



"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. 11.

NEW YORK, MARCH 12, 1896.

Price, three cents.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 39 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
Entered at the New York Post-Office.

THE BIBLE, PROTESTANTISM, AND THE PAPACY.

THE two distinguishing features of Protestantism are the supremacy of the word of God and the right of private judgment.

So closely connected are these principles that the latter is only the logical result of the former; for the word of God being the supreme tribunal, the church itself must be judged by it, and even the most humble of the people have the right of appeal to it.

"The Bible, I say, the Bible only," writes Dowling, "is the religion of Protestants. Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the genuine Protestant *how early* a doctrine originated if it is not found in the Bible. . . . The consistent and true-hearted Protestant, standing upon this rock, 'the Bible and the Bible only,' can admit no doctrine upon the authority of tradition."¹

In that grand protest from which springs the very name of Protestantism, the German princes, rejecting tradition together with papal and imperial authority in all spiritual matters, declared thus for the word of God: "Seeing . . . that this Holy Book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness: we are resolved, with the grace of God to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only word, such as it is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up

against it shall fall before the face of God."²

In this protest the Reformers assert not only the supremacy of the divine word, but the right of private judgment, for, "he who builds on this foundation shall stand." This is as true of a single individual as of ten thousand, for no matter how large the number in the aggregate, every soul builds for himself, and must stand or fall for himself. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the

ness of the wicked shall be upon him."³

"The principles contained in this celebrated protest," writes D'Aubigne, "constitute the very essence of Protestantism. Now this protest opposes two abuses of man in matters of faith: the first is the intrusion of the civil magistrate, and the second the arbitrary authority of the church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate; and the authority of the word of God above the visible church. In the first place, *it rejects the civil power in divine things*, and says with the prophets and apostles: *We must obey God rather than man*. In presence of the crown of Charles the Fifth, it uplifts the crown of Jesus Christ. But it goes farther; it lays down the principle that *all human teaching should be subordinate to the oracles of God*."⁴

As the fundamental principles of Protestantism are the supremacy of the word of God and the right of private judgment, or what is the same thing, the right to have and exercise a conscience in matters of faith, so the distinguishing features of the Papacy are a denial of the sufficiency of the divine word and of the right of private judgment. In fact, both are bound up in one, for if, as the Papacy insists, the individual must take his faith from the church, he must accept his conscience, ready-made, from the same source. Obviously, whatever militates against this in the least degree, must be regarded by the Papacy as harmful; hence papal opposition to the reading of the Scriptures by the people.

That this opposition to the Scriptures is real and not imaginary is evident from the writings of Roman Catholics themselves. "It is not necessary," says a standard Roman Catholic authority, "for all Christians to read the Bible. . . . Parts of the Bible are evidently unsuited to the very young or to the ignorant, and hence *Clement XI. condemned the proposition that 'the reading of Scriptures is for all.'*"

"These principles are fixed and invariable, but the discipline of the church with regard to the reading of the Bible in the vulgar



Archbishop Tonstall, Burning Bibles in London, 1530.

iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wicked-

¹ "History of Romanism," Book II, chap. 1.

² D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," Book VIII, chap. 6.

³ Eze. 18:20.

⁴ "History of the Reformation," Book XIII, chap. 6.

tongue has varied with varying circumstances. In early times the Bible was read freely by the lay people, and the fathers constantly encouraged them to do so, although *they also insist on the obscurity of the sacred text.* . . .

"New dangers came in during the Middle Ages. When the heresy of the Albigenses arose there was a danger from corrupt translations, and also from the fact that *the heretics tried to make the faithful judge the church by their own interpretation of the Bible.* To meet these evils, *the Councils of Toulouse (1229) and Tarragona (1234) forbade the laity to read the vernacular translations of the Bible.*

"*Pius IV. required the bishops to refuse lay persons leave to read even Catholic versions of Scripture unless their confessors or parish priests judged that such reading was likely to prove beneficial.* During this century, *Leo XII., Pius VIII., and Pius IX., have warned Catholics against the Protestant Bible societies.*"⁵

"The church," says Cardinal Gibbons, "is the only divinely-constituted teacher of revelation.

"Now the Scripture is the great depository of the word of God. Therefore, the church is the divinely-appointed custodian and interpreter of the Bible. For her office of infallible guide were superfluous, if each individual could interpret the Bible for himself."⁶

It appears from this, as before remarked, that the Roman Catholic Church opposes the reading of the Bible because it tends to develop independence of thought and action, and is in itself a negation of the claim that to "the church" is committed the faith and even the very consciences of all men.

It is true that the Papacy says, "A man is always bound to follow his conscience, even if false and erroneous. . . . Nor can any injunction of any authority, ecclesiastical or civil, make it lawful for a man to do that which his conscience unhesitatingly condemns as certainly wicked."⁷ But this does not mean that the Roman Catholic Church recognizes the supremacy of the Scriptures or the right of private judgment.

Says Cardinal Gibbons: "The church is indeed intolerant in this sense, that she can not confound truth with error; nor can she admit that any man is conscientiously free to reject truth when its claims are convincingly brought home to his mind."⁸

And again the cardinal says: "A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshipping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God."⁹

As already seen, Rome, through her popes and councils, forbids her children to read even her own version of the Scriptures, except under such restrictions as forbid the right of private judgment. Our illustration shows how Rome prevented the reading of the Bible in London in the era of the Reformation. Tyndale had given England the New Testament in the language of the people, but Henry VIII., upon whom Leo X. had bestowed the title, "Defender of the Faith," was bitterly opposed to the reading of the Scriptures.

"The bishops" says D'Aubigne, "led the attack. 'We must clear the Lord's field of the thorns which choke it,' said the arch-

bishop of Canterbury to Convocation on the 29th of November, 1529; immediately after which the bishop of Bath read to his colleagues the list of books that he desired to have condemned. There were a number of works by Tyndale, Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle, Ecolampadius, Pomeranus, Brentius, Bucer, Jonas, Francis, Lambert, Fryth and Fish. *The Bible in particular was set down.* 'It is impossible to translate the Scripture into English,' said one of the prelates.—'It is not lawful for the laity to read it in their mother tongue,' said another.—'If you tolerate the Bible,' added a third, 'you will make us all heretics.'¹⁰

In this matter "Rome had every reason," remarks the historian, "to be satisfied with Henry VIII. Tonstall, who still kept under lock and key the Testaments purchased at Antwerp through Packington's assistance, had them carried to St. Paul's churchyard, where they were publicly burnt. The spectators retired shaking the head, and saying: 'The teaching of the priests and of Scriptures must be in contradiction to each other, since the priests destroy them.'¹¹

It was thus Rome opposed the Scriptures 366 years ago, and she uses the same tactics yet when she can. Only a few weeks since we printed in these columns the facts concerning the burning of forty-seven Bibles and fifty Testaments in Bahia, Brazil, no longer ago than last June by order of a Roman Catholic vicar.¹² And everybody knows Rome's undying hostility to the reading of the common version of the Scriptures everywhere. The Douay or Catholic version of the Scriptures is never printed without notes; thus even where Rome permits the reading of the Bible, she first injects into it the poison of tradition and the vagaries of the so-called Fathers of the Christian Church.

