



"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 19, 1894.

NUMBER 16.

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.

PROFESSED Protestantism and Roman Catholicism have already clasped hands; their present apparent antagonism is only superficial; it is the effervescence of individual particles which marks a chemical union. The principles of the two religious systems are fast becoming identical.

As Roman Catholicism and professed Protestantism assimilate, their union with Spiritualism will become more and more apparent; but, through its defense of the unscriptural theory of natural immortality Protestantism will be led first to join itself with the higher forms of Spiritualistic doctrine,—then, when the three, Catholicism, false Protestantism, and Spiritualism, are in full sympathy and union, the rights of conscience will be totally ignored and this country be ripe for the great delusion which prophecy foretells.

Character and Aims of the Papacy.

ROMANISM is now regarded by Protestants with far greater favor than in former years. In those countries where Catholicism is not in the ascendancy, and the papists are taking a conciliatory course in order to gain influence, there is an increasing indifference concerning the doctrines that separate the reformed churches from the papal hierarchy; the opinion is gaining ground, that, after all, we do not differ so widely upon vital points as has been supposed, and that a little concession on our part will bring us into a better understanding with Rome. The time was when Protestants placed a high value upon the liberty of conscience which has been so dearly purchased. They taught their children to abhor popery, and held that to seek harmony with Rome would be disloyalty to God. But how widely different are the sentiments now expressed.

The defenders of popery declare that the Church has been maligned; and the Prot-

estant world is inclined to accept the statement. Many urge that it is unjust to judge the Church of to-day by the abominations and absurdities that marked her reign during the centuries of ignorance and darkness. They excuse her horrible cruelty as the result of the barbarism of the times, and plead that the influence of modern civilization has changed her sentiments.

Have these persons forgotten the claim of infallibility put forth for eight hundred years by this haughty power? So far from being relinquished, this claim has been affirmed in the nineteenth century with greater positiveness than ever before. As Rome asserts that she "*never erred, and never can err,*" how can she renounce the principles which governed her course in past ages?

The papal Church will never relinquish her claim to infallibility. All that she has done in her persecution of those who reject her dogmas, she holds to be right; and would she not repeat the same acts, should the opportunity be presented? Let the restraints now imposed by secular governments be removed, and Rome be reinstated in her former power, and there would speedily be a revival of her tyranny and persecution.

A recent writer speaks thus of the attitude of the papal hierarchy as regards freedom of conscience, and of the perils which especially threaten the United States from the success of her policy:—

There are many who are disposed to attribute any fear of Roman Catholicism in the United States to bigotry or childishness. Such see nothing in the character and attitude of Romanism that is hostile to our free institutions, or find nothing portentous in its growth. Let us, then, first, compare some of the fundamental principles of our Government with those of the Catholic Church.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees *liberty of conscience*. Nothing is dearer or more fundamental. Pope Pius IX., in his encyclical letter of August 15, 1854, said: "The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defense of liberty of conscience, are a most pestilential error—a pest, of all others, most to be dreaded in a State." The same pope, in his encyclical letter of December 8, 1864, anathematized "those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship," also "all such as maintain that the Church may not employ force."

The pacific tone of Rome in the United States does not imply a change of heart. She is tolerant where she is helpless. Says Bishop O'Connor: "Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world."

The Archbishop of St. Louis once said: "Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes."

Every cardinal, archbishop, and bishop in the Catholic Church takes an oath of allegiance to the pope, in which occur the following words: "Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord the pope, or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose.—*Josiah Strong, D. D., in "Our Country," pp. 46-48.*

It is true that there are real Christians in the Roman Catholic communion. Thousands in that church are serving God according to the best light they have. They are not allowed access to his Word, and therefore they do not discern the truth. They have never seen the contrast between a living heart-service and a round of mere forms and ceremonies. God looks with pitying tenderness upon these souls, educated as they are in a faith that is delusive and unsatisfying. He will cause rays of light to penetrate the dense darkness that surrounds them. He will reveal to them the truth, as it is in Jesus, and many will yet take their position with his people.

But Romanism as a system is no more in harmony with the gospel of Christ now than at any former period in her history. The Protestant churches are in great darkness, or they would discern the signs of the times. The Roman Church is far-reaching in her plans and modes of operation. She is employing every device to extend her influence and increase her power in preparation for a fierce and determined conflict to regain control of the world, to re-establish persecution, and to undo all that Protestantism has done. Catholicism is gaining ground upon every side. See the increasing number of her churches and chapels in Protestant countries. Look at the popularity of her colleges and seminaries in America, so widely patronized by Protestants. Look at the growth of ritualism in England, and the frequent defections to the ranks of the Catholics. These things should awaken the anxiety of all who prize the pure principles of the gospel.

Protestants have tampered with and patronized popery; they have made compromises and concessions which papists themselves are surprised to see, and fail

to understand. Men are closing their eyes to the real character of Romanism, and the dangers to be apprehended from her supremacy. The people need to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty.

Many Protestants suppose that the Catholic religion is unattractive, and that its worship is a dull, meaningless round of ceremony. Here they mistake. While Romanism is based upon deception, it is not a coarse and clumsy imposture. The religious service of the Romish Church is a most impressive ceremonial. Its gorgeous display and solemn rites fascinate the senses of the people, and silence the voice of reason and of conscience. The eye is charmed. Magnificent churches, imposing processions, golden altars, jeweled shrines, choice paintings, and exquisite sculpture appeal to the love of beauty. The ear also is captivated. The music is unsurpassed. The rich notes of the deep-toned organ, blending with the melody of many voices as it swells through the lofty domes and pillared aisles of her grand cathedrals, cannot fail to impress the mind with awe and reverence.

This outward splendor, pomp, and ceremony, that only mocks the longings of the sin-sick soul, is an evidence of inward corruption. The religion of Christ needs not such attractions to recommend it. In the light shining from the cross, true Christianity appears so pure and lovely that no external decorations can enhance its true worth. It is the beauty of holiness, a meek and quiet spirit, which is of value with God.

Brilliance of style is not necessarily an index of pure, elevated thought. High conceptions of art, delicate refinement of taste, often exist in minds that are earthly and sensual. They are often employed by Satan to lead men to forget the necessities of the soul, to lose sight of the future, immortal life, to turn away from their infinite Helper, and to live for this world alone.

