



"Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political."

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, MAY 25, 1893.

NUMBER 21.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, - - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

Of the Sunday closing of the great Fair now in progress at Chicago, the *Herald* of that city, says:—

The closing of the gates will not be an unmixed evil. The indignation which it will excite will be a death-blow to similar crank legislation. The first step toward the union of Church and State in this country will be the last.

This is a mistake. "The territory that Government invades it dominates. The jurisdiction it takes it keeps." It was Senator Plumb who said this, but years before, Hon. Richard M. Johnson, as chairman of the House Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, said in his report on the proposition to abolish Sunday mails:—

Let the national legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge of the fairest portions of the Old World.

Of the principle of governmental interference in religious matters, Mr. Johnson said:—

If admitted, it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when the influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence.

The closing of the World's Fair by an act of Congress is only the beginning of the end. The people refused to believe it possible that any such action would be taken until it had been done. And even then they were not thoroughly aroused. Now it is too late. In any event the misguided religious influence that secured the closing of the gates of Jackson Park will be strengthened. If the Fair remains closed the precedent will have been thoroughly established. On the other hand

should the Fair be opened on Sunday in defiance of law the advocates of Sunday closing would pose as the defenders of law and order, and congressmen jealous for their authority, and touched because it had been set at naught would go to still greater lengths in order to vindicate past action. The Government stands committed to the championship of a religious institution, and not only so, but to a course of religious legislation at the dictation of the same influence that was potent to secure passage of the Sunday-closing proviso.

Why They Refuse Obedience.

LAST week we gave, at some length, evidence showing that the Adventists who have been imprisoned in Tennessee and Maryland for violation of the Sunday laws of those States, hold not only that the fourth commandment enjoins abstinence from labor on the seventh day of the week, but that it also forbids a like observance of any other day; and that for this reason, and for this reason only, they subject themselves to imprisonment by working on the first day of the week. On another page of this paper is an article written by one of these martyrs to his faith which fully bears out the statements which we made last week.

As will be seen by reading the article referred to, found on page 163, the persecuted Adventists hold that the Roman Catholic Church, the Papacy, is the persecuting power described in Dan. 7:25, 26, and parallel texts, and that the Sunday-Sabbath is the badge of its power. Commenting on Dan. 7:25, Dr. Albert Barnes says: "Can any one doubt that this is true of the Papacy? . . . Indeed, the slightest acquaintance with the history of the Papacy will convince any one that what is here said of making 'war with the saints' (verse 21), and wearing 'out the saints of the Most High' (verse 25), is strictly applicable to that power, and will accurately describe its history."

This is the view generally entertained by Protestants, not only of the application of Dan 7:25, but of many other scriptures. But one feature of the prophecy is very generally overlooked. Dan. 7:25 not only says of this power that he

should "speak great words against the Most High," and "wear out the saints of the Most High," but also that he should "think to change times and laws," evidently of the Most High. This prophecy, the Adventists believe, is fulfilled in the change of the Sabbath, by the Papacy. And as shown last week by quotations from Catholic catechisms, the Romish Church boasts of having made the change, and appeals to that fact, and the acquiescence of Protestants in the change, as proof of its power to establish feasts and holy days and to command their observance under sin.

That the Sabbath has been changed so far as it is possible for man to change that which God has established, all are agreed; but when it comes to stating the reason and manner of the change, there is not the same unanimity of sentiment. Some have endeavored to show that it was by divine authority, but for this position there is no warrant in the Scriptures; moreover, the very nature of the Sabbath law forbids the idea that it should at one time enforce one day and at another time another day. The fourth commandment sets forth explicitly the reason for enjoining the observance of the Sabbath, namely, the creation of the world, and God's rest on the seventh day of the creation week; and to change the day must, of necessity, change the reason for its observance. And to change the reason for an institution is to entirely change the institution itself, or rather it is to destroy one institution and establish another in its stead. And this is just what has been done, as far as man could do it, in the case of the Sabbath; for instead of the seventh day being kept as a memorial of creation, we have another day kept for another reason.

That this change was made this side of Christ and the apostles, is thus confessed by an adherent of the Sunday Sabbath:—

The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian Church; and on this basis, and on none other, does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest.—*Christian at Work, Jan. 8, 1885.*

In order that none may misunderstand what is meant by "the early Christian Church," we supplement this quotation

by another from the same paper under date of Feb. 18, 1886, as follows:—

We hear less than we used to about the apostolic origin of the present Sunday observance and for the reason that while the Sabbath and Sabbath rest are woven into the warp and woof of Scripture, it is now seen, as it is admitted, that we must go to later than apostolic times for the establishment of Sunday observance.

