



"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, APRIL 5, 1894.

NUMBER 14.

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.

"ROME never changes." This is the oft-repeated boast of the papacy, and it is true.

It is true, too, in a much larger sense than many realize, even of those who believe the proposition.

IN its spirit, in its disposition, in its essential nature and characteristics, Rome is the same to-day that it was two hundred or five hundred years before Christ.

BETWEEN Rome's beginning and our day, between 753 B. C. and 1894 A. D., she has appeared in different outward forms, she has taken on different phases, such as the kingly, the republican, the imperial and the papal, but it has been Rome all the time—Rome in spirit, in nature, and in essential characteristics.

THERE is no world-power that occupies so large a place in the Bible as does Rome. Rome, from its rise in ancient time and in its pagan form, through all its career, its merging into the papal form, and clear on to its impending ruin in our own day, is traced in all its workings, and is marked in its every essential feature, by the pen of inspiration. And it is Rome all the time and always the same—cunning, crafty, insinuating, arrogant, violent, persecuting and bloody—always actuated by the same spirit and pursuing steadily the same policy. So constant, so persistent, and so characteristic is this policy, that it is singled out in the Scripture and distinctly defined as "*his* policy."

IN the eighth chapter of Daniel there is a prophecy of the career of Media and Persia, of Grecia under Alexander, and then under Alexander's successors, and of the power that should succeed these which by every evidence of Scripture and history, is demonstrated to be Rome only. And in

that place it is briefly but powerfully sketched thus:—

And in the latter time of their [Alexander's successors'] kingdom when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

Thus it is distinctly declared that "through *his* policy also, he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand," "and by peace shall destroy many." To know what this "policy" is, is to know Rome from beginning to end. To understand the workings of this "policy," is to understand the workings of Rome so well, even to-day, that she can never deceive nor get any advantage of him who understands it.

IN Rollin's ancient history there is an analysis of this Romish policy and its workings in the progress of Rome to power and dominion over all the ancient nations. And so entirely is this "*his* policy" ever, that Rollin's analysis of it as it was manifested in ancient times is as perfectly descriptive of Rome's policy and its workings to-day as it is of it in ancient days. Here are the historian's words:—

The reader may perceive from the events above related, one of the principal characteristics of the Romans, which will soon determine the fate of all the States of Greece, and produce an almost general change in the universe; I mean a spirit of sovereignty and dominion. This characteristic does not display itself at first in its full extent; it reveals itself by degrees; and it is only by an insensible progress which at the same time is sufficiently rapid, that we see it carried at last to its greatest height.

It must be confessed, that this people, on some occasions, show a moderation and disinterestedness, which from a superficial view, seems to exceed everything we meet with in history, and which we feel it incumbent on us to praise.

Was there ever a more glorious day than that in which the Romans, after having carried on a long and dangerous war, after crossing seas and exhausting their treasures, caused a herald to proclaim, in a general assembly, that the Roman people restored all the cities to their liberty, and desired to reap no other fruit by their victory than the noble pleasure of doing good to nations, the bare remembrance of whose ancient glories sufficed to endure them to the Romans? The description of that immortal day can hardly be read without tears and without being affected with a degree of enthusiasm of esteem and admiration.

Had this deliverance of the Grecian States proceeded merely from a principle of generosity, void of all interested motives; had the whole tenor of the conduct of the Romans been of the same nature with such exalted sentiments, nothing could possibly have been more august, or more capable of doing honor to the nation. But if we penetrate ever so little beyond this glaring outside, we soon perceive that this specious moderation of the Romans was entirely founded on a profound policy; wise, indeed, and prudent, according to the ordinary rules of government, but at the same time very remote from that noble disinterestedness so highly extolled on the present occasion. It may be affirmed that the Grecians then abandoned themselves to a stupid joy, fondly imagining that they were really free, because the Romans declared them so.

Greece, in the times I am now speaking of, was divided between two powers; I mean the Grecian Republics and Macedonia; and they were always engaged in war; the former, to preserve the remains of their ancient liberty, and the latter, to complete their subjection. The Romans, perfectly well acquainted with this state of Greece, were sensible that there was no necessity of apprehending any difficulty from those little republics, which were growing weak through length of years, by intestine feuds, mutual jealousies, and the wars they had been forced to support against foreign powers. But Macedonia, which was possessed of well disciplined troops, inured to all the toils of war, which had continually in view the glory of her former monarchs, which had formerly extended her conquests to the extremities of the globe, which still harbored an ardent, though chimerical desire, of attaining universal empire, which had a kind of natural alliance with the kings of Egypt and Syria, sprung from the same origin and united by the common interests of monarchy; Macedonia, I say, gave just alarm to the Romans, who, from the ruin of Carthage, had no obstacles left with regard to their ambitious designs but those powerful kingdoms that shared the rest of the world between them, and especially Macedonia, as it lay nearest to Italy.

To balance, therefore, the power of Macedon, and to dispossess Philip of the aid he flattered himself he should receive from the Greeks, which, indeed, had they united all their forces with his, in order to oppose his common enemy, would perhaps have made him invincible with regard to the Romans, they declared loudly in favor of those republics, made it their glory to take them under their protection, and that with no other design, in outward appearance, than to defend them against their oppressors; and farther, to attach them by still stronger ties, they hung out to them the specious bait, as a reward for their fidelity. I mean liberty, of which all the republics in question were inexpressibly jealous, and which the Macedonian monarchs had perpetually disputed with them.

The bait was artfully prepared and as eagerly swallowed by the generality of the Greeks, whose views penetrated no farther. But the most judicious and most clear-sighted among them discovered the danger that lay concealed beneath this charming bait, and accordingly, they exhorted the people from time to time, in their public assemblies, to beware of this cloud that was gathering in the West; and which, changing on a sudden into a dreadful tempest, would break like thunder over their heads, to their utter destruction.

Nothing could be more gentle and equitable than the conduct of the Romans in the beginning. They acted with the utmost moderation towards such States and nations as addressed them for protection; they succored them against their enemies, took the utmost pains in terminating their differences, and in suppressing all troubles which arose among them, and did not demand the least recompense for all these services done for their allies. By these means their authority gained strength daily and prepared the nations for entire subjection.

Under the pretense of manifesting their good will, of entering into their interests and of reconciling them, they rendered themselves as sovereign arbiters of those whom they had restored to liberty, and whom they now considered, in some measure, as their freedmen. They used to depute commissioners to them to inquire into their complaints, to weigh and examine the reasons on both sides, and to decide their quarrels; but when the articles were of such a nature that there was no possibility of reconciling them on the spot, they invited them to send their deputies to Rome. But afterwards they used to summon those who refused to be reconciled, obliged them to plead their cause before the Senate and even to appear in person there. From arbiters and mediators having become supreme judges, they soon assumed a magisterial tone, looked upon their decrees as irrevocable decisions, were greatly offended when the most implicit obedience was not paid to them, and gave the name of rebellion to a second resistance. Thus there arose, in the Roman Senate, a tribunal, which judged all nations and kings, and from which there was no appeal. This tribunal, at the end of every war, determined the rewards and punishments due to all parties. They dispossessed the vanquished nations of part of their territories, to bestow them on their allies, from which they reaped a double advantage; for they thereby engaged in the interest of Rome such kings as were in no way formidable to them, and weakened others whose friendship the Romans could not expect, and whose arms they had reason to dread.

We shall hear one of the chief magistrates in the republic of the Achæans inveigh strongly in a public assembly against this unjust usurpation, and ask by what title the Romans were empowered to assume so haughty an ascendant over them; whether their republic was not as free and independent as that of Rome; by what right the latter pretended to force the Achæans to account for their conduct, whether they would be pleased should the Achæans, in their turn, officially pretend to inquire into their affairs, and whether there ought not to be an equality between them. All these reflections were very reasonable, just and unanswerable, and the Romans had no advantage in the question but force.