A religion of externals is attractive to the unrenewed heart. The pomp and ceremony of the Catholic worship have a seductive, bewitching power, by which many are deceived; and they come to look upon the Roman Church as the very gate of heaven. None but those who have planted their feet firmly upon the foundation of truth, and whose hearts are renewed by the Spirit of God, are proof against her influence. Thousands who have not an experimental knowledge of Christ will be led to accept the forms of godliness without the power. Such a religion is just what the multitudes desire.

The Church's claim to the right to pardon, causes the Romanist to feel at liberty to sin; and the ordinance of confession, without which her pardon is not granted, tends also to give license to evil. He who kneels before fallen man, and opens in confession the secret thoughts and imaginations of his heart, is debasing his manhood, and degrading every noble instinct of his soul. In unfolding the sins of his life to a priest,—an erring, sinful mortal, and too often corrupted with wine and licentiousness,—his standard of character is lowered, and he is defiled in consequence. His thought of God is degraded to the likeness of fallen humanity; for the priest stands as a representative of God. This degrading confession of man to man is the secret spring from which has flowed much of the evil that is defiling

the world, and fitting it for the final destruction. Yet to him who loves self-indulgence, it is more pleasing to confess to a fellow-mortal than to open the soul to God. It is more palatable to human nature to do penance than to renounce sin; it is easier to mortify the flesh by sackcloth and nettles and galling chains than to crucify fleshly lusts. Heavy is the yoke which the carnal heart is willing to bear rather than bow to the yoke of Christ.

There is a striking similarity between the Church of Rome and the Jewish Church at the time of Christ's first advent. While the Jews secretly trampled upon every principle of the law of God, they were outwardly rigorous in the observance of its precepts, loading it down with exactions and traditions that made obedience painful and burdensome. As the Jews professed to revere the law, so do Romanists claim to reverence the cross. They exalt the symbol of Christ's sufferings, while in their lives they deny him whom it represents.

Papists place crosses upon their churches, upon their altars, and upon their garments. Everywhere is seen the insignia of the cross. Everywhere it is outwardly honored and exalted. But the teachings of Christ are buried beneath a mass of senseless traditions, false interpretations, and rigorous exactions. The Saviour's words concerning the bigoted Jews, apply with still greater force to the Romish leaders: "They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers." Conscientious souls are kept in constant terror, fearing the wrath of an offended God, while the dignitaries of the church are living in luxury and sensual pleasure.

The worship of images and relics, the invocation of saints, and the exaltation of the pope, are devices of Satan to attract the minds of the people from God and from his Son. To accomplish their ruin, he endeavors to turn their attention from him through whom alone they can find salvation. He will direct them to any object that can be substituted for the One who has said, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

It is Satan's constant effort to misrepresent the character of God, the nature of sin, and the real issues at stake in the great controversy. His sophistry lessens the obligation of the divine law, and gives men license to sin. At the same time he causes them to cherish false conceptions of God, so that they regard him with fear and hate, rather than with love. The cruelty inherent in his own character is attributed to the Creator; it is embodied in systems of religion, and expressed in modes of worship. Thus the minds of men are blinded, and Satan secures them as his agents to war against God. By perverted conceptions of the divine attributes, heathen nations were led to believe human sacrifices necessary to secure the favor of Deity; and horrible cruelties have been perpetrated under the various forms of idolatry. The Romish Church, uniting the forms of paganism and Christianity, and, like paganism, misrepresenting the character of God, has resorted to practices no less cruel and revolting. In the days of Rome's supremacy, there were instruments of torture to compel assent to her doctrines. There was the stake for those who would not concede to her claims.

There were massacres on a scale that will never be known until revealed in the Judgment. Dignitaries of the church studied, under Satan their master, to invent means to cause the greatest possible torture, and not end the life of their victim. The infernal process was repeated to the utmost limit of human endurance, until nature gave up the struggle, and the sufferer hailed death as a sweet release.

Such was the fate of Rome's opponents. For her adherents she had the discipline of the scourge, of famishing hunger, of bodily austerities in every conceivable, heart-sickening form. To secure the favor of heaven, penitents violated the laws of God by violating the laws of nature. They were taught to sunder every tie which he has formed to bless and gladden man's earthly sojourn. The churchyard contains millions of victims, who spent their lives in vain endeavors to subdue their natural affections, to repress, as offensive to God, every thought and feeling of sympathy with their fellow-creatures.

If we desire to understand the determined cruelty of Satan, manifested for hundreds of years, not among those who never heard of God, but in the very heart and throughout the extent of Christendom, we have only to look at the history of Romanism. Through this mammoth system of deception the prince of evil achieves his purpose of bringing dishonor to God and wretchedness to man. And as we see how he succeeds in disguising himself, and accomplishing his work through the leaders of the church, we may better understand why he has so great antipathy to the Bible. If that book is read, the mercy and love of God will be revealed; it will be seen that he lays upon men none of these heavy burdens. All that he asks is a broken and contrite heart, a humble, obedient spirit.

Christ gives no example in his life for men and women to shut themselves in monasteries in order to become fitted for heaven. He has never taught that love and sympathy must be repressed. The Saviour's heart overflowed with love. The nearer man approaches to moral perfection, the keener are his sensibilities, the more acute in his perception of sin, and the deeper his sympathy for the afflicted. The pope claims to be the vicar of Christ; but how does his character bear comparison with that of our Saviour? Was Christ ever known to consign men to the prison or the rack because they did not pay him homage as the King of heaven? Was his voice heard condemning to death those who did not accept him? When he was slighted by the people of a Samaritan village, the Apostle John was filled with indignation, and inquired, "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?" Jesus looked with pity upon his disciple, and rebuked his harsh spirit, saying "The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." How different from the spirit manifested by Christ is that of his professed vicar.

The Romish Church now presents a fair front to the world, covering with apologies her record of horrible cruelties. She has clothed herself in Christ-like garments; but she is unchanged. Every principle of popery that existed in past ages exists today. The doctrines devised in the darkest ages are still held. Let none deceive themselves. The popery that Protestants are now so ready to honor is the same

that ruled the world in the days of the Reformation, when men of God stood up, at the peril of their lives, to expose her iniquity. She possesses the same pride and arrogant assumption that lorded it over kings and princes, and claimed the prerogatives of God. Her spirit is no less cruel and despotic now than when she crushed out human liberty, and slew the saints of the Most High.