But as we said before, the opposition to the reading of the Bible comes not so much from enmity to the Scriptures themselves, as from the papal principle of the denial of the right of private judgment. It is of no avail for people to read a book which they cannot understand, and which they have no right to understand for themselves. It follows that to permit the reading of the Scriptures is to invite independence of thought and of action in matters of religion. The man who reads the inspired declaration, every man "shall give account of himself to God," feels that he has an individual responsibility toward God which no other man can discharge for him; and reasoning is not necessary to convince him not only that he has the right of private judgment, but that it is his duty to exercise that right in the fear of God; but this Rome can never admit, for to admit it is to abdicate the throne of spiritual dominion which she has usurped, and to which she owes her power over the nations.

LETTING DOWN THE BARS.

[Bible Echo, Melbourne, Australia.]

THE demand on the part of many styling themselves Protestant, that the state should teach religion in its schools, opens the way for a counter demand from the Roman Catholics that the state should bear the expense of all the secular instruction given in their schools. And one demand is as consistent and can be urged with as much propriety and

with as much force as the other. And this latter demand is being urged. A Catholic deputation, which waited on Lord Salisbury the first week in December, declared that Roman Catholics would never rest until the whole expense of the secular education of their schools was borne by the state. When Protestants begin to mix up secular and religious affairs, and demand the assistance of the state in teaching religion, they are letting down the bars, and they must not be surprised if others follow where they have led the way.

A WORLD-WIDE DIFFERENCE.

THERE is a world-wide difference, and much more than that, between man's law and the law of God.

This difference may not be apparent in the wording of the laws, as they are compared one with the other; but it is none the less real.

For example, the law of God says, "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not steal." Man's law also specifically forbids killing and stealing. But man's law against murder, even though expressed in the exact language of the sixth commandment, is not God's law. It is not a reenactment of God's law. It falls as far short of that law, in its breadth and depth and purpose, as man falls short of God.

God's laws are not only prohibitions, but they are promises. With the command, God also gives power to perform it. Man could not possibly keep God's law by his own power; his very nature is contrary to it. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God neither indeed can be." God must supply the power necessary for the fulfillment of his law in man, if ever any man is to keep it. And he does this by the power of the life of Christ.

That plan and that power are set forth by the apostle Paul in the words, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. 2:20. Christ lives in the believer; his life is the life of Christ; and that life is now, as it ever has been, in perfect harmony with God's law.

Thus the law of God is not a measure of man's power towards God, but of God's power toward man. It is a promise of what God will do for every individual who will come unto him by faith. That law operates by God's own power, and not by the power of man.

In brief, the law of God commands love to God, and love to man. It requires us to love God with all the mind and strength, and our neighbor as ourself. But who can love by his own will? "God is love," and "love is of God." God must supply the power by putting love—which is putting himself—into man's heart.

God's law deals with the heart. An evil thought is a violation of his law. "The word of God is living, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb. 4:12.

Man's word—man's law—on the other hand, cannot rise above the level of man's own human power and wisdom.

Man can neither reenact nor enforce the law of God. God's law says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Man also has

⁵ "A Catholic Dictionary," published by Benziger Bros., "Printers to the Holy Apostolic See," New York, 1893. All italics ours.—Ed.

⁶ "Faith of Our Fathers," p. 97, edition of 1893.

⁷ "A Catholic Dictionary," Art. "Conscience."

⁸ "Faith of Our Fathers," p. 268; edition of 1893.

⁹ *Id.*, p. 264.

¹⁰ D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," Book XX, chap. 15. Italics ours.—Ed.

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² For the facts and particulars, see *Missionary Review of the World*, for February.

made a sabbath "law," which commands the observance of the first day of the week. But it is with this law as with his laws against murder, theft, or adultery,—it is not the law of God. Yet in making it, man assumes to reenact and enforce the Sabbath law of God, since the Sabbath is an institution pertaining solely to man's relation to God.

It is proper that human laws should forbid murder, theft, adultery, etc., in order that men may live in the enjoyment of their natural rights. But of the Sabbath God says, "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord." Eze. 20:20. The Sabbath being a *sign* between God and his people, it cannot properly pertain to any other relation than that between God and his people. It cannot pertain to the relations between human beings.

Since therefore man's word is infinitely below God's word, in power and wisdom and truth, and it is infinitely beyond man's power either to make a sabbath as God did or to reenact or enforce the law of God, and since the Sabbath is God's distinctive sign between himself and his people (because it points him out as the Creator and therefore the true God) man's sabbath law is nothing else than a most daring piece of presumption. And quite in keeping with its character as such is the fact that it contradicts the law of God by setting up the first day of the week instead of the seventh, as the Sabbath.

It ought therefore to be speedily removed from every civil code in which it has found a place.

FALSE STANDARDS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Low standards of righteousness are a characteristic of the times in which we live. Speaking of this age, the Apostle Paul wrote to Timothy: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud; . . . having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3:1-5. The world is full of religious formalism and phariseism, but there is little seen of the power of godliness.

Low standards of righteousness always pertain to religious formalism. And a low standard of righteousness is a false standard, just as formalism and phariseism are false standards of religion. And because of these low standards of righteousness, which do not reach above the level of formalism, many people are deceiving themselves with the idea that the world is growing better.

In this country we hear much about "civic righteousness," and we also see much that illustrates the meaning of the term. We also see an increasing effort being made, especially by the forces of the religious world, to set up this "righteousness" in the place of soul righteousness, and to lead people to put their trust in it. We see legislators being influenced to believe that by the manufacture of such "righteousness" they are making the people better, and saving the nation from divine wrath. All this is a dangerous delusion.

For example, we notice some comments of the New York *Independent*, of February 13, on some of the evils lately suppressed by law in this country, under the heading, "The Passing of Pugilism." The statements of the *Independent*, besides carrying much influence in themselves, represent the ideas held by a prominent, if not a large, class of the American people.