They acted in the same manner, and their politics were the same with regard to their treatment of kings. They first won over to their interests such among them as were the weakest, and consequently, the less formidable; they gave them the title of allies, whereby their persons were rendered, in some measure, sacred and inviolable, and was a kind of safeguard against other kings more powerful than themselves; they increased their revenues and enlarged their territories, to let them see what they might expect from their protection which had raised the kingdom of Pergamos to such a pitch of grandeur.

After this the Romans invaded, upon different pretenses, those great potentates who divided Europe and Asia. And how haughtily did they treat them even before they had conquered. A powerful king, confined within a narrow circle by a private man of Rome, was obliged to make his answer before he quitted it; how imperious was this! But how did they treat vanquished kings? They commanded them to deliver up their children, and the heirs of their crowns, as hostages and pledges of their fidelity and good behavior; obliged them to lay down their arms; forbade them to declare war, or to conclude any alliance without first obtaining their leave; banished them to the other side of the mountains, and left them, in strictness of speech, only an empty title and a vain shadow of royalty, divested of its rights and advantages.

We have no room to doubt that Providence had decreed to the Romans the sovereignty of the world, and the Scriptures had prophesied their future grandeur; but they were strangers to those divine oracles; and besides, the bare prediction of their conquests was no justification with regard to them. Although it be difficult to affirm, and still more so to prove, that this people had from their first rise, formed a plan, in order to conquer and subject all nations; it cannot be denied, if we examine their whole conduct attentively, that it will appear that they acted as if they had a foreknowledge of this, and that a kind of instinct determined them to conform to it in all things.

But, be this as it may, we see, by the event, to what this so much boasted lenity and moderation of the Romans was confined. Enemies to the liberty of all nations, having the utmost contempt for kings and monarchies, looking upon the whole universe as their prey, they grasped with insatiable ambition, the conquest of the whole world; they seized indiscriminately all provinces and kingdoms, and extended their empire over all nations; in a word, they prescribed no other

limits to their vast projects than those which deserts and seas made it impossible to pass.—*Book XVIII., chap. I., section VII., under "Reflections on the Conduct of the Romans," etc.*

THIS statement of Rome's policy and its workings is as true and as appropriate in the case of the Roman Church and the American Republic to-day, as it is in the case of the Roman State and the Grecian Republics in all time. It describes the policy of Leo XIII. and the ultimate purpose of it toward the Government and people of the United States; toward the workingmen; as the self-appointed intermediary between capital and labor; and the would-be world's arbiter, to-day, as truly as it describes the policy of the Roman Senate and its ultimate purpose toward the governments and peoples of Grecia and the other nations of antiquity. Nor is the identity of this policy in Rome to-day, and in Rome of old, denied by the papacy. In fact, it is asserted by the papacy, and the continuance of this policy from ancient Rome is the acknowledged inspiration of modern Rome.

WHEN Imperial Rome was falling to ruins under the violent inroads of the barbarians of the North, the spirit and policy of Rome not only survived but was deepened and perfected in papal Rome. And this spirit and policy were conscientiously and intentionally continued by the popes of the time and was conscientiously received and diligently cultivated by each succeeding pope.

INNOCENT I., A. D. 402-417, was pope when the barbarians first overran the Western Empire and attacked, and even sacked, the city of Rome. And "upon the mind of Innocent appears first distinctly to have dawned the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet, and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline."* He was succeeded by Zosimus, March 18, A. D. 417—December 26, 418, who asserted with all the arrogance of Innocent, all that Innocent had claimed. He not only boasted with Innocent that to him belonged the power to judge all causes, but that the judgment "is irrevocable;" and accordingly established the use of the dictatorial expression, "For so it has pleased the apostolic see," as sufficient authority for all things that he might choose to command. And upon this assumption, those canons of the Council of Sardica which made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, he passed off upon the bishops of Africa as the canons of the Council of Nice, in which he was actually followed by Leo, and put tradition upon a level with the Scriptures. He was succeeded by Boniface I., 419-422, who added nothing to the power or authority of the bishopric of Rome, but diligently and "conscientiously" maintained all that his predecessors had asserted, in behalf of what he called "the just rights of the see," in which he had been placed. He was succeeded by Celestine I., 422-432, who, in a letter written A. D. 428, plainly declared: "As I am appointed by God to watch over his church, it is incumbent upon me everywhere to root out evil practices, and introduce good ones in their room, for my pastoral vigilance is restrained by no bounds, but extends to all places where Christ is known and adored."† It was he who ap-

pointed the terrible Cyril his vicegerent to condemn Nestorius, and to establish the doctrine that Mary was the Mother of God. He was succeeded by Sixtus III, 432-440, who, as others before, added nothing specially to the papal claims, yet yielded not an iota of the claims already made. He was succeeded by Leo I., "the Great," A. D. 440-461. Such was the heritage bequeathed to Leo by his predecessors, and the arrogance of his own native disposition, with the grand opportunities which offered during his long rule, added to it a thousandfold. "All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone."‡ At the very moment of his election he was absent in Gaul on a mission as mediator to reconcile a dispute between two of the principal men of the empire. He succeeded in his mission and was hailed as "the Angel of Peace," and the "Deliverer of the Empire." In a sermon, he showed what his ambition embraced. He portrayed the powers and glories of the former Rome as they were reproduced in Catholic Rome. The conquests and universal sway of heathen Rome were but the promise of the conquests and universal sway of Catholic Rome. Romulus and Remus were but the precursors of Peter and Paul. Rome of former days had by her armies conquered the earth and sea: now again, by the see of the holy blessed Peter as head of the world, Rome, through her divine religion, would dominate the earth. §

THIS is Rome; Rome always, and Rome ever the same. This is "his policy"—craft and hypocrisy, hypocrisy and craft, always employed to feed an insatiable ambition for universal dominion. "Rome never changes," that is true. In "policy," in spirit, in working, in essential nature, it never has changed and it never can change. In all this, Rome is just as bad as it can be, and yet thinks itself better than God, and therefore how would it be possible to change? No, sir, Rome never changes,—That is the truth. She never can change,—And that is the truth.

A. T. J.

A Religious Proclamation.

A CORRESPONDENT sends us the following proclamation:—

STATE OF CONNECTICUT.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY,
LUZON B. MORRIS, Governor.

A Proclamation.

I hereby appoint Friday, the 23rd day of March, as a day of fasting and prayer.

It has been the custom of the people of this Commonwealth, for many years, to observe this day by meeting in their places of public worship and invoking the blessings of Heaven upon this country. The minds of the people seem so greatly at variance concerning the things needful for their happiness, that it would be well for them to continue the custom of observing this day, and in their invocation say, "O Jesu hominum Salvator, with thy gracious light illumine the minds of thy children, who, groping in darkness, are unable to see the truth when it is presented to them."

Given under my hand and seal of the State at the capitol in Hartford, this thirteenth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and

* Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book II., chap. 1, par. 8.

† Bower's "History of the Popes," Celestine, par. 15.

‡ Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book II., chap. IV, par. 2.

§ Id.

ninety-four, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and eighteenth.

LUZON B. MORRIS.

By his excellency's command:

JOHN J. PHELAN, Secretary.

Upon this the sender comments thus briefly but pertinently:—

The foregoing affords a large amount of food for reflection. The masses do not know how to pray and they do not know the truth when they see it. So our dear governor tells us how to pray and it is natural to suppose that the time is near for the executive to define the truth. "But none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand." Dan. 12: 10.

Certainly if it is the province of the executive to direct the religious services of the people thus far he might go one step farther and instruct them in the "truth." And the legislature of Connecticut might provide a penalty for disregard of his excellency's instructions as to the exact time and form of prayer.

