



"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, MAY 10, 1894.

NUMBER 19.

## 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.

Two years ago a few preachers invaded the capitol of the United States and demanded of Congress legislation in behalf of religion and the churches, and they got it.

THESE preachers had with them a few genuine petitions which they fraudulently multiplied into millions and used so threateningly that the scared vision of Senator Hawley and others multiplied them into many millions more.

THUS under threats these preachers demanded that Congress should openly violate the spirit, the letter, and the whole history of the Constitution; and that at the same time each member of Congress should violate his oath to maintain the Constitution. For these preachers knew perfectly well that what they were thus demanding was in every element of it contrary to the plain language and meaning of the Constitution. All this, however, was nothing to them so long as they could get Congress to do that which they had firmly settled in their minds ought to be done.

UNDER the threats and other persuasions thus brought to bear, Congress did surrender to the demands of the preachers, and did do the unconstitutional thing that they had determined should be done. And thus Congress did make the Government of the United States subordinate to the religious element as expressed through these threatening ecclesiastics. So certainly is this true, and so well did the ecclesiastics know it, that when Congress would have retraced its false step and reversed its unconstitutional action they simply raised their threatening voices to a louder clamor than ever, and Congress still yielded to the clamor for fear that more mischief would be done if it did not yield than if it did.

ALL this is a matter of history with

which all the people of the land are acquainted. And Senator Hawley, all know, also, was the grand chief advocate of the movement in Congress. It was he who made the most, and the most lengthy, speeches in its favor. He it was who challenged his fellow-senators to "vote against it if you dare," under the dread alternative of "How many of you would come back here again?" He it was, and Senators Colquitt and Frye, who declared that the "salvation of the nation" depended on this subordination of the Government to the demand of the preachers, this subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power in this nation.

AND now behold there is another set of preachers coming up to Washington to invade the capitol with demands for legislation to suit themselves. They are coming by the hundreds and thousands from all directions. True they are not as well dressed as were the previous ones: they do not look quite as scholarly as those others; it is probable that these do not wear as many gold rings and diamond studs as did those; nor do these come at half fare or lowest excursion rates in elegant trains on all the railroads. Yet they are certainly coming, and what is just as certain is that in principle this new set of preachers preach the same identical gospel as did the others—the gospel of the personality, the paternity, and the divinity, of the Government.

BUT, lo! Senator Hawley stands up in his place and denounces this new set of preachers as "not representative," and their errand so fraught with the elements of anarchy that when some of his fellow-senators act toward these as he did toward the others he hesitates not to denounce their action as "anarchistic." It is true that these new preachers do not come with a few "representative petitions" on paper, which they will fraudulently multiply into millions. No, these come in their own proper and individual persons, and in their own proper persons they propose to "petition;" and no man can deny that they can speedily and in very fact be multiplied into millions. And as to their being representative, they are just as certainly representative as were those preachers who went there before, and whose bad

cause Senator Hawley was so prompt to espouse. No man can deny that Coxe, Kelly, Browne, and Frye, are as completely representative as were Crafts, Cook, Shepard, and George. The truth is that they are far more so. And as to the movement of these new preachers containing the elements of anarchy, it is no more true of these than it was, and is, of the others. And in one sense not nearly so much; for the others originated and carried to successful issue, the first movement to undermine every principle of government and order. And in so doing they set the example which these are now following only too fully.

WHY, then, should Senator Hawley denounce these when he supported the others? Senator Peffer denounced the others and favors these. Senator Peffer and his confreres are more consistent than are Senator Hawley and his. For when the principle has once been recognized by legislation in behalf of one class, it is only fair and consistent enough that it should be followed in favor of any other class, on demand. Senators Peffer, Allen, and others, in favoring these are but following in the steps already taken by Senators Hawley, Frye, and others, in favoring those other preachers. And to be consistent Senators Hawley, Frye, Quay, and all the others who surrendered to the clamor and threats of those other preachers in their demand for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, should now be just as prompt in surrendering to the clamor of the preachers of the "commonweal," and just as diligent in advocating their demands.

Is it possible that those senators, and indeed Congress altogether, were so thoughtless in 1892, as not to be able to discern that when they surrendered to the clamor and threats of the ecclesiastics for unconstitutional legislation, or even for any purpose, they were establishing a precedent that could be followed by every other element in the land? Could they not see that when they plainly announced that they not only yielded to the religious sentiment, but that they did not "dare" to do otherwise—could they not see that in this they were but making an open bid for every discontented or self-assertive

element in the nation to come before Congress in the same way, and secure consideration of their demands by the same means? In 1892, Congress thus sowed to the wind, and neither the men who led in that transaction, nor anybody else, should be surprised if in 1894 they should be called upon to reap the whirlwind. And that which is now in sight, perplexing and dangerous as it is, is but a summer's breeze as compared with the destructive storm that is surely and speedily to come. And all in this same line of things, too. The men who, in 1892, established the evil precedent of "legislation by clamor and threats," will have ample opportunity yet to see their pernicious example followed to the nation's undoing. They were told of these things before, but they would not hear. These things will tell of themselves henceforth, and those men will hear.

A. T. J.

### Catholicism, 1776—1876.

Six columns in the *Catholic Times* of April 21, 1894, are devoted to a discourse by the Very Rev. D. I. McDermott in attempting to prove the assertion that the papacy is not inimical to the prosperity of this country. A contrast between some of the statements made in the course of his remarks, and the records of history, form a striking picture which cannot fail of impressing upon many the gravity of the impending crisis that threatens America and American institutions from papal aggression.

After referring to the attachment which the Catholics feel for the land of their birth and the ties of kindred, and saying that they have no regrets for having come to this land of liberty and entertain no desire to return to their native land, he says:—

Unlike the Jews of old, Catholics have no motive for dissatisfaction or disloyalty. They desire no change in our form of Government, for they know that the solution of all the questions which perplex statesmen and excite bigots will be found in the righteous application of the fundamental principles of the Republic, freedom of conscience and civil equality. . . . This Government not only satisfies Catholics, excites their admiration because preëminently just, but also fills them with reverence because they look upon it as the work of God.

What the papacy claims to be the fundamental principles of this Republic, and what the founders of it in fact intended, are two entirely different things. It is a matter well known to every one who has watched the course of events that this growing feeling of satisfaction with which Rome looks upon the progress of affairs in this country has not always existed and has arisen solely from the fact that, in every possible way, the interests of Rome are being fostered and strengthened. A few years ago expressions of this kind were unknown, but, as a prominent Catholic journal recently said in speaking of the petition which the Methodists have forwarded to the pope, "times have changed," and it is only the liberalizing policy of professed Protestants, who have adapted themselves to the aims of the papacy, and are working harmoniously and unitedly with her, in her efforts at self-aggrandizement, that has caused this change in sentiment on the part of Rome. Again he says:—

As the outcome of the American Revolution, religious toleration is not to be credited to the design of the men of 1776 so much as to an overruling providence of God, which had made it morally impossible to form any general government for the thirteen colonies, except on a basis of religious liberty.

It is for the Catholic Church to put

forward the claim that the heroes of the Revolution did not know for what they were contending, and, if the assumption of the Rev. Mr. McDermott is to be followed out, it was left for Rome, as the instrument in the hands of an overruling providence, to indoctrinate the principles of religious liberty in the fundamental principles of this Government. While it is true that an overruling providence was manifested in the affairs of this, as of all other nations, and all honor should be ascribed to France for the important part she took in the great struggle for American independence, it is not true, as stated by the Rev. Mr. McDermott, that "the men of 1776, notwithstanding their bravery and many sound principles, owed their success, under God, to Catholic France."