Popery is just what prophecy declared that she would be, the apostasy of the latter times. It is a part of her policy to assume the character which will best accomplish her purpose; but beneath the variable appearance of the chameleon, she conceals the invariable venom of the serpent. "We are not bound to keep faith and promises to heretics," she declares. Shall this power, whose record for a thousand years is written in the blood of the saints, be now acknowledged as a part of the Church of Christ?—*Great Controversy*, pp. 563-571.

The National League and Its Amendment.

THE New York *Sun*, of April 9, under the title "Don't Confuse this with the A. P. A.," has this notice of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions:—

Active work has already been begun by the "National League for the Protection of American Institutions," in preparation for the coming Constitutional Convention, to meet in May next. The especial object toward which the efforts of the league will be directed will be that of urging upon the voters of the State the necessity for the adoption of the following amendment to Article VIII. of the Constitution as now in force:—

Sec. 12. No law shall be passed respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, nor shall the State, or any county, city, town, village, or other civil division, use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation or otherwise, or authorize either to be used, for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or in any other manner, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.

The amendment has been prepared by the Law Committee of the league, consisting of William Allen Butler, Dorman B. Eaton, Wheeler H. Peckham, Henry E. Howland, and Cephas Brainerd.

An address to the citizens of the State has just been issued by the league, explanatory of the amendment for which the votes of the people will be asked, which says, in part:—

New York State, more than others, has suffered from politico-religious alliances based upon enormous sectarian appropriations to institutions and undertakings under sectarian control. These have introduced religious questions into politics, have debased both religious and civil life, have encouraged a scramble for spoils, and have discouraged political reform. The proposed amendment deals impartially with all religious sects and creeds, protects the common school fund, and secures that money drawn from the people by taxation shall honestly be used only for those civil purposes for which it was collected.

We believe that the proposed amendment, when incorporated in the organic law of the State, will produce the following results:—

1. Preserve the integrity of the funds and the fair and impartial character of the American free public school system.
2. Eliminate religious controversy from political questions and issues.
3. Secure and perpetuate essential separation of Church and State.
4. Destroy the intimidating power of ecclesiasticism over both citizens and lawmakers.
5. Neglect to pass this amendment to our organic law at the present time would result in:
 1. Increased and continually increasing arrogance on the part of those who seek ecclesiastical or sectarian advantages by political organization, and by the use of public money.
 2. The continued disturbance of civil peace, of political issues, and of legislative and executive action by insatiate claimants of public money for private ends.
 3. The continued effort to decide questions of religious faith by political majorities.
 4. Continually increasing burdens laid upon the State for the support of private ecclesiastical or sectarian institutions.
 5. The gradual dismemberment and destruction of our free common school system.
 6. The indirect but dangerous union of Church and State in matters pertaining to taxation.

This proposed amendment to the constitution of the State of New York is in similar terms to the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which the national league has already presented before the Judiciary Committee of Congress. The effort of this league is

concentrated upon the public funds; although the language of its amendment is general and sweeping, really the entire purpose of the organization is to secure the public funds from "sectarian" use,—and that because of the fact that the Roman Catholic institutions have succeeded in obtaining the lion's share of the religious appropriations from the State of New York and from Congress.

This league has been confused with the A. P. A., much to its chagrin,—and it is not at all surprising that it should have been, for the main difference between the two is that while the A. P. A. is confessedly a secret organization, this league is professedly non-secret; but the purposes of the two orders are really identical, although not co-extensive. The one is directed against Roman Catholicism and Roman Catholics in every walk of life, social, business, and political, while the other confines itself to the school question and the appropriation of public moneys, and constitutes itself a special guardian of those public interests against Roman Catholic encroachment. But the National League for the Protection of American Institutions has no thought of protecting American institutions from the encroachments of so-called Protestants,—quite the contrary, its desire to protect them from becoming Roman Catholic spoil is merely that they may be reserved wholly for the use and occupation of an apostate Protestantism.

This league either knowingly and intentionally stultifies itself with the deliberate intent of failing to live up to the full meaning of the terms of its amendment, or else it is ignorant of the full scope of their significance. W. H. M.

An Abridgment of Worship.

CIVIL government, according to both the Constitution of the United States and the gospel of the Man of Calvary, has no rights but civil rights; therefore, no right whatsoever to abridge the worship of Almighty God by any person.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States declares: "*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*" Jesus Christ says: "Render therefore unto Cæsar (civil government) the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." The worship of every man, if he desires to worship, is due the Lord, and should be rendered to him, without molestation or interference in the least from the State.

It has so often been averred by would-be advocates of religious liberty, but in spirit truly Jesuitical, that to prohibit common labor upon the first day of the week, even by fine and imprisonment, although the supposed offenders had rested the seventh day, both physically and spiritually, according to the example of Christ Jesus, is not religious persecution or an abridgment of individual worship.

Note that there are three classes of worshippers. The heathen are *true* worshippers of *false* gods; the hypocrite is a *false* worshipper of the *true* God. The Christian is a *true* worshipper of the *true* God. Not to enter into the realm of discussion of the constituent parts of the religion or worship of the heathen or the hypocrite, but only that of the Christian; the Christian knows that his religion is good for seven days in each week. It is not a re-

movable thing that can be worn one day in the week, like a Sunday garb, and then laid upon the shelf the other six, to become covered with dust, but is kept in daily use. To illustrate: When the consistent Christian has worshiped upon the seventh day, according to his conscience and the divine text-book, by resting both physically and spiritually, then there remains six days in which he, as a Christian, is in duty bound, and has a God-given right, to worship, both according to conscience and the example of Christ Jesus. His worship thenceforth consists in continuing to rest spiritually in Christ, and laboring physically as did the great Exemplar. Paul says: "Whatsoever you do, do all to the glory of God," and to do so is worship.

Now, for the civil government to prohibit any from working upon the first day of the week, after having rested upon the seventh day, as before stated, is truly religious persecution. An abridgment of his God-given right to worship; also dictating his religion,—hence actuated by the same evil spirit of the Church of Rome—that spirit which God will destroy.

H. W. COTTRELL.

God in the Constitution.

