



"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."

VOLUM 9.

NEW YORK, MAY 17, 1894.

NUMBER 20.

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. MCKER.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is Christian, Protestant, and American.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is therefore uncompromisingly and everlastingly opposed to every element of the papacy from beginning to end.

HOWEVER, from a survey of all the field of the operation of the papacy, which is only political and worldly, we have found, and our readers must have seen, what an immense disadvantage it is, under which any form of opposition must be carried on which is in any way political or according to worldly methods.

TO-DAY, every conceivable political or worldly advantage is with the papacy. So entirely is this so that those very provisions of the United States Constitution, which were intended to be an everlasting barrier against any encroachment of religion upon the Government, and against any recognition of any religion by the Government,—these very provisions are now taken advantage of by the papacy to crowd herself upon the Government and to take possession of it for her own purposes.

THE Constitution of the United States declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or position of trust under the Government." The papacy takes advantage of this to get her agents into every office or position of trust that is possible, and then uses all the opportunities of that office or position to favor the papacy and to give her fuller hold upon the Government. And just as soon as any exposure of it is made she raises the cry of "persecution" and of "bringing religion into politics!" And as certainly as any opposition is attempted she denounces it as "a violation of the Constitution" by making "a religious test" a qualification for office!

AGAIN, the Constitution says that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The papacy takes advantage of this also to do whatever she pleases to crowd herself upon the Government in every possible way, knowing that she can never be interfered with because "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion!" And when any attempt is made on the part of anybody to interfere with her schemes, she raises the cry of "violation of the Constitution," and "attacking religious liberty." Thus the very provisions of the Constitution, which were intended to protect the country and people from the domination of religion and Rome, are made the shelter under which Rome and her religion shall be made to dominate the country and people.

THIS is the grand discovery that Leo XIII. has made with reference to the Constitution of the United States. And this is one grand reason why Leo commands all Catholics in the United States to bear in one hand the Catholic Bible and in the other the Constitution of the United States as they "go forward" on their great mission to bring their "country into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness"—the Church of Rome. This is why Leo has such great love for the American Constitution—it prohibits any political or governmental interference with his mischievous and unconstitutional schemes. And professed Protestants have set the example of these encroachments of religion and the Church upon the Government, and have actually joined hands with the papacy in the accomplishment of some of them. Having thus betrayed the Government to the papacy, they have robbed themselves of all power of protest, and have greatly increased the already great advantage of the papacy.

THE secret of this great advantage that the papacy holds is that peculiar "policy" by which she can so fully and constantly "cause craft to prosper" in her hand. She is such a perfect mistress of every kind of deceitful invention that there is no kind of human working that can successfully contend with her. To attempt

to oppose her by any kind of crafty method, is not only to be so far just like her, but at the last to find yourself so far outdone in craftiness as to be made ashamed that you ever tried it. To attempt opposition to her *now* by any political or governmental method, even though it be right, is to find yourself at such an immense disadvantage as to make all such effort practically useless. And what is the use of putting forth strenuous efforts when every evidence demonstrates that they are only in vain. It is only exhausting yourself for nothing.

So we are brought again to the question, What shall be done? Shall we sit still and do nothing?—No, no. We are to be more active, and do more than ever before. How then shall it be done?—There is one way to do it, and only one. *That is* with the Word of God, the everlasting gospel. This method gives to him who employs it *every* advantage of position and of power over the papacy and all her workings. It gives every advantage in *position*, because the papacy knows nothing of the gospel, and in contending with him who uses that method only she is all at sea. It gives every advantage in *power*, because the gospel itself is the power of God, and in contending with him who depends upon the power of God and is allied to it only, the papacy is impotent. This is the true Christian way, this is the true Protestant way, to oppose the papacy; and in this way there is no such thing as defeat or failure; for what seems to be failure is victory, and what appears to be defeat is triumph. This has been clearly and abundantly proved in history. This is true of the time of Luther and the rise of Protestantism. So long as Protestants held faithfully to the gospel alone and depended only upon its power, the papacy which then possessed all the power of Europe, was powerless before them. Martin Luther, the chief and leader of the opposition to the papacy in that day, was personally attacked with all the power, cunning, and craft, of the papacy; by the published decree of the emperor in behalf of "holy church," he was outlawed in all Europe, and everybody was commanded, under penalty of treason, to take him and deliver him up, and receive the

reward due to so good a work. Yet for all this the papacy was unable ever to lay a hand on him or do him harm, and he died at last peaceably and in his bed an everlasting victor over all the power of the papacy; and, living and dying, a proof to all the world of what a man can do in opposition to the papacy who depends upon the gospel alone and allied to the power of God only. And so long as Protestantism was faithful in its allegiance to the gospel and the power of God only, so long the tide of the Reformation swept irresistibly onward. But the moment this allegiance was slackened, this tide was checked; and as this allegiance has lessened the tide was reversed. And now that this allegiance of professed Protestantism has wholly ceased and papal principles and methods only are recognized or employed, the papacy once more overflows and possesses all the power of earth. But the gospel has not ceased. The Word of God is not bound. The power of God is not slack toward those who believe. The everlasting gospel abides, and is to be preached with the attendance of the power of God in such measure as the world has never seen, and which is to accomplish indeed what Luther longed to see—the complete overthrow and engulfing of the papacy and all her abominations.

THIS is the way, and the only way, of assured and complete success in opposing the papacy to-day. This is the way that the AMERICAN SENTINEL takes and which it is going to follow to the end. This is the way of true Christianity. This is the way of true Protestantism, and we want everybody to go this way. Come with us, and we will do thee good, for God has promised victory over the beast and over his image, and a song of triumph to all who take this way. A. T. J.

Note the Contrast and the Harmony.

THE following, from the Newark *Catholic Register*, if it suggests a contrast, also marks notably the harmony of action among Roman Catholics and so-called Protestant denominations. The *Register* says:—

A Methodist clergyman of Newark, in his usual Sunday evening discourse to his people last Sunday, took occasion to state that the lately elected mayor of the city is of his creed, and, incidentally, to express a hope of good government on that account. In which there was certainly no great harm, and probably no harm at all.

At the Congregationalist Conference a few days later, Rev. Mr. Scudder, of Jersey City, spoke in favor of developing still further the attractive and entertaining features of church membership, and in particular mentioned military drills for the young as one to be encouraged. A very good idea, say we, not only innocuous, but positively beneficial and useful.

