



"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, SEPTEMBER 27, 1894.

NUMBER 38.

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.

"THE infallibility of the pope"—where does it come from? and how does he get it?

THE claim of infallibility on the part of the pope, is but the plain and logical consequence of the other claims made on his part.

THE claim of the headship of the Church of Christ, or of "the regency of God on earth," as is claimed by the pope and for the pope—either of these logically demands that he shall claim infallibility also.

BUT as we have seen, the claim of any such thing as a regency of God is supremely ridiculous and blasphemous; and the claim that any other than "Christ himself" is head of his body, is preposterous and supremely immoral; so the claim of infallibility on the part of any man anywhere is the embodiment of all these.

LET us examine this claim of the infallibility of the pope. And in order to do this more fairly and fully, let us see what is the exact statement of the claim as officially and "infallibly" pronounced. Here it is:—

Wherefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of the Christian people, we, the sacred council, approving, teach, and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when discharging the office of pastor, and teacher of all Christians, by reason of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church—he, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals: and that, therefore, such definitions of the said Roman pontiff are of themselves unalterable and not from the consent of the church.

Consequently, Catholics believe that the pope is infallible when he teaches the faithful *ex cathedra*,

that is, "from the chair" of St. Peter, in matters of faith or morals.—*Catholic Belief*, p. 69.

FROM this it is seen that there is no claim that infallibility attaches to the pope except when he speaks "*ex cathedra* that is, from the chair of St. Peter;" and he speaks "*ex cathedra*" only when he speaks (a) "as the father and doctor of all Christians;" (b) "discharging the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians;" (c) and then only as he speaks on a question of faith or morals. That is to say: If he speaks or writes only as a priest, a bishop, or a theologian, he is not claimed to be infallible, nor is that which is so spoken or written claimed to be infallibly true. If he speaks about the weather, or the crops, or the loss of his temporal power, or politics generally, or his plans and hopes concerning the United States and the world, or his great "love for Protestants"—in none of this is it claimed that infallibility attaches to him or to anything that he says. It is only when he speaks on a doctrine "regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church," that he or anything that he says is claimed to be infallible: and even then he or it is not infallible unless at the same time he speaks as the "father and doctor of all Christians," and also "in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians," as the successor of St. Peter. All three of these elements are essential to *ex cathedra*, and *ex cathedra* is essential to his infallibility. And this is the doctrine of "the infallibility of the pope."

THAT this analysis is correct, can be seen from the following statement of the case, by Cardinal Gibbons:—

Bear in mind, also, that this divine assistance that makes him infallible is guaranteed to the pope, not in his capacity as a private teacher, but only in his official capacity, when he judges of faith and morals as head of the church. If a pope, for instance, like Benedict XIV., were to write a treatise on canon law, his book would be as much open to criticism as that of any doctor of the church.

Finally, the inerrability of the popes, being restricted to questions of faith and morals, does not extend to the natural sciences, such as astronomy or geology, unless where error is presented under the false name of science, and arrays itself against revealed truth. It does not, therefore, concern itself about the nature and motions of the planets. Nor does it regard purely political questions, such as the form of

government a nation ought to adopt, or what candidates we ought to vote for. . . .

What, then, is the real doctrine of infallibility? It simply means that the pope, as successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, by virtue of the promise of Jesus Christ, is preserved from error of judgment when he promulgates to the church a decision on faith or morals.—*Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 147, 148.

It is only fair to state also that from the dogma above quoted, as well as from the cardinal's statement of the doctrine, it is plain that the question of just what is embraced in the phrase, "faith or morals," is left wide open. So that whatever the pope chooses to say is faith or morals, that is faith or morals. Therefore as a matter of fact the question of how narrow or how wide the application of this infallibility is or may be, is left entirely to be decided as the wish of the pope, or the interests of the papacy may demand on the particular occasion of the application of the doctrine. It may be so narrow as to touch but one single point or phase of a single abstract question, or it may be so wide as to embrace every interest of man in all the relations of life pertaining to this world and the next.

FROM the dogma itself and from the cardinal's statement of the doctrine, it is perfectly clear that it is not claimed that infallibility attaches to the man at all, who happens to be a pope, but that it attaches to the pope who happens to be a man. For instance, Joachim Pecci happened to become a pope. When he was just plain Joachim Pecci and nothing else, no hint of a claim of infallibility ever attached to him. And if he had always remained plain Joachim Pecci no hint of any such thing, in the mind of anybody, would have ever attached to him. When he became "Father Pecci," a priest, it was the same way; when he became Bishop Pecci, it was the same way; when he became Archbishop Pecci, it was still the same way; and when he became Cardinal Pecci, it was yet the same way—in none of these positions was any thought of infallibility ever connected with him in the mind of anybody. And if he had always remained in any one of these positions, no thought of infallibility ever would have been connected with him.

It is perfectly plain then, that outside

of the *office* of pope there is no thought of infallibility connected with the man who happens to become pope. As priest, or bishop, or archbishop, or cardinal, no vestige of it attaches to him in the mind of anybody. Yet it was by a vote of 363, against two, bishops, archbishops, and cardinals, that the doctrine was established that infallibility does attach to him when he happens to become pope. This, too, while not one of the 363 made any kind of claim of infallibility on his own part! In this, therefore, we are treated to the absurd suggestion that 363 elements of absolute infallibility could infallibly settle the doctrine that infallibility is connected with one of their own absolutely fallible selves when he happens to be made pope!—No, this is not quite the full statement of the case yet; for when the 363 had voted it, it was not infallibly fixed until the pope had *ex cathedra* proclaimed it. That is to say, the 363 fallibles voted it infallibly so, then he of whom, till this, it was not infallibly so, proclaimed it infallibly so, and thus it became infallibly so. In other words, 363 fallibles voted his infallibility when he speaks *ex cathedra*; but this could not be infallibly certain till he himself had infallibly proclaimed it; and he could not infallibly proclaim it until it was infallibly so! *Like produced totally unlike. Out of nothing SOMETHING CAME!*

AGAIN: The pope *must* be chosen from among the cardinals, and this by the vote of the cardinals themselves. But not one of the cardinals makes any claim of any shadow of infallibility connected with himself. Yet these men, not one of whom has any shadow of it, elect one of themselves pope and then, lo! he has it! Today, he is completely destitute of it, and to-morrow he is clothed with it; and all this because a number of persons as completely destitute of it as he was, put some ballots in a box which elected him pope! And so, on a second count, it is clear that "the infallibility of the pope" springs from the law of, like produces totally unlike; and, out of nothing something comes.