An extract from "Bancroft's History of the United States" forms an interesting and instructive commentary on the above quotation, and illustrates the relation of the papacy to the original thirteen colonies, and how she was regarded by the framers of the Declaration of Independence. On page 40, Volume 4, he says:—

The thirteen colonies were all Protestant. The members of Congress said, in their address to the people of Great Britain, "The Roman Catholic religion dispenses impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion throughout every part of the world."

Again, in Volume 5, page 474, "History of the United States," Bancroft says:—

The Irish Parliament, at the time of the Revolution, composed of nearly all papists, "heard of the rebellion with abhorrence," and donated 4,000 men to put it down.

The *Massachusetts Gazette*, Sept. 21, 1775, contained the following:—

A brigade of Irish Roman Catholics is forming in Munster and Connaught to be sent to Boston to act against the rebels.

Until the records of history shall have been obliterated or the facts utterly suppressed, it is well to turn the search light of truth upon some of the arrogant claims made by Catholic prelates. Continuing, the Rev. Mr. McDermott says:—

The participation of the French in the struggle for independence made religious liberty under the general Government a necessity. It were as if the colonists themselves, unable to build the ship of State, had found it necessary to allow Catholics to aid in its completion.

History again records the fact that of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, fifty-five were Protestants, and but one was a Roman Catholic. It certainly is an edifying spectacle to offer to intelligent people,—with the expectation that they will believe it to be true,—a statement that out of fifty-six individuals who signed the Declaration of Independence, but one could be found, and he a member of the Roman Catholic Church, who had the wisdom to safely launch the ship of State.

"Before launching the vessel," continued Mr. McDermott, "they agreed that she should carry men of every faith, that the captain and crew should keep on their earthly course, and while consulting the safety and comfort of the passengers, leave them free each to steer his course heavenward."

With the usual facility of perversion, for which Rome is characterized, while posing as the founder and champion of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, she is in reality laying the foundation for a despotic tyranny, not only over the spiritual, but the temporal affairs of this nation. The following statement, taken from a recent issue of the *Missionary Review*, giving a copy of a handbill exten-

sively circulated in Leon, Nicaragua, is right to the point, and shows what we may expect to see in this country if her work is not interrupted:—

#### ATTENTION! CATHOLICS!

The wolf of Protestantism has found its way into the Catholic flock! A minister of the sect of Luther and Voltaire is in Leon, accompanied by various mercenaries, who are busy selling in the streets Protestant Bibles and a false book of the Gospels. Do not buy these books, Christians! Scorn these propagandists of a sect divorced from the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ, divorced from the truth, and which is resolved on depriving us of the most precious legacy received from our forefathers! Do not allow your religion to be harmed by these knight errants of evil! Let us hurl them away! No law authorizes their coming here to dechristianize us. Liberty of worship does not exist here, and these peddlers of adulterated Bibles and Gospels are of a foreign flock. Nicaragua belongs to God; Protestantism to the devil. Away with them!

Rome never changes!

E. E. PARLIN.

### Sunday Law Enforcement in Australia.

MATTERS in this country have not undergone any very great change during the last month. Times are just about as hard financially, and the prospects of the poor are a little dark, considering that winter will soon set in, when the chances for procuring work rather diminish. Much has been said and written of late concerning the way out of the present depression.

The Sunday law people, however, are as persistent in their cause as though nothing else was weighing on the public mind. Like the Jews of old, they are full of zeal which smacks much of fanaticism. They have their committees at work hunting up cases which may serve to keep their cause before the public until general sentiment will sustain their much-vaunted piety. Only a day or two ago one of their number was on his Sunday rounds looking after refractory individuals, and not happening to light upon any suitable case among Europeans, he went to the Chinese quarters, where he espied one Ah Quie doing something with a carpenter's plane. The next day the celestial was brought up and charged, under an act of Charles II., with "exercising the worldly work of his ordinary calling (cabinet-making) on part of the Lord's day commonly called Sunday."

It was established that the celestial was not a cabinet-maker, but a French polisher, and was, therefore, not working at his trade, but simply planing down the sides of a small mirror preparatory to shaving himself. It was, moreover, maintained by the defense that any man had a right to work on Sunday to make an article for his own use. But the keenest bit of argument made was that it is impossible to compel an alien *unbeliever* to observe the Lord's day, on the ground that its real observance required belief in it. The case was accordingly dismissed, and the prosecutors failed to win their much-coveted glory.

The activity in this line does not pass unnoticed by the secular press. The *Age*, in an editorial on this point, said:—

The man who wishes to spend Sunday in the fresh air is not necessarily such a criminal as the Sabbatarian would have us believe; nor will he be goaded into attending divine worship by being absolutely debarred from all rational relaxation and enjoyment on the first day of the week. If regularity at church entailed of necessity a high moral code, it would plainly be desirable to drive every citizen to the church door at the point of the bayonet—that is, supposing he declined to go of his own accord; but, alas! the Jabez Spencer Balfours, the George Nicholson Taylors [noted criminals], and the rest of them are so often distinguished by all the outward manifestations of

piety that one feels a doubt as to the efficacy of such a plan. Donald Nicholl, chairman of directors of the City of Glasgow bank, absolutely refused, on principle, to read Monday's paper, because its publication had entailed a certain amount of Sunday labor; yet he was proved to have knowingly connived at a system of swindling which reduced thousands from affluence to beggary, and caused a shock through Scotland that those who were there at the time will not readily forget. And of course the list might be easily prolonged.

From the above it is seen that the discussion of the Sunday question here is bringing out some of the fine points connected with it, and much to the detriment of those who are so piously jealous of the way the unbelieving world spend Sunday. This topic promises soon to be a very interesting one, and we hope its discussion will result in opening the eyes of many to the truth of the matter. Indeed it is already doing that. Not long since a deputation of ministers waited on the premier of New South Wales, asking for more stringent Sunday laws. He asked if they based their requests on the demand of the fourth commandment. They said that was the very basis of their action. "Well, then," said he, "Sunday is ruled out of the case: for that commandment enjoins the keeping of the seventh day, and that is Saturday." The deputation were obliged to retire rather crestfallen. But these people care little for rebuffs. They will soon stir up the thing again, when we expect to see considerable public agitation about it. Let it come, the sooner the better; for then the conflict will the sooner be over, and the work done which is to bring our blessed Lord.—*J. O. Corliss, in Review and Herald.*

#### Protection and Coercion.

In the United States Senate a bill has been introduced entitled, "A bill to protect the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship," etc.

"Protection" to-day is a much more taking expression than coercion of men, yet both mean the same thing. The only way in which a day can be "protected" as a day of rest and worship, is by prohibiting everybody from laboring, and by compelling all to attend worship on that day. For example, here is a field that is to be protected from trespassers. Now it is no protection to the field, if none are prohibited from crossing it save those whose inclination does not lead them that way, and if those who wish to cross it, or to play upon it, are allowed full liberty to do so. So a day cannot be "protected" from being used for labor or recreation, except by forcibly compelling some to pay regard to it against their will.