Thinks He Has Solved the National Reform Problem.

THE following letter is deserving of careful consideration because of its evident candor. We shall point out its defects in an after comment:—

North Adams, Mass., Feb. 18, 1894.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN SENTINEL—*Dear Sir:* A few copies of the AMERICAN SENTINEL were sent to me by a friend, and I tender my hearty thanks for this favor.

As it is naturally becoming to be interested in the welfare of one's own family, I take this opportunity to present the truth collected in my capacity, hoping it will serve this aim. Surely it will do so when we consider that gold is a precious metal, whether it is in the hands of kings or in the hand of the least titled soldier. Now, then, having taken time to consider your thoughts, I find that my knowledge coincides entirely with your statement, and I fully realize that "to cherish the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical body is to cherish a venomous viper." I hope people will understand that we do not hate the Roman Catholic people, but we condemn the coöperation of their priests, which results in the poverty of the people under them, both mentally and financially—I mean in giving them poor education and in taking away their money. This is not done in other sects. My knowledge that the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical body is an evil and a wise serpent in managing to get power over people, teaching them to be obedient to their will, in order to keep them down is a manifest fact to the observer, as also to me in my experience (experience is God's visible truth on earth) at my home, in Syria (Asia), that the people were by them so degenerate that, in the towns, there were none that knew how to write or read except the priests. Ignorance and its vices that prevailed there I am ashamed to mention.

Not until the free spirited missionaries of England and of this Republic went and changed the darkness into light did the people exhibit even the common virtues of Christianity in their daily lives. So much about the history of the papacy in my own experience. It still remains for me to give the truth concerning your remarks in relation to the Protestants of the present day. May I say there is no doubt the excited and enthusiastic actions of the National Reform brethren (though sincere in themselves) have been unwise, and the proof is evident. Yet pardon is one of God's attributes. Allow me therefore to present, on their behalf, an argument which points out an easy way to their pardon and peace, and the prevention of remonstrance and reproof on your part, and may it, by God's help, bring union and fellowship with our brethren, and may all differences be settled wisely. Maxim: "The blows of a brother are better than the kisses of an enemy." My argument is, while it is a virtue to resist temptation it is also a virtue and wise to be far removed from them. In a community of a Christian majority—as the heads of a family are concerned in removing the temptations from before their children, so are they concerned and ought to have the privilege to govern their community to their best ability by removing iniquitous persons, prohibiting liquors and keeping the Lord's day without disturbance. The same is true of a majority of any other religious community, that they may rule their children according to the dictates of their own conscience. This may be granted without affecting the general republic or the government of the world. In so doing it would show the difference in temporal and spiritual development between a Christian ruled community and any other community; so that when reformation is needed in any place missionaries may be sent to them as they are sent to foreign lands; thus

no individual is obliged to be ruled by a community so long as he can remove himself, unless he wants to stay thereat. This would make religion deal temporarily and spiritually with her children. To Christians (you may know and rightly so) freedom of conscience in religion is all happiness, and to deprive them from acting and ruling their community is to deprive them of both temporal and spiritual blessings. Is it right, then, to say to a Christian, you must not have your religious principles rule in the community or in this world? when he could do so with blessings both to himself and his offspring? I hope not.

Christianity, or God, to me is the backbone of all good government, and the giver of all good gifts, and I must show this in all my actions, bodily and spiritually. This is all my belief. Now, then, I am your Protestant brother for a free republic, with the privilege of granting a majority of Protestants or others to have their own rule, not infringing upon the laws of the general republic or the government of the world.

In regard to the sanctity of Sabbath as a day, I may state that while I know of no declared change of the day, in the New Testament, into the first day of the week, yet I do know of a spiritual change of the Jewish Sabbath. The Jews called our Saviour a Sabbath-breaker, but he taught them that the Sabbath to him is not a law of Moses, a day of complete rest, but a day of doing good. In the same way he submitted to Jewish dispensation or God's dispensation to the Jews to fulfill the prophecies, but afterwards taught a more complete dispensation, that while circumcision was not declared null, it was declared to be essentially an inward circumcision of the heart. And that while the Sabbath day was not changed in the first day, it was changed spiritually into the assurance of salvation. The resurrection from the dead, the triumphant victory—what other victory has been more spiritually contemplated? Faith is now completed! Especially when we know that it is a change of time but spiritually modified. Shall then any man dispute and say a "Romish Challenge?" I refer them to the fourteenth chapter of Romans commencing with the fifth verse: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day he regardeth it unto the Lord, and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Both are blessed according to one's conviction.

Closing with do not forget to teach the young the truth as in the Bible, and that is shown by Protestants in general (in spite of the existing petty differences of sincere opinions), emphasizing the steady and deep piety and morality therein! And do not forget to throw the light on the snaring grounds—Romanism.

Your brother in Christ,

GABRIEL ABBOTT.

We take it that the gentleman who writes this letter is a missionary, and that most of his life has been spent in a foreign land, where his religion was tolerated, though regarded as an evil. He seems to be entirely honest in his convictions, but is evidently unacquainted with the question. His proposition, carried to its logical conclusion, is as far-reaching, and would prove as disastrous to liberty of conscience as would the policy of Ignatius Loyola himself. Our correspondent's own rule would have justified the majority in that land had they excluded both himself and his religion from Syria. If the principle is good for anything it must be as good in Asia as in America. But "Christianity" has been forced upon many foreign lands at the cannon's mouth while its missionaries have insisted upon the right of the majority in so-called Christian lands to rule even in matters of faith and to protect themselves and their children against the influence of false doctrine from whatever source.

Christian missionaries going into Syria or any other non-Christian country necessarily assail the most cherished beliefs of the majority of the people, and teach doctrines utterly abhorrent to the great mass of the people. They embrace every opportunity to inculcate their doctrines, teaching the people publicly and privately, in mission and from house to house. They proselyte young and old, gathering the children into schools and there instructing them in a religion diametrically opposed to the faith of their parents. And they deny the right of the parents

to put a stop to this work by expelling them from the country. Were the authorities to drive them out or even to permit the people to do so, the missionaries would appeal to their home governments for "protection," and the result would be, at least has often been, that the people would be compelled to let the work go on.

Now we have no fault to find with the missionaries for insisting on their right to teach the gospel without molestation either from the government or from individuals: We wish simply to point out the inconsistency of their position for they very frequently assert rights in other lands that they would deny to others in their own land.

The so-called Protestant principle expressed by our correspondent amounts to no more than the popish principle, namely, "When we are in the minority you must tolerate us, because we are right; but when we are in that majority we will persecute you because the truth cannot tolerate error." This is the real position of National Reform the world over, for it is dominated by the same spirit everywhere, namely, the spirit of the enemy of all real liberty. The Saviour recognized this fact when he said to the persecuting Jews, "Ye are of your father, the devil; and the works of your father ye will do." Our correspondent has probably never heard the infamous utterance of that eminent National Reformer, Rev. E. B. Graham, yet he says substantially the same thing. Mr. Graham said, in a National Reform Convention at York, Neb., in May, 1885: "If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then, if they can stand it, stay there till they die." If anybody does like not the tyranny of so-called Christian government he can become an exile from home and friends; he can do as did Roger Williams, seek an asylum in the wilderness. This is the religion of National Reform, whether in Syria or in America; but the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ is, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." The one is a divine conception, the other is from the enemy of God and of man.

C. P. B.

The Time Is at Hand.

THE Washington Post, of March 26, contains this report of a late address by a somewhat noted spiritualistic speaker and teacher:—

"He is not here, but risen," began Mrs. Cora L. V. Richmond, at Metzerott Hall yesterday morning, in her lecture on "The Resurrection Morn is the Light of Spiritualism." Continuing, Mrs. Richmond in part said: "Whatever frees man from the fear of death and that which comes after death, is the resurrection. I quote from the words of an eminent Unitarian who said four years ago in his Easter sermon, 'Spiritualism is the only religion or philosophy in the world to-day that makes a celebration of Easter possible; that which reveals immortality without a creed or dogma is Spiritualism.'

