



"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."

Vol. 11, No. 1.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 2, 1896.

Price, three cents.

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, }
 LEON A. SMITH, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

RETROSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE.

WITH this number the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the eleventh year of its publication.

When the first number of the SENTINEL was issued, few, comparatively, even of its friends, realized the real necessity there was for such a paper, and very many thought that there was in this country no field for a journal devoted to the advocacy of religious liberty. But subsequent events have fully justified the existence of the SENTINEL, every year making the necessity for it more apparent than the previous one.

The past year has been unusually eventful in the conflict between truth and error, between righteousness and unrighteousness, between soul-liberty and the bondage of sin.

The year opened with persecution for conscience' sake, actually in progress in Switzerland, in England, and in various parts of our own country, notably in Tennessee; and there has been no general abatement.

Under color of the Swiss Factory Act, the Seventh-day Adventist publishing house in Basel was closed some months since, the manager imprisoned, and the publishing work carried on there greatly crippled.

The employes of this publishing house, instead of being protected by the operations of this "law," have been greatly embarrassed and made to suffer hardship because of the loss of employment; and this seems the more inconsistent because Sunday is not as strictly observed in Switzerland as in some other countries. The plaza in front of the Imprimerie Polyglotte, the Seventh-day Adventist publishing house, is frequently the scene of Sunday military parades and athletic games; and on at least one recent occasion the reviewing stands were erected on Sunday. Nevertheless both the government and people of Switzerland have turned a deaf ear to the

prayer of the Seventh-day Adventists for simple justice.

In England religious persecution, waged against the same people, has run about the same course. Here, as in Basel, it was carried on under color of the Factory Act; and, as appears from the statement which we take from the *Daily Graphic*, published upon page 4,* the greatest sufferers have been those whom the act styles "protected persons." The facts, as set forth in the appeal of the Board of Directors to the Home Secretary, to which we have just referred, unmistakably stamp the action of the authorities in this instance as religious persecution.

Intolerance in Our Own Land.

In our own country bigotry and intolerance have been no less pronounced. The first quarter of the year saw ten Seventh-day Adventists convicted and imprisoned in Rhea County, Tenn., upon the technical charge of "nuisance," their offense being the performance of ordinary secular labor on the first day of the week. And this conviction was had notwithstanding the absence of all evidence that there was any disturbance other than the mental annoyance experienced by those whose bigotry and intolerance render them incapable of cheerfully awarding to others the exercise of rights which they demand for themselves. This persecution was a gross injustice not only to the imprisoned men and their families, but also resulted in cutting short a term of the Graysville Academy, to the great detriment of a number of students who were about ready to graduate.

An appeal to the legislature of Tennessee for relief by repeal of the oppressive act was treated with contempt; and four months later eight Seventh-day Adventists, including several of the same individuals formerly imprisoned, were again convicted and imprisoned and worked in the chain-gang with common criminals. During the same time there were other similar cases of persecution in Massachusetts, Maryland, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Illinois, Ontario, and Manitoba.

Statutes Overridden.

In both Illinois and Arkansas there is a clause exempting from the penalties of the "law" observers of the seventh day. But this provision has been overridden, notably in Illinois, and quite inoffensive, and in every

respect law-abiding citizens have been haled before courts, and have been tried and unjustly convicted. And but for an appeal to the Supreme Court, now pending, these men would be suffering imprisonment at the present moment for the exercise of their God-given, constitutional, and statutory rights.

And what has been the attitude of the people toward these persecutions? Largely one of indifference. This has been especially true in foreign lands. In London it is said by a high government official that the numbers concerned were too insignificant to justify any action looking to relief, by the government.* In this country, a considerable part of the secular press has spoken out nobly in defense of the rights of conscience, and in condemnation of tyranny. But a majority of the *religious* papers have been either silent or have given their voice in favor of restriction and oppression.

With the single exception of the American Baptist Publication Association, the various religious bodies of this country, so far as they have spoken, have by resolutions not only indorsed the restriction of religious liberty, but have demanded the enactment and enforcement of still more stringent statutes calculated to bind as with a chain not only the bodies but the souls of men to the Sunday Juggernaut. With the details our readers are familiar.

What Is Involved.

The law of God declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and commands in unequivocal language that it be kept holy. Not only so, but God appeals repeatedly to the facts set forth in that commandment as the ground of his rightful authority over all men, and also declares: "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."¹ Thus the Sabbath is the sign of God not only as Creator but as re-Creator, or Saviour.

But in contradistinction to this the Catholic Church commands the observance of Sunday, to which she appeals as the badge of her authority to command men under sin.² And

* See "Too Few to Have Rights," on page 4.

¹ Eze. 20: 12.

² *Ques.* How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

Ans. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they

such has been her influence with the nations of earth that almost every civilized State on the globe has incorporated into its statutes the papal dogma of Sunday sacredness. So far is our country from being an exception to this statement, that it has stood forth so prominently in this respect that this institution is by many styled "the American Sabbath."

Notwithstanding the fact that in 1829 and 1830 the Congress of the United States adopted the Sunday Mail Reports, written by Hon. Richard M. Johnson, in which it was declared that if the Sunday act then demanded "should be adopted, it would be difficult for human sagacity to foresee how rapid would be the succession or how numerous the train of measures which [would] follow, involving the dearest rights of all—the rights of conscience." The Fifty-second Congress in its World's Fair legislation in 1893 took this dangerous step by interpreting the law of God, declaring in effect that the fourth commandment was not only binding upon all men and nations, but that it required the observance of the first day of the week.

It is true that the Government has not been consistent in this matter, but it is plainly seen that the trend of public sentiment and of governmental policy is in the direction of showing greater honor to the Sunday institution; and in this the several States are not one whit behind the General Government. In fact, most of the States have for many years been committed to the defense of the Sunday dogma.

What of the Future?

What the present Congress will do it is of course impossible to tell; but indications are not lacking that it is ambitious to make a "reform" record. Already there has been introduced into both the Senate, and House, the joint resolution which we print on page 6; but even if adopted, this proposed amendment would add but little to what we already have in general orders, religious proclamations, the practice of employing chaplains, State and national statutes, and judicial decisions.

Judge Brewer's dictum of Feb. 29, 1892, that this is a "Christian nation," while theoretically without force as law, has practically nullified that portion of the First Amendment which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Being a "Christian nation," it follows that the "Christian" religion is the religion of the nation, and that its institutions are to be protected because they are "Christian." Such was probably the most potent argument (aside from threatened political boycott)³ urged in behalf of the World's Fair Sunday-closing clause. But be this as it may, the trend of events in this country and in the world cannot be mistaken. Everywhere the Papacy is being exalted either in its own proper character, or by the adoption of its institutions, dogmas and methods.

fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

Q. How prove you that?

A. Because by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin.—"An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine," by Rev. Henry Tuberville; Imprimatur, the Right Rev. Benedict, Bishop of Boston; Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay St., New York, 1833, p. 58.

³ This boycotting resolution, sent up to Congress from the "evangelical" churches in all parts of the country, after prescribing what was demanded of Congress in respect to the World's Fair, runs as follows: "Resolved, That we do hereby pledge ourselves and each other, that we will from this time henceforth refuse to vote for, or support for any office or position of trust, any member of Congress, either senator or representative, who shall vote for any further aid of any kind for the World's Fair, except on conditions named in these resolutions."

But this occasions no surprise to the student of sacred Scripture, for it is plainly declared in Rev. 13:8: "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him [the Papacy], whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Obedience is the highest form of worship, and regardless of their profession, those who knowingly obey the command of the Papacy rather than the command of God, thereby worship the beast. It is the boast of Rome that "the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage [worship] they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Roman Catholic] church."⁴

The Papacy and Its Image.

The beast, the Papacy, is a church clothed with civil power and therefore holding adulterous connection with the nations of the earth. One of the symbols by which it is represented is that of a lewd woman. (See Rev. 17:1-5.) It follows that any church forsaking the power of God and seeking the power of the State becomes papal in character, whether recognized as a part of the Papacy or not.

