



“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 30, 1894.

NUMBER 34.

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,	}	- - - EDITORS.
CALVIN P. BOLLMAN,		
A. F. BALLENGER,		ASSISTANT EDITOR.

JOACHIM PECCI, as Leo XIII., is pope of Rome, and of all that the word Rome suggests.

THIS Joachim Pecci, as “Leo XIII., Pope,” has recently—June 21—addressed a communication “to the Princes and Peoples of the Universe.”

BUT why does this man Pecci presume to speak to the princes and peoples of the universe? What causes Joachim Pecci to think that the universe will listen or care to listen to what he has to say?

OH, he thinks that he is God on earth! He actually tells “the princes and peoples of the universe” that “We”—there seems to be more than one of him—“We hold the regency of God on earth.” And he tells it with an air that suggests that he really expects the universe to take seriously and believe the ridiculous statement.

Now, what is a regency?—This is what it is: A regency is the office and administration of a regent; and a “regent is an administrator of a realm during the minority or incapacity of the king;” “one who rules or reigns, hence, one invested with vicarious authority; one who governs a kingdom in the minority, absence, or disability, of the sovereign.”

Now, if there are any princes or peoples in the universe who think that God is in his minority and is therefore too young, or that he is old enough but is afflicted with some disability and is consequently unable to conduct the affairs of the universe; or who think that he is all right himself, but has gone off somewhere outside of the universe; and if, in addition, those princes and peoples think that the Lord has left Joachim Pecci to run the universe during the period of his “minor-

ity, disability, or absence;” then of course it is to be expected that such princes or peoples will listen respectfully to what Mr. Pecci says when he addresses the princes and peoples of the universe. For, as a matter of course, if Mr. Joachim Pecci occupies the throne and conducts the affairs of the universe in the place of God, it follows plainly enough that when he speaks he speaks to the universe, and must be listened to accordingly.

BUT if any person believes that God is what he is, “the King Eternal, Immortal, Invisible, the Only Wise God,” then that person knows that it is impossible that such a thing could ever occur as his “minority, absence, or disability;” that therefore it is impossible that there ever could be any such thing as a “regency of God;” and that, consequently, the idea that Joachim Pecci or any other man should “hold the regency of God on earth,” or anywhere else, is too ridiculous for serious consideration if it were not supremely blasphemous. NO; Vincent Joachim Pecci, as “Leo XIII., Pope,” has no more right or authority to assert or claim to hold any “regency of God,” and from such position speak to the princes and peoples of the universe, than has any other Italian or any Hottentot. Yet there are so many princes and peoples who actually believe this ridiculous and blasphemous thing, and there are so many more who will admit tacitly or otherwise this ridiculous and blasphemous claim, and all together will therefore give such place to this claim and such force to these words, that for this reason and no other, it is well to set forth the principal points in this communication to “the universe.”

IN calling all the universe to “the unity of the Catholic faith,” he first designates those outside the pale of Christendom, next the Eastern churches, next the Slavonic race, and lastly the Protestants. He so longs for the Protestants in particular that he says, it is with “burning charity” that he turns toward these. Yes, there is no doubt of that. Those who have exercised this same “regency” before him have always had a burning charity for Protestants. John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and thousands of other

Protestants, were literally burned to ashes by it. We—and there are actually more than one of us—we desire to see no more manifestations of this “burning charity” anywhere in “the universe.”

THAT part that is the most important to the people of the United States—that part that will be the most taking to the professed Protestants in the United States, and that will be pushed to the front most here, is the passage in which he states the relations of the Church to the State. Here it is:—

It [the Church] is invested with power to make laws, and in the exercise of this power it is just that it should be free, even as this is just to all in any way depending on its authority. This liberty, however, need not arouse rivalries and antagonisms, for the Church aspires to no power and obeys no ambitions. What it desires solely is to preserve among men the exercise of virtue, and by this means assure their eternal salvation. And so it uses condescension and maternal processes. More than this, having regard to the requirements of all societies, it sometimes waives the exercise of its own rights, as has been shown abundantly by its conventions with different States. Nothing is farther from its thoughts than to trespass upon the rights of civil authority, which in return should respect the rights of the Church and beware of usurping any part of them. . . . God, Creator and Ruler of the world, of his high foresight, has given forth government of human societies, both civil and sacred authorities, wishing thereby, no doubt, to keep them distinct, but forbidding all rupture and conflict between them. This is not all. The Divine will and the general good of societies require that the civil power should be in harmony with the ecclesiastical power.

The State has its own rights and duties. The Church has hers. Between them there should be the bonds of strictest concord. So would surely be suppressed the unrest visible in the relations of Church and State—an unrest for many reasons perilous and grievous to all good people. So, without confusing or separating rights, all citizens could render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things which are God’s.

That all sounds very well, and looks nice enough on paper, but like fly-paper, or the sugared pill, its sweetness is all on the surface and very thin at that. As thin as it is, however, it is altogether likely that it is thick enough to cause many professed Protestants to think that instead of a sugar pill it is a perfectly rounded bulb of solid sweetness, or instead of mere fly-paper and poisoned too, it is a whole hive of honey. Let us set alongside of this a passage on this point, written only three years ago by this same Mr.

Pecci, writing then as now as "Leo XIII., Pope." Here it is:—

It is the Church that proclaims from the gospel those teachings by which the conflict can be put an end to, or at least made far less bitter; the Church uses its efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by its precepts the life and conduct of men; . . . and acts on the decided view that for these purposes recourse should be had in due measure and degree, to the help of the law and of State authority.

This shows that "the bonds of strictest concord" that should be between the Church and the State are such bonds as shall bind the State to do the bidding of the Church and be her obedient tool in helping the Church in "its efforts not only to enlighten the mind but to direct by its precepts the life and conduct of men."

HE next condemns, without measure, "the Masonic sect." We are not qualified to defend Masonry; but we know perfectly well that, admitting the truth of all that he says of Masonry, most, if not all, of it is true with far more force of the papacy. Here it is:—

It is a formidable power which has long oppressed all nations, and especially Catholic nations. Insolently proud of strength, resources, and successes, it spares no pains in these our troubled times to affirm and extend its dominion everywhere. From the dark caverns where it once plotted it has invaded our cities in broad daylight. . . . Most deplorable is it that wherever it enters it permeates all classes and all State institutions, as though it would constitute itself the sovereign arbitrator of all things. This we hold specially regrettable, for the perversity of its opinions and the iniquity of its designs are flagrant. Under cover of protecting the rights of man, and reforming society, it assails Christian institutions. . . . Marriage, the idea of the family, the education of youth, it strives to deprive of their Christian character, aiming also at the destruction of the popular respect for divine and human power. The cult it orders is the cult of nature. And it holds up the principles of nature as the one measure and the one rule of truth, honesty, and justice. Thus, as we see, man is driven to the ways and habits of an almost pagan life, if the abundance and refinement of seductions do not drive him still lower.

He says that it is in that very city of Rome, "the capital of the Catholic world, that it has established headquarters;" and with vastly more force it is true of the papacy that in the city of Washington, "the capital of the modern world," the church of Rome has established headquarters, that mean only mischief to the United States and to the world. His wish concerning Masonry is thus expressed:—

May the divine mercy upset these dark designs, and may Christian people understand that they must do away with this sect, and shake off, once for all, its shameful yoke.

Such is his "burning charity" toward them and all the rest of us, just as it always has been.

