



"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. 17.

NEW YORK, APRIL 23, 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.

ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.
CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, }
LEON A. SMITH, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PAUL BEFORE AGRIPPA.

IN Paul's day Rome ruled the world, paganism was entrenched in the laws and customs of the people, and new religions were proscribed.

All gods were then regarded as national deities, and while the gods of Rome were held to be superior to all others, even to Jehovah, Rome permitted conquered nations to maintain their accustomed worship; hence Judaism was tolerated.

But Rome forbade innovations in religion. The law was:—

"No man shall have for himself particular gods of his own; no man shall worship by himself any new or foreign gods, unless they are recognized by the public laws."¹

"Whoever introduces new religions, the tendency and character of which are unknown, whereby the minds of men may be disturbed, shall, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death."²

Christianity, while only the perfect development of the religion of the Hebrews, was regarded by both Jews and Gentiles as a new faith, and therefore prohibited; but the apostle argued that Christianity was simply the faith of the fathers, and consequently within the "law," that is, not prohibited by "law."

Paul a Roman Citizen.

Paul, though a Jew, was a Roman citizen; and this fact imparts a peculiar interest to the record of his life, because his relation to the State corresponded more nearly to that of most

men of to-day than did that of any other of the apostles.

Not every Roman subject was a citizen. There is a wide difference even to-day between residence and citizenship; and there was very much more difference then. "The early law of Rome," says the "Encyclopedia Britannica," "was essentially personal, not territorial. A man enjoyed the benefit of its institutions and of its protection, not because he happened to be within Roman territory, but because he was a citizen,—one of those by whom and for whom its law was established."



Paul Before Agrippa.

Paul, on three recorded occasions, availed himself of the privileges that were his by virtue of his Roman citizenship. And once did he plead that he was "a citizen of no mean city," Tarsus. This, however, was not tantamount to Roman citizenship, for we subsequently find the chief captain, to whom this

statement was made, apparently ignorant of the fact that the apostle was a Roman.

Paul's first appeal to his Roman citizenship is recorded in the 16th chapter of Acts. "And it came to pass," writes Luke, "as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying: the same followed Paul and us, and cried, saying, These men are the servants of the most high God, which shew unto us the way of salvation. And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour. And when her masters saw that the hope of their gains was gone, they caught Paul and Silas, and drew them into the market-place unto the rulers, and brought them to the magistrates, saying, These men, being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our city, and teach customs, which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, being Romans. And the multitude rose up together against them: and the magistrates rent off their clothes, and commanded to beat them. And when they had laid many stripes upon them, they cast them into prison, charging the jailer to keep them safely: who, having received such a charge, thrust them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks."³

Proper Dignity Maintained.

"When it was day, the magistrates sent the sergeants, saying, Let these men go." "And the keeper of the prison told this saying to Paul." "But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out. And the sergeants told these words unto the magistrates: and they feared, when they heard that they were Romans. And they came and besought them, and brought them out."⁴

Roman law guaranteed to the citizen a trial

¹ Torrey's translation of Neander's "Church History," Vol. I, p. 86.

² *Id.*

³ Acts 16:16-24.

⁴ Acts 16:37-39.

before condemnation or punishment; and in taking the course the apostle did he only insisted that the proceedings should be according to the law which the magistrates professed to respect and enforce.

We are not warranted in attributing to Paul any improper motive in thus demanding his rights under the law. He must have had in view the glory of God and the spread of the truth; and doubtless the influence upon all concerned was salutary. "Paul and Silas felt that to maintain the dignity of Christ's Church, they must not submit to the illegal course proposed by the Roman magistrates. . . . They had been publicly thrust into prison, and now refused to be privately released, without proper acknowledgments on the part of the magistrates."* It was seen that the apostle and his companion were not unreasoning fanatics, but rational, thinking men, who knew their rights and were neither afraid nor ashamed to maintain them by proper means. It was also demonstrated that they were not revengeful, for while demanding at the hands of the magistrates such acknowledgment as would vindicate them from the unjust charges made against them, they sought no revenge for the indignities they had suffered.

We cannot doubt that in all this the apostle acted wisely. It is not only the Christian's privilege but his duty to take such a course under all circumstances as will place him in a favorable light before the bar of public opinion. Silence and abject submission are sometimes mistaken for confession of the truth of unjust changes; while a calm, dignified defense and assertion of civil rights commands respect and secures attention to the principles involved. To the manly stand taken by the apostle upon this occasion is largely due under God the freedom enjoyed in the world to-day in matters of conscience.

"They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin."

Unlawful to Scourge a Roman Uncondemned.

The second recorded instance in which the apostle availed himself of his rights as a Roman citizen was when on the occasion of the uproar at Jerusalem, "the chief captain commanded him to be brought into the castle, and bade that he should be examined by scourging, that he might know wherefore they cried so against him. And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying, Take heed what thou doest; for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was freeborn. Then straightway they departed from him which should have examined him: and the chief captain also was afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him."^b But in this instance, as upon the former occasion, Paul sought no revenge. He was a Roman, but was also a Christian.

The Apostle Exercises the Citizen's Right of Appeal.

The third, and so far as we know, the last occasion upon which Paul asserted his rights as a Roman, was when "Festus, willing to

do the Jews a pleasure, answered Paul, and said, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me? Then said Paul, I stand at Cæsar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. For if I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Cæsar."^c

The appeal of a Roman citizen to the emperor could not be disregarded, and Festus answered, "Hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? unto Cæsar shalt thou go."

Festus really had no option in the matter; but there being no clearly-defined charge against the apostle, he was in doubt as to the account of the case which he ought to send to the emperor. Festus therefore kept Paul in prison until Agrippa and Bernice came unto Cæsarea. He then brought the apostle before them, and briefly recited the facts in the case, concluding thus:—

When I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death, and that he himself hath appealed to Augustus, I have determined to send him. Of whom I have no certain thing to write unto my lord. Wherefore I have brought him forth before you, and specially before thee, O king Agrippa, that, after examination had, I might have somewhat to write. For it seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not withal to signify the crimes laid against him.^d

"Then Agrippa said unto Paul," continues the record, "Thou art permitted to speak for thyself. Then Paul stretched forth the hand, and answered for himself."

Paul's defense is recorded in the twenty-sixth chapter of the Acts, and being of easy access, we shall only call attention briefly to it.

Christianity Not a New Religion.

Paul established by a circumstantial statement the fact that he was not only a Jew but a Pharisee; and then anticipating the only charge that could lie against him on religious grounds under Roman law, namely, that he had introduced a new religion or worshiped a God not recognized by Roman law, he declared: "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise of God unto our fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews."