Fourteen of the "evangelical" denominations of the United States, banding themselves together in the American Sabbath Union,⁵ have sought and obtained civil power for the furtherance of their ends, and the enforcement of at least one of their dogmas,⁶ namely, that of Sunday sacredness,—the dogma to which, in preference to all others, as we have shown, the Papal Church appeals as the symbol of her power to "command men under sin."

In thus imitating the Papacy and receiving power from the State instead of from her Lord, the professed Protestant church of America has inaugurated an American papacy, an image as it were of the Papacy of the pope. And against the worship of this image as well as against obeying the Papacy itself, the Scriptures give the solemn warning of Rev. 14:9, 10. It is for the purpose of sounding this warning that the SENTINEL exists. We have never for a moment expected to prevent those things which are foretold in the Scriptures. Opposition may retard, but cannot finally avert that which the Word of God long since declared would come to pass.

This country was settled and this nation established, we firmly believe, in the providence of God, that it might be an asylum for the oppressed of all nations, and that here a purer church might be maintained and greater liberty to preach the gospel be enjoyed than was possible in any other quarter of the globe. But these privileges have not been appreciated, and misguided men, ambitious for their own aggrandizement and mistaking ambition for religious fervor, have untiringly plotted for the overthrow of liberty of conscience in the supposed interests of the religion of Him who said to the impulsive Peter: "Put up thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

One after another of the constitutional guarantees of religious liberties have been and are being swept away, not indeed by direct

⁴ "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," by Mgr. Segur; Imprimatur, Joannes Josephus Episcopus, Boston; Thomas B. Noonan & Co., Boston, p. 213.

⁵ "So far as the writer knows," says Mr. Crafts, "there is but one among the State and national and international reform societies that was officially organized by the churches; this one exception being the official institution, at his suggestion, of the American Sabbath Union, by fourteen evangelical denominations, through official votes at their national conferences."—*Practical Christian Sociology*, page 53.

⁶ This fact was thus expressed by Dr. H. H. George after Congress had yielded to the demand of the confederated churches: "I have learned that we [the churches] hold the United States Senate in our hands." And if this be true of the Senate, how much more so of the House.

repeal, but by legislation subtly inconsistent with our charters of liberty, State and national, and by practices equally at variance with the spirit of our free institutions, and scarcely less sophistical than the legislation referred to; and by judicial decisions based upon colonial history and royal charters rather than upon those guarantees of freedom of conscience by which the people of nearly every State have sought to make sure their liberties.

The Sunday institution figures more largely in this assault on soul-liberty than any other papal dogma, because it is the test of loyalty to the Papacy, as the Sabbath is the test of loyalty to God. It is for this reason that we view with alarm every attempt to coerce men in this matter, and raise our voices in warning against every forward step which is taken in the exaltation of this man-made institution, this papal counterfeit of the Sabbath of the Lord. And so the SENTINEL will continue in the future to uncompromisingly oppose, as it has in the past, every step in the direction of a more perfect development of union of Church and State, which is bound up with and necessarily included in every statute and every judicial decision, and every governmental action designed in any way to either enforce upon the people the observance of any religious dogma, or which prohibits in any manner the free exercise of religious faith. The nation may not hear, the great mass of the people may not pause, apostate Protestantism may not desist from her pursuit of civil power; but individuals will heed the warning and be saved in the kingdom of God. And to this end we labor.

WILL THE "CHRISTIAN" NATIONS FIGHT?

THIS is the question that is now agitating many minds in all parts of the civilized world, and no one is able to give it a conclusive answer. Two great "Christian" nations have had a serious falling out, and one of them has threatened the other with a possible settlement of their differences by force of arms. Both are standing upon their dignity, and announce that they are firmly resolved to maintain the same, by a careful avoidance of anything like a confession of being in the wrong.

The situation was very generally discussed by leading clergymen in their Sunday sermons, Dec. 22, and a number expressed themselves strongly concerning the unchristian spectacle which would be presented in the event of war. The Rev. Dr. John Hall, of the Fifth Ave. Presbyterian Church, New York, said that "nothing would cause more malignant satisfaction to the devil than the possibility of strife between two such great Christian nations as ours, and that with which we are most closely associated by ties of blood and kindred interests." Rev. Francis E. Mason, of Brooklyn, noticed that "the world is in a state of commotion and war. Even our own Congress, the Congress of an avowed Christian nation, is this moment considering the purchase of 2,000,000 rifles." And the Rev. L. A. Banks, of the same city, alluding to the idea of a forcible annexation of Canada, which would be an inevitable outcome of hostilities, inquired: "Has a nation any more moral right to steal a State than a private citizen to steal an overcoat or a watch?" He might also with equal pertinency have inquired whether a nation has any more moral right than a private citizen has to kill people who stand in the way of its covetous or ambitious designs.

It is pleasing to note that the leading cler-

gymen of the country, with some exceptions, stand firmly for the maintenance of peace, and that the "sober second thought" of the people has turned largely in this direction. Still, as has been pointed out, a nation may be led into war against the wishes of the majority of its people. In the present case, it is evident that both in England and America the people almost universally deprecate the idea of war; *but*—there are certain things a "Christian" nation cannot sacrifice even to a ert war. A "Christian" nation must at all costs maintain its dignity. A backdown,—a confession of being in the wrong, is not to be thought of on either side; at least not from any other motive than that of fear of the consequences. And here lies the danger. Have these two great "Christian" nations, through the action of their chief representatives, taken a definite antagonistic stand on the question of controversy? If they have, then war seems inevitable, notwithstanding the natural aversion of the people thereto; for must not a "Christian" nation fight rather than acknowledge itself in the wrong? Certainly—to voice the general sentiment—it must.

Hence both nations will await with anxiety the result of the commission to be appointed by President Cleveland to make an investigation which will settle the question of the duty of the United States. Meanwhile suggestions are being made by peace-loving people, of means which they think still open to this nation or to England to avoid a conflict without any loss of dignity. It is possible, and certainly devoutly to be hoped, that events may furnish such a solution of the difficulty. But in case they do not, and it remains either to confess or to fight, then these two "Christian" nations will lay hold of all the carnal weapons they can command, and kill, maim, burn, batter down, and in general do their best to disable each other, in order that their "Christian" dignity may be maintained!

Can we not see that all talk about this or any other nation being Christian, in a governmental sense, is nonsense?

“PRACTICAL CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.”

In Dr. Crafts' work, "Practical Christian Sociology," referred to in our issue of Dec. 19, 1895, he makes this argument(?) for the first day of the week, to which he applies the names "Sabbath" and "Lord's Day":—

That first gospel, the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and it should bruise his heel, pictures the promised Christ as a bruised Conqueror, a Saviour-King. The later prophecies painted the Coming One sometimes as a sufferer, sometimes as a sovereign, which led some of the Jews that were unable to conceive of a king as a voluntary sufferer to expect two Messiahs. At the birth of Christ two cries rang out together: "Unto you is born a Saviour." "Where is he that is born King?" On the Mount of Coronation Jesus "spake of his decease." When we recall the cross at the *Lord's Supper* that very name should prompt us to look above his wounded feet and hands and side and brow, to the words above his head, "This is the King;" to which also points the word *sacrament*, whose original meaning is a soldier's oath of loyalty to his king. These double pictures of the Saviour-King culminate in Revelation in the throne on which was a Lamb "as it had been slain." "The gospel of our salvation" is also "the gospel of the kingdom," the *good news* including not only pardon through Jesus the Saviour, but also protection and direction through Christ the King.