BEFORE closing he covertly pays tribute to his own authority as supreme, and warns all of what they may expect if they are not subject to it. This he puts thus:—

Reason yields to some the lawful right to command and enjoins on others to obey. In this obedience there is nothing hurtful to human dignity, since, speaking strictly, God is obeyed rather than man, and God reserves his most rigorous judgments for those who command unless they represent his authority in conformity with right and justice.

And lastly, he does not miss the opportunity to set himself forth as the "mediator of peoples and governments" in these times of disorder and "prevailing unrest" in the present, and of "fear of the future." And here are his words on that:—

Lastly, if we reflect upon what the Church can do as a mother and mediator of peoples and governments,

helping all by its authority and counsel, we shall see how important it is that all nations should adopt the same feeling and profession in matters appertaining to the Christian faith. While our mind dwells on these thoughts and our heart prays for their realization, we see in the far distant future a new order of things unfolding itself. We know nothing sweeter than the contemplation of the great benefits which would result naturally from it. . . . The virtue of these benefits would not be limited to civilized nations. It would go far beyond, like a broad, fertilizing river. . . . Especially do we implore princes and rulers in the name of their political foresight and solicitude for the interests of their peoples, to weigh our designs equitably, and second them by their favor and authority. Were only a part of the fruits that we expect to ripen, the benefit would not be small amid the present rapid downfall of all things, and when to the prevailing unrest is joined fear of the future.

Thus he invites princes and rulers to help forward his grand scheme of insinuating himself into the place of dictator of the nations, and obediently enforce his dictates upon the people of the world.

THIS communication of "Leo XIII., Pope," was taken up and discussed by the *Tribune* of this city in a "tone and manner" which the *Catholic World* is "much pleased to acknowledge" as "most respectful and amicable." And this fact, the *Tribune* being Protestant, the *Catholic World* says "furnishes one of the best arguments which can be adduced in proof of the legitimacy and validity of the claim which the pope makes to be the vicegerent of God on earth and the divinely commissioned teacher of the Christian religion to all mankind." The argument is, that if the *Tribune* and others who speak and act as it does on this subject were really Protestant, they would not show any respect or courtesy to such a document issued upon such claims as is this. But being Protestants and receiving it with its claims "with respect and courtesy," this is declared to be "a powerful proof" that the claims that are made are legitimate and valid. We are not real certain but that there may be something in this view of the matter. For when anybody can treat with respect and courtesy a communication addressed as this one is, asserting the supremely ridiculous and blasphemous claims that this one does, then it would seem that such person really supposed that there might be something in the claim that was worthy of respect and courtesy. And when anybody, professing to be a Protestant, does such a thing, it would seem that it is not far from a tacit concession of some sort to the legitimacy and validity of the claim.

In this same number of the *Catholic World* a prominent Catholic describes Seventh-day Adventists as being of the last remnants of "consistent Protestantism." We are glad that they recognize even a remnant of consistent Protestantism, and we are very glad that they recognize us by name as being this remnant. It is therefore doubtless expected by them that we shall not receive this communication with any respect or courtesy. This is right. Their expectation is fulfilled so far. Therefore, in closing, we may be allowed to state that we have no more respect for Joachim Pecci as "Leo XIII., Pope," addressing the princes and peoples of the universe, and notifying them that he holds "the regency of God on earth," or addressing anybody else in any other way, than we have for any other man who should set forth the ridiculous and blasphemous claims that he does.

The Rights of Conscience.

THE question of the rights of conscience has been brought very prominently before the country by the case of Private Charles O. Cedarquist, Company A, Second Infantry, the particulars of which case are thus given in the official report, copied in the *Congressional Record* of August 3, as follows:—

Charge.—"Disobedience of orders, in violation of the twenty-first article of war."

Specification.—"That Private Charles O. Cedarquist, Company A, Second Infantry, having been ordered by his superior officer, Second Lieut. Edwin V. Bookmiller, Second Infantry, in the execution of his office, to take a rifle and proceed at once with his target practice, did refuse to obey, and did disobey said order. This at Bellevue Rifle Range, Bellevue, Nebr., June 17, 1894."

Pleas.—"In bar of trial." Not sustained by the court. The accused then pleaded "Not guilty."

Findings.—"Guilty."

Sentence.—"To be confined at hard labor under charge of the guard for the period of six months, and to forfeit to the United States \$10 per month of his pay for the same period."

The defense in this case was "limited to the contention that the order in respect of which disobedience was charged was an unlawful one in that, first, it enjoined a duty to be performed on Sunday in violation of orders and regulations limiting Sunday labor in the Army to the measure of strict necessity; and second, that the act required to be done would have been a violation of section 241 of the criminal code of Nebraska."

The view taken of the matter by the court was—

That a commanding officer has a discretion under existing orders to require target practice by his command on Sunday in a case of necessity, is undoubted. The evidence in this case fails to fix upon the commanding officer of Bellevue Rifle Range, Nebraska, any abuse of discretion in the issue of the order complained of by the accused. The legality of that order and the obligation of the accused to obey it when duly transmitted to him cannot, in the opinion of the reviewing authority, be questioned. It was not for him to judge the necessity for the issue of the order. That discretion pertained to his commanding officer, and once exercised, whether erroneously or not, it was the duty of the accused to obey.

The sentence of the court-martial was approved by Brig. Gen. Brooke, who, however, commuted it with this remark:—

The sentence is approved, but in view of the peculiar circumstances attending the commission of the offense, is mitigated to confinement at hard labor for two months at the station of his company. It is desired, however, that it shall be understood that, in view of the warning held out in this order, offenses of the character charged in this case will not in the future be regarded as fitting ones for the exercise of clemency.

August 1, Mr. Cedarquist was released, by order of the President, communicated in the following telegram:—

Adjutant-General's Office, Washington,
August 1, 1894.

COMMANDING GENERAL, Department Platte, Omaha,
Nebr.:—

The unexecuted portion of the sentence awarded Private Cedarquist, promulgated in General Court-Martial Orders No. 45, current series, from your headquarters, is this day remitted by the President, and you will cause the man to be released at once. This action, however, is not in any manner to be regarded as a justification of the disobedience of orders on the part of the soldier. The officer who ordered target practice on Sunday, in violation of the order of President Lincoln, given in November, 1862, must be brought to trial for his disobedience of orders.

By order of the Secretary of War,
GEO. D. RUGGLES, Adjutant-General.

Speaking in the House on the 2nd inst., to a resolution asking that the facts of case be laid before Congress, by the War Department, Mr. Grosvenor of Ohio, said:—

It appears by the record of the court-martial that on the day in question some officer of the United States

Army ordered the company of troops to which Cedarquist belonged to go upon a rifle range somewhere in the neighborhood of Omaha and engage in the business of firing at target. It appears by the record that the soldier respectfully declined to go, stating at the time that it was improper and unlawful to make such a requirement, and that he was conscientiously opposed to doing that duty on the Sabbath day.

This shows that the real defense was the rights of conscience. Private Cedarquist (mistakenly, it is true) regards Sunday as the Sabbath, as he has a right to do; and having the courage of his convictions, he dared to obey God (as he supposed) rather than man. In so doing he stands vindicated and approved by the Government of the United States. But having established this precedent, will the Government consistently adhere to it? or will it respect only the Sunday conscience? In other words, was the real purpose of the President to vindicate the rights of conscience, as such and in *any* man, or to honor Sunday? Time will tell.

