



"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, DECEMBER 20, 1894.

NUMBER 50.

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.

THAT which distinguishes Christianity from every other religion is its spirituality.

WHEN Christianity ceases to be spiritual it ceases to be Christianity; for it has lost its distinguishing feature.

CHRISTIANITY is not of this world, even as its Author is not of this world; and being spiritual, and not of this world, it can be advanced only by means not of this world; hence the words of our Lord: "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

THE sword stands not alone for the weapon bearing that name, but for civil power, for the authority of the State, and for all carnal force in spiritual things. Christ's kingdom is not of this world, hence its interests cannot be advanced by the use of carnal weapons. "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds."

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL has, from the first day of its publication until the present time, adhered consistently to this principle. It has insisted that as the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ is wholly spiritual, it not only cannot be enforced upon any person whatever, but that its promulgation cannot be either helped or hindered by worldly means; that as it cannot be promulgated by the sword, so it cannot be assisted by gifts from civil powers.

STATE support in any degree, whether in exemption from taxation or in direct gifts of land or money, means, at least, a measure of State control. But how can a spiritual church, teaching a spiritual truth, and dependent upon spiritual power, submit in any degree to be controlled by

any power except her divine and spiritual Lord?

BUT, as before stated, State aid means State control, either in whole or in part. A State grants a charter to a railroad, giving it the right of eminent domain; and in return the railroad must submit to have its business regulated by the State, to an extent and in a manner beyond the control exercised over other kinds of business.

A NUMBER of citizens contribute freely in work and money to build a grist mill. The mill is built as a custom mill. Later, the owners desire to run it as a merchant mill; but they must first repay every penny donated to assist in building it, because neighborhood aid means a measure of neighborhood control.

THIS principle is clearly stated by Dr. A. P. M'Diarmid, pastor of the Tabernacle Baptist Church, Brooklyn, in his pamphlet, "Should Church Property Be Taxed?" He says: "Accepting the support of the State, we must logically accept the authority of the State over the Church. It is, practically, the argument by which the State-church has always been defended." This is sound; State aid necessarily involves State control, either directly, in legal enactments binding the Church, or in undue influence exerted by the State, and which the Church dare not resist for fear of forfeiting the favor of the State.

LOBBYING, wire-pulling, and compromise are inseparably connected with the acceptance of public lands or public funds. If the civil government, by whatever name it may be called, or whatever may be its form, gives anything to a church, it is in expectation of receiving a return in influence. The church is then expected to support the government, to indorse its laws; in short, to give its moral support in return for the bounty granted by the government. But this no church can engage to do and remain loyal to God. It is sometimes necessary for a church to oppose the policy of a government and disobey its laws, even as did the apostles, and, like them, return to civil rulers this answer: "Whether it be right in the sight

of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." "We ought to obey God rather than men." Therefore, as the chaste woman will not accept presents from a man not her husband, and to whom she is not betrothed, so no pure church should accept bounties from any civil government under heaven.

"Obey the Law Until Repealed."

THE Lord says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord." Again, speaking of the seventh day, the Lord calls it "my holy day." Again the Lord says of the seventh day, "The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day."

Besides declaring that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," the Lord of the Sabbath says, "Six days shalt thou labor," and calls these six days, "The six working days."

Seventh-day Adventists believe the Lord. More, they obey him. They keep holy the seventh day, and commencing on the first day, they work on "the six working days."

While thus obeying the Lord, the government, instigated by representatives of opposing religions, lays its heavy hand on them and says, "You are guilty of 'Sabbath breaking,' you 'profane the Lord's day'" contrary to law. Seventh-day Adventists protest that they have not profaned the Lord's day, and read the words of the Lord, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord." But the law of Tennessee¹ replies, "The Sabbath day" is "Sunday."² Montana,³ Vermont,⁴ New Hampshire,⁵ and Pennsylvania⁶ agree with Tennessee, and say, "The Lord's day" is "the first day of the week."

¹ Ex. 20: 9, 10.

² Isa. 58: 13.

³ Matt. 12: 8.

⁴ Ex. 20: 9.

⁵ Ezek. 46: 1.

⁶ Maryland Code of Public and General Laws. Vol. 1, Art. 27, sec. 247.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Code of Tennessee, 1884, chap. 11, sections 2013 and 2289.

⁹ In Tennessee law, "Sabbath-day" and "Sunday" are used interchangeably, as in the laws of other States the "Lord's day," the "Sabbath-day" and "Christian Sabbath" are used interchangeably with "the first day of the week," or definitely designated by the term, "commonly called Sunday."

¹⁰ Compiled Statutes of Montana, 1887, sec. 1406.

¹¹ Revised Laws of Vermont, 1881, chap. 203, sec. 4315.

¹² General Laws of New Hampshire, 1878, chap. 273, sec. 3 and chap. 8, sec. 1, of Acts of June Session 1887.

¹³ Laws of Pennsylvania, 1883, Vol. 2, p. 1517, *et seq.* 835, sec. 3, 5.

Arkansas¹⁴ and New Jersey¹⁵ join the controversy and remark, "The Christian Sabbath" is "the first day of the week." Colorado¹⁶ puts it a little differently and asserts that "the Sabbath or Lord's day" is "the first day of the week." Florida,¹⁷ Illinois,¹⁸ Indiana,¹⁹ Iowa,²⁰ Kansas,²¹ and Wisconsin²² in concert declare, "The Sabbath day" is "the first day of the week." Maine²³ is very definite, and says, "The Lord's day" is "the first day of the week," and "includes the time between twelve o'clock on Saturday night and twelve o'clock on Sunday night." Massachusetts²⁴ does not say which day is the "Lord's day," but clearly infers that it is not "the seventh day;" and Virginia²⁵ and West Virginia²⁶ in like manner infer that "the Sabbath day" is not "the seventh day."

Minnesota,²⁷ in explaining her position, remarks, "The first day of the week being by general consent set apart for rest and religious uses, the law prohibits the doing on that day of certain acts. . . . A violation of the foregoing prohibitions is Sabbath-breaking."

Missouri²⁸ agrees with Minnesota, and states that "to labor or perform any work" "on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is "Sabbath-breaking." Nebraska²⁹ agrees with Missouri. Georgia,³⁰ Mississippi,³¹ and South Carolina³² all agree that "the Sabbath day" is "Sunday," and Tennessee adds that the seventh day is one of the "week days."

Vermont³³ asserts that "any person who, between twelve o'clock Saturday night and sunset on the following Sunday, exercises any business or employment" is guilty of "Sabbath-breaking."

North Dakota and South Dakota³⁴ are still more emphatic, and say, "Doing servile labor on the first day of the week" is "Sabbath-breaking," and one of the "crimes against religion."

Seventh-day Adventists again look at their Bibles and notwithstanding all this testimony from human law, the law of God still reads, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord."

They appeal to the United States Circuit Court, but that court says it cannot interfere. And before they can get their case before the Supreme Court of the United States, this tribunal of last resort decides unanimously that "this is a Christian nation," and as one proof cites the very "Sabbath laws"³⁵ which oppress them and which declare that the first

day of the week is the Sabbath day or the Lord's day.

Closely following this decision the Congress of the United States, in violation of the Constitution, takes sides with the States and joins in declaring that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday"³⁶ is the Sabbath; a thing it had for a hundred years refused to do and which the United States Senate said if done would constitute "a legal decision of a religious controversy"³⁷ and lay the foundation for "that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World."³⁸

When in 1829 the Senate of the United States was petitioned to enact a law enforcing the observance of the "Sabbath or first day of the week," the Senate answered by committee report: "With these different religious views [the seventh day is the Sabbath" and "the first day is the Sabbath"], the committee are of the opinion that Congress cannot interfere. It is not the legitimate province of the legislature to determine what religion is true and what is false."³⁹ Notwithstanding these solemn warnings the Congress of the United States in 1892 took sides with the several States and with the Supreme Court in deciding that the claim that the first day of the week is the Sabbath is true and that the claim that the seventh day is the Sabbath is false.