At the portals of that same book of Revelation, which is preëminently the book of Christ's Kingship, stands the most impressive sign of his present earthly authority, "the Lord's Day," the profound significance of which in this connection I have never seen developed. One day in every week an invisible Lord commands us to halt in the most absorbing pursuits of our earthly life: in the pursuit of money and business; in the pursuit of pleasure; in the pursuit of politics

and fame; in the pursuit of education; and we halt as a sign that we believe in that invisible Lord and are loyal to his law. There is no other sign of our faith and loyalty so impressive to a selfish world as this twenty-four-hour halt in our work every week at Christ's command. The Lord's day is therefore the "sign," the ensign of our Lord Jesus Christ; its field of blue spangled with stars and sun; its stripes the black and white of night and day, and the many colors of sunrise and sunset; and this flag of Christ is carried round the world every week and is saluted by some in every land by the laying aside of tools and toil, in token of their loyalty to a living Lord. Breaking the sabbath, therefore, is tearing the flag of the government of the universe, and so an offense kindred to treason. We have forgotten all the murderers of the Revolution, but not Benedict Arnold, because an offense against a good government the calm verdict of history adjudges to be a greater wrong than any that can be done to individuals. Desecrating the Lord's day, in addition to any wrong to workers or to society that it involves, is high treason to the Lord himself.¹

With the first of these paragraphs we have no fault to find. The cross and the throne do indeed both appear in the Lord's Supper. The words, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death *till he come*,"² point us not only back to the valley of humiliation, but forward to Mount Zion; and the eye of faith sees Christ not only as the Man of Calvary, the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," but beholds him coming again as "King of kings and Lord of lords."

But the second paragraph is as full of error as the first one is of truth. "The Lord's day" truly stands "at the portals" of the book of Revelation "as the most impressive sign" of Christ's authority, but that day is not Sunday, nor does it stand for civil authority exercised by self-appointed vicars of the Son of God.

The only Lord's day known to the Scriptures of truth is the seventh day, "the Sabbath of the Lord," kept by patriarchs, prophets, apostles, the holy women at the tomb, and by our Lord himself. That this day, honored alike by God and his people, is indeed the Lord's day, is evident from Ex. 20:8-11; Isa. 58:13; and Matt. 12:8. The first of these texts says plainly: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" in the second, the Lord calls the Sabbath "my holy day;" while in the third, that same Lord, as the Son of man, styles himself "Lord even of the Sabbath day." The conclusion is irresistible that the seer of Patmos was in the Spirit upon the day divinely sanctified and blest for man,—"the Sabbath of the Lord."

But the Lord's day of Rev. 1:10 is none the less the badge of Christ's authority. Dr. Crafts himself says:—

When the laws and law principles of the Old Testament have been added to those of the New, we have not yet before us the complete law of Christ, which includes also the so-called "laws of nature," "the Oldest Testament," of which Christ is divinely declared to be the author. "In the beginning was the Word. The world was made by him, and the world knew him not." Nor does it yet know Christ as its Creator. Although John three times declares that "the world was made by him," who was "made flesh and dwelt among us;" and although the book of Hebrews twice declares the same; and although Paul in Colossians, which presents Christ as King of the Cosmos as well as King of the Church, proclaims that in him were all things created, and that with him all creation is filled, and that by him all things "hold together," yet how seldom to a child's curious questions about the great world does anyone answer "Jesus made it"! He is known as the author of "the new creation," only—as Redeemer, but not as Creator. If the so-called "Apostles' Creed," which is partly responsible for the exclusion of Christ from the work of creation, is to be made truly apostolic, in view of the foregoing words of apostles we must change a word and say, "I believe in God the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth *through* Jesus

Christ his only begotten Son, our Lord." Natural science, by its evidences of design, order, and progress, proves mind in nature; Scripture proclaims that mind to be "the mind of Christ," whom we disobey whenever we disregard a law written in our bodies as surely as if it were written in our Bible.³

Beyond all question Christ is the Creator. The Sabbath is therefore the Lord's day because it is both the memorial of his work and of his rest, the day he himself blest and sanctified, the day which he himself made for man before sin had doomed him to wearing toil,—and hence the day primarily designed not for physical rest but for spiritual rejoicing.

Nor is the Sabbath, the Lord's day of the sacred Scriptures, simply the memorial of a finished creation and of divine rest. The Sabbath is a sign to every son of Adam,—separated from sin by redeeming grace,—of the divine power by which he is saved: "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."⁴ As "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters"⁵ to bring order out of confusion, to transform chaos into beauty, so the same divine Spirit changes the stony heart to a heart of flesh, and from the chaos of sin brings forth the beauty of holiness, the spiritual "man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."⁶ "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."⁷ The power that redeems, that re-creates, is the same that in the beginning created the world from nothing, and that from darkness made light. And in every age and in both Testaments the Sabbath of the Lord, the Lord's day, stands as the symbol of that power.

But the author of "Practical Christian Sociology" scorns the Lord's day of the Scriptures and insists that another day shall represent the Lord's power! He tramples in the dust "the ensign of our Lord Jesus Christ," the standard which our Lord himself as Creator ordained, whose "field of blue" he himself "spangled with stars and sun," and whose "stripes the black and white of night and day, and the many colors of sunrise and sunset," his own fingers painted; and in its stead he unfurls the flag of antichrist and demands that it shall be acknowledged as the standard of "the King of kings, and Lord of lords"! Ignoring the only divine command ever given to "halt as a sign that we believe in that invisible Lord and are loyal to his law," our author demands for the counterfeit Lord's day the honor due alone to the Sabbath of the Lord, the true Lord's day, and declares that breaking this false sabbath, this man-made Lord's day, is tearing the flag of the Government of the universe, and so an offense kindred to treason!⁸ How dare any man so write? and what shall such an one answer when the Lord of the true Sabbath shall demand, "Who hath required this at your hands?" Are not such well described in these words of Holy Writ: "Have ye not seen a vain vision, and have ye not spoken a lying divination, whereas ye say, The Lord saith it; albeit I have not spoken?"⁹ "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them."¹⁰

³ "Practical Christian Sociology," pp. 24, 25.

⁴ Eze. 20:12.

⁵ Gen. 1: 2.

⁶ Eph. 4: 24.

⁷ 2 Cor. 4: 6.

⁸ Eze. 13: 7.

⁹ Eze. 11: 16.

¹ "Practical Christian Sociology," pp. 26, 27.

² 1 Cor. 11:26.

NATIONAL REFORM CONVENTION IN BALTIMORE.

As noted in our last issue, the National Reform Association held its annual convention in Baltimore, Dec. 12-14. The attendance was small, but as the real work of the association is done by means of local meetings, addresses before churches and colleges, and by the dissemination of National Reform literature, its influence cannot be measured by the number attending its conventions.

Among the speakers present were Rev. W. F. Crafts; Rev. J. M. Foster, of Boston; Rev. David McAllister, editor of the *Christian Statesman*; and Rev. R. C. Wylie, of Pittsburg.

Mr. Foster is "a stalwart of the stalwarts" among National Reformers, and at the conclusion of his address Rev. C. A. Fulton, pastor of the Immanuel Baptist Church in which the convention was held, and who presided at this particular meeting, rose and said: "I have accepted an invitation to preside over to-night's meeting, but if I thought for an instant that the gentleman who has spoken represented the views of this gathering, my own feelings and my conscience would compel me to decline to take any part in it."

Dr. McAllister rose and assured the pastor that every word spoken in the conference was simply a personal expression of the speaker and could in no wise be taken as a declaration of the association. This satisfied Mr. Fulton, and the discussion was ended for the time being. And this notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Foster has for years been prominent not only upon the National Reform lecture platform and pulpit, but as a writer for the *Christian Statesman*. However, the doctor need not have made his disclaimer of responsibility for Mr. Foster's sentiments so broad, for Mr. Fulton is reported by the Baltimore *Sun* as saying subsequently: "When I spoke Thursday, after an address of Rev. J. M. Foster, of Boston, I was in favor of this part of his remark [the "Christian" amendment], but opposed his idea that Christians should refrain from voting until the Constitution is so amended."

A protest against the National Reform scheme was received from Mr. E. Livezey, a citizen of Baltimore. It was in part, as follows:—

The purposes of the National Reform Association are thoroughly revolutionary, as they are to change entirely the character of our Constitution. This Constitution was wisely framed by the fathers of this Republic. The name of God was omitted because they wished to establish religious liberty and a purely secular form of government; Church and State were to be forever separate.

It was declared that Congress should make no laws for the establishment of any religion. Religion, as Madison declares, was not within the "purview of government," and Washington affirmed in the treaty of Tripoli "that in no sense whatsoever is this Government founded upon the Christian religion."

These are the foundation principles of our Government. The question arises, is it policy to change our form of government and inaugurate a new scheme; make this a religious government and put God and Christ and the Bible in the Constitution and radically reform its spirit and purpose?"