As before remarked, Christianity was not a new religion; it was simply a new phase of that religion given to our first parents at the fall, cherished by the patriarchs, and restored to Israel through Moses; and as such it was not a violation of Roman law to teach it, nor was it an offense under the law to worship the God it revealed. But as previously stated, neither Jew nor Gentile recognized this fact. In the eyes of both, Christianity had its origin in the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, and was no part of any previously-existing system of religion; and, as they viewed it, was consequently prohibited by the law of the empire.

Recounting before the king his trip to Damascus, his experience in being stricken to the earth by a light from heaven, the voice speaking to him, his conversion, etc., the apostle declared that he witnessed none other things than the prophets and Moses did say should come—in short, that he was not a setter-forth of strange doctrines.

The Apostle Labored to Save Men.

Paul's words on this occasion were not however, merely, nor even chiefly, a defense of his

own rights; nor was it his chief object to convince Agrippa that he had violated no law. His defense of himself was rather a means to an end. It was the apostle's life work to preach the gospel; and his motto was: "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." His heart burned within him for the salvation of his royal auditors.

Most graphically did he depict the scenes attending his conversion on the way to Damascus, and most eloquently did he present the claims of the gospel and unhesitatingly declare his relation to it.

"Having therefore obtained help of God," concluded the apostle, "I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people, and to the Gentiles." "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest. Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian. And Paul said, I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am, except these bonds."^e

Forgetful as he ever was of himself, willing to endure all things that he might save some, the apostle was nevertheless conscious of the value of that physical liberty which was his by divine right; and in the words, "except these bonds," we discover something of the yearning after freedom which God has implanted in the human breast that he might gratify it by giving the glorious liberty of the children of God; for without such aspirations the message which proclaims "liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound" would fall upon ears dead alike to calls to human progress or to spiritual growth; and Christ would have died in vain.

KING MENELEK AND CHRISTIANITY.

WHILE the secular and religious press have been full of expressions of indignation concerning the attacks upon Armenian Christians by the Turks, we have seen little or nothing in condemnation of the equally unjustifiable attack of the Italian forces upon the Christian king and people of Abyssinia. The partition of Africa among the nations of Europe is evidently regarded as almost, if not quite, a Christian proceeding; for is it not being carried on by "Christian" nations? Doubtless the Italian government has as good reasons for its efforts at national aggrandizement at the expense of king Menelek and his subjects, as have any of the other "Christian" nations for their wars of conquest upon the African natives elsewhere; but there is no justification for any of them, more than there would be for a war between two of these "Christian" nations themselves.

The following letter from king Menelek to a missionary named Clarke, printed in the *Washington Post*, of April 3, breathes a spirit quite in contrast with that which led to the attack upon his country by the Italian forces. Menelek said:—

You are mistaken in believing that I do not care for your prayers. All prayers of believers are dear to me, even when they come from the children of Europe. Not all are aggressors in my kingdom; not all commit the iniquity of attacking those whom they hope to find weaker than themselves; not all have bent the

* See notes from the Life of Paul," p. 76.

^b Acts 22: 24-29.

^c Acts 25: 9-11.

^d Acts 25: 25-27.

^e Acts 26: 22, 23; 27-29.

knee before Baal, the god of destruction and the slaughterer of brothers. Many, I am sure, still truly adore the God of the cross, the God of justice and of peace. With them I feel in perfect communion of faith, and I am happy that they pray for me, for my household, and my people.

I only wish that they would make truth dwell in the sanctuary, and that instead of a mutilated gospel, which explains the confusion and the infidelity of the peoples of Europe, they would return and lead others back to the true gospel, which began with the creation of the world.

By what right do they efface the whole portion of it which precedes the coming of Jesus Christ, and have they done away with that God established for all time?

What you call the Old Testament is as true as the New, and what is contained in it must be respected and observed by those who follow Jesus and the apostles, announced by the prophets.

There are more than 300,000 of them [Jews] in my kingdom, and, though they enjoy almost complete independence, they are obedient and industrious subjects. They never conspire, pay all tributes, and respect our abuna as much as do the Christians. If they are worse in Europe it is because the Christians, too, are worse. Our Lord Jesus forgave them on the cross. Why should we persecute them? You, at least, do not persecute them. May the other Christians of Europe imitate you.

What you need is to return to our God, to observe all his ordinances, to no longer separate Moses and the prophets from the apostles, or St. Peter from St. Paul. Whoever wishes to serve God must humble himself and obey. You know that, envoy of God. Teach it in Europe and Asia. I am having it taught in Africa.

May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

MENELEK.

Of course, the fact that the Abyssinians are (professedly) Christians does not make an attack upon them any more wicked than it would be if they were heathen. The selfish grabbing for African territory at the expense of the property and lives of the natives, is altogether unchristian and wicked. Evidently all king Menelek desires of the "Christian" nations of Europe is to be let alone.

SIGNIFICANT.

[*Southern Sentinel, Melbourne.*]

OCTOBER 31, 1895, the following motion was introduced in the Anglican Synod at Auckland, N. Z.:

That this synod welcomes with thankfulness the kind expressions towards the British people, and the call to prayer for unity, contained in the letter of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII., and in response to his wishes and of those of the Archbishop of Canterbury, now respectfully requests the bishop to take such steps as he shall see fit, and call all the people in this diocese to pray to the great Head of the church for the unity of Christendom.

Although the motion did not pass, that such a motion should be introduced in an Anglican Synod is significant. It indicates a drift toward Rome.

SUNDAY ENFORCEMENT IN MASSACHUSETTS.

A LETTER received April 14, from Mr. W. T. Gibson, of Everitt, Mass., shows how the spirit of Sunday enforcement is manifesting itself in that section of the country. Mr. Gibson relates that on Sunday, April 5, he was doing some work on a chimney on the top of a building located at the intersection of Thorndyke and Robbins Streets, Everitt, when he was hailed by a policeman from the sidewalk on Robbins Street, and an interesting dialogue followed. We quote from Mr. Gibson's letter:

Officer.—Gibson, do you build chimneys Sundays?
I said, I am pointing it.
O.—Been working all day?
Yes, sir.

O.—How long have you worked Sundays?
For eighteen years.

O.—Well, you must stop this Sunday work.

I said, I think not; I am not disturbing any one. I cannot keep two days, and am not going to.

O.—You come down here.

I kept at work all the time.

He walked around to the front entrance on Thorndyke Street, and with loud voice demanded, "Gibson, come down here," several times.

I made no reply.

He then came up, as I suppose, to the top floor, and said, "Gibson!"

