



"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, AUGUST 23, 1894.

NUMBER 33.

## American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE  
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.  
Entered at the New York Post-Office.

ALONZO T. JONES, }  
CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, } EDITORS.  
A. F. BALENGER, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

THE President of the United States has appointed a board of commission of "arbitration," in consequence of the Chicago strike.

IN the way that this has been brought about, however, there could not be a more complete misnomer than to call it a board or commission, or anything else, of *arbitration*.

THERE is not a single element of arbitration in it. For arbitration is "the hearing and determining of a controversy by a person or persons *mutually agreed upon by the parties to the dispute*."

NOW these persons have not been "mutually agreed upon by the parties to the dispute." There has been no sort of an agreement in the matter by the parties to the dispute. Indeed, only one of the parties to the dispute called for it or had anything to do with it in any way. This board or commission, or whatever it is called in that respect, therefore, is entirely lacking in the very first elements that attach to a board or commission of *arbitration*.

INDEED, the idea of any mutual agreement or action on the part of the parties to the dispute seems not to be contemplated in the act of Congress under which this commission is appointed. For the act provides that "the services of the commission to be ordered at the time by the President, and constituted as herein provided, *may be tendered by the President for the purpose of settling a controversy such as contemplated, either on his own motion or upon the application of one of the parties to the controversy, or upon the application of an executive of a State.*" Thus it is clear that there is no such thing as a mutual agreement of the parties to the dispute respecting who shall be the arbitrator, nor even that there shall be an

arbitration of the controversy at all. The appointment of the commission and the tendering of its offices may come altogether from the outside, and the nearest that it gets to the parties is that it may be appointed and tendered upon the application of *one of the parties* to the dispute. Thus in any and every phase the procedure lacks every element of arbitration. Yet for all this lack, the commission has been appointed; it is called a commission of arbitration, and is expected to have, indeed, "shall have," "all the powers and authority given in section 2 to a board of arbitration"!

NOW, if the action of this board is to have any force whatever—whether its decision is to be enforced by the power of the Government upon the party adjudged by it to be in the wrong, or whether it is to be only by the "moral influence" of the weight of the Government in favor of the other party, putting the party adjudged to be in the wrong to the disadvantage of publicly disagreeing with the national Government; in either case the result can be only *dictation* instead of arbitration. If the decision of the committee is not intended to have any real force either governmental or moral, then the procedure amounts simply to a piece of meddling which in itself is suggestive of dictatorship. But it may be asked, Shall the Government do nothing? Answer: The Government, State or national, as the case may be, shall see to it that all parties shall keep the peace in all respects, whatever their differences or disputes may be. This the governmental power may do and keep itself and all others in place.

YET there is no doubt that the decision of this commission is intended to have force of some sort, and that, apparently, in no small measure. And as the commission, with the procedure altogether, is totally lacking in the elements of arbitration, whatever force it may exert will be nothing else than the assertion of the principle of dictation. This is true also in another way; because it is intended by those who are engineering this that if this does not bring the desired result then the next step is to be legislation establishing "compulsory arbitration" in so many

words. But compulsory arbitration is a contradiction in terms. The very suggestion of compulsion destroys all idea of arbitration. The only word that will properly express the idea of "compulsory arbitration" is the plain and simple word *dictation*. This plain and simple word, however, is rather too strong to start with, and so it must be covered up with the self-contradictory expression, "compulsory arbitration;" and even to this the way must be smoothed by the practice of a pretended arbitration that is not arbitration at all in any true sense of the word.

WITH the action of the committee, however, we have nothing to do. It matters not which way it decides nor what it does. It is the establishment of the principle and the fixing of the precedent, with which we are concerned; it is this and this only that we are discussing. It is the logical tendency of this sort of "arbitration" that we desire to trace. We are simply inquiring what is wrapped up in this thing, and what therefore must inevitably come out of it.

IT is worth remarking that this idea and practice of "arbitration" is not intended nor expected to put an end to strikes. In fact, it is the doctrine of one of the chiefest of the leaders of organized labor that without contention there can be no arbitration, and without a strike there can be no contention. In remarking upon the appointment of this committee by President Cleveland, Mr. Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, said:—

If President Cleveland has made any stipulation that the strike should be called off as a preliminary, he has made arbitration impossible; for that means the attainment of a settlement between contending forces, and *after the strike ceases the contention has ceased*.

According to this doctrine, and according to all the probabilities in the case, there is no room for doubt that strikes will continue, and continue to increase in extent and violence, as they have done ever since labor-unions were first organized in this country.

CONSIDER, then, that strikes will continue, and that this kind of "arbitration"

will also continue. It is hardly to be expected that the decisions will *always* be in favor of the strikers. If this is expected, then this only adds to the procedure another element of dictation. If there is any probability that the decision of the "arbitrators" will at some time be against the strikers and in favor of the operator, then this carries with it also the probability that there will come a time when the decision of the "arbitrators" will not be at all satisfactory to the strikers. Then they will denounce the board as being allied with capital against labor, and will refuse to accept it as a settlement. In other words, they will strike against the decision of the "arbitrators." Suppose this commission had been appointed in time to reach Chicago at the height of the contest last month, and by any possibility had found and decided that the Pullman Company was justified in the stand that they had taken, is there a man in the United States who supposes that Debs and his committee would have accepted such a decision and ordered off the strike? In view of their open denunciation of the President of the United States for merely ordering troops to Chicago to maintain the laws of the United States, is it at all supposable that they would have accepted a decision actually in favor of the Pullman Company or the board of railway managers?

As certainly as there is a probability that a decision will fall sometime against the strikers, so certainly also there is a probability that the strikers will sometime strike against the decision. But a strike against the decision of the "arbitrators" will be nothing less than a strike against the Government itself.\* Then as certainly as such a thing as that ever happens, there will be a dispute between labor and the Government, *which dispute will have to be arbitrated*. Then who shall be the "arbitrators" to settle this dispute? Neither the Government nor capital nor labor can do it, because these are all parties to the dispute. There cannot be one chosen from each of the three parties in dispute, because as the Government will have already decided in favor of capital, and the strike is now against both, this would give a board of two to one against labor to start with. Plainly, then, the Government and capital and labor will all be excluded from conducting any arbitration between the Government and labor. There is one element remaining, and but one, that could do it, *and that is the Church*. This is the only element remaining sufficiently separated from all parties to such a dispute, to be qualified to come between them in the character of arbitrator. And she will occupy the place as surely as it shall ever be made. And the place will be made as surely as this sort of "arbitration" that has been started shall continue. And it is just as likely to continue as that the contest between "capital and labor" shall continue.