THIS is where the infallibility of the pope comes from. This is the source of the thing, in the abstract. Now let us inquire, How does it become so connected with him as to be available on demand? That we may arrive at the point of this inquiry in the easiest way, let us trace the thing onward from the point which we have reached. Not only is it true that as a mere man, or as a priest, or a bishop, or an archbishop, or a cardinal, there is no shadow of infallibility attaching to him; but even more than this, when he, being a cardinal, is elected pope, not even yet is he infallible. And when, by his coronation, he is duly installed in the office of pope—even yet he is not infallible. Not till all this has been passed through by him, and then, *in addition*, he as pope sits in "the chair of St. Peter," and from that particular *phase* of the office speaks as the head of the church—not till then does any principle of infallibility attach to "the Roman Pontiff," according to the dogma of "the infallibility of the pope." Therefore, as infallibility does not attach to him except as he occupies that *particular phase* of the office, as successor of St. Peter, it follows plainly enough that it comes to him *from that seat*. As in the seat he has it, and out of

the seat he does not have it, there is no other possible conclusion than that all the infallibility the pope ever has he gets from the seat which he occupies when he speaks, "*ex cathedra*, that is, *from the chair* of St. Peter."

AGAIN: This is seen from the very language of the dogma of infallibility itself, and it is the inevitable logic of that language. The dogma declares that he is infallible, *not* by the divine assistance promised to him *in himself*, nor in him *from those who elected him*, but "by the divine assistance promised to him *in blessed Peter*." As it is promised to him only "in blessed Peter," there has to be some connection formed between him and "blessed Peter," or else he cannot have it. But how can this connection be formed? Oh! it is claimed that Peter occupied the seat of the bishopric of Rome, and that when the "Roman Pontiff" sits in that seat the necessary connection is formed between him and "blessed Peter," that makes infallibility available as occasion may require. Therefore it is the only logic of the dogma, that the pope gets his infallibility in its concrete form so that it is available, altogether *from the seat* which he occupies when he speaks, "*ex cathedra*, that is, *from the chair* of St. Peter." By this we would not insist that this seat must necessarily be the identical, literal chair in which papal "tradition" says that Peter literally sat. We are willing to allow that the pope may speak *ex cathedra* from another than that identical, literal chair, and that such speech would be as much "infallible" as though spoken from that literal chair. But we do insist, and the dogma and the whole theory of papal "infallibility" demands it that as it is not in *the man*, nor in *the ecclesiastic*, nor in the election, nor in the office *apart from that particular phase* of it, it is inevitably derived from that seat, whether it be the identical chair in which Peter is said to have sat, or any other, or none at all.

LET no one say that in tracing the infallibility of the pope altogether to the seat which he occupies when he speaks "from the chair," we are carrying the thing too far, and taking an advantage merely for the sake of advantage, by a mere play upon word. This is not so. It is nothing else than the plain, sober, consequence of the words of the dogma; and of the cardinal's statement of the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope. It is not true of the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope, to say that it attaches to him by virtue of *that office* rather than by *the seat* which he occupies when he speaks *ex cathedra*, *in the exercise of the office*. For he may hold *the office* of pope and exercise the ordinary duties and prerogatives of that office as long as he lives, and yet no claim of infallibility attach to anything that he ever does or says, or to him in the doing or saying of anything; because during the whole time of his occupying that office there may be no occasion for him to speak *ex cathedra*. For it is only when so speaking that it is claimed that infallibility attaches to him or to anything that he says. It is a fact that Leo XIII. has never yet spoken "*ex cathedra*," and therefore has never yet exercised the prerogative of infallibility. But he does hold the *office* of pope and has exercised all the duties of the office that occasion has de-

manded—and all this without infallibility attaching to what he has said or done, or to him in the saying or doing of it.

It is therefore certain that the infallibility claimed for him does not come to him simply by virtue of *his office as pope*. The source of it is back of that yet. And as he may occupy that *office* and exercise all the duties of that office that occasion demands, to the end of his office and his life, without ever being called upon to speak "*ex cathedra* defining a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church;" as it is only when he so speaks that infallibility is claimed to attach to him or anything that he says; and as, so to speak—to speak "*ex cathedra*"—is in itself to speak "from the chair," from the seat, "of St. Peter," it follows plainly, soberly, and inevitably, without any play upon words, that all the infallibility that the "Roman Pontiff" ever can have, comes to him not by virtue of the *office* which he holds, but altogether from *the seat* which he occupies when he speaks "*ex cathedra*, that is, 'from the chair' of St. Peter;" defining "a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church."

It is in *the seat* and not in the office at all. It is not connected with the office except as *that particular prerogative* of the office is exercised upon the particular question of faith or morals, and in that particular way, namely, "*ex cathedra*, that is 'from the chair' of St. Peter."

THEREFORE the only conclusion that can ever be honestly or logically derived from the dogma of the infallibility of the pope is that all the infallibility that the pope has or ever can have, he gets solely from this conception of "*ex cathedra*." And as it is as plain as A, B, C, that no such thing as infallibility could ever possibly come from a sheer abstraction, it follows just as plainly that the only source of "the infallibility of the pope" is the "law" that, out of nothing something comes.

THIS is the truth. Of course it is an absurd conception; but let not the people of these States or of the United States laugh at this absurd claim on the part of the pope until they are sure they are entirely clear of all such conception in their own practice, or in their own consent even. This phase of the subject, however, will be discussed next week.

A Backslidden Baptist.

THE International Religious Liberty Association addressed a letter to the secular and religious papers of the country asking them to join in protest against the imprisonment of Mr. Capps, a Seventh-day Adventist, for doing common farm labor on Sunday. It was expected that Baptists, above all others, would be most unanimous in their protest; but we fear, from the returns which are coming in, that in this we are to be disappointed. The *Alabama Baptist*, of Aug. 9th, whose motto is, "Speaking the truth in love," replies as follows:—

Now, Baptist believer in liberty of conscience as we are, we cannot accept the invitation. We do not see persecution in the case. The people of Tennessee, like those of other States, by statute law recognized the Christian Sabbath as God's holy day, and they de-

clared that certain things must not be done on that day. Mr. Capps did one of those things, and thereby violated the law. Whether the law is good or bad, or whether Mr. Capps' convictions or conscience may be right, are not questions to be considered. The simple fact is that he deliberately violated a plain law of the State, of long standing, and which expresses the will of a large majority of the people, and he could not reasonably expect anything else than to pay the penalty of such violation.

As a part of our comment we introduce the following quotation from the Baptist *Examiner*, of this city, which is an effort to convert another Baptist organ to the scriptural and time-honored Baptist principle of religious liberty:—

We did not expect that any Baptist would defend the prosecution of otherwise inoffensive Christians for labor on the first day of the week that disturbs nobody else. The *Baptist and Reflector*, of Nashville, however, undertakes to justify this persecution in the State of Tennessee, which is similar to the cases that have recently occurred in Maryland and Georgia. It would have been easy, by the use of similar arguments, for those who persecuted Baptists in the past, to have justified their conduct and policy. If there is any body of Christians that has solemnly and stoutly protested against such persecution, no matter who were its victims or its authors, it is the Baptists. We have never before seen an attempt at justification of religious persecution in the Baptist Church newspaper. We hope never to see one again.

And now to show how "easy" it would have been for the persecutors of Baptists to have justified themselves "by the use of similar arguments" we will put the "arguments" of the *Alabama Baptist* into the mouth of Massachusetts Puritans and address them to Elder Holmes and other Baptist victims.