"One earnest minister in the assemblage of the Episcopal congregation said about fifteen years ago: 'The time is coming when the Church will need the evidence that Spiritualism offers to prove the foundations of immortality.' That time is here. When Bishop Young strictly put aside theological sermons and went to preaching concerning the fraternity of man, he knew it. When Newton, in New York, laid aside pomp and formality and preached more of the spiritual fervor of love and immortality, he knew it. When Minot J. Savage, on the borders of materialism,

saw skirting around the church over which he held charge the fear of annihilation, he straightway said, 'If Spiritualism does not prove a future existence, there is no proof of it in the world.' That is what we mean to-day, that in the light of a living testimony, the spiritual manifestation is the light of the resurrection. Nothing that dies can be resurrected again, and in Spiritualism there is no resurrection, because there is no death. The body which dies changes its essential conditions, and science declares that atoms reappear. In the change called death the resurrection is already accomplished.

"To-day you celebrate not that which has been built upon the rare spiritual manifestations at the sepulchre and tomb of Jesus, but that which has been demonstrated in your own lives and hearts, and from the door of every sepulchre, from the tomb of every buried casket, from the heart pangs of every one who has mourned, Spiritualism rolls away the stone of sorrow and the shadow of death and says: Never, for one instant of time, not for the slightest thousand-millionth part of a moment has the spirit that you loved been dead, but when dust was shaken off and became dust, when the body, by slow degrees, tortured by pain, was cast aside, and before there was time to say, 'My beloved one is gone,' that loved one was away, alive, arisen, freed from the dust, the shackles shaken off, and trying to make you know it.

"Spiritualism has kindled the lights of religion and the sermons of to-day are all pervaded with somewhat of this light which has given them a new tongue of eloquence, which has given them a greater certainty of immortality and it makes more plain the victory over death. If there is a death, all that is meant in that word is the human state—dead in darkness, in striving, in passion, in corruption of earthliness. The glorious inheritance of life is not to be denied or taken away from any soul in the kingdom of God's creation."

Certainly, the time has come, or if not is very near at hand, for the coalition of apostate Protestantism, Roman Catholicism, and Spiritualism. The delusions of Spiritualism are absolutely necessary to the maintenance of the system of religious error which Romanism has built up and from which Protestantism, now so-called, does not dissent. The very next act in the drama of false religion will be the open acceptance of these false lights which Spiritualism has kindled on the shores of eternity, and by which those, who accept and follow the traditions of men and the deceits of the evil one, rather than the pure word of God, will be drawn to eternal shipwreck. The statements of this speaker as to the dependence of the popular religionists of the day upon Spiritualism are founded in fact. It is true also that the time for the acknowledgment of the alliance is at hand. It has long been tacitly realized. The doctrine of natural immortality, the adoration of canonized saints and martyrs, and Spiritualism, are interdependent, without the first the other two must necessarily fall, and they all three mutually support one another. They are natural allies. They are necessary each to the other. The exponents of this great and fatal delusion see themselves that the hour is at hand when the union of all its advocates is to take place for the last great deception.

W. H. M.

Strange Infallibility.

In the *Catholic Mirror* of October 21, 1893, the following statement appeared:—

The ripples of Cardinal Gibbons' influence cross the threshold of the Vatican. Leo, the mighty inspirer of men, is inspired and encouraged by his lieutenants, from whom he often asks: "Watchman, what of the night?" The historic incident of the Knights of Labor, whose condemnation Cardinal Gibbons averted by personal interview with Leo, was one of the preparations to the encyclical on the "Condition of Labor." But Cardinal Gibbons is an American; let him be judged from America.

Look at it: "Cardinal Gibbons' influence crossed the threshold of the Vatican," and "averted" what otherwise would have been "condemnation," turning the threatened anathema into a blessing.

But suppose the cardinal had remained

at home and Leo had carried out his intentions according to his own "judgment," then what? then the encyclical would have contained the opposite of what it did contain by reason of the cardinal's "personal interview with Leo."

As it is, it is infallibly true. But what made it what it is? Oh! the cardinal's "personal interview." Question: Can two things, directly opposite to each other, both be infallibly true? If not, whose "judgment" was the infallible guide in this case?—Plainly the cardinal's.

In his book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," the cardinal says, page 155: "The Roman pontiff is called the head of the whole church, that is, the visible head. Now the church, which is the body of Christ, is infallible. . . . But how can you suppose an infallible body with a fallible head? How can an erring head conduct a body in the unerring ways of truth and justice?"

On page 154, he says:—

The council acknowledges them to be the supreme and infallible arbiters of faith.

Again, page 148:—

The pope, as successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, by virtue of the promises of Jesus Christ, is preserved from error of judgment when he promulgates to the church a decision on faith or morals.

In the case referred to in the *Mirror*, the "supreme" "infallible" "head of the whole church," was "preserved from error of judgment" by the "personal interview" of Cardinal Gibbons. Now, since the "judgment" of the cardinal was that which was contained in the encyclical and not the "judgment" of the pope, who, in this case, was the "infallible" "head?" And if the cardinal was the "infallible guide" in this matter, why may he not be in other matters? How long before the cardinal will become the pope of Rome? Truly, "Leo, the mighty inspirer of men, is inspired by his lieutenants"—not by the Lord.

E. R. WILLIAMS.

Joseph and Christ.

THE history of Joseph illustrates that of Christ. Joseph's brothers envied and hated and sold him into slavery, because he was more worthy and their father loved him better than them; for the same reasons the Jews hated and delivered Christ to death. Joseph's steadfast uprightness in his humiliation was the means of his exaltation; so with our Saviour. "We behold Jesus . . . because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor." Heb. 2:9, R. V. Joseph became "lord of all Egypt." "The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath," enthroned in the midst of the Decalogue. As the Egyptians were obliged to submit to the authority of Joseph, so all who come to Christ must accept the entire law of God, from which he is inseparable. Said the psalmist of Christ, "Thy law is within my heart," they must come submitting their wills to the will of God, which is his law. "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea thy law is within my heart." Ps. 40:8, 9.

Joseph had made provision during the seven years of plenty so that he had an abundance with which to preserve life during the years of famine, not alone for the Egyptians, but for all the world, for all countries came into Egypt to Joseph to buy corn. "To Joseph was especially given power that he might save his father's house." Gen. 45. Christ is "the Saviour of all men, specially of those who believe."

1 Tim. 4:10. Jesus made abundant provision for the salvation of all who would come to him. The Sabbath as a reminder of creation, assures us that he who is its Lord, having creative power, he who gave himself for us and to us, while possessing this power, is well able to sanctify and save us. Eze. 20:12.

Joseph's brothers were very dear to him; their lives were the reward of his days and years of bitter trial. He freely, fully forgave them, gave them the best of the land of Egypt and nourished them all the days of their lives. The subjects of his grace are as much dearer to the heart of our precious Saviour as his sufferings for them exceeded Joseph's. They represent the reward of his mediatorial work, his labor of love, and are valued by him in the light of eternal salvation. He "forgives all their sins" "cleanses them from all unrighteousness" and "it is his good pleasure to give them the kingdom."

Joseph was honored, obeyed and loved by his brethren. Thus it is with Jesus and will be forever increasingly so, in as much greater degree as the infinite exceeds the finite. The people could procure food of no one but Joseph; Christ alone has the bread of eternal life which is himself: "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." John 6. Joseph, lord of Egypt, dealing out bread to the people fitly represents Christ, Lord of the Sabbath, doing the same. For bread the Egyptians gave all they had, first their property, then themselves. Christ is "the pearl of great price," and he who would possess it must give all for it.