After all this has been done the demand is made that Seventh-day Adventists, by the act of resting on the first day of the week, shall assent to, and thereby teach, the doctrine that the "first day is the Sabbath." But with the States of the Union, with the Supreme Court of the United States, and with the Congress of the United States, declaring that the first day is the Sabbath, Seventh-day Adventists find that the commandment still reads, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord."

For their faithfulness to the law of God and their refusal to bow to the image—a counterfeit—of that law which men have set up, they are fined and imprisoned, and when let go are admonished in future to obey the laws of the State which declare that the first day of the week is the Sabbath. Seventh-day Adventists answer, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."⁴⁰ When let go, they continue to labor on the first day of the week in harmony with the law of God and in violation of the law of the State.

They are again arrested, fined, and imprisoned, and told by judges that they ought as good citizens to obey the laws of the State until they could secure their repeal. Prosecuting attorneys, prosecuting witnesses, the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, State Sabbath Associations, popular churches, law and order leagues, and young people's societies assume an air of patriotic loyalty to law, and in a chorus respond, Amen. But the Seventh-day Adventists answer, "We ought to obey God rather than men."⁴¹ And then the judge, whose province it is to judge according to the civil laws, leaves this judgment-seat and climbs to the throne of the Infinite, and usurps the "divine prerogative," and judges the

consciences of the accused, and tells them that there is no element of conscience involved in the question, that the law does not forbid them to keep the seventh day, but only requires them to observe the Lord's day on the first day of the week, and that there is no element of conscience involved in refraining from labor on the first day of the week, and to contend that there is but a manifestation of fanatical stubbornness.

The charge of fanaticism and stubbornness is as old as religious persecution, and has been met by the reformers of all ages. There is a conscientious principle involved, and Seventh-day Adventists will continue to maintain their loyalty to God and give a reason for the hope that is within them with meekness and fear.

The observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, or the Lord's day, is an act of religion, an act of worship. The Sabbath, or Lord's day, is commanded by the law of God which Paul declares is "spiritual" and "holy." When the State therefore attempts to compel men to observe the Sabbath, or Lord's day, it undertakes to enforce obedience in spiritual matters. And as obedience in spiritual matters is worship, so to obey the Sabbath laws of the State is to worship the State. And the Seventh-day Adventist says to the State, in the words of Martin Luther to the Emperor Charles V.:—

God, who is the searcher of hearts, is my witness, that I am ready most earnestly to obey your majesty, in honor or in dishonor, in life or in death, and with no exception save the Word of God, by which man lives. In all the affairs of this present life, my fidelity shall be unshaken, for here to lose or gain is of no consequence to salvation. But when eternal interests are concerned, God wills not that man shall submit unto man. For such submission in spiritual matters is real worship, and ought to be rendered solely to the Creator.⁴²

But what has the Government done in presuming to decide this religious controversy regarding the Sabbath and demanding obedience to its decision under penalty of fine and imprisonment? It has done just what the Baptists, Presbyterians, and Quakers, with Jefferson and Madison, said in their memorial to the Virginia legislature in 1776, denying the rightfulness of "the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith,"—it has erected "a claim to infallibility" which is papal in principle and can but "lead us back to the church of Rome."⁴³ In deciding that the first day is the Sabbath, in favor of certain sects that profess the Christian religion, and against the position of another Christian body which holds that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," it violates the great Protestant principle after which it was imaged by the hands of its founders, and is moulded in the image of the papacy which has always claimed the right to infallibly decide questions of faith and to enforce the decision by fines and imprisonment.

It is plain, therefore, that in attempting to compel Seventh-day Adventists to obey the government in the spiritual matter of Sabbath-keeping, which obedience is real worship, the attempt is made to compel Seventh-day Adventists to worship the image of the papacy.

But this is not all. The first day rival of the Sabbath of the Lord was not originated by the Government of the United States. As a so-called Christian institution the first-day Sabbath originated with the papacy, that power which Daniel said

¹⁴ Acts and resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, 1887, p. 12, sec. 1.

¹⁵ Revision of the Statutes of New Jersey, 1877, p. 1227, sec. 1.

¹⁶ Criminal code of Colorado, 1843, chap. 25, sec. 189; and chap. 64, sec. 18.

¹⁷ Laws of Florida, 1881, chap. 79, sec. 9.

¹⁸ Revised statutes of Illinois, 1889, chap. 38, sections 259 and 261.

¹⁹ Revised statutes of Indiana, 1888, sec. 2,000.

²⁰ McLain's "Annotated Code and Statutes," 1888, vol. 2, chap. 12, sec. 5,438.

²¹ General statutes, vol. 1, 1889, sections 2,395 and 2,396.

²² Annotated statutes of Wisconsin, 1889, chap. 2,310, sec. 4,593.

²³ Revised statutes of Maine, 1883, chap. 124, sections 22 and 23.

²⁴ General statutes of Massachusetts, chap. 98, sections 2 and 13.

²⁵ Code of Virginia, 1887, p. 900, sections 3,799 3,800.

²⁶ Code of West Virginia, second edition, 1887, chap. 149, sections 16 and 17.

²⁷ General statutes of Minnesota, 1888, vol. 2, chap. 1, sections 222 and 223.

²⁸ Revised statutes of Missouri, 1889, vol. 1, chap. 47, sec. 3,852.

²⁹ Compiled statutes of Nebraska, 1885, chap. 23, sec. 241.

³⁰ Code of the State of Georgia, 1882, p. 1196, sec. 4,578.

³¹ Revised code of Mississippi, 1880, chap. 77, sec. 2,949.

³² Code of South Carolina, vol. 2, chap. 61, sec. 3,782.

³³ Revised code of Vermont, 1881, chap. 202, sec. 4,315.

³⁴ Compiled laws of Dakota, 1887. Under crimes against religion, sec. 6,241.

³⁵ United States Supreme Court decision, Trinity Church case, Feb. 29, 1892.

³⁶ Act closing the World's Fair on Sunday, signed Aug. 5, 1892.

³⁷ "American State Papers," class 7, p. 225.

³⁸ *Ib.*

³⁹ *Ib.*

⁴⁰ Acts 4: 19.

⁴¹ Acts 5: 29.

⁴² D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, Book VII, chap. 11.

⁴³ Baird's "Religion in America," book 3, chap. 3, par. 11.

would "think to change times and laws,"⁴⁴ and which Paul prophesied would "exalt himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped."⁴⁵ The papacy claims to be able to change the time of the Sabbath of the Most High in the face of the plain command of God.

On this point Cardinal Gibbons says:—

Is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday, and to abstain on that day from unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most prominent of our sacred duties? But you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.⁴⁶

A standard catechism of the Roman Catholic Church speaks thus plainly on the same subject:—

Question.—Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

Answer.—Had she not such power she could not have . . . substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scripture authority.⁴⁷

Thus the church of Rome confesses that "the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week," is the Sabbath, instead of the "seventh day," originated with her. This is denied by some professed Protestants on the ground that Sunday was kept before the Roman Catholic Church was recognized as a distinct body. This does not alter the matter. "The mystery of iniquity," which now assumes the name Roman Catholic Church, was at work in Paul's day.

But it devolves on those who keep the first day as the Sabbath and who deny the claim of Rome as the author of Sunday observance, and who accept the Bible as an infallible rule of faith, to find where the great Law-giver has abrogated the command to observe "the seventh day" and enacted a law enjoining the observance of the "first day." But this they confess they cannot do. Here are some of their confessions.