I said, What, sir?

O.—You must stop work.

I said, I think not. You have no right to stop my working.

O.—Do you think so?

I said, Yes, sir; and if it were a matter that I considered you had a right to demand of me, I would willingly obey you. I have a right to earn my living.

O.—Will you stop work?

I said, I do not think so.

O.—Well, if you don't, I will put you in court to-morrow.

I replied, Well, I cannot help it if you do.

He went down, and I finished my work.

Mr. Gibson expected to be summoned before the court on the following day, but up to the time of writing had not been informed of any legal proceedings against him.

Mr. Gibson was prosecuted in December, 1894, for keeping a small store open on Sunday. He was fined fifty dollars and costs on that occasion, but no effort has been made to collect the money, nor has Mr. Gibson been imprisoned in lieu thereof.

EACH HAS ITS SPHERE.

[By H. W. Bowman, in A. P. A. Magazine for April.]

THE church and civil society are two vast organizations, essentially different as to their origin, the object they have in view, and the means of obtaining that object. The church is drawn together for moral improvement and spiritual benefit; the State is a necessary mutual association to promote the civic welfare of the people.

The church instituted by Christ Jesus is founded upon revelation. The sense in which every civic society acknowledges God as its author is—it was the original will of God that men, for their own happiness and protection, should unite themselves and form the various civil societies such as exist in the world. The papal dogma that makes the church, as the exponent of God's will, the basis of civil society, is false and pernicious. The true origin of civil society is the compact of union, and submission to a supreme power; and it is from this compact that all the rights of civil society arise. Or, in the words of the wise statesmen of America, "All governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The principles of church government and State government are dissimilar. The institutions are fundamentally so unlike that they cannot be blended without destroying the nature of one or both. For the civil ruler, the great and only essential qualification is to be able to wield the chief physical force of the community, whether by means of moral influences,* or otherwise; for the church a superiority in spiritual graces—love, humility, wisdom and disinterestedness—is needed. In short, church authority and State authority rest on essentially different bases, require different qualifications, are recognized on

* The expression "moral influences," is used here evidently in its secondary or accommodated sense as meaning no more than the consensus of public opinion as to how people ought to relate themselves to each other as social beings and to the community.—EDITOR SENTINEL.

different principles. Hence a union of church and State works an injury to both.

The chief object of the church is the moral reformation of sinners, and the establishment of believers in virtue. The discipline of the church relates to internal sentiments of the soul, rather than to any external actions. Now, as physical force does not produce internal sentiments, it follows that the church, in order to obtain its object, has no other means than instruction, exhortation, exercises piety, and sometimes the exclusion from spiritual privileges of contumacious or refractory members. The use of physical coercion does not belong to the sphere of its operation. Rome, in claiming the right to use force, violates a fundamental law of the Christian religion.

Civil society has for its object the preservation of public order, the attainment of justice, the establishment of law and the acquisition of the greatest temporal happiness to the individuals composing it. To obtain this object it refers solely to external acts, not to the internal sentiments of individuals. Civil laws, not moral ones, are the only kind it can enforce. The civil power is obliged to use force in obtaining its object. Policemen do not depend on moral suasion, nor preachers of the gospel upon the use of a club. Religion is not a subject of legislation by civil government, nor civil government a province of the church. Religious freedom does not mean religious despotism. If the church is left free to worship God according to the dictates of the individual conscience, it is not thereby granted the right to usurp the powers and prerogatives of the State and exercise them. God's law covers the realm of thought, man's law that of action. Covetousness is forbidden by God, yet the State cannot punish for it. But let one reach forth his hand and steal, and the State will punish him. Religious morality does not come under the cognizance of State law, and cannot be punished before an earthly tribunal. The State can punish incivility, it cannot punish immorality. It does not enact laws because they are revealed by God, but because they are expedient to human society. Therefore a civil government is not a moral government. *Its laws are civil, not moral.* The church deals with morals—the State with civics. Civic "righteousness" is a duty owed to the State; morality involves our obligation to God.

THE MOVEMENT GROWS.

Adherents Numbered by Millions.

WHAT movement grows?—The movement that looks to the enthronement of Christ by religio-political methods; the movement that proposes to bring in a reign of "righteousness" by force of civil law and the policeman's club; the movement that proposes to make the polling places "holy ground," and turn politicians into "saints;" the movement that is now, even as in the earlier centuries, instilling the virus of the poisonous doctrine of a false theocracy into the minds of the masses; the movement that proposes to make a legal Christianity easy by removing all obstacles and crosses, and the road to ruin so hard that no sinner will dare to go in the broad road; and so bring in the temporal millennium.

The organ of the National Reformers, in 1887, said:—

The political aim of Christianity is to bring forth a time in which Christianity shall control the caucus, religion shall control the politics, the politicians shall be saints, and the polls, holy ground.

In the same year, the Woman's Christian

Temperance Union voiced the same thing in national convention, as follows: "The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law [force] through the gateway of politics." And in 1886, they said: "A true theocracy is yet to come, and the enthronement of Christ in law and law-makers." At that time the movement attracted little attention.

According to the statement of Mr. Buell, Chief of Church Statistics in Eleventh United States census, at this time nearly all the religious organizations in the land have allied themselves to the movement, so that its friends from these sources may be numbered by many ten thousands. And, as a sample of how the so-called Protestant churches are voicing the same thing, and giving their influence to the movement, we give here a quotation from a sermon recently delivered by a minister of St. Paul, Minn., as follows:—

The millions of Christian people in this country and the other millions of patriotic people allied with them in spirit, if not in name, are coming to see as never before, that the kingdom of God, which is the reign of law, of reason and of righteousness, is not to be postponed to some far celestial future, but is to be realized here and now in just laws, honest politics, clean business, and a social state in which all shall get their rights and none shall be wronged.

This is an alluring picture; one to be cherished if only it were true. But it is the one song of "peace and safety" from first to last. And the word of the eternal One is that "when they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, . . . and they shall not escape." And the rapid increase and present volume of the movement gives evidence that the great crisis is very near at hand, and the destruction even now pending.

H. F. PHELPS.

St. Paul, Minn.

A PERNICIOUS FALLACY.

BY E. J. WAGGONER.

VOX POPULI, VOX DEI,—“The voice of the people is the voice of God,”—is a very popular saying. This might be expected from the very nature of the case; for anything which tends to give “the people” a good opinion of themselves is sure to be popular. At the same time, no saying was ever invented that was farther from the truth. It is one of the most dangerous of Satan’s lies. Its effect is to lead people to ignore the plain commandments of God, which are revealed in his word, and to put themselves in the place of God. It is taken for granted that what “the people” say and do must be right, even though there may be a command of God to the contrary. And thus this mischievous saying leads “the people” to exalt themselves above God, by making them think that by their united action they can change the decrees of God.