Not a priest in the diocese of Newark will say from his altar next Sunday that the Methodists are mixing their religion and politics, nor that the Congregationalists are arming to overthrow the Republic. Yet every Roman Catholic elected to office serves certain pulpits as a welcome illustration of the dangerous political power of Rome, and should his election be mentioned by a priest to his people, the fact would be proclaimed throughout the land as conclusive evidence of evil designs on the part of the pope. This very Mr. Scudder was engaged a short time ago in a controversy with Rev. Hugh P. Fleming, of Orange, which controversy grew out of some other minister's attack upon the Catholic Church, in the course of which the drilling at Seton Hall College was denounced as preparation for waging war upon the commonwealth at the order of the pope. That minister will not say a word against the young Congregationalists' arming and drilling, of course, but neither will any priest say a word in opposition to the suggestion. As no man knows how soon skill in arms may be needed by the sons of the Republic, none but its enemies or the insane would decri military training.

The contrast between the dignified bearing of our Catholic priests towards those who differ with them on religion and the little fellows who are forever seeking an opportunity to howl about Roman Catholic ascendancy, is made to appear very plain by such happenings as the aforesaid. It is one of the things that goes to show that ours is the church of charity, the true Church of God.

The contrast is very clear. The point made is a good one, and undeniable. Why is it that not a priest raises his voice to accuse the different denominations of ulterior motives in this reprehensible military organization of the youth in the Sunday schools? It is because the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church know that these Protestant organizers are ignorantly forwarding a great Roman Catholic propaganda,—that they are, unawares, working in harmony with those whom they ignorantly think they oppose. The motives are in perfect harmony; the contrast is in the fact that the one is intelligently doing what the other is ignorantly assisting to further. W. H. M.

Is Japan Dealing Fairly?

THE silver wedding of the emperor was observed with due ceremony and eclat, on the ninth of March, notwithstanding the unfavorable condition of the weather. When the emperor rode out to review the troops the empress rode in the same carriage with him. This is the second time in the history of the nation when such a thing has been done. The first-time was on the promulgation of the constitution. It is to be presumed that in both instances the act was intended to show to the outside world the adoption of foreign usages by the court, and to exhibit the advance made by Japan in the civilization of the nineteenth century. The act calls our attention to the constitution, and to a recent incident which may perhaps indicate the real value of at least one portion of that document. The twenty-eighth article reads as follows:—

Japanese subjects shall, *within limits not prejudicial to peace or order, and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects*, enjoy freedom of religious belief.

The Christian world has spoken very favorably of this article of the constitution, and has inferred and hoped very much from it. When looked at closely, especially the part I have italicized, it will be seen that the "freedom" may very easily be set aside by "the powers that be." It would not be difficult to insist on kinds of obedience that would instantly take away and utterly destroy all freedom of religious belief.

The incident that illustrates the present working and value of this article, number twenty-eight of the constitution, is this: A verbal command has recently gone out from "A Prince of the Blood," who is the commanding officer of the chief and related garrisons in a certain part of Japan, that all the soldiers who are Christians must give up their Christianity. In one of the garrisons a dozen or so of the rank and file, and a few officers, are Christians. The men have decided that they must perforce obey the order as to outward appearance, hence half a dozen of them have already asked that their names be erased from the church register. The remaining half-dozen will do the same very shortly. They did not make the request in a body, I am told, lest the few Christians remaining in the church should be too much disheartened and the church broken up. The men affirm that they have no intention of giving up their faith, but they

feel constrained to give up the open profession of their religion. In another of the garrisons all the Christians, with the exception of one who is at present resolute in holding out for his right to religious liberty under the constitution, have asked to have their names erased from the church register.

No one has heard that the Shinto and Buddhist soldiers have been ordered to give up their religion. The discrimination is solely against the Christians. The verbal command required secrecy as well as apostasy, but in the nature of the case it was rather difficult to enforce the former. The Japanese pastors whose work is directly affected by this despotic command are deeply stirred by it, and it is probable that they will make it public through the press. This is certainly the most flagrant act of tyranny that I have heard of for some time, although acts of a kindred nature have been altogether too common since, as well as before, the promulgation of the constitution.

On inquiry I find that it is practically in the power of heads of departments to exercise a good deal of tyranny in this and in other matters, too. It is generally understood that students in the government normal schools, and in fact, all persons in government service, are forbidden to have any thing to do with politics or political assemblies; but I am not aware of any such public prohibition in religious matters. As the case now stands, it seems that if the principal of a school happens to be a Christian, or friendly to Christianity, the students are at liberty to attend Christian services, or to become professing Christians; otherwise their liberty is taken from them. The same is true of the common schools where there is a head and under teachers. If the principal is opposed to Christianity, the under teachers are given to understand that they are to have nothing to do with it. If they refuse to obey, their services are soon dispensed with, *but never because they are Christians!* I am told that the same is true of the teachers—who are nearly always men—and the school children they have to teach. If the teacher is antichristian, the scholars are notified that they must let Christianity alone. If they disobey, school life is made very uncomfortable for them. This accounts very largely for the difficulty experienced in reaching the children. Sunday-schools do not flourish. The reasons given to the children by antichristian teachers is that Christianity is a foreign religion, and that it is antagonistic to the best interests of the country. The children accept the statement as true—as a matter of course—and then tell what they have learned to their parents, who in turn become more difficult to reach. This accounts, in part at least, for the present and very general lack of interest among the people in Christian preaching.

I am told that the chief of any and all departments, military, civil, legal, educational or what not, exercise at their discretion this arbitrary authority in allowing or forbidding a variety of things. The authority is said to be extra legal or lawless, yet it is exercised as though it were properly delegated and employed. It is not easy to imagine that the highest authorities are ignorant of this assumption and arbitrary use of power. It must be assumed that for reasons best known to themselves, they choose to wink at it. The Government of Japan may be said to tolerate Christianity, but it can hardly be

said that it encourages it. A fair front is put on before the outside world, but behind this choice lacquer of appearance there is the silent allowance—or possibly worse—of the unfairness, injustice, and tyranny already mentioned. Is Japan dealing fairly with her own subjects in allowing such a state of things? Is she dealing honorably with the enlightened nations in whose presence she is making such an outward show of having attained, or almost attained, to the highest summit of nineteenth century civilization?

If foreign merchants were hampered in such ways as these named in this article in their business relations with native merchants, would they be apt to remain perpetually silent? Would they not, instead of this, take immediate and forcible action in bringing the matter to the attention of the highest authorities through their national representatives?

Should Christian workers be any less earnest and energetic in endeavoring to remove any and all impediments to the progress and success of their business?

Can Japan be said to be dealing fairly either with its own subjects or with the Treaty Powers while "the government" allows officials, high or low, large or small, to exercise such discretionary and despotic power over the religious liberty of those under them as the commanding officer already named has exercised, and as others are and have been exercising in other departments of the national service?—*Rev. J. L. Atkinson, in Independent.*

The Sunday Movement in Ireland.

THE spirit and animus of Sunday laws is not confined to the United States. Here in Ireland the same steps are being taken that have been traveled by the agitators in America. The Sabbath (Sunday) Observance Society is making itself felt in different ways. Through its influence twenty-four ministers of different denominations advertised to speak on the Sabbath question April 15. Large audiences were reported from many churches.