This latter quotation shows clearly that the *Christian at Work* does not think that the apostles, nor the Church in the days of the apostles, had anything whatever to do with the change; and in this it is manifestly correct, as can be demonstrated by the most reliable historians. We have room in this connection for only a single extract, and until that is controverted (and it never can be), it will not be necessary to cite any other proof. Neander, of whom "McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia" says that he is "universally conceded to be by far the greatest of ecclesiastical historians," gives this pointed and candid testimony:—

The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them and from the early apostolic Church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin.—*Rose's Neander, page 186.*

This is a plain statement. But the fact remains that the change has been made; and if Christ and the apostles did not make it, how was it accomplished? If there is no divine authority for the change what authority is there for it? And if it was not introduced in the days of the apostolic Church, when was it brought in?

In answer to these questions Adventists say the Papacy made the change not only without divine authority but in direct violation of the divine law; and that to observe the day is, in effect, to recognize this apostate power as above God, who instituted the Sabbath. But it is objected by some that, as the Sabbath was changed at least as early as the fourth century, whereas the earliest date assigned by Protestants for the establishment of the Papacy is A. D. 538, it is not possible that the Papacy changed the Sabbath, a century before it (the Papacy) had an existence.

But let those who make this objection remember that the Papacy was the result of growth. It did not spring into being in a day, nor did it attain full stature in a century. As early as A. D. 54, the Apostle Paul wrote:—

For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. 2 Thess. 2:7, 8.

This, as all Protestants agree, is a reference to the Papacy, or at least to the apostasy which culminated in the Papacy. The fact is, that instead of being established in A. D. 538, the papal power attained its majority at that time. Its infancy and youth were far back of that date, and not a little of its work was done before that time. In his history of the "Early Church," p. 591, Killen says of the bishop of Rome:—

In the third century the chief pastor of the Western metropolis must have been known to the great officers of government, and perhaps to the emperor himself. Decius must have regarded the Roman bishop as a somewhat formidable personage when he declared that he would sooner tolerate a rival candidate for the throne, and when he proclaimed his determination to annihilate the very office.

At this time the bishop, or pope, of Rome exercised power over only a part of the church, but his power was the same in kind, if not in extent, that was exercised by his successors two centuries later. Those who deny that the Papacy changed the Sabbath, on the ground that the change was effected before that power had an existence, only show how limited is their knowledge of the history of the first great apostasy, and the development of the papal power.

Protestants all agree that the papal system has in it many features borrowed from paganism; and just so surely as it has, Sunday-keeping is one of them. Every Bible student knows that the Scriptures contain no hint of the change of the Sabbath by divine authority; scores of first-day writers have acknowledged the fact; ecclesiastical historians of note have repeatedly said that "the festival of Sunday was always a human ordinance." Do Adventists not justly accuse "the mystery of iniquity," which, even in Paul's day, was working for the corruption of the Church, with the crime of thinking to change the law of God, especially the fourth commandment, as foretold by the prophet Daniel? And do they not also do well to obey God rather than man, even when to do so involves civil penalties? C. P. B.

Forbidden by the Word of God.

We are asked to explain why it is that if a theocracy was a good thing for the children of Israel it would not be an equally good thing now. This is not for us to say. God has said that there shall be a theocracy no more until He come whose right it is; and then the dominion will be given to him. It follows that anything claiming to be a theocracy since the passing away of the Jewish theocracy, could be only man-made, and without divine authority. The government of Israel was a true theocracy. That was really a government of God. At the burning bush, God commissioned Moses to lead his people out of Egypt. By signs and wonders and mighty miracles multiplied, God delivered Israel from Egypt, led them through the Red Sea, and through the wilderness, and finally into the promised land. There he ruled them by judges, to whom "in diverse manners" he revealed his will, "until Samuel the prophet."

In the days of Samuel, the people asked that they might have a king. Their request was granted, but only under earnest protest. "Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us; that we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles. And Samuel heard all the words of the people, and he rehearsed them in the ears of the Lord. And the Lord said to Samuel, Harken unto their voice, and make them a king. And Samuel said unto the men of Israel, Go ye every man unto his city."

God chose Saul, and Samuel anointed him king over Israel. But Saul failed to do the will of God, and as he rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord rejected him from being king, and sent Samuel to anoint David king over Israel; and David's house, and David's throne, God established for evermore.