But be this as it may, the Cedarquist case opens up again the whole question of the rights of conscience, *i. e.*, of how far conscientious convictions should be recognized and respected by the State. Can the plea that a man acted conscientiously ever be admitted as a justification for violation of law?

That this plea had weight in the Cedarquist case there can be no doubt. Had it been evident that this man had no regard for Sunday, that he had no conscience in the matter, but that his disobedience was willful insubordination, the case would have occasioned no remark and would have received no attention from the President. It is probably true that owing to the prevailing agitation of the Sunday question, this case has received more attention than it would have received had the issue been raised over any other matter, but that does not remove the fact that the President of the United States, and through him, the Government of the United States, has recognized the principle that even private soldiers have rights of conscience which ought to be respected. But, again, the query arises, where shall the line be drawn? It is clear (1) that government cannot become the judge of men's consciences; and (2) that the plea of conscientious conviction cannot be accepted as a final and sufficient defense in all cases of violation of law. What rule, then, can be adopted which will preserve the authority of the State and yet not trench upon the rights of conscience?

The question thus raised is well answered by a clause in the Constitution of the State of Maryland: "No person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless under color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the State, . . . or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights." In this the line is drawn just where it should be, namely, *at the equal rights of others*. Under this provision the courts are not called upon to judge any man's conscience, but only to judge whether or not his conscience leads him to infringe the equal rights of his fellow-men. That a man's conscience is just what he says it is, no man has either right or occasion to deny. A man's statement of his conscience is an end of controversy; but it does not follow that one has a right to do whatever his conscience tells him is right for him to do. There is a difference between conscience and the *rights* of con-

science. No man, however conscientious, has any right to infringe the equal right of another; and at this point civil government has a right to take cognizance, not of any man's conscience, but of the relation of the act to the rights of others.

The principle briefly stated is this: No man should be either required or forbidden to do any act contrary to conscience, however erroneous that conscience may be, unless the doing or forbearing to do that act trenches on the equal rights of others. This rule would (1) abrogate all civil laws requiring the observance of Sunday or of any other day; and (2) it would leave the courts free, not to judge men's consciences, but to protect all men against wrong in the name of conscience. But this is only saying in other words that which we have said many times before, namely, that civil governments are instituted not to create or to "grant" *rights*, but to guarantee the free and untrammelled exercise of equal, natural, God-given, inalienable rights, and that of these the highest and most sacred is perfect freedom in matters of religious belief and practice.

The Government has acted upon this principle in the Cedarquist case; will it, we again ask, adhere to it consistently to the end? or will it regard conscience only in the Sunday-keeper, and ignore it in the Sabbath-keeper, as several of the States have done and are doing? We shall see. As for us, we expect nothing else than that the procedure in this case will be lifted far above all the rights of conscience and of everything else, and will be made to do service in the exaltation of Sunday and its exclusive support by the Government of the United States.

Saint Worship.

SHOULD Paul come forth from his grave and visit the shrine of "Good St. Anne of Beaupré," near the city of Quebec, Canada, his spirit would again be stirred within him as "he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." He would not see the "temple of the great goddess Diana," but the temple of the "valiant," "invincible," "blessed," "holy," "glorious St. Anne," "Mother of the Queen of Angels," "Mother of the Mother of God." Instead of hearing Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen shouting for "the space of two hours," "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," he would find the people saying, day and night, "O good, O glorious, O pious, O merciful, O incomparable Mother Anne." Instead of beholding the people prostrate before the shrine of the "goddess Diana," he would see them kneeling before a gilded statute of "St. Anne" imploringly saying, "Grant, O Good St. Anne, that henceforth I may show myself more worthy of thee, so that, one day, I may be united to thee in heaven." He would see the people crowding the marts of the church buying, not the "Holy Scriptures which," as Paul wrote to Timothy, "are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus," but memorial beads, chains, medals, rings, books, and images of "Good St. Anne" with which, through faith in St. Anne, they hope for protection from the ills of this life and "eternal glory through her intercession."

All this idolatry is practiced by the church claiming to be Christian, to be "the only true church," the "spouse of Christ," the "holy Catholic Church." When the servant of God raises his voice

against such apostasies, as of old, its votaries are "full of wrath," "the whole city is filled with confusion" and, as in the case of the Baptist mission at Quebec on August 7, the servant is stoned and the house of worship wrecked by a Roman Catholic mob.

All this idolatry is sanctioned and encouraged by Pope Leo XIII. in three briefs dated Jan. 28, 1886, Jan. 16, 1887, and May 5, 1887; and a "Pontifical Bull," dated April 26, 1887. And now this man comes forth with an encyclical letter declaring "we hold the regency of God on earth," and invites us to return to his idolatrous and blasphemous worship, to the veneration of "a venerable fragment of a finger bone of St. Anne," and the worship of the "Glorious Mother of the Mother of God," "the Grandmother of Jesus Christ." He also sends a "Delegate Apostolic" and assures us that "what the church has done in the past for others she will do for the United States," that is, what she has done for the Province of Quebec in teaching her poor, deluded, superstitious votaries to pray the following prayer, she promises to do for the people of the United States, and teach them to forsake the "one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ," and divide that place with the woman "St. Anne," whose "life," "virtues," and even "name" "has been left" by the inspired Word of God, "in complete oblivion."

All the quotations regarding St. Anne, referred to in this article, are from a work entitled "Manual of Devotion to Good St. Anne," published by General Printing Office, A. Coté & Co., Quebec, 1891, and is indorsed by Cardinal Taschereau, archbishop of Quebec. Read the following cardinal-indorsed prayer to "St. Anne:"—

PRAYER.

Praise to St. Anne.

Hail, holy Anne, illustrious daughter of David and descended from a race of kings! The Eternal Father cherishes thee as the Mother of His beloved Daughter and the Grandmother of His divine Son. Hail, holy Anne, the Son of God, the eternal Word loveth thee, because thou didst give Him so pure, so good, so holy a Mother. Hail, holy Anne, worthy spouse of the virtuous Joachim! The Holy Ghost holdeth thee in great esteem, because thou didst give unto Him so worthy, so beautiful, so perfect a Spouse. Hail, holy Anne, Mother of Mary, the immaculate Virgin! The whole court of Heaven beholdeth thee with admiration, because thy happiness surpasseth that of all other mothers. Hail, holy Anne, joy of the Angels! All the blessed spirits hold thee in reverence because thou didst give birth to Mary, their august and gentle Queen. Hail, holy Anne, fruitful vine! All the Saints honor thee as the sacred tree whence sprang that lovely flower who is their delight in Heaven, and that worthy fruit which was their joy during their exile on earth. Hail, holy Anne, valiant woman, invincible fortress! The whole Church celebrates thy praises as the Mother of the spotless Virgin, who has always triumphed over every heresy. Hail, holy Anne, sure help of mankind! The just and the sinner alike invoke thee as their beneficent protectress and their powerful advocate before God. Hail, holy Anne, brilliant star that guideth the shipwrecked to port. The exile and the pilgrim look on thee as their stay and their charitable conductress. Hail, holy Anne, mirror of all virtue, in which all who are called to a higher life find a model of perfection, and all Christians find aid in the accomplishment of their duties. Hail, holy Anne, consoler of the unfortunate! In thee the widow finds support, the orphan a mother, the prisoner deliverance, the sick health, and the dying hope. Hail, holy Anne, help of all who implore thy assistance! Thy intercession is all-powerful with the Sacred Heart of Jesus; and Mary, thy immaculate Daughter, beareth thy petitions to the foot of the throne of our thrice-holy God.