In behalf of the Sunday and the nature of its observance the witnesses did not seem fully to agree; but as it was with the witnesses against Christ they agreed that he was worthy of death, so these all agreed that Sunday must be kept. One argued for Sunday from the fourth commandment which teaches the observance of the seventh day, first stating that the Sabbath was changed with the sanction of the apostles; then afterward trying to prove that Christ changed it. But the burden of the whole argument seemed to be to get the people into the church on Sunday. The special reasons given why such a general move was being made now was that the railroads and steamboats were offering inducements that would enable many to go on excursions.

Another minister said, "We will take it for granted the Sabbath was changed by the proper authority." Then he argued the strict observance of Sunday from the Sabbath law. The secretary of the society said he was not arguing as to which day was the Sabbath, but was simply presenting the laws regulating the Sabbath. He claimed a large share of the Sunday desecration was owing to the shops and stores keeping open late Saturday afternoon. Hence he would have Parliament enact laws shutting up places of business at a certain hour on Saturday afternoon. This would give the people time for recreation

and other necessary work so that Sunday would be protected.

Of course this seems a very harmless kind of legislation. But where will the Sunday law advocates stop? They are not, and would not be, content with shutting up the shops and stores on Sunday unless they could in some way get the people to fill their churches. And so they would make laws infringing on the rights of men to carry on their business on another day of the week so that the employed may have time for excursions, recreation, etc., so they will be willing to attend church on Sunday.

From what I have seen here, however, enforced idleness means drunkenness, debauchery, and crime, instead of rest, development, and spirituality. There is but one way in which men can be brought to keep the Sabbath and that is to bring them to Christ. Circumstances may force men into outward conformity, but it is only the living Christ within that can give virtue to any act.

O. O. FARNSWORTH.

Belfast, Ireland.

The Growth of Congressional Religion.

THE progress of the spirit of formal religion in Congress is evidenced by this debate, which took place in the House of Representatives on April 30. The extract is from pp. 5152-53, of the *Congressional Record*, May 1:—

The Clerk read as follows:—

That with the view of increasing the facility for religious instruction in the army, the council of administration, at a post where there is no chaplain, is authorized to employ a minister of the gospel, for the purpose of religious instruction at said post, the total expenditure at each post for such purpose not to exceed \$1,500 per annum, and no further appointments of chaplains in the army shall be made until the total number is reduced below twenty.

Mr. Pickler and Mr. Bowers, of California, rose.

Mr. Bowers, of California, obtained the floor.

MR. PICKLER. I desire to reserve a point of order on this provision.

MR. BOWERS, of California. I make a point of order on this paragraph. I do not care to argue the question, but will simply state it. By Rule XXI, it is provided:—

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as, being germane to the subject-matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Now, I submit that this provision is not in line with either of the three requirements of this rule. It does not retrench expenditure in any one of the three ways which the rule contemplates. It does not reduce the number of employes, nor their compensation, nor the amount appropriated in the bill. In no sense can it be proper legislation upon this bill. In effect, it provides for the appointment of sixty-two additional officers whose yearly salary will amount to over \$90,000, with other allowances amounting to nearly as much. Thus this provision largely increases the amount to be appropriated hereafter by increasing the number of these officers. I do not care to discuss the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. Will not the Chair hear the other side?

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not obliged to hear the other side; but as a matter of courtesy will withdraw its decision and hear the gentleman.

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the number of officers, and therefore is not subject to the point of order.

Any amendment is in order under Rule XXI., which to use the words of the rule—

shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of officers of the United States.

This paragraph of the bill does reduce the number of chaplains in the army from thirty-four to twenty.

The gentleman is quite mistaken as to the expenses which may be incurred under this provision. It simply authorizes the employment of certain persons at a compensation not exceeding \$1,500 a year for any post. Some large posts have a great many soldiers; but however large the post the compensation of the person employed is not to exceed \$1,500. At some of the smaller posts the expenditure will probably not

exceed \$50 or \$60 a year, and may be even less, and at many of the posts there would be no expenditure at all.

There is nothing in the bill whatever to show that the expenditures would exceed more than two or three thousand dollars, which would manifestly be a great saving when we consider the number of officers that are dispensed with by the adoption of this provision in the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this amendment was suggested by the changed condition of the country: the army posts are now being surrounded by civilization; the frontier is a thing of the past, and at most of the army posts the necessity for having permanent chaplains has ceased to exist. Is it not better for posts near cities for the council of administration to be authorized to employ ministers to visit these posts and preach, and also to visit the sick and dying, than to retain permanent chaplains? A Catholic soldier, for instance, when he is dying, prefers to see a Catholic priest and certainly he does not want a Presbyterian minister, or a minister of any other denomination to come and administer to him, no matter how good such minister may be, and a soldier who has been reared in the Protestant religion would, of course, prefer to see a minister of his own faith.

MR. BOWERS, of California. Even if he is the chaplain of the post.

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. My contention is that at posts which are surrounded by civilization, and where the services of ministers of the various denominations can be secured, it would be better to have ministers of different denominations preach from time to time than to have the same chaplain every Sunday for four years.

MR. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow a question?

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. Yes.

MR. HOPKINS, of Illinois. The gentleman does not mean to convey the impression, I presume, that a Catholic priest would not be admitted to any post now to administer to a dying Catholic soldier under existing law?

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. No, by no means; but I think there should be some provision to pay his expenses for going there. Take a man from Fort Sheridan, for instance, or any post near a city—

MR. HOPKINS, of Illinois. No minister of the gospel or priest under such conditions would ask to be remunerated. He regards it as a part of his duty.

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. But does not the gentleman think it better for a great Government like ours to pay the expenses incurred by good ministers in travelling to and from posts rather than have them pay their own expenses? Ministers are generally poor—

MR. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Well, make provision for them if you want to, but keep the chaplains in the posts.

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. There will be enough chaplains left for all the posts on the frontiers, where they can not have the facilities that I have suggested.

MR. PICKLER. Then why do you want more chaplains?

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. The bill does not provide for any more chaplains. I have just stated that at some of the frontier posts they ought to have chaplains, because at those distant points there are no ministers sufficiently near to visit the posts. Therefore the services of a chaplain are necessary, and the bill retains twenty chaplains for posts of that character.

But take a place like Governor's Island, or Fort Hamilton, N. Y. Arrangements could be made in advance so as to secure the services of eminent divines to preach at those posts at times when they happened to be in New York. They could be paid a moderate sum and would be entertained by some officer at the post, and a sermon by an eminent preacher will call out every soldier and officer and everyone else at the post and would do a great deal of good. Distinguished ministers like to preach to such congregations and would readily accept such invitations.