"There is now," says the *Independent* (italics ours), "no inch of soil in the United

States where prize fighting can be legally carried on. Congress passed a bill last week, and the President promptly signed it, which makes it a crime in the District of Columbia, or in any Territory of the United States, or in any strip of country under Federal control, to hold a prize fight. *This is a final victory for good morals and humanity over a species of entertainment that has come to rank with bull fights and other degrading sports.*

"The time was when the prize fights were considered a very choice kind of amusement for the general public. . . . *But the public standard of morality is so much higher than it used to be that prize fighting has become as intolerable to the public conscience as dueling, the lottery, and other forms of vice.* No clearer proof of this could be asked than the entirely successful efforts by the governor of Arkansas and the governor of Texas in preventing the threatened encounter last year."

Now the simple truth is that the "public standard of morality" in the days of our ancestors when pugilism was not prohibited in this country, was not only as high as it is today, but much higher. Ask the white-haired survivors of those earlier times if there was then any such carnival of murder, riot, robbery, arson, lust, and general immorality as is heralded by the newspapers of our land today. They will answer, No. Ask them if the house of God was desecrated by church lotteries, fairs, theatricals, and ridiculous shows, as it is to-day, or if infidelity found utterance in the pulpit then as it does to-day? They will tell you, No.

As to recently-enacted laws against pugilism, it is almost too well known to need mentioning, that the actuating motive of such legislation was mere policy, and not a horror of the thing prohibited. Each State wishes to be considered as respectable in the public eye as any other State. One State does not wish another to say to her, What is not good enough for me is good enough for you. Even Mexico, while allowing and encouraging the bloody and brutal bull-fighting exhibitions, forbade the proposed pugilistic encounters as strictly as they were prohibited in the United States. The higher "public standard of morality" did not figure in the matter at all.

The *Independent* continues: "It is a good time to point out to those who think the world is going to the bad, . . . that they misread the signs. *There is a whole series of indications going to show that the moral tide is rising instead of falling.* There was a time when some of the people of this country looked with more or less tolerance on the slave trade. Within a generation millions of our citizens have defended slavery. . . . The slave trade in the world has been almost entirely broken up; all of the continents except one are practically free from slavery."

It is true that there is now no place in our country where an individual of the negro race can be legally held in involuntary servitude; but alas, that form of slavery is not the only one by which it is possible for men to oppress their fellow-beings. There are multitudes of white slaves in our land to-day, made so by human rapacity, greed, lust, and conscienceless use of power. There are hundreds of thousands of unfortunates in the lower stratum of society as it exists in our great cities—not to mention the "submerged tenth"—condemned by human selfishness to a slavery as cruel and as hopeless and as real as any that this country ever knew. And while this state of things continues, and is growing worse, as it is to-day, it is useless to point to the abol-

ition of negro slavery as evidence of a rising tide of public morality. Had it not been for the terrible convulsions of the body politic in the civil war, that feature of American life might not yet have been eliminated from our land.

"We have also," continues the *Independent*, "banished the lottery. That was a form of iniquity which seemed to be deeply rooted in one of our States; but in one of the most brilliant contests ever waged against wrong by an aroused conscience, it was finally and forever defeated and banished from the soil of the United States." The history of that contest is, however, very much like the history of the contest against pugilism. There is very good reason to believe that conscience had far less to do with the banishment of the evil than had the policy of conforming to the common standard of respectability.

We are further told that, "It is in the last decade that the Mormons have surrendered polygamy as an article of their faith and have promised henceforth to respect the conscience of the country. There will be an end to the abomination in form as well as in fact when men who have contracted such marriages have passed away, they having agreed meanwhile to be the husband of one wife only."

This is again a most misleading fact in its bearing upon the question here considered. For of the three forms of polygamy known to society in this country, there can be little doubt that the one suppressed was less evil than the others. Open polygamy as formerly practiced in Utah has been prohibited; but secret polygamy, in which only one of the parties concerned is granted the name of wife and the privileges of that relation, is practiced in every part of the Union, and by a far greater number of people than were ever participants in the polygamy of the Mormons. This fact cannot be questioned; nor are our legislators themselves, many of them, guiltless upon this point.

The third form of this evil has been termed "consecutive polygamy," and this has the sanction of our courts of law. It is seen where parties who have entered into the marriage relation, separate upon some one of the many slight grounds recognized by our courts as legally sufficient, and reënter the same relation with other parties. The fearful prevalence of this "consecutive polygamy" is a widely-recognized fact, and one which has led to a strong agitation in our country for more stringent laws regulating marriage and divorce. And while it does prevail, as it does to-day, it is useless to point to the suppression of Mormon polygamy as a victory of public morality.

The *Independent* also refers to the victories recently gained in the fight against "gambling;" but here again we may be misled. For the worst form of gambling remains unsuppressed, in open and bold defiance of law and public sentiment. Gambling with dice and cards has been to some degree suppressed; but what has been done to suppress gambling in its higher and more "respectable" and more ruinous forms? We allow men to gamble with and "corner" the necessities of life, not only to their own ruin, but to the loss of millions of others, whom they plunge into poverty and suffering. And it is a serious question whether this may not lead ere long to a social revolution which will drench the land with blood.

It is a great mistake to imagine that immorality can be suppressed, or righteousness established, by human law. The seat of immorality, or of righteousness, is the heart; and that no human law can reach. We must, of course, have laws against those evils which

are destructive of human rights; and it lies within human power to enact and enforce laws which will protect the people in the enjoyment of their rights, to a great degree. But such laws do not make men moral, and are not designed for that purpose. They can create an outward appearance of morality, but the whitened sepulchres to which the Saviour likened the Pharisees, had a good outward appearance. The Pharisees were very moral in outward appearance.

When men mistake the outward appearance of morality for the thing itself, they are in a position to become the victims of the worst deceptions, and to commit the gravest errors of legislation from which mankind has ever suffered.

SUNDAY AND THE SALOON.

A SMALL pamphlet, entitled, "Summing up Against the Sunday Saloon," has been "written for the Church Temperance Society," by "Col. B. F. Watson, Chairman of the Legislative Committee." We have been favored with a copy of this pamphlet, and find in it statements which call for notice in the columns of the SENTINEL.

The author divides his subject into a number of topics, under the general heading of "'Local Option' as to the Enforcement of the Ten Commandments in 'Cities of the First Class.'" At the outset he notices the fact that a bill was recently introduced into the New York Legislature, entitled, "An Act to provide for submitting to the electors in cities of the first class, the question, Shall spirituous liquors, wines, ale, and beer, be sold on Sunday between the hours of 1 P. M. and 10 P. M.?" He then begins his attack by saying,* "The majority of those voting in a first-class city is empowered by this bill to decide for the State, that such city may *deseccrate Sunday* by publicly carrying on the most offensive and dangerous traffic in the list; that such city's vote may suspend from operation, within its limits, a State law by which the entire State outside of its limits is fast bound. In effect, this would enable a favored locality through its own option to secure not only the monopoly of desecrating the 'Lord's day,' but the unconstitutional monopoly of selling spirituous liquors seven days in the week while the rest of the State is restricted to six days."