Ejaculation.—Good St. Anne, obtain for me the grace of honoring God in his Saints. pp. 103-5.

"Come unto me [not 'grandmother' Anne] all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." **Matt.** 11:28.

Papal Infallibility.

[This matter first appeared in an anonymous pamphlet published and circulated in Italy immediately following the Vatican council of 1870, which proclaimed the dogma of papal infallibility. The pamphlet purported to be a speech delivered in the council "by a bishop," against the dogma. However it is not published on the strength of its having been delivered "by a bishop," for this is denied, but it is reprinted solely on its own merits, scriptural, logical, and historical.]

VENERABLE FATHERS AND BRETHREN: It is not without trembling, yet with a conscience free and tranquil before God, who lives and sees me, that I open my mouth in the midst of you in this august assembly. From the time that I have been sitting here with you, I have followed with attention the speeches that have been made in the hall, hoping with great desire, that a ray of light, descending from on high, might enlighten the eyes of my understanding, and permit me to vote the canons of this holy Ecumenical Council with perfect knowledge of the case. Penetrated with the feelings of responsibility, for which God will demand of me an account, I have set myself to study with the most serious attention, the writings of the Old and New Testaments, and I have asked these venerable monuments of truth to make known to me if the holy pontiff, who presides there, is truly the successor of Saint Peter, vicar of Jesus Christ, and the infallible doctor of the church. To resolve this grave question, I have been obliged to ignore the present state of things, and to transport myself in mind, with the evangelical torch in my hand, to the days when there was neither Ultramontanism nor Gallicanism, and in which the Church had for doctors St. Paul, St. Peter, St. James, and St. John—doctors to whom no one can deny the divine authority, without putting in doubt that which the Holy Bible, which is before me, teaches me, and which the Council of Trent has proclaimed as the rule of faith and of morals. I have, then, opened those sacred pages. Well, shall I dare to say it? I have found nothing, either near or far, which sanctions the opinions of the Ultramontanes. And still more, to my very great surprise, I find no question in the apostolic days of a pope, successor to St. Peter, and vicar of Jesus Christ, no more than of Mahomet, who did not then exist. You, Monsignor Manning, will say that I blaspheme; you, Monsignor Fie, that I am mad. No, monsignori, I do not blaspheme, and I am not mad. Now, having read the whole New Testament, I declare before God, with my hand raised to that great crucifix, that I have found no trace of the papacy as it exists at this moment. Do not refuse me your attention, my venerable brethren, and with your murmurings and interruptions do not justify those who say, like Father Hyacinthe, that this council is not free, but that our votes have been from the beginning ordered (*in precedenza imposti*). If such were the case, this august assembly, on which the eyes of the whole world are turned, would fall into the most shameful discredit. If we wish to make it great, we must be free. I thank his excellency, Monsignor Dupanloup, for the sign of approbation which he makes with his head; that gives me courage, and I go on.

Reading, then, the sacred books with that attention with which the Lord has made me capable, I do not find one single chapter, or one little verse, in which Jesus Christ gives to St. Peter the mastery over

the apostles, his fellow-workers. If Simon, son of Jonas, had been what we believe his holiness, Pius IX., to be today, it is wonderful that he had not said to him, "When I have ascended to my Father, you should all obey Simon Peter as you obey me. I establish him my vicar upon earth."

Not only is Christ silent on this point, but so little does he think of giving a head to the Church that, when he promises thrones to his apostles, to judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28) he promises them twelve, one for each, without saying that among these thrones one shall be higher than the others—which shall belong to Peter. Certainly, if he had wished that it should be so, he would have said it. What do we conclude from this sentence? Logic tells us that Christ did not wish to make St. Peter the head of the apostolic college. When Christ sent the apostles to conquer the world, to all he gave the promise of the Holy Spirit. Permit me to repeat it; if he had wished to constitute Peter his vicar, he would have given him the chief command over his spiritual army. Christ—so says the Holy Scripture—forbade Peter and his colleagues to reign or to exercise lordship, or to have authority over the faithful, like the kings of the Gentiles (St. Luke 29:25). If St. Peter had been elected pope, Jesus would not have spoken thus, because, according to our tradition, the papacy holds in its hands two swords, symbols of spiritual and temporal power. One thing has surprised me very much. Turning it over in my mind, I said to myself, if Peter had been elected pope, would his colleagues have been permitted to send him with St. John to Samaria to announce the gospel of the Son of God? What do you think, venerable brethren, if at this moment we permitted ourselves to send his holiness, Pius IX., and his excellency Mont Plantier to go to the patriarch of Constantinople to pledge him to put an end to the eastern schism? But here is another still important fact: an Ecumenical Council is assembled at Jerusalem to decide on the questions which divide the faithful. Who would have called together this council if St. Peter had been pope? St. Peter. Who would have presided over it? St. Peter or his legates. Who would have formed or promulgated the canons? St. Peter. Well, nothing of this occurred. The apostle assisted at the council, as all the others did, and it was not he who summed up, but St. James; and when the decrees were promulgated, it was in the name of the apostles, the elders, and the brethren. Acts 15. Is it thus that we do in our church? The more I examine, O venerable brethren, the more I am convinced that in the Scriptures the son of Jonas does not appear to be first.

Now, while we teach that the church is built upon St. Peter, St. Paul, whose authority cannot be doubted, says in his epistle to the Ephesians (2:20), it is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus himself being the chief corner-stone. And the same apostle believes so little in the supremacy of St. Peter, that he openly blames those who say "we are of Paul," "we are of Apollos" (1 Cor. 1:12), as those who would say, we are of Peter. If, therefore, this last apostle had been the vicar of Christ, St. Paul would have taken great care not to censure so violently those who belonged to his own colleague. The same apostle,

counting up the offices of the church mentions apostles, prophets, evangelists, doctors, and pastors. Is it to be believed, my venerable brethren, that St. Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, would have forgotten the first of these offices, the papacy, if the papacy had been of divine institution? This forgetfulness appeared to me as impossible as if an historian of this council were not to mention one word of his holiness Pius IX. (Several voices—"Silence, heretic, silence.") Calm yourselves, my brethren, I have not yet finished. Forbidding me to go on, you show yourselves to the world to do wrong, and to shut the mouth of the smallest member of this assembly. I continue.

The Apostle Paul makes no mention, in any of his letters directed to the various churches, of the primacy of Peter. If this primacy had existed—if, in one word, the Church had in its body a supreme head, infallible in teaching, would the great apostle of the Gentiles have forgotten to mention it? What do I say? He would have written a long letter on this all-important subject. Then, when as he has actually done, the edifice of the Christian doctrine is erected, would the foundation, the key of the arch, be forgotten? Now, unless you hold that the Church of the Apostles was heretical, which none of us would either desire or dare to say, we are obliged to confess that the Church has never been more beautiful, more pure, or more holy than in the days when there was no pope. (Cries of "it is not true, it is not true.") Let not Monsignor di Laval say, "No." Since if any of you, my venerable brethren, should dare to think that the church which has today a pope for its head is more firm in the faith, more pure in its morals than the *Apostolic Church*, let him say it openly in the face of the universe, since this inclosure is the centre from which our words fly from pole to pole. I go on.