Joseph bought for Pharaoh all the lands and people of Egypt. Christ will redeem the earth unto God, saved from all the effects of the curse and peopled with the holy, happy, immortal nations of the saved. Rev. 21.

To Joseph was given Pharaoh's ring. "This signet-ring was used for signing public documents and its impression was more valid than the sign-manual of the king."—*Jamieson*. The Sabbath, as seal of the law of God, is the sign of Christ's authority. The Sabbath is the sign of creative power, as we have learned from the Bible; God alone has this power. Since Christ is Lord of the Sabbath, he has all the power represented by the Sabbath, and therefore is God. He who would abolish or change the creation Sabbath day, robs our Saviour of the great proof of his divinity. Well may the question come home to us: "Will a man rob God?" Is not robbing God as heinous a crime now as it ever was? He has pronounced the judgment, "Ye are cursed with a curse for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." Mal. 3:9.

"The Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. Did Christ conclude, Wherefore man is lord of the Sabbath? "Knowing what was in man" he neither committed himself nor his precious Sabbath to man. "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." He who presumes to touch any of its divine appointments is meddling with that which Christ has reserved wholly to himself and he betrays an irreverence or carelessness most astonishing and deplorable. He commits a sin like that of Nadab and Abihu who disregarded the order of the Lord, putting no difference between the common and the holy, and God destroyed them. The Lord did not take the first day of the week of which to make his Sabbath. Sunday was

a common work day; it has just the nature of every other work day; while the very nature of the seventh day of the week God hallowed *i. e.*, made holy; and he commands us all, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

M. E. STEWARD.

The Judge's Charge in the Georgia Cases.

In the trial of Messrs McCutchen and Keck, at Gainesville, Ga., for Sunday labor, the entire plea of the prosecution was that "Sunday is the day fixed by the State of Georgia upon which work cannot be done. Whether it is the Sabbath of the Bible is none of our business, but to stick to the Georgia law, for it is that under which we live."

The charge of the judge to the jury had particular reference to that phrase of the statute prohibiting the following of one's "ordinary calling" on Sunday, and was substantially as follows:—

"Gentlemen of the jury: This is an indictment against W. A. McCutchen and E. C. Keck, charging them with misdemeanor, that is, working on the Lord's day. You will see the charge fully set out in the indictment which you have.

"The indictment is founded upon this statute:—

Any tradesman, artificer, workman or laborer, or other person whatever, who shall pursue their business or work of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's day (works of necessity or charity only accepted), shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

"This is the law under which these defendants are indicted. So, if the evidence proves that the defendants, within two years before the finding of the indictment, in this case, and in this county, pursued their business or work of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's day as charged in the indictment, you will be authorized to find them guilty.

"The Lord's day, as used in this statute, means the day known as Sunday.

"You will notice, gentlemen, that the statute reads where any persons 'pursue their business or work of their ordinary callings.' Notice the language of the law!

"I charge you, that under this statute, you cannot rightfully find the defendants guilty unless the proof shows that the work, if any, done by them, was in pursuance of their business or work of their ordinary callings. 'Ordinary calling' means the business or occupation which a person usually pursues to obtain profit, or support, or livelihood.

"It is not enough to prove that the defendants did work on the Lord's day. It is not a crime, under the law, merely to work on that day; to make it so it must be done in pursuance of the business or work of the ordinary calling of the person who does it. To illustrate: If one, whose business or ordinary calling is to buy and sell goods, were to repair a public road on a Sunday, this would be no crime, especially, if it should be done gratuitously. We have nothing to do with the question of its being morally right or wrong. It is our duty to enforce the law as we find it; we are not to go beyond it.

"You are to determine what the evidence proves or does not prove, and fairly and impartially find whether or not the defendants are guilty under the evidence and the law.

"If, after you have carefully examined all the testimony in the case, weighed it carefully and impartially, under the rules

given in this charge to you,—I say, if after you have done that, you have a reasonable doubt in your minds whether the defendants are guilty or not, and that doubt arises from the evidence or want of evidence, it will be your duty to give the defendants the benefit of that doubt and find them not guilty.

"The defendants have each made a statement in this case in their own defense, and these statements are to have such force only as the jury may think right to give them, and the jury may believe such statements in preference to the sworn testimony in the case.

"We have nothing to do with the question as to whose religious belief is right. You are not to determine whether you or the defendants are right. That is a question we have nothing to do with now. You are to determine fairly and impartially whether the defendants are guilty according to the evidence and the law. Nothing else should influence you in making your verdict.

"You are not obliged to find both defendants guilty or not guilty. The evidence may show one guilty and the other not. If you should determine one guilty and the other not, then you will find a verdict accordingly; that is, you will say: We, the jury, find the defendant (naming him) guilty, and we find the other defendant (naming him) not guilty. If you find them both guilty, the form of your verdict will be: We, the jury, find the defendants guilty. If not guilty say: We, the jury, find the defendants not guilty. Retire, gentlemen, and make up your verdict."

In the course of the trial it had been made clearly known that the occupation of one of the defendants was that of a minister and the other that of a teacher, yet for all this the jury, after remaining out sixteen hours, failed to agree, and the cases went over for a second trial.

Sabbath-Keepers and Sunday Laws in Switzerland.

It was not long after we began working on Sunday as on other working days in our Basle publishing house until a policeman came into the office one Sunday, and called our attention to the fact that we were violating the Sunday law. We took pains to explain to him our position and the reason why we worked. He listened attentively, and in a very friendly manner replied that we were entirely correct in our position; still he was under oath to report all violations of the law, and would have to report our work.

In a few days a notice from the police informed us that we were fined twenty francs (\$4) for working on Sunday without permission. We promptly returned the notice, stating that we did not submit to the fine. This led to the appointment of a time for a hearing in the police court, giving us an opportunity to show why we did not submit to the fine. At the appointed hour, the writer appeared for the house, as the director is personally held accountable before the law. After usual preliminaries, the judge asked on what ground we refused to pay the fine. I replied that we did not pay it because we had a right to work,—permission and even a command to do so. The court then asked where we obtained our permission to work on this day. Hereupon, I drew a German Bible from my pocket, and turning to Exodus 20, was about to read verses 9 and 10 when the judge asked for the Bible and the

reference. He then read, "Six days shalt thou labor," and closing the Bible without reading further, replied that he still remembered that much of his Bible; and without giving me opportunity to speak further, proceeded to state that the case could not be appealed, but we could enter complaint against the fine as unjust in the court of appeals, and in this manner the case might go up to the supreme court. He then dismissed the case.

The manner in which the hearing was conducted, indicated quite clearly that the matter had been previously considered by the court; they seemed to know that we would not submit to the fine. On several occasions, I have discussed our position and attitude in regard to Sunday laws, union of Church and State, etc., with the lawyer who attends to our legal affairs; and it is quite evident that he has talked with the authorities about our work and position.

This lawyer did all he could to persuade us not to withstand the authorities, as this would in his opinion lead to endless and incurable difficulties. He said, "You are known as quiet, law-abiding people, and have a good name; but if you rebel against the authorities, you will soon destroy your good name and the esteem which you now enjoy." I replied that our good name depended more upon our obeying God than man; and that if the city of Basle punished us with fines for keeping the commandments of God, it would thereby hurt its good name more than ours. If the facts were made known, we were sure that many could see that such a course was nothing but religious persecution; and we should by no means leave our printing-office to lie idle, but should use it to circulate the facts. To this he replied, "It's a fatal affair."