"Well, is there not of necessity the element of compulsion, or forcible restraint, in every law?" Certainly, and that is all right when the law is just; but we are not discussing the quality of law, but the propriety of a certain specific act of legislation. If it were within the province of civil government to legislate concerning Sunday or any other day, as a day of rest, then nothing could be said; but no law is a just law if by any reasonable application of it, it can possibly work injustice to anybody; and a law which declares men to be criminals for doing on one day that which is lawful in itself, and which the law allows on any other day, is unjust and inconsistent. It will be asked, "Do you then deny the right of government to appoint certain days as holidays?" By no means; but be it remembered that laws concerning holidays are merely permis-

sive, and not mandatory. That is a law making a certain day a national holiday, gives people permission to rest, and find recreation, without danger of losing their situations, but does not compel any to cease from labor. On any holiday people who do not wish to rest are at liberty to work; but no Sunday law contemplates anything of that kind.

The wise man has said that "Whatever God doeth, it shall be for ever." Now in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, and rested on the seventh day, which day he blessed and sanctified. So we read, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Just as surely as God commanded that the seventh day of the week should be kept holy, so surely he commanded that the other six days should be regarded as working days. Not that people are obliged to work every hour, but that the first six days are days in which people may work without sin. What God has permitted no man has a right to forbid.

"The Sabbath was made for man." Man was made first; the Sabbath was made for his aid and protection. The Psalmist, speaking to the righteous in the time of trouble, says, "His truth shall be thy shield and buckler." Ps. 91:4. The Sabbath is the protector; not the thing to be protected. The Sabbath needs no laws for its protection. When a day which men call the Sabbath, is "protected," and men are coerced, then the day is put above the man. The Sabbath was made for man; but Sunday laws regard man as made for the Sunday. Such laws show a total lack of comprehension of what the Sabbath is, not simply as to the day of the Sabbath, but as to the principle of Sabbath observance. No man can injure the Sabbath of the Lord, sacred as it is, by working on it. The injury is to himself—to his own soul. The Sabbath is just as sacred, just as valid, as though it had not been trampled upon by millions of people. It does not need protection. It is not like a glass vase, but is the very principle of life. If professed Sabbath-keepers should ask for, or be able to secure, laws against Sabbath-breaking, they would show that they knew nothing of the true, life-giving character of God's holy day; and when men ask for laws to "protect" Sunday as a rest day, they show that it has not in itself any of the characteristics of the true Sabbath of the Lord.

The bill in question makes an exception in favor of "works of necessity and mercy, and work by those who religiously observe Saturday, if performed in such a way as not to involve and disturb others." It is strange that men think such provisions in a Sunday law to be evidences of liberality and breadth of mind. On the contrary, they are the very things which emphasize the wickedness and inquisitorial nature of the law. How can that be? Look at the matter for a moment. In the first place, the law provides for an inquisition concerning one of the Christian graces,—one of the fruits of the Spirit, mercy which distills as the gentle rain from heaven. Here is a man who is arrested for doing work on Sunday. He claims that it was an act of mercy; his accuser contends that it was not. It is the motive of the heart, rather than the act itself, that determines whether or not it was a merciful act. And so the court, in order to a perfect execu-

tion of the law, must take the place of God, to judge the thoughts and intents of the heart. You say, "They can't do that." Of course not; and that shows the wickedness and folly of a law which makes the attempt necessary.

Again, another man is acquitted, although he has also worked on Sunday, because it is decided that his work was a work of mercy. Yet the man may have been actuated by the basest and most selfish motives. How many professedly charitable deeds are performed by schemers, who are working only for gain to themselves. The apostle tells of some who suppose that gain is godliness; and it is very easy for a man to be deceived in that way. But a Sunday law usually provides that fallible men shall be judges of secret thoughts.

Those are exempted who "religiously observe Saturday." But who is to tell whether a man has observed the Sabbath religiously, or whether he has abstained from labor on that day because his surroundings are such that he can work to better advantage on Sunday? So we see that in order to carry out even the "liberal" provision of the law, a man's religious character must be the subject of judicial investigation. Let it therefore be understood that any Sunday law, consistently carried out, involves the revival of the Inquisition. Why cannot Protestants who decry Church establishment see that civil laws enjoining religious duties are the perfection of Church and State union? —*Present Truth, London, Eng.*

#### Priest and Publisher.

S. D. PHELAN is not only a priest, but the proprietor of the *Western Watchman*. As a priest he is a paragon of servility to the popish propaganda. As an editor he is an American man, an unawed advocate of freedom of the press. He will take his religion from Rome, but no ban from bishop or pope on his republican right of utterance. He recently promulgated the pernicious heresy that priests and ecclesiastics are subject to the States, to the civil statutes, the same as any one else. He maintained that the allegiance of American Catholics to our Government was paramount to their religious loyalty to the ghostly potentate at Rome. For this presumption Archbishop Kain ordered a condemnation of the *Western Watchman*. It was pronounced a paper unfit to circulate among Catholics. It was interdicted, like heretical publications in the Middle Ages. Its ecclesiastical condemnation was ordered to be read in every Catholic Church in the diocese. Rev. Phelan, still faithful as a priest, read the condemnation of his own paper to his own congregation. But the next day he entered his editorial empire and expressed himself thus:—

I own this paper. Now let me say to Archbishop Kain: No man owns me. He comes from an ex-slave State, and he knows what that means. No man owns me. I will go further and say, no man owns my pen. . . . Neither Archbishop Kain, nor all the bishops that assembled in Baltimore, have any authority to control the columns of the *Watchman*. . . . As long as I am editor I shall control this paper, and while expressing honest opinions in a respectful way, I shall never apologize for them at the point of a threat or the thrust of a censure. If the future is to be stormy for me, may it be bright for my fellow-priests, who will benefit by my suffering.

But for all this bravado the Rev. Mr. Phelan, in the columns of his paper April 15, publishes the following public apology and retraction:—

I, Rev. D. S. Phelan, editor of the *Western Watch-*

man, also of the *Sunday Watchman*, hereby publicly disavow every utterance which I have published or permitted to be published in said papers derogatory to the person, or sacred office, of any bishop of the church, and I hereby recall any reflection upon the most reverend administrator of this diocese which has appeared in the columns of those papers, and I promise to prevent any such publications in the future under my control. I also retract the false position assumed in the article entitled "Address of the Editor," and fully acknowledge the right given to bishops over papers that claim to be exponents of Catholic thought.

It appears that the Church of Rome is again triumphant in her determination that free speech shall be suppressed, and that Catholic editors are owned by their superiors.—*Ironclad Age*.

#### A Christian's Plea for Truth, Justice, and Freedom.

[The *Independent Pulpit*, of Waco, Texas, June, 1893, contained a reprint of a speech, by Rev. H. M. Curry, before the National University, of Lebanon, Ohio, which was called forth by an address advocating the prohibition of infidel literature by law. It is so replete with good sense, that I make some lengthy extracts for the AMERICAN SENTINEL, trusting that the editors will give it room, and so give others the benefit of the same, inasmuch as the principles equally apply to all religious laws enacted by the State.—H. F. PHELPS.]

THIS question involves the most sacred rights of man, and the most vital principles of human government. I take my stand upon the side of truth, justice and freedom. I am not an infidel; but suppose I were, would that subject my conscience to the dictates of other men? Would it take from me the inalienable rights to which I am born, and which are vouchsafed to me by all principles of government? So far as human legislation is concerned, I have a perfect right to worship any god or no god, just as my conscience might dictate. I have a perfect right to criticise or to question any creed, any religion, or any book, notwithstanding any claim that either may make to divine origin. If I should not believe the Bible I have a right to say so, and no one has a right to prohibit me from publishing to the world my reasons for not believing it.