Neither in the writings of St. Paul, St. John, or St. James have I found a trace or germ of the papal-power, St. Luke the historian of the missionary tours of the apostles, is silent on this all-important point. The silence of these holy men, whose writings make part of the canon of the divinely inspired Scriptures, has appeared to me burdensome and impossible if Peter had been pope, and as unjustifiable as if Thiers, writing the history of Napoleon Bonaparte, had omitted the title of emperor. I see there before me a member of the assembly who says, pointing at me with his finger, "There is a schismatic bishop who has got among us under false colors." No, no, my venerable brethren, I have not entered this august assembly as a thief by the window, but by the door like yourselves. My title of bishop gave me the right to it, as my Christian conscience forces me to speak and to say that which I believe to be true. That which has surprised me most, and which, moreover, is capable of demonstration, is the silence of St. Peter. If the apostle had been what we proclaim him to be—that is, the vicar of Jesus Christ on the earth—he surely would have known it; if he had known it, how is it that not once did he act as pope? He might have done it on the day of Pentecost when he pronounced his first sermon and did not do it; neither in the two letters directed to the Church. Can you imagine such a pope, my venerable brethren, if St. Peter had been the pope? Now, if you wish to maintain that he was the pope, the natural consequence

arises that you must maintain that he was ignorant of the fact. Now, I ask whoever has a head to think, and a mind to reflect, are those two suppositions possible?

To return. I say, while the apostles lived, the Church never thought that there could be a pope; to maintain the contrary, all the sacred writings must have been thrown to the flames, or entirely ignored.

(To be continued.)

Opening Political Assemblages With Prayer.

It has long been customary in this country to open political assemblages, conventions, etc., by prayer. At the national capital a chaplain is employed and paid from the public funds for this purpose, while in the State legislatures it is a sort of compliment passed around among the various sects, each prayer costing the taxpayers \$5; at least this is true in some States. Many cases where remarkable political prayers have been offered are on record, and the writer not long since saw a collection of them covering several columns of a newspaper.

There is on record the fact that forty years ago, at the first sitting of the Iowa legislature at Des Moines, a certain minister, Mr. Shinn, by name, who, with his family, was just removing to this State in a covered wagon, happened that morning to be in the city, and was asked by a friend, who was a member of the legislature, to come up and offer prayer. This he consented, somewhat reluctantly, however, to do, and then asked if there was anything special that it was desired that he should pray for. The reply was that the only consideration was that the prayer be brief; whereupon he opened the session with a prayer containing just thirty-four words. Its pointedness and brevity was so marked that it was immediately voted that the elder be allowed \$10 for that prayer; but which he refused to accept at the time, and now, after all these years, it has been suggested that a warrant be issued to him for the amount with all the accrued interest, seeing that he is greatly advanced in years and in limited circumstances.

In 1872, one, Rev. Mr. Wilson, then a pastor of the Wesley Chapel in this city, opened the Republican State Convention with a prayer that secured for him some notoriety, in which he prayed for 40,000 majority, and added, "Yea, Lord, if it please thee, make it 80,000." For a moment the audience was stunned at the words, but finally broke out in the wildest applause. These and other prayers of like character are called to mind by the remarkable prayer that was made at the opening of the Republican State Convention just held in this city, by Rev. Mr. Weaver, a Christian minister and pastor of one of the churches of that denomination here, which was as follows:—

O Lord, we believe that it is fitting that this meeting should be opened with prayer, for we meet here to-day to name the men who shall be our standard bearers to lead us to victory. But as we meet here in joy and gladness there comes a shadow of sorrow over our thoughts when we remember that the great Democratic party, which has so aimlessly held on for so many years with such bull-dog tenacity, is about to retire into innocuous desuetude, to appear upon the stage of our country no more forever, and when we stand by its open grave and hear the clods fall upon its coffin lid, may we throw the mantle of charity over its faults and remember it only by the good it has done, if, perchance, it has done good enough to elicit our memory.

O Lord, give us wisdom for the guidance of our

deliberations to-day, and grant victory to the cause. Amen.

At the point where he referred to the "bull-dog tenacity" of the incumbent political party, there was an outburst of applause, which the chairman sought to quell with his gavel, but without effect, and when the "amen" was said, the vast audience of three thousand people engaged in a storm of applause that was deafening.

The press, generally, have commented on it, some pro, and some con, some declaring that it was the "hit" of the convention, a "corker," and such like expressions, while others denounce it as little less than blasphemy.

The question arises, is this prayer not more of a mockery than otherwise? and are not such prayers as these fair samples of what State chaplaincy is liable to degenerate into? Is it not unchristian and un-American, and should the practice not be abolished? W. E. CORNELL.

Des Moines, Ia.

Reflections on the Results of the Reformation, by Guzot.

RIDPATH, in his "Cyclopedia of Universal History," Vol. 2, page 617, says:—

No better summary has ever been presented of the whole situation than that given by the candid and sober-minded Guzot:—

"What," says he, "are the reproaches constantly applied to the Reformation by its enemies? Which of its results are thrown in its face as it were as unanswerable?"

The two principal reproaches are, first, the multiplicity of sects, the excessive license of thought, the destruction of all spiritual authority, and the entire dissolution of religious society; secondly, tyranny and persecution. "You provoked licentiousness," it has been said, to the Reformers—"you produced it; and after having been the cause of it you wish to restrain and repress it. And how do you repress it? By the most harsh and violent means. You take upon yourselves, too, to punish heresy, and that by virtue of an illegitimate authority."

If we take a review of all the principal charges which have been made against the Reformation, we shall find, if we set aside all questions purely doctrinal, that the above are the two fundamental reproaches to which they may all be reduced.

These charges gave great embarrassment to the Reform party. When they were taxed with the multiplicity of their sects, instead of advocating the freedom of religious opinion, and maintaining the right of every sect to entire toleration, they denounced sectarianism, lamented it, and endeavored to find an excuse for its existence. Were they accused of persecution? They were troubled to defend themselves; they used the plea of necessity; they had, they said, the right to repress and punish error, because they were in possession of the truth. Their articles of belief, they contended, and their institutions were the only legitimate ones; and if the Church of Rome had not the right to punish the Reform Party, it was because she was in the wrong and they in the right.

And when the charge of persecution was applied to the ruling party in the Reformation, not by its enemies, but by its own offspring; when the sects denounced by that party said, "We are doing just what you did; we separate ourselves from you just as you separated yourselves from the Church of Rome," this ruling party were still more at a loss to find an answer, and frequently the only answer they had to give was an increase of severity.

The truth is, that while laboring for the destruction of absolute power in the spiritual order, the religious revolution of the sixteenth century was not aware of the true principles of intellectual liberty. It emancipated the human mind, and yet pretended still to govern it by laws. In point of *fact*, it produced the prevalence of free inquiry; in point of *principle*, it believed it was substituting a legitimate for an illegitimate power. It had not looked up to the primary motive, nor down to the ultimate consequence of its own work. It thus fell into a double error. On the one side it did not know or respect all the rights of human thought; at the very moment it was demanding these rights for itself, it was violating them toward others. On the other side, it was unable to estimate the rights of authority in matters of reason. I do not speak of coercive authority which ought to have no rights at all in such matters, but of that kind of authority which is purely moral and acts solely by its influence upon the mind. In most re-

formed countries something is wanting to complete the proper organization of intellectual society, and to the regular action of old and regular opinions. What is due to and required by traditional belief has not been reconciled with what is due to and required by freedom of thinking; and the cause of this, undoubtedly is, that the Reformation did not fully comprehend and accept its own principles and results.