This much is sufficient to show the standpoint from which the pamphlet is written. The author argues for legislation against the Sunday saloon, to prevent "desecration" of the "Lord's day;" in other words, he wants irreligion put down by the civil law,—which means that the majority shall suppress by law everything that may be contrary to their religion. As already noticed, he states the issue as being "local option as to the enforcement of the ten commandments in cities of the first class," although, as shown elsewhere in this week's SENTINEL, the law of God cannot be enforced by human power. Nor is it proposed by any class of citizens to vote on a question of local option in such a matter.

Coming to the second division of his subject, the author says, "The issue is, Shall divine commands be defied and the policy of the Republic reversed?" Bearing in mind that the question under consideration is wholly one of the enactment and enforcement of a civil law, it is evident that the real issue raised is, Shall religious observances be enforced by civil law and the policy of the Republic reversed? For that policy is reversed

by any scheme which aims to compel people in things pertaining to religion.

Under this topic the author notices the fact that "surrender to the saloon is not only capitulating to a notorious law-breaker, but is also a craven attempt to propitiate a traffic whose fruits, gathered during only six days of the week, are fully three-fourths of all the crime and pauperism which pile up our taxes, which endanger and pollute our streets, and by which the hearts of helpless mothers and wives are wrung." And this being so, as it unquestionably is, how can Christian men and women be willing to surrender to the saloon by legalizing it on six days of the week? For the Sunday prohibitory law sanctions two things: it sanctions Sunday as a day different in character from other days of the week; and *it sanctions the saloon*, by giving its traffic legal protection during six days of the week.

Legal Sanction for a Law-breaker.

Think of it! "a notorious law-breaker" given legal protection in his business six days in every week! "A traffic whose fruits, gathered during only six days of the week, are fully three-fourths of all the crime and pauperism which pile up our taxes, which endanger and pollute our streets, and by which the hearts of helpless mothers are wrung," is given legal sanction for six days in every week! Why is not this "notorious law-breaker" outlawed and shut up like other law-breakers? Or if not shut up, why at least should it be recognized and its nefarious business sanctioned, during six-sevenths of each week? This murderous thing is recognized and sanctioned and clothed with respectability as a law-abiding institution, in order that special recognition may be given to Sunday as a sacred day! For were it not for the supposed sanctity of Sunday as the divinely-appointed rest day, it would never have been proposed to legalize the saloon by a Sunday "law." And there is no other visible source from which legal sanction for the saloon could be derived, with the support of the best classes of American citizens.

In other words, but for this desire to legalize Sunday on the part of so many well-meaning but mistaken citizens, who largely constitute the class from which alone real opposition to the saloon can be derived, this death-dealing institution would be left like other institutions, to stand upon its own merits; and having no merits of its own, its eventual fall would be a matter of reasonable hope. The opposition of the better class of citizens would not have a ground of compromise upon which they cease to wage the battle, leaving the saloon to emerge victorious from its fight for life, invested with a borrowed respectability as a Sunday-observing and law-abiding institution.

The people are now saying to the saloon, You may exist and go on with your business, if you will keep Sunday. And this is just what will be said ere long to the people themselves.

The author of "Summing Up" goes on to say that "saloon opening abolishes the sacred Sunday"—not a very stable institution, surely, if it can be abolished thus easily. It is not so with God's Sabbath, for though heaven and earth should pass away, God's word and his sacred institutions which rest upon it would still stand fast.

Scripture and Reason against Sunday.

He then takes up the question, "Is Sunday hallowed by divine authority?" After stating the position of those who contend for the observance of the seventh day, he says: "On

the other hand, the contention of Christians generally has always been that it nowhere appears that the Sabbath day of the fourth commandment, or prior to it, was the seventh day of the *week*, as time is now divided; that the essence of the commandment is, that after six days' work, the next, the seventh, should be sacred as a day of rest, because God himself hallowed such a day or period of rest, by himself resting thereon after the six days of creation." But can any person tell how God's rest day could have been any other than the seventh day of the week when it was his division of time into periods of seven days, at the close of creation, that made the week? For the week originated in no other way than by the act of the Creator in instituting the Sabbath, after having worked six days in making the heavens and the earth.

Again, who does not see that hopeless confusion would result from a practical application of this "seventh-part-of-time" theory, each man resting whenever he might choose after seven days of labor. In such a state of things there would be as many sabbaths as there were days in the week; and thus God's commandment would defeat itself, since the whole idea of the Sabbath is that the day is set apart—"sanctified"—from other days. Who will dare charge God with being the author of confusion, and with giving a commandment which annuls itself? If man finds it necessary to have one day of rest for all alike, did not the Omniscient see that necessity when he gave the Sabbath to mankind? Is it left for man to correct an error on the part of the Almighty!

But—stranger yet if possible—our author proceeds to say that "the fourth commandment, in this sense, adopts Sunday"! In the sense of not commanding the observance of a particular day, but only of one day in seven, the commandment adopts Sunday! A profound statement, truly, upon which comment would be superfluous.

An Unsound Maxim.

In the third division of the subject the author asserts that "whether Sunday is or is not sacred by divine authority, it is decreed by immemorial law." But can the "immemorial law" of man set aside the eternal law of the Creator? He cites the fact that "aside from the question whether or not Sunday supersedes the Sabbath, or shares with it divine sanction, it is, as a day of rest and worship, invested with the sanction of human law from the time of the first Christian emperor Constantine to the present," and adds, "To this general proposition, then, to this universal custom eighteen hundred years old, reinforced by that imperative law of nature which demands stated periods of rest from labor, . . . the stubborn soul must submit, and may do so gracefully by adopting as its own the maxim, '*Vox populi, vox Dei.*'"

Not only is this the "graceful" way of acquiescing in such a thing, but it is the only way; for the only support the Sunday institution has, is the idea that "the voice of the people is the voice of God." But this "maxim" is most untrue. "Let God be true, but every man a liar." Rom. 3:4. When the Saviour rode into Jerusalem, the voice of the people said, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" but less than one week later, in the same city, the voice of the people said, "Crucify him!" This illustration reveals the exact amount of truth that this maxim contains.

This suffices to show the nature of this new weapon added to the Sunday armory, and the amount of dependence that can be placed upon it. It is like all the rest that have been

* Italics ours.

manufactured for the Sunday cause. The "Church Temperance Society" will certainly fail in its mission if it fights the battles of its warfare with the boomerangs of error. Let the temperance forces insist upon the outlawing of the saloon, as the nature of its business demands.

SUNDAY "LAW" PERSECUTION.

WE have received from the International Religious Liberty Association a tabulated statement of the cases of the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists under Sunday "laws" of the various States and countries from 1878 and to the present time.