The Protestant Episcopal Church says:

Is there any command in the New Testament to change the day of weekly rest from Saturday to Sunday? None.⁴⁸

The Church of England says:—

There are some points of great difficulty respecting the fourth commandment.

In the first place we are commanded to keep holy the seventh day; but yet we do not think it necessary to keep the seventh day holy; for the seventh day is Saturday. It may be said that we keep the first day instead; but surely this is not the same thing; the first day cannot be the seventh day; and where are we told in Scripture that we are to keep the first day at all? We are commanded to keep the seventh; but we are nowhere commanded to keep the first day.

The reason why we keep the first day of the week holy instead of the seventh is for the same reason that we observe many other things, not because the Bible, but because the Church, has enjoined it.⁴⁹

The Methodist Episcopal Church publishes this:—

This seventh-day Sabbath was strictly observed by Christ and his apostles previous to his crucifixion. Mark 6:2; Luke 4:16, 31; 13:10; Acts 1:12-14; 13:14, 42, 44; 17:2, 18:4.

Jesus, after his resurrection, changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week.

When Jesus gave instruction for this change we are not told, but very likely during the time when he

spoke to his apostles of the things pertaining to his kingdom.⁵⁰

Says Rev. Edward T. Hiscox, a Baptist minister, author of the "Baptist Manual," in a recent address before a Baptist ministers meeting of New York City:—

There was and is a commandment to "keep holy the Sabbath-day," but that Sabbath-day was not Sunday. It will however be readily said, and with some show of triumph, that the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, with all its duties, privileges and sanctions. Earnestly desiring information on this subject, which I have studied for many years, I ask, where can the record of such a transaction be found? Not in the New Testament,—absolutely not. There is no Scriptural evidence of the change of the Sabbath institution from the seventh to the first day of the week. I wish to say that this Sabbath question, in this aspect of it, is in my judgment the gravest and most perplexing question connected with Christian institutions which at present claims attention from Christian people.

Space will not admit the introduction of a great mass of similar confessions from other professedly Protestant denominations.

And now, we ask, when a civil government transforms itself into an image of the papacy and commands men to obey its decrees in the spiritual matter of Sabbath-keeping, and attempts to compel men to observe the first day as the Sabbath, when God says, "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and since the first day Sabbath is the Roman Catholic Sabbath, and since "such submission in spiritual things is real worship," it follows that to obey such laws is to worship, not only the image of the papacy but the papacy itself, and this is just the view which Roman Catholics take of the question in the following quotation:—

This observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage [worship] they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Roman Catholic] church.⁵¹

But this is not all. Not only does the papacy claim the power to change the law of God; not only does it claim to have changed the Sabbath, the seventh day, to Sunday, the first day, but it puts forth this very change as a mark or sign of its power to command the obedience of men under penalty of sin. Here is the claim:—

Question.—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

Answer.—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

Question.—How prove you that?

Answer.—Because by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin.⁵²

And now from all this it is clearly seen that when Seventh-day Adventists refuse to obey laws made to compel the observance of the first day as the Sabbath of the Lord, they refuse to obey or worship a power which by the very act of deciding which day is the Sabbath, and enforcing that decision upon them, transforms itself into an image of the papacy. They refuse also to obey or worship the papacy itself, which originated the Sunday rival of the Sabbath of the Lord. And, lastly, they refuse to receive, either with a willing mind or under the hand of compulsion, the Sunday institution which the papacy itself claims as the mark of its power.

And in thus refusing they are acting in

harmony with the warning found in "The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him to show unto his servants," which says: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12.

This is the reason why Seventh-day Adventists cannot obey Sunday laws until they are repealed. To the statement that this position will bring them in conflict with every civilized government in the world, they answer that the Lord has predicted that the "kings of the earth and their armies" would rally to the support of this papal apostasy against those "who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." But blessed be his name, the "King of Kings and Lord of Lords" marshals the "armies in heaven" for the defense of the faithful few who keep the commandments of God, and joins in battle with "the beast and the kings of the earth and their armies," and the "beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." "And them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints."⁵³

And the great controversy between truth and error, the battle of the ages, is ended.

Still Troubled by Adventists.

"FATHER" WALTER ELLIOTT, a Catholic priest of the order of the Paulist Fathers, in writing from Michigan, some months since, said of Seventh-day Adventists: "The sect is the most venomous enemy of Catholicity in these parts." Mr. Elliott is still troubled by the Adventists, who attend his meetings in Ohio, as they did in Michigan, and fill his question box with queries that seem to almost upset the equanimity of the doughty priest.

In the *Catholic World* for December, Priest Elliott says:—

In the question box our only abundant matter was furnished by the Seventh-day Adventists, for their propaganda had won over a little band of fanatics. They seemed to be surprised that I took the Protestant side of the controversy on the question of Sunday observance, and then they deluged us with angry interrogatories. I maintained that, first, a "Bible Christian," one who holds to the private interpretation of the Scriptures as the only rule of faith, can and must believe that the entire ceremonial law of the Jews is totally abolished by Christ, including all liturgical observances whatever, no less the Jewish Sabbath than the Jewish sacrifice. Second, I maintained with the catechism of the Council of Trent that there is

⁵³ Rev. 19:16.

⁵⁴ Rev. 19:19.

⁵⁵ Rev. 19:20.

⁵⁶ Rev. 15:2, 3.

⁴⁴ Dan. 7:25.

⁴⁵ 2 Thess. 2:4.

⁴⁶ "Faith of Our Fathers," p. 111.

⁴⁷ "Doctrinal Catechism," by Rev. Stephen Keenan, Imprimatur, John Cardinal McCloskey; Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay St., New York, 1876, p. 174.

⁴⁸ "Manual of Christian Doctrine," p. 127; published by James Pott & Co., 12 Astor Place, N. Y.

⁴⁹ "Plain Sermons on the Catechism," vol. 1, pp. 334-336; by Rev. Isaac Williams, B. D., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford; Longmans, Green & Co., 15 E. 16th St., N. Y., and 39 Paternoster Row, London, E. C.; also James Pott & Co., N. Y.

⁵⁰ Binney's "Theological Compend, Improved," by Rev. Amos Binney and Rev. Daniel Steele, D. D.; Hunt and Eaton, New York; pp. 170, 171.

⁵¹ "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," by Mgr. Segur; Imprimatur, Joannes Josephus Episcopus, Boston; Thomas B. Noonan & Co., Boston, 1868, p. 213.

⁵² "An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine," by Rev. Henry Tuberville; Imprimatur, the Right Rev. Benedict, Bishop of Boston; Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay Street, New York, 1838, p. 58.

evidence in the New Testament of the selection by the apostles of the Sunday as a substitute for the Mosaic Sabbath; and if the texts are not conclusive of an obligation, they are still plainly indicative of the apostolic origin of the new custom. That gave me ample opportunity to demonstrate the need of church authority in such matters; but the two points above stated compel us, I am sure, to take sides against the Adventists. I dread their fanaticism. If they ever grow strong, the Sunday is gone from public courts and legislatures, from the industrial and domestic life of the people—an incalculable loss to religion. These new sectarians are making converts in many places, full of deadly hatred of the Catholic Church, some of whose exponents have, unhappily, supplied them with their most effective weapons to unsettle Protestant belief and practice on the question of Sunday observance.

It will be noted that "Father" Elliott acknowledges that he took "the Protestant side of the controversy on the question of Sunday observance." It is clear therefore that he did not take the Roman Catholic position. In other words, pressed by the questions of Seventh-day Adventists he abandoned the position of his church, and took a position that the *Catholic Mirror*, the organ of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Baltimore, branded only a few months since as "groundless, self-contradictory and suicidal."