AT intervals for a half a century or over the movement to introduce God into the Federal Constitution has shown a good deal of passing activity. Just at this time it has been revived, and certain ministers of the gospel are intent on having the periodical discussion of the subject renewed.

It is understood that the expression decided on to introduce into the text of the Constitution is the following: "In God's appointed way, through Jesus Christ." These words would certainly give the instrument the necessary Christian character, although it is hard to see what effect they would have one way or another on the religious sense of the nation. The American Constitution would have a Christian label attached to it, and nominally, at least, the Americans would thereafter be a Christian people. This much we are now, so that the gain even in that direction does not seem quite palpable.

The great objection to the proposal in question is that it opens the door to still further amendments in that behalf, and that in their zeal for religion the several Christian sects may in time come to consider whether some one or more of them are not entitled to constitutional recognition; for surely, if the Christian religion itself is entitled to recognition in the Constitution, should it happen that any very large proportion of Americans in the future were found professing one of the creeds, it would not be altogether wrong to expect that the adherents of that creed would regard themselves as representing all there was of Christian faith worthy of being embodied in the Constitution.

In many of the colonies one or another of the sects was recognized as the State religion. In Virginia the Church of England was the established faith until Thomas Jefferson brought about the conditions which put an end to such a state of things. At the present moment there is nothing in the Federal Constitution or in many of the State constitutions which forbids the establishment of a State Church. In many of the States, too, the adherents of one given faith are so far in the ascendant that they could, if they desired, secure

the passage of an amendment such as would recognize their form of Christianity as the constitutional one.

There is no way in which this question of religion in the constitutions, State or national, can be safely treated except on the basis of exclusion. The attitude of the Federal Constitution is purely negative in that regard: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." That is all. Religion has nothing to do with the Constitution or with Congress, and Congress or the Constitution should have nothing to do with religion. That is the principle, and the only principle, on which the American people should treat any proposal to unite religious and secular affairs in the conduct of government.—*St. Paul Dispatch.*

Why Adventists Work on Sunday.

[The SENTINEL has been asked to define its position as to the requirement of the fourth commandment in its relation to Sunday labor. This cannot be done better than by reprinting No. 55 of the Sentinel Library, which was first published as an article in this paper on May, 18, 1893. The paragraphs quoted from the *Review and Herald* can be found in its issue of June 14, 1892, page 377.]

THE Sunday cases in Maryland have again revived the question of how Adventists regard the fourth commandment of the Decalogue; not that it is a proper legal question, for it is not, but because in Maryland, as in Tennessee, courts of justice have so far forgotten their proper functions as to assume to declare that the religious faith of the Adventists does not require them to work on Sunday.

The fact is that the Adventists do regard it as a sacred duty to habitually devote Sunday to secular purposes; and this because they understand that the fourth commandment establishes a difference between the Sabbath and the six other days of the week, and requires men to respect that difference. To ignore this distinction between the Sabbath and the other days of the week, is simply to defeat the object of the divine law, and to set up a counterfeit of the memorial which God has ordained to keep in remembrance the fact that he is the Creator of the heavens and the earth.

The view of the Adventists is that physical rest for man is not the primary object of the Sabbath; for it "was made for man" before the fall, as our Lord himself declares, and consequently before man stood in need of rest from wearing toil. Clearly its object was to keep in lively exercise man's loyalty to God as the Creator, just as our peculiarly national holidays—the Fourth of July and Washington's Birthday—are designed to fan the flame of patriotism in the American breast. Viewed from this standpoint, it is plain that the fourth commandment, not only enjoins the keeping of the true Sabbath, but it likewise forbids rivals and counterfeits.

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

In like manner the Sunday institution

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

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

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

Q. How prove you that?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some months since the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, the denominational organ of the Adventists, had an editorial article upon this subject which we reprinted at the time, but from which we now make the following extracts:—

Every person has a right to work six days in every week, for the language of the commandment is, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." These words . . . confer upon mankind a God-given right, . . . beside which all opposing human authority becomes an absolute nullity.

But the language of the commandment imparts something more than a mere permission to labor upon six days of the week. It imparts something in the nature of an obligation. . . . Six days of the week are left to be devoted to man and his temporal interests, but the seventh day is the Lord's—the day upon which he rested, and which he blessed and sanctified. This day must therefore be kept distinct and separate from all other days, and of course the means for doing this must not be likewise employed in behalf of other days, or the distinction would be lost. . . . The observance of the commandment by rest upon the seventh day would be nullified by the like rest upon the other day. It is absolutely essential, therefore, that the six working days should be kept distinct in character from that day which God has set apart for himself.

But the impropriety of resting upon both the seventh and first days of the week does not stop here; for the first day is a *rival Sabbath*, Peculiarly offensive to God, therefore, must any act be which is an acknowledgment of the claims of this false Sabbath to the sanctity and reverence due his own day. In what other way could such observance of the first day, by one who knew its claims to be false, be taken, but as an insult to the Creator? In what other way could the Creator himself regard it?

The person who refrains from labor upon the first day of the week, thereby acknowledges either the claims of the day, or the authority of the power which seeks to enforce such rest. He may not "keep" the day as the Sabbath day should be kept according to the spirit of the Sabbath commandment—his observance of it may be one of form only; but this in the eyes of others at least, is an observance of the day, for only each individual can examine the thoughts and intents of his own heart. The eyes of the world around us can not, or at least do not, penetrate beyond the letter of our Sabbath observance—the outward refraining from labor; this is all, therefore, that can be asked of any one in enforcing Sunday observance. This also is all that the authors of the first day Sabbath ever asked as that which should constitute its observance. Sunday was never blessed, sanctified, and made holy; as a rival to the true Sabbath, it is sufficient that the religious world should be induced to rest and attend religious worship upon that day instead of on the seventh day. The edicts which gave rise to Sunday observance never commanded anything more; nor is anything more exacted by the apostate church which has ever been the especial guardian of the day. Every intelligent person knows that the Roman Catholic Church does not demand of its members the observance of Sunday in the spirit of Isa. 58: 13.