Men ought to be able to learn something from history; if they do not, history is written in vain. The lessons which we learn from the history of the past are equivalent to lessons concerning the future, for, “The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done.” This is true because human nature is the same among all people, and in all ages. Let us recall a few of the things that have been.

The People Corrupted Their Ways.

Within a thousand years after the creation, God saw that “the people” had corrupted their way on the earth, and so nearly universal was the downward tendency, that only

one man was found who followed the expressed commandment of the Lord. Yet, although the people were so nearly unanimous in their choice of evil, it did not cease to be evil, neither did they change the mind of God. Every man who followed the way that was “right in his own eyes” was destroyed by the flood.

It was “the people” who, shortly after the flood, thought to make a name for themselves by building a city and a tower whose top should reach to heaven; but God frustrated their plan to exalt themselves above him, and their city was destroyed and they were scattered.

God Selected a People.

Coming down to later times, we find that when God would have a people for himself, who should honor him and keep the knowledge of his will alive in the earth, he found only one man, Abraham, whom he could select as the father of his people. And when that people had become great and were being conducted to the land which God had given to them, they were told, “The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people.” Deut. 7:7. The majority of “the people” ignored God, and did as they pleased. Surely, if it were true that “the voice of the people is the voice of God,” God would not have rejected the bulk of mankind for a comparatively insignificant race.

Leaving out the great world who had rejected God, and had in consequence been rejected by him, we find that “the people” whom God chose as his own peculiar people were, as a people, more often in opposition to God than in harmony with him. It was “the people” who said to Aaron, “Make us gods, which shall go before us;” and when the golden calf was made, “the people” worshiped it. It was “the people” who said, “Let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt;” and it was “the people” who time and again murmured against the Lord’s chosen prophet, and were often on the point of stoning him to death.

The People Cry, “Crucify Him.”

In the days when Christ was on earth, it was his own people to whom he came, who rejected him. When he was accused before the Roman governor, it was “the people” of Israel—God’s own chosen people—who cried, “Crucify him!”

Still later, when the disciples of Christ were many thousands in number in Jerusalem, they were still a poor, despised sect, and so few in number in comparison with “the people” who constituted the State Church, that they were compelled to flee for their lives. Then Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church. And he killed James with the sword; and when he saw that “the people” were pleased, he proceeded to take Peter also. This same Herod it was who a short time afterwards made an oration to a vast concourse who had assembled to do him honor. “And ‘the people’ gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man.” In this case “the voice of the people” was immediately shown to be *not* the voice of God, for God rebuked their impiety, and caused the vile creature, whom they called a god, to die a loathsome death.

Still later we find that “the people” whom God had taken out from among the Gentiles, became so great that they were deemed worthy of State “recognition.”

In the Great Empire of Rome, which filled the world, the “Christians” were

so numerous that the crafty and worldly-wise Constantine saw that it would be greatly to his advantage to favor them rather than his pagan subjects. So “the church” was “recognized” by the civil power, to the extent that “its ordinances and its laws” were enforced by “a statutory arrangement.” The State undertook to “regulate the administration” of the ordinances, customs, and laws of the church “in conformity with its [the church’s] constitution and object.” Thus the sect, which in the days of Paul was “everywhere spoken against,” now sat in the high places of the earth, and all nations were flowing unto it. See Isa. 2:2, 3. Surely now the voice of the people must have been the voice of God, because Rome, which was then only a synonym for “the world,” was a “Christian nation.” Mark you, this had not been brought about by a mere legal enactment without the concurrence of “the people,” but Christianity was exalted to the throne of the world because the majority so willed it. Constantine was too wise a ruler to make laws that would not receive the commendation of the majority of his subjects. The voice of the people was to him the voice of God, and when Christianity became the religion of the empire, it was simply the recognition of the prevailing sentiment.

But was the voice of the people in that case really the voice of God? Far from it. This expression of the will of “the people”—the church—was only the last step but one in that great apostasy of which Paul had written (2 Thess. 2:1-8), and which culminated in the

Establishment of the Papacy,

that “man of sin,” “the son of perdition,” who opposed and exalted himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; so that he as God sat in the temple of God, showing himself to be God. This was the practical working of the adage, “The voice of the people is the voice of God.” The falsity of that claim is shown by the fact that “the people” who have impiously exalted themselves above God by claiming that their voice is his, are to be consumed with the spirit of the Lord’s mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of his coming.

In the brief description of the rise of the Papacy, the reader cannot fail to recognize the words which the “National Reformers” use to describe their movement. It is a significant fact that the same language which they use to describe what they are working for, most accurately describes the establishment of the Papacy, that professedly Christian power that persecuted Christians to the death. There is not a plea which the National Reformers use in behalf of their proposed amendment to the Constitution, which will not apply exactly to the setting up of the Papacy. They say, This movement is wholly in the hands of the Christian Church. So was the great apostasy of the first three centuries. National Reformers say, We do not want an amendment to the Constitution until it will be the natural outgrowth of the sentiment of the Christian people of the country. All Constantine and his successors did was to make laws voicing the sentiments of “the Christian people” of the empire. Say the “Reformers,” “The success of this movement will make the United States a Christian nation.” That is what Rome became. Say they, We will never persecute. So said “Christian” Rome under similar circumstances, but time will in this case demonstrate the fact that like causes always produce like effects.

“Woe unto you, . . . because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the

sepulchers of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers." Matt. 23:29-32.

And like effects bring like punishments. Let those who are inclined toward so-called "National Reform" take heed and beware.

THE APOSTLES AND THE POWERS THAT BE.

BY PROF. W. W. PRESCOTT.