Thus there can be, and almost certainly will be, created the much-coveted opportunity for the Church further to insinuate herself into the place of control and guidance in governmental affairs. And as to what church it will be, in the last resort at least, there can be no shadow of doubt. It will be *the Catholic Church*. For some

considerable time Cardinal Gibbons has been advocating a national board of arbitration, such as is now begun. Besides this, as so vast a majority of the discontented, agitating, striking, violent, element, are members in good and regular standing in the Catholic Church, it will be urged, and urged successfully, that she is entitled to a representative on the board. More than this probability, she has a representative on this board that has been lately appointed by the President, namely, Francis Kernan, who finished his education at that Jesuit seat of learning Seton Hall College, Orange, N. J. And if Mr. Magone, who was first named, is not also a Catholic, the fact is contradictory to the suggestion of his name.

THIS is the logical outcome and the sure result of this scheme of "arbitration" that has been begun in the United States. And when the Catholic Church shall have made firm her footing here in this thing, and shall have thus put herself in the place of chief "arbitrator" in national affairs for, and to, this great American nation, then in this also Europe will be drawn to follow the example, and thus in another way will the papacy be lifted to the headship and control of the world. And thus will the great ambition of Leo XIII. be accomplished in having the pope recognized and referred to as the great "arbiter" of all national differences.

In times of such difficulties as those that have covered this country the present year, and which will be continued along the line that we are here discussing, both in this country and in Europe—in times such as these, it is with peculiar force that the papacy suggests itself to the minds of rulers and statesmen as the source of the greatest help. In times of violence, strife, anarchy, and revolution, when the very foundations of States and even of society itself seem to be moved, it is almost instinctively that the European statesman especially grasps the hand of the papacy. The papacy has passed through revolution after revolution, and complete anarchy itself is no terror to it.

THE papal church not only saw, but *caused*, the fall of the Roman Empire. And as that empire was the "mightiest fabric of human greatness" ever set up, so its fall was the most terrible ever seen in history. Yet the papacy not only passed through it, but she gathered new strength from it all. The Catholic Church thrives on revolutions; the perplexities of States are her fortune; to her, anarchy is better than order, unless she can rule. She is so completely the mistress of every kind of devilry that it matters not what phase of it presents itself, she can manipulate it to her own advantage. Therefore when revolution is imminent and anarchy threatens, it is almost instinctively that rulers and statesmen grasp the ever-proffered hand of her who has survived the anarchy of the Middle Ages and the revolutions of fifteen centuries.

It is with perfect satisfaction that the papal church sees the Government of the United States taking the step that involves "arbitration" between itself and its own violent and lawless citizens. For she knows that as the vast majority of these violent and lawless ones are her own subjects, so the outcome must certainly re-

dound to her profit and her exaltation. As she has already announced that "the solution of the present social difficulties is to be found in the Catholic Church;" and that "if society is to be saved from a condition worse in some respects than pagan times, it is from the Vatican the savior must come;" so she is most gratified to see the steps taken that inevitably involves herself and her power as this savior. And she has also announced that, as "the United States succeed in solving these problems, Europe will follow their example," and these, too, will turn to her as their savior. This is the publicly announced plan of the Roman Catholic Church, and everything is drawing her way, and she is glad of it. This is the means by which she ascended to her height of power and dominion before; this means will surely raise her to that place again. From her experience before, she knows how to take advantage of the like means now to raise herself to the place of power and dominion such as she had before, only greater as the world is larger now than it was then. Mgr. Satolli made no mistake when he declared, in behalf of the papacy, that in America more than anywhere else lies the key of the future. Mgr. Satolli is here to turn that key. It can be turned many ways to favor the aims of the papacy. And in no one way can it be turned more to favor the papacy than in the manipulation of this idea of "compulsory arbitration." This is simply dictation, and it will end in the dictation of the papacy to the nation and to the world.

#### Too Late to Deny It.

In the *Catholic World* for August, "Rev." Walter Elliott, a Roman Catholic missionary, tells of his experience among the Seventh-day Adventists in Michigan. "Father" Elliott says:—

The sect is the most venomous enemy of Catholicity in these parts. . . . And yet some of our Catholic journals have favored it on the question of the observance of the Sunday as against Protestantism generally. I am persuaded that this is bad policy, to say the least of it. If Protestants, as a body, are mistaken as to the office of scripture, they are right as to the day of the Lord. Do not be too eager to make men give up the truth by showing them that they are "illogical." . . . Our policy is to favor the right side among our jarring brethren, rather than to compel consistency. Say to them, First be right, and then be consistent and get wholly right. To play off error against inconsistency is not fraternal. Furthermore, the Seventh-day Adventists incline to be Old Testament Christians, Puritans of the worst sort, and are making a propaganda of much energy, and not without results. If what the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* calls the Christian Sabbath shall lose its place in our national customs, and if its legal observance shall drop out of the competency of our legislators, the end will be the abolition of a general observance of any day of rest and prayer at all—a calamity of the first order. I have been almost everywhere assailed with quotations from one of our oldest and most respectable Catholic journals against the scripture basis of the observance of the first day of the week—claiming that it has not any scripture authority whatever, is wholly without a scripture basis, etc. Such, however, is not the sense of the Catholic Church.

The "reverend" "father" seems to be hard hit by the quotation from "one of our oldest and most respectable Catholic journals," but his denial is vain. He quotes Catholic authorities in support of his position, but that is also vain. It is not the *Catholic Mirror* alone (the old and respectable journal referred to) which asserts the fact that there is no scriptural authority for Sunday observance. "The Faith of Our Fathers," by Cardinal Gibbons, has on page 111, this paragraph:—

You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the

\* Since this was written, Mr. Debs has said in an interview at Terra Haute, Ind., July 29, that "the United States regulars came, and it was a strike against the Government."

sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.

In "Catholic Belief," a standard Catholic work, published in this city by Benziger Brothers, and indorsed by Cardinal McCloskey, June 5, 1884, we find this on page 251, from the Creed of Pius IV. :—

I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions,† and all other observances and constitutions of the same church.

The dagger refers to a foot-note as follows:—

† That is, I admit as points of *revealed truth* what the church declares the apostles taught as such, whether clearly or not clearly expressed or *not even mentioned in the written word of God: as, for instance, that baptism is to be conferred on infants, that Sunday instead of Saturday (called the Sabbath) is to be kept holy: and moreover, I admit those points of discipline which the church holds as established by the apostles, or by their successors as lawful rulers of the church in the early centuries of Christianity, such as points of liturgy or of church government.*

We have italicized the salient part of this note to call attention to the fatal confession which it contains in reference to two cherished dogmas of so-called orthodoxy. Priest Elliott will have to add this and the cardinal's book to his *Index Expurgatorius*. But it will be hard for him to conceal the naked truth. The fact is as it is, and it would be none the less a fact if every papist in the world denied it. There is no scriptural authority for Sunday, and this politic priest knows it. It may have been "bad policy" for the Catholics to tell the truth on this point; but they have told it as their published works abundantly prove.