But it is not strange that a Romish priest takes a "Protestant position" when occasion demands; for, "The end justifies the means" is a time honored motto with the papacy. But it is too late in the history of the world for the priests of Rome to deny the position of their church upon the change of the Sabbath. "Father" Elliott only stultifies himself and his cause when he abandons the claim that the Roman Catholic Church changed the Sabbath, and tries to make it appear that it was done by the apostles. The catechisms and publications of the Catholic Church are against him. Every Seventh-day Adventist in the United States ought to have several copies of the *Catholic Mirror* pamphlet,* "The Christian Sabbath," to use against this virulent priest wherever he goes. Loan them to your neighbors, and ask them to read them; and when Mr. Elliott denies the claim of his own church as put forth by the official organ of the American Cardinal-Archbishop, the people will readily see in his devious course the trail of the Romish serpent, and will judge him by the rule, *Falsus in uno, Falsus in omnibus*.

"Is It Religious Persecution?"

THIS question was raised by the New York *Independent*, in its issue of November 29, in an article devoted to the discussion of the recent imprisonment of two Seventh-day Adventists in Centreville, Md., for "doing bodily labor on the Lord's day."

The *Independent* has several times in the past spoken in no uncertain terms concerning the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists, for failure to observe Sunday in obedience to civil laws, and the opening paragraph of the present article has some of the old-time ring. Our contemporary says:—

In the progress of the spirit of independence and liberty persecution has become a hateful thing, an intolerance which the right-minded refuse to tolerate. It is with a feeling of humiliation, if not with positive horror, that we look back to the time in our own history, not so far away as we could wish, when the members of certain sects were proscribed and persecuted; when imprisonment and fines were meted out to those who did not fall in with prevalent religious

practices. We are not sure that we have not still among us a vestige of that species of persecution by which the civil authorities used to punish men and women for their neglect or refusal to comply with religious observances enforced by law.

This is good. We certainly still have among us very considerable "vestige of that species of persecution by which the civil authorities used to punish men and women for their neglect or refusal to comply with religious observances enforced by law." But the *Independent* grows timid as it progresses, and after giving expression to the sentiments we have quoted, begins to hedge in this fashion:—

Strictly speaking, the courts do not enforce this civil law because of the divine sanction or because of the religious observances of the day. The law is based on the idea that a periodical rest-day is for the good of men and that its enforcement is a matter of police regulation, for which it is perfectly proper that the State should make provision. This is the main ground, as we take it, but connected with it is also the principle that those who desire to observe it as a day of religious exercise are entitled to do so in quietness and peace without the disturbance which characterizes an ordinary day of labor.

Of course all the courts do not necessarily enforce this "civil law because of the divine sanction or because of the religious observance of the day," but because the law directs them to enforce it. That does not, however, touch the real question at all: Why are such laws enacted? Let the *Christian Statesman*, of November 3, answer:—

The State is bound to keep the Sabbath as a witness for God before the eyes of the people. This witness must be kept on the witness stand that men may profit by its testimony. The Sabbath is a witness to the Lordship of the Almighty. God designed that men should not be permitted to forget his authority. He, therefore, so orders it by means of the institution of the Sabbath, that every seventh day there should be before their eyes a reminder of his supremacy. And so it is that all over this wide world, wherever by human authority, men are required to cease from toil on the Sabbath God has a witness on the stand testifying to his supremacy. This is why wicked men desire to annul the legislation that requires the cessation from usual labor on the Lord's day—they want to get rid of its testimony to the authority of God.

Next to the cross of Calvary, the ordinance of the Sabbath witnesses most eloquently to the benevolence of God.

This is a bold avowal of the real purpose of Sunday laws. *Their design is to honor a religious institution as such; and they are enacted in obedience to the demand of the churches.* In the *Christian Statesman*, of July 3, 1890, Rev. W. F. Crafts, the great Sunday law champion, said:—

During nearly all our American history the churches have influenced the States to make and improve Sabbath laws.

In like manner, United States District Judge Hammond, in his *dictum* in the well-known King case, in western Tennessee, said:—

Sectarian freedom of religious belief is guaranteed by the constitution [of Tennessee]; not in the sense argued here, that King, as a Seventh-day Adventist, or some other as a Jew, or yet another as a Seventh-day Baptist, might set at defiance the prejudices, if you please, of other sects having control of legislation in the matter of Sunday observance, but only in the sense that he should not himself be disturbed in the practices of his creed; . . . which is quite a different thing from saying that in the course of his daily labor, . . . he might disregard laws made in aid, if you choose to say so, of the religion of other sects.

Again, in the same connection, Judge Hammond, though deciding against King, says:—

It is a somewhat humiliating spectacle to see the Sunday advocates trying to justify the continuance of Sunday legislation . . . upon the argument that it is not in conflict with the civic dogma of religious freedom. It surely is. The bare fact that the mass [of the people] desires Sunday as the public day of rest, is enough to justify its civic sanction; and the potentiality of the fact that it is in aid of the

religion of that mass might be frankly confessed and not denied.

This is a plain statement of the fact which the *Independent* seeks to explain away, namely, that Sunday laws rest not upon civil but upon religious grounds, and hence are religious laws, *i. e.*, laws designed to control, to some extent, the people in religious things. They rest confessedly upon religious prejudices and not upon civic reasons. The *Independent* would better get off the fence. It is impossible to serve two masters. The imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists for working on Sunday is either right or it is not right. If right, let the *Independent* fearlessly defend it; if wrong, let it as fearlessly say so, as it has done in the past, and not try to carry water on both shoulders.

It is evident that the *Independent* is in a great strait betwixt a desire to please the people who demand Sunday laws, and an innate sense of justice which revolts at evident injustice. The third paragraph of the article in question runs thus:—

So far as the courts are concerned we have no reason for holding that the imprisonment of seventh-day observers for laboring on the first day is in the nature of religious persecution. The courts must consider such cases as are legally brought before them, and must decide according to the law. The element of persecution may appear, however, in connection with the complaint. It is quite possible that some, whose zeal for the Christian Sabbath is warmer than their love for their Christian brethren, are led to secure the enforcement of law on account of a feeling of prejudice. However this may be, it is a painful thing to see men who conscientiously observe the seventh day, arraigned and imprisoned for refusing to observe also the first day. It looks like religious persecution; it looks like intolerance toward those who cannot conscientiously accept the views of the majority as to the Sabbath. Making all allowance for the charge that some of the seventh-day people invite the penalties of the law by ostentatiously violating it, it does seem to us that such cases as those in Maryland and Tennessee are an anachronism. It is perfectly easy so to modify the law as to permit those who observe the seventh day regularly to have the privilege of working on the first day, provided they do not infringe, in thus laboring, the rights of the majority. There is such a provision in the laws of this State and in those of other States, and we wish it were universal.

It may be, as before remarked, that so far as the courts in general are concerned, the motive is not religious. Indeed, we have personally known of judges who were very reluctant to try these Sunday cases, and States attorneys who were loth to prosecute them; but there are very many judges who are in hearty sympathy with just such legislation. A number of judges of various courts have been, and are, identified with the National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union, thus giving their influence to the enactment of civil laws for the enforcement of religious dogmas.