When Solomon succeeded to the king-

dom in the place of David his father, the record is: "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father." 1 Chron. 29:23. David's throne was the throne of the Lord, and Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king over the earthly kingdom of God. The succession to the throne descended in David's line to Zedekiah, who was made subject to the king of Babylon, that perchance the kingship with the kingdom might stand. Zedekiah entered into a solemn covenant before God that he would remain a faithful subject of the king of Babylon. His name was Mattaniah at first, and when he entered into this covenant, the king of Babylon changed his name to Zedekiah, which means *The Justice of Jehovah*. Mattaniah gave his hand, and accepted this new name as the seal of the covenant with the king of Babylon, and in so doing pledged that if he should break that covenant, he would incur the judgment of the Lord.

Zedekiah did break this covenant, upon which the Lord said: "As I live, saith the Lord God, surely in the place where the king dwelleth that made him king, whose oath he despised, and whose covenant he brake, even with him in the midst of Babylon he shall die. . . . Seeing he despised the oath by breaking the covenant, when, lo, he had given his hand, and hath done all these things, he shall not escape. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; As I live, surely my oath that he hath despised, and my covenant that he hath broken, even it will I recompense upon his own head." Eze. 17:16-19. And in recompensing this evil upon the head of Zedekiah, the word of Samuel to the people was fulfilled when he told them, "If ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king." For to Zedekiah, and to the kingdom forever after, God gave this testimony: "Thou profane, wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." Eze. 21:25-27.

The kingdom was then subject to Babylon. When Babylon fell, and Medo-Persia succeeded, it was overturned the first time. When Medo-Persia fell, and was succeeded by Grecia, it was overturned the second time. When the Greek empire gave way to Rome, it was overturned the third time. And then says the word, "It shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." And he whose right it is, is thus named: "Thou . . . shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:31-33.

But that kingdom is not of this world, nor will he sit upon that throne in this world. While Christ was here as "that prophet," a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, he refused to exercise any earthly authority or office whatever. When appealed to, to mediate in a dispute between two brothers in regard to their inheritance, he replied, "Man, who

made me a judge or a divider over you?" Luke 12:14. And when the people would have taken him and made him a king, he withdrew himself from them, and went to the mountain alone. John 6:15. The last night he spent on earth before his crucifixion, and in the last talk with Pilate before he went to the cross, he said, "My kingdom is not of this world." John 18:36. Thus the throne of the Lord has been removed from this world, and will be no more in this world nor of this world, until, as King of kings and Lord of lords, he whose right it is shall come again. And *that time is the end of this world and the beginning of the world to come.* This is shown by many scriptures, some of which it will be in order here to quote.

To the twelve disciples the Saviour said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Luke 22:29, 30. As to when this shall be, we are informed by the Word in Matthew, thus: "*In the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.*" Matt. 19:23. And the time when he shall sit upon the throne of his glory, is stated by another passage in Matthew, thus: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations." Chap. 25:31, 32. By these scriptures and all others on the subject, it is evident that the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of God, is not only not of this world, but is nevermore to be of this world. Therefore while this world stands, a theocracy can never be in it again. From the death of Christ until now, every theory of an earthly theocracy has been a false theory. And from now unto the end of the world, every such theory will be a false theory.

The Logical Conclusion Reached.

In an editorial article written during the first week of the World's Fair, the *Chicago Herald* says:—

If the directors will listen to the protests voiced last Sunday in the vast multitude that sought admission, and in the rather scant attendance week days up to this time, they will open the gates of Jackson park next Sunday and every Sunday thereafter. Give Congress back its paltry appropriation and let the American people rule the Columbian Exposition. It belongs to them.

It is certain that Congress was outside its legitimate sphere of legislation when it passed the Sunday-closing proviso. Congress of course has a right to affix conditions to appropriations which it may make, but it has no right to attach any religious condition or test to any legislative act. This Sunday closing was a religious condition, it affixed a test of the performance of a stated religious form as the condition precedent to acceptance of an appropriation. This test Congress had no right to establish, and if Congress had no right to make it, the National Commission and the Local Directory could not properly accept it. If they did accept it, that would not cure the fatal defect of unconstitutionality in the original act. The Directory of the World's Fair and the National Commission were not gifted with supreme legislative capacity by which they could render bad law good

law, and make constitutional that which was unconstitutional—what the supreme law of the land, by which all legislative acts must be corrected and adjusted, rendered invalid and ineffective—that no private corporation, or creature of Congress, could render valid or effective. Congress passed, and the President of the United States signed, an act which was constitutionally invalid. The World's Fair authorities formally promised to obey the unlawful requirement, and lastly, due obedience was rendered. But had all this any effect to annul the phrase of the Constitution which says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"? Certainly not. If that clause of the Constitution was in force when Congress passed the Sunday-closing proviso, it is in force now. However, this was not the first step. The three possible stages of legislative discrimination, in religion, asserted in the convention which adopted the Virginia "Declaration of Rights," as the logical progress of religious legislation, have been consecutively reached.