This nation is not owned by a church, nor creed, nor any body of divinity. This is a purely secular Government, a Government for the people, without respect to shade of religious belief whatever. Let us forget, then, for a short time, that we are Methodists, or Baptists, or Presbyterians, or Catholics, and remember that we are men and women, American citizens, living under a constitutional Government, which declares that all men are created free and equal.

Thomas Paine, Voltaire, David Hume, Diderot, and many other illustrious men, were driven to renounce the Christian religion by the abominations of the so-called "Christian Church." The abuses of the name of the Christian religion have led more thinking men to question the truth of the Bible than all the infidel books ever published.

But the religious people are afraid the infidel will prove that the Bible is false, and destroy the Christian religion. Where is their faith in the divine authorship of the Bible? Where is their faith in the divine origin of the Christian religion? Where is their faith in God as the author and preserver of both Bible and religion, when they think that the infidel must be restrained by law from demolishing both? If those who profess Christianity and pretend to believe the Bible, would show their faith by their works, others would

have more respect for their profession and more confidence in the existence and character of God. True Christianity does not need any such protective tariff system for its preservation. The current commercial religion of the present day may need such protection, but I am sure that Bible religion does not. The evidences of the truth of the Bible are written far beyond the reach of infidels. They are written in the very framework of the universe; written in the earth and in the sky; written in the stones and in the stars; and closer still, written in the experience of millions of human hearts. If the Bible should be burned, and the ashes scattered to the winds, the heavens would still declare the glory of God, and the firmament would still show forth his handiwork. If men should hold their peace, the stones themselves would cry out.

Truth has never sought protection behind such legislation; neither has it ever sought to suppress error by law. It has always stood upon its own merit; and though sometimes crushed to earth, has risen again, and in the resurrection has shone forth more brilliant, more convincing, more powerful than ever. Jesus said, "I am the truth;" he also said, "I have overcome the world." Truth, then, has overcome the world; and the victory denies that this measure is for truth's protection. All the interests of the Christian religion, both for time and eternity, are centered in Christ; and he said, when brought before Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world." This was the greatest crisis, from a human standpoint that Christianity can ever be called upon to pass through. Look at the picture: Christ, the Founder, the Builder, the Prophet, the Priest, the King, the Hope, the Life of the Christian religion, stood arraigned before the judgment seat of the powers of darkness, to receive the sentence of death. If there is anything in the elements of this world that could contribute to the defence of his kingdom in any way whatever, it certainly would have been called into action by this time; and if in this most trying hour he had nothing to ask of the rulers of this world, we may safely conclude that there never can arrive a period when earthly governments will be required to defend his cause. Christianity is not of this world, in its origin, elements, provisions, protection, government, nor destiny. It is of heavenly birth, and by its own inherent power it shall accomplish its mission on earth.

The proposition is altogether impracticable. What court or tribunal would decide the infidelity of a literary production? Congress would have to create a Sanhedrim for this purpose, and the matter would naturally fall into the hands of the clergy. To favor one sect to the exclusion of all others would be acknowledging a State church, which is an impossibility in America, at least for the present. To form such a council of representatives of all sects and non-professing men would be creating a State authority in matters of religion, which is not only contrary to our Constitution, but would be trampling under foot the blood of our fathers, setting up a beast that would turn and rend us by devouring every principle of freedom we now enjoy. . . . The proposition calls for restriction of the liberties of the press, and it is to be objected to on that account. Our Constitution provides that Congress shall make no law whatever abridging the freedom of speech or of the

press; and with jealous care of what is almost universally regarded as a sacred right essential to the existence and perpetuity of a free government, a provision of similar import has been embodied in each of our State constitutions; and a constitutional principle is thereby established, which throws a shield of protection around the free expression of opinion in every part of our land. Does this oneness of sentiment of the great and good men who framed our Government argue nothing against this measure? They were men of the broadest experience, the ripest wisdom, the purest motive, and the profoundest statesmanship, and they with one accord declared that the press must be free. But we forget the experience, wisdom, and prudence of our fathers, and are carried into the merest religious sentimentalism.

This proposition is barefaced intolerance; and what could be more hateful to a Christian, more obnoxious to an American citizen, or more antagonistic to free government? Something occurs every day to remind me that the spirit of the Inquisition still slumbers in the breasts of the people. True it has ceased to burn alive, to saw asunder, to lash the back, to bore the tongue, to cut off the ears, to build dungeons and erect gallows; but it comes with the face of the lamb, and modestly, meekly, piously requests that the press be surrendered to its control—that the most sacred rights of man be laid at its feet. The spirit that would deny the infidel the freedom of the press, would forbid him the freedom of speech; as a last resort would burn him at the stake. The leading creeds of the world, whether Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or Mohammedan, have arrogated to themselves authority over the consciences of men and have taken upon themselves the herculean task of ridding the world of heresy, infidelity and all false worship; and in their vain attempts to accomplish their utopian whims, they have filled the earth with blood. The principles of this resolution are children from the womb of infidelity itself, cradled in superstition, nurtured in intolerance, and grown old in their father's business, and are calculated to raise up and dignify a religious aristocracy, to prostrate the rights of man, and eventually to repeat the dreadful scenes of persecution which in past ages have drenched the earth with human gore.

The gentleman who advocated this proposition from this stage had a great deal to say about a law for blasphemy. Concerning this allow me to relate an incident. The makers of the Presbyterian creed caused Servetus to be arrested for blasphemy. Calvin was his accuser. He was condemned to death by fire. He was bound to the stake, the fagots were lighted, and for awhile the wind carried the flames away from his body, so that he slowly roasted for hours. At last the flames climbed round his form; his murderers beheld through fire and smoke a white, heroic face. There they watched until the man became a charred and shriveled mass. Law against blasphemy banished liberty from Geneva, and there was nothing but religious intolerance left.

Hear another and then draw your conclusions. A few centuries ago a serene and noble man made his appearance in one of the Eastern countries. None had ever seen one like him before. He was wiser than Solomon, he was meeker than Moses, he was more patient than Job,

more faithful than Abraham, more loving than Jonathan, and more prayerful than David. When he was reviled he reviled not again, and no guile was found in his mouth. He was not in sympathy with the popular religion, so he was arrested and brought before the judgment-seat. The priests were his accusers. They testified, "We have heard him blaspheme;" and upon this charge he was put to death. This man was Jesus, the Founder of the Christian religion. What need we further witness to see that all laws defining and punishing blasphemy were passed by impudent bigots, and ought to be repealed by honest men.

Now, of the things spoken this is the sum. This measure is the embodiment of every evil, both civil and religious, that could possibly come upon the nation, and merits the contempt of every loyal citizen; so let every honest heart unite in willingness to "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

### The Breckinridge-Morse District Sunday Bill.

[At the hearing on the Breckinridge Sunday bill for the District of Columbia, held before the House Committee on the District, Jan. 6, 1891, Alonzo T. Jones, editor of this paper, addressed the committee. Much of his address is just as applicable to the Morse bill, which is now before the Commissioners and the District Committees. The following is taken from what was there said before the committee by Mr. Jones.]

THERE is enough virtue in Jesus Christ, and enough power in that virtue, to enable a man to do right in the face of all the opportunities and all the temptations to do wrong that there are in this world. That virtue and that power are freely given to every man who has faith in Him who brought it to the world. Why, then, do not these men, these professed ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ,—why do they not endeavor to cultivate in men that faith in Christ which will empower them to do right from the love of it, instead of coming up here to this capitol, and asking you gentlemen of the national legislature to help men to do what *they* think right by taking away the opportunity to do what *they* think to be wrong. Virtue can't be legislated into men.