### True Protestantism.

A CORRESPONDENT calls attention to the too prevalent idea that the term "Protestant" applies to "all who are not Roman Catholic," and asks that the SENTINEL aid in correcting that idea. This the SENTINEL is doing and will continue to do. It is true, non-Catholics are not necessarily Protestants, but it is also true that many professed Protestants are not Protestants at all.

The word "Protestant" as applied to those who oppose the papacy, is derived from the word "protest," which appeared in the famous document presented by the dissenting princes at the Diet of Spire, April 19, 1629.

The Diet of Spire, in 1526, decreed religious liberty, but in 1629 the Roman Catholic princes proposed to annul the decree of 1526 and declare instead that "the ministers shall preach the gospel, explaining it according to the writings accepted by the holy Christian [Roman Catholic] Church."

Against this proposed decree the princes who espoused the Reformation protested in the following noble words:—

Moreover, the new edict declaring the ministers shall preach the gospel, explaining it according to the writings accepted by the holy Christian Church; we think that, for this regulation to have any value, we should first agree on what is meant by the true and holy Church. Now, seeing that there is great diversity of opinion in this respect; that there is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; that this Holy Book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness: we are resolved, with the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only Word, such as it is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine

and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God.

For these reasons, most dear lords, uncles, cousins, and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we protest by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, and who will one day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people, neither *consent* nor *adhere* in any manner whatever to the proposed decree, in *anything* that is *contrary to God, to his holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of our souls, and to the last decree of Spire.*

This was Protestantism in the 16th century, and it is true Protestantism in the closing years of the 19th century. True Protestantism says: "There is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God." He who teaches or practices contrary to this is not a Protestant. True Protestantism says: "The Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine." He who teaches any other doctrine is not a Protestant. True Protestantism pledges itself "to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only Word, such as it is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it." Where true Protestantism is found to-day this pledge is maintained.

When the civil power attempts to prohibit the exercise of this great privilege and duty, either in precept or practice, true Protestantism arises in its Christian manhood and refuses either to "consent" or "adhere in any manner whatever," and makes its protest in the face of kings, princes, "lords, uncles, cousins and friends," and "before all men and all creatures." This is true Protestantism; but it is more, it is true Christianity, and none but a true Christian can be a true Protestant though he may be opposed to the Roman Catholic Church and belong to an anti-Roman Catholic society.

We recommend to our correspondent and to all others who wish to examine this matter further and do missionary work among their neighbors to secure copies of a little thirty-two page tract, entitled, "Protestantism, True and False," published by the International Religious Liberty Association, and for sale at the SENTINEL office. A second edition of this tract has just been issued, which contains three appendixes of valuable new matter. Those who read the tract on its first publication ought to get a copy of the second edition, price 4 cents, \$2.00 per hundred.

### Acting Like "Protestants" in Maryland.

THE Sun, of the 8th inst., had the following:—

QUEBEC, Aug. 7.—A French Baptist mission has recently been established in this city with its headquarters in a building on Bridge Street, not far from its intersection with St. Joseph Street. Yesterday's *Le Lecteur* contained a reference to this mission and erroneously styled it the Salvation Army. Last night a mob estimated at 5,000 persons gathered round the place and began throwing stones at it. Those in the mission at the time were the Rev. Mr. Burwash, of Grande Ligne, general evangelist; Mr. C. W. Grenier, Grande Ligne, missionary; Mme. Grenier, Mlle. Desjardines, and Mr. Taylor. The attack was a fierce one, and windows and doors soon yielded to the shower of stones. The missionaries were without any means of defense and were held prisoners until after some time a force of policemen came along and cleared the crowd away somewhat.

The mob left the Baptist mission and went up to the building at the corner of George and Richelieu Streets, which is now occupied by the French Episcopal mission. This place, too, was battered with stones, the windows being destroyed. Before the time that the police came up the rioters had moved on to the Salvation Army barracks on Palais Hill.

Another broadside of stones was fired and the property of the army sustained considerable damage. The girls who occupied the place were obliged to flee. The police again arrived too late to make any arrests, and hearing that the gang had again made for the Grande Ligne mission house on Bridge Street, they started in cabs for that place, where they arrived just in time to prevent a second riot. The streets were cleared as thoroughly as possible and the missionaries were then escorted to their home by the police.

A similar disturbance led to serious results a few years ago. To-night's papers say that if the police are unable to cope with the rioters and to preserve the peace and protect all law-abiding citizens in worshipping according to the dictates of their own consciences, they should say so at once, and the military will be called out to do it for them. As it is, the tax-payers will have quite a bill to foot as a result of last night's riots, and not a single person has been arrested. Services will be again attempted at the mission house to-morrow.

This is very similar to the way in which certain so-called Protestants in various parts of Maryland act toward Seventh-day Adventists. Is such conduct any less justifiable in one case than in the other?

### Have Protestants Got Out of Rome?

WAS the Reformation of the sixteenth century a true and complete reform in principle, or was it only partial and incomplete in its principles and consequences? Let the following reflections by Ridpath, in his "Cyclopedia of Universal History," vol. 2, page 615, answer. After stating that the Diet of Augsburg, September 1555, produced a religious peace, which was more than a name, in that freedom of worship and equality of rights before the law were freely and fully granted, he proceeds in the next paragraph as follows:—

It is to modern times, and ever will remain, a matter of surprise, that even in this rather liberal settlement of the religious troubles in Germany, the principles of a *true reform*, of a genuine emancipation of the human mind and conscience, were still unrecognized. A clause was put into the treaty, that the people should not change their faith until *the prince had first changed his!* Thus, in substance, was reasserted by the Reformers themselves that very doctrine which they had renounced at the outset as unbiblical and opposed to reason. As a matter of fact, under the rule adopted, the people of the Palatinate of the Rhine were, in the age following the Diet of 1555, obliged to change their faith *four times* from Catholic to Protestant, and back again, in a vain endeavor to conform to the beliefs of their successive rulers!

Such facts as these may well lead us to inquire for a moment into the true nature of the Reformation. The trouble with the reform party of the sixteenth century was that it proceeded unconsciously under one principle of action, and openly avowed *another*. One motive was, so to speak, hidden in the breast of the movement, and another was given forth as the reason of the insurrection.