The following is the number of Sabbatarians arrested for Sunday work each year:—

Years.	Arrests.	Cases.
1878.....	3.....	3
1880.....	1.....	1
1882.....	2.....	2
1885.....	9.....	9
1886.....	16.....	16
1889.....	3.....	3
1892.....	11.....	11
1893.....	11.....	14
1894.....	23.....	31
1895.....	47.....	62
1896.....	5.....	5
Total,	131	Total, 157

The following States have been or are involved in this inquisitous business:—

- | | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Alabama, | Arkansas, |
| California, | Florida, |
| Georgia, | Illinois, |
| Maryland, | Massachusetts, |
| Michigan, | Mississippi, |
| North Carolina, | Ohio, |
| Pennsylvania, | Tennessee, |
| | Texas. |

The foreign countries in which arrests have occurred are England, Switzerland, New South Wales, Manitoba, and Ontario.

The total number of cases in foreign countries are 17, leaving 130 occurring in the United States. At this writing nine cases are pending in the lower courts. One hundred and sixteen cases have been brought to trial; 27 have been dropped before trial on account of exemption clauses; in five cases no arrests were made; in two or three instances the indicted parties had removed to other States before the indictments were secured; in one or two instances, only the surname was given and the warrants were never served because they were too indefinite. Of the 116 cases brought to trial 109 resulted in conviction. Four cases have been dropped after conviction; twenty-five have been appealed to higher courts.

In three cases occurring in Australia the sentence was the payment of a fine, or in default to sit in the public stocks. These fines were never paid and the sentences were never carried out because the authorities had no stocks.

The total fines and costs in these cases amount to \$2,269.69; total number of days served in prison, 1,438; days served in chain-gangs, 445. "As a result of the hardships endured in confinements," says the report, "the death of two men was hastened, and several have not recovered from the effects of bad food and ill-treatment."

In a very large majority of these cases the work complained of was of such a nature that it could not possibly afford anybody just ground for complaint. It was not work that involved anybody else or required anybody else to labor; nor was it work that interfered in any way with the rest or quiet of other people. For the most part it has been farm work done by individuals upon their own premises,

and in a large number of the cases, was only observed by those who made it their business to spy upon the Adventists.

But notwithstanding these facts some deny that these prosecutions are in any sense religious persecution. The claim is that it "is only enforcing the law." But, as the AMERICAN SENTINEL has repeatedly stated, with the exception of isolated cases of mob violence, that is all religious persecution has ever been. The persecution of the Christians under the Roman Empire was only the enforcement of civil "law." Indeed some of the Roman governors and emperors were as reluctant to enforce the "laws" against the Christians as are some of the judges and sheriffs in the United States to-day. But they held that the "law" must be enforced, just as kind and "good-hearted" men hold to-day in the United States and in other countries.

The trouble is with such "laws." Statutes that can be used as engines of persecution ought to be repealed or declared void by the courts as they are in fact. It is a well-established principle of law that rights do not originate with the State or with the Government; and that they exist independently of statutes; and that when any pretended law invades natural right it is void in the very nature of the case.

That statutes which imprison honest men for doing honest labor, and that interfere with the rights of any person, are unjust and oppressive, must be evident to every man who will honestly put himself for a few moments in the position of one who is thus prosecuted. Let the ardent Sunday-keeper imagine the conditions reversed; let him imagine himself required by statute to rest habitually upon some day not regarded by him as sacred, and he will certainly conclude, if he is honest with himself, that such a regulation is unjust; and that as far as law can properly go is to forbid anything that interferes with the equal rights of others. And that is all the Adventists of the United States and other countries demand. They do not ask exclusive privileges, but they claim equal rights.

IS THERE A PRINCIPLE INVOLVED?

BY A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

A RELIGIOUS paper, not intentionally hostile to the principle of separation of Church and State, recently published a question from a subscriber, which, with the answer, may be of interest to the readers of the SENTINEL.

The subscriber asked, "What right has the President of the United States, or the governors, to appoint days of thanksgiving?" and adds, "Is not that so much of union of Church and State?" In reply the editor says:—

The above almost reminds us of the saying that some people stand up so straight that they lean over backward. . . . What wrong would there be, we wonder, in the President's, or any one else's, suggesting a day of special thanksgiving? Those proclamations are only suggestions. Those who observe Thanksgiving day in a proper spirit, do so not in obedience to the behest of the State, but because thanksgiving and praise belong to God, and certainly nothing would be more fitting than to see a whole community uniting in giving thanks to God for mercies and blessings received. And there is no one who can more appropriately suggest the day than the man who stands at the head of the community. The laws of our country compel no one to observe the day; it is wholly voluntary, and, to our mind, is quite an appropriate institution, if it be observed in a proper way.

The above editorial contains food for much careful thought.

1. It is most certainly our duty and privi-

lege to render praise and thanksgiving to God. And it is well for the people to unite at specified times in these exercises. But why should the President of the United States make the appointment? Why should he be regarded as the religious "head of the community"? If politics and religion are not mixed, if Church and State are not united, why should political power or civil authority place a man at the "head of the community" in religious affairs and exercises?

The answer to these questions is obvious. To say that a man should appoint a day of thanksgiving because he "stands at the head of the community" is to assert that he "stands at the head of the community" in a religious sense. And to say that he stands thus because he is president or governor, is to assert that civil and religious influence and authority belong together; but this is union of Church and State.

2. But it is said, "Those who observe Thanksgiving day in a proper spirit, do so not in obedience to the behest of the State," etc. Then nobody observes it properly save those who have heard nothing about the appointment, or, having heard, have paid no attention to it. For whoever adopts a certain day because of the President's official announcement, is certainly observing the day in obedience to the behest of the State. If people do not observe the day in obedience to the behest of the State, why is it that they always happen(?) to select the same day the State has appointed? There was nothing in nature or revelation which indicated Thursday, November 28, 1895, as a day of special thanksgiving, yet in all parts of the country many laid aside their work on that day; and it would not be far from the truth to say that all who did so were led to that act by the President of the United States. Guided solely by their desire to worship God, they would have been as likely to have selected any other day as to select the one appointed by the State.

3. But "those proclamations are only suggestions." On this point, Thomas Jefferson says:—

I consider the Government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline, or exercises.

But it is only proposed that I should recommend, not prescribe, a day of fasting and prayer. That is, that I should indirectly assume to the United States an authority over religious exercises, which the Constitution has directly precluded from them.

It must be meant, too, that this recommendation is to carry some authority, and to be sanctioned by some penalty on those who disregard it; not, indeed of fine and imprisonment, but of some degree of proscription, perhaps in public opinion. And does the change in the nature of the penalty make the recommendation less a law of conduct for those to whom it is directed?