The people of this colony, like those of other colonies, by statute law recognized sprinkling as God's holy mode of baptism, and they declared that baptism by immersion or rebaptism must not be done. Mr. Holmes did both of these things, and thereby violated the law. Whether the law is good or bad, or whether Mr. Holmes' convictions or conscience may be right, are not questions to be considered. The simple fact is that he deliberately violated a plain law of the colony, of long standing, and which expresses the plain will of a large majority of the people, and he could not reasonably expect anything else than to pay the penalty of such violation.

We appeal to all Baptists. Are the cases not parallel? The penalty in the case of Elder Holmes was thirty pounds or thirty lashes. The penalty in the case of Mr. Capps was \$68.65 or 280 days' imprisonment. Elder Holmes conscientiously refused to pay the fine and was whipped. Mr. Capps conscientiously refused to pay the fine and was imprisoned. And the difference between Mr. Capps and the editor of the *Alabama Baptist* is that Mr. Capps is the legitimate successor of Elder Holmes in suffering for conscience' sake, and the editor of the *Alabama Baptist*, though claiming to be a Baptist, is a legitimate successor of Cotton Mather in defending the persecutors of a Seventh-day Adventist who is suffering for conscience' sake.

Germany and the Jesuits.

As generally anticipated, the Prussian Federal Council has refused to sanction the bill allowing the return of the Jesuits, which was passed by the Reichstag. But it allows some Catholic orders, like Redemptorists and others, to return. This restoration costs the government a large amount withheld from the Catholic prelates and priests during the *Kulturkampf*, because they refused to accept the May or

Falek laws. The government has paid back to them nearly 14,000,000 marks, and over 2,000,000 marks to other higher Roman officials. These immense sums are now being used by the Roman Church in Germany for the support of their poor congregations, the erection of new churches, and the support of superannuated clergymen. These facts show what it costs the State to maintain religious establishments.

The Romanists, however, will not cease their efforts to secure the return of the Jesuits, and as the Protestants are divided by dogmatic quarrels among themselves, it is feared that they will succeed. It would be an unspeakable humiliation if Germany would again "go to Conossa," notwithstanding Bismarck's famous declaration to the contrary.—*The Lutheran Observer*.

Did the Roman Catholic Church Ever Persecute?

Donahoe's Magazine for September has an article in which it is denied that Rome ever persecuted. In answer to a question, "Why does not the Catholic Church publicly disavow and condemn all sorts of religious persecution?" it is replied:—

One good reason why the church does not do this is because she has never sanctioned or approved religious persecution of any kind.

And of the Inquisition, this statement is made:—

As to the Inquisition, every well-informed reader knows that whatever punishments were inflicted upon heretics during the time of its existence, were carried out by the civil, not by the ecclesiastical authorities. "As for the Roman court," says the Rev. James Kent Stone, a convert to Catholicity, who is now known as Father Fidelis, speaking on the subject of the Inquisition, "I am not aware that the smallest proof has ever been given that its proceedings were other than mild and conservative."

And, again the editor makes the statement that "Rome did nothing that calls for disavowal now."

Likewise, Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," says: "The Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of civil and religious liberty."—*Page 265*.

In one sense, and in one sense only, is the denial of persecution by the Roman Catholic Church true: It was the civil arm, that is, the State, that executed the penalty against heretics. But this is making a distinction without a difference, since it was the ecclesiastical authorities who instigated and insisted upon the persecution.

In 1229 the Council of Toulouse "passed forty-five articles, instructing the bishops to bind by an oath a priest in every parish, and two or more laymen, to search out and apprehend heretics and those who sheltered them. Heresy was to be punished with the loss of property, and the house in which a heretic was found was to be burned. . . . Every two years,

males from fourteen years upwards, and females from twelve years upwards, were obliged to repeat an oath to inform against heretics. The neglect of the annual confession was a sufficient ground for suspicion, as was also the possession of the Scriptures, especially in translations. In spite of these measures and the rigorous execution of them, especially in Southern France, the desired result was not secured. The bishops were accused of apathy, and were themselves made subjects of the Inquisition by the papal chair. In 1232 and

1233 Gregory IX. appointed the Dominicans a standing commission of inquisitors in Austria, Germany, Aragon, Lombardy, and in Southern France. At the same period was organized the so-called 'soldiery of Jesus Christ against heretics.' . . . The suspicion of heresy was made a sufficient ground for apprehension; and, by a bull of Innocent IV. in 1252, resort was had, if necessary, to torture, to extract a confession."—*Schaff-Herzog, art. Inquisition*.

The "Encyclopædia Britannica," art. Inquisition, says:—

The germ of the Inquisition lies in the duty of searching out and correcting error entrusted to the deacons in the early churches. The promise in the Anglican Ordinal that the priest will be "ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word" is a pale reflection of this ancient charge. The episcopacy thus providing the instruments, the temporal power soon offered to enforce the sentences of the church: the edicts of Constantine and his successors now began that double system which, by ordaining that heretics should be dealt with by the secular arm, enabled the church to achieve her object without dipping her own hands in blood.

As before remarked, it is in this sense and in this sense only, that the Roman Catholic Church can, by any possibility, claim that she never persecuted. But no student of history will be deceived by such sophistry. The Inquisitors were the agents of "the church." They were commissioned by the pope and acted for him. It was at the Council of Toulouse, in 1229, that the title of Inquisitor was first applied to the agents of the papacy. Prior to this time it was applied only to those who inquired into matters of taxation. "But the thing itself," says the "Cyclopedia Britannica," Art. Inquisition, "was far older than the name." The same authority continues: "In 1184 the Synod of Verona cursed all heretics and their shelterers, ordered relapsed persons to be handed over to the secular arm for capital punishment, confiscated their property, and clearly indicated that the new Inquisition would go far beyond the older episcopal function. The synod did not hesitate to threaten easy-going bishops, urging them to more frequent and more searching visitations, standing over them as a superior power. And henceforward Inquisition becomes more systematized, with papal not episcopal authority; it was developed by those three masterful pontiffs, Innocent III. (1198-1216), Gregory IX. (1227-1241), and Innocent IV. (1243-1254), who all, regarding the supremacy of Rome as the keystone of society, claimed authority over men's souls and bodies, above the authority of prince or bishop. Thus, soon after his accession, Innocent III. sent two Cistercians, Guy and Regnier, to visit the dioceses of Southern France and Spain, "to catch and kill the little foxes," the Waldensians, Cathari, and Patarines, to whose tails were fastened firebands to burn up the good corn of the faithful."