If our National Reformers of the nineteenth century would turn away their eyes from their schemes for coercing others into their ways they might be made to see that they, too, have failed to comprehend the true principles of the Reformation and their results. They might see that while they demand full and perfect freedom of religious action for themselves, they deny such freedom to others. They might see that they like their half-reformed predecessors have failed to appreciate the true principles of intellectual and religious liberty, and then they would begin to know that they had not yet looked up to the primary motive, nor down to the ultimate consequences of their own work. If the logic of history will not convince them, what will?

G. D. BALLOU.

Gainesville, Ga.

The Popular Idea of Religious Liberty.

ON July 18, last, the International Religious Liberty Association sent a statement from the Chicago *Herald* of July 14, in regard to the Capps case in Tennessee, to several thousand newspapers in the United States and Canada. A large number of these papers published the facts in the case. Many of these notices were accompanied by editorial references to the principles involved. A consideration of the various positions taken upon the question of religious liberty as involved in this case is deeply interesting, being illustrative to some extent of the popular idea of religious liberty.

The *Republican*, of Springfield, Mass., after giving the details of the conviction of Mr. Capps, dismisses the subject with the truthful remark that "apparently the case is one of religious persecution and disgraces Tennessee."

The *Sentinel*, of L'Anse, Mich., refers to the case as a striking commentary on modern civilization, and asks the question, "Is this a land of religious liberty?" and immediately proceeds to answer it by saying, "It would seem that it makes a heap of difference to what church one belongs, whether he is to enjoy religious liberty or not."

The *Democrat*, Caro, Mich., becomes facetious over the matter, and adds: "If the law were not *ex post facto* we should expect to hear of the Deity being arraigned before the Tennessee courts." As ridiculous as this seems, another paper, the *Evening Press*, of Ogden, Utah, in all seriousness, proceeds to do this very thing and places a Rev. Mr. Gifford upon the stand in proof of the charge that Christ himself was a chronic Sabbath-breaker. This paper, however, gives evidence of a considerable degree of insight into the situation by pointing out that the law of Tennessee, under which Mr. Capps was convicted, is in direct conflict with the letter and the spirit of the Constitution of the United States and of the Declaration of Independence, which prohibits interference with the rights of conscience, and stating that American law does not attempt to prescribe how the American citizen, or an alien, shall employ his time. Each, so long as their action does not

work an injury to the State should be allowed to worship God at the time, in the manner, and wherever they please. The *Press* asks for others what it demands for itself, that the spirit of the Constitution shall be respected, and all alike be protected in their constitutional and inherent rights.

The *Evening Standard*, of New Bedford, Mass., finds some extenuating circumstances in the case which should appeal to the tender mercies of the Tennessee judges, but thinks after all, that Mr. Capps should be grateful that the sentence of the Mosaic law, that the Sabbath-breaker should be stoned, was not imposed upon him.

The *Evening Journal*, of Ottawa, Canada, regards the conviction of Mr. Capps as a commendable effort on the part of the State of Tennessee to uphold a desirable civil and social regulation, rather than a religious dogma, and says that it cannot therefore be persecution. The necessity for such a law as the State of Tennessee has, according to the *Journal*, is due to the fact that the selfish desire of one man to get ahead in business, if unrestrained, would lead others to deny themselves needed rest. If the State should ask Mr. Capps to work on his Sunday (meaning the seventh day of the week), that would be persecution sure enough. It suggests that a person in this dilemma should observe two weekly days of rest, and that the satisfaction to be derived from the thought that he was assisting in the "maintenance of that dear day whose quiet is a godsend and a blessing to tens of millions of toilers," would be ample compensation for his loss of time and money in so doing. While giving Mr. Capps credit for being an honest man, it adds that unwittingly he seems to have done his best to accomplish a grave injury to his fellow human beings.

Under the heading, "Anarchy not Liberty," the *Inland Sentinel*, of Kamloops, B. C., says: "In this country, where people believe the laws are to be obeyed, Mr. Capps will get little sympathy. He worked on Sunday with his eyes open, was fined, the supreme court of Tennessee upheld the conviction—where the injustice?" For one to question the constitutionality of any law, or to oppose religious dogmas when supplemented by civil law, is denounced as anarchy pure and simple. The remedy, if the minority are unable to secure a modification of such laws and are aggrieved thereby, is for the dissatisfied ones to form a little colony of their own.

The *Register*, of Sandusky, Ohio, says that it is time for a revolution in Tennessee, and that such a law as that under which Mr. Capps was convicted is not only a travesty on justice but a violation of the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees to every man freedom of religious worship. The offense charged against Mr. Capps was in no way an interference with the rights of his neighbors, and in violation of no principle on which the Constitution was founded. The Tennessee law under which Mr. Capps was convicted is declared to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and, being such, would not stand for a moment in any northern State. In Connecticut, even, no man would be arrested and sent to jail for working on Sunday, provided he observed Saturday, or any other day of the week, as the Sabbath.

The *Enterprise*, Belle Vernon, Pa., can

see nothing prejudicial to religious liberty in Mr. Capps not being allowed to desecrate the Sabbath (Sunday), and says it is better to keep two days than to have no Sabbath at all.

The *Canadian Baptist*, Toronto, says that the question of which this case is an illustration, is a very difficult one. If the State is proceeding upon religious grounds, and its law is based on a religious dogma, it is clearly a case of religious persecution. If, on the other hand, the State Sunday law is enacted and enforced simply on physiological and sociological grounds, it is evident that it would be very difficult to make exceptions without injuring the enforcement of the law. Ordinarily the loss of the second day each week is the price which those at variance with the majority have to pay in order to live as their conscience dictates. The fact that the commandment says "six days shalt thou labor" is referred to as adding to the difficulty which the *Canadian Baptist* experiences in thus disposing of the question. It finds some consolation, however, in the thought that the requirement of the commandment is, after all, an individual matter, in which the *Canadian Baptist* is not specially concerned, but it asks, in the interests of humanity, why an exemption should not be made in the case of one who observes the seventh as a day of rest.

The *Four Corners*, Wheatland, Cal., asks, "Is it possible in America, the land of religious liberty, in this the era of progress, of enlightenment, of research, of tolerance, to find one State whose laws, if executed, would result as in this case of Mr. Capps?" It declares that so long as a law of this nature remains upon the statute books of Tennessee, it should be ignored as a State, and calls upon the governor of that commonwealth, if he has any use for the prerogative of pardon, to set this man at liberty.

The *Times-Democrat*, New Orleans, reviewing the case says it is very plain that the religious freedom of which we are wont to boast with a considerable degree of effusiveness in this country, is very much of a myth. It is not religious freedom at all; it is the freedom or license of a majority of the population to tyrannize over a minority because the religious views and practices of the minority do not conform to the religious views and practices of the majority.

Quotations of this kind might be greatly multiplied, but enough have been given to show the trend of public sentiment. The press may be considered as representing, to a very large extent, the popular view upon any subject, and it is worthy of notice that a conviction of this character, the injustice of which appeals to the intelligence of every one who has a right conception of the fundamental principles of religious liberty, finds so many defenders. The religious press, while deploring persecutions for conscience' sake in other lands, have little to say with regard to the spirit of intolerance which is being manifested in our own country. Is it not time for every individual who appreciates the blessings of civil and religious liberty to be awake to the situation?

E. E. PARLIN.

THE most sacred of human rights is that of conscience; and the government that invades it is a despotism, no matter by what name it is called.

No Such Right Exists.