In reply to this, Dr. McAllister reiterated the usual National Reform argument. He asked, "Who discovered America?"—"Christians." That settles the whole matter. Being discovered by "Christians," it follows that the country is "Christian." But has it never occurred to Dr. McAllister that this country was also discovered by Roman Catholics? Is he willing to grant that it is therefore or ought of right to be Roman Catholic? Rome thinks so.

There is, however, Christianity and "Chris-

tianity." The former is the religion of Christ, and does not seek the aid of the civil power to make men religious, neither does it put a premium upon hypocrisy by making "Christians" the only office-holders, as National Reform proposes to do by disfranchising "every logically consistent infidel," or in other words, every honest man who should refuse to wear the regulation National Reform collar. The latter, or "Christianity," is not able to stand alone and so seeks the support of civil "law," police clubs, army rifles, etc.

Among the resolutions adopted was one demanding the adoption of the proposed amendment which we print on page 6; another in favor of Sunday observance; and another requesting the Executive Board of the Association to maintain a representative at Washington "to prosecute a vigorous policy on moral issues in the course of legislation."

A resolution condemning secret societies which take a hand in politics was promptly tabled when it was brought up.

The next annual convention is to be held in Philadelphia.

"FATHER" O'KEEFE ON SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

As promised, we reprint in this issue the letter of the Rev. M. O'Keefe on Sunday observance, to supply the numerous calls received for the same after its first publication.

In the *Baltimore Methodist* of Nov. 21, appears what is termed, "A Sufficient Reply" to this letter; but which is no reply at all so far as concerns the justification of Sunday observance or the enforcement of Sunday laws. No attempt is made by it in this direction, further than to quote a letter purporting to have been called out from another Catholic priest in answer to his co-religionist, and dealing mainly with the question of the Sunday saloon. As concerns this, we are, as we have often stated, in favor of a closed saloon on Sunday and on every other day of the week.

"Father" O'Keefe replies again through the *Catholic Mirror* of Dec. 7, noticing the absence of any effort on the part of his Protestant opponents to sustain Sunday keeping and Sunday enforcement from the Scriptures, and repeating the charge of Protestant inconsistency in pursuing a course contrary to the example of Christ and the apostles, and to the teaching of that Book which Protestantism proclaims its only guide in spiritual things. Referring to this fellow-priest, whom he deemed such only in pretension, he says:—

What living Catholic priest is there who does not know that Protestantism has, *contrary to its fundamental principles*, abandoned its sole acknowledged teacher, the Bible, on the Sabbath question, and, guilty of a double apostasy, gone over, bag and baggage, to the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church? In putting the question, I must make honorable exception. I refer to the Seventh-day Adventists. *They are the only consistent Protestants on earth.* They follow the teachings of their Bible by keeping the Sabbath enjoined by God and their acknowledged guide, only to be fined, punished and imprisoned by their fellow-Protestants even in the State of Maryland, for their consistency, whilst their prosecutors have shamefully abandoned the very principles for which they punish them.

"Father" O'Keefe is not the only Catholic who has pointed to seventh-day observers as the only consistent Protestants. "Father" Elliott, a "Paulist" priest, who has come into close contact with the former in Michigan and elsewhere, while he bitterly denounced them, said he thanked God that consistent Protestantism was narrowed down to one small sect.

As stated elsewhere, we are not in sympathy with the manner of expression used by "Father" O'Keefe in his arraignment of inconsistent Protestants. We have no sympathy with anything like a spirit of bitterness or railing, and prefer to see the truth stated free from any mixture of this kind. We published his letter because it emphasizes, by the testimony of a Roman Catholic through the organ of Cardinal Gibbons, a truth which every Protestant ought to know; namely, that the Bible gives no sanction to Sunday keeping or Sunday enforcement, and that consistent Protestantism is therefore separate from either one. As a testimony to this truth, we trust it will serve a useful purpose.

TOO FEW TO HAVE RIGHTS.

SUCH is the meaning of the decision rendered by the British Home Secretary (London), in the case of the International Tract Society, located on Holloway Road, in that city, the prosecutions of which for Sunday labor we have several times mentioned. Recently the society addressed to the Home Secretary the following appeal:—

The Board of Directors of the International Tract Society, Limited, beg respectfully that you will allow them to call your attention to the following facts, showing the operation of the Sunday clause in the Factory Act in the case of our printing works, situated at 451 Holloway Road, N.

By the seizure of machinery and material to satisfy fines imposed for allowing certain women and young persons to work on Sunday we are compelled to close the factory.

For six years in our present factory our work was allowed to proceed without interference. Visiting inspectors recognized the fact that the spirit of the Act was complied with, and that the violation was only technical. We being observers of the seventh day of the week, and all our employes being of like faith, our works have been entirely closed on the Sabbath, and opened on Sunday.

Further, had we been able conscientiously to sign the Jewish exemption form, we might have continued without interference. But we are Christians—the International Tract Society, Limited, being one of the publishing branches of the Seventh day Adventist denomination—and cannot truthfully enter ourselves as Jews under the Act. Thus the administration of the law discriminates against us as Christians, forbidding that which would be allowed us did we falsely declare ourselves Jews.

We have not been contending for our rights nor for our convenience in doing business. But God's right to our obedience to the fourth commandment is not ours to surrender, nor can we obey that commandment to keep the Sabbath holy and at the same time keep the Sunday—an institution established by human authority in opposition to the Sabbath—even as we could not serve God and at the same time recognize other gods. In effect the law has sought to compel us to recognize a religious institution which loyalty to the law of God requires that we should not observe.

We acknowledge the uniform courtesy of her majesty's inspectors who have taken this new departure regarding our relation to the Factory Act, but we have felt it not disrespectful to address you this note of remonstrance against the action of a law by which the work of our factory is stopped and our factory employes deprived of this means of earning a livelihood. In the act these are named as "protected persons," but by the operation of the act they have been shut out from their work.

We respectfully submit that this is an injustice not contemplated by the framers of the act.

This appeal was published in the London *Daily Graphic*, of Dec. 5, from which we take it. In the *Graphic* of Dec. 17, appears the following reply from the Home Secretary:—

Whitehall, 13th Dec., 1895.

SIR,—With reference to your letter of the 1st inst., drawing attention to the operation of Section 21 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1878, in as far as it affects the printing works of the International Tract Society at 451 Holloway Road, I am directed by the Secretary of State to acquaint you that the matter has already received his very careful consideration; but, as the law at present stands, the Seventh-day Advent-

ists cannot be exempted from the penalties consequent upon a breach of the factory laws as to Sunday labor. The Secretary of State does not think the numbers of the sect afford any hope or reason for legislation to alter their position.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
KENELM E. DIGBY.

The Secretary, International Tract Society,
451 Holloway Road, N.

Thus it appears that these Christian seventh-day observers are refused justice and freedom of conscience on the ground that they are few in number, and this too by one of the world's great "Christian" nations. If they were able to cast any considerable vote, so as to be a power in politics, then it would be quite proper to let them have their rights! We are living in the closing years of the nineteenth century, but everywhere it is evident that men still have more respect for might than for right.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

Letter From Rev. M. O'Keefe on this Subject.

[From the Catholic Mirror, Baltimore, Md., Nov. 9.]

In response to an invitation to attend a meeting of ministers in Towson, Father O'Keefe replied as follows:—

Towson, Baltimore Co., Md.,
Oct. 23, 1895.

REV. MESSRS. J. FRED HEISSE, W. G. CASSARD, and C. E. GUTHRIE—*Gentlemen:* I am in receipt of your esteemed favor of the 19th instant, courteously inviting me to attend a meeting in the lecture room of the M. E. Church, Towson, at 2:30 P. M. to-morrow, as follows:—

REV. M. O'KEEFE—*Reverend and Dear Brother:* The violations of the Sunday laws in your county is flagrant. The exposure of guilty parties is arresting attention. We desire a conference of the ministers of the county. Please meet us in the lecture room of the Towson M. E. Church, at 2:30 o'clock, next Thursday afternoon, Oct. 24. Sunday laws must be enforced. Come. Do not disappoint us.

Your Brethren,

J. FRED HEISSE.
W. G. CASSARD.
C. E. GUTHRIE.

October 19, 1895.