AFTER Christ was raised from the dead, he called his disciples together, and said to them, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Go throughout the whole Roman Empire and preach the gospel to every creature; yet he knew that that was directly contrary to the law of Rome. The disciples went and preached as they were instructed, and then the civil authorities came down upon them. The disciples were put in prison, but "the angel of the Lord by night opened the doors and brought them forth and said, Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life. And when they heard that, they entered into the temple early in the morning and taught. But the high priest came and they that were with him, and called the council together, and all the senate of the children of Israel, and sent to the prison to have them brought. But when the officers came and found them not in the prison, they returned and told, saying, The prison truly found we shut with all safety, and the keepers standing without before the doors; but when we had opened, we found no man within. Now when the high priest and the captain of the temple heard these things, they doubted of them whereunto this would grow. Then came one, and told them, saying, Behold, the men whom we put in prison are standing in the temple and teaching the people. Then went the captain with the officers, and brought them without violence; for they feared the people, lest they should have been stoned. And when they had brought them, they set them before the council, and the high priest asked them, saying, Did we not straightly command you that ye should not teach in this name? And behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us. Then Peter and the other apostles answered, and said, *We ought to obey God rather than man.*" Yet it was *contrary to law.*

Paul, who had himself been a persecutor, after he had been converted took Barnabas, and went out preaching, *contrary to law.* They passed through Asia Minor preaching the word, and on coming to Phillipi, healed a woman possessed of an evil spirit. "But when her master saw that the hope of their gains was gone, they caught Paul and Silas, and drew them into the market place unto the rulers; and brought them to the magistrates, saying, These men, being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our city." They did not trouble the city at all. They simply took away from the man his hope of gain. They shut them in prison, but the prison doors were thrown open,—God's way of teaching them a lesson.

At every step the apostles were hounded with that law, and yet Christ said, "Go ye

into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." They fought it out, and bled and died, and kept the fight up for centuries, till the Roman Empire was compelled to yield. That is what brought

Liberty into the World.

God was saying to Cæsar, "Keep on your side of the fence. Let my subjects teach in my realm." This had to be learned over and over again. It had to be learned in the Reformation; but the liberty that was preserved in the Dark Ages, and the liberty that we have to-day, we owe to the establishment of that principle that Cæsar has to do with the things of Cæsar, and God with the things of God. God will take care of his followers in doing this and he commands everyone of them to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's when he stays in his own realm.

Results of Church and State Union.

Let me say further, that unless these things are kept separate as God has put them, it will destroy both the Church and the State. When the Jews crucified Christ, they said, "His blood be upon us and our children forever," and it was. Of all the horrible pages of history the most horrible is the siege of Jerusalem, when mothers ate their own children; but these things came upon them because they mixed the things of God and the things of Cæsar, and took hold of the arm of Cæsar to control the things of God. They suffered the penalty. Their nation as a nation was at that time brought low, and has never recovered. And the lesson is the same to-day. Let me say that any religion that needs the support of Cæsar is not worth supporting. I care not what religion it is. Jesus Christ did not call for Cæsar to help him. He depended upon the power and the love of God to win for him. And they have won. The Roman Empire has gone down in destruction, but the kingdom of Jesus Christ lives; for it is not of this world. It is founded on eternal principles. It lives and will live. But any church that fancies it necessary to call upon Cæsar for help is not worthy to live. It had better die. Any church that asks Cæsar for help, any church that accepts the proffered help, is not a Christian church; it is Cæsarism. Any form of Christianity that fancies it necessary to get the support of the civil power, is ready to die.

These Lessons for Us To-day.

These lessons, written on the pages of sacred history, wherein God has put underlying principles, are for us to-day. What means it that in every land there is a growing desire to put together the things that God has separated? I have reports from every land of the desire to unite the Church and the State. There is a demand made for it, and I regret to say that the demand comes from the side of the church. What does it mean? It is a sign of the times. I want to tell you, my friends, that this seeking for the aid of Cæsar on the part of the church, is the published confession before God and man that the church has *lost the power of God.* When the church has the power of God it despises the power of Cæsar; it wants none of it. Think of exchanging the power of God and the religion of Jesus Christ for the power of man and hypocrisy; because all that Cæsar can do is to control the actions. God has made the mind free, and even Jesus Christ, who came to save the world, said, "If any man believe not, I judge him not." He came not to condemn, but to save.

When the church takes the power of the

civil government to aid in anything that pertains to the things of God, it is a published confession, before God, before all heaven and before man—a confession that Christianity should blush to make—that it has lost the power God has given it. Christ said, "All power in heaven and earth is given unto me." Who would exchange that power for the paltry power of Cæsar? This is for us. Have nothing to do with it. Let alone that cursed union between Church and State, which has wrought the misery of the ages, and has written in blood thousands of pages of history, and slain millions of martyrs. Have you not seen enough of it to understand the ruin it will cause? Will you not say, God rather than Cæsar; religion rather than hypocrisy?

Civil government cannot touch religion at any point, it matters not where it is, without involving a mixture which will bring trouble, to both the Church and the State. "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." God will bless, sustain, and keep every one that does this. No matter at what sacrifice—houses, friends, property,—obey God rather than man. Everyone who desires to make his religion practical is earnestly urged to keep these principles in mind.

THE SABBATH AND REST.

THE word "sabbath" means rest. After employing six days in creating the heavens and the earth, God rested on the seventh day, and was refreshed. Ex. 31:17. The rest and refreshment which pertain to the Sabbath do not arise from cessation from wearisome toil, for "the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary" (Isa. 40:28); and as the Sabbath was when it afforded Him rest and refreshment, so he has given it to man. Moreover it was instituted for man in Eden before the fall, before man was obliged to earn bread by the sweat of his brow; and it will be observed in the new earth, where toil and weariness will not be known. While it affords a welcome relief from toil in this life, it has also a rest and refreshment of a different and higher sort. It has a rest and a delight which are spiritual. Isa. 58:13, 14.

Yet this institution, given to mankind in order that they might enjoy complete and perfect rest, is being made the occasion of great unrest among men at the present time. It is being made the basis of an agitation which affects all classes of people; which disturbs political parties, causes trouble and labor to legislators and judges, and in various ways disturbs the public peace. All this is plainly a gross perversion of the God-ordained purpose of the Sabbath day.

The trouble is that men are not taking the Sabbath as God has given it to them; but they have made a sabbath of their own—the first day of week—the purpose and "law" of which are also of their own manufacture; and they are endeavoring to make this sabbath take the place of the Sabbath of the Lord. But their sabbath does not promote peace among men, but rather confusion and strife. The whole religious world is in confusion concerning its basis and proper observance. It is the center of a ceaseless agitation, which gives no satisfaction to either the Church or the State.

The remedy is to turn from the man-made institution based upon tradition and popular custom, to the Sabbath of the Lord, based upon his divine word. Whoever will observe

this divine Sabbath, will find rest and refreshment which the world knows not of. The Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day, blessed and hallowed by the Creator—gives perfect rest, as it was designed to do by its Author. The confusion, unrest, and strife, which pertain to the question of Sabbath observance in the world to-day, would cease at once if men would but observe the Sabbath God has given. But nothing else can come from the effort to establish the man-made sabbath in the place of that which is divine.

THE PURPOSE OF THE "LAW."