THE NEW YORK AMERICAN SENTINEL says:—

The right of men to quit work whenever for any cause they see fit to do so cannot be denied without destroying liberty.

We deny that such right exists except in a limited and restricted sense. When men are engaged upon an employment that if suddenly suspended will work serious injury to the employer or the public, and when the very nature of the work is one necessarily of continuity, there is a moral obligation, an implied contract, to not quit work without giving reasonable notice so that others may be employed to fill the places to be made vacant. An implied contract is as binding, morally, as a specific one. It is no destruction of liberty to insist that workmen shall fairly and faithfully execute implied as well as specific contracts with employers.—*Washington Chronicle*.

The *Chronicle* is quite right in its criticism of our unqualified statement. However, we did not mean by the term "whenever," that the engineer could abandon his train between stations, or the teamster his employer's horses at the market-place. We had in mind the right of the laborer to cease work with a view of bettering his condition either with his old employer or with a new one. We recognize the "moral obligation" modifying the "whenever" of our statement, and should have expressed it. However, if the "moral obligation" of employer to employé were universally recognized, it would materially reduce the number of strikes.

Barbarous, Unchristian Persecution.

A SEVENTH-DAY Adventist, a Mr. Capps, citizen of Weakley County, Tenn., did some necessary farm work on a Sunday, he having, according to the rules of his church, given Saturday to worship and religious meditation. He was arrested for working on Sunday, fined, and jailed. He is a poor man, of weak frame. His young wife and four children are, meantime, on the verge of starvation. The New Orleans *Times-Democrat* denounces the treatment of Mr. Capps as barbarous, unchristian persecution, and is raising a fund for the payment of the fine and costs. The *Times-Democrat* says:—

And this is religious persecution, at the end of the nineteenth century, as surely as ever religious persecution was practiced either in New England at the end of the eighteenth century, or in Spain at the end of the fifteenth century. Tennessee should make haste to change its laws regulating the "day of rest;" they are not in keeping either with the civilized conditions of this part of the world or of this advanced age in the world's history.

We believe the *Times-Democrat* is right. The Sunday laws, so far as they simply cover the police power of the State to preserve order on the first day of the week, so that worshipers in our churches be not disturbed, are all right. When they propose to compel Quakers, Adventists and others, who worship on other days to keep Sunday, according to the rules of other churches, then these laws are essentially laws restricting both religious liberty and the rights of the citizen. Governor Porter takes the same ground. He defended some Adventists, who were persecuted by bigots in his county, and defeated the persecutors in the courts.—*Chattanooga Daily Times*, July 29, 1894.

Ritualism Running Riot.

A CORRESPONDENT of the Record has been examining popular Ritualist works, and makes some interesting extracts illustrating the Romeward progress. In "The Ceremonial of the Altar," there is a prayer for "Our Pope, our Bishop, our Sovereign." Is the pope at Rome or Canterbury? A little book, instructing English churchmen in the use of the rosary, has references to "The Repose of the Mother of God." "Simple Lessons," by Canon Carter, suggests that Paul's cloak, left at Troas, was his eucharistic vestment, and that the many lights in the upper chamber at Troas, during Paul's preaching, were, "most likely," "burning to give honor to the blessed sacrament which was going to be celebrated in the early morning." "A Little Catechism for Little Catholics," drops into poetry, of which a specimen is

Once each month to my confession,
And to my communion go,
At confession I will always
Tell out every sin I know.

"Children at the Altar" gives hymns, of which this is a verse:—

O, see! within a creature's hand
The vast Creator deigns to be
Reposing, infant like, as though
On Joseph's arm or Mary's knee.
Sweet sacrament, we thee adore,
O make us love thee more and more.

"The Catholic Religion," by Mr. Vernon Stacey, openly mourns the loss of extreme unction, the ceremony for which is introduced. "The Ceremonial at the Altar" is very explicit on the subject of fasting before communion. It warns the priest that the taking of a lozenge, or the sipping of a glass of water, breaks a fast as effectually as a hearty meal. The "Directorium Anglicanum" goes farther and enjoins that the priest shall not even cleanse his teeth, nor wash his mouth before mass, lest the taste of water mingle with his saliva. And it is a body that encourages such views which is at the back of the clericals on the London school board.—New York Observer.

Peter's Sword.

A CORRESPONDENT writes:—

The position taken by you, if I mistake not, is that it is wrong to use the sword of the State either to propagate or defend Christianity. How do you harmonize the instruction of Christ in Luke 22:36, with the above positions?

This scripture, taken with its contexts and the recorded events following, and the SENTINEL's position, are in perfect harmony. To show the harmony, the text with the two following verses are quoted:

He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one. For I say unto you, that this that is written must be accomplished in me, and he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end. And they said, Lord, behold here are two swords. And he said unto them, it is enough.

The swords were not wanted for defense, but for the fulfillment of prophecy,—“this that is written of me must be accomplished.” Two swords among eleven disciples are declared to be “enough;” another proof that they were not wanted for defense. Only one sword was used, hence one was “enough.” The sword was wanted to fulfill the prophecy,—“he was reckoned among the transgressors [Greek, anomos, lawless].” Peter in resisting the arrest of his Master and striking the servant, transgressed the civil law, and as Christ was his companion, “he was reckoned among the transgressors” or lawless

ones. There was in the disciples, and especially in Peter, some of the transgressor's spirit, manifested in the use of the sword in the garden (John 18:10), and on other occasions. Peter and John proposed the murder of the unbelieving Samaritans (Luke 9:54), which showed an utter misconception of the spirit of the gospel, and a willingness to transgress the laws of the State.

This instance of Peter's use of the sword brought to the surface the transgressor's spirit, and besides fulfilling prophecy, furnished an opportunity to rebuke the transgressors, and to forever forbid the use of carnal weapons in the defense of Christianity. This he did in healing the wounded ear (Luke 22:51), the Lord's last miracle before his crucifixion, and in the words, “Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.” Had these words been obeyed by all of Christ's professed followers from that day to this, it would have prevented the murder of millions of martyrs.

THE Monitor, a Roman Catholic paper published in San Francisco, has this to say about the Independent of this city:—

There is a paper in the East called the Independent. It is one of the ablest Protestant papers of its kind in the world. But it is broad-minded, generous, and truthful according to its light. While it is a thorough-going Protestant organ, yet it speaks of the pope's encyclical in terms of deep sympathy and it pays tribute to his piety and sincerity. If all the others were like the Independent how soon the Catholics and Protestants would learn to like each other better as they knew each other more.

To get the full significance of this it is necessary to bear in mind to what the pope's encyclical invites “the peoples of the world.” This the encyclical itself does not tell, but the article entitled “Saint Worship,” on another page of this paper reveals something of the nature of the feast which Rome has prepared for her guests. Truly, “if all the others were like the Independent how soon would the Catholics and Protestants learn to like each other better;” yea, how soon there would be no Protestants even in name, and all the world would be worshiping finger bones of the various saints, and other objects of popish superstition.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES,

A SIXTEEN-PAGE

Weekly Religious Journal.

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

This really two dollar paper will be furnished at the following

PRICES OF SUBSCRIPTION:

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

Address, Signs of the Times,

12TH AND CASTRO STREETS, OAKLAND, CAL., U. S. A.

California and the Pacific Coast.

A GOLDEN opportunity is offered to parties intending to visit California. Rates are lower than usual and a weekly tourist car-line over the West Shore Railroad, under the management of Messrs. A. Phillips, and Co., make the trip at this time one of economy and pleasure.