In reply, I would beg leave to say that whilst fully appreciating the courtesy extended me as a clergyman residing in the county, I am at loss to conjecture whether the invitation may be regarded as referring to me as a citizen or clergyman, or as both combined. Anyhow I regret to be obliged to state that I could not conscientiously participate in a discussion of the infraction of the Sunday laws.

Holding no office under the civil law, whether as judge, magistrate, sheriff, squire, bailiff, constable, detective or spy, paid or unpaid, I could not help regarding myself otherwise than as an officious intermeddler in the legitimate business of the proper officers appointed to execute the laws, and who would very naturally regard my action as a gracious piece of interference in their legitimate calling.

The above officials under county commissioners are the responsible officers entrusted with the duty of taking due cognizance of all such violations, and, doubtless, are as willing and ready as they are competent to bring all violators of the law to condign punishment. Hence, as a citizen of this great republic, I am amenable to the laws enacted by the people's representation for the benefit and happiness of the masses, and as one of the number, I highly appreciate and duly enjoy with undisguised gratitude the temporal blessings assured to every law-abiding citizen under that glori-

ous flag of ours, which is the synonym of that genuine and plenary liberty attainable nowhere else on this planet.

Nevertheless, as a citizen neither the holder of nor aspirant to any office, State or Federal, I am happy and contented in the role of a private individual, neither invited nor aspiring to a participation in the control or management of public offices. Nor does my position as a recognized minister of the Christian religion seem to call for, or warrant any such interference. I hold in such esteem the divine calling I so unworthily represent that I would never, during my long life, avail myself of the right to register my vote for one or other political party; nor am I ever likely to do so, unless, indeed, that the ghost of "Sam"—defunct Know-nothingism—should once more develop itself in A. P. A.ism or other kindred, dark-lantern conspiracy, as it did in the early fifties only to be crushed to powder by the voice and votes of an indignant people, uncompromisingly jealous of their liberty, religious as well as civil.

It is not, then, with me a question of right, but one of expediency as to whether I could consent to mire my priestly robes in the turbid and foul waters of muddy politics.

Hence, as a clergyman, I question the propriety or expediency of interfering, indirectly even, in the execution, or rather failure (if it prove so), on the part of officials to execute the Sunday laws, which are of a purely civil character.

As representatives of Christianity, we occupy a very questionable, nay, highly mortifying position, viz: to be obliged to acknowledge that the moral power of the Christian religion is lamentably inadequate to reform, measurably at least, the morals of its votaries without having recourse to the aid and interference of the civil law by imposing civil pains and penalties; thereby, publicly confessing the mortifying and shameful failure of Christianity to compass one of the chief ends of its institution and mission, viz: the culture of the moral law in the heart of Christians. For the above reason, and others equally cogent (had I time to unfold them), I am reluctantly compelled to forego the pleasure which a meeting with my fellow citizens for discussion of the question named in the invitation would afford me.

Deeply impressed with the above views, during a long life as citizen and clergyman, I regret that our views as to the object of the meeting do not harmonize.

As a Catholic clergyman, I have ever been an earnest and steadfast advocate of Sunday observance; and I may say, too, without egotism, a life-long impersonation of total abstinence, and whilst I sincerely regret the use of intoxicants, I never could consent to be in touch with those who, in their rank fanaticism, would rob man of that God-given freedom which would be to him an inalienable gift and treasure. Two wrongs never made a right: and the drunkard and the fanatic are equally a nuisance—the latter the more dangerous of the two.

Whilst dealing with the question, I publicly own that I have never but once in my life tasted liquor, and then whilst presumably in the jaws of death from yellow fever, my physician admonished me that death was inevitable, unless I consented to use a mint-julep—the vomit, the last stage of yellow fever, having set in. I then touched liquor for the first and last time during a life fast verging on the three-score and ten.

Before closing this letter, I would call attention to a distinction between violation of the

divine and civil law. The latter enacts a penalty from the man who sells liquor on Sunday, on conviction, and should intoxication result to the individual, he is amenable to the law of God for his complicity in the crime of drunkenness, not because of Sunday, for the same guilt attaches to any other day. Were he and his victims Catholics, they are both before God guilty of the additional crime of desecration of the Lord's day. This is the result of an overt act of disobedience to the voice of the Church, commanding her children to keep the Sunday "holy;" God commanding us to hear her voice. But, reverend sirs, let me admonish you that no Protestant, true to the principles of his religion and conscientiously obedient to his teacher, the Bible, need ever have misgivings as regards the freedom of Sunday; nay, more, his teacher is consistent in impressing on him in every page of the New Testament as well as of the Old, that God has appointed the Sabbath or Saturday as the day set apart by him for his worship.

Our Saviour, whilst on earth, kept no other day; and we learn that for over thirty years after his death, the Acts of the Apostles record the fact that the Apostles consistently kept their divine Master's Sabbath (the Sabbath which the Jews have kept ever since for over eighteen centuries, they having the same teacher, the Bible, as you have) according to the practice and teachings of Christ and his apostles, without modification, as testified by the New Testament from Matthew's Gospel to the Revelation. This statement is absolutely true and unsusceptible of successful contradiction; imagine, then, my surprise on reading in the city papers yesterday of the anomalous and self-stultifying position occupied by you, as accredited ministers of the Christian religion, assuming the role of . . . spies—a self-constituted smelling committee—for you represent no civil office whatsoever, laying snares and traps to inveigle the unwary that you might drag them before the civil courts for violation of a purely civil law, forbidding the sale of liquor on the first day of each week. On what grounds, may I ask, can you justify such proceedings? How were these people interfering with you in the practice of your religious acts? Place your finger on any page of your acknowledged divine teacher, the Bible, and show the world the proof that, on your own principles, they had violated any ordinance of the Christian religion. I hereby denounce your conduct in this matter as not only highly reprehensible, but as being in direct violation of the revealed will of God as taught by your Bible.

You had succeeded in getting a verdict against them before the civil courts for transgression against the civil law. I now in the presence of the public pronounce you, on your principles, guilty of the grossest misdemeanor, thousands of times over, against the divine law.

When, let me ask, have you, even once, in your lifetime, kept the command of God: "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy"? Which day is the Sabbath? I answer, the last day of the week, the day kept by God himself, and for that reason assigned by him for observance by man, the Sabbath or the day kept by the Redeemer and his apostles whilst they lived on earth.

You pose before the world as models of Christian morality, and behold every week of your lives you are guilty of gross violation of one of God's most positive precepts, "Remember the Sabbath," etc. Let me illustrate in order to prove God's earnestness in this respect: "And it came to pass, when the children of Israel were in the wilderness; and had found a man gathering sticks on the Sabbath-day; that they brought him to Moses and Aaron,

and the whole multitude. And they put him into prison, not knowing what they should do with him. And the Lord said to Moses: Let that man die, let all the multitude stone him without the camp. And when they had brought him out, they stoned him, and he died as the Lord commanded." Num. 15:32-36. Such, Rev. Sirs, was the punishment meted out by command of God to a man who was guilty but once of an infraction of the law of the Sabbath, whilst each one of you is guilty of a similar desecration of the Sabbath (Saturday) each Saturday of his life—and this on the unerring testimony of your own teacher, the Bible. "Out of thy mouth I judge thee thou wicked servant."

Nor has God's counsels changed by the exercise of infinite patience. He can afford to abide his time for the vindication of his authority and contempt of his commands. The precept, "Remember the Lord's day to keep it holy," is as obligatory now as it was in the Old Law, as in the instance above quoted. Can you offer the slightest pretext or palliation for your abandonment of your teacher, the Bible, which enjoins absolutely the keeping of that day, kept by God himself first, after the creation? You pursued the violators of the civil law unrelentingly and did not cease, until you secured a conviction. How, may I ask, will you fare when cited before the divine Tribunal, and compelled to confess from the pages of the divine Record, which you boast of as your guide and teacher, that you have *never once* obeyed the Sabbath precept, and that you stand to-day before God, heaven and earth as the most unmitigated Sabbath breakers on earth? Do I exaggerate in the slightest degree the unscrupulous antagonism to the law of the Sabbath evinced by you every week of your lives? Not in the least. And for the purpose of leaving you not a shadow of excuse, I herewith present each of you two pamphlets containing the countless proofs of your apostasy from the teachings of the Bible, your sole and recognized teacher. I defy you to disprove these pamphlets. Observe silence with regard to them, and the public must conclude that you rank, as I have already designated you, amongst the champion Sabbath breakers on earth, as the pamphlets, based on God's Word, your guide, prove you to be.