Quite recently, our lawyer has been appointed as one of the judges; hence he may yet have to sit on our case. Thus, at least one of the judges will have a knowledge of our position. In a recent conversation, he seemed quite desirous to learn more about how Sunday supplanted the Sabbath, and stated that he would have to read up on the question. I shall take pains to supply him with reading. Like nearly all the Swiss of education, he is able to read the English. Last week he went to Bern, the capital, on business, and took occasion to speak with one of the judges of the supreme court about our position. From the conversation, the lawyer gathered that there was little hope of succeeding by appealing to the supreme court.

Religious freedom is guaranteed by the federal constitution; but there are already several decisions of the supreme court on record to the end that Sunday laws do not infringe the rights of conscience.

The police court confirmed our fine, and in case we do not carry it to the supreme court, and gain a favorable decision, we will be held to pay the fine. Sixty days' time is allowed, after which the fine will be collected by sheriff's sale, if not willingly paid before. The notice states twenty francs' fine, or in case of inability to pay, four days' imprisonment; we shall certainly not voluntarily pay the fine, for thereby we should assent to it as just. We do not yet know what course will be pursued in our case, but as we have means, it is quite likely that they will collect the fine by force.

Some of our brethren in Basle and vicinity have ceased to send their children to

school on the Sabbath. For this, one has already been called before the police court. He was kindly treated and given an opportunity to give the reasons for not sending his children. The judge imposed the lowest fine possible, two francs (about forty cents), and advised him to send his children to a private school. A report of the case appeared next day in the dailies. The leading one stated that, now that the difficulties with the Salvation Army are past, the waters are troubled by the Adventists, who in their zeal refuse to submit to the school-law by not sending their children to school on Saturday. The judge fined the man, and told him that the Bible was no more to be taken literally, but that he should go to the city officials to learn its meaning!

To avoid difficulties, two families of our people have moved to the canton of Baseland, where the school-law grants six half days of absence per month. As school holds only till Saturday noon, making but four half days' school on the Sabbath per month, our people can here readily avoid sending their children on the Sabbath, without infringing the law. But, to their surprise, they met the same difficulty here as elsewhere, the authorities refusing to excuse the children, holding that the law was not made for any such purpose. The parents were cited to appear before the city council. Brother Erzenberger, the first called, was treated very disrespectfully, but he responded kindly, and gave them some solid truths to think about. The second called was treated more favorably. The brethren appealed first to the law of God, and secondly to the law of the canton. The cases have not yet been finally disposed of; but the teachers show their ill-will in maltreating the children, in making fun of their religion before the school, and by whipping them with scarcely any pretext.

In one of the Catholic cantons, a brother was fined six francs for Sunday work. He refused to pay the fine, and allowed the case to go up higher. Recently his case was heard before the district court of the canton, which confirmed the fine; it will next go to the supreme court of the canton, then to the supreme court of the federation, and lastly to the legislative assembly, in case the decision of the lower courts is not reversed before.

Thus, at the present, five cases are pending,—two for Sunday work, and three for refusing to send children to school on the Sabbath. We can expect nothing else than serious difficulties; but we know that the Master, whose cause it is, can guide in all to his glory and the advancement of the truth.—*H. P. Holser, in Review and Herald.*

Has Christ Become This World's King?

THE religio-political portion of the "Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king; yea, verily, *this world's king* in its realm of cause and effect,—king of its courts, its camps, its commerce, king of its colleges and cloisters, king of its customs and constitutions. . . . The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics."

Has not the desire of the union been realized? perhaps not just as it expected, neither did Christ come the first time as the religious leaders expected, but he came

as the prophecy said he would, though because of their blindness and desire for self-aggrandizement they did not see the fulfillment of the prophecy; and so it is now. Has not the kingdom of Christ already entered through the gateway of politics and Christ become this world's king with his seat of government at Washington? Bishop Coxe says truly that "the President is a citizen who comes and goes. He is a guest who tarries but a night. The vice-president has no official house in Washington. . . . The one irremovable potentate (Potentate,—one who possesses great power; a prince; a sovereign; a king—*Webster*), is the *Roman pontiff* . . . and that as Queen Victoria by her viceroy reigns as empress in India, so henceforth Leo XIII. and his successors reign on the Potomac."

Now, is not Leo "Christ's vicegerent" (substitute) on the earth? and, as he is not ubiquitous, when he particularly takes possession of the United States he sends his substitute. A late Catholic work says, "Surely God's plans are manifest. America is the last and greatest of nations, and he means to possess her for himself." Paul, in speaking of the pope, says: "He as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:4; and, as is well known, he and his followers do call him God.

Now, if God, in the person of his earthly substitute, the pope, means to possess America for himself, and has, for that express purpose, sent Satolli as his substitute, another god or christ, to reign as the "one irremovable potentate" at Washington, and as he has entered "through the gateway of politics (Bishop Coxe says the horse called in the rider, Satolli), has not the "all-absorbing purpose," the "undying enthusiasm" of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union been realized, and is not Christ(?) already enthroned at Washington as king, in the person of Satolli? And surely, according to Bishop Coxe, his reception by the people was much more befitting a king than was that of the Babe of Bethlehem. And now it is in order for the Roman-Catholic-National-Reform-religio-political-Woman's Christian-Temperance-Union combination to go and worship their king, for Christ Jesus has said that "all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13:8. And whose names are not written there? Jesus said, "Whoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 10:33.

On the memorable night of his betrayal he said to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world." And when, as is recorded in John 6:15, the people would take him by force and make him king he departed from them. Have not those who declare that Christ "shall be this world's king" denied these words of his and tried by force to make him king, and by so doing been left to worship the beast according to the prophecy of Rev. 13:8? And does not this "irremovable potentate" just as nearly represent the "Prince of Peace" as any that can ever come through the gateway of politics? R. B. BARKER.

Hillsboro, Colo.

"RELIGIOUS opinion cannot be fashioned by statute. Legislation, looking in that direction, can result only in making slaves and hypocrites."

A Plea for Religious Liberty.

[This article is from the *Florida Baptist Witness*, Ocala, Fla., February 7, 1894.]

AN article in the *Witness* of January 3 is entitled to the commendation and gratitude of all friends of religious liberty. It is styled, "Persecuting Adventists," and is an earnest and well-timed protest against the indictment and conviction recently, in the courts of Maryland, of certain Seventh-day Adventists for Sunday work. It is, as you say, an interference with the exercise of their religious liberties, such liberties as are specially and positively guaranteed in both the Federal and State constitutions, under which the citizens live. It is an outrage that ought to elicit the most earnest protest from all professors of the Christian religion particularly. And this not because they are more interested personally than others, on the ground that if religious persecution is tolerated in one instance it may be in others, and only those who worship according to the State plan are exempt; but all professing Christians may plant their opposition on infinitely higher ground, however legitimate this may be. The religion they profess, the religion of the Lord Jesus, is a religion of love, and not one of hatred and force, or one of persecution. It is founded upon the sacred edicts, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," and "Love thy neighbor as thyself." We know that there can be none of this in the law nor in those who would enforce it, who would settle the differences of opinion that prevail upon the Sabbath or any other religious question, by fines and imprisonment. Why not settle the question of the mode of baptism by the same arbitrament? Our Methodist brethren think it a great offense to public decency to immerse, and there is as much civil reason in their view of the case to have this mooted question of religious import settled by legislative enactment as there is in favor of a Sabbath or Sunday law. . . .

Let us rise up as one man against this thing. Our religious liberties are at issue in the matter. The religion we profess calls for protest against so unchristian and inhuman a thing. But our protest is not confined to Maryland. A case of the same kind is now pending before the Supreme Court of Tennessee, and two men are soon to be tried at Gainesville, Ga., for the same offense. Is the proud escutcheon of our liberty-loving country to be thus disfigured and dishonored?