In *fact*, the Reformation tended to one result; in its *avowed principles* to another. The Reformers said that they set themselves against the authority of the Church, only because that authority had become abusive. They admitted the *principle* of [Church] authority almost as absolutely as the mother church herself. They claimed to fight against the *abuses* of authority only. But, in *fact*, the movement was against the *principle* of authority. Thus the Reformers were soon obliged to disown the logical results of their own work. The actual tendency was to emancipate men from ecclesiastical and dogmatic thralldom; but this the Reformers durst not allow. They were afraid to admit the doctrine of religious freedom. They denied that their labors were to that end. They affirmed that their work was to substitute a legitimate for an illegitimate authority in the Church. But what was a legitimate authority? Should the Church decide that question for herself? If so, that was what Rome had said from the beginning, and Protestantism was already on the high road to run the same career as Catholicism had run, and to arrive at the same miserable end. For, suppose that the Church had declared her authority, and the individual judgment and conscience rejected the decision, what then? Would Protestantism punish and persecute the heretical? Her *avowed principles* declared she must, and her practices soon showed that she would. And for more than three centuries the fatal results of this false assumption of authority, which in the very nature of a genuine Protestantism cannot exist, has distilled its deadly dews in the world.

As a result of this misapprehension or cowardice on

the part of the Reformers, the new churches which they established in those countries that fell under their religious sway, became as abusive as the mother church had been before them. True it is that in a certain moral purity—a certain inner clearness of the organization—the new church was better than the old, but her practices were equally abusive, and her logic worse—worse, because she could adduce, in justification of her conduct, no major premise which had not belonged to Rome for centuries. So when Protestantism, coming into the ascendancy in Germany, Switzerland and England, began to commit in the name of religion, the very crimes of which Catholicism had been guilty, and to justify them by the same arguments, it was not wonderful that sarcastic Rome turned upon her rival a withering glance.

After these clear cut reflections the historian proceeds to outline briefly the events which followed the Diet of Augsburg, in which the true character of the Reformation was seen. He continues:—

It will thus be seen that the Reformers of the sixteenth century, having once made the fatal mistake of taking up the very same major premise under which Rome had all the time been acting, namely, that individual judgment, will and conscience might be properly governed, controlled and coerced by church authority, rushed blindly and of necessity into the same abuses and crimes of which Rome had been so monstrously guilty.

And this came to pass simply because the Reformers did not get entirely out of Rome. Perhaps a complete and perfect emancipation from Roman principles in one or two generations was impossible. The Reformers could not see the logic of their relation to Roman Catholic principles while their great central purpose was organic separation from her communion. Three and a half centuries have passed away and their descendants boasting of greater light fail to see the logic of their modern position on the principles of Rome while they vigorously(?) oppose her outward organization. Rome says the Church was constituted to rule the State. Protestants of Europe and America have all along said and still say the same. *Proof*—Protestant State churches of Europe and in America clamor for church power in politics and the government. Rome claims infallibility, so does Protestantism, by undertaking to establish her religion on “an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.” Rome forbids the Bible to the common people wherever it is possible for her to do so. Protestantism, by her higher criticism, sets the Bible at naught in the estimation of the people, and results are practically the same.

Rome claims to rest her faith on the Bible and tradition. Protestants, in the great central thought of their religious practices—Sunday observance—admit that they have only the authority of the Church, and they take this charge from the mother church and swallowed it without a whimper (See “Rome’s Challenge”). Rome claims the right to coerce the conscience to even correct it by punishments, yea, even to burn a soul to save it.

Protestantism upholds Sunday laws, which fine and imprison men for not giving allegiance to an institution which they consider to be an offspring of apostasy and an abomination to God and heaven. Note the manner in which Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists are treated wherever those old relics of the Dark Ages—Sunday laws—are still upon our State statute books. These men cannot conscientiously bow down to this pagan-papal antichristian pseudo-Sabbath. But their Sunday-Protestant neighbors give them no credit for any conscience nor admit that they have any rights in this matter any more than did religious bigots of the sixteenth century the dissenters of their time,

and so send them to jail. How long before they will demand blood to atone for Sunday desecration? Where is the clear-minded man or woman who cannot see the logic of the present situation? Those who are drunk with the wine of Babylon’s false principles will not see but will repeat the history of the past, and thus fulfill the prophecy of God’s Word.

G. D. BALLOU.

Gainsville, Ga.

#### The Protestant Ministers Also.

A GREAT deal has been said, and much of it justly said, about the arrogance of the Catholic priesthood in the matter of the expurgation from the public school text-books of certain matters of well authenticated history, which show up the papal church of the past in an unenviable light. Much has also been said, and justly said, in denunciation of the subserviency of certain boards of education (notably that of San Francisco), in yielding to the aforesaid demands of the Catholic clergy. One who has given utterance to the bitterest words against Catholics and Catholic aggression is a leading Protestant minister of Stockton, Cal.

And now come the Ministers’ Union of that city, including that same bitter critic of Catholic arrogance, to present a demand to the school board of Stockton, involving the same principle as that of which such loud complaint has been made against the Catholics. It appears that the principal of the high school took occasion to deliver some lectures before his classes on the subject of “evolution,” to which the ministers, and quite a good many other people for that matter, took exception; and the Ministers’ Union, in their ministerial capacity, formally protested.

If the said principal transcended his prerogative as a public school teacher in presenting before his classes, as such, matter of a disputed character not included in the authorized curriculum of the school, the ministers, as citizens, had a legitimate right to protest, and protest earnestly. But that their protest should have any more weight because they are ministers, is sheer assumption. And that assumption is becoming more and more marked as the clergy, both Protestant and papal, assume authoritative functions in the promulgation of their doctrines.

As evidence that the Ministers’ Union of Stockton, deem their protest of superior importance on account of the ministerial position of the petitioners, we present one of the resolutions contained in said protest. It reads as follows:—

*Resolved*, That the school board be also requested by us as ministers not to employ as teachers in our public schools those who will knowingly and intentionally teach in the schools such things as they know to be directly opposed to the teachings of every pulpit in the city, and that without warrant or authority found in the course of study or curriculum adopted by the board, and also, in our estimation, contrary to the spirit of the laws governing the public schools.

As before stated, there is no doubt of the right of the ministers, as citizens, to protest against the introduction in the schools of unauthorized matter; but when they protest against the teaching of anything merely for the reason that it is opposed to that which is taught in their pulpits, then their position is as unwarranted and dangerous as that of the Catholic prelates who demand the expurgation of historical facts from the text-books because such facts are opposed to the teach-

ings of the Catholic pulpits. Whenever our Protestant brethren assume special prerogatives for the ministry or for the Church in secular affairs, they place themselves on Catholic ground. Whenever they assume that the voice of the ministry should be heard above that of others in such matters, they mount the Catholic platform.