The Catholic Church does not demand Sunday observance as an act of worship to God, but as an act of homage to itself, and as such it is an act in the highest degree offensive to God. It lowers his Sabbath before the world to a level with the spurious, rival Sabbath which is of satanic origin. It nullifies entirely the act of resting upon the preceding seventh day. To worship God, and an antichristian power also, is to worship the latter power alone. God demands that we should worship and serve him always, and him only. The devil is satisfied to let us serve God part of the time and himself the rest of the time, well knowing that we are thereby serving him all the time, and God not at all. We do not think also that any person can afford to surrender, under such circumstances, his right, before mentioned, to six days of secular employment in every week. He who surrenders a God-given right in obedience to an arbitrary demand by any earthly power, merely as an act of homage to itself, makes himself a *slave*.

We think therefore that it should be a matter of conscience with all observers of the true Sabbath, not to comply with the demand to rest on the first day of the week.

This is put very mildly, but it is none the less positive; it expresses the view of the denomination upon the subject, and should settle at once and forever the question of how Adventists regard the claims of the fourth commandment. Of course it is not a matter of which the courts can properly take cognizance, for to do so would be to become judges of the consciences of that people; but the fact does show most conclusively that Sunday laws do at least interfere with the religious rights of the Adventists, by requiring of them a service which they can not conscientiously render. This is in addition to the hardship of being deprived of one-sixth of the time divinely allotted to them for work. C. P. B.

Defection of the "Mail and Express."

THE *Mail and Express*, of Monday, April 9, in the course of an editorial article on the subject of prohibition, expresses itself thus upon the question of attempted enforcement of morality:—

We repeat our proposition that coercion is a failure in regulating human conduct. You cannot prevent vice or produce virtue by force. Indeed, there is no virtue in a forced act. People cannot be legislated into morality. Virtue is voluntary and must come from within. Laws are for the regulation of external acts, and while they may to some extent restrain human conduct, they must forever fail in forming and controlling human character.

Out of the heart proceeds the issues of life. As a man "thinketh in his heart so is he." Moral precepts are addressed to the heart, the seat of the moral nature of man. Character is determined by the kind of principles adopted for the regulation of conduct. Character is the pivot upon which conduct turns. Law properly framed may measurably regulate conduct, but it can never reform, much less transform, character. True reformation must come from within, through the influence of Christian motives. Divine law controls the heart-issues by changing the heart.

Human law seeks to restrain conduct by the deterring influence of fear. Divine law is the eternal standard of moral principles as well as the gauge of human conduct, and therefore must stand, whether obeyed or violated. Human law is simply an expedient for the restraint and regulation of conduct, and if inoperative and unsuccessful, has no reason for its existence.

The *Mail and Express* has always been an outspoken National Reform and Sabbath Union organ. From the standpoint of these organizations, such views as the *Mail and Express* has here adopted, are rank heresy.

These views, however, are just and right and truthful,—let the *Mail and Express* hereafter consistently cling to them.

The Proposed Amendment to the Constitution.

DURING the past month an amendment was introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. Morse, and in the United States Senate by Mr. Frye, proposing the acknowledgment of God and Christ in the Constitution.

The people represented by the movers of said amendment are making strenuous efforts to accomplish their end, and it becomes a solemn, imperative duty to those realizing the danger involved in the proposed change to raise their voices in opposition in unmistakable terms.

The meaning and object of the proposed amendment cannot be misunderstood. It is an entering wedge for the establishment of a union of Church and State. It is to render subservient to the demands and dictates of some particular religious denomination a Government hitherto free and independent, and untrammelled by any influences that have no bearing upon the secular interests common to all the people of this wide land. It is an attempt which, if successful, would place a stumbling block in the way of a continued healthful and harmonious development of our national Government. It is a menace to personal freedom, a death blow aimed at the highest and most treasured privilege of the citizens of a free land—religious liberty.

Let us calmly and dispassionately consider the question from various points of view.

The framers of our Constitution omitted from it any reference to dogmas and beliefs of any religious sect or creed. Was such an omission unwise? Did it not rather leave our national Government free from any harassing entanglement in sectarian issues, free to devote its undivided attention to the peaceable advancement of those interests in which all the people, without regard to religious belief, were equally concerned?

Or was that omission in any wise harmful or detrimental to the cause of religion and its development? On the contrary, it proved an inestimable benefit for the prosperous, because free, unhindered, peaceful growth of all the various creeds into which the heterogeneous mass of the American people is divided. During the last hundred years a great nation's reverence and love for a Constitution proclaiming freedom of thought and action did not prevent, but rather stimulated that deep sense of religious reverence and devotion that may be said to be peculiar to the American people. Nowhere on the face of the globe has the cause of religion secured a firmer hold than at the firesides and within the hearts of the people of this free Republic. Side by side, in ever

increasing numbers, cathedrals and churches, temples and synagogues, silently but eloquently proclaim a prevailing religious tendency, *deep* enough to ever spread its ennobling influences, and at the same time, *broad* enough to fully and cheerfully recognize the God-given, glorious privilege of freedom of mind and conscience. Only under a free Constitution, guaranteeing equal rights to all, to the exclusion of none, such results could be obtainable.

Or was that omission, we may furthermore ask, in any way sinful or wicked? Did it bring down upon our nation the wrath and anger of an offended Deity, which now, after a hundred years, it becomes the duty of pious men to appease by the proposed amendment? Unparalleled in the history of the world has been the progress and prosperity of our nation. The gracious love and mercy of Almighty God has favored a nation that wisely engrafted upon its statute books the underlying principle of all religion: Love of man, justice, and equity!

I make bold to declare that the adoption of that amendment would render us unworthy of the divine favor we hitherto enjoyed, for it would imply a flagrant violation of the sacred principles to which as a nation, we heretofore adhered. Especially is the recognition of the divinity of Christ contrary not alone to the First Amendment to our Constitution, declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," but also to the very preamble in which it is proposed to be inserted: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic happiness, . . . and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States."

There are millions of true, law-abiding citizens in this country, Jews as well as non-Jews, unexcelled in their love for and allegiance to the country of their birth or adoption, dissenting from that proposition of the proposed amendment. And an adoption thereof would prove the opposite of insuring domestic tranquillity, the opposite of establishing justice and securing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity; a high-handed measure, indeed, destined to throw the firebrand of ever-increasing dissensions between creed and creed, utterly incompatible with American fairness, statesmanship, and patriotism. Futile attempts have been made again and again to establish a union between Church and State by various propositions. The introduction of this amendment appears a clumsy effort to attain all desired ends by one bold sweep. Its adoption—which is hardly to be feared—would logically lead to more or less direct abrogations of the rights of non-conformists and their, at least, partial disfranchisement. It would reverse the wheel of progress, even to those dark days when the Pilgrim fathers, forgetful of their own bitter experiences, would not extend to others the religious liberty they had sought for themselves.