Moreover, in some cases courts have, by construction, actually made laws of just this character. For instance, the statutes of Tennessee provide a fine of three dollars for violation of the Sunday law, to be recovered before any justice of the peace. But the courts of that State have, by construction, made a law that a repetition of such acts becomes a nuisance, an indictable offense, punishable by a fine in any sum over fifty dollars, at the discretion of the jury, and under that sum at the discretion of the judge. This decision was rendered, and this law made by the Supreme Court of Tennessee in a case where an Adventist was the defendant. And this decision was made in the face of a prior decision by the same court in a similar case, but where no religious issue was involved, to the effect that "to hold that it [ordinary labor] becomes a nuisance when carried on on Sunday, is a pervers-

* Will be sent from this office; price single copy, ten cents; six for fifty cents.

sion of the term 'nuisance.'" Certainly, in view of this clearly expressed opinion of the same tribunal, there was no legal obligation binding the judges to decide that Sunday work was a nuisance; and this is but one of many cases that might be cited to show that judges as well as prosecuting witnesses have shown unmistakably that they were influenced not by a zeal for the maintenance of civil order, but by religious bigotry worthy of the Dark Ages.

And so it is not without reason that the *Independent* says, "It looks like religious persecution; it looks like intolerance toward those who cannot conscientiously accept the views of the majority as to the Sabbath." Yes, it certainly does look "like religious persecution;" in fact, that is just what it is; dressed, it is true, in modern garb, but the same nevertheless, though still masquerading under another name; for religious persecution has never been willing to use its proper designation. Touching this "civil" disguise of religious laws, the church historian, Robert Baird, has this pungent paragraph:—

The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death and banished "Antinomians" and "Anabaptists," not because of their religious tenets, but because of their violation of civil laws. This is the justification they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse! But just so it is; wherever there is a union of Church and State, heresy and heretical practices are apt to become violations of the civil code, and are punished no longer as errors in religion, but infractions of the laws of the land. So the defenders of the Inquisition have always spoken and written in justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal.—*Religion in America*, p. 94.

This effectually disposes of the "civil law" argument. Of course, in one sense such laws are "civil," *i. e.*, in the sense that they are enacted and enforced by the civil power; but they are religious in this that they rest upon the religious prejudices of the people and are designed for the protection of religious institutions.

But the *Independent* takes another tack. It admits that the Adventists are conscientious, but thinks the matter of scarcely sufficient importance to make so much stir about. It says:—

Of course, as it seems to us, our seventh-day brethren of various Christian names make entirely too much of a particular day. It has always seemed to us that the difference as to day is a very narrow basis on which to build up separate denominations of Christians; but it is a matter of conscience with several thousand of our brethren, and we cannot ask them to violate their consciences by working on the seventh day and observing the first. It is possible, of course, for them to avoid prosecution by observing the first day as well as the seventh, and this is what most of them do. There is in Plainfield, N. J., a very attractive church building, recently erected by the Seventh-day Baptists. When they made their contracts with the builders it was stipulated that no work should be done on the seventh day. As most of the workmen were in the habit of observing the first day of the week, work on the building could go on only five days in the week. Of course such a peculiar contract could not be made on the most favorable terms for the church. The contractors had to take the enforced idleness of two days in the week into account, and doubtless the church had to pay a larger amount because of it.

Now, the first part of this is quite aside from the real issue. It matters not how absurd the faith of any people may be, nor how few that people, they have a natural and inalienable right to practice that faith so long as in so doing they do not infringe the equal rights of others. But the *Independent* mistakes in supposing that it is possible for Seventh-day Adventists "to avoid prosecution by observing the first day as well as the seventh." The seventh day is the badge or sign of the true God: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that

they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Eze. 20:12. In like manner the Sunday is a counterfeit of the Sabbath, the badge of an apostate power the mark of the papal power, the sign of the usurped authority of the "man of sin" "to appoint feasts and holy days, and to command men under sin." No Seventh-day Adventist can observe it and remain loyal to God. Therefore, to keep Sunday is with the Adventist to apostatize from God. But the Adventist does not deem it necessary to needlessly offend their neighbors by "ostentatiously" violating Sunday. Adventists are a quiet, well-behaved people on all days of the week; but they insist that they have, from a proper civil standpoint, as much right to follow on Sunday their usual callings as their neighbors have to follow theirs on the seventh day.

The *Independent* concludes its article by this paragraph:—

It is very often an inconvenience and a matter of hardship to these people to be faithful to their own conscientious convictions and also to obey the civil law. Of course they cannot be compelled to work on the seventh day; but, on the other hand, does their conscience impel them to work on the first day? Hardly, one would say. If there were no alternative it would be better that they should suffer some inconvenience and loss in observing two days in the week than that the one rest-day in which the great majority are united should be overthrown. When Mr. Whaley writes from jail to say that he is "thrust into prison for the sake of God's eternal truth," he does not truly represent the case. He was not imprisoned for observing the seventh day, but for working on the first day. But the number of seventh-day observers, including the Jews, is not numerous, and the law can be modified to suit their case without overthrowing the foundations of the general rest-day. It is a great deal better to be tolerant in this matter than to engage in what looks like religious persecution.

This is undertaking to say what is conscience and what is not. Mr. Whaley says he suffered for conscience' sake; the *Independent* says not. How could the *Independent* possibly know what Mr. Whaley's conscience is except by what he says it is? Resort was formerly had to torture to compel men to reveal the secrets of their hearts; and this is the logic of denying that a man's conscience is just what he says it is. But inasmuch as Mr. Whaley is an Adventist, and as we know of our personal knowledge that Adventists regard Sunday-keeping in the light in which we have presented it, namely, as a denial of the sovereignty of God, we are morally certain that Mr. Whaley's conscience is just what he says it is, notwithstanding the *Independent's* denial. The *Independent's* tortuous logic is simply indicative of the course that the remnant of the religious press will take. It is aptly expressed by a slight adaptation of the words of Pope:—

Persecution is a creature of such hideous mien
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
But seen too oft, familiar with his face;
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

The Scriptures tell us that persecution is to be the lot of the last church upon earth; and that for which the *Independent* so weakly apologizes is only the beginning of the end.

The Pope as Mediator.

ALL the world is indeed beginning to wonder after the beast.

In the recent trouble in Armenia, as was to be expected, the Armenians appealed urgently to the pope to approach the Sultan in their behalf. But the "Holy Father," "like all intuitive souls," of course observes the greatest caution, fearing to offend the Patriarch of Constantinople, and thus

obstruct the reunion of the Eastern and Western churches, that is so near his heart.

And now comes a dispatch in a round-about way from Tokio, saying that "on November 8, a telegram was received by the Japanese government from Rome to the effect that the Chinese minister had applied for the mediation of the pope in the war, and that his holiness had replied that he would use all his influence with the European powers to initiate mediation." Count Ito, the Japanese premier, is reported as indorsing the truth of this announcement.

Thus all things are slowly but surely tending toward the aggrandizement of the papacy, and hastening on the time when "all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him whose names are not written in the book of life." GEO. E. PRICE

Woodstock, N. B., Canada, Dec. 5, 1894.

A Sign of the Times.

[From "Great Controversy," a Seventh-day Adventist work, issued in 1885; Vol. 4, pp. 380-382, 387, 388, 405.]

[From the New York World, of Dec. 4, 1894.]

ROMANISM is now regarded by Protestants with far greater favor than in former years. There is an increasing indifference concerning the doctrines that separate the reformed churches from the papal hierarchy; the opinion is gaining ground that, after all, we do not differ so widely upon vital points as has been supposed, and that a little concession on our part will bring us into a better understanding with Rome. The time was when Protestants placed a high value upon the liberty of conscience which has been so dearly purchased. They taught their children to abhor popery, and held that to remain at peace with Rome would be disloyalty to God. But how widely different are the sentiments now expressed.

The defenders of popery declare that she has been maligned; and the Protestant world is inclined to accept the statement. Many urge that it is unjust to judge the Romish Church of to-day by the abominations and absurdities that marked her reign during the centuries of ignorance and darkness. They excuse her horrible cruelty as the result of the barbarism of the times, and plead that civilization has changed her sentiments.