The Supreme Court has given a judicial preference to Christianity in this country. Congress has discriminated in favor of a certain body of Christians—the World's Fair authorities have enforced the discrimination. This is the complete judicial, legislative, and executive series. Because the Commission and the Directory have consummated the judicial theory and the legislative mandate by the executive act, it does not of necessity follow that the theory was correct and the whole series sound. On the contrary deductions from an unsound premise must necessarily be unsound. In this case the theory being false, the entire series falls. As a matter of charity, and what, in many business circles, would be thought an unnecessary refinement of conscience, the World's Fair authorities might kindly refund the \$2,500,000 granted them with a proviso attached which was void from the beginning, but they could not necessarily be compelled so to do.

Congress has trifled with this matter in the most pitiful manner. It passed legislation which many did know and all should have known, was forbidden to it. Then, too weakly proud to acknowledge an error, and too politically timid to take any course to undo its effects, it subsequently diverted a portion of its gift, with the intent, probably, on the part of certain ones at least, to raise a question as to whether or no Congress had not, by breaking faith, released the Fair from its acceptance of the proviso, because the proviso was accepted as to the whole, and not as to a portion.

When the supreme law-making power of the country can be influenced to such things in the face of the earnest warnings from its own statesmen, spread upon the pages of its own early records, how can it be said that the American people still rule? And what, now, belongs to them?

W. H. M.

THE best security for the Sabbath is not in any civil law, but in its holy observance by those who love its great Founder. Let our own example strengthen that moral sentiment in the community which is more powerful than anything else for the preservation of the Sabbath. —*N. Y. Christian Advocate.*

The Sunday Question Discussed by an Imprisoned Adventist.

THE question of Sunday observance is the question of to-day; and that it is part of history and prophecy no one can deny. In the prophecy of Daniel, beasts of fierce character, and otherwise, are used to show governments of like character. In Rev. 13, the last power or government is shown coming up, having two horns like a lamb, but speaks as a dragon. It makes an image to the beast—the Papacy—and it is to cause the earth and the inhabitants thereof to worship the first beast, or in other words, to acknowledge its authority. The Roman Catholic Church "changed" the Sabbath, and thus fulfilled Dan. 7:25. History agrees with this; and the Catholic Church claims Sunday as a badge of its authority to "command feasts and holy days."

When the World's Fair Sunday-closing measure was before the United States Senate, they deliberately took the fourth commandment and substituted therein the first day for the seventh. Now look for a parallel. On the occasion of the fifty-third anniversary of the Philadelphia Sabbath Association, Rev. Dr. R. C. Matlock, in an earnest address before this body, discussed the observance of Sunday from the standpoint of religion, morality and patriotism. Rev. Dr. J. A. Worden delivered an address on the proposition that it is God's purpose to make America a great Christian Nation to evangelize the world; that America has a special mission to fulfill in the observance of Sunday; and that such observance largely rests upon the individual. He called attention to the fact that some of the European powers had issued Sunday postage stamps in order to get the sentiment of the people regarding Sunday rest. He spoke of the position this country has taken, and of the present opportunity,—the World's Fair in progress, all nations represented,—our country will thus give new life and impetus to the Sunday question all over the world.

Who can doubt that we shall soon see the fulfillment of Rev. 13:12: "And causeth the earth and them that dwell therein to worship the first beast," or acknowledge his authority?

The ministers and the religious sentiment are the direct agencies in this movement. The Apostle Paul says, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." Gal. 5:1. "Why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?" 1 Cor. 10:29. Where is the Spirit of Christ in this Sunday law? In John 13:34, 35 a new commandment is given, which is quoted by our Sunday friends as showing the old not binding. It is, "That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples." If we take the Bible as our standard, (and all Sunday advocates profess to) and measure their Sunday enforcement by it, not many disciples will be known by any man.

It can not be the love of Christ that constraineth us to force our neighbor's conscience. Whose love is it? A description of this spirit is found in Rom. 10:2, 3. "For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge, for they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the right-

eousness of God." "For all thy commandments are righteousness." Psa. 119:172. Solomon says: "I know that whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever; nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it; and God doeth it that men should fear before him." Eccl. 3:14.