The churches at the seaside resorts are nearly all kept up in that manner.

A committee of the church correspond with ministers of great note and in that way arrange to have one eminent divine preach one Sunday and another the next, and so on through the season. They pay them about \$50, and one of the vestry entertains the minister at his house.

The chaplain at West Point is a very excellent, cultivated, and eloquent gentleman, but all will admit that it is a pretty hard task for him to preach in the same pulpit week after week and year after year all his life, and it would be a great relief for him to have a distinguished minister to take his pulpit alternate Sundays, and the most distinguished ministers of Europe and America would gladly accept invitations to preach to the cadets. Young men like cadets are the kind of people great preachers like to impress.

MR. BOWERS, of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order. I believe the only point before the committee is the point of order. Not the merits of the case. That is not before the committee now. It is the point of order on the paragraph.

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. My friend himself argued the merits, and I was only replying to him.

But I insist that the point of order can not be sustained against the paragraph on the ground the gentleman alleges, because as a matter of fact it reduces the number of chaplains to twenty.

MR. BOWERS, of California. When?

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. As fast as vacancies occur; and there is nothing in the bill to provide that it shall not commence at once.

MR. BOWERS, of California. Do I understand from the gentleman's view that no appointments are to be made until the number of chaplains is reduced below twenty?

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. They can, under this provision of law, have the chaplains or ministers from the neighboring churches to come to the post.

MR. BOWERS, of California. But this provides for chaplains at every post. Now, there are ninety-eight of these posts, and we must increase the number by sixty-two in order to provide for them.

MR. WHEELER, of Alabama. The gentleman, certainly, did not read the bill properly. It authorizes the employment of ministers and does not create more chaplains. I think the limit of \$1,500 ought to be reduced, and we could very properly incorporate a proviso in the bill that in no event should the expense incurred exceed the amount now paid to chaplains. This would fully answer the gentleman's objections.

One expense of permanent chaplains my friend has overlooked. The retired chaplains are becoming very numerous. The number of chaplains now on the retired list are more than half as great as the entire active list.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and rules out the paragraph excepted to.

In this case, therefore, the Government did not commit itself to further facilitating religious instruction in the army by appropriation of public money.

Australian Correspondence.

THERE are organizations in existence and at work here for the purpose of enforcing the Sunday, and other like measures, the same as in America. We have the "Council of the Churches," the "Christian Electors' Association," the "Scripture Education League," the "Lord's Day Observance Society," and the "Anti-Sunday Traveling Society." They answer exactly to the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the like over there. And they are beginning to be quite active. They are speaking out recently in no uncertain tones. In the language of Mr. H. H. George, they mean to show the Parliaments over here that these are Christian nations, or colonies rather. They are sending out circular letters to the electors, or voters, telling them how to vote. Yet they will assert in these very letters that they are "neither political nor ecclesiastical, in the limited sense of the term, but ethical." They boldly declare that they want the "balance of power" placed in the hands of the Christian element of the country. They are besieging the various premiers of the colonies to have Sunday entertainments and amusements stopped, as the churches cannot stand the competition. They say they want the present Sunday laws "vigorously enforced," and more of like legislation. The New South Wales Parliament has already acceded to their demand that Sunday concerts and amusements shall be stopped, though the premier of this colony, Sir George Dibbs, set up a deputation from the "Council of Churches" that recently waited on him praying against these things, in pretty good shape. Here is a little of the conversation that passed between them, as reported in the Sydney *Daily Telegraph*, of February 17, 1894:—

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. What is this Council of the Churches?

MR. WALKER. It is the representatives of the six largest Protestant denominations of the colony, the Anglicans, the Presbyterians, the Wesleyans, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, and the Primitive Methodists. It is desired that the Premier should enforce

the law in regard to Sunday entertainments. A charge is being made for admission at the Alhambra and the Tivoli.

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. Have you been there?

MR. WALKER. No.

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. Where is the Tivoli?

MR. WALKER. I don't know.

Several members of the deputation: In Castlereagh Street.

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. Which of you was there last? A member of the deputation explained that they had got others to go there.

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. Oh!

MR. WALKER. These entertainments are of a secular character.

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. What do you call secular?

MR. WALKER. They are by no means sacred in any form. They are comic. And we have evidence that they sing parodies of sacred songs.

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. Have you been able to draw the line between secular and sacred music? I have made several attempts and failed.

MR. WALKER complained that it was a desecration of the British Sunday.

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. What is the British Sunday? I have heard of British beer, but not of British Sunday.

MR. WALKER. I think you know what it is.

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. I don't know what it is. Do you go to the two tables of stone for it?

MR. WALKER. Yes.

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. Then you are out of court.

After another discussion,—

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. You clergymen, you know, are too exacting; and because you are too exacting, the people are obliged to resort to these tricks (of advertising "free" and then charging an admission).

MR. WALKER. Do you think there is any great curtailment of liberties of the people of New South Wales?

SIR GEORGE DIBBS. You must recollect that you cannot make good people by Act of Parliament.

The Rev. Dill-Macky said they were afraid of a continental Sabbath. By and by they would want the law a little more stringent. Then they should be able to deal with the dancing saloons that open on Sunday.

From this it can be seen that we are likely to have as lively times over here soon as you have had in America.

How this treatment of this deputation is regarded by the religious press may be seen from the following quotation from the Australian *Christian World*, of February 22, 1894:—

A more miserable, pitiful, shuffling reception of an influential deputation could scarcely be imagined, yet it is only natural, from the simple fact that the Church is not recognized as a factor in politics. The churches of the land have taken no part in the political life of the country. The Church, as a Church, has no vote nor influence in Parliament, so it is simply sneered at by the premiers. Some of the remarks made by Sir George Dibbs were little short of blasphemous, such as, for instance, when Rev. John Walker said that such concerts as were being given in these places of amusement were a desecration of the British Sunday, the premier sneeringly said: "What is the British Sunday? I have heard of British beer, but not of British Sunday."

This will give you a little idea of what is in the wind here. The spirit of persecution is abroad in the land. Only last Sunday my nearest neighbor, a devout Presbyterian, got quite angry because my two children were playing in an open field back of our lot, in the sand with their little toy cars. He commanded them to go home, and threatened to whip them if they did not. When I went over to ask for an explanation of his course and find out who was supposed to have jurisdiction over my children, he said that if we stayed here we must keep the Sunday; and if these things were not stopped he would take measures to see that they were, and would make it "hot for us." Of course, I told him that this was not the Christian way of doing; that we observed the seventh day and expected to go about our business on Sunday the same as on other days; and that I thought we would get along all right if he would simply attend to his own affairs and not try to run the whole neighborhood. But this only illustrates the spirit that is being aroused as the wit-

nesses for God's Sabbath begin to scatter out into the world preparatory to the last great conflict and struggle. The signs truly are thickening on every hand for the great battle. W. A. COLCORD.