The tendency of Protestantism to-day is strongly set that way. As it was in Great Britain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the contest between Protestantism and Catholicism is not for purity of religion, but for political influence. In those days when Catholic prestige was overcome, Protestantism assumed the prerogatives that the vanquished religion temporarily laid down, and *vice versa*. To-day, when Protestant ministers assail with bitter denunciations the presumptuous acts of Catholic authorities, we are apt to see them ambitious to wield the same power that they deny to the Catholics. If we are to have Church domination in secular affairs, it matters but little to the masses which Church is the dictator,—it is bigoted oppression in either event. As the spirit of Church dictation in secular matters is the papal spirit, whether it proceed from a Protestant or Catholic professor, it will finally lead to papal victory. Much that is nominally Protestant to-day, under the growing Church-and-State spirit will shortly appear in its true papal character. The “deadly wound” of the papal “beast” is fast healing, and it is being healed with the effective salve of professed Protestantism, which is blinded with the delusion that there is spiritual power in numerical strength and political influence.

W. N. GLENN.

Oakland, Cal.

#### Shame on Tennessee.

IN an editorial paragraph in the *Examiner* of this week, you say: “We are fighting for the good old Baptist principle of complete separation of Church and State.” Will you please state your position on our Sunday laws, which are at present causing outrageous persecution for conscience’ sake in different parts of our country. One young man, a Mr. Capps, in Tennessee, only a few weeks ago, was taken from his family, a young wife and four small children, one of them sick at the time, living in the woods, at a distance from any neighbor, and is serving a sentence of fifteen months in jail, for laboring on Sunday after having kept the seventh day as sacred. That the origin, purpose, and sentiment that is now supporting our Sunday laws are wholly religious, can be easily seen even by a careless observer.

G. B. W.

So writes one who, we infer, cannot have been a reader of the *Examiner* long, or he would be in no doubt regarding its position. In our issue of Feb. 15, we expressed our sentiments in no doubtful terms, in an article headed, “Shame on Maryland,” regarding a similar case of persecution. A year or two ago such a case in Tennessee called forth an equally unmistakable declaration of our position.

Set it down as a fundamental principle of the *Examiner*’s that it is opposed to persecution of all kinds, everywhere. It is a Baptist newspaper, and Baptists have always protested, and always will protest, against persecution. It is religious perse-

cution, nothing less, to punish men who keep the seventh day of the week holy because they labor on the first day of the week. That is for the State to interfere in a matter that belongs wholly to each man's conscience. All laws that thus undertake to enforce the religious observance of Sunday are, to that extent, a relic of the union of Church and State, and should be at once expunged from the statute book of every American State.—*Examiner*, Aug. 9.

### Saint Worship.

At Saint Anne de Beaupré, a small town on the St. Lawrence River, about twenty-three miles below Quebec, is located a Roman Catholic shrine. To this shrine more than one hundred and fifty thousand "pilgrims" will resort during the year 1894. Some will come from the United States, but a majority are French Catholics from the Catholic Province of Quebec. Excursionists or "pilgrims" flock to the shrine of "St. Anne," by boat and by rail, led by their parish priest, and on landing march to the church, chanting the litany with pious ardor. They bring with them the maimed, the sick, the halt, and the blind, believing that "St. Anne" will cure them. On the arrival of a pilgrimage they immediately repair to the church of "St. Anne," where mass is celebrated for their benefit, and then begins the worship of "St. Anne."

But who is "St. Anne"? Let a book entitled, "Manual of Devotion to Good St. Anne," containing the official indorsement of "Cardinal Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec," answer: "St. Anne is the mother of the mother of God" (p. 73), "the mother of Mary and the grandmother of Jesus" (p. 71), "who from all eternity was more agreeable to God than all other mothers, the Blessed Virgin excepted." p. 132. Where does the cardinal get this astonishing information? Let the book again reply:—

The sacred Scriptures speak very little of many holy personages whose destiny was bound up with the work of our redemption. A single page would contain all that is directly related therein of the Blessed Virgin, and scarcely is St. Joseph mentioned at all, while the *life*, the *virtues*, and even the *name* of St. Anne has been left in complete oblivion. The ever blessed and beloved name of St. Anne has been transmitted to us only by tradition and by the gratitude of Christian nations (p. 70).

But why make pilgrimages to St. Anne de Beaupré? Why ask "St. Anne" to heal the sick? Is "St. Anne" at Beaupré? Oh, no; only "a notable fragment of a finger bone of St. Anne" (p. 73). Where was it obtained?

St. Anne, after her holy death, was buried near Jerusalem; but later on her sacred remains were deposited in the church of the "sepulchre of our lady" in the valley of Jehoshaphat. During the reign of the Roman Emperor Trajan, in the first century of Christendom, the venerable body of St. Anne, or rather the greater portion of it, was brought over to the town of Apt, in the diocese of Avignon (France) where it is still held in deep veneration.\*

Concerning the removal of these precious remains, it is reported that one day a mysterious bark was seen

\*The "Lives of the Saints by Rev. A. Butler," a standard Roman Catholic work, indorsed by 29 bishops and archbishops, says (p. 212, Vol. 3): "Her body was brought from Palestine to Constantinople in 710, whence some portions of her relics have been dispersed in the West." The Roman Emperor Trajan reigned between the years 98 and 117. Therefore the body brought over to France during his reign was not "the hallowed body of St. Anne" at all, for "her body was brought from Palestine to Constantinople in 710," about six hundred years later. Twenty-nine bishops and archbishops against one cardinal! The chances are then 29 to 1, according to Catholic authority, that the "notable fragment of the finger bone of St. Anne," and the half of the "hand bone," before which hundreds of thousands of devout Roman Catholics are prostrating themselves and offering such prayers as, "St. Anne, obtain for me the love of Jesus crucified," were portions of some other "grandmother" or something.

to approach the shores of France. It had neither sail nor rudder, but God was its pilot. Never had the ocean borne a greater treasure. For in the bark were St. Lazarus, with his pious sisters, St. Mary Magdalene and St. Martha, together with several other saintly women. They were fleeing from Palestine, their country, carrying away with them [a] number of priceless relics, the most precious among which was the hallowed body of St. Anne. . . . However, on account of the reigning persecutions, St. Anne's body had to be buried in the ground to protect it against sacrilegious hands, and at length the place where it had been secreted was wholly forgotten. pp. 1-4.

Not to weary the reader longer with details, this Cardinal-indorsed story goes on to say that "a miracle caused the discovery of the hiding place" in 792, seven hundred years after its loss. When found, it is asserted that the case bore the words: "Here lies the body of St. Anne, mother of the Glorious Virgin Mary." From the discovered body the "notable fragment of a finger bone of St. Anne" was secured and exhibited at Beaupré in 1670. "Finally in 1891, after long and constant entreaties, the chapter of Carcassone has graciously condescended to divide into two equal parts its valuable relics of St. Anne, namely, the hand bones, and to share this priceless object with our church." So according to this childish story there is at Beaupré, Quebec, "a fragment of a finger bone of St. Anne" and the half of her "hand bones." This is the reason a hundred and fifty thousand "pilgrims" will visit the place this year, and prostrate themselves on the floor before a glass case containing a part of the relic, and crowd, as the writer has seen, like sheep at a salt lick, around this decaying fragment of mortality, hoping to kiss the glass that covers it. The blind, the halt, and the maimed, aided by friends and relatives, struggle to touch, not the hem of the garment of *Jesus*, "who ever liveth to make intercession for us," but the decaying "fragment of the finger bone" of the "grandmother of *Jesus*." More anon.