I have no sympathy with violations of the civil law, but when men are hunted down by self-righteous, self-constituted . . . spies and detectives, whose record as violators of one of God's most positive precepts is unquestionable, I am reminded of Satan rebuking sin.

I will now conclude with the word of rebuke spoken by our divine Saviour (Matt. 7:2): "And why seest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye [the violations of the civil law] and seest not the beam in thy own" (the life-long career of a Sabbath breaker)? "Or how sayest thou to thy brother: Let me cut the mote out of thy eye; and behold a beam is in thy own eyes? Thou hypocrite; cast out first the beam out of thy own eye, and then shalt thou see to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." Remove the beam before you search for the mote.

Having assigned you your true position as champion biblical Sabbath breakers, whilst I have shown that the victims of your self-righteous, arrogant and unjustifiable persecution, were merely violators of the civil law, a crime insignificant compared with yours, I close this correspondence with the sincere hope that you will reopen it with a manly effort at self-vindication. Count on a reply.

M. O'KEEFE,

Catholic Pastor, Towson.

A RELIGIOUS AMENDMENT PROPOSED.

THUS early in the first session of the 54th Congress, have the National Reformers secured the introduction of the following joint resolution proposing the establishment of a national religion and the adoption of a national creed:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amended form of preamble to the Constitution of the United States be submitted for ratification by conventions in the several States, which, when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the States, shall be valid as a part of the said Constitution, namely:

PREAMBLE.

We, the people of the United States (acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all power and authority in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and His revealed will as of supreme authority in civil affairs) in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

It may be asked, In what way would this establish a national religion and adopt a national creed? The answer is, the adoption of this proposed amendment would be to make so-called Christianity the national religion; the "revealed will" of the Lord Jesus Christ the national creed—not indeed really his revealed will, but that will as interpreted by the Government, just as a portion of it has already been interpreted by Congress in the Sunday closing clause of the World's Fair legislation, by the adoption of which, for the reasons given, the fourth commandment was interpreted as enjoining Sunday observance.

PERSECUTION AT DARRELL, ONTARIO.

BY J. G. LAMSON.

ON Sunday, Nov. 3, 1895, three ministers. A. O. Burrill, P. M. Howe, and William Simpson, having rested the day previous according to their belief, were engaged in slacking lime, preparatory to the erection of a church building for the Seventh-day Adventist denomination at Darrell, Ont. These ministers had been preaching at or near Darrell for some time, their ministry had borne fruit, and it was decided to erect a house of worship. The ire of the neighboring church people was aroused, and they set spies to watch whether the Adventist ministers would labor on Sunday.

Ontario has what is known as a "Lord's Day Act," it being copied almost verbatim from the statute of King Charles the Second, which was first enacted about eighteen years after the Cromwellian period,

This statute provides that "a person shall not do any worldly labor, business, or work of his ordinary calling on Sunday." The labor of the ministers was certainly not of their ordinary calling, but it was an easy matter for the prosecutors to overcome this; for it was alleged that they did work of a worldly nature of "one of their ordinary callings."

Under this information sworn to in the case of one of the ministers, testimony was offered showing that the ordinary callings of the men were those of laborer, carpenter, or mason. Witnesses were very willing to swear to this, but every one of them swore positively that they did not know that these three men were

ministers, in spite of the fact that two of them, at least, had preached for three months in succession in the neighborhood of Darrell. The witnesses admitted attending the meetings that the Adventist ministers had held, and yet all the witnesses swore positively that they did not know that the defendants were ministers.

The complaining witnesses went twenty-two miles in order to get the matter before a justice where there was a prospect of conviction. The city of Chatham, with several magistrates, queen's counsel, and the County Court, were passed by, and the prosecutions were taken to Ridgetown, twenty-two to twenty-four miles away. The cases were tried Dec. 5th, and the remaining two Dec. 12th, the decision in the last case, that of the farmer, being reserved for seven days, bringing the decision for that one, Dec. 19.

The three ministers were convicted and sentenced to pay fines, ranging from ten to twenty dollars, and in default of fine, forty to sixty days in jail.

An appeal has been taken in the three cases of the ministers, while the farmer's case was dismissed, it having been decided several times that farmers do not come within the statute.

In speaking of the testimony given by one of the witnesses (a student for the Methodist ministry who sometimes preaches), one of the attorneys for the prosecution said: "It is inconceivable that a man who is studying for the ministry of a rival denomination should be so zealous to enforce laws against these people, and have nothing but the honor of the British law in mind. Were he an honest man he would enforce all law equally with this one against a rival denomination."

At the close of the trials of the ministers, several leading citizens expressed their abhorrence of such proceedings, and such a manifest travesty of justice. "It is to be regretted," said one, "that these people are not permitted to worship God as they choose, and then go quietly about their work upon Sunday, if they want to."

There was not a word of testimony to the effect that the work done by the defendants had disturbed any one in the least, except in their religious feelings. One testified that he was pained; another that his religious "scruples" were wounded! The witnesses who testified to the last expression, upon being questioned by the attorney, admitted that had he stayed away from the place where the work was being done, it would not have hurt him at all.

The witness in these prosecutions gets half the fine, if one is paid. This may add somewhat to the understanding of why the prosecutions were begun.

The cases will come up on motion to quash in the high court in Toronto, some time in January or February, and it is to be hoped that the honorable court will be able to weigh, impartially, the questions at stake, and remember that her majesty, Queen Victoria, issued a proclamation in 1858, in which she said:—

Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects. We declare it to be our royal will and pleasure that none be in anywise favored, none molested nor disquieted, by reason of their religious faith or observance, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us, that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects, under pain of our highest displeasure.

Not only should the court have in mind her

majesty's government, but they should also remember that before God they will be held accountable for any obstacle they may lay in the way of any being who is a free moral agent in his worship of God. They should remember that it is impossible that any man can delegate to any other man the right to say whether he shall worship God or not. Neither is it within the power of any individual to say how another individual shall worship God.

Absolute religious liberty alone, and positive silence on the matter of religious laws, is the only way by which a government can place it beyond the power of any fanatic to inflict persecution upon his fellow-beings.

THE OFFICER COMPLETED THE AWFUL CRIME.

[New York World, Dec. 16.]

A FARMER named Schwab, living in Bronx-dale, bought a fine milch cow in the East forty-sixth Street stockyards Saturday afternoon. Schwab wanted his cow before Monday, and at 6 A. M. yesterday Solomon Beck, a young man living at 107 East Fifty-second Street, was sent to deliver her. The animal was made comfortable in the box of a big express wagon, and Beck started for Bronx-dale. He drove through four police precincts passing dozens of policemen unmolested and had arrived within a half mile of Schwab's barn when Patrolman Dermody, of the Tremont station, stopped him.

"Don't you know you are breaking the law?" he asked.

"No," answered Beck.

"Where are you taking that cow?" asked the officer.

"Over to Schwab's farm," responded the driver, smiling at what he supposed the policeman meant to be a joke.

"Don't laugh," said Dermody, "I'm in dead earnest. By delivering that cow on Sunday, you are breaking the Sunday law and I'll have to lock you up."

With that he jumped in beside Beck and ordered him to drive to the station house. The sergeant received the complaint, and Beck was locked up.

"What shall we do with the cow?" asked Dermody.

"You'd better go over and deliver it yourself," said the sergeant, and an hour later the bluecoat arrived at Schwab's farm with the cow.

"THE BREATH OF THE PURITAN."

[By Addison Blakely, Ph. D., Lecturer in Political Science and History, University of Chicago.]