"Catholicity in Macedonia."

THIS is the heading of an article which appeared March 4, in the *Western Watchman*, of St. Louis, "A Catholic journal devoted to the interests of the Catholic Church in the West." There are several points in the article that are very significant and worthy of careful consideration. It is as follows:—

The Catholics who in 1870 were not more than 2,000 to 3,000 are to-day at least 30,000, thanks to the energy of Mons. Miladenoff. The sacrifices which the converts from among the schismatists are obliged to make is ample proof of their sincerity. The apostolic zeal of the bishop has obtained for him the imperial firman, which gives him extraordinary authority in his diocese, authority not only in *ecclesiastical*, but in *the civil courts*. Thus transports, bills of sale, etc., have no value without the *seal of the Catholic bishop*; all his sentences on matrimonial contracts and *others*, have to be executed without further investigation or proof by the civil authorities; and he has to give diplomas to school teachers. Where is there a government more clerical and ultramontane than that of the Sultan?

This, then, is "Catholicity in Macedonia." But as the article appears in a journal "devoted to the interests of the Catholic Church" in America, and thanks "the energy" of the promoter of this Catholicity, and calls it "apostolic zeal," may we not justly conclude that this is *true Catholicity* in America?

But there need be no question as to whether this is Catholicity in this country, and every other. It has been such ever since Constantine, over one thousand years ago, established the evil precedent of allowing the Catholic bishops to rule in civil affairs. The historian Gibbon gives a description of that precedent that has a striking similarity to parts of the article just quoted. He says:—

The Latin clergy, who erected their tribunal on the ruins of the civil and common law, have modestly accepted, as the gift of Constantine, the independent jurisdiction, which was the fruit of time, of accident, and of *their own industry*. . . . The arbitration of the bishops was ratified by a positive law; and the judges were instructed to execute, *without appeal or delay*, the episcopal decrees.—*Decline and Fall*, ch. XX., par. 25.

The custom, then, of allowing Catholic ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil courts, supreme courts at that, was in Rome, "the fruit of time, of accident, and of their own industry." But the "extraordinary authority" of the Bishop of Macedonia, "not only in ecclesiastical, but in civil courts," is attributed to his "apostolic zeal." Apostolic zeal! What a travesty on the love and fervor of those holy men of old, who went forth at the command of Him who said, "All power is given unto me. . . . Go ye therefore into all the world, and *preach the gospel!*" This was all the "firman" they required; and it gave them extraordinary power too. It also forever forbade them, and all who would follow Him who sent them, from seeking any power but that of the gospel, which is the power of love. But all who forsake this imperial firman are thereby deprived of its power, and as power they will have, they seek that of the State, which is that of force alone.

But that this evil should be done under the guise of Christianity, as "apostolic zeal," is a shame and blight on that holy cause. But this is Catholicity, Satan's

masterpiece, an imitation and perversion of the true. How shall we escape its deceptions?—By having nothing in common with it. By ceasing to trust in men, their power, and their traditions. By trusting in God, his word and his power. In this way, and this alone.

But shall we wait till Catholicity in truth becomes Catholicity in practice, as in Macedonia? Shall we wait until "matrimonial contracts and others" have to be sanctioned by the Catholic clergy and "bills of sale, etc., are of no value without the seal of the Catholic bishop?" You know the Word of God speaks of a time when "no man might buy or sell save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast." The "mark" to which the Catholic Church points with such evident pride, and claims as distinctively its own, is the day which it has commanded to be observed as holy instead of the day which God has commanded to be observed as holy. As long as we cling to this, from whatever pretext, we are standing upon Catholic ground, and are upholding Catholicity. And "no man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other." More than this; many think that they love God, when they do not. "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous." The commandments of God forbid the keeping of the day that the Catholic Church says is holy. They command that another day, "the seventh," be kept holy. And if it be a "grievous" thing to keep it holy, where is our love for God? To know God is to love him; "but he that saith (by his profession), I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John 2:4.

If we love God, then, more than we love the day commanded by the papacy to be kept holy, we will keep the day which his commands declare is holy. God calls upon us now to prove our loyalty to him. He brings a test upon the love we have professed. What shall we say to the charge he brings against us, if we claim by our profession to know him and yet do not "keep his commandments?" The question turns of loyalty to God or loyalty to the Catholic Church. The time for a decision is at hand. Christianity or Catholicity, which will you choose?

C. G. HOWELL

Priest, Politics, and Woman.

At the Woman's Suffrage mass meeting, held in the great hall of Cooper Union, New York City on the evening of Monday, May 7, a Roman Catholic priest, Father Ducey, is reported as expressing himself thus, by the *New York World*, with a few comments as to the effect of his words:—

"We hear it said by these Protestants—I am a Catholic, as you know, and I am opposed both to Protestants and protestants—that if women voted, then suffrages would be used by the Catholic Church to fasten its hold upon the nation."

"The priest came to the edge of the platform, and, flinging up his hand, cried: 'That's a lie!' In the whirlwind that came then the tinkle of a glass from his pince-nez was lost, but the glass was not. It bounced down on a reporter's copy and was handed back.

"The Catholic Church has elevated woman, and non-Catholic women will bear

me out in this. The church has put a woman in her dearest and purest and holiest embodiment among the Godhead.'

"There was a timorous handclapping at this.

"She has put Mary, the mother of Jesus, and, as I believe, the mother of God, side by side with our Redeemer and our redeeming Brother.'

"Hisses mingled with applause. Approval strengthened. They who indorsed what the priest had said strove with those whose religious prejudices were opposed to the honor paid to the mother of Jesus. Approval won, though it took long to do it. The incident had its significance to those who remember that the heaviest vote polled at those school elections where women have the ballot has been called out when religious prejudice was a campaign issue."

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.]

THE intent of the makers and promoters of this bill is to subvert the constitutional rights of the people. The intent of the law-maker is the law. As, therefore, *by their own words*, the intent of this exemption clause is to stop all effort to teach or to persuade people to keep the Sabbath instead of Sunday; as the intent of the body of the bill is to compel all to keep Sunday who do not keep the Sabbath; and as the intent of both together is to "scoop all in" and "make sure work," it follows inevitably, and my proposition is demonstrated, that the promoters of this legislation do distinctly contemplate the taking away of the right to observe the Sabbath in this nation, and to allow the keeping of Sunday only.

There is another consideration in this which shows that the State will be compelled to take official and judicial cognizance of the conscientious beliefs and observances of the people. It is this: When a law is enacted compelling everybody to refrain from all labor or business on Sunday, excepting those who conscientiously believe in and observe another day, then there will be scores of men who know that in their business—saloons, for instance—they can make more money by keeping their places of business open on Sunday than on another day, because more men are idle that day. They will therefore profess to observe another day and run their business on Sunday.* This is not simply a theory, it is a fact proved by actual examples. One of the very latest I will mention. I have here a clipping from the *Southern Sentinel*, Dallas, Texas, February 4, 1890, which I read:—

Right here in Dallas we have an example of how the law can be evaded. Parties have leased the billiard hall of the new McLeod Hotel, and have stipulated in their lease that they are conscientious observers of the seventh day [though to the best of the common knowledge and belief they are not]; that, in consequence, their business house will be closed on Saturday, and will be open on Sunday.

MR. GROUT.—If they are known to be conscientious worshipers, and keepers of the seventh-day Sabbath, what defense would they have?

MR. JONES.—The defense would still be a claim of "conscientious belief in, and

observance of, another day." The claim indeed might not be sincere. And if there were any question of it in the community, it would certainly be disputed, and the court would be called upon to decide. Thus you see that by this bill the United States courts will be driven to the contemplation of conscientious conviction and compelled to decide upon the sincerity of conscientious beliefs and observances. And thereby it is proved that the introduction and advocacy of this bill is an endeavor to commit Congress and the Government of the United States to the supervision of the conscientious convictions of the people.

Now, gentlemen, to prevent this was the very purpose of the First Amendment to the Constitution. It is well known, as I have stated, that the colonies which formed the original thirteen States had each one an established religion. When it was proposed to organize a Federal Government, the strongest influence that had to be met and overcome was jealousy of a national power—a fear that a national power would override the powers and interfere with the domestic affairs of the States. It was this that caused the adoption of the First Amendment to the Constitution. Their affairs of religion and the exercise thereof being the dearest of all, are first assured protection. Fearing that the national Government might enact laws which would restrict or prohibit the free exercise of the religion of any of the people of any of the States; or that it might adopt or indorse some one of the religious establishments of the States, and thus form an alliance which might annihilate both political and religious individuality; that the political individuality of the States and the religious individuality of the people might be free; for themselves and their posterity the people declared that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

It is not to be inquired whether there was any danger of that which they feared, they feared it and that is enough. And because they feared it, because they were so jealous—rightly jealous too—of their religious rights and conscientious convictions, they guarded these, as they intended and supposed, forever, from any supervision or cognizance whatever on the part of the national Government. And upon this I quote now more fully the words of Bancroft, to which I merely referred a little while ago:—

Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the *American Constitution*, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and, not from indifference, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power.—*History of the Formation of the Constitution*, Book V, chapter 1.

Thus, says the historian, there is by the Constitution "perfect individuality extended to conscience." This individuality, these rights, are as dear to us and as sacred as they were to the fathers of our nation, yet no more so to us than to other people. Therefore, gentlemen of the committee and the representatives of the people, by your respect for the Constitution and your oath to support it, and in behalf of the sacred rights of all the people, we implore you to give no heed to any demand

for legislation, which in any way, to the least degree, proposes to touch the conscientious beliefs or observances of a solitary individual in all the land; give no heed to this bill, which, in its very terms, proposes to commit Congress to the supervision of conscientious beliefs, and proposes to drive the national power into a field where the makers of the national power forbade it to go, and to compel it to assume jurisdiction of questions which they have forbidden it even to consider.

Now as to the petition—that petition shows what this bill means. Both this bill and the Senate bill, “which includes this,” were framed and introduced upon this petition. If we know what the petition asks for, we shall know also what the bills are intended to give. Here is the petition—I read the one for the national law, “which includes this:”—

To the House of Representatives of the United States—
The undersigned organizations and adult residents (21 years of age or more) of the United States hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding in the United States mail and military service, and in interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, *except works of religion.*

That is the petition which they are circulating. That is the petition which they present to you. That is the petition upon which these bills were framed. They ask you to stop everything on Sunday—“all Sunday traffic and work,” all “work, labor, or business,” “*except works of religion.*” And yet they have the face to plead before the public, and in the presence of this committee, that this question “has nothing to do with religion.” Nothing to do with religion when it prohibits everything “except works of religion”? If this is not a religious petition, why do they “except” only “works of religion”?

Except works of religion, and works of *real* necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who *religiously* and regularly observe another day of the week by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.

Of traffic, work, labor, or business, the exception is works of *religion*; of the people, the exception is only of those who *religiously* and regularly observe another day. Those who are to observe the day named must be religious that day; those who do not observe the day named must be religious, and regularly so, some other day of the week. Now, gentlemen, these bills were framed upon this petition. The intention of the petition is the intention of the bills. Therefore it is as plain as the day that the object of both this bill and the Senate bill is the enforced conscientious belief in, and religious observance of, a rest-day.

The question then which would inevitably arise upon this is, What religion is it whose works of religion only shall be excepted? That question would have to be answered. It would have to be answered by the United States courts or by Congress. But whenever, or by whichever, it shall be answered, when it is answered, *that moment you have an established religion—a union of Church and State.* You cannot go back if you take the first step. The last step is in the first one, and we beg of you, gentlemen of the committee, and of these men themselves, for their own sakes as well as ours, *do not take the first step.*

We all know that the most wickedly cruel and most mercilessly inconsiderate of all governments is that in which the ecclesiastics control the civil power. And

how are you going to escape it under such laws as here proposed? Who is to enforce these Sunday laws? Who, indeed, but those who are working for them? Certainly those who are opposed to them, or indifferent about them, will not enforce them. Who then are they who are working for the enactment of these laws? Who organize the conventions and count out the opposite votes? Who appeared here before your committee to argue in favor of it? Who, indeed, but the Church managers? for you saw how summarily the Knights of Labor part of the delegation was squelched.

Well, then, if it is the Church which secures the enactment of the law, it will be the Church that will have to see to the enforcement of the law. In order to do this she will have to have police and courts which will do her bidding. This is her great difficulty now. There is now no lack of Sunday laws, either in the States or the Territories, but the laws are not enforced. In order to get executives and police and courts who will enforce the law to her satisfaction, the Church will have to elect them. Then, as said Mr. Crafts in this city the other day, they will form “Law and Order Leagues to enforce” the Sunday laws. Here then is the system: The Church combines to get the law enacted; the Church secures the election of officers who will do her bidding; the Church forms “Law and Order Leagues” to make sure that the officers do her bidding and enforce the law. Where, then, will the State appear, but in the subordinate position to formulate and execute the will of the Church? Then you have the Church above the State, the ecclesiastical superior to the civil power. This is just what is in this national Sunday-law movement; and this is what will certainly come out of it. It is inherent there.