May our zealous friends realize that their leaning upon the strong arm of government for the support of religious dogmas may be so construed as to point to the weakness of their cause, to their inability to strengthen or uphold it by the power of persuasion and conviction. The Czar of Russia may glory in unifying the consciences of his subjects by the strong arm

of State laws and at the point of the bayonet. Our political friendships for holy Russia should not carry us so far as to prompt us to adopt the methods of her supreme autocrat.

Let our good Christian friends rather adhere to the principle laid down by the founder of their religion: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's!" Let them desist from mixing politics with religion. Let Church and State forever remain separate, and our country will continue to prosper; and the various denominations, working side by side, hand in hand, peacefully and harmoniously, will thus be best enabled, each in their own way, to improve the manhood and womanhood, the moral and spiritual welfare of the masses, instilling into all hearts love and reverence for God, law, and religion, without the need or aid of any reference to God and religious dogma in the fundamental law of our Constitution.

The inviolable sacredness of that document has been recognized by our brightest minds and noblest patriots. Handed down to us by the fathers as a sacred legacy, tried for more than a century and never found wanting, it must be preserved at all hazards in its pristine purity. And as Americans and as Jews we shall ever solemnly protest, as we do now, against any attempted encroachment upon the fundamental principles of our Constitution, fervently joining in the warning cry that arises in its behalf from millions of loyal hearts: "Hands off! Touch not mine anointed!"—*Rev. L. Stern, in Jewish Messenger.*

The Province of Civil Government.

ALTHOUGH much has been said and written upon this subject, yet there is one feature to which, as it seems to the writer, but little, if any, more than simple reference has been made. That is the realm and province of religion and worship in its priority of existence. It is evident that both civil government and religion were ordained of God. Civil government was not needed and was not called out until after the fall of man. If man had remained loyal to his Maker, had not sinned, and thereby become a selfish being, there would have been no necessity for civil government. But because of sin, in yielding to the temptation to gratify self, man became so supremely selfish as to be altogether unable to conduct himself in a becoming manner, not manifesting even due civility toward others, unless aided by the power of God, or restrained by some organization of society. This organization is called civil government. And the necessities of man's condition as a fallen creature called it into existence.

Not so with religion or worship. Of course, religion, in the common acceptance of the word, is any system of faith and worship. But primarily, the word is used to refer to the performance of those duties that man owes to his Creator, and forms a principle of obedience to the divine will. And worship is to adore and reverence with supreme respect and veneration; to perform acts of adoration; to perform religious service. It needs no argument to prove that all this was in existence before the fall of man; indeed, before his creation even, dating even back to the beginning of the life of the first created

being. If the angels were the first created beings, religion and worship dates back to the beginning of their history.

As the sequel has proved, all these were created with the power of choice, to worship or not to worship; to obey or not to obey. Among the angels there could be no such thing as a civil government, notwithstanding some of them sinned and fell; because that was a theocracy pure and simple. That is purely a government of God, where the unfallen angels render willing obedience and the disloyal were cast out. And among the countless thousands of worlds there was but one world where the inhabitants refused to render willing obedience to that God who made them all; and consequently but one world where there is any need of civil governments of any form whatever. In those worlds religion pure and simple may be found, and religious observances and supreme worship carried on without the aid or restraint of civil government; and it is but reasonable to conclude that in those worlds religion and worship is to be found in its perfection, as is only possible when created beings have not made themselves supremely selfish by disobedience, and this is according to God's design.

Thus it becomes evident that religion does flourish best where it is in no way connected with the State. It is also just as evident that religion has a different realm from that of the State. It is also evident that in this world it was the purpose of God that religion and worship should have been found in just as pure and simple and perfect a condition as in any of the worlds or in heaven itself. It is further evident that this purpose of God will yet be accomplished in this world till there shall not be one blot in all the universe of God. As this work or purpose was not accomplished in the first Adam, it will be accomplished in the second Adam.

But to whom was this work committed, to the Church or to the State? And how or by what power? Will it be by that of the State or by the power of God? Evidently, by the same power that began the work, and that is the creative power of God. Man was created in the image of God and made the ruler of the world. But man fell, and became, instead of a ruler, the abject slave to his own supreme selfishness; and nothing but the same power that created can redeem him again from that bondage. This was offered through Jesus Christ, and began its work before civil government was organized. It has been carried on through Jesus Christ in all the ages of the world, and to gather out a people who would accept of that power of God, and that power of God is in the gospel of Jesus Christ; for it "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." And every one who will take hold of that power by faith in Jesus Christ may and will be saved from the power of his own supreme selfishness; and all who, from Adam down to the present time, have availed themselves of this power of God, have been lost to self to that extent that they could and did recognize and respect the inalienable rights of all men. They have not needed the power of the State to aid or to compel them to be civil towards others. Indeed, these have only been as "strangers," and in a strange country, seeking a heavenly country where all men would be civil respecting the rights of all. And as this work was begun and offered to Adam even

before his expulsion from Eden, even so God gave this work into the hands of those who would believe, to his church composed of believers, and this work of the church begun by Adam, to carry forward to the end of time. And all who have believed, and all who will believe, have ever depended and will depend upon the power of God and not upon the power of the State for salvation.

But all men have not believed to lay hold upon that power; and always there have been some who have so far refused to yield themselves to the influence of that power, that their own supreme selfishness has led them to overt actions, trespassing, infringing, invading and even subverting the rights of others to their own selfish purposes. Now, as the power of God, as revealed in the gospel of Jesus Christ, could not be the power of God if it should constrain by force, for it is the power of love, there must be some other power brought to bear upon all who will not voluntarily accept of and lay hold upon the power of God to save themselves from the power of their own selfish hearts. Here was the necessity of civil government, and here is its province. For this purpose it was ordained. The Church was ordained to do the work that pertains to the realm of religion and all those things that pertain to a future life, but never the work of the State; while the State is ordained with reference to the things of this life, with no reference to, or connection with, the work of the Church, each in its own realm carrying forward each its own work. H. F. PHELPS.