THE following, recently printed in the *Leamington Post*, a paper published in Essex County, Ontario, shows very plainly the purpose of the amendment to the so-called Lord's day act of that Province:—

Speaker's Chamber,
Legislative Assembly,
Toronto, April 3rd, 1896.

To ———, Esq., Blytheswood:

MY DEAR SIR,—I have been finally enabled to get a bill through the legislature prohibiting farmers from working on the sabbath day. I trust this will have the effect desired in regard to the second Adventists who have been giving some annoyance in your neighborhood.

Yours respectfully,

W. D. BALFOUR.

As "the intent of the law-makers is the law," there can be no question as to the "law" for Sabbatarians in Ontario. They must observe the legal "sabbath" or suffer for it. Bigotry has so decreed and legislators have so voted.

THE BARBER SUNDAY LAW UPHELD.

THE New York State Court of Appeals, in session at Albany, affirmed, April 14, the decision of the lower court in the case of the people *vs.* Henry J. Havenor, a barber of New York City, who was convicted of keeping open his shop on Sunday during prohibited hours. The "law" covering the case provides that barber shops in New York City and Saratoga may be kept open on Sundays until 1 o'clock P. M., but those in all other places must be closed the entire day.

The court was divided on the case, three judges sustaining the "law," and two holding it to be unconstitutional. The opinions of the two dissenting judges, Gray and Bartlett, are not based upon the principle of religious freedom. As quoted by the *New York Sun*, of April 15, Judge Gray said: "Regarded as an exercise of police power it cannot be justified as either necessary for the good of society or as conducive to its welfare; and it is violative of constitutional principles in that it restrains unduly and unequally the liberty of those engaged in a lawful business." In other words, the "law" is, in his opinion, class legislation, and therefore unconstitutional. Judge Bartlett holds a similar view, but in referring to the decision of the court, says that the court has very properly held that the "Christian sabbath" is one of the civil institutions of the State, and that the legislature may regulate its observance and prevent its desecration. Thus he dissents from the lesser injustice, while upholding the far greater one of religious legislation.

The principle which should have been recognized is that any Sunday "law" is class legislation, since it is passed in the interests of a certain class of the people—those who keep Sunday and want others to keep it—and against the interests of that class who regard Sunday as merely a working day. If this plain and vital fact be ignored, it is useless

to oppose the "law" on other grounds. The battle for freedom will never be permanently gained while the principle of Sunday legislation is allowed to stand.

This decision adds one more prop to the legal support of the Sunday sabbath. And when Sunday observance is fully established in the civil "law," the civil liberty of the people will be at an end. We are fast nearing the time when the dividing line will be drawn between moral freemen and moral slaves.

THE PROPOSED SUNDAY REST LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

DISCUSSING the proposed Sunday "law" for the District of Columbia, Mr. Allen Moon, President of the International Religious Liberty Association, says in the *Washington Star* of the 8th inst:—

"I and a multitude of others are compelled to dissent from the views presented by the Rev. Dr. Elliott. I am pleased to know that the gentleman agrees with me on so many points presented in my former letter. I take it that he agrees with me on all points not controverted. But how he can find in the expression 'Sundays excepted' a recognition of Sunday, and a precedent for enacting Sunday 'laws,' is rather difficult to conceive. The Constitution nowhere says the President shall rest on Sunday, nor does it say that Congress may enact that the President shall rest on Sunday, nor that he shall not sign any bill on Sunday, but simply in the count of days Sunday shall be a *dies non*. . . . There is a wide difference between Congress legislating that every man shall observe a sabbath and leaving him free to do that which may be, and is with many, a matter of faith.

"The Declaration of Independence asserts that men have inalienable rights, and that governments are instituted to secure these rights, not to invade them. The convention that framed the Constitution had a perfect right to adjourn over Sunday, but by this act it did not obligate Congress to compel all men to follow its example in observing the day. The individual members of the convention might be believers in the Sunday institution and regard it for themselves, but it would have been tyranny for them to have enforced their religious practice upon the people of the nation.

"It is a sufficient answer to Dr. Elliott's question as to whether the District government did enact sectarian laws to say that no human government is infallible, and laws have been enacted, even in this land of liberty, that have resulted in sending Christian men to prison and the chain-gang for no crime whatever, except that they had violated the religious sentiment of the people that had been enacted into law.

"The chief object of the pending bill is to get Congress committed in favor of the religious sentiment of the people as regards the Sunday institution. Let us see how this bill would affect the liberty of the whole community. After the prohibitions of the bill, the second section provides that it shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for servile labor on the first day of the week that the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as a day of rest. There is no guarantee that the man who observes another day shall not be arrested on Sunday and locked up until Monday, and then be brought before the court to make a defense. I want to ask, is it in harmony with liberty that American citizens and Christians should thus be subjected to arrest and arraignment, and be compelled to

prove that they observe another sabbath, in order to be exempt from the operations of a religious law? And also 'that the labor complained of was done in such a manner as not to interrupt or disturb other persons in the observance of the first day of the week as a day of rest.' When people have a law in their favor they will be disturbed, if they have to turn detective and go spying into windows to see if they cannot find something to disturb them, as several gentlemen have reported having done the last few Sundays past. This is not the worst feature of this clause, for there is no provision whatever for the man who has no religious convictions. If he cannot set up the defense provided for in the bill, he must meekly submit and keep the religious day, whether he will or not. There is no liberty in it; it is monopoly. We must not be disturbed; the State must protect us in every minutia, is the spirit of this measure. I am a Christian, but I believe that the God-given right of every man is inalienable.

"The bill being religious and only religious, it follows conclusively that Congress is positively forbidden by the first amendment to have anything at all to do with it, for that such is the intent of the first amendment is evident from the following consideration: Amid the discussion and the interesting and important events that immediately preceded and, in fact, led up to the making of the Constitution as it is as respects religion, this whole question was widely discussed, and James Madison published these words: 'We hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth that religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence. The religion, then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man, and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate.' For these and other reasons we protest against the proposed District Sunday bill."

INFANT CRIMINALS.

[*New York World*, April 12.]

WHAT is the meaning of the prevalent epidemic of precocious crime? What are its causes? One day we read of a band of boy train-wreckers up the State, another day of a band of boy burglars in the wholesale district of the city. In Jersey City even little Mamie Timothy turns highwayman and robs smaller children, and her ten-year-old brother John breaks jail twice in a day. On Fifth Avenue eleven-year-old George Farrell and two companions hold up and rob two full-grown women. Even a police captain in New York is imposed on by a boy criminal. In a single day we have the stories of a boy firebug of thirteen years of age, of an eight-year-old thief and of two others aged sixteen and seventeen respectively.