Have these persons forgotten the claim of infallibility for eight hundred years put forth by this haughty power? So far from relinquishing this claim, the church in the nineteenth century has affirmed it with greater positiveness than ever before. As Rome asserts that she has never erred, and never can err, how can she renounce the principles which governed her course in past ages?

The papal church will never relinquish her claim to infallibility. All that she has done in her persecution of those who reject her dogmas, she holds to

FOR the first time in the history of the Union Theological Seminary, and probably for the first time in the history of any Protestant divinity school in this country, the lecture platform was occupied last evening by a priest of the Roman Catholic Church. It has been the custom during the past few years for the members of the Homiletical Society, an association of students of the senior class of the seminary, to invite clergymen of various denominations to address them at certain periods on subjects appertaining to the work of the ministry, to which the most prominent pulpit orators and thinkers of all shades of Protestant belief have responded. It was left, however, for this season's course of lectures to include one from a representative of the Roman Catholic Church, the Rev. Alexander P. Doyle, of the Paulist Fathers. The subject was, "Methods of Preaching."

When it had been determined to ask Father Doyle to address the students, the Rev. Dr. Briggs, Professor of Biblical Theology, was requested to extend the invitation to the Paulist, and did so. With the hearty assent of Archbishop Corrigan, the Rev. Father Doyle accepted.

Prof. Briggs presided, and introduced the lecturer in these words: "I

be right; and would she not repeat the same acts, should the opportunity be presented? Let the restraints now imposed by secular governments be removed, and Rome be re-instated in her former power, and there would speedily be a revival of her tyranny and persecution.

It is true that there are real Christians in the Roman Catholic communion. Thousands in that church are serving God according to the best light they have. They are not allowed access to his Word, and therefore they do not discern the truth. They have never seen the contrast between a living heart-service and a round of mere forms and ceremonies. But God looks with pitying tenderness upon these souls, educated as they are in a faith that is delusive and unsatisfying. He will cause rays of light to penetrate the dense darkness that surrounds them. He will reveal to them the truth as it is in Jesus, and they will yet take their position with his people.

But Romanism as a system is no more in harmony with the gospel of Christ now than at any former period in her history. The Protestant churches are in great darkness, or they would discern the signs of the times.

Protestants have tampered with and patronized popery; they have made compromises and concessions which papists themselves are surprised to see, and fail to understand. Men are closing their eyes to the real character of Romanism, and the dangers to be apprehended from her supremacy. The people of our land need to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty.

Every principle of popery that existed in ages past exists to-day. The doctrines devised in the darkest ages are still held. Let none deceive themselves. The popery that Protestants are now so ready to embrace and honor is the same that ruled the world in the days of the Reformation, when men of God stood up at the peril of their lives to expose her iniquity. She possesses the same pride and arrogant assumption that lorded it over kings and princes, and claimed the prerogatives of God. Her spirit is no less cruel and despotic now than when she crushed out human liberty, and slew the saints of the Most High.

Popery is just what prophecy declared that she would be,—the apostasy of the latter times. It is a part of her policy to assume the character which will best accomplish her purpose but beneath the variable appearance of the chameleon, she conceals the invariable venom of the serpent. "We are not bound to keep faith and promises to heretics," she declares. Shall this power, whose record for a thou-

take pleasure in introducing to you the Rev. Father Doyle. He represents the great preaching order of the Paulist Fathers. I knew the Rev. Father Hecker, the founder of the order, slightly. I have watched its progress with much interest. In my own mind it has done much more to elevate the character of preaching in the Roman Catholic Church than any other. I am glad to welcome Father Doyle here as the representative of the great Mother Church of Christendom, whose head recently issued a touching appeal for the reunion of the Church. It breathed a spirit like that of the Master himself."

Father Doyle said: "When the invitation came to me to address the Homiletical Society of the Union Theological Seminary, through my highly esteemed friend, Dr. Briggs, I felt it would not only be an error of judgment on my part to refuse it, but I would be guilty of neglect in my devotion to one of the great principles of my life, for it would be casting aside one of those rare opportunities of *healing the breach of religious dissension* and securing Christian unity. I have always made it a settled purpose to sit on the same platform with my brethren of other denominations whenever it was possible *without sacrificing any principle of dogmatic faith*. I felt constrained, therefore, to accept the invitation so generously accorded me, because I knew that the coming of a Catholic priest among you would be *one more span added* to that magnificent bridge that is being built in this age across the dark and muddy stream of religious intolerance.

"It goes without saying that all our religious misunderstandings and most of our religious antipathies arise from the fact that we do not know each other well enough. Ignorance of each other's opinions and want of appreciation of each other's motives have often lead us to impute false ideas and extravagant notions to

sand years is written in the blood of the saints, be now acknowledged as a part of the Church of Christ?

It is not without reason that the claim has been put forth that Catholicism is now almost like Protestantism. There has been a change; but the change is in Protestants, not in Romanists. Catholicism indeed resembles the Protestantism that now exists; but it is far removed from Protestantism as it was in the days of Cranmer, Ridley, Knox, and other reformers.

As the Protestant churches have been seeking the favor of the world, false charity has blinded their eyes. They do not see but that it is right to believe good of all evil; and as the inevitable result, they will finally believe evil of all good. Instead of standing in defense of the faith once delivered to the saints, they are now, as it were, apologizing to Rome for their uncharitable opinion of her, begging pardon for their bigotry.

Through the two great errors, the immortality of the soul and Sunday sacredness, Satan will bring the people under his deceptions. While the former lays the foundation of Spiritualism, the latter creates a bond of sympathy with Rome. Protestantism will yet stretch her hand across the gulf to grasp the hand of Spiritualism; she will reach over the abyss to *clasp hands* with the Roman power; and under the influence of this threefold union, our country will follow in the steps of Rome in trampling on the rights of conscience.

each other, while a better knowledge and broader charity would have united us in a common brotherhood. There is much that is in common between us like the solid mother earth that unites these two cities on either side of the East River, but there has been a stream running between us as swift, as dark, and, at times, as dangerous, as the river itself. It has had its shoals and hidden rocks of error, and it has been poisoned by the sewerage of religious prejudice, and it has been running strong and swift with its currents of misconception; but the day of building a great bridge came, and on the day that the bridge opened its wide avenues for the people to pass and repass, on that day we conceived the Greater New York that was born of the vote of the people in the late elections.

"These are days of bridge-building over the streams of religious prejudice, and as I used to boast that I passed over the Brooklyn Bridge before there was any bridge there, when only one cable was laid and a little footpath over it, so I rejoice tonight that mine is the pleasure to be the first to pass over the bridge of religious toleration and *join hands* with you in Christian unity."

It Depends.

APROPOS of the persecutions of Seventh-day Adventists in Maryland, the operation of the Sunday law of that State is brought to bear principally, if not wholly and solely, on this religious sect, who believing that the recognition of Sunday as a religious day would be offensive to the One who established another day (the seventh), exercise the God-given right to work on that day. The writer, on a recent Sunday, happened in the neighborhood of the home of the magistrate before whom R. R. Whaley and W. G. Curlett, recently released from Centreville prison, were tried for Sunday work. Just across the road from the magistrate's home, a man was working in his hay loft while the magistrate was looking on and talking with him. No action was taken against this man. Had he been an Adventist the probabilities are the matter would not have passed unnoticed.

And now comes the Kent County, Md., Sunday-school Association, which held a convention in Millington, recently, and it proposes to do something for an institution for which there is no warrant in the gospel of Christ. Among the resolutions passed by this convention is the following:—

We deprecate the violation of the Sabbath law in our county, *whether such a violation is made in the name of religion or for purpose of pecuniary gain*, and believe the time has come when we should set our

faces like flint against every encroachment upon the sanctity of God's holy day.