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

FATHERS
OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH.
BY E. J. WAGGONER.

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

HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE

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

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

is alone worth the price of the book.

Fine English Cloth, Substantially Bound,

CONTAINS ABOUT 400 PAGES,

Will be Sent Post-paid for \$1.00

IS THE
PAPACY
IN
PROPHECY?

BY THE

Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,
Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

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

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States,

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

Is Outlined in the Prophecies of Holy Scriptures,

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

Paper Covers, - - - 25 Cents.
Cloth Covers, - - - 60 Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET.

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

It perfectly secures pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it can not fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

No. 1. Russia leather, for 2 pens 10c.
No. 2. " " 3 " 15c.
No. 3. Sealskin, 2 " 15c.
No. 4. " 3 " 25c.
No. 5. Russia leather, for 4 " 25c.
No. 6. Sealskin, 4 " 40c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices.

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



KLIPS

Bind Papers.
Sample dozen, 75c.
Covers to order.
Price List—Free.

H. H. BALLARD, 193, Pittsfield, Mass.



NEW YORK, AUGUST 30, 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.

IN connection with the first-page notes in this issue, read "Saint Worship," on page 267, and see to what folly and superstition the pope of Rome invites "the princes and peoples of the world."

THE publication of the article on the primacy of St. Peter, promised two weeks ago, is begun in this number. Let no one fail to read it. It will be "dry" only to those who have no conception of the importance of the question discussed.

CAN the plea of conscience be admitted by the State as a justification for the violation of law? If not, is a conscientious man debarred from pleading the rights of conscience? This perplexing question is made as clear as a sunbeam in the article on another page entitled, "The Rights of Conscience." Read it.

IT was for the building of St. Peter's cathedral in Rome that indulgences were sold in the 16th century. Martin Luther protested, and the Reformation followed. An exact copy of the church at Rome, one-eighth its size, is being erected in Montreal, Quebec, and indulgences are sold to raise the money with which to defray the expenses of construction. Will there be a reformation in Quebec in the 19th century?

THE Sunday closing mania has reached the town of New Canaan, Conn. A society has been organized among the church people, and on a recent Sunday the proprietors of butcher shops, groceries, drug stores, news stands, and livery stables were arrested and their places of business closed. Later a compromise was effected by which the butcher shops and groceries are allowed to keep open until eleven o'clock. There is still war between the society and the druggists and liverymen. The liverymen say if their business is interfered with in the future, they will arrest any church member or person who rides out on Sunday, save to and from church, since the law says no one shall "engage in any sport or recreation on Sunday."

WHITESTONE, L. I., not far from this city, has undertaken a crusade against Sunday excursions. There are in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, with their nearly three millions of people, tens of thousands who are dependent upon their daily labor and who have no opportunity for recreation except on Sunday. These flock to the seashore and to the

various resorts on Sunday. Hitherto Whitestone has received its share. In order to stop this the council of that village passed an ordinance prohibiting the landing of excursionists there on any day. On Sunday, August 19, the police made a partially successful effort to enforce the "law." The Law and Order League is back of the movement, which is in the interests of Sunday sacredness. The Supreme Court has since enjoined the village authorities from interfering with excursionists.

LET no reader of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, while enjoying the comforts of home and the free exercise of religious convictions, forget that a fellow-man is confined in a Tennessee jail for no other offense than following the dictates of his conscience in the matter of Sabbath observance. In this connection it might be well to also remember that in Maryland and Georgia several Sunday cases are now pending. It is almost a foregone conclusion that in at least two or three of these cases imprisonment will follow. Still other States have upon their statute books the necessary laws for inaugurating an era of persecution, and the National Reformers of the various schools and under various names, are fast manufacturing the public sentiment which will ere long set the machinery of the law in motion against those who honor the Bible Sabbath and disregard the papal Sunday.

CATHOLICS are persecuting Methodist missionaries in South America. The Methodists petitioned Archbishop Ireland to petition Satolli to petition the pope to become the champion of religious liberty in South America, where there is a chance to put his beautiful theories set forth in the United States, into actual practice. This was a perplexing matter. These sugar-coated religious liberty pills were for American Protestant palates and not for Spain or South America. Satolli replied as follows:—

DEAR SIR: Your letter of June 22 and document dated July 12 came duly to hand. The enclosed copy of the encyclical letter of our holy father is, I think, the most fitting reply I can make.

The encyclical addresses princes and peoples, calling them back into the Roman Catholic Church. The answer to the Methodists who ask for liberty in South America from papal persecution is in substance "come back into the Roman Catholic Church and you can have it." Methodists, and all lovers of equal liberty, will spurn such an answer. But it is the same answer which persecuted Seventh-day Adventists are receiving in Maryland, and elsewhere, from Methodists. When the Seventh-day Adventist asks freedom from Methodist persecution the answer is, "Keep Sunday and you can have it." That is, come back to the practice of our church's view of the Sabbath and the persecution will cease.

THE Law and Order Society of Pittsburg, Pa., has not been active for some time, and as the *Christian Statesman* puts it, "Sabbath desecration has increased to such an extent that a movement has been begun among the young people's societies of the various denominations to organize the entire better element of the two cities, [Pittsburg and Allegheny] into an immense Law and Order Society. Every minister in Pittsburg, is said to be committed to the support of the undertaking." Of course the Sunday ministers are committed to the support of the movement; having no divine warrant for Sunday observance, and no divine law to bind the consciences of the people to it, they are ever ready to avail themselves of the services of the State to uphold their dogma.

SPEAKING recently in Allegheny, Pa., on "Law versus Lawlessness," Rev. J. S. Hutson, pastor of the Nixon Street Baptist Church, said:—

The many labor troubles in this country are not conflicts between capital and labor, but conflicts between intelligent Christian citizenship and ignorance, vice and anarchy. In those days when they had no king in Israel every man did what was right in his own eyes. God was their king and the principle of subjection was religious, but the people generally were irreligious. The same thing has been true in all ages, and is emphatically true to-day. The race of man, apart from Christ and Christianity, is unwilling to be governed by just and wise laws. Well, we know the result of a strike for a larger liberty and higher wages. The result has always been the same. It is strange that men should be so slow to learn and so ready to forget the meaning of those old-time phrases, "Thou Shalt" and "Thou Shalt Not."

In olden times God himself was the lawgiver and king, and every man was personally responsible to him for his conduct. The purpose of Christ and Christianity is to bring man back into subjection and under the authority of God.

And the speaker might have added that it is the purpose of National Reformers and American Sabbath Unionists to accomplish this, not by the preaching of the gospel and by getting men converted, but by civil law; and that the authority of God to which they propose to bring men, is the authority of God as interpreted by these pseudo-reformers; and that under their proposed régime men are not to be personally responsible to God, but to civil rulers for the discharge of their duties to God. These so-called reformers want to share with Leo XIII. the "regency of God on earth." Is Mr. Hutson one of them? or is he a true Baptist?

JUST before going to press, the following telegram was received from Gainesville, Ga. :—

Indictment against Keek and McCutchen quashed and case dismissed.

Eld. W. A. McCutchen and Prof. E. C. Keek, both Seventh-day Adventists, were arrested for disturbing the peace by doing common labor on Sunday, and arraigned before the mayor of Gainesville and fined \$50. The case was appealed. Later the parties were indicted by the grand jury and tried for violating the Sunday law. The jury disagreed. The telegram announces the result of the second trial.