It is not pleasant to think that the natural explanation of the existence of this evil is one which holds out no promise of relief from it. Children get their ideas of right and wrong from their surroundings, and largely from parental influence, and the laws of New York and of all adjoining States are doing as much as lies in their power to confuse all the natural ideas of right and wrong in the minds of those who are most exposed to temptation.

Such harmless actions as getting shaved on Sunday or selling a pint of milk or giving away a sandwich are now solemnly proclaimed by the laws of New York to be crimes. . .

Innocent acts which the people have committed unmolested for generations have been by law declared to be as criminal as burglary, highway robbery and larceny. It is no wonder that this produces a confusion of ideas; no wonder that dull, illogical children think that the crime of robbing is after all no worse than the harmless acts for which their parents and neighbors are raided and arrested.

This is one explanation of the epidemic, and it may serve to show that the attempt to reform people against their will may sometimes bring about the very opposite result to what was intended.

THE SUPPORT OF A WORLDLY CHURCH.

SAYS the Cincinnati *Christian Leader*, of April 14:—

Does the Church lean on the world for support? Measurably it does. The appeals for money which the Church makes to the world through all sorts of concerts and entertainments and festivals, which minister only to the emotions, imagination and appetite, and which are devoid of all spiritual aspirations, make the fact evident that the Church is leaning largely upon the world. Has it come to this, that the "Church of the First-born" is so selfish and covetous and niggardly—so lost to all sense of self-respect—as to go cringing before an exacting world, and begging of saloonists and distillers of alcohol, and dancing masters, and sportsmen, and head men of theaters, and "society women" of bad repute, for a sordid pittance with which to run the Church—into shame and everlasting contempt!

And it is precisely such a church that covets the power of the civil arm to maintain its worldly observances which have no support

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN RUSSIA.

[*New York Independent*, April 10, 1896.]

JUST what the Russian State and Church think of religious liberty can be learned from the court proceedings at Ufa, where recently a young people were charged with having denied the Orthodox faith and become Mohammedans. The defendants declared that they had never been Christians and did not want to be, and the investigation of the officials showed that their parents had indeed, many years ago, submitted to forced baptism and were entered in the church records as converts, but that the accused had been reared as Mohammedans. On the basis of existing laws the church declared that they had been guilty of a denial of Christianity, and decreed that they should be put into a cloister, and that their property should be confiscated until they would return to the Christian religion. Essentially the same principles of procedure and laws are in vogue in the dealings of the Orthodox Church with the Protestants of the three Baltic Provinces.

A GRATIFYING DECISION.

[*Midland (Mich.) Republican*, April 10, 1896.]

It is a most gratifying fact that the judiciary committee of the House of Representatives at Washington, after careful hearing of the arguments in favor of and against the proposed so-called "Christian" amendment to the Constitution of the United States, decided unanimously not to recommend it. It is a proposition fraught with danger, and it is to be hoped it will take a long rest.

One who earnestly favored it, Dr. McAllister, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, was asked, "If the Bible is placed in the Constitution does it not become a part of the law of the land?" He said, "Yes." Again: "If,

then, the Bible is the law of the land, must not the Supreme Court give its construction to the Bible as law?" Again he said, "Yes." Then came this question: "If, then, the Supreme Court decides that the Bible Sabbath is Saturday and not Sunday, will not all citizens be compelled by law to keep Saturday instead of Sunday?" This was a poser. The doctor did not like the idea of the Bible being construed by the Supreme Court, unless he could control the court, and the answer was not forthcoming.

These few questions and sudden pause, show what a dangerous menace to the rights of conscience any such provision would be.

Large Type
BIBLES

For Those with Poor Eyesight

We have many inquiries for a Bible of convenient size to use and carry, and with large clear print. The Bible, specimen type of which is shown below, we think will meet the requirements of the case. (Specimen of type shows only one column of the Bible. It is a two-column book like most Bibles, the full size of page being 5½ x 8½ in.) Persons desiring such a Bible as

The burnt offering EXOD

32 And Aaron and his sons shall eat the flesh of the ram, and the bread that is in the basket, by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

33 And they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement

Specimen of Small Pica Type in Bible No. 1730.

this are usually elderly persons, and want simply the Scriptures themselves, without helps or references. This Bible contains a Family Register, Tables of Weights and Measures, and 16 excellent Maps, but has no references or other additional matter. It is printed from clear, new, small pica type, and is bound in French Morocco, limp round corners and has gilt edges. Sent postpaid on receipt of price. Order by number.

PRICE:

No. 1730. French Morocco, Limp Covers, Round Corners. Side and Back Title in Gold, Gilt Edges, Postpaid, \$2.00.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.

39 Bond St., New York.

Oakland, Cal.

Kansas City, Mo.

STEPS TO CHRIST,

By Mrs. E. G. White.

We take pleasure in announcing an important and exceedingly helpful work, under the title of STEPS TO CHRIST. The rare ability of the author in the presentation of Scripture truth has never been used to better advantage than in this little work. STEPS TO CHRIST is not alone suitable as a guide to the inquirer and young convert, but is rich in thought and suggestion for the most mature Christian. Some idea of its scope and practical character may be gathered from the following table of contents:—

- THE SINNER'S NEED OF CHRIST. REPENTANCE.
- CONFESSION. CONSECRATION. FAITH AND ACCEPTANCE.
- THE TEST OF DISCIPLESHIP. GROWING UP INTO CHRIST.
- THE WORK AND THE LIFE. KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.
- THE PRIVILEGE OF PRAYER. WHAT TO DO WITH DOUBT.
- REJOICING IN THE LORD.

The book is issued in a rich, neat cloth binding, embossed in silver, at 75 cents per copy; in white vellum cloth, silver edges, \$1.00. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price.

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.

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.

PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,

39 BOND STREET, - - - NEW YORK CITY.

∴ The Story of ∴

Pitcairn Island

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. The title of the new work appears above. It is written by Miss Rosa Young, one of the direct descendants of the mutineers of the *Bounty*. The book, of 256 pages, 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 continued perusal. This work is illustrated with 26 engravings by the half-tone process, and its 23 chapters have each a neatly engraved heading.

PRICE \$1.00, POSTPAID.

Thousands can be sold by those who will canvass their neighborhood. Address any State Tract Society, or

Pacific Press Publishing Company,

Kansas City, Mo. Oakland, Cal. New York City.

A DICTIONARY of the BIBLE:

COMPRISING ITS

Antiquities, Biography, Geography,
Natural History and Literature,

WITH THE

Latest Researches and References to the
Revised Version of the New Testament,

WITH EIGHT COLORED MAPS

—AND—

FOUR HUNDRED AND FORTY ILLUSTRATIONS.