The Canny Scott and the Sabbath.

On one occasion Robert Chambers thus reproved a friend for saying the Sabbatarian narrowness of Edinburgh people would render life in Edinburgh intolerable to him.

"That's joost one of sooth-country prejudices, and nothing more. There's no sic teerany and intolerance in Adinbro as y' imagine. If you will only have a prudent care for local sainsibeelity and forbear to fly in the face of your neighbors' opeenions, you may amuse yoursel' in Adinbro vara moch as you do in London on Sunday. In Adinbro I dine and sup with my friends on the Sabbath joost as I do in London. Of course, when I drive out to dine with a friend on Sunday in Adinbro, I don't get into the carriage at my ain door, but round the corner near by, where I have ordered it to be waiting for me. An, of course, I seize the occasion for slipping into it when no folk are watching me. You're quite wrong in fancying the Sabbatarian saintiment in Adinbro is so teerrannical as to prevent you from enjoying yourself an the Laird's day."

"Anyhow—queried his friend—by your own confession, it is so intolerant and tyrannical that you dare not get into a fly at your own door, or even in any street of the neighborhood on a Sunday, when people are looking at you. If that isn't social tyranny, what the deuce is social tyranny?"

"Ay, that's a soothroon's pugnacious way of looking at the question," replied Mr. Chambers, with a merry twinkle in his eye. "If y'd been reared in Adinbro in the right way in your yourth, you would not speak so bitterly of the wholesome moral eenfluence o' your neighbors."—*Free Sunday Advocate, London.*

The foregoing is not an inappropriate

commentary upon the system which proposes to secure "Sabbath-keeping" by civil law. If conscience toward God be lacking such conscience as would secure full obedience without civil law, the general result is to secure hypocrisy, as in the case noted above. Genuine obedience in religious matters is never promoted by civil law alone.—*Evangel and Sabbath Outlook.*

Should Church Property Be Taxed?

YES.

The character of a stream is most surely and thoroughly known by tracing it to its source. By this we ascertain its component parts, and learn the frame-work, as it were, on which is built the entire thing. There are often, it is true, accumulations and accretions, which serve to hide the real nature of the elements derived from the fountain; but this fact only makes more apparent the necessity for such thorough investigation as leads to the primary cause or source whence the thing we seek to know comes.

In this way we may best investigate this broad and intensely interesting question of Government favors bestowed upon religious bodies, whether it consists in placing the name of the being whom they worship in the Constitution, using their text book in the public schools, relieving their property from taxation, or paying the salaries of their ministers all of which are steps in the same direction, links in the same chain of bondage with which so many nations have been bound, and are still bound to-day.

We do not yet in this land have them all, but we have some of them; and there is a large and persistent class of religionists, who are determined that we shall have them all. The subject is therefore a proper one for thought and discussion.

The basis of State action looking to the bestowment of any favors upon religious bodies, such as we have mentioned, is the belief, still surviving in our own land, that the State should have something to say about religion. If this is not true, whence comes the idea that it may properly discriminate between public property and say concerning one part of it, "that is used for a religious purpose and need not bear any portion of the national burden in the way of taxes, and that is not used for a religious purpose and must therefore be taxed." If the Government, as such, has a right so to discriminate in favor of religious people where they are in the ascendancy, and relieve them of their share of the Government burden thus making the irreligious people bear more than their share, why is it unjust for governments where non-believers are the most numerous to place the heavier burden of taxation upon the believers and thus relieve from such burden the non-believers? Is there any difference in the principle applied in both cases? Is not one application of it equally as just as the other? Is it not as just to relieve the Mohammedan by imposing an extra burden upon the Christian, as to relieve the Christian by imposing an extra burden upon the Mohammedan? If church property is relieved of taxation, other property must be taxed that much higher in order to meet the expenses of the Government; so the State holds out a financial inducement to investment in religious property.

We might, however, endure the clear injustice involved in the discrimination as

to property, but for the fact that it paves the way for a still greater and more vital discrimination with reference to principle and personal freedom of action in the choice of religion. Discrimination with reference to church property, argues a right to discriminate with reference to anything that belongs to the Church as contradistinguished from what belongs to that portion of mankind not of the Church. This involves a legal construction of the term church, in which there must necessarily be an investigation of rites, ordinances, forms of worship, authority, etc. So, religious people, by accepting at the Government's hands the favor of freedom from taxation for their churches, and other church property, have not only tacitly conceded the Government's right to discriminate with reference to property and determine which is and which is not church property, and hence what is and what is not a church; but have also logically conceded to the same political power the right to make still further and keener discriminations touching the religious liberties of the people in matters of conscience and forms of worship.

No people can be said to be entirely free, if while faithful to the government, they are placed at any disadvantage by reason of personal opinions touching matters over which the government proposes to have no control. But so long as freedom from taxation is granted to church property, while other public property is taxed, those holding the non-taxable public property have an advantage over those holding the taxable public property, which is granted to them for no other reason than that they hold a certain opinion, or profess to hold it, touching the subject of religion. So long as this is the case, can we say that thought is unfettered touching the subject of religion, and that a man's opinions thereon do not affect his standing in the government? One class are successful candidates for government favor; the other class to an equal extent are made to feel the government's disfavor, and all because of a difference of opinion touching religion. If men's property may be favored because of their religion, the men themselves may be favored for the same reason. The precedent is a dangerous one, and its danger should not be unknown.—*Independent Patriot, Lamoni, Iowa.*

Alabama Imitates Louisiana.

THE following dispatch, from Birmingham, Ala., will set people thinking whether we live in America or Russia. Read and be astonished:—

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., Mar. 24.—Troy, Ala., is excited over whitecap notices which have been received by mail by prominent Jewish merchants of that town. The notices are confined to the Jews, nearly all of whom have received them. A notice received by Levin & Sons, says:—

GENTS: This is warning for you to leave the city. We will give you until May 15th to wind up your business and get out of the city. After that date if you are caught in the city you will be dealt with as snakes are. You know our rule is never to give second warning but to act, therefore do not let your friends persuade you to stay.

WHITECAPS.
P. C. D. F. A. W., President.