"In Italy," says the "Britannica," "the Inquisition was established under Dominican supervision as early as 1224. Inquisitors were at a later time brought into England to combat the Wickliffite opinions." Of the Inquisition in Spain, the same work says: "The motive of strictly religious fanaticism influenced, not the monarchs, but the Dominican instruments of the Holy Office;" and so persuaded by the minions of the pope, Ferdinand sent to Rome to solicit the establishment of such a tribunal. Sextus IV. granted the request in 1478, and it was by this pope

that the infamous Torquemada, a Dominican "father," was commissioned Inquisitor-General for Castile and Leon. Rome must do more than keep the pupils of her own schools in ignorance of history if she would escape the terrible responsibility of her acts in the Dark Ages; she must blot from the pages of history the black record; but that she can never do. Nor would she do it in the sense of changing the facts if she could; for "Rome did nothing that calls for disavowal now." She would do the same thing again if she could, and wishes now only to conceal the facts. But why do even this; for, are not "Protestants" in our own and other lands persecuting Christians to-day and making the same excuse, namely, "We are only enforcing the civil law"? Yea, verily. The papal spirit still lives, not alone in the Roman Catholic Church, but in the natural heart; and as long as it does so live, there will be religious persecution under color of "civil" statutes; and it will be excused as "only enforcing civil law." The modern Protestant Inquisition differs from the Inquisition of the popes only in degree. The principle is the same.

The Sectarian Principle.

THE contest in the State Constitutional Convention at Albany over the principle of no sectarian appropriations has been a very interesting one. When the convention met, the National League for the Protection of American Institutions submitted a form of amendment designed to assert this principle and prevent its violation. The amendment had been subjected to the scrutiny of some of the ablest lawyers in the State, and they had given it their approval. It proposed, first, in the words of the first article of the Constitution of the United States, that no law should be passed respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; second, that neither the property, funds nor credit of the State nor of any civil division thereof shall be used, directly or indirectly, for the maintenance of any church, religious denomination or religious society; third, that no institution, society or undertaking in whole or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control shall receive such aid.

This is a sweeping amendment. It would cut off not only all churches, but all denominational schools, even such as might be put under State control, all denominational institutions for secondary instruction, such as academies, institutes and seminaries, and all charitable institutions under denominational direction, from receiving any money from State, county or municipal treasuries. This is just what ought to be accomplished. It means complete separation of Church and State, and that, and that only, will settle the sectarian question.

The proposed amendment was divided. The first clause, we understand, is to go into the preamble to the constitution; the question of appropriations to schools was referred to the Committee on Education, and that relating to charitable institutions to the Committee on Charities. The Committee on Education gave hearings to both sides, and was so impressed with the general demand for a constitutional prohibition of sectarian appropriations, that it reported the amendment almost unchanged, and supported it with this strong recommendation:—

In the opinion of the committee there is no demand

from the people of the State upon the convention so unmistakable, widespread and urgent; none, moreover, so well grounded in right and reason as that the public school system of the State shall be forever protected by constitutional safeguards from all sectarian influence or interference; and that public money shall not be used, directly or indirectly, to propagate denominational tenets or doctrines. We have sought to give the clearest and strongest expression possible to these principles in the proposed section. The arguments in favor of such a provision are, in our opinion, conclusive: and the objection that it will result in making the schools "Godless," or that such a constitutional prohibition would imply upon the part of the people enacting it hostility or even indifference to religion, seems to us to be both groundless and absurd. In adopting this section the convention will, in our opinion, most effectively aid all that is highest and best in religion; for, by establishing the principle that State education must necessarily be secular in its character, the field is left open, beyond question or misunderstanding, for religious teaching in the family, the Sunday-school and the Church.

This splendid paragraph gave the unbiased judgment of the committee, and it gives with equal accuracy the judgment of the great mass of the people of the State. But large denominational interests would be affected by the cutting off of all educational institutions under sectarian control, and these interests made themselves felt in one way and another; and the committee subsequently reported the following amendment, to be added to the section:—

This section shall not apply to schools in institutions subject to visitation and inspection by the State Board of Charities.

The effect of this would be to open the door which the section originally reported would effectually close. The friends of the non-sectarian principle were amazed that the committee should so stultify itself, and they rallied against the amendment, and, with the assistance of President Choate, defeated it.

Other amendments of the same tenor were proposed, however, in committee of the whole, and defeated one after another, but by a very small margin in some instances. The most specious of them all was offered by a Protestant, a member of a denomination which occupies the highest ground on the question of separation of Church and State. He proposed a substitute limiting the use of public moneys to schools or institutions wholly owned or controlled by the State or minor civil division. This was a shrewd device to secure the continuance of State aid to denominational academies and seminaries, which are under the control of the State Regents and of such parochial schools as have been or may be turned over to the State, and it was actually carried in committee of the whole. President Choate, in the convention, characterized it as meaning "local option for the rankest sectarianism," but such was the hold which the denominational interests, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, had secured on the convention, that it was barely defeated by a vote of 71 to 68.

The amendment, as it now stands, is sound and good; but it has not been finally adopted. Nothing could show more forcibly how deeply the poison of sectarianism has sunk into the system of the State than the unseemly struggle which has been made in its behalf in the Constitutional Convention. Men too intelligent to deny the correctness of the principle in the abstract set themselves to secure opportunity to evade and violate it in practice. A Baptist or Methodist academy that has been receiving a few hundred dollars a year, clings to the subvention and hates to have it cut off, and the politicians become eloquent pleaders for Catholic and

Jewish institutions because of the promise it gives them of votes. Sectarian interests, therefore, may possibly defeat the educational amendment, or they may allow it to pass with the expectation of getting a concession when the Charities Amendment is acted on.

It is regarded as settled that private charitable institutions will not be cut off. The Committee on Charities proposes to report a paragraph of this tenor:—

Nothing shall prevent the payment of money by the State or any civil division thereof to the institutions mentioned and made subject to the visitation and inspection of the State Board of Charities, for the care, support, maintenance and education other than religious instruction of inmates received and retained therein, pursuant to law and to rules established by said board. Such rules shall be subject to the control of the legislature.

This would so far vitiate the educational amendment as to allow the State to support schools in sectarian charitable institutions. It is a pity, when the demand of the people is "so unmistakable, widespread and urgent" for constitutional safeguards against sectarian appropriations, that the convention should fail to meet it. The circumstances of its failure to do so afford one of the strongest arguments for the final and complete separation of Church and State. If the educational amendment is submitted one step in this direction will have been taken, and the campaign of education must go on until the last tie is cut and all denominational institutions are left entirely to their own resources.—*The Independent*, Sept. 13.

Against "Contract Schools."

It may have escaped the attention of our readers that the Indian Appropriation bill passed by the last Congress received an amendment directing the Secretary of the Interior to inquire into the propriety of discontinuing contract schools, and the effect of such action on the education of Indian children; and "to submit to Congress at the next session the result of such investigation, including an estimate of the additional cost, if any, of substituting Government schools for contract schools, together with such recommendations as he may deem proper." It is, of course, generally understood that "contract schools" are schools established and carried on by various religious denominations, and receiving from the Government a stipulated payment for each child under their charge. The facts which led to the offering and adoption of this amendment are, briefly, that out of the total amount of \$525,881 appropriated to denominational schools last year, one denomination, the Roman Catholic, received \$369,235; while all the others together, fifteen in number, got only about \$156,000. During the last eight years more than one-half of the entire amount devoted by Congress to Indian education has gone to the Roman Catholics. The violation which this whole system involves of our fundamental principle of the separation of Church and State has become so glaringly obvious that the Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Congregationalists have refused to accept any further governmental aid for their schools. The Baptists, we rejoice to say, while they have done comparatively little for the Indians, have always consistently declined to take the public money.* We cannot doubt that popular

* See note on this subject on page 302.

sentiment generally, when it is intelligently roused on the subject, will echo the strong and true words of Senator Gallinger, of New Hampshire, who introduced the amendment in question: "I do not believe," he said, "that the Congress of the United States can long stand upon the ground we occupy to-day. There is already a gathering storm in this country against this matter of appropriating money for sectarian purposes. The principle is wrong. It will have to be reversed sooner or later, and, in my opinion, the sooner it is done the better it will be for the rights and the liberties of the American people."—*Examiner*, Sept. 6, 1894.