But there is yet more of this. I read now from the same book (Craft's "Sabbath for Man"), page 428:—

Among other printed questions to which I have collected numerous answers, was this one: "Do you know of any instance where a Christian's refusing to do Sunday work, or Sunday trading, has resulted in his financial ruin?" Of the two hundred answers from persons representing all trades and professions, *not one is affirmative.*

Then what help do the people need? And especially what help do they need that Congress can afford? Wherein is anybody being "forced to labor on Sunday?" Where is there any danger of anybody's being forced to labor on Sunday? Ah, gentlemen, this effort is not in behalf of the laboring men. They do not need it. By Mr. Craft's own published documents it is demonstrated that they do not need any such help as is proposed in this bill. That claim is only a pretense under which those who are working for the bill would hide their real purpose. And just here I would answer a question that has been asked, in which there is conveyed a charge that we have no sympathy with the workingmen. It has been asked, "Why is it that you—the AMERICAN SENTINEL—have no words to say in favor of

the law to assure the workingman his Sunday rest, but instead oppose those who are in favor of it?" I answer, It is because we have more respect for the workingmen of this country than to think of them that they are so lacking in manliness, and have so little courage and ability to take care of themselves, that it is necessary for the Government to take charge of them, and nurse and coddle them like a set of grown-up babies. And therefore it is in the interest of manliness and courageous self-dependence that we object to the church managers coming to the national legislature to secure a law under such a plea as this, whose only effect would be to make grown-up babies of what should be manly men. We have respect for the laboring men in this matter, and we want them all to have the respect of their employers. Therefore we would ever encourage and help them to stand so courageously by their convictions of right and duty, as that to each one his employer may be led to say, as did this railroad superintendent to that engineer, "I respect your position, and you shall never be called on for Sunday work again."

Gentlemen of the committee, if evidence can prove anything, then the evidence which I have here read—not from an opponent, but from the chiefest factor in the movement in favor of this bill—proves to a demonstration that the object of this bill, as defined in the title, and as pleaded here to-day, is absolutely unnecessary and vain. This evidence proves to a demonstration that nobody in this District, nor in the United States, nor in the world around, is being forced to labor on Sunday. Not only this, but it demonstrates that there is not the slightest danger of anybody in this nation ever being forced to labor on Sunday; because actual "gain" and "worldly prosperity" lie in the refusal to work on Sunday, and it is certain that in this land everybody is free to refuse. This evidence also, coming from the source whence it does come, demonstrates that the title of the bill does not define its real object, but is only a pretense to cover that which is the real purpose—to secure and enforce by law the religious observance of the day.

Now, as to Sunday in the Constitution, will the gentleman who has just spoken on the opposite side, or will any of these gentlemen, insist that the phrase "Sundays excepted," in the Constitution, bears the same relation to the President as they by this bill, would make the Sunday bear to the people of the District of Columbia? Is there any inhibition in it? Is the President forbidden by it to perform any secular labor or business on that day? Cannot the President go a-fishing, or do anything on that day, and that, too, without any inhibition whatever by the Constitution? Does that phrase in the Constitution mean anything else than simply the recognition of the legal *dies non*? That is just what it is, and that is all that it is. And against this we have not a word to say in itself; but when it is proposed to take this mere legal no-day and stretch it into the creation of a precedent that will sanction an act of Congress prohibiting everybody from doing any manner of work, labor, or business pertaining to this world, on Sunday—then we most decidedly protest. If these men are ready to go so far as that in the construction and use of a mere non-committal phrase, what would they not do under the author-

ity of the specific words of a sweeping statute?

But Mr. Elliott—Rev. J. H.—says Sunday laws have been sustained as constitutional by the Supreme Courts of the States. True enough. But what does that amount to in a question as to the laws of Congress? I would like by some means, if possible, to get into the minds of these men who are supporting Sunday laws, the fact that the decisions of the Supreme Courts of the States have no bearing upon a national question. Let them bring a decision of a national case. There is no such case, and no such decision, for the simple reason that no such statute has ever been enacted by Congress, because it is forbidden by the Constitution. Therefore such a question has never come within the province of the United States Supreme Court. And every one of the decisions of the States, in reference to this question, have been rendered upon the basis of religion. Mr. Elliott—Rev. George—cited here to-day the decisions of the Supreme Courts of New York and Pennsylvania. I am glad he did, because both these decisions sustain the constitutionality of the Sunday laws upon the basis of *Christianity as the common law*, which clearly shows that *religion* is the basis upon which rest Sunday laws and the decisions which sustain them. All the original thirteen States were formerly the thirteen Colonies, and every one of these Colonies had an established religion, and therefore Sunday laws, as is proved by the old Maryland statute of 1723, cited here to-day, which is now the Sunday law of the District of Columbia. Thus the original thirteen States had Sunday laws, and this is how they got them. The younger States have followed these in Sunday legislation; and as the Supreme Courts of the original thirteen States have held such laws to be constitutional, the Supreme Courts of the younger States, from these, have held so also.

But the United States Government has no religion and never had any. It is forbidden in the Constitution. Therefore I say, We should like, if it were possible, to get these men to understand that though the Supreme Courts of the States have declared Sunday laws to be valid under the constitutions of those States, such decisions can have no bearing whatever upon Sunday laws under the Constitution of the United States.

MR. GROUT—Will you quote that part of the Constitution to which you refer?

MR. JONES—"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Congress can make no law upon the subject of religion without interfering with the free exercise thereof. Therefore the Seventh-day Adventists, while observing Saturday, would most strenuously oppose any legislation proposing to enforce the observance of that day. That would be an interference with the free exercise of our right to keep that day as the Sabbath. For we already have that right—

THE CHAIRMAN—Would this law take away your right to observe the Sabbath?

MR. JONES—Yes, sir. I was about to prove that it does interfere with the *free exercise* of our right to observe it; and having done that, I will prove that this bill does *distinctly contemplate* the taking away of the *right* to observe it.

First, as to its interference with the free exercise of our right to observe the Sab-

bath. I take it that no one here will deny that now, at least, we, as citizens of the United States, have the constitutional right to observe Saturday as the Sabbath, or not to observe it, as we please. This right we already have as citizens of the United States. As we already have it by the Constitution, their proposal to give it to us is only a concealed attempt to deprive us of it altogether. For if we consent to their right or their power to grant it, the power to grant carries with it the power to withhold. In consenting to the one we consent to the other. And as the granting of it is, as I shall prove, for a purpose, and for a price, the withdrawing of it will surely follow just as soon as the purpose of it is accomplished, and especially if the price of it is not fully and promptly paid.

Now this bill positively requires that whosoever does not observe Sunday shall "conscientiously believe in and observe" another day of the week. We do not keep Sunday. The bill does, therefore, distinctly require that we shall conscientiously believe in and observe another day. We maintain that we have the constitutional right to rest on Saturday or any other day, whether we do it conscientiously or not, or whether we conscientiously believe in it or not. Haven't we? Congress has no constitutional power or right to require anybody to "conscientiously believe in" anything, or to "conscientiously observe" anything.

But when it is required, as is proposed in this bill, who is to decide whether we conscientiously believe in it or not? Who is to decide whether the observance is conscientious or not? That has already been declared in those State Sunday laws and decisions which have been referred to here to-day as examples for you to follow. It is that the burden of proof rests upon him who makes the claim of conscience, and the proof must be such as will satisfy the court. Thus this bill does propose to subject to the control of courts and juries our conscientious convictions, our conscientious beliefs, and our conscientious observances. Under this law, therefore, we would no longer be free to keep the Sabbath according to the dictates of our own consciences, but could keep it only according to the dictates of the courts. Gentlemen, it is not enough to say that that would be an interference with the free exercise of our right to keep the Sabbath; it would be an absolute subversion of our right so to do.