Some say that the seventh day can not be the true Sabbath because so few keep it. Look at the words of our Saviour in Luke 12:32—a "little flock" only. Only eight rode safely through the flood, in the ark. The Lord asks if he shall find faith on the earth when he comes. Luke 18:8. In speaking of the Judgment, he bids us remember Lot's wife; for one single act of disobedience—looking back—she was turned to a pillar of salt. He gave the Sabbath as an everlasting memorial of creation and commands us to keep it holy. He will accept no substitute for it. He says: "To obey is better than sacrifice." 1 Sam. 15:22.

Christ says: "Tell ye the daughter of Zion, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." Matt. 21:5. Christians claim to be of Zion. How about the meekness? Some are pushing toward the kingdom with the power of the dragon, eager to execute judgment in matters of conscience, which is God's right. For even Christ himself said, "I came not to judge the world but to save the world." Wait, my brother, God's time.

J. W. JUDEFIND.

Chestertown (Md.) Jail, May 10, 1893.

Hearing at Lansing, Michigan.

A SECOND hearing was granted upon the Barbers' Sunday Rest bill, which was introduced in the Michigan legislature, on the evening of May 10. The first hearing was before the Senate Judiciary Committee, on the evening of March 2, upon the following bill:—

A bill to regulate the closing of barber shops on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

SECTION 1. *The people of the State of Michigan enact*, That it shall not be lawful for any person or persons to carry on or engage in the art or calling of hair cutting, shaving, hair dressing, and shampooing, commonly called that of a barber, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

SECTION 2. And further it shall not be lawful for any person or persons to keep open their shops or places of business aforesaid, on said first day of the week, commonly called Sunday (except such persons shall be employed to exercise such art or calling in relation to a deceased person). *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall apply to persons who conscientiously believe the seventh day of the week should be observed as the Sabbath, and who actually refrain from secular business on that day.

SECTION 3. Every person offending against the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$10 nor more than \$25, or be imprisoned in the county jail for not more than 30 days, or by both such fine or imprisonment in the discretion of the court.

SECTION 4. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The same bill, with slight modification, was about this time introduced in the House, and a few days since passed the House by a vote of sixty-four to seven. Coming into the Senate, it was referred to the committee on labor, and another hearing granted upon it before this committee. The hearing was held in the open Senate chamber, and lasted from eight o'clock in the evening until nearly midnight. Not less than one hundred persons were present. Notwithstanding the House was in session that evening until a late hour, so much interest was manifested in the dis-

cussion going on in the Senate chamber upon the barbers' bill that a number of representatives left the proceeding in the House to come in and listen to, or take part in, the discussion at the hearing.

A number of barbers, Senator McGinley and Representative Barkworth appeared in favor of the bill. Prof. G. E. Fifield and the writer spoke in opposition to it. The usual arguments in favor of such bills were made,—that the barbers were "forced" to labor on Sunday, their families deprived of their association on Sunday, would lose their positions and come to want if they refused to work on Sunday, or some barber who did not care for Sunday would keep open his shop and get some of the trade they thought they were entitled to. Senator McGinley even went so far as to declare that if it were not for Sunday laws men could not exist, and without them there would be seen no church steeples pointing heavenward and "kissing the blue-tipped clouds."

Against this and all other like measures the following arguments, in brief, were presented:—

1. All Sunday laws are religious. When the Sunday-closing measure was up in Congress last July, Senator Hawley said:—

Everybody knows what the foundation is. It is founded in religious belief.

Senator Peffer likewise said:—

To-day we are engaged in a theological discussion concerning the observance of the first day of the week.

And Senator Quay sent the Bible to the speaker's desk to have the fourth commandment read by the clerk, as the foundation for the proposed legislation. Likewise, at the former hearing of the barbers' bill above mentioned, Senator McGinley, the framer of the bill and chairman of the committee before whom the hearing was held, opened the Bible and read the fourth commandment as the foundation for asking the passage of the measure he had drafted. And everybody knows that the Bible is a religious book and the fourth commandment a religious command.

2. Religious legislation is un-American. The Government of the United States was founded on a new order of things; not the principle held by other nations that the Lord divided the human race into two classes, one to rule and the other to be ruled and enjoy their rights and liberties only as they were doled out to them; but upon the principle of the sovereignty of the people, and the equality of all men in the matter of rights.

3. Such legislation is not only un-American but unchristian. Christ said: "If any man hