Sixteenth Amendment to make the last two operative. There are no Christian governments on earth. Christianity is the only solution for caste and race prejudice. This we must have.

And this is an illustration to show that we ought to have a so-called Christian amendment as the missing link between the Government and the Massachusetts fast-day, and other similar days. Instead of abolishing them because not observed, give the Government the constitutional power to enforce them and to punish their non-observance. A fine scheme truly! But such is National Reform.

ONE of the best numbers of the *Religious Liberty Library* yet issued, is No. 19, "Protestantism, True and False." This tract is now ready, and ought to be given a very wide circulation. Price, 4 cents; \$2.00 per hundred. Order of Pacific Press, 43 Bond Street, New York City.

#### 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.		