Nor is it for ourselves only that we plead. We are not the only ones who will be affected by this law. It is not our rights of conscience only that will be subverted, but the rights of conscience of everybody—of those who keep Sunday as well as those who keep Saturday—of those who are in favor of the law as well as those of us who oppose the law. When the law requires that those who do not observe Sunday shall conscientiously believe in and observe another day, by that it is conclusively shown that it is the conscientious belief in, and observance of, Sunday itself that is required and enforced by this law. That is, the law requires that everybody shall conscientiously believe in and observe some day. But every man has the constitutional right to conscientiously believe in and observe a day or not as he pleases. He has just as much right not to do it as he has to do it. And the legislature invades the freedom of religious worship when it assumes the

power to compel a man conscientiously or religiously to do that which he has the right to omit if he pleases. The principle is the same, whether the act compels us to do that which we wish to do, or whether it compels us to do that which we do not wish to do. The compulsory power does not exist in either case. In either case the State assumes control of the rights of conscience; and the freedom of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience is gone, and thenceforth all are required to worship according to the dictates of the State.

Therefore, in opposing this bill, and all similar measures, we are advocating the rights of conscience of all the people. We are not only pleading for our own right to keep the Sabbath according to the dictates of our own consciences, but we are also pleading for their right to keep Sunday according to the dictates of their own consciences. We are not only pleading that we, but that they also, in conscientious beliefs and observances, may be free from the interference and dictation of the State. And in so pleading we are only asserting the doctrine of the national Constitution. In the history of the formation of the Constitution, Mr. Bancroft says that the American Constitution "withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul." Let the American Constitution be respected.

Now to the point that this bill, through its promoters, does distinctly contemplate the taking away of the right to observe the Sabbath. I read from the bill the exemption that is proposed:—

This act shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday, as a day of rest.

Now why is that clause put in the bill? The intention of the law-maker is the law. If, therefore, we can find out why this was inserted, we can know what the object of it is. During the past year Mr. Crafts has advertised all over this country, from Boston to San Francisco, and back again, and has repeated it to this committee this morning, that the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists are the strongest opponents of Sunday laws that there are in this country, and that they are doing more than all others combined to destroy respect for Sunday observance. All this, and yet these are the very persons whom he proposes to exempt from the provisions of the law, which is expressly to secure the observance of Sunday! Why, then, does he propose to exempt these? Is it out of respect for them, or a desire to help them in their good work?—Certainly not. *It is hoped by this to check their opposition until Congress is committed to the legislation.*

How do we know this?—We know it by their own words. The lady who spoke here this morning as the representative of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union—Mrs. Catlin—said in this city, "We have given them an exemption clause, and that, we think, will take the wind out of their sails." Well, if our sails were dependent upon legislative enactments, and must needs be trimmed to political breezes, such a squall as this might take the wind out of them. But so long as they are dependent alone upon the power of God, wafted by the gentle influences of the grace of Jesus Christ, such squalls become

only prospering gales to speed us on our way.

By this, gentlemen, you see just what is the object of that proposed exemption—that it is only to check our opposition, until they secure the enactment of the law, and that they may do this the easier. Then when Congress shall have been committed to the legislation, it can repeal the exemption upon demand, and then the advocates of the Sunday law will have exactly what they want. I am not talking at random here. I have the proofs of what I am saying. They expect a return for this exemption. It is not extended as a guaranteed right, but as a favor that we can have if we will only pay them their own stated price for it. As a proof of this I read again from Mr. Crafts' book, page 262:—

The tendency of legislatures and executive officers toward those who claim to keep a Saturday-Sabbath is to over-leniency rather than to over-strictness.

And in the convention held in this city Jan. 30, 31, 1890, Mr. Crafts said that this exemption is "generous to a fault," and that "if there is any fault in this bill it is its being too generous" to the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists. But I read on:—

For instance, the laws of Rhode Island allow the Seventh-day Baptists, by special exception, to carry on public industries on the first day of the week in Hopkinton and Westerly, in each of which places they form about one-fourth of the population. This local-option method of Sabbath legislation after the fashion of Rhode Island or Louisiana, if generally adopted, would make not only each State, but the nation also, a town heap, some places having two half Sabbaths, as at Westerly, some having no Sabbath at all, as at New Orleans, to the great confusion and injury of interstate commerce and even of local industry. *Infinitely less harm* is done by the usual policy, *the only constitutional or sensible one*, to let the insignificantly small minority of less than one in a hundred, whose religious convictions require them to rest on Saturday (unless their work is of a private character such as the law allows them to do on Sunday), *suffer the loss of one day's wages* rather than have the other ninety-nine suffer by the wrecking of their Sabbath by the public business.

Why, then, do they offer this "special exception"? Why do they voluntarily do that which they themselves pronounce neither constitutional nor sensible?—It is for a purpose.

Again I read, and here is the point to which I wish especially to call the attention of the committee. It shows that they intend we shall pay for the exemption which they so over-generously offer:—

Instead of reciprocating the generosity shown toward them by the makers of Sabbath laws, these Seventh-day Christians expend a very large part of their energy in antagonizing such laws, seeking, by the free distribution of tracts and papers, to secure their repeal or neglect.

Exactly! That is the price which we are expected to pay for this generous exemption. We are to stop the distribution of tracts and papers which antagonize Sunday laws. We are to stop spending our energy in opposition to their efforts to promote Sunday observance. We are to stop telling the people that the Bible says "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and that Sunday is not the Sabbath.

But have we not the right to teach the people that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," even as the Bible says, and that only the keeping of that day is the keeping of the Sabbath according to the commandment? Have we not the right to do this? Have we not the right to tell the people that there is no scriptural authority for keeping Sunday, the first day of the week? Why, some of these gentlemen themselves say that. Mr. El-

liott here—Rev. George—confesses “the complete silence of the New Testament, so far as any explicit command for the Sabbath, or definite rules for its observance, are concerned.” Many others speak to the same effect. Have we not as much right to tell this to the people as they have? They do not agree among themselves upon the obligations of Sabbath-keeping, nor upon the basis of Sunday laws. In every one of their conventions one speaks one way and another in another and contradictory way. Have we not as much right to disagree with them as they have to disagree with one another? Why is it, then, that they want to stop our speaking these things, unless it is that we tell the truth?

More than this, have we not the constitutional right freely to speak all this, and also freely to distribute tracts and papers in opposition to Sunday laws and Sunday sacredness? Does not the Constitution declare that “the freedom of speech, or of the press,” shall not be abridged? Then when these men propose that we shall render such a return for that exemption, they do propose an invasion of the constitutional guarantee of the freedom of speech and of the press. Why, gentlemen, this question of Sunday laws is a good deal larger question than half the people ever dreamed of.

**Was It Prophetic?**

ABOUT sixty years ago Alexander Campbell, editor of the *Millennial Harbinger*, a man of extraordinary acuteness of intellect, and who seemed to see into the far future almost with the eye of an inspired prophet, put upon record the following words:—

Were I to be asked what is the darkest and most ominous cloud in our national heavens, unhesitatingly I would answer: “Slavery as now established by law.”

Again, were I asked for the next most inauspicious and portentous cloud in our political horizon, I must, with equal promptitude, reply: “The rapid growth of a popish empire in the bosom of a republic.”