By Wm. Smith, LL.D.

Revised and Edited by REVS. F. N. and M. A. PELOUBET.

Price, post-paid, - - - - - **\$2.00**

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.:

39 Bond Street, New York City.

Oakland, Cal.

Kansas City, Mo.



NEW YORK, APRIL 23, 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.

IF "An Earnest Questioner" will send us her name and address, we will take pleasure in answering her questions.

ONE million ninety-six thousand seven hundred copies of the AMERICAN SENTINEL were printed during the fiscal year ending March 31st. As we issue only fifty numbers per volume, the weekly average for the year ending March 31st was 21,934 copies, our highest average for any entire year in the history of this paper. These figures are not large, but they are encouraging, and account in large measure for the rout of the National Reformers at the hearing in Washington on March 11th.

"It is high time that one thing should be settled in this country," says the New York *Observer* of April 16, "and that is the question of the entire severance of Church and State." This is at least an admission in the right direction. Most people in this country seem to imagine that here Church and State are already severed, but this is far from the truth. Not while Christianity is held to be part of the common law of the land, not while Sunday observance is commanded by the civil "law," and not while religious combinations can force legislation from Congress, will Church and State be actually severed in this country.

A LETTER received, just as we go to press, from Mr. Allen Moon, President of the International Religious Liberty Association, informs us that C. A. Gordon and wife, the two Seventh-day Adventists of Eagle Township, Ark., sentenced on the 6th inst. by Justice DeShay, for "sabbath-breaking," are still in custody, and have been compelled to work two Sabbaths—April 11th and 18th. As stated two weeks ago, the Sunday "law" of Arkansas expressly exempts observers of the seventh day; but in this case the statute has been overridden in the interests of Sunday "sacredness." Everything possible is being done to secure justice for this persecuted couple. They have been very brutally treated notwithstanding the fact that they are known to be respectable people.

"CHIEF CONLIN, of the Police Department, was sitting on the bench with Magistrate Wentworth in the Jefferson Market Police Court this morning," says the *Evening World*, of the 13th inst. "The chief looked with amazement when he heard the complaint

of one officer who told Magistrate Wentworth that he arrested Luigi Govis, a poor Italian vender, who violated the Sunday law yesterday by selling two cents' worth of onions. The policeman looked proud as he presented his case before the magistrate in presence of his chief. 'My! but that's a serious crime,' said Chief Conlin in an undertone. Magistrate Wentworth seemed to think so, for he fined Govis \$1."

A FEW flower venders still continue to sell in this city on Sunday, but it is illegal. The traffic in roses, pinks, violets, etc., goes on only because policemen fail to do their sworn "duty." Doubtless some ardent "reformer," or more likely some "pious" dealer who prefers to close and who wants no Sunday competition, will discover ere long that the "law" ought to be enforced "because it is 'law,'" and then the street corner Sunday flower venders will have to go; but the sellers of vile cigars who stand on the same corners and thrust themselves and their offensive wares upon the attention of all passers-by can legally continue their traffic, for that is the "law." Great is the Sunday law!

THE Rev. W. N. Cleveland, pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Chaumont, N. Y., and brother of the President, has filed an earnest protest against the action of the St. Lawrence Presbytery in forcibly severing his pastoral relation with his church. It is alleged that political considerations were the cause of Mr. Cleveland's dismissal. Assuming this to be true, his case but illustrates the state of things which will prevail when politics and religion shall have been united, as is now presaged by the political activity of the churches and religious organizations. It will then be in order, when a political party comes into power, to remove church pastors for political reasons, just as it is now considered to be proper to remove civil officials on the same grounds.

THE agitation for stricter Sunday laws in this country has received an impetus by the announced intention of the Western League of baseball players to play Sunday games. "At Indianapolis, Ind.," says the *Christian Statesman*, "the ministers have taken hold of the matter with earnestness and much practical unanimity, and have interviewed both the mayor of the city and the sheriff of the county." What a spectacle—ministers of the gospel of Christ appealing to the mayor and the sheriff to prevent an act because it is regarded as irreligious! What a testimony to give to the mayor, the sheriff, and the world of their own powerlessness as ambassadors of Christ! Is irreligion to be put down in this earth by the exercise of the civil power? What is the power of the divine word for if not to turn men from sin to righteousness?

It is a pity that such "earnestness and practical unanimity" should not have been displayed in holding up the divine Sacrifice

that "taketh away the sins of the world," and presenting the Sabbath of the Lord, as a day of blessing for mankind,—a token of the Creator's love. Ah, there was the trouble; there was no "practical unanimity" among them regarding the Sabbath day, except that they believed it to be Sunday. Concerning its nature and obligation, its basis in the divine economy and its proper observance, they were all at variance. They could cite no divine authority in support of their contention that Sunday should be kept as a holy day. There was "practical unanimity" among them only on the one point that people ought to be made to observe Sunday as the Sabbath; and it is not to be wondered at that under such circumstances they confined their efforts to an appeal to the mayor and the sheriff.

THE New York *Christian Advocate*, of April 16, quotes the following from Dr. A. H. Plumb:—

The civil rest day is coming to be acknowledged by all true social reformers as a precious boon for the workingman, but we may all be well assured that we cannot long have our civil rest day unless religion helps to save it for us.

This is in harmony with the statement made by Rev. W. F. Crafts, a National Reform leader, that when religion is taken out of the Sabbath day, the rest is taken out of it also; and shows that a religious observance of the rest day must be the ultimate aim of all attempts to enforce Sabbath-keeping by law.

It is true that without religion, there can be no real rest in Sabbath observance; and this alone affords proof that it is just as impossible to give men Sabbath rest by law as it is to make them religious by law.

ON a recent rainy Sunday a New York street pedler sold an umbrella to a police spy, and was arrested for desecrating the sabbath, and fined \$5, in default of which he went to jail. Commenting on these facts, a Free-thought journal bitterly says:—

We are accustomed to look to the past for examples of religious barbarism, but we do not need to while such outrages as this are perpetrated in our own day. It may be said that the punishment now is not so barbarous as formerly, but it cannot be denied that the spirit which inflicts it is as savage as ever. Advancing civilization has left the Sabbatarians [improperly so called] behind in company with the Spanish Inquisitors, who, compared with their environment, were no greater monsters than the religious bigots of to day.

Were it not for "examples of religious barbarism" and intolerance there would be fewer "freethinkers." Infidelity flourishes when Christianity denies itself by appealing to civil power.

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.