In this Sunday agitation we have often heard our Puritan ancestors praised for the position they took on Sundayism. An eminent divine, inspired by his feelings of antagonism to Sunday activity, sometime ago uttered the meaningful words, "Oh, for the breath of the Puritan." These words have peculiar force in this connection, for in no thing were the early settlers more peculiar than in their radical ideas on Sundayism. That utterance, therefore, prompted the writer to collect the following "breaths of Puritan law," prefacing them with a similar "breath" from Virginia:—

A VIRGINIA "BREATH."

PENALTY OF DEATH FOR NON-ATTENDANCE AT CHURCH ON SUNDAY.¹

Every man and woman shall repair in the morning

to the divine service and sermons preached upon the sabbath day, and in the afternoon to divine service, and catechising, upon pain for the first fault to lose their provision, and the allowance for the whole week following;² for the second, to lose the said allowance and also be whipt; and for the third, to suffer death.³

Whoever shall absent himself from divine service any Sunday, without an allowable excuse, shall forfeit a pound of tobacco; and he that absenteth himself a month shall forfeit 50 lbs. of tobacco.⁴

SOME "BREATHS" FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

Further bee it enacted that whosoever shall profane the Lords day by doeing any servill worke or any such like abuses, shall forfeit for every such default tenn shillings or be whipt.⁵

PRESUMPTUOUS SUNDAY DESECRATION TO BE PUNISHED BY DEATH.⁶

9. This court taking notice of great abuse, and many misdemeanours, committed by divers persons in these many wayes, Profaning the Sabbath or Lord's day, to the great dishonor of God, Reproach of Religion, and Grief of the spirits of God's People,

Do therefore Order, That whosoever shall profane the Lord's-day, by doing unnecessary servile Work, by unnecessary travailling, or by sports or recreations, he or they that so transgress, shall forfeit for every such default forty shillings, or be publicly whipt; But if it clearly appear that the sin was proudly, Presumptuously and with a high hand committed, against the known Command and Authority of the blessed God, such a person therein despising and reproaching the Lord, shall be put to death or grievously punished at the Judgment of the Court.

10. And whosoever shall frequently neglect the public Worship of God on The Lords day, that is approved by this Government, shall forfeit for every such default convicted of, ten shillings, especially where it appears to arise from negligence, Idleness, or Prophaness of Spirit.

PENALTY FOR TRAVELING ON THE LORD'S DAY.

To prevent prophanation of the Lords day by foreigners or any other unnecessary travelling through our Townes on that day; It is enacted by the Court that a fitt man in each town be chosen unto whom whosoever hath necessity for travelling on the Lords day in case of danger or death or such necessitous occasions shall repaire and making out such occasions satisfying to him shall receive a Tickett from him to pas on about such like occasions which if the traveller attend not unto; It shall be lawful for the Constable or any man that meets him to take him up and stop him untill hee be brought before authoritie or pay his fine for such transgression as by law in that case is provided: and that if it after shall appear that his plea was falce then may hee be apprehended att another time and made to pay his fine as aforesaid.⁷

¹ "Articles, Laws, and Orders, Divine, Politique, and Martial, for the Colony in Virginia; first established by Sir Thomas Gates Knight, Lieutenant-General, the 24th of May, 1610. Again exemplified and enlarged by Sir Thomas Dale, Knight, Marshall, and Deputie Governour, the 22d of June, 1611." Reprinted at Hartford in 1876.

² This was at the time the Virginia plantation held all things in common; and if the sabbath was not observed according to the requirements of the government, all supplies were cut off.

³ "The first settlers [of Virginia] were emigrants from England, of the English Church, just at a point of time when it was flushed with complete victory over the religions of all other persuasions. Possessed, as they became, of the powers of making, administering, and executing the laws, they showed equal intolerance in this country with their Presbyterian brethren who had emigrated to the Northern government. . . . Several acts of the Virginia Assembly, of 1659, 1682, and 1693, had made it penal in parents to refuse to have their children baptized; had prohibited the "unlawful" assembling of Quakers; had made it penal for any master of a vessel to bring a Quaker into the State; had ordered those already there, and such as should come thereafter, to be imprisoned till they should abjure the country,—provided a milder penalty for the first and second return, but death for their third. If no capital executions took place here, as did in New England, it was not owing to the moderation of the church, or spirit of the legislature, as may be inferred from the law itself; but to historical circumstances which have not been handed down to us."—Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia" (1788), p. 167.

⁴ Hening's "Statutes at Large," Vol. I. p. 123.

⁵ "The Compact, Charter, and Laws of the Colony of New Plymouth." Boston, 1836.

⁶ "The Book of the General Laws of the Inhabitants of the Jurisdiction of New Plymouth, collected out of the records of the General Court; and lately revised, and with some emendations and additions, established and disposed into such order as they may readily conduce to general use and benefit, and published by authority of the General Court for that jurisdiction, held at Plymouth, the sixth of June, annodom. 1671. Cambridge: 1672." From chap. III., "Criminals," secs. 9, 10; reprinted at Boston, 1836.

⁷ "The tithingman also watched to see that 'no young people walked abroad on the eve of the sabbath,' that is, on a Saturday night (after sundown). He also marked and reported all those 'who lye at home,' and others who 'prophely behaved,' 'lingered without doers at meeting time on the Lordes Daie,' all the 'sons of Belial strutting about, setting on fences, and otherwise desecrating the day.' These last two classes of offenders were first admonished by the

Whosoever shall profane the Lord's day, or any part of it, either by sinful servile work, or by unlawful sport, recreation or otherwise, whether wilfully or in a careless neglect, shall be duly punished by fine, imprisonment, or corporally, according to the nature, and measure of the sinn, and offence. But if the court upon examination, by clear, and satisfying evidence find that the sin was proudly, presumptuously, and with a high hand committed against the known command and authority of the blessed God, such a person therein despising and reproaching the Lord shall be put to death, that all others may feare and shun such provoking rebellious courses.⁸

tithingman, then 'sett in stocks,' and then cited before the Court. They were also confined in the cage on the meeting-house green, with the Lord's Day Sleepers. The tithingman could arrest any who walked or rode too fast a pace to and from meeting, and he could arrest any who 'walked or rode unnecessarily on the sabbath.' Great and small alike were under his control, as this notice from the *Columbian Centinel* of December, 1789, abundantly proven. It is entitled 'The President and the Tithing man.'

"The President (George Washington), on his return to New York from his late tour through Connecticut, having missed his way on Saturday, was obliged to ride a few miles on Sunday morning in order to gain the town at which he had proposed to have attended divine service. Before he arrived, however, he was met by a tithing man, who commanding him to stop, demanded the occasion of his riding; 'and it was not until the President had informed him of every circumstance and promised to go no further than the town intended that the tithing man would permit him to proceed on his journey.'" Earle's "Sabbath in Puritan New England," pp. 74, 75.

⁸ "Nevv-Haven's Settling in New England. And some laws for Government; Published for the use of that Colony. Though some of the orders intended for present convenience may probably be hereafter altered, and as need requireth other Lawes added. London 1655." Reprinted at Hartford, 1876. The laws of the adjoining colonies were copied from the laws of Massachusetts, which accounts for their likeness here, although I have transcribed the Plymouth laws from a book of a later date.

The Story of PITCAIRN ISLAND.

(SECOND EDITION.)

BY ROSALIND AMELIA YOUNG
A Native Daughter.

Pitcairn Island, one of the volcanic gems of the Pacific, has been heard of wherever the English language has been spoken. The story of the working out of the problem of human life on its limited territory reads stranger and more thrillingly in many respects than a romance. But most, if not all, of the tales told and books printed have either been too fragmentary or incorrect and misleading. It will be interesting to the friends of that miniature world to know that an authentic history has been written, and that by a native of the island, one to the manor born. Miss Rosa Young is one of the direct descendants of the mutineers of the *Bounty*. The book is a plain, unvarnished tale of Pitcairn and its inhabitants from its settlement to the year 1894. It is written with a charming simplicity of style which refreshes the reader and invites a continual perusal. Illustrated with 26 engravings by the half-tone process, and its 23 chapters have each a neatly engraved heading.

Price, \$1.00
PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street,
New York City.



THE "CYCLONE"

STILL WHIRLS!

SWEEPING EVERYTHING CLEAN BEFORE IT.

SEE WHAT THE PEOPLE SAY!