Podoxy is naturally, essentially and necessarily despotic, cruel, and implacable. It constitutionally claims a sovereignty over, not only the secular sword, but over everything on earth; thought, language, action, spirit, soul, body, and estate. It regards itself as the heir of all earthly things, and by a right divine, and irrevocable, the only earthly king of kings and lord of lords. Its motto is: “The empire of the globe or nothing.” The law of gravity will cease to act sooner than this superstition sleep on this side of absolute dominion.

It cannot be the guest in any land; it must be the host. It claims to be the church, the only church in which there is salvation; and that, as Jesus Christ is in heaven head over all things for the church, so his vicar of Rome is to be—*jure divino*—the head over all earthly things for the sake of the church, in which alone salvation can be found.

It cannot be cured; man cannot wash the Ethiopian white nor change the leopard's spotted skin.

While popery lives, it must reign. It is the soul, the soul, the very life of the system, and take away from it these attributes and nothing remains.

The words of those extracts are not the words of fanatics or enthusiasts or alarmists who cry “wolf, wolf” where there is no wolf; but of a highly enlightened judicial and thoughtful man, who, as a true watchman on the ramparts of Americanism and Protestantism, sounded the warning signal of the approach of the foe coming over the distant hills and plains. What a clear-sighted seer he was! How plainly this horoscopic sketch through that long stretch of years is defined to our eyes in our country's more recent history—of the coming foes, come, and laying close siege to the citadel of American liberty!—*Christian Leader*.

**Apples of Gold**  
ENVELOPE SERIES  
**Library**

THIS is the title of a little monthly publication recently started by the Pacific Press, and is designed especially for use in personal correspondence. It is printed on thin paper, and one or two numbers can be put in a No. 6 envelope, with an ordinary letter, without increasing the postage.

The following numbers have already been issued:—

- No. 1. Looking unto Jesus.
- “ 2. The Christian's Privilege.
- “ 3. The Sure Promises of God.
- “ 4. How to Get Knowledge.
- “ 5. The Church and the World. (Poetry.)
- “ 6. The Elect of God.
- “ 7. How Esther Read Her Bible.
- “ 8. The Thief on the Cross.
- “ 9. The Eleventh Hour.
- “ 10. Benefits of Bible Study.
- “ 11. Righteousness; Where Is It to be Found?

Five copies for one year, postpaid, 50 cents; or 12 copies for \$1.00. Single subscriptions are not desirable, for two reasons: (1) The numbers being so small they are liable to be lost in the mails. (2) If they are used in correspondence, as recommended, more than one copy would be necessary.

Single or assorted numbers of the *Library* will be mailed in quantities at the following rates: 50 cents per hundred, or \$4.00 per thousand copies. Always order by the NUMBER.

**The Law of God as Changed by the Papacy**

Is the title of a large Chart just issued, which shows in a striking manner the blasphemous pretensions of the Papal power. The testimony of the *Best Catholic Authorities* is given, and shows, by quoting their own words, that Sunday is a child of the Catholic Church. These quotations, together with admissions from standard Catholic works, are arranged in parallel columns on either side of this Chart, while the center column contains the Ten Commandments as taught by the Catholic Church. The whole forms a collection of extracts of incalculable value for every Bible student.

The Charts are three by four feet in size, and are printed on heavy map cloth in bold type, easily read across the largest room.

Price, Post-paid, \$1.00.

A fac-simile edition on thin paper, size 5½ x 7½ inches, suitable for missionary distribution, has been prepared, and will be sent post-paid at 50 cents per hundred, or \$4.00 per thousand.

**STEPS TO CHRIST,**

By Mrs. E. G. White.

We take pleasure in announcing an important and exceedingly helpful work, under the title of STEPS TO CHRIST. The rare ability of the author in the presentation of Scripture truth has never been used to better advantage than in this little work. STEPS TO CHRIST is not alone suitable as a guide to the inquirer and young convert, but is rich in thought and suggestion for the most mature Christian. Some idea of its scope and practical character may be gathered from the following table of contents:—

THE SINNER'S NEED OF CHRIST.	REPENTANCE.
CONFESSION. CONSECRATION. FAITH AND ACCEPTANCE.	
THE TEST OF DISCIPLESHIP.	GROWING UP INTO CHRIST.
THE WORK AND THE LIFE.	KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.
THE PRIVILEGE OF PRAYER.	WHAT TO DO WITH DOUBT.
REJOICING IN THE LORD.	

The book is issued in a rich, neat cloth binding, embossed in silver, at 75 cents per copy; in white vellum cloth, silver edges, \$1.00. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address Pacific Press,  
43 Bond Street, New York City.  
or Oakland, Cal.

**PRISON LIGHT** Edited by one sending the Third Angel's Message to the perishing in prisons all over the land. Agents wanted. 50 per cent. commission. Trial year 20 cents. Terms and sample copy 2 cent stamp. Indorsed by the SENTINEL. PRISON LIGHT, 40 Green Street, Brattleboro, Vt.

**PUBLICATIONS ON THE SABBATH QUESTION.**

READ the following and see if there is not some publication among them which you desire to read, or which will benefit some friend:—

**The Abiding Sabbath.** By A. T. JONES. No. 9 of the *Bible Students' Library*. This is a review of two Sabbath “prize essays,” one of \$500, and one of \$1,000. It contains mighty arguments on the Sabbath question; 174 pages; price, 15 cents.

**Is Sunday the Sabbath?** No. 24 of the *Library*. A brief consideration of New Testament texts on the first day of the week; 8 pages; price, 1 cent.

**Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment.** By J. H. Waggoner. No. 54 of the *Library*. Clear and strong in argument; price, 10 cents.

**Sunday; Origin of its Observance in the Christian Church.** By E. J. Waggoner. No. 80 of the *Library*. The testimony given with reference to Sunday is wholly Protestant. All Protestants should read it; price, 15 cents.

**Who Changed the Sabbath?** No. 107 of the *Library*. What God's Word predicted; what Christ says; what the papacy says; what Protestants say. A most convincing document; 24 pages; price, 3 cents.

**“The Christian Sabbath.”** No. 113 of the *Library*. A reprint of four articles in the *Catholic Mirror*, the organ of Cardinal Gibbons. What Catholics have to say to Protestants on the subject; 32 pages; price, 4 cents.

**Christ and the Sabbath.** By Prof. W. W. Prescott. The spiritual nature of the Sabbath, what true Sabbath keeping is, and the relation of Christ to the Sabbath in both creation and redemption. A most important tract. No. 14 of the *Religious Liberty Library*; 38 pages; price, 5 cents.

**The History of the Sabbath.** By John N. Andrews. A complete history of the Sabbath and first day of the week in religious life and thought, from the earliest ages to the present time, and especially during the Christian dispensation; 550 large octavo pages; price, cloth, \$2.00; library binding, \$2.50.

**THE POCKET ATLAS OF THE WORLD**

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

Any of the above may be obtained post free on receipt of price by addressing Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal.; 18 W. Fifth Street, Kansas City, Mo.; 43 Bond Street, New York City. Works on all phases of Bible truth. Send for catalogue.

**A NEW DEPARTURE.**

Through Palace Cars to the Pacific Coast.

The West Shore Railroad in connection with the Nickel Plate and Rock Island routes have established a through Tourist Car Line, making weekly trips to California at extraordinary low rates.

These excursions are under the personal supervision of Mr. A. Phillips, who has had several years' experience in the tourist business, and he or his representative accompanies each excursion *en route*.

For detailed information apply to any ticket agent of the West Shore Railroad.

**THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES,**

A SIXTEEN-PAGE

Weekly Religious Journal.

Doctrinal, Practical, Earnest,  
Protestant, Scriptural, Christian.

This really two dollar paper will be furnished at the following

PRICES OF SUBSCRIPTION:

Single Copy, One Year, Post-paid,	\$1.50
Single Copy, Six Months, Post-paid,	.75
In Clubs of Ten or More to One Address, Post-paid,	1.25
To Foreign Countries in Postal Union, Post-paid,	(\$2) 8s.

Address, *Signs of the Times,*

12TH AND CASTRO STREETS,

OAKLAND, CAL., U. S. A.



NEW YORK, MAY 10, 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 resumption of the articles on Roman Catholicism, which have been discontinued for a time that those who desired them might send their orders for those issues, may be expected soon. Those who wish to have this valuable series of articles should send in their orders now, immediately.

THE *Union Signal*, of April 26, says—

The saloon men of Minneapolis have joined the ranks of the most radical supporters of Sabbath observance. Because they are compelled to close their own places of business on Sunday, they declare that theaters and other places of amusement shall do likewise. They would even stop the street cars if that were possible. On the principle of "set a thief to catch a thief," it is possible they may have better success than the reformers they are trying to retaliate upon. Let the good work go on.

So this is the *Union Signal's* definition of a "good work"!

AMONG the suggestive signs of the hour is the appearance of a strange infatuation, of which the European dispatches make this mention:—

The recent sacrilegious thefts in Paris, including that at Notre Dame the other day, have been traced to the sect known as Luciferians, or worshipers of the devil. Their headquarters are near Fribourg, Switzerland, but a large branch live in Paris. They have a liturgy which is a parody of the mass. The consecrated elements are either stolen from churches or received in communion by female adherents. A service of profanation then takes place, which is known as black mass. Mgr. Faya, Bishop of Grenoble, has issued a circular to the clergy, ordering special vigilance, as the Luciferians abstract the hosts from village churches in lonely districts without stealing the ciboriums and monstrances in which the sacrament is contained. At the Ministry of Public Worship the subject has been discussed, and instructions have been given to the Prefect of Police to increase his surveillance of the churches of Paris.

Religious delusion and fanaticism is increasing on every hand. The leaders of the so-called "Army of the Commonweal," in this country, are making pretensions to supernatural possession, and claiming to be reincarnations, under such circumstances that no man can forecast what may be the result, or what moment the utter unreason of devil-born religious mania may not seize them and their followers.

THIS item comes, most remarkably, from the *Mail and Express*, unless perhaps it may be that it is in earnest:—

HOW BROWNE MIGHT BE PUNISHED.

The *Mail and Express* Bureau,  
Washington, D. C., May 2.

Chief Clerk McKinney, of the United States Supreme Court, this afternoon unearthed one of the old Blue Laws of Maryland, which is still in force in the

District of Columbia, under which Carl Browne can be punished for his blasphemous pretensions of being the reincarnation of Christ.

The law provides that for the first offense the offender shall have his tongue bored through and pay a fine of £20, or suffer six months' imprisonment. For the second offense he shall be branded on the forehead with the letter B and pay £40 or suffer imprisonment for one year. For the third offense he shall suffer death without the benefit of the clergy.

In 1887 Mr. Phelps, then acting United States attorney general, gave an opinion that this law was still in force, and there has been no repealing enactment since.

In the last issue of the SENTINEL, extracts from this law were reprinted in the article entitled "Breckinridge—Morse Sunday Bill." It will be noticed there that a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia declared that six years previous a man had been tried under that law in the District. There is the law then, and precedent is not wanting for the application of at least a portion of it.

THE *National Baptist*, at the close of an article on the "Christian Amendment" to the Constitution, expresses itself in this language:—

We have seen Christianity make its way in spite of obstacles and menaces and persecutions; now we are afraid that it cannot continue to exist without a great deal of legal help. Christianity has asserted itself against the dominion of Nero, of Louis XIV., of the Inquisition. It will still conquer, and it will not allow itself to be indebted to the legal power for the triumphs which it will win.

Part of the last sentence of this is especially worthy of notice and of remembrance,—“It will not allow itself to be indebted to the legal power for the triumphs which it will win.” This is truth. The fact that it is so, even if there were no other reason to offer, would make all attempts by the civil law to enforce, support, or promote religion, utterly futile, and therefore entirely uncalled for.

IN its issue of November 23, 1893, this was said in the SENTINEL:—

There are no more worlds to conquer. For generations the hives of Central Asia and Central Europe had swarmed and swept on to the westward. The Atlantic met them. They bridged it with ships. A new world was found. That too is occupied. They go to and fro but find no more worlds to conquer.

As these advancing human tides turned back upon themselves when they first came to the impassable sea, so now, as they meet the Pacific boundaries of emigration and encounter the reverse current from the Orient, they turn again. There is no new world beyond. Neither is there any possibility of stemming the flood, either from the east or the west. Here the conflict will be.

It is the showing of history that at comparatively regular periods, as the generations have reached their majority, vast and seemingly inexplicable movements of human hordes have been organized and have never rested in their aimless march, until dissipated by destruction or by being swallowed up in new and unoccupied lands or absorbed by alien peoples. The present march of the "Army of the Commonweal" may well be another of these great world movements, but if it be the beginnings of

such it will prove of greater moment than the devastating incursion of the Huns across the then known world, or of the return march of the crusaders. Present social conditions do not so readily admit of a final advantageous outcome of such things, as then. The commonwealers will find no new worlds to conquer. It is beyond their power to renovate the old. What will be the result?

THE Rev. Joshua Stansfield, of Port Huron, Mich., has discussed in his pulpit the question of "State Religions and the Public Schools." The *Daily Times*, of Port Huron, publishes his address. He summarizes his charges against Roman Catholicism thus:—

And now to sum up. We charge in a word against this foreign system:—

1. That the supreme sovereignty of the pope is obstinately opposed to the sovereignty of the people.
2. That as a supreme pontiff in both spiritual and temporal things, the pope demands the allegiance of every Roman Catholic to him, instead of to the laws and Constitution of the land.
3. We see that all Romanists who seek citizenship in this country do not cease allegiance to that foreign potentate at Rome, although they swear to do so in order to receive the rights and benefits of American citizenship.
4. Romanism teaches and practices religious intolerance instead of religious liberty, which the Constitution of our country so clearly calls for.
5. The Romish Church is stoutly opposed to the freedom of speech and of the press, claiming a divine right of censorship of all ideas in both speech and letters.
6. We find from her own utterances that the papal church is unanimously in favor of the union of Church and State, whereas our Constitution demands entire separation.
7. The Romish Church is determinedly opposed to our public school system, and her avowed purpose is to break it down.

Rev. Mr. Stansfield is a Methodist, and of late years the Methodists have been particularly prominent in this country in the enforcement and attempted enforcement of religious laws, by which they have taught and practised "religious intolerance instead of religious liberty, which the Constitution of our country so clearly calls for." Again, the Methodist Church expressed itself unanimously in favor of the action of Congress to close the World's Fair on Sunday, and Justice Brewer's decision that "this is a Christian nation,"—which things virtually created a union of Church and State in this country; therefore, the Methodist Church is "unanimously in favor of a union of Church and State, whereas our Constitution demands entire separation." There is evidently room for Rev. Joshua Stansfield to turn his guns upon the Methodist Church as well as the Roman Catholic. Will he do so? If he should not, what will it prove?

#### 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.