Persecuted Sabbath-Keepers.

THE Christian Reformer and Dissenter for August 25th, makes a labored effort to defend the wrongs which are being done to Sabbath-keepers by the partisan and unchristian enforcement of Sunday law in Maryland, Georgia and Tennessee. The position of our contemporary is this: The Government must have a Sabbath, a civil institution. The people must be compelled to keep the Sabbath which the Government institutes. This position is Judaistic theocracy, and pagan State churchism, combined. It is not the doctrine of the New Testament, nor of the New Testament Christianity. The real animus of the *Reformer's* position is found in the arrogance of majorities. It is practically this:—

1. Resolved, That the world belongs to the saints.
2. Resolved, That we are the saints.
3. Resolved, That foolish minorities of "less than one-eighth of one per cent." must be subject to the saints.

Attest the following paragraph from the *Reformer*:—

It is evident that the Sabbath observed by the Government must be the one observed by the people. Otherwise there will be conflict. Starting with the idea that the people have a divine right to a Sabbath, it follows that the State will regard as the Sabbath the day which the people regard. We do not now intend to discuss the claims of either the first or the seventh day of the week to recognition as the Sabbath. We maintain, however, that the first day of the week is now the Sabbath, not by the decree of Constantine or of the Roman Catholic Church, but by the decree of God. This is the day observed by the vast majority of the people. Those who observe the seventh day, including Jews, Seventh-day Baptists, and Seventh-day Adventists, are less than one-eighth of one per cent, of the entire population.

This is the polished but not less genuine doctrine of despots and bullies, everywhere, as the closing paragraphs of the *Reformer's* editorial further show. These read as follows:—

- (1.) The State must have a Sabbath.
 - (2.) That Sabbath must be the day observed by the people.
 - (3.) It must be protected by law.
 - (4.) Our Sabbath laws, either by specific enactment or by judicial decision, guard the rights of those who keep another day.
 - (5.) Those who plant themselves on Old Testament usage, without regard to the change made at the resurrection of Christ, and who trample on statute laws protecting the first day as the Sabbath, and thereby molest others, and interfere with their rights to rest and worship and also interfere with the rights of the State, must be dealt with as polygamists or others who make their religion a shield for violation of law.
- We would like to see a beginning made, however, in enforcing the law against railroad, steamboat, and street car companies, and newspapers issued on the Sabbath, and the saloon that is open on that day. These are the great enemies of religion and the chief promoters of disorder and immorality.

The position of this *Reformer* who thus insults Sabbath-keeping Christians and Jews by classing them with "polygamists," and defends their persecution, is worthy of no date this side of the Dark

Ages. Reduced to its lowest terms, we have this—

(1.) This great, good, pious Christian nation—see our late Congress, for example—empowered by Jehovah to make laws touching religion, has decreed that Sunday is the Sabbath, hence all people must keep it holy.

(2.) But this pious Christian nation wickedly breaks its own laws in countless ways. It carries on business, and runs its mail trains; its pious congressmen hold important committee meetings on its own sacred day. It is the leader in lawlessness. All strong corporations follow its example. The great newspapers, and those promoters of good order and religion, known as saloons, are very attentive to the advantages which the enforced idleness of the masses offer to their never-ceasing business.

(3.) Our reforming contemporary "would like to see a beginning made," etc. That might be well. Lawmakers ought to obey their own laws. But since the Government will not obey its own laws, since it is accustomed to grant to itself and all strong corporations and newspapers, etc., a "dispensation," to be as lawless as the circumstances may demand; and since the Jews and Sabbath-keeping Christians are a "one-eighth" minority, a mere trifle compared with the saints to whom the ends of the earth belong; and since Sunday work in a back lot, by a Seventh-day Adventist, in Georgia is a terrible menace to the morals and good order of the nation; since the selling of shoe-strings by a poor Jew in New York or Philadelphia might corrupt the morals of a weak congressman like Breckinridge, of Kentucky; and since, therefore, Resolved, that all "Saturdarians" shall be compelled to obey the righteous decrees of this Christian nation touching the sacred American Sabbath, or pay a fine or go to jail, or to the "chain gang." And the *Reformer*, who virtually says all this, wants God put into the Constitution of the nation, in order to get a better basis for enforcing Sunday laws!! We suggest, respectfully, that the *Christian Reformer and Dissenter* (Pittsburg) invite Christ to its editorial rooms that it may learn from him something of Christian charity and the meaning of religious liberty.—*Evangel and Sabbath Outlook*.

What Sunday-Keeping Really Means.

TIME and again it has been shown from the mouths of Catholics themselves that the Sunday institution is the badge, mark, or sign of the authority and power of the Roman Catholic Church. It has likewise been shown that the leading representatives of so-called Protestantism acknowledge Sunday to be the test, mark, or sign of that religious system. This is particularly true of the United States. The representatives of popular religious thought call Sunday "the test of all religion," "the corner-stone of Christ's kingdom," "the sign of the Christian nation," "a mark of American religion," etc., etc. It is worth while, then, to inquire what the Sunday institution really represents.

As the papacy is set forth in the Scriptures under the symbol of a "beast" (Rev. 13:1-10), its mark is usually called "the mark of the beast." See Rev. 19:20; 13:16, 17; 14:9; 15:2. There is a slight variation, however, in Rev. 14:11. Here the "mark of the beast" is called

"the mark of his name." Sunday, then, is that which represents the name of the beast. What name is here referred to? This is explained in the thirteenth chapter, verses 17, 18: "And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred threescore and six." Here the name of the beast is declared to have a "number," and that number "is the number of a man." This proves that the "beast" and the "man" are practically the same thing. In other words, the beast is a one-man power, and is represented by that one man.

Now every one knows that this is true to the very letter of the papacy, all the power of which is exercised and controlled by the pope. It is the pope who speaks to the church and speaks for the church. In him centers everything pertaining to the church.