But when George III. undertook to make the military superior to the civil power, our liberty-loving fathers declared it tyranny and avowed such things should not be in this land. And now when a movement reaches the national capitol which bears in itself an attempt to make the *ecclesiastical* superior to the civil power, it is time for the American people to declare that this is tyranny also, and resolve that no such thing shall be in this land. That attempt one hundred and fourteen years ago grew out of the “divine right of kings” to govern, and the doctrine that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This attempt now grows out of the divine right of the *ecclesiastics* to govern, and likewise that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The president of the American Sabbath Union, which is the originator of this national Sunday-law scheme, has definitely declared in so many words that “governments do not derive, their just powers from the consent of the governed;” and one of the secretaries of an auxiliary union has as definitely stated that “this movement is an effort to change that feature of our fundamental law.”

Gentlemen, when such doctrines as these are openly avowed, and when such an attempt as this is made by those who avow them, to embody them in national law, it is time for all the people to declare, as the Seventh-day Adventists decidedly do, that this nation is, *and of right ought to be, FREE AND INDEPENDENT OF ALL ECCLESIASTICAL OR RELIGIOUS CONNECTION, INTERFERENCE, OR CONTROL.*

Fanatical and Unconstitutional.

SENATOR GALLINGER has introduced a bill “to protect the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia.” As this bill was presented “by request,” he is not responsible for its conception, which can be readily traced to its authors. Is it incumbent upon congressmen to waste time and exasperate freemen by presenting bills that are absolutely unconstitutional? Ought not the result of their last attempt to throttle liberty of conscience to suffice as an object lesson for at least two years? What good came of attempting to shut up the World’s Fair on Sunday? The law was defied and Congress was slapped in the face, as it ever will be when fanaticism overrides reason and demands that we return to the intolerance of the Puritans.

“Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,” is the very First Amendment to a Constitution upon which this Republic is based; yet cranks in trousers and in petticoats ever and anon do demand now that God be put into the Constitution, and now that the District of Columbia, which is at the mercy of men who pay taxes elsewhere, shall be subjected to religious legislation. Have we no Hebrews among us? No second Adventists? No agnostics? So long as public peace is preserved, what business has Congress to mind the business of the people of this District? Listening to fanatics, legislators have driven cabs from their stands on Sunday against the wishes of both drivers and the public, the latter of whom are sadly inconvenienced. Pursued to its logical end this tyranny would stop horse and cable cars as well. Why should cabs be more impious than cars?

Senator Gallinger’s Senate bill 1628 has been referred to the District Commissioners. In the name of liberty and the Constitution, I protest against the bill that insults both. Let the commissioners open their Bibles, and, turning to the second chapter and sixteenth verse of Colossians, read Paul’s excellent advice: “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days.”

Behold the tolerance of a Christianity that its bigoted professors refuse to follow. Are these bigots disciples of Calvin? Then let me tell them that Calvin would repudiate such unworthy followers. What was his counsel to his students? “Observe the Sabbath day, but if any man says to you, you must keep it, then break it as a token of your Christian liberty.”

I commend St. Paul and Calvin to the attention of the three Commissioners of the District of Columbia.—*Kate Field’s Washington.*

The Stundists in Russia.

FOR many years the Russian authorities have been banishing Stundists and other Protestants to the Caucasus. As might have been foreseen, this has made that province a stronghold of Protestantism; and now at a meeting of the Holy Synod, soon to be held, the head of the Greek Church in the Caucasus is to submit a plan for breaking up the communities of believers and isolating the individual members in villages where they may be under closer surveillance. But wherever the real Protestant goes he carries the

word of God, and that is the power to convert men; so that this further dispersal will only scatter the light into regions unentered. Ecclesiastics depending upon numbers and ritual and earthly power never seem able to comprehend the fact that they cannot bind the word of God nor hinder the progress of the truth by penal legislation.—*The Present Truth.*

The True Reason.

THE Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, U. S. A., has decided that a law compelling barbers' shops to be closed on Sunday is within the police power of the State. It holds that "the best reason for maintaining the police power of the State to prohibit citizens from engaging in secular work on Sunday, is that experience has shown that one day's rest in seven is necessary to the physical welfare of the individual."

But the fact is that experience has shown nothing of the kind. There have never been any better specimens of manhood, physically, than the ancient Greeks and Romans, who knew nothing of a weekly-recurring rest day. In a time when nations existed only by the power of the sword, and fighting was little more than an athletic contest between the individual soldiers of two armies, the physical welfare of citizens was the chief concern of government; yet no pagan nation has ever known any such thing as a weekly rest day. That is sufficient to disprove the fallacy so widely spread, that the physical welfare of man is the chief object of the Sabbath rest.

But even suppose it were, why should the State interfere in the matter? It is certain that regular nightly rest is far more necessary to one's physical welfare than a weekly rest, yet no nation thinks of enacting laws requiring that all the people shall sleep from 10 P. M. till 6 A. M., or from midnight till eight o'clock in the morning. If any legislative body in the world should presume to pass such a law there would be a general protest against such an arbitrary exercise of power.

But no such law will ever be passed, because, although the securing of a sufficient amount of sleep every night is very essential to the health of the body, it has nothing to do with any system of religion; while Sunday laws are in the interest of religion. The claim that they are a physical necessity is nothing but an excuse that has been devised in America to conceal the fact that Church and State are united there as well as in the Old World.—*Present Truth, London, Eng.*

Legislative Religion Is Not Christianity.

WE deny, absolutely deny, the right of any civil power to legislate, directly or indirectly, regarding anything pertaining to religion, especially here in these United States. The majority may rule in civil things, but God alone should rule the hearts of men and the affairs concerning his worship.

There has been more blood shed and crime caused by religious—not Christian—laws and religious jealousies than from all other causes combined.

The religion which cannot be sustained without the aid of civil law is not the religion of Jesus, it is not Christianity.—*Our Prison Light.*

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 Conferenc 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 1 1/4 cts.

No. 10. RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND THE MORMON QUESTION. Is the Prohibition of Polygamy Religious Legislation? 20 pp. Price 2 1/2 cts.

No. 11. THE "CIVIL SABBATH;" OR DISGUISED RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION. Sabbath laws shown to be religious and only religious. 12 pages. Price 1 1/2 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 5 1/2 cts.

No. 13. THE LIMITS OF CIVIL AUTHORITY, from the standpoint of natural rights and divine obligation. 12 pages. Price 1 1/2 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 cts.

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

Order of PACIFIC PRESS,

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

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

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

EUREKA HEALTH FLOUR

Contains every particle of the Wheat Grain that is digestible by the human stomach. Very rich, sweet and nutritious. Makes the best of bread, gems and cakes. Invaluable for dyspeptics, all invalids, and growing children. Everyone likes it. Used by the largest sanitariums.

SPECIAL OFFER.—One barrel Eureka Health Flour for only \$6.00. If not perfectly satisfactory return at my expense and get your money. Wholesale and retail dealers supplied. Agents wanted everywhere. Send stamp for particulars.