When it is known that there are Seventh-day Adventist churches in Millington, and Rock Hall, Kent County, it is not very difficult to determine that unholy zeal and religious prejudice lie at the base of this "deprecation," and furnish the excuse for the consequent use of the words in the resolution, "whether such a violation is made in the name of religion."

These are some of the many cases which go to show the character of all religious worship which is not built upon a plain, "thus saith the Lord."

S. B. HORTON.

Comments of the Press on the Persecution of Adventists.

So far as religious liberty is concerned, the laws of Switzerland are seemingly, strangely and unreasonably discriminating against the Adventists.—*Clinton Weekly Age (Iowa)*.

The dominant religion of Switzerland is Lutheran, but those in power have strayed from his teachings, for he denied the holiness of Sunday, and rather than that his followers should give sanction to such an unscriptural doctrine, he told them, if necessary, to give emphasis to their abhorrence of attributing sanctity to a pagan holiday, to work on it, and even dance on it. . . . We, in the United States, however, can complain with poor grace of the action of the authorities in Switzerland. It is always best to cast the beam from our own eye before we search for the mote in our brother's. As we write, there is lying before us the account of the arrest of two good, upright, peaceable, Christian citizens of Maryland, who have just been incarcerated in prison in that State for following their legitimate vocations on Sunday. They, too, are Seventh-day Adventists. They believe in the ten commandments strictly, the fourth with the rest. They rested on the Sabbath, and were attempting to do all their work on the other six days of the week, as commanded, when they were arrested.

Such laws are totally at variance with the principles at the basis of this government as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution.—*The Gazeteer, Denison, Texas, Dec. 2.*

Religious persecution of the present day does not put on the thumb-screws, torture people on heated iron bedsteads, bore out one's eyes, slip the tongue or burn at the stake, but it does occasionally take up the practice in a degree.—*The Charlotte (Mich.) Tribune, Nov. 14.*

It is such laws and their prejudicial enforcement that keeps the independent, thinking men and women out of the church. Sometimes we think the nineteenth century is not commenced, let alone being so near its end.—*The Four Corners, Wheatland, Cal., Dec. 1.*

The Adventists, as a denomination, are conscientious and law abiding citizens. In this country they are quite numerous, and while a majority of them carry on their labors on Sunday, they observe their own Sabbath (Saturday) religiously. Further than this, they give those in their employ, of a different faith, perfect liberty, and never require them to violate their own Sabbath. The prosecution of

these people for infraction of the Sunday law smacks very much of religious persecution.—*The Dixon (Cal.) Tribune, Nov. 30.*

In all these places non-professors, and a good many professors, follow the bent of their own minds as to work or pleasure on Sunday, and no complaint is made; but the instant an Adventist digs a few potatoes, chops a bit of firewood, etc., on Sunday, some one's religious senses are wounded, and that individual immediately proceeds to the Christian(?) work of having his seventh-day neighbor instructed in religious matters through the medium of the courts!—*Medical Lake (Minn.) Ledger, Nov. 30.*

The International Religious Liberty Association calls the attacks upon the Adventists "religious" persecution. It is difficult, however, to see what religion has to do with such manifestations of hatred and fanatical spirit. The Seventh-day Adventists reject the authority and custom of all other Christian denominations in not observing the first day of the week as the "Lord's day," but that is certainly no reason for alleged Christians displaying toward them the spirit of persecution, which is far more opposed to the genius of Christianity, than any question about the proper day of Sabbath.—*Davenport (Ia.) Leader, Nov. 23.*

THE absurdity of Sunday laws has been shown in Switzerland, where an American Seventh-day Adventist preacher has been put in prison in Basel for working on the Sabbath, though the whole city is given over on Sunday to popular sports. Although the widest latitude is given to diversion in this Swiss city on Sunday, work is very carefully prevented by law, and it was because he chose to set type in his printing office that the American was punished. It is to be feared that this preacher will have to abate his ardor for work and take two holidays during the week, for the Swiss laws are something like those of the Medes and Persians.—*San Francisco Chronicle, Nov. 13, 1894.*

THE public is fairly familiar with the outrageous persecutions of the Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, where they were repeatedly arrested and imprisoned for exercising their vaunted "religious liberty." It was supposed that this country and Russia were the only "civilized" nations left that possessed an inquisition, but word comes that Switzerland, the "cradle of liberty," has just sentenced Rev. H. P. Holser, a Seventh-day Adventist pastor, to a sixty-one days' term of imprisonment, on prison fare, for working in his office on Sunday. This seems all the more strange because the "Continental Sunday" is observed in Switzerland, as elsewhere in Europe, with noisy revelry. . . . But they have a law which forbids ordinary labor on Sunday, and this is used by the powers that be to prevent the exercise of the conscience.—*Galion (Ohio) Inquirer, Nov. 16, 1894.*

Abiding Sabbath And Lord's Day.

BY ALONZO T. JONES.

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

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.]

If Christ Should Come To-day.

I HAVE come, and the world shall be shaken
Like a reed, at the touch of my rod,
And the kingdoms of time shall awaken
To the voice and the summons of God;
No more through the din of the ages
Shall warnings and chidings divine,
From the lips of my prophets and sages,
Be trampled like pearls before swine.

Ye have stolen my lands and my cattle;
Ye have kept back from labor its meed;
Ye have challenged the outcasts to battle,
When they plead at your feet in their need;
And when clamors of hunger grew louder,
And the multitudes prayed to be fed,
Ye have answered with prisons or powder,
The cries of your brothers for bread.

I turn from your altars and arches,
And the mocking of steeples and domes,
To join in the long, weary marches
Of the ones ye have robbed of their homes;
I share in the sorrows and crosses
Of the naked, the hungry and cold,
And dearer to me are their losses
Than your gains and your idols of gold.

I will wither the might of the spoiler,
I will laugh at your dungeons and locks,
The tyrant shall yield to the toiler,
And your judges eat grass like the ox;
For the prayers of the poor have ascended
To be written in lightnings on high,
And the wails of your captives have blended
With the bolts that must leap from the sky.

The thrones of your kings shall be shattered
And the prisoner and serf shall go free;
I will harvest from seed I have scattered
On the borders of blue Galilee;
For I come not alone, and a stranger—
Lo! my reapers will sing through the night
Till the star that stood over the manger
Shall cover the world with its light.

—James G. Clark, in *December Arena.*

THE new Czar of Russia has celebrated his accession by pardoning a great many people, among them fourteen murderers, in addition to two steamboat captains who are under penalty for having caused a collision between their ships in the Black Sea, by which many lives were lost. It is a very doubtful way of celebrating the coronation to let loose fourteen murderers once more to engage in their favorite industry. It is a very doubtful mercy to the few and very certain danger to the many. Now, if he had ceased the infamous persecution of the Stundists and the Jews, and had released all of these innocent and long-suffering people from punishment and exile, there would have been something in it.—*The Examiner and National Baptist, Dec. 13, 1894.*

ONE of the largest retail dealers in New York will not advertise hereafter in the Sunday newspapers, though we believe he has formerly done so. By putting his advertisement in Monday's newspaper he accomplishes two things: he defers to the sentiment of a large and influential part of the community, and he secures a prominence for his business announcements that he could not have in the unwieldy and over-crowded Sunday paper. We do not know but this has come to be a question of conscience with the merchant, or it may be only a shrewd business policy; we pass no judgment on his motives, but we commend his act to the consideration of other retail merchants. Indeed, we wonder that it never before occurred to some of them that there were advantages in

"pandering to the moral sentiment of the community." The people who are the largest buyers in this city are people who wish Sunday observed, not with Puritanic rigidity, but with some decency and order. They are thoughtful people, and they recognize the fact that of all the influence promoting the desecration of the Lord's day the Sunday newspaper is the most powerful and the most unscrupulous. Therefore it is safe to say that they will not be less disposed than before to buy of a merchant who shows respect for the day they reverence.—*The Examiner and National Baptist, Dec. 13, 1894.*

The Pope Throws Another Sop to the Greek Church.