Does the pope bear the number six hundred threescore and six? He does. Upon his pontifical crown may be seen in jewelled letters this title: "*Vicarius Filii Dei*," "Vicegerent of the Son of God." Taking the letters of this title, used as Roman numerals, in their regular order, their value is just six hundred and sixty-six. The letters A, R, S, F, and E are not used as numerals. The letter U was originally made like V, and represented five. Arranging the letters used as numerals in a vertical column with their equivalent values, we have this:—

V	5
I	1
C	100
I	1
U (V)	5
I	1
L	50
I	1
I	1
D	500
I	1
<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	
	666

By this it is proven that the name which has the number, is "*Vicarius Filii Dei*," or "Vicegerent of the Son of God." And Sunday, as a religious institution, is the mark of this name. Those who receive the mark receive the name with all that it implies. And what does this name imply? What is the meaning of it? It means that the pope stands in the place of the Son of God as the saviour of men. It means that he holds in his hands the keys of the kingdom of God, so that he can grant or refuse an entrance to whomsoever he will. It means that "the pope has power to change times, to abrogate laws, and to dispense with all things, even the precepts of Christ." It means that the power he possesses and exercises is the power of God.

All this and much more is acknowledged by the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week. Those who observe the papal Sabbath, instead of God's Sabbath, thereby acknowledge that the pope had the right to put himself in the place of God and to substitute his law for the law of God. And in this they acknowledge that his title, "*Vicarius Filii Dei*," is a proper one, and that they accept him as their saviour, rendering to him homage which would otherwise belong to God.

It is strange that so few realize the enormous sin which is committed in recognizing the rightfulness of this blasphemous title. To admit that the pope

stands in the place of the Son of God, is to admit that he exercises the authority and power of the Son of God. But the Bible says, "The dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority." Rev. 13:2. The Scripture also says that the dragon is the devil. Rev. 12:9. It is therefore true that all the power which the papacy possesses came directly from the devil. The power of the Catholic Church is the power of the devil, and not the power of God. And those who observe Sunday, knowing its origin and authority, thereby assert, though it be unwittingly, that the power of the devil is the power of God.

Of the second beast of Rev. 13, which represents the United States of America, it is said, that "he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him." Then this nation will exercise the power of the devil, too, will it not? This power is to be exercised in influencing and compelling the people to worship the papacy and its image. Rev. 13:12-15. And they are to worship the papacy by receiving its mark, the papal Sunday. Verses 16, 17. Catholics are pleased with the prospect. They say:—

The observance of Sunday by Protestants is an homage [worship] they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Catholic] church.—*Plain Talk for Protestants*, p. 213.

Again:—

The church changed the Sabbath to Sunday, and all the world bows down and worships upon that day in silent obedience to the mandates of the Catholic Church.—*From a lecture by Father Enright, 1884.*

This quotation agrees pretty well with Rev. 13:8: "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life."

All except God's people will assert that the power of the papacy, which changed the Sabbath, is the power of God. When the Pharisees called the power of God the power of the devil, they were charged with blasphemy. Are not men guilty of the same offense when they assert that the power of the devil, exercised by the Catholic Church, is the power of God? And is not that equivalent to saying that the devil is God, and that his worship is the worship of God?

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

The Facts in the Case.

OUR attention has recently been called to a statement made in these columns September 14, 1893, to the effect that "the Methodist, the Episcopalian, the Congregationalist, and the Baptist churches" had "all refused to take any more" money from the Government for the support of their Indian schools. The statement is made that "the Baptists never received any public money for Indian schools, or for any other purpose, and could not, therefore, have refused to take any more."

As soon as our statement that the Baptists had refused to accept further State aid was challenged, we began to make inquiries to learn the exact truth of the matter. To this end we asked Mr. Allen Moon, president of the International Religious Liberty Association, a resident of Washington, to ascertain the facts for us. He subsequently wrote thus, under date of September 11:—

I have spent considerable time at the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and have looked up the record of the Indian Contract Schools as far back as 1887, and there is no record of any Baptist school in the United States having received any money from

the Government, while the Catholics, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, Mennonites, Quakers, and others have had such appropriations from the Government. I am inclined to think your statement is a mistake, so far as the Baptists are concerned; but you need not make any retraction on this authority. The commissioner has set a clerk to look the matter up, as far back as the contract schools have been in existence, and will give me a statement, in writing, in a few days that will be reliable.

The Baptist people have several Indian schools, but they are and ever have been supported by that denomination without Government aid.

It was not until the year 1890 that some of the Protestant churches began to refuse Government appropriations for Indian schools.

September 14, we received from Mr. Moon the following letter, containing the definite information:—

Department of the Interior,
Office of Indian Affairs,
Washington, Sept. 12, 1894.

ALLEN MOON,

President International Religious Liberty Ass'n,
728, 9th Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

Sir:—Referring to our conversation of 11th instant, relative to contracts, for the education of Indian children, with the Baptist Church, you are informed that I find records of contracts from the year 1879 to 1884, between this office and Henry L. Morehouse, of New York City, Secretary of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, for the Freedmen of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians, in the Indian Territory, as follows:—

In 1879, 6 day schools at \$875.00 for six months.

In 1882, 1 boarding school and 8 day schools at \$2,250.00.

In 1883, 1 boarding and 8 day schools at \$2,750.00.

In 1884, 4 day schools at \$700.00, and again in the same year for 6 schools at \$1,500.00.

Very respectfully,

FRANK C. ARMSTRONG,
Asst. Commissioner.

We are sorry that the Baptists have not been able to show themselves clear in this matter. If all Protestants had consistently held themselves aloof from all such compromising partnerships with the State, Rome would not now be feeding at the public crib and complacently asking, What are you going to do about it?

Significant Paragraphs.

[We publish under this heading paragraphs more or less significant, without either approval or dissent, and without comment. The careful observer of the signs of the times will readily discern the pertinent facts and opinions, and will know how to turn them to account in the great controversy between truth and error.]

A Methodist Camp Meeting.

LANCASTER CAMP GROUNDS, August 13.—As the skirmish is to the general engagement, so the work of last week has simply been a "feeler" to the great battle that will be waged this week. To-day every Christian member of this camp is hustling and making ready for the fight that is before him.

Everybody that heard Rev. N. H. Lathrop at the 10 A. M. meeting at the auditorium, pronounced it one of the most refreshing showers of gospel rainfall that we have had. His theme was the millennium and in his version of the great revelation of St. John, the divine opened up new thoughts and new studies in this old field that will last longer than the camp meeting of 1894.

In talking of the improvement and difference of worship of the old Romans and that of the Roman Church of to-day, he said: "God bless the Catholic Church of to-day," and further said, "I believe that the time will come when the Catholic Church will wheel into the same line with the Protestant churches." He strongly commended the action of Bishop Watterson in taking his manly and Christian stand in the temperance cause, and said:

"God bless Bishop Watterson!" A hearty amen came from the lips and hearts of more than one hundred ministers and multiplied hundreds of listeners.—*Ohio State Journal, August 14.*

Want Saloons Closed on Sunday.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., Sept. 10.—At least a thousand people, representing three law and order leagues and twenty-nine churches, of this city, called at the city hall this afternoon, and, through their spokesman, Thomas Jones, President of the Missouri Christian Endeavor Society, made a demand on the police board to enforce the law relative to the closing of saloons on Sunday. The members of the police board were taken by surprise, but Mayor Davis responded to the demands of the people by promising to have the law enforced.—*Chicago Herald, Sept. 11.*

To Stop All Business on Sunday.