Before Christians consent to this wicked thing—surely none doubt that religious persecution of any sort is wicked—let them be fully convinced that where the civil power is thus invoked to interfere in matters of conscience or religious conviction, that there is Bible authority for the thing they would set up by its exercise. The opinion is here ventured that no advocate of Sunday holiness can be found to debate with any Sabbath-keeper as to which is the day. The writer, though not at all in sympathy with seventh-day Christians in any of their tenets, would not shirk a meeting with any Sunday advocate as to any sort of holiness belonging to that day.

The condition of things in Georgia is fearful to contemplate. The two Adventists to be tried are almost sure, if convicted, to be sentenced to work in the chain-gang on the public highways. When it comes to working on Saturday, their

Sabbath, they will die before they will do it. Under the laws of Georgia, to thus refuse to work is mutiny, and they are liable to be shot down on the spot.

WM. P. T.

Lake Weir, Fla.

The Church and Constitution.

THE attempt of certain ministers to secure an amendment to the Constitution by which that instrument will be given a religious tone is questionable in wisdom. Their desire is to have inserted this or some similar phrase, "In God's appointed way through Jesus Christ," with a purpose to have the Constitution recognize the influence of the Christian faith in government. A great deal might be said in support of the proposition in a purely religious way, but the precedent of giving to this instrument any religious significance whatever might justify proceedings in future that would give a distinct denominational drift to a principle of nationalism, the virtue of which now is that it gives equal shelter and security and equality to all religious sentiment and belief.

It surely cannot be contended that the introduction of the name of God into the Constitution would tend to the better establishment of religion, for such a contention would be equivalent to the admission that religion needs a constitutional recognition and support. It should not be contended either that the Christian faith requires any such bulwark, for that would be to admit the dependence of the Christian faith for its life and propagation upon legislative provisions, a confession of weakness that the Christian Church should be slow to make. The zeal that attempts now, at this late day, to change the national basis from a purely secular to a constructively religious character reflects more credit upon the spiritual enthusiasm than upon the patriotic judgment of those who are actuated by it.

The Church should not seek reinforcement from the Government. The wisdom of the fathers of the Republic in making a distinct separation of Church and State was the result of experience with a contrary state of affairs, and their determination to avoid, in the new experiment of government, the conditions that had been productive of so much friction and so many evils in the government from which they had divorced this country should not now be lightly estimated, the more particularly when there is something of a religious contention impending.

If the Constitution may be amended to take account of the Christian faith or church, why may it not with equal propriety be amended in some future time to recognize, specifically, some branch or division of the Christian Church? If now may be inserted the phrase, "In God's appointed way through Jesus Christ," after a time there may be a future amendment so that the declaration shall read: "In God's appointed way through Jesus Christ and his vice-regent on earth, the holy Roman pontiff." It is a dangerous thing our zealous preachers propose, and our legislators in Congress should be made to understand that the sentiment of the American people is opposed emphatically to any religious interference whatever with a Constitution, the great glory of which is its absolute equity toward all humanity irrespective of race or creed or lack of creed.—*The Inter Ocean.*

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY LIBRARY.

A monthly publication (with occasional extras) published by the International Religious Liberty Association. The following have been issued:—

No. 1. DUE PROCESS OF LAW AND THE DIVINE RIGHT OF DISSENT. An interesting and instructive work upon the "Process of Law," "Christianity and the Common Law," "Individual Right of Religious Belief," "The Divine Right of Dissent," etc., in review of Judge Hammond's decision in the King case. By A. T. Jones. 120 pages. Price 15 cts.

No. 2. RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE IN THE REPUBLIC. A lucid and vivid portrayal of recent persecutions in Tennessee, written by the editor of the *Arena*. 16 pages. Price 2 cts.

No. 3. CHURCH AND STATE. A timely document upon the origin of Church and State union with the arguments and excuses for Sunday laws, laws exempting Church property from taxat'on, laws against blasphemy, religious tests, etc., all well considered. By James T. Ringgold, of the Baltimore Bar. 60 pages. Price 10 cts.

No. 4. THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW. Arguments in behalf of the rights of American citizens, presented by A. T. Jones in opposition to the Blair Sunday-rest Bill. A thorough catechism upon the subject of Church and State. 192 pages. Price 25 cts.

No. 5. SUNDAY LAWS IN THE UNITED STATES. Their groundlessness and unconstitutionality exposed. By James T. Ringgold. 24 pages. Price 3 cts.

No. 6. THE CAPTIVITY OF THE REPUBLIC. A Report of the Hearing on the Sunday Closing of the World's Fair, before the House Committee on Columbian Exposition, Jan. 10-13, 1893. 128 pages. Price 15 cts.

No. 7. APPEAL AND REMONSTRANCE. Resolutions adopted by the General Conference of the Seventh-Day Adventists, Feb. 24, 1893, with documentary evidence attached. 24 pages. Price 3 cts.

No. 8. APPEAL FROM THE U. S. SUPREME COURT DECISION MAKING THIS A "CHRISTIAN NATION." A PROTEST. A review of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, declaring that "this is a Christian nation;" a powerful protest against the union of Church and State involved in this decision; also the subsequent act of Congress closing the World's Fair on Sunday, and how it was secured. The work contains the text, in full, of this remarkable decision of the U. S. Supreme Court. By A. T. Jones, Editor *American Sentinel*, New York City. 86 pages. Price 15 cts.

No. 9. SHALL RELIGION BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS? A lucid exposition of both the unconstitutionality and impracticability of connecting religion with our public school educational system. 12 pages. Price 1½ cts.

No. 10. RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND THE MORMON QUESTION. Is the Prohibition of Polygamy Religious Legislation? 20 pp. Price 2½ cts.

No. 11. THE "CIVIL SABBATH;" OR DISGUISED RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION. Sabbath laws shown to be religious and only religious. 12 pages. Price 1½ cts.

No. 12. THE COLUMBIAN YEAR, AND THE MEANING OF THE FOUR CENTURIES. An address delivered by Alonzo T. Jones, on Columbus Day, 1892. Revised to date. 44 pages. Price 5½ cts.

No. 13. THE LIMITS OF CIVIL AUTHORITY, from the standpoint of natural rights and divine obligation. 12 pages. Price 1½ cts.

No. 14. CHRIST AND THE SABBATH. A study of the spiritual nature of the Sabbath and what Sabbath-keeping really is, showing the impossibility of its enforcement by civil law. 44 pages. Price 6 cts.

No. 15. ROME'S CHALLENGE: WHY DO PROTESTANTS KEEP SUNDAY? A reprint of a series of articles which appeared recently in the *Catholic Mirror*, the official organ of the papacy in the United States, in which Protestants are sharply arraigned on account of the absurdity of their position with reference to the Sunday institution; with copious notes, by A. T. Jones, Editor of the *American Sentinel*. 40 pages. Price 5 cts.

No. 16. OUR ANSWER: WHY DO SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS SUFFER IMPRISONMENT RATHER THAN KEEP SUNDAY? A brief, historical, scriptural presentation of the Sabbath—the sign of loyalty to God—and Sunday—the sign of loyalty to the Roman Catholic Church. "It should be translated into every language, and placed in the hands of every person on the earth."—A. T. Jones, Editor *American Sentinel*.

No. 17. SCRIPTURAL RELATION OF RELIGION AND THE STATE. A scriptural presentation of the principles upon which the proper relation of religion and the State is based, substantiated by facts of history. 80 pp. Price 10 cts.

No. 18. CHRIST AND THE PHARISEES; OR, CHRIST'S FAITHFULNESS IN SABBATH-KEEPING. A striking parallel between the time of Christ and our day, showing that as Christ was persecuted and even put to death for his faithfulness in keeping the Sabbath according to God's idea, so in our day those who keep God's Sabbath—the seventh day—are being and will continue to be persecuted for the same thing and for the same reasons. 40 pp. Price 5 cts.