ROME, DEC. 6.—A papal decree, the outcome of the recent conferences looking to the reunion of the Roman and Eastern churches, appears to-day.

It provides that ecclesiastical colleges founded in the East by the papacy shall be developed in favor of the Eastern Church. The rites of the latter church shall be maintained intact. Any Latin priest trying to proselyte among Greek Christians shall be suspended.

Roman Catholics in places where there are no priests of that church may attend services held by priests of the Eastern rite without prejudice to their own religion. No more Roman Catholic colleges may be established in the East without papal permission. The pope will found colleges and churches there.

All members of the Eastern Church who live outside Eastern sees will receive instruction according to the rites of their own church, and those who have embraced the Roman Catholic faith can return to the Eastern rites.—*New York World, Dec. 7, 1894.*

"Before He Is Twenty,"

—OR—

"Five Perplexing Phases of the Boy Question."

IS A VERY HELPFUL BOOK FOR PARENTS.



It is divided into five chapters, by as many different writers, each treating of a particular phase of a boy's life.

The first chapter, "THE BOY AND HIS FATHER," by Robert J. Burdette, is alone worth many times the price of the book to any father of a young boy.

The other chapters, "WHEN HE DECIDES," "THE BOY IN THE OFFICE," "HIS EVENINGS AND AMUSEMENTS," and "LOOKING TOWARD A WIFE," are all important and helpful.

104 pages, bound in cloth, embossed in jet and gold, price, 75 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 BOND STREET, New York City.

MEMOIRS OF EDWIN BAINBRIDGE.

The subject of this memoir is the young English tourist who met his death at the dreadful volcanic eruption of Tarawera, New Zealand, on the 10th of June, 1886. 12mo., 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

—ADDRESS—

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street, New York City.



NEW YORK, DECEMBER 20, 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.

WITH this number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL Vol. IX. closes. The next issue of the paper will be No. 1, Vol. X., and will bear date of January 3, 1895.

LAST week, in giving some account of an assault upon a Seventh-day Adventist colporter by a city marshal in Arkansas, we located the scene of the brutality at Lewisville. That was a mistake. The letter giving us the facts was written from Lewisville, but the assault was committed in Waldo, Columbia County.

A LETTER just received from W. T. Gibson, of Everett, Mass., the Seventh-day Adventist, who was fined fifty dollars and costs for selling a half pound of candy on Sunday, announces that his case, which was appealed, has been postponed to the next term of court with the probability that it will never come to trial. The reason given by the prosecuting attorney for the first postponement was that it ought not to come up until after election. As of old, the persecuting priests fear the people. We will give our readers some interesting matter connected with the trial in the lower court in our next.

THE annual meeting of the American Sabbath Union was held in this city Dec. 9 and 10. As usual, the meetings were small, but boasted great things. A "grand rally" was advertised for Monday evening in one of the largest churches in the city. But the large audience expected did not materialize, and at 8 o'clock the one hundred, or possibly more, present adjourned to the chapel, because the auditorium was too large for such a small gathering. The only notable feature of the evening was a speech by Mr. John W. Wood, general secretary of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, an Episcopal organization. Much had been said about the "Sabbath," but Mr. Wood boldly took issue with the use of that term and said he preferred the name "Sunday." He said, "We do not keep the last day of the week but the first day; we do not keep the day commemorating creation but redemption; we do not keep a day of rest but of activity," etc. And then he said he thought people ought to go to holy communion in the morning and spend the rest of the day in recreation. He thought excursions down the bay and into the country were in perfect keeping with proper Sunday observance, and said that the real Sabbath-breakers were not the poor who spent the day in recreation, but

the rich who made it impossible for them to take recreation at other times. Of course all this was sadly out of harmony with the spirit of the American Sabbath Union. But nevertheless that organization goes marching on in its campaign for more rigid Sunday laws and stricter enforcement of those already on the statute books. Its meetings may be small, but its organization is thorough and its influence far-reaching. It is still one of the powers for evil in this fair land once dedicated to liberty of conscience, but now dominated largely by religious bigotry and intolerance.

A MISSIONARY, writing to the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, from South Africa, tells of the methods of the British South African Company—which is an English colonial government—in securing its land from the natives. He says:—

The Chartered Company that conquered the Matabeles in the late war, claim their cattle as well as their land to pay expenses. The cunning Matabeles, however, have secreted many thousand head in the bush, which from time to time are found and sold by the Chartered Company.

After thus obtaining the land of the natives, the government offers to give large tracts of this land to missionaries in exchange for their aid in civilizing and christianizing the natives, and thus encouraging immigration. We have been informed by the secretary of the Foreign Mission Board of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, that a large tract of this land has been offered to Seventh-day Adventist missionaries, but that the land has not been accepted by the denomination. Here was a subtle temptation to violate the great principle of complete separation of Church and State, and we are glad to know that the denomination has not compromised itself.

A READER, writing from Elgin, Nebr., frankly commends the course of the SENTINEL in general, but says:—

I don't think you are justified in your persistent hostility to the Catholic portion of the population of this country. There is nothing in the past history of our country to prove that they are enemies of free government or opposed to a republican form of government.

Our correspondent mistakes opposition to the doctrines of the Catholic Church for opposition to Catholics themselves. We would not injure a Catholic in any way if we could. We would not deny them a single right enjoyed by others; but we would, if we could, induce them to exchange the errors of popery for the truths of the gospel, the bondage of priestcraft for the glorious liberty of the children of God.

We have never intimated that Catholics were opposed to a republican form of government. Individual Catholics no doubt love liberty just as well as do Protestants, and they are no doubt just as ardently attached to republican institutions; but

the Roman hierarchy is opposed to all liberty outside the Catholic Church, and to all government not controlled by the church. A republic dominated by "the church" would doubtless suit Rome just as well as any other form of government. Indeed, Leo XIII. seems to be rather partial to republics, doubtless because he finds it easier to dominate the people than to control the princes.

But any government dominated by Rome, or Romish principles, could be nothing but a despotism; and a despotism of the many is not less galling than a despotism of the few or of one. Republican government is a guarantee of civil and religious liberty only so long as the people know what liberty is and prize it as they ought. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," not less in a republic than under any other form of government.

It is superficial reading and thinking that makes people indifferent to encroachments on their liberties, and cause them to rest in fancied security when the very foundation principles of liberty are being assailed. "Rome never changes." And she has promised to do for this country what she has done for other countries. Rome never gave freedom to any country, but she has fettered the mind; stifled conscience; clogged the wheels of mental, moral, and spiritual progress; degraded and debauched whole peoples; murdered millions who dared to think for themselves; enshrouded the world in darkness; and she would do the same again. Verily, "Rome never changes."

"THE Mutiny of the Bounty and Story of Pitcairn Island." This book which is just out, is written by Rosalind Amelia Young, a native of the island, and is a complete history of Pitcairn Island from its occupation by the mutineers of the *Bounty* in 1790 to the present time. While other books have been written about Pitcairn, none gives so complete a history of the island as does this one, and not all of them together approach the present volume in the story of the domestic and social life of the descendants of the mutineers. The book contains twenty-six illustrations, besides illustrated chapter headings. It is printed on good paper, is well bound in cloth, and is embossed in jet and gold; 254 pages; price \$1. Address Pacific Press, 43 Bond Street, New York City; or Oakland, Cal.

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.