SAGINAW, Mich., Sept. 10.—*Special Telegram.*—The Saginaw Liquor Dealers' Association will endeavor to close up all sorts of business places on Sunday next. The saloon-keepers are not allowed to do business on that day, and they propose to see that no one else does. They will protest against the running of the street cars and sale of cigars, newspapers, soda water, etc. The association insisted upon the members keeping their places closed on Sunday, and all complied but three or four. It is proposed to close every place up as tight as a drum.—*Inter-Ocean, Sept. 11.*

No Business to Be Allowed on Sundays.

IONIA, Mich., Sept. 5.—Ionia has a law and order league which is alive to the interests of Sunday observance, and through its influence the common council at last night's meeting passed an ordinance forbidding the opening of all places of business on the first day of the week, after October 1.

It makes it the duty of the marshal to see that the law is enforced, and empowers him to shut up all places working or doing business, and to arrest such persons without due process of law. If such an ordinance is enforced, and the marshal declares it his intention to do so, Ionia will be a veritable paradise for lovers of a quiet time.—*Detroit Free Press, Sept. 7, 1894.*

A Resolution Denouncing the A. P. A.

THE session of the German Roman Catholic Central Verein was concluded yesterday at the school hall of the Most Holy Redeemer, at 222 East Fourth Street.

In the afternoon the resolutions of the convention were adopted. The following reference was made to the A. P. A.:—

"The fruits of religious hatred and fanaticism, which of late years the secret societies have brought forth by endeavoring, under the mask of patriotism or Americanism, to ostracize Catholics, must spur our Catholic societies to join forces for the purpose of defending and preserving our religious as well as our civil rights. In such societies our men, young and old, will learn, above all, how to face the arrogance, nay, impudence, of resuscitated Know-Nothingism. Our Catholic societies are by no means political societies; every one of their members is at full liberty to side with either political party, and yet our religious conviction, and solely this, will decide our choice in all

those cases in which a party or individuals see fit to drag religion into politics and to become the tool of cliques, as un-American as they are un-Catholic."—*New York Sun*, Sept. 20.

Joins the Catholic Church.

NEW YORK, Sept. 9.—The Roman Catholic Church has gained a convert from Episcopalianism in the person of the Rev. Walter Clayton Clapp. The Rev. Mr. Clapp was received into the Catholic Church Friday by the Rev. Father Elliott, at the Paulist Church of St. Paul the Apostle.

Dr. Clapp, during the time of his connection with the Protestant Episcopal Church, was known as a very high churchman. He is thirty-two years old. He was graduated from Amherst College in 1883. He is the son of a New York business man who is a deacon in the Baptist Church of the Redeemer in Harlem.—*Washington Post*, Sept. 10, 1894.

Rome Wants Statistics.

[Of the return of Dr. Burtzell to this country from Rome, the *Tribune*, of the 3rd. inst., says:—]

HE has been appointed agent for the United States of the Society for the Propagation of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, for the proclamation of that body with his name attached has preceded him. His appointment as the agent of this society is considered by his friends to be a great honor.

The Society for the Propagation of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, of which little or nothing is known in this country, has for its object the promulgation and fostering of the principles of the encyclical of the pope on the labor question two years ago. It is one of special interest to the pope, and its president is Cardinal L. M. Parocchi, Vicar-General of the pope. Following is a copy of the proclamation, which will be distributed in every diocese for information concerning the workingmen's organizations in the United States:

Important to workingmen's societies. Society for the Propagation of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. His Eminence Cardinal L. M. Parocchi, Hon. President.

The committee has in hand the compilation of a collection of written opinions on the Encyclical (*Rerum Novarum*) and on its practical application. Until now, all the crowned heads of Europe, the episcopacy, and the most celebrated men of social science have contributed to the work; and we are able to state that this demonstration of sympathy with his far-seeing views, has gladdened the heart of Leo XIII. If by chance you have not taken part, we beg you to regard yourself as earnestly invited by this circular to do so at your earliest convenience. At this moment, moreover, the same committee is engaged in the compilation of statistics of all the practical works for the benefit of the working classes which have either been called into existence by the words of the Supreme Pontiff, or have brought themselves into conformity with the lines of action traced out in the encyclical. Hence, the committee earnestly begs you to second it in this undertaking by kindly writing answers to the questions here enclosed.

Then follows a blank form containing these questions, the answers to which are to be appended:—

Number, names and location of workingmen's societies, date of foundation, number of members. What percentage of total number of workingmen belong to the societies? By whom are they managed? Are there workingmen's banks? What is the capital of each? Has the encyclical produced an effect upon these societies?

The document closes with a space for the signature and residence of the sender, with the direction to forward to the Rev. Dr. Richard L. Burtzell, Rondout, New York. It was said that this commission, which has been given to Dr. Burtzell at

the instance of the pope, may have some influence in hastening his return, for it is likely that the desired statistics should be prepared and transmitted as soon as possible.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY LIBRARY.

No. 1. **Due Process of Law and the Divine Right of Dissent.** A review of Judge Hammond's decision in the King case. By A. T. Jones. 120 pages. Price, 15 cents.

No. 2. **Religious Intolerance in the Republic.** A portrayal of recent persecutions in Tennessee. 16 pages. Price, 2 cents.

No. 3. **Church and State.** By James T. Ringgold, of the Baltimore Bar. 60 pages. Price, 10 cents.

No. 4. **The National Sunday Law.** Arguments by A. T. Jones in opposition to the Blair Sunday-rest Bill. 192 pages. Price, 25 cents.

No. 5. **Sunday Laws in the United States.** By James T. Ringgold. 24 pages. Price, 3 cents.

No. 6. **The Captivity of the Republic.** 128 pages. Price, 15 cents.

No. 7. **Appeal and Remonstrance.** 24 pages. Price, 3 cents.

No. 8. **Appeal from the U. S. Supreme Court Decision Making this a "Christian Nation."** A Protest. By A. T. Jones. 86 pages. Price, 15 cents.

No. 9. **Religious Liberty and the Mormon Question.** 20 pages. Price, 2½ cents.

No. 10. **The "Civil Sabbath;" or Disguised Religious Legislation.** 12 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 11. **The Columbian Year, and the Meaning of the Four Centuries.** 44 pages. Price, 5½ cents.

No. 12. **The Limits of Civil Authority.** 12 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 13. **Christ and the Sabbath.** 40 pages. Price, 5 cents.

No. 14. **Rome's Challenge: Why Do Protestants Keep Sunday?** 40 pages. Price, 5 cents.

No. 15. **Our Answer: Why Do Seventh-day Adventists Suffer Imprisonment Rather Than Keep Sunday?** By A. F. Ballenger. 12 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 16. **Christ and the Pharisees; or, Christ's Faithfulness in Sabbath-keeping.** 40 pages. Price, 5 cents.

No. 17. **Protestantism, True and False.** 32 pages. Price, 4 cents.