### Woman Suffrage in a School Election.

MUCH ill-feeling has been engendered in South Amboy by the school election. The election was the first held under the new law, and a full board was elected. The trouble has grown out of the action of the priest in charge of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, who, it is said, ordered the women of the parish to vote for the candidates of their religious faith. About the time the polls opened the Catholic women met in St. Mary's School Hall. From there they went to the polling place in blocks of four. All were provided with ballots.

The Protestants knew nothing of this until the women began to vote in large numbers, always four in a squad. They soon found out what was going on. For the rest of the time the polls remained open there was lively work on the part of the Protestants to overcome the advantage obtained by the Catholics. The wives, daughters, and sweethearts of the Protestants were hurried to the polling places as soon as possible.

Many of them were called from bed to cast the ballot they were entitled to. It was too late when the work of the Protestants commenced to avail them much. The count showed that the Catholics had elected six of the nine trustees. The Protestants claim that they will contest the election on the ground that many of the women who voted were not of the required age. It is understood that prom-

inent members of the Junior Order A. P. A. will enjoin the board from entering into the discharge of their duties. This will bring the matter into court on *quo warranto* proceedings.—*Primitive Catholic*.

### Strikes in This Country in the Order of Their Occurrence.

- 1796. Philadelphia, boot and shoemakers, for an increase of wages.
  - 1798. Philadelphia, same trade and cause.
  - 1799. Philadelphia, same trade and cause. These strikes were successful.
  - 1803. New York, sailors struck for an increase of wages from \$10 to \$14 a month. They became riotous, were suppressed, the leader convicted and sent to jail. Failed.
  - 1805. Philadelphia, journeymen boot-makers for an increase of pay. Failed. The organizers, found guilty of conspiracy to raise wages, fined \$8 each.
  - 1809. New York, two hundred shoemakers. Successful.
  - 1815. Pittsburg, shoemakers struck, but failed.
  - 1821. Albany, printers struck against non-union workmen. Result not now known.
  - 1827. Spinning girls in Coheco Mills, N. H., against a rule that tardy employes should pass through a certain room and submit to questions as to the cause of their tardiness; also against reducing their wages.
  - 1830. The carpenters and masons of Boston for ten hours as a day's work. Failed.
  - 1834. (April.) The laborers on the Providence Railroad system struck, became riotous, and were suppressed by Massachusetts militia.
  - 1835. Operatives of twenty mills in Paterson, N. J., struck for shorter hours. Failed.
  - 1835. Coal handlers of Philadelphia for ten hours a day. Without result.
  - 1835. Journeymen shoemakers of Philadelphia struck for shorter hours and more pay. Strike successful.
  - 1836. Dam builders in Maine for the right to smoke at work. Successful.
  - 1836-42. Fifteen strikes—ten unsuccessful, three without positive advantage to either side, two successful.
  - 1842. (February 5.) Iron makers of Pittsburg, for a fixed wage scale. Unsuccessful.
  - 1842. (August.) Weavers of Philadelphia, for more wages; great disturbances, lasted till January, 1843, resulting in a compromise.
  - 1843. (May.) Brickmakers.
  - 1845. (May.) Iron workers of Pittsburg, for higher wages. Successful.
  - 1848. Many strikes in Philadelphia. Generally successful.
  - 1848. Weavers in Fall River, Mass.
  - 1849. (December.) Great strike in iron industries in Pittsburg, accompanied by riots, beating nonunion men; wives and daughters of strikers join with them. Failed.
  - 1850-60. Many strikes of small importance, and generally unsuccessful.
  - 1850. (February 22.) Many strikes of Massachusetts shoemakers. Militia quelled the riots.
- No record is found of labor disturbances during the war.
- 1868. Fall River spinners and weavers,

- against a reduction of wages. Successful in part.
- 1868-69. Seventeen large strikes, most of which failed.
1874. (December 5). Iron workers of Pittsburgh, against unfair wages. Successful.
- 1871-75. Union cigarmakers struck seventy-eight times.
- 1873-75. Strikes all over the country in cotton, wool, and mining trades.
1877. The "great railroad strike" began at Martinsburg, W. Va., July 16, with the strike of the locomotive firemen on the Baltimore and Ohio. Within a week it included nearly all the great roads east of the Mississippi, except the New York Central. At Martinsburg the mob prevailed against the troops; the Fifth Maryland Regiment was mobbed in the streets of Baltimore; the National Guard of Pennsylvania was mobbed in the streets of Pittsburgh; five millions dollars damage to the Pennsylvania Railroad alone. Not until United States troops arrived were the mobs dispersed. The men on the New York Central did not join in that strike. In return for their loyalty the company distributed one hundred thousand dollars in cash among them.
1880. According to the Tenth Census, there were seven hundred and sixty-two strikes.
1886. There were nineteen hundred strikes, including the Gould strike on the Southwestern railroad system.

In six years there were over 20,000. According to Carroll D. Wright, the causes of strikes were: For increase of wages, 42.44 per cent.; for reduction of hours, 19.45 per cent.; against reduction of wages, 7.75 per cent.; for increase of wages and reduction of hours, 7.53 per cent.; against increase of hours, 0.62 per cent.—*New York Sun*.

#### Important Historical Errors Corrected.

A WORK has recently appeared on "The Sources of the Constitution of the United States." Its author is Dr. C. E. Stevens, the rector of a Protestant Episcopal church. The book has received high praise for fullness of information concerning the relations which our political institutions bear to those of the mother country. It contains, however, evidence that the author holds "a brief for his pet theory of the exclusively Anglican source of our American ideas." Dr. Lewis G. Janes, President of the Ethical Society of Brooklyn, points out serious historical errors in the work, and does it so conclusively as to deserve the thanks of the public.

The statement of Dr. Stevens which he refutes is this:—

The boast is wont to be made that the Puritans of New England led the way in establishing by law religious toleration. A similar claim is still put forth in behalf of the Baptists of Rhode Island. Truth must award the honor to Maryland, where action proceeded from a combination of Roman Catholic and non-Catholic conditions. This action of Maryland took place in 1649, and that of Rhode Island in 1663. In the next year (1664) the proprietaries granted to the colonists of New Jersey the widest toleration. Enactments known as the Duke's laws, issued in 1665 by an assembly which met on Long Island at the call of Governor Nichol, declared that no person professing a belief in Christianity should be molested for his judgment in matters of religion.