No. 19. PROTESTANTISM, TRUE AND FALSE. This work, by A. F. Ballenger, after stating clearly the fundamental principles of true Protestantism, shows by incontrovertible evidence that modern Protestantism has fallen away from these principles. 32 pages. Price 4 cents.

Annual subscriptions to the Library, \$1.00. Liberal discounts on any of the numbers in quantities and to the trade.

Order of PACIFIC PRESS,

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

FATHERS

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY E. J. WAGGONER.

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

HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE

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

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

is alone worth the price of the book.

Fine English Cloth, Substantially Bound,

CONTAINS ABOUT 400 PAGES,

Will be Sent Post-paid for \$1.00

IS THE

PAPACY

IN

PROPHECY?

BY THE

Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,

Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

The above is the title of a treatise written by the author, at the request of the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, California. It grew out of a discussion upon the present aspect and aims of

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States,

the author taking the ground that the rise, progress, present and future condition of the temporal power known as the Papacy, or Vaticanism,

Is Outlined in the Prophecies of Holy Scriptures,

with sufficient accuracy to determine what the "Papacy" is, and what is to be its future development and ultimate end.

Paper Covers, - - - 25 Cents.

Cloth Covers, - - - 60 Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

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.

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
Oakland, Cal.

43 Bond St., New York.

Health, Pleasure and Business.

Travel on the Famous Trunk Line and Picturesque

WEST SHORE RAILROAD.

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

Address for rates, time tables and other information:

C. E. LAMBERT,

General Passenger Agent,
5 Vanderbilt Ave., New York City.



NEW YORK, APRIL 5, 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 publication of the series of articles, of which notice was given in the issue of March 22, will be postponed for a few weeks. This will give opportunity for all who wish to make use of an extra quantity of these issues to arrange in advance. Some of the subjects to be discussed are, Justification by faith or penance, which? Infallibility, where is it found? The real Presence, in what does it consist? etc. These articles will be of interest to every class of readers, and the numbers containing them should receive a wide circulation.

AFTER many years of hard fighting, the Sunday opening of picture galleries in London has just been conceded by the common council, but only through the casting vote of the Lord Mayor. The council stood eighty-eight in favor and eighty-eight against the motion, and it was amid much excitement that the Lord Mayor gave his casting vote. A motion to rescind the resolution will come up at the next meeting.

THE *Present Truth*, of London, Eng., says:—

A Spanish correspondent reports that the Protestant churches in some of the provinces have been closed, and a church in Madrid has been required to close its front entrance and use the side door; as the open doors on the street constituted an offense against the religious sentiments of the people.

This is but another expression of the same religious sentiment which in Georgia, Tennessee and Maryland is "disturbed" by labor done on Sunday, even though the laborer be far out of sight and hearing.

THE "Oshkosh Sabbath Association" has been formed in Oshkosh, Wis., and a committee on Sunday closing appointed "to attain, if possible, voluntary closing of places of business and the cessation of public amusements and the like on the Sabbath day, and also to see that the laws are enforced in case there be any one who will not otherwise be persuaded to desist from desecrating publicly the Sabbath day." So the citizens of this Wisconsin city are to be put in compulsory remembrance of the fact that the first day of the week is the Sunday of the United States of America! How many will recollect that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord their God?

THE third Monday in this month another Seventh-day Adventist will be called to stand trial for his faith in Kent County, Maryland. A month later two men of the

same faith will answer before a Georgia court for exercising their God-given right to work on the first day of the week as required by their faith. Another case is pending in the Supreme Court of Tennessee, and will be decided in a few days.

A MEETING of the Sunday Closing Association recently held at Birmingham, England, shows that very much the same views and purposes are held by the promoters of the movement there as obtain here in the American Sabbath Union. The attitude toward the Sunday closing of saloons is quite identical. The Bishop of Coventry said in a communication to the association:—

I have long been convinced that the stoppage of the sale of drink on Sunday would be no real hardship to the drink consumer, and that he could by a little forethought obtain on Saturday all that he may require on Sunday, and by a little self-control keep what is so obtained on Saturday for Sunday use.

This ingenuous statement of the bishop is commended to those who think they are favoring the cause of temperance by advocating Sunday closing laws.

THE *Boston Pilot*, of March 24, has this editorial paragraph:—

The AMERICAN SENTINEL of New York, defending the A. P. A. conspiracy, says, with impressive italics:—"Some of their *methods* may be wrong. But even though *some* of their methods be wrong, or even though *all* their methods be wrong, whatever the *methods* the *object* is as certainly right as that the principles of the United States Government, as founded by our fathers, are right." In other words, "the end justifies the means"—good A. P. A. doctrine, no doubt, but not usually so bluntly confessed.

In this the *Pilot* has jumped to several erroneous conclusions. In the first place a careful reading of the article from which the sentence quoted was taken, will show that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is no more "defending the A. P. A. conspiracy" than the Roman Catholic conspiracy. Then to say that an *object* sought is right, though the *methods* used to attain it may be, or are, wrong, is not justifying the methods, but quite the contrary. For instance, it is, of course, the ostensible object of the Catholic Church to bring man to a knowledge of God and the gospel. This *object* is certainly right, but neither the *Pilot* nor any one else can accuse the AMERICAN SENTINEL of defending the Roman Catholic Church, and indorsing its *methods*, because the end which it asserts to be its *object* is right.

In the March number of the *Catholic World* there appears a significant article on the probable position of Europe at the beginning of the next century. "It forecasts," says the *Northwestern Chronicle*, "a rearrangement of the geographical delimitations and a settlement of the Roman question upon a basis toward which the current of modern thought appears to be certainly tending. In the pope's intense admiration for American institutions the writer sees more than the sentiment of a

lover of constitutional freedom, and finds in the application of a portion of the American principle to the Roman difficulty a solution of the vexed question of the pope's temporal sovereignty." We shall have more to say of this later.

THE *Pilot* states that "a movement has been begun in the Catholic Church which is to be conducted on lines somewhat similar to those under which the Methodist Book Concern is carried on. It has been started by the Rev. James L. Meagher, of Cazenovia, N. Y., who has founded the Christian Press Association, which is composed of priests and lay persons, governed by a constitution approved by Mgr. Sattoli, the Apostolic Delegate. The association is recommended by more than forty Catholic prelates." This is only another step in the popish conspiracy against the freedom of America. The sooner all freedom of opinion and expression is utterly crushed out of her own communion, the sooner it can be crushed elsewhere.

If the lady who sent us a few pages of copy for a three hundred page book, requesting an answer by return mail, will send her address we will be glad to furnish the information asked, and also to return the manuscript.

"Is the Papacy in Prophecy?" is a most interesting and timely question, and it is aptly answered by Rev. Thomas Haskins, A. M., Rector of Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal., in a pamphlet bearing that title. This work is the outgrowth of a series of papers read by Mr. Haskins before the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, and subsequently published by him at the request of the union. That the papacy is in prophecy is clearly shown and its course traced to its final destruction. Mr. Haskins' little work is well worth reading. One hundred pages; size of page, 6 x 9 inches; price, in paper covers, 25 cents; in boards, cloth covered, 50 cents. Address, the author, Los Angeles, Cal., or Pacific Press, 43 Bond Street, New York.

"THE Fathers of the Catholic Church," is the title of a valuable work by Dr. E. J. Waggoner, now of London, Eng. This book ought to be in the hands of every person who has to meet the testimony of the "Fathers" in behalf of the Sunday institution. Every Sabbath-keeper ought to be familiar with the facts given in this book. If you have not this book you ought to get it at once. Nowhere else can you get so much in such convenient form. 390 pages, handsomely bound; price \$1.00. Address, Pacific Press, 43 Bond Street, New York.

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.