No. 18. **Civil Government and Religion.** 182 pages. Price, 25 cents.

No. 19. **Congress on Sunday Legislation.** 16 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 20. **The Legal Sunday: Its History and Character.** 260 pages. Price, 40 cents. The same in cloth, 75 cents.

No. 21. **The Sabbath Question in the Dominion Parliament,** as viewed by Hon. G. Amyot, M. P. 12 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 22. **What Do These Things Mean?** The true meaning of the present unsettled condition of "Capital and Labor," finances, etc. 20 pages. Price, 2½ cents.

Annual subscription to the Library, \$1. Liberal discounts on any of the numbers in quantities and to the trade.

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

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.

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?
- " 12. The Power of Forgiveness.
- " 13. Responsibility of Parents.
- " 14. Choose Ye This Day.
- " 15. The Cross of Christ.

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

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

The Law of God as Changed by the Papacy

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

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

Price, Post-paid, \$1.00.

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

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.

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.



You can Bind

One Sheet, or three hundred sheets, in ten seconds.

The Klip binds loose sheets, pamphlets, or magazines.

If you want covers also, you had better send for a Klip price-list—that's free. If you will try the Klip, I will mail a sample dozen, six sizes, and a pair of Klip-Keys to put them on with for seventy-five cents.

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



NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 27, 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.

IF the gentleman writing to us from South Monterey, Mich., under date of September 4, about the Capps case, will send us his name, instead of simply his initials, we will reply to his letter.

IT is stated that the pope would like to interfere in the Korean difficulty, but cannot see his way clear to do so without offending one or other of the great powers. Leo XIII. certainly has a wonderful itching to arbitrate something.

THE facts stated under "Significant Paragraphs," in regard to Dr. Burtzell's commission to collect statistics, are directly in line with the statement made in these columns some weeks since to the effect that the papacy is scheming to insinuate itself into the labor question in such a way as to become the arbitrator, not only of disputes between labor and capital, but between labor and the civil authorities. The pope's interest in the United States is not disinterested benevolence by any means. Rome means to dominate the United States, and she sees in the unrest of the masses an opportunity to make it appear that she is quite necessary to the stability of the Republic.

WE begin this week the publication of several articles on papal infallibility. We ask for them a careful reading. Of course infallibility does not attach to the pope in any way, except in the minds of his votaries. It is altogether a vanishing quantity. It is claimed that it inheres only in a certain prerogative of the office of pope, namely, in *ex cathedra* utterances; and to this term the Vatican council of 1870 affixed such a definition that almost any utterance, on almost any subject, may be held to be *ex cathedra* or not *ex cathedra*, at the sweet will of the pope himself, or of those who are affected by the utterance. This is of course to leave a loophole by which to escape from the many glaring errors, to say nothing of the downright wickedness of many of the popes of Rome. That which part of the church accepts as *ex cathedra* may be denied by another part; or that which one pope has spoken "from the chair of St. Peter," as he supposed and intended, may by another pope be ignored, or set down as simply an opinion on canon law or a deliverance on discipline. Three inquiries have recently been made from this office of as many high Roman Catholic officials in this country concerning *ex cathedra* utterances by the

present pope. One of these officials (the highest in rank in the United States) replied: "It is not very often that the popes are obliged to speak in such a manner [*ex cathedra*]; but they have done so in many instances, as did Leo XIII. on a recent occasion." When asked what the recent occasion was, and where an authentic copy of the utterance could be obtained, "the prince of the church" twice evaded the question. One archbishop and another archbishop's chancellor replied that they had no knowledge of an *ex cathedra* utterance by the present pope. It is therefore evident that the pope's infallibility is altogether chimerical, derived from an imaginary function of a man-made office, from the will of the "sovereign pontiff," and dependant upon the interpretation of those to whom it is addressed. This is papal infallibility, and it is to faith in this that Leo XIII. invites "the rulers and peoples of the universe."

ONE of the most significant of our "Significant Paragraphs," this week, is that in which it is related that a Methodist preacher, in Ohio, exclaimed at a recent camp meeting: "God bless the Roman Catholic Church of to-day."

"Rome never changes." The Roman Catholic Church of to-day is, according to her own boast, the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Ages. Cardinal Gibbons says, in "The Faith of Our Fathers," page 71:—

Perpetuity, or duration till the end of time, is one of the most striking marks of the Church. By perpetuity is not meant merely that Christianity in one form or another was always to exist, but that the Church was to remain forever in its integrity, clothed with all the attributes which God gave it in the beginning. For, if the Church lost any of her essential characteristics, . . . she could not be said to be perpetual, because she would not be the same institution.

Again, on page 83 of the same book, we find these words:—

Amid the continual changes in human institutions, she [the Roman Catholic Church] is the one institution that never changes. . . . She has seen monarchies changed into republics, and republics consolidated into empires—all this has she witnessed, while her own divine constitution has remained unaltered.

That Rome adapts herself in some measure to different ages is true; but that she changes in character is not true. Her doctrines, her purposes are the same now as in the Middle Ages, and if she could she would push back the car of human progress to the position it occupied when she dominated the civilized world, and the Inquisition tortured its victims and hunted its enemies where it would. Says Brownson, a Roman Catholic writer, whose work is on sale in all Catholic book stores: "Always will the period from the sixth to the end of the fifteenth century stand out as most glorious in the annals of the race."—*Liberalism and the Church*, page 182.

No, "Rome never changes," and she is sorry that the world has changed. She is

sorry that there was ever such an era as that of the Reformation. She is much grieved at the existence of the various Protestant sects, of which the Methodist Episcopal Church is one. And yet a Methodist preacher says, "God bless the Roman Catholic Church of to-day." If Rome is the Church of God, there is no excuse for Methodism; its inception was wickedness, its continuance is presumption. But if Rome is, as the Scriptures characterize her, "the mystery of iniquity," "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," how dare any man bearing the name of Protestant, bid her God speed?

ANOTHER case of persecution for conscience' sake is reported from Australia. An Adventist was arrested for Sunday work in Parramatta, a suburb of Sydney, early in August, and was fined two shillings and sixpence, or to be set in the stocks for two hours. The fine not being paid and there being no stocks, orders were given to erect some. But the Minister of Justice did not relish a return to mediævalism, and finding that the statute of Charles II. provided a fine of five shillings instead of two shillings and sixpence, he took advantage of the technicality and ordered proceedings to be stopped and the prisoner to be set free. The Adventists embraced the opportunity to circulate their literature and their work has been advanced rather than hindered by the arrest.

IN another column we print an article from the *Independent* touching the question of State appropriation to religious or semi-religious institutions, as viewed by the Constitutional Convention of this State. We publish the matter because of its statement of facts, but do not indorse the action of the convention; because it prohibits appropriations only to institutions "under control or direction of religious denominations or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught." It leaves the door wide open for appropriations to institutions claiming to teach undenominational tenets.

It is now positively stated that Mgr. Satolli will not be recalled by the pope, but that he will presently be formally appointed supreme head of "the church" in this country.

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.