On this Dr. Janes shows, first, that the Maryland declaration limited the condi-

tions of toleration to those Christian sects who did not deny the doctrine of the Trinity, and excluded not only all non-Christians, but all Unitarian Christians, from its benefits. He then shows that the original compact of the settlers of "Providence Plantations," 1636, bound the inhabitants to submit themselves to all orders and agreements made for public good by the majority "only in civil things." He shows that March 17, 1644, five years before the date of the Maryland edict, a charter had been obtained at the personal solicitation of Roger Williams, during the period of the Commonwealth in England, which expressly affirmed the principle of noninterference of the civil government with matters of conscience and belief, and that even before that the towns had by mutual agreement organized a general government and chosen representatives to a legislative assembly. One of the first acts of this assembly was to affirm the principle of religious liberty in these words: "That none be accounted a delinquent for doctrine, provided it be not directly repugnant to the government or laws established."

Roger Williams held the doctrine of "soul liberty," and he argued that neither papists, Jews, nor Turks should be deprived of liberty of conscience, or be forced to observe any other worship than that which satisfied their own conscience. Having disposed of this matter, and thus shown that Dr. Stevens errs in fixing the date of the Rhode Island Edict of Toleration in 1663, because that year King Charles II. granted a charter to the colony, for the Baptists preceded that seventeen years; he then observes that the exclusive claim sometimes made for the Baptists of Rhode Island is also open to objection, as the doctrine of "soul liberty" was proclaimed as the corner stone of the new commonwealth before the Baptists, or the Anabaptists, as they were then called, came thither from Massachusetts, and before Roger Williams himself was converted and baptized into that faith; but that Roger Williams was in fact the founder of the *first organized commonwealth* in the world's history that expressly affirmed the doctrine of soul liberty and the complete separation of religion from the control of the civil authority.

We have long been aware that the most careful critics hold that the religious toleration which prevailed in Maryland, so much vaunted, was "evidently dictated by worldly prudence rather than prompted by advanced charity," and became aware of it in a very peculiar and somewhat humiliating manner. The writer, making an address in Maryland, paid it the usual compliment for being the first to establish toleration, and one of its citizens took him aside afterward, and said that that was rhetorically proper, but if he would investigate closely the facts he would discover that it was an act dictated by political prudence, under a condition making it practically necessary to give the Roman Catholics what they wanted, and was not upon a principle of general liberty and the right of all to it, but was restricted to serve the purposes of those who formed the combination.

Dr. Janes justly observes that it is to the honor and credit of Roger Williams, who, during his whole life was involved in controversies with papists, Quakers, Puritans, and many others, that "in spite of these controversies and disagreements, he steadfastly upheld the right of every

sort of schismatic to hold his own opinions, obedient to the dictates of his own conscience, without interference by the civil power."—*N. Y. Christian Advocate*.

#### The Pope on Bible Study.

REV. A. MEILLE, a Waldensian pastor in Italy, comments very pertinently on the encyclical letter regarding the "Study of the holy Scripture" issued some months ago by the pope. In a late number of the *Voice from Italy*, a missionary periodical of the Waldenses, he writes:—

"Those who fondly hoped that the encyclical marked a new departure in the attitude of the church of Rome towards the Bible must recognize that, on the contrary, all the old positions are maintained without a single exception. At the very outset, oral tradition is placed on the same level as the written word, as being equally with it a revelation of God. 'The church' is declared to be the only custodian and rightful interpreter of the Bible.

"There is not the slightest promise in the whole encyclical of the Bible ever being given into the hands of the people, who must remain satisfied with such fragmentary portions of it as they can find in their mass books or hear read from the steps of the altar. And as for the priests, they themselves are not to be allowed to study the Scriptures in an independent manner.

"Then the text-book to be placed in their hands is the Latin Vulgate Version, and recourse to what is curiously called 'the previous languages' is only to be allowed in special circumstances. No one is permitted to expound the Scriptures in a way contrary to the meaning attached to them by the church or the unanimous consent of the fathers."

#### State and Church.

IN a recent editorial on the state of the churches the *Boston Herald* says: "Between this age and those which have preceded it, there is no point of difference more clearly marked than that which relates to the attitude of the State toward religion. Not even the mechanical triumphs of our age would make a greater impression on men of another time permitted to revisit earth than this unqualified subjection of the Church to the State. For it is a complete inversion of the order of society out of which our civilization has grown and in which our liberty found its roots. The doctrine that the State has no concern with a man's beliefs is a conception so decidedly modern as not yet to have made a complete tour of civilization. There are certainly countries within the pale of civilized intercourse in which it would be scouted as energetically as it would have been in the England of three hundred years ago, where restless and daring spirits were already beginning to conceive the scheme of founding a greater England across the western main." Our contemporary is a little over-confident, however, when it assumes that there is no substantial danger in these days from the encroachments of any church in the sphere of government. We have only to recall recent attempts to introduce a religious creed in the Constitution, and the Sabbatarian agitation to close the World's Fair on Sunday, to be reminded that ecclesiasticism is anxious enough to use government for the restriction of liberty.—*Christian Register*.

**Nineteenth Century Mediævalism.**

DISAPPROVING of the Coxeyite movement does not entail approval of the treatment of the Denver contingent of the army which is now lying in jail at Fort Sydney, Neb. According to the dispatches the men have been confined more than a month in a small building, hardly large enough to accommodate one-half their number. Many of the prisoners have no blankets or other covering, and are compelled to sleep on the bare floor, which is overrun with vermin. They are without the most common conveniences generally granted to even the lowest class of criminals in all prisons. The men are guarded by about forty deputy United States marshals, who allow the prisoners no outdoor exercise except an occasional bath in the creek. Two meals a day are given, generally consisting of boiled beef, often tainted, bread, and a thin infusion of coffee. To make matters worse an epidemic of typhoid fever has broken out among the prisoners.—*The Examiner.*

Are we living in the latter part of the nineteenth century, or in the Middle Ages, which? The men who are responsible for such outrages should be put for a long term where the Coxey movement would not trouble them.