It would be useless to ask the chief executive officer of the State to make such an appointment unless his words were intended to carry some weight. At present the penalty may seem light, but it is, nevertheless, a penalty. The man who refuses to give respectful attention to the "suggestion" of the chief representative of the people, will be "peculiar," "unpatriotic," "fanatical," "too straight in the back," etc., etc. And he will soon become aware of the fact that the community would treat him more cordially if he would act like other people.

4. At the present time the National Reform Association is laboring energetically to secure an amendment to our National Constitution which shall acknowledge Jesus Christ as ruler of this nation and the Bible as the supreme law, thus placing "all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal

basis in the fundamental law of the land." This can result in nothing less than a complete union of Church and State, and the people, instead of reading the Bible for themselves and receiving the interpretation which God by his Spirit impresses upon their minds, will be compelled by law to accept human interpretations, and thus to follow man instead of God.

These so-called reformers claim that there has always been a union existing between religion and the Government, but that there has been practically no acknowledgement of the fact in the Constitution. This acknowledgement they are working to secure; and they have been so far successful that the bill for the proposed amendment is actually before Congress at the present time. And one of the proofs which they bring to show that the Government is already religious, and that they therefore have an historical basis for their movement, is the fact that Thanksgiving proclamations are annually issued by the President of the United States. It can not be denied that this basis has existed and does exist; but there are those who protest against both the wicked proceeding of the "reformers" and the basis upon which it rests.

The reader will call to mind how very tolerant and generous was Constantine when he began to make official suggestions about Christian observances and doctrines, but these suggestions soon became stern commands backed up by terrible penalties.

The camel of Church and State has for some time been thrusting his nose into our National Tabernacle in the form of Thanksgiving proclamations, army chaplaincies, appropriations of money to religious societies, etc., and he now claims the right not only to walk in bodily, but to receive ample recognition in the National Constitution. He should not be tolerated in the slightest degree. It is impossible to stand up too straight on this subject.

A BAD BUSINESS ENDED.

[The Examiner, Baptist.]

ATTEMPTS have been made during the last few years to stop the appropriation of moneys from the United States Treasury for the support of sectarian schools among the Indians. It would seem that at length these efforts are successful. On Monday, February 24, the House of Representatives ordered, by a vote of 93 to 64, that all appropriations for such schools be stricken from the Indian appropriation bill. This shows that less than one-half of the full House (356) voted, but it is not likely that the Senate will disturb the decision of the House, or that the majority will be changed by any subsequent action. The vote was taken directly on the merits of the question, after frequent discussions through a series of years, and it will stand. It is a happy ending of a long dispute, which ought never to have been raised.

Under the wise and forward movement in dealing with the Indians, started by General Grant's "peace policy," various Christian denominations were asked to assist in educating the Indian youth. In many cases the Christian schools were already established, and the Government availed itself of them in its educational work, assigning pupils to them from the reservations, and paying so much *per capita* for the pupils, or in lump sums to the managers of the schools. The evils of the system soon became manifest, and the public sentiment of the country began to show itself against this form of union between Church

and State—the use of public funds for the support of sectarian schools. From the beginning the Roman Catholics received the lion's share of these appropriations, and they worked the scheme for all it was worth. From 1886 to 1895 (ten years) the sums appropriated for these "contract schools," as they were called, amounted to \$4,767,436, of which the Roman Catholics received no less than \$3,100,000, while all others, representing fifteen denominations and some private institutions, received only \$1,667,000. The Roman Catholics were so eager and insolent that they hurt their own cause, and thus indirectly aided in effecting its overthrow.

Gen. T. J. Morgan, when he was Commissioner of Indian Affairs, took the ground that these appropriations for sectarian Indian schools should be diminished as rapidly as possible, and wholly cease at the earliest practicable day, the Government meanwhile to provide schools of its own for all Indian children, after the pattern of the common schools of the country. This policy, bitterly antagonized by the Roman Catholics, has now been formally indorsed by the House of Representatives.

The autumn conferences of the "Friends of the Indians" at Lake Mohonk did much to crystallize and solidify a true public sentiment on this subject. In successive years their "platform" approached a clear and unequivocal utterance, until finally it was affirmed that no Christian denomination should receive public funds for its mission schools among the Indians. No one who was present will soon forget the scene when, after long and high debate, this resolution was moved by a noble Quaker, seconded by an Episcopalian Bishop, and sustained in a strong and fervid speech by an eminent Methodist.

Nearly two years ago (June 7, 1894), when the Indian appropriation bill was before the House of Representatives, Hon. William S. Linton, of Michigan, sought to have the appropriations for these sectarian schools stricken out. He pleaded strongly, and set forth an array of cogent facts in support of his argument, but he was defeated by a vote 158 to 58 (136 not voting). Afterward the Secretary of the Interior was directed to reduce expenditures upon contract schools by twenty per cent. of the sum thus expended in the previous year, until such schools should become extinct. Mr. Linton has bided his time. Two years ago he told the House that they would not dare to neglect the warnings that were abroad. They rejected his advice then, but they have given heed to it now. It was on his motion that, on Monday of last week, the appropriations for contract schools were stricken from the bill, and an amendment inserted prohibiting the Secretary of the Interior from spending any of the money appropriated for education in a sectarian institution. All Protestant denominations had withdrawn their requests for such aid, or, like the Baptists, had never asked it.* The Roman Catholics stood alone in continuing the demand, and asked for more than \$250,-

* We are sorry that it is so; but facts compel us to state that the Baptists did for a time, through Henry L. Morehouse, of this city, Secretary of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, receive money from the Government for the support of denominational schools. Mr. Frank C. Armstrong, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, replying to an inquiry upon this subject, Sept. 12, 1894, said:—

"I find records of contracts from the year 1879 to 1884, between this office and Henry L. Morehouse, of New York City, Secretary of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, for the Freedmen of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians, in the Indian Territory, as follows:—

"In 1879, 6 day schools at \$875 for six months.
"In 1882, 1 boarding school and 8 day schools at \$2,250.
"In 1883, 1 boarding and 8 day schools at \$2,750.
"In 1884, 4 day schools at \$700, and again in the same year for 6 schools at \$1,500."

It is true these sums are small and were not for Indian schools, but that does not alter the principle in the least. The fact remains that the Baptists received public money for denominational schools, and the proper thing for them is to candidly own it.—EDITOR SENTINEL.

000 from the public treasury for the current year. Sixty-four members of the House were willing to give it to them, but the system is dead.

The duty of the Christian churches to the Indians now become more imperative than ever. These "wards of the Nation" must not suffer because righteousness has prevailed in Congress. The Government will, in some form, provide secular education for all; but evangelistic work, and all to which it leads, must be pressed with redoubled energy.

DOINGS AT THE CAPITAL.