A notice received by Rosenberg Bros., says unless they leave by May 15th, they will be hanged by the neck. The citizens are highly indignant over the outrages. Troy is a town of 5,000 inhabitants.

The Governor of Alabama, to his credit be it said, has taken every precaution to prevent fanatical outrages. The United States authorities have also been notified. We should not wonder in the least if some of our threatened co-religionists in the sunny South should pack up and leave.—*Jewish Times and Observer, April 6, 1894.*

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 taxation, 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,

Or Oakland, Cal.

43 Bond Street, New York City,

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.

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

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 City.

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 19, 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.

WORD has come from Jackson, Tenn., that the appeal case of M. B. Capps to the Supreme Court of Tennessee from the circuit court of Weakley County, where he was convicted under the statute against Sunday labor, has failed to come up as expected because of the loss of the papers and record of the case in the lower court. If the papers are found, the case, it is expected, will be set for the middle of May.

THE pope recently sent an encyclical to the Russian bishops which has aroused the attention of the Russian Government, and called forth official expressions of displeasure at what is termed the inopportune interference of the pope in Russian affairs. So the inhabitants of Russia have at least one ray of comfort, that the Czar realizes that he is pope enough without the pope of Rome to help him.

THE manager of the publishing house of the Seventh-day Adventists at Basle, Switzerland, has been again called before the authorities for Sunday work, and fined. The case will be appealed. There is now more than three hundred francs in fines and costs against the publishing house, for which the manager is responsible. As the fine will not be paid, this means imprisonment,—at the rate of five francs a day,—for over sixty days. But how will it end? The publishing house will not yield the principle. Will the authorities recede from their position?

THE Board of Education of San Francisco has pending before it the question of the use in the public schools of "Myers' General History," a decided protest against it as a text-book having been made by the Roman Catholics. The facts of history are of course unpalatable to the Roman Catholic Church, and so the demand is made that those facts be suppressed. Catholicism may succeed in this protest. Can those who favor the teaching of religion in the public schools fail to see that if Rome can exercise so much control now, how much more will the schools be directed by her hand when religion has been made a part of their accepted course of study?

ALTHOUGH the so-called "Christian amendment" to the Constitution of the United States is defeated in the judiciary committees, yet it is laid on the table only for this session of Congress, and will certainly be revived again. It is therefore by no means a dead issue. Indeed, now is

the time when it should receive thorough consideration, and the fatal governmental and religious error upon which it is based be fully shown. Its advocates are completely given over to their idols. Through the *Christian Statesman*, they say, "One defeat or a hundred defeats, cannot arrest a movement so instinct with the truth of God, and so vital to the welfare of this great Christian people." The *Statesman* continues as to the principles which animate them, "In the profound conviction that they are right, and must prevail, its advocates will continue to press them upon the attention and consciences of the citizens of the nation." And so they will, by every power that can be brought to bear, moral, social, political, legal, legislative. Oh, no! this measure is not dead; do not make that mistake.

AN effective sentence from the pen of Professor George D. Herron, Iowa College, is this:—

The social revolution, making the closing years of our century and the dawning years of the next the most crucial and formative since the crucifixion of the Son of man, is the call and opportunity of Christendom to become Christians.

This is striking language, but it is even more impressive truth. The evidences that this country is entering upon an era of social tumult and struggle are unmistakable. However Falstaffian an array the "Army of the Commonwealth" may appear to be,—it is the vanguard of the unknown column marching out of the mists of the coming years, and, as the herald of the era which it ushers in, is worthy of sober consideration rather than jeers. Coxe's army and the Tillman war are precursors of social tornadoes to come which will disturb the civic peace as the atmospheric calm of the western prairies is broken now already by the whirling blast of the dreaded cyclone. These things are the cry marking the approach of the darkest hour before the dawn, and the final opportunity.

THE Methodist conferences have not even yet ceased passing resolutions in regard to the Sunday closing of the World's Fair. The *New York Sun*, of April 10, has this paragraph in a report of proceedings:—

The World's Fair furnished a theme for discussion to the New York Methodist Conference yesterday. The Committee on Sabbath Observance presented through its chairman, the Rev. A. H. Ames, a report that the Sunday closing of the Fair at Chicago proved that Sunday was still regarded as sacred to the people of the country. This didn't meet with the approval of Dr. McAnnay of Tarrytown, who arose, and, speaking with some heat, said: "We take it for granted that the Fair was closed on Sunday because of reverence on the part of the management for the sanctity of the day. It wasn't. It was because it wouldn't pay to keep open on Sunday. I protest against such a report." Some one moved that the passage about the World's Fair be stricken out, but the motion had no second and the report was adopted.

The Methodists seem to have come to a point where they believe most implicitly

in the infallibility and omnipotence of a set of resolutions. The heretics who have any doubt as to the efficacy of their evangelizing influence are very quickly relegated to the scoffers' corner.

THE *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* has this item:—

In most of the States of the Union Sunday fishing is prohibited, and in this State the legislature recently refused to pass a bill which made it legal. On general principles it may be said that any law which prohibits such a harmless and innocent amusement as fishing on Sunday is a relic of bigotry. The notion that it is the province of the State to enforce Sabbath observance in such an extreme direction was exploded long ago. It is very certain that the existing law will not be heeded by any true fisherman, even though Sunday fishing be proverbially unlucky.

The *Eagle* seems to think that Sunday fishing is such a little sin that it don't count. But what is the difference in principle between laws prohibiting fishing on Sunday, solely because it is Sunday, and laws prohibiting any other amusement or labor on Sunday for the same reason.

THE *Christian Advocate*, of April 5, has this paragraph:—

The *Presbyterian* tells how one man stopped Sabbath work in the Reading shops at Williamsport, Pa. He declined to work on the Sabbath, and was discharged as a man who had too many scruples for a railroad worker. He quietly informed the men who were in the shops that if they went to work he would prosecute them for violation of the Sunday law of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Seventy-five of the men declined to work the next Lord's day. The name of the sturdy upholder of the civil law was Andrew Anderson.

In thus sturdily upholding the "civil law," did Andrew Anderson show himself to be a "sturdy upholder" of the Golden Rule? In this act did he show that he loved his neighbor as himself? Was this a Christian deed? Did Andrew Anderson thus prove himself to be a Christian?

"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 City.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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.