F. W. BARTLE,
Oxford, N. Y.

No great railroad in America offers the advantages for summer travel and enjoyment equal to the

WEST SHORE RAILROAD.

Starting from New York (around which are clustered more pleasure resorts than any other city in the world), paralleling the grandest river on the continent, it traverses valleys celebrated in song and story, reaches many crystal lakes reposing like gems in their mountain settings, furnishes access by branches and connections to the magnificent forests of the Catskill and Adirondack Mountains terminating at the World's Wonder, Niagara Falls.



NEW YORK, MAY 17, 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 bill repealing the law excluding the Jesuits from Germany, which was passed by the Reichstag, has been rejected in the Bundesrath or Government Council. This defeats the measure.

LONDON dispatches, of May 2, say, "The Church Patronage Bill, introduced by George C. T. Bartley (Conservative), passed its second reading in the House of Commons to-day. The bill stops the sale of the next presentations to church living, places restrictions upon all sales of church livings, and empowers bishops to prevent improper persons from being instituted in the benefices.

"The Radicals opposed the bill as aiming to hide scandal instead of extirpating it. They contended that the proper remedy is disestablishment.

"Sir William Harcourt, Liberal leader, did not oppose the bill, as he regarded it a step in the right direction."

WITH this issue the series of articles on the Roman Catholic question is resumed. The following are some of the subjects which will be treated,—Justification, is it by Penance, or by Faith? Christ or the Immaculate Conception, Which? The Real Presence, Where and How is it Manifested? The Head of the True Church, Christ or the Pope, Which? Infallibility; is it in Christ alone, or in the Pope, Which?

In reality the subject and thought of this series has not been materially broken, because, of the five issues which have intervened, only one has contained a leading article which varied in its line of thought from the discussion of the subject of Roman Catholicism as previously promised. Those who have read with care the leading articles in Nos. 15, 16, 17 and 18, of the dates of April 12, 19, 26 and May 3, will realize that the subject has not been allowed to drop, and that although the form of its presentation has been changed somewhat in these numbers the matter is equally valuable, and in reality properly introductory to that which is to follow.

PORTCHESTER, N. Y., is rejoicing in a full blown Law and Order League which, on Sunday, May 6, began its work with the Sunday closing of all the saloons. After a six days' relapse into common every day immorality it will again arouse and, not only close the saloons on Sunday, but make up for allowing the saloons to do business six days of the week by the

Sunday closing also of ice cream saloons, barber shops, and drug stores. Of the effect of the Sunday crusade on the saloons the New York World says:—

The result of the closing up in Portchester was to make a flourishing trade for the livery men. All who could afford the luxury drove to Harrison, where there is no license and evidently no excise law. Others walked to East Portchester, in Connecticut, and soon found their way to the side doors.

Is such a result as this a victory for true religion? Certainly not. Where there is no true religion, either in the methods or motives, there certainly will not be in the results.

THE following is the last recorded resolution in favor of the congressional passage of Sunday laws for the District of Columbia; it was passed by an auxiliary society of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Washington:—

WHEREAS the Christian sentiment of this community has recently again been insulted and shocked by the not only irreverent but blasphemous manner in which Robert G. Ingersoll, on Sunday, has spoken in an open theatre, and for gain, an admission of from one dollar to one dollar and fifty cents being charged. Therefore,

Resolved, That we appeal to the Sabbath-loving and God-fearing citizens of this community to bring to bear all proper means to secure the passage of Senator Kyle's bill for the protection of Sunday in this District.

Resolved, That we appeal officially to the Senate committee of this District of Columbia, asking a full and favorable report of the bill to the Senate that its passage may be secured this session.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District was very zealous in furthering the cause of the Breckinridge Sunday bill for the District of Columbia when it was before the House Committee on the District.

IN narrating the strange events which were the precursors of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem, Milman says that they who witnessed it could not but remember, at the downfall of the city, "the wild cry of Jesus, son of Ananus,—'Woe, woe to the city!' which he had continued from the government of Albinus to the time of the siege, when he suddenly stopped, shrieked out—'Woe to myself!' and was struck dead by a stone."

In the "Great Controversy between Christ and Satan," the same incident is thus narrated:—

For seven years a man continued to go up and down the streets of Jerusalem, declaring the woes that were to come upon the city. By day and by night he chanted the wild dirge, "A voice from the east; a voice from the west; a voice from the four winds; a voice against Jerusalem and the temple; a voice against the bridegroom and the bride; and a voice against all the people." This strange being was imprisoned and scourged; but no complaint escaped his lips. To insult and abuse he answered only, "Woe to Jerusalem! woe, woe to the inhabitants thereof!" His warning cry ceased not until he was slain in the siege he had foretold.

How many years shall not only one, but many, go up and down the streets and highways of this nation, their very condition, appearance, and presence, in itself, a louder and more insistent cry than that

of the strange prophet of evil in Jerusalem, and yet the people not take warning? No, not even when the "General of the Army of the Commonwealth" speaks such words as these, which the Washington Post records,—in the Capitol City, at the head of the vanguard of the crusade of the 19th century:—

He said the occasion marked a crisis in the country that was little dreamed of. "This country," said he, "is like a big bunch of straw, and all that is necessary to start it into a roaring blaze is the torch. Do you dream that in court to-day the torch was applied? We came here as an army of peace. God knows violence is the last wish of any member of this army, but I fear that the match has been applied, and that time alone will tell what is to be the outcome. If violence does follow the consequences will not be on our heads, for others were the cause of it. It now looks to me as though it would be useless to try and accomplish anything more in the line of public reformation by peace."

Troy had its Cassandra, Jerusalem its Jesus, the son of Ananus, and the United States cannot afford to turn a deaf ear to the warning cries of the times, even though the voices which proclaim them are not pleasant to the ear.

THE Review and Herald is the church paper of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, and is the oldest periodical published by that body. The editor-in-chief, Elder Uriah Smith, at the request of the Foreign Mission Board of the Seventh-day Adventists, is about to make an extended tour through Europe and Western Asia. He will attend important meetings in England, Scandinavia, Germany, and Switzerland, after which he will visit Rome, Greece, and possibly extend his tour to Palestine. While thus traveling over this historic ground, his ever-fruitful pen will still be busy in editorial work for the Review and Herald, and we bespeak for that paper an extensive circulation, especially during this time. As every one who is acquainted with Elder Smith knows, he is an earnest believer in the soon coming of Christ, and, while visiting these battle-fields of the Church of past ages, he will no doubt be able to draw many practical and important lessons for those who expect to pass through the final conflict, and stand ready to meet the Messiah at his second coming.

The Review and Herald is a 16 page weekly, and the subscription price \$2.00 a year. Address all orders to the Review and Herald Publishing Company, Battle Creek, Mich.

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.			