Burnett Junc., Wis., Oct. 23, 1895.
MESSRS. COON BROS.: I find the Cyclone Washer to be indeed a practical washer; it works on scientific principles, works easy, and hence does away with much hard work. In fact, it makes wash day the easiest day in the whole week. I take much pleasure in recommending it.

Mrs. A. H. CADY.

Charlevoix, Mich., April 15, '95.

MESSRS. COON BROS.:
Gentlemen: The Cyclone Washer which I ordered of you is giving perfect satisfaction. It surpasses all other machines in time, wear of the garments, and work. I think it is the greatest labor-saving machine, and think it will do all you claim for it. There is no need of my going into details in regard to the excellent points of your machine. I would not part with it for double the amount I gave for it. I think that every lady should have the Cyclone Washer.
Very truly yours,
Mrs. Chas. Lamoreaux.

Bellevue, Mich.
MESSRS. COON BROS.: I am well pleased with the Cyclone Washer I bought of you, and the more I use it, the better I like it. It is beyond comparison.
R. T. STURBINO.

SPECIAL BARGAIN.

We have for sale one set of Encyclopedic Dictionary, consisting of 4 volumes, 8 1/2 x 11 1/2 inches in size, aggregating 5325 pages, with 3000 illustrations, nicely bound in cloth, marbled edges, the very lowest price of which is \$16, and we are informed it will soon be advanced to \$42, and it is said to be cheap at that.

We offer this set, packed in a box and on board the cars, for \$12. PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING Co.,
43 Bond Street, New York.



NEW YORK, JANUARY 2, 1896.

AS 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.

At its recent session in Fond du Lac, the Wisconsin Sabbath Association, so-called, adopted resolutions urging all "Christian people" to withhold patronage from Sunday trains and Sunday papers, and to support for office only open and avowed friends of the "Lord's day."

THE *Coöperative Age*, of St. Paul, Minn., noting in its issue of Dec. 19, some of the facts of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Maryland and Tennessee, says: "The Constitution of the United States guarantees to every citizen of the country the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own heart. We are beginning to wonder what 'guarantee' means.

"It has come to pass in this 'free' country that in many States a man who worships God according to the Bible is a criminal.

"Is it not about time to curb the fanatics who seek to force others to worship God according to an intolerant bigot's notion or suffer imprisonment as heretics?"

THE city of Tacoma, Washington, has passed an ordinance forbidding any barber shops to be open for business on Sunday. A barber named Krech said it seemed curious to him that the barber shops which wanted to close on Sunday had to have an ordinance before they could do it, and announced that he would keep his shop open as usual. He did so and was arrested and convicted. He appealed his case to the higher court, but the Sunday law was sustained. Of course if barbers can be rightfully forbidden to do business on Sunday, other tradesmen can be likewise restricted; so it will be in order next for the city to pass an ordinance commanding the closing of all places of business on the first day of the week. Only give the germ contained in this barbers' ordinance a chance to grow, and the upas tree of religious legislation will spring up speedily.

DECEMBER 6, Representative Morse, of Massachusetts, introduced into the House a bill entitled, "A bill for the protection of the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia." The text of this bill is as follows:—

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that on the first day of the week, known as the Lord's day, set apart by general consent in accordance with divine appointment as a day of rest and worship, it shall be unlawful to perform any labor, except works of necessity and mercy and work by those who religiously observe Saturday, if per-

formed in such a way as not to involve or disturb others; also to open places of business or traffic, except in the case of drug stores for the dispensing of medicines; also to make contracts or transact other commercial business; also to engage in noisy amusements for gain, or entertainments for which admittance fees are charged; also to perform any court service, except in connection with arrests of criminals and service of process to prevent fraud.

SECTION 2. That the penalty for violating any provision of this Act shall be a fine of not less than \$10 for the first offense; for second or subsequent offenses a fine not exceeding \$50, and imprisonment for not less than ten nor more than thirty days, and one year's forfeiture of license, if any is held by the offender or his employer.

SECTION 3. That this act shall take effect upon its passage.

Drs. H. H. George and W. F. Crafts are both working for the passage of this bill.

SPEAKING in regard to the principle which is believed to be at stake in the present controversy of this country with Great Britain, the New York *Sun* of Dec. 25 says:—

General Sherman spoke of war as hell; and unquestionably it is an infernal business, with its horrible destruction of life, the cruel physical suffering and mental anguish it causes, and its frightful waste of the fruits of industry. But there is something worse than war and more disastrous, and it is the sacrifice of principle by a nation in order to avert war.

But what about the sacrifice of the great principle of religious freedom—the very foundation principle of our national structure—which is going steadily on month by month, and year by year, as evidenced by such spectacles as that of eight honest and conscientious citizens serving in the chain-gang (seen in Tennessee last summer) for no other "crime" than that of setting apart the seventh day of the week, as enjoined by the law of God? Should there be anything done to preserve this principle?

WE reprint on another page "Father" O'Keefe's letter to certain "Protestant" preachers of Baltimore, in reply to an invitation to participate in a meeting in the interests of legal Sunday enforcement. This letter first appeared in the *Catholic Mirror*, the official organ of Cardinal Gibbons. This fact, rather than the name of the writer, gives it significance. The reason for republishing this letter is a demand for copies of it which we were not able to supply when it first appeared in our columns.

"Father" O'Keefe's position as to the correct attitude of the Church toward the civil power and toward civil authority cannot be successfully assailed. Nor have the Baltimore ministers attempted to assail his position. We have no right to question this priest's sincerity in the matter, so far as his own practice is concerned, but his letter to these Protestant ministers is a fearful arraignment of the policy which his own church has pursued in every age and in every country. The Roman Catholic Church has sought and obtained the aid of the civil power wherever she could, and this is freely admitted in standard Roman Catholic publications. A "Catholic Dictionary,"

published in this city by Benziger Bros., "Printers to the Holy Apostolic See," says of the Inquisition:—

The duties and powers of inquisitors are minutely laid down in the canon law, it being always assumed that the civil power will favor or can be compelled to favor, their proceedings. Thus it is laid down that they "have power to constrain all magistrates, even secular magistrates, to cause the statutes against heretics to be observed," and to require them to swear to do so; also that they can "compel all magistrates and judges to execute their sentences, and these must obey on pain of excommunication;" also that inquisitors in causes of heresy "can use the secular arm," and that "all temporal rulers are bound to obey inquisitors in causes of faith."

Cardinal Gibbons, in "Faith of Our Fathers," page 269, quotes from that eminent Catholic theologian, Becanus, the statement that "religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it." "This," the cardinal says, "is the true Catholic teaching on this point."

"Father" O'Keefe very properly and justly arraigns the preachers to whom he writes on the charge of inconsistency in transgressing the fourth commandment, the only Sabbath law in the sacred Scriptures; and they have made no attempt whatever to reply to him upon this point, nor are they likely to do so. But it is in vain that "Father" O'Keefe or any other Roman Catholic, or any number of Roman Catholics pose before the people as advocates of total separation of Church and State, and non-interference in politics; for, as we have seen, it is and always has been the policy of that church to control and use the civil power, wherever possible, to further the interests of "the church."

AN index to Volume 10 of the AMERICAN SENTINEL has been printed, and will be sent to any address upon application. Of course it will be of value only to those who have preserved files of the paper.

Bound Volumes.

THOSE desiring bound volumes of the SENTINEL for 1895, should send in their orders at once. The prices are the same as formerly: \$1.50 in manilla paper, and \$2.50 in cloth with leather back and corners.

R. T. WOODWARD, 66 Emerald St., Boston, Mass., desires unsoiled copies of the AMERICAN SENTINEL for free distribution in that city. Postage should be fully prepaid. Four copies can be sent for one cent. The rate on such matter is one cent for four ounces or fraction thereof. Nine copies properly wrapped would cost but two cents.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and is 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 and under 25 copies to one address, 1 year	- 75c
" 25 and under 50 " " " 1 " "	- 60c
" 50 and under 100 " " " 1 " "	- 55c
" 100 or more " " " 1 " "	- 50c
To foreign countries in Postal Union, - - - 1 " "	- 5s

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
48 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.