MR. GEORGE, of Mississippi, has introduced into the Senate a joint resolution for an amendment to the Constitution providing that eight hours shall be a legal day's work for persons doing manual labor, and forbidding an employer to allow an employé to work more than 48 hours a week. But why 48? Is there anything sacred and mystical about that number? There would still have to be a Saturday half holiday. That would reduce the hours of labor to 44 a week. Then there should be a mid-week rest on Wednesday. Hours of labor remaining, 36. But Monday should be fishing day, Tuesday hunting day, Thursday speech and convention day, and Friday should be set apart to making the hours of labor still shorter. Then instead of 48 hours a week, 0 hours a week would be a constitutional week's labor. Still, Mr. George could have done better by resolving to abolish hours and labor altogether.—*The Sun.*

SURELY the country in which Romanism gets the most and gives the least is Ireland. A Dublin paper says that to any one who has much to do with religious work in Ireland it is evident that Rome is not changed in the matter of persecution. The other day a mother who had placed her children in a convent in the suburbs of Dublin, went to reclaim them, she having, since their admission, become a Protestant. A hostile crowd assembled, and the mother was compelled to go away without her children. It will be like this in America if the Romanists and the half-breed Protestants have their way.—*The Denver American.*

**Abiding Sabbath And Lord's Day.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES.

A pointed review of the \$500 and \$1,000 prize essays in support of the Christian Sabbath, so called. Those desiring some \$1,000 reasons for keeping the first day of the week, will find them here. 173 pages, 20 cents. Pacific Press, 43 Bond St., New York City.

**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. 123 pages. Price 15 cts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Order of PACIFIC PRESS,

43 Bond Street, New York City,

Or Oakland, Cal.

**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.

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.

**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.

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.



NEW YORK, AUGUST 23, 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 paragraphs quoted on page 260, from the *Examiner*, in condemnation of the persecution of Adventists under the Sunday laws of certain States, are from an article, the latter part of which is a weak defense of such statutes on so-called civil grounds. The *Examiner's* heart is in the right place, but the paper is not consistent throughout.

LET no reader of the AMERICAN SENTINEL forget that during this hot weather an honest Christian man is languishing in a southern jail for no other offense than working on Sunday according to the express command of God: "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work." He had work to do and he did it; for this he is in prison and will be, if he lives, for months to come.

THE *Christian Statesman* states that "under the régime of the present emperor of Germany, a strict observance of the law forbidding manual labor on Sunday is being enforced." That is not strange since it is written in the Word of God that all the world shall worship the papacy "whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb." Of course Germany will be no exception; it, too, will exalt the Sunday, the badge of papal power.

THE editor of the *Salamanca News*, formerly the *Bugle Horn*, informs us that his paper "recognizes that there are other things deserving treatment as well as 'prohibition and woman suffrage,' and treats them, too," and asks, "Does the SENTINEL do likewise?" Well, yes. In fact, as those subjects are generally treated they have never seemed to us to be very important, and we have given our attention very largely to other issues. But that is no reason why the *Bugle Horn*, *News*, or whatever the thing may happen to be this week, should violate the ninth commandment. In referring to this paper it says: "If a person were to read the AMERICAN SENTINEL, he would be led to conclude that there was only one commandment, and that for the observance of the Sabbath." Now, the editor either knew when he wrote that he wrote a falsehood, or else he had not read the SENTINEL, and so did not know whereof he affirmed. He can choose which horn of the dilemma he will take. The good Book says: "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him." Our contemporary may not be malicious but only demonstrating the truth of the Scripture.

In a sermon in this city, July 29, Rev. Thomas Dixon said:—

The outlook for the immediate future is one of suffering and oppression. The capitalists will surely retaliate on the workingmen. They will triumph in their strength. Yet they should not imagine that they are safe from future violence. Another strike is bound to come. It will affect every industry and paralyze the world. I predict that a fearful struggle will occur in the near future.

Thoughtful men everywhere take a similar view of the situation. The outlook is not promising from a worldly standpoint. But while men's hearts are "failing them for fear and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth," the foundation of God stands sure. He will be the refuge of his people.

THE *Examiner*, "the national Baptist newspaper," published in this city, has these pertinent words relative to the influence of women in politics:—

One wonders what sort of women those are who are joining in "ovations" to Col. W. C. P. Breckinridge, the dissolute representative from Kentucky, who is now seeking reelection to Congress. The revolting conduct of which he was guilty, and of which he seems on the whole, rather proud, ought to exclude him for ever, not only from public life, but from the society of all pure-minded men and women. And yet, at a recent political gathering in his district, one hundred "ladies" are said to have been present, and to have lavished upon him the most fulsome flatteries. Is it in such ways as this that "woman's influence" is to purify politics?

The fact is, as we have before remarked in these columns, that men and women are both human, and it is vain to look to human nature for salvation from the evils of such nature.

SENATOR GEORGE has introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, as follows:—

JOINT RESOLUTION

To amend the Constitution in relation to hours of labor.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution of the United States:

"Eight hours shall constitute a legal day's work for persons doing manual labor. No person, association, or corporation engaged in mining, manufacturing, or in any other mechanical pursuit or public work, or in transportation other than watercraft, shall require or permit any employé doing manual labor to work for such person, association, or corporation more than forty-eight hours in one week, except in cases of emergency prescribed by law. Persons voluntarily and lawfully engaged in any of the above pursuits shall not be unlawfully hindered or obstructed.

"Congress shall enforce this provision by appropriate legislation."

It seems that two things are to be accomplished by this resolution; first, six days is to constitute a week of labor; and, second, it is to give the United States undoubted jurisdiction over all labor difficulties. How far it can be manipulated in the interests of Sunday remains to be

seen and will depend very much on the legislation enacted under it, should it become a part of the fundamental law of the land.

THE *Philadelphia Inquirer*, of July 31, has this significant paragraph concerning the trouble between China and Japan:—

Supposing that England and Germany took up the cause of China, and Japan refused to take their advice with the backing of the czar, and supposedly that of France, there would be a war such as the earth never felt before. With 10,000,000 European soldiers, armed and equipped in the latest manner, added to the countless millions of China and Japan, and with several hundred modern warships, there would ensue a war that would bear out all the terrible prophecies of the Apocalypse.

This does not seem probable just now, but the general war referred to as a subject of prophecy will surely come. The Word of God cannot fail. But whether it comes now or a little later the paragraph quoted shows the state of mind which prevails very largely everywhere. General forebodings fulfill the words of our Lord: "Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth."

"THE Legal Aspect of Sunday: Its History and Character," is the title of No. 22 of the *Religious Liberty Library*. The work is by James T. Ringgold of the Baltimore Bar, who is not a stranger to the readers of the SENTINEL. The author discusses the historical, moral and constitutional aspect of the question so exhaustively as to leave "no point untouched and no question unsolved." The work is dedicated to members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, though as the preface declares, "the author is not a member of that communion." Though holding views of this question similar to those held by members of this church they are not borrowed from them, since Mr. Ringgold published a legal work embodying these views long before he knew that there was such a people holding them. The matter is divided into seventeen chapters which, together with the prefaces and a very interesting supplement on the present "fad" of "clerical slumming," make a book of 252 pages. The work is a veritable digest of the Sunday law fallacies with their complete refutation. Price 40 cents, with usual discounts to dealers. Order of Pacific Press, 43 Bond St., this city or of the International Religious Liberty Association, 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.