[Special Correspondence from Washington.]

MARCH 2, the House District Committee gave a hearing on the Sunday rest bill. This bill, introduced by Mr. Morse, of Massachusetts, provides:—

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 performed 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 or 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.

Sec. 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.

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

This bill was referred to the commissioners of the District of Columbia, who, after granting a hearing upon it, refused to recommend it for passage.

Its friends then besieged the District Committee of the House, who granted a hearing of two hours, the time to be divided equally between the friends and the opponents of the measure. This arrangement did not suit the advocates of the bill, however, and they were conspicuous alone by their absence. It is said, however, that they will demand another and a secret hearing.

The Bill Religious.

House bill No. 167, said its opponents, provides "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 labor," etc. If the claim herein set forth, they argued, is well founded, this is the best reason in the world why the Congress of the United States should have nothing whatever to do with it. Can man add anything to that which is divinely appointed? The most that man has ever done is to mar the work of God. Should not we be content with absolute liberty, such as all enjoy who choose to observe Sunday? If the day is divinely appointed, God is able to protect his own day, and the Government may safely confine itself to the business of regulating civil things.

It was to keep legislation within the sphere of things civil that the founders of this Republic put in the First Amendment this prohibition: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The bill under consideration is clearly in conflict with this provision of the fundamental law,

in that it both proposes a religious establishment and prohibits the free exercise of religion. It proposes to establish a day of rest and divine worship for one class, and prohibits to all who dissent from this establishment, the free exercise of the God-given right to worship according to their conscientious convictions. If this bill is enacted into law, the proscribed class will be completely at the mercy of the believers in the established Sunday, and they may deal with them as they see fit.

A Guarantee of Absolute Freedom in Matters of Religion.

If the provisions of the Constitution and the First Amendment mean anything to the American people and the world, they are a guarantee of absolute freedom in matters of religion, so long as that freedom does not lead to incivility. The bill under consideration is essentially a violation of this principle. It proposes to place in the hands of one religious party the power to determine just how much or how little labor may be performed by another religious party on a day regarded as sacred by the one and not by the other, although the labor or acts are not crimes in themselves. It proposes also to place it within the power of the favored class and the courts to judge of the religious character of the person to be exempted, thus giving to this favored class a complete monopoly in religious matters.

A Difference Between Liberty and Toleration.

Dr. Schaff, in his book, "Progress of Religious Freedom," wisely says: "There is a wide difference between toleration and liberty. The one is a concession and the other is a right; the one is a matter of expediency and the other is a principle; the one is the gift of man the other the gift of God." In a free country nobody wants to be tolerated for his religious opinions, or sacred convictions. "Toleration is an intermediate state between religious persecution and religious liberty." Religious liberty is founded in the sacredness of conscience, which is the voice of God. Liberty of conscience requires liberty of worship as its manifestation.

Toleration Presupposes an Establishment of Religion.

An act of toleration always presupposes an establishment of religion by law, and the right of the State to control public worship. Toleration may proceed from necessity or from policy, and may be withdrawn at the will of the State, or when the necessity for it ceases to exist. The American idea is that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This is infinitely above the sentiment that prevails in the Old World, and unfortunately finds supporters in the New, that liberty is only for the favored few, all others being proscribed or tolerated according to the liberality of the party in power.

There never was a community in which uniformity of religious sentiment existed.

False Zeal in Religion.

has always led men to seek the power of the State to enforce their opinion upon those holding different views. The State should punish crime by whomsoever committed, but the State has no right to create crime out of that which is laudable in itself, because the act or thing is done on time by some regarded sacred.

Since the United States declared for abso-

lute religious freedom, it has exerted an influence upon all the nations of the earth, and the tendency has been toward that high and exalted principle. But if this greatest of all nations shall relinquish that which above all has made her great, then she will lose her moral power over the nations, and like the states of South America will descend to the level of other Church and State governments.

The American System is a Free Church in a Free State.

This is the American solution of the problem of ages. Not one of the governments of the Old World ever rose higher than the theory of toleration. De Tocqueville, the French statesman, said of America, "There is no country in the whole world in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America." All this is the result of the fact that religion is free and not forced. "The church needs, and should ask nothing from the state; . . . she commends herself best to the world by attending to her proper spiritual duties, and keeping aloof from political and secular complications." "She can only lose by force and violence, she can only gain and succeed by spiritual weapons of truth and love." He is no true friend of his country, who would wish to see the religious freedom guaranteed by the Constitution narrowed in its operations, or who would favor any measure tending to such result.

Such were the arguments in substance urged before the committee, and it is believed that they were not without weight and that a majority of the committee is not favorable to the bill. * *

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET.

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

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

PRICES.

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

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

IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

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

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

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States,

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

Is Outlined in the Prophecies of Holy Scriptures,

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

Paper Covers, 25c.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
39 Bond St., New York.
Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

FATHERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY E. J. WAGONER.

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

HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE

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

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY is alone worth the price of the book.

Fine English Cloth, Substantially Bound,

CONTAINS ABOUT 400 PAGES,

Will be Sent Post-paid for \$1.00

His Glorious Appearing.

An Exposition of Matthew 24.

REVISED, ENLARGED, AND ILLUSTRATED.

Contains ninety-six pages, with twenty full-page illustrations.

The work takes up Christ's great prophecy of his own second coming, and the signs of the times are clearly pointed out in relation to that greatest of all events.

JUST THE BOOK FOR THE TIMES.

Interesting, Timely, and Instructive.

Price, attractive board cover, - - .25

With Sentinel, one year, - - - \$1.10

THE RIGHTS of the PEOPLE

Or Civil Government and Religion

By Alonzo T. Jones.

An Up-to-Date Pamphlet on the Principles of Religious Liberty.

This book cannot fail to be of great value to all in the study of the series of S. S. Lessons on Religious Liberty for the last three months of 1895. It was not written to go with these lessons, but it is fortunate and timely that it should be published at this time.

"THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE" contains fifteen chapters, the following being a portion of the chapter headings:—

Christianity and the Roman Empire—What is due to God and What to Caesar—The Powers That Be—How the United States Became a Christian Nation—What is the Nation?—Who Made the Nation?—Religious Right in the United States—Religious Right Invaded—The People's Right of Appeal—National Precedent on Right of Appeal—Sunday-law Movement in the Fourth Century and Its Parallel in the Nineteenth—Will the People Assert and Maintain Their Rights?—Religious Rights in the States.

In the four appendixes to the book are given the Declaration of Independence—The Constitution of the United States—The Dred Scott Decision, and the "Christian Nation" Decision.

This is a book of permanent value for reference and study and one that all should possess. It contains 384 pages with several illustrations, is issued as No. 32 of the *Religious Liberty Library*, and is bound in paper covers. Price 40 cents.

A finer edition on laid paper is also ready. It is neatly bound in cloth. Price One Dollar.

Address all orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO., 39 Bond St., New York
18 W. Fifth St., Kansas City, Mo.
12th & Castro Sts. Oakland, Cal.

YOUNG MAN | CULTIVATE YOUR WOMAN | MEMORY.

Procure a set of BIBLE EXERCISE CARDS containing precious texts on the PROMISES OF GOD and RULES FOR THE CHRISTIAN that every Christian should memorize. INTERESTING, INSTRUCTIVE, INSPIRING, 25c per set. Address, Wm. WARD SIMPSON, Battle Creek, Mich.



NEW YORK, MARCH 12, 1896.

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.

Do not overlook the article, "Sunday Law Persecution," on page 85.

THE article, "Is there a Principle Involved?" on page 85, is worthy of more than a cursory reading. Its candid tone will command respect, and its clear logic should carry conviction to every mind.

AS this number of the SENTINEL goes to press, five Seventh-day Adventists are on trial in Lake County, Tenn., for quietly exercising their God-given right to labor six days after having rested one. Against one of these men there are two indictments.

PETITIONS bearing 100,000 signatures have been received by the House Judiciary Committee favoring the joint resolution proposing a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States. A hearing on the resolution was held yesterday.

"WHAT strange and wicked use," remarks a London paper, "of the word Christian is being made. A dispatch tells this news of a disturbance in Crete. Some Christians murdered two Turks. In revenge some Turks murdered two Christian families. 'As soon as the news was known the Christians of neighboring villages assembled and attacked the Turks.'"

THE *Western Watchman*, a Roman Catholic paper of St. Louis, says:—

If we mistake not, the House will give the Catholic Indian schools their appropriation just as it gave the Catholic institutions of the Capital theirs. Some members of the House, mostly A. P. A.s, are fools all the time; all the members are off a little sometimes; but the whole House will not stay crazy all the time.

It seems hardly likely that this prediction will be realized. The element in Congress opposed to such appropriations is too strong. The Catholics will probably have to support their own denominational Indian schools in the future.

MARCH 4, Archbishop Kenrick, one of the most widely-known Roman Catholic prelates in the United States, died at St. Louis in the ninetieth year of his age. Archbishop Kenrick was one of the two members of the Vatican Council of 1870, who opposed the dogma of papal infallibility. It is said that but for his opposition to the will of the papacy upon that occasion, he would have been made a cardinal in November, 1892, "as a crowning feature of the golden jubilee of his election to

the bishopric." A very able argument against papal infallibility has been published, and is said to have been delivered by Archbishop Kenrick before the Vatican Council. This, however, has been denied. As some of our readers doubtless remember, this matter was published in these columns, Aug. 30, Sept. 6, and Sept. 13, 1894, but only upon its merits. We have no reliable information as to its authorship.

FEBRUARY 21st, Rev. C. J. Oehschlaeger (Lutheran), of Richmond, Va., was invited by the State Assembly, through its clerk, to officiate as chaplain for the House for the day. He declined the invitation, saying:—

I do not believe in opening a promiscuous political body with prayer. The promiscuous character of the body makes it an abuse of prayer, and the political character of the body makes it an unnatural union of Church and State. I, as a Christian, and any member of the body as a Christian, can privately pray for the sessions, but the State which that body represents has nothing to do with prayer.

If there were more ministers with the good sense of Mr. Oehschlaeger, there would be less of governmental religion and probably more personal piety in the world.

MARCH 4, a hearing was given by a committee of the Senate at Albany on bills for Sunday opening of saloons in New York. A number of ministers and other representatives of the religious forces of the city were present and protested against the passage of any such measure.

Col. Benjamin F. Watson, Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Church Temperance Society, said he was pained to hear no mention of God and his commandments by the clerical gentlemen who favored the bill. The fourth commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," has something to do with the government. Will you abolish the fourth commandment in the interest of liquor sellers?

Colonel Watson did not attempt to show wherein the fourth commandment applies to Sunday; he only assumed that liquor-selling was worse on Sunday than on other days; that it was a violation of the law of God on Sunday, and of course by necessary inference it is perfectly legitimate and moral upon other days! It is thus that arguments for Sunday-closing exalt the saloon by making it respectable and even necessary in itself, and evil only on Sunday.

THE first Congregational Church at Lowell, Mass., is in trouble and is trying to get the legislature of the State to settle some of its difficulties. Recently some of the gentlemen connected with it went before the legislature asking to have a bill passed regulating the membership of the church. This bill, as printed in the *Lowell Citizen*, of February 28, runs as follows:—

Hereafter any member of the First Congregational Church of Lowell, Mass., above the age of twenty-one years, who hires and pays for a pew or sitting in said church, may be, and act as a member of the society

of the First Congregational Church, after first giving notice in writing to the clerk of said society that he is a member of said church and that he rents and pays for a seat in said church, and upon the filing of such notice, and signing the roll of membership of said society, the person giving such notice shall have and exercise all the rights of a member of said society.

It does not appear just how discipline is to be enforced in this church after this proposed bill shall become a law. It would seem, however, that if the qualifications of members are fixed by law, if the church should desire to withdraw the hand of fellowship from any member it would have to do so by regular civil proceedings in the courts. Of course, this is quite in keeping with the various measures of religious legislation being urged in several different States. It is, nevertheless, a little in advance of anything else which we have seen seriously proposed.

REPRESENTATIVE KOSTER, of this city, has introduced into the Assembly a bill to exempt from taxation the real property of ministers and priests to the value of \$1,500. It seems scarcely possible that such a measure can procure the support of any considerable number of representatives. The fact that it has been seriously proposed, however, is significant.

Another religious measure before the New York Legislature is a bill introduced by Senator MacNulty, of Brooklyn, prohibiting on Sundays "performances of plays, operas or minstrels, whether in costume or not; also, monologs or singing, except in religious ceremonies." Commenting upon this measure the *World* says:—

This would prevent the recitation of the Declaration of Independence on Sunday, or the singing in public of the noblest music by the greatest singer, "except in religious ceremonies."

Another New York paper suggests that "a law providing that the citizen should each week pay to the church one-seventh of his earnings would give us only another phase of the robbery that is contemplated by Sunday laws and perpetrated under their sanction. If the workman and business man were compelled to labor on Sunday and give that day's wages to the ministers, the iron would enter a little deeper, perhaps, than it does now, but they would have just as much money for the week's exertion as now when they are forbidden to earn any on that day. It might be better, on the whole, if the church took its one-seventh in that manner, for then, not having a day of idleness before them on the morrow, fewer laborers would squander their week's wages in dissipation on Saturday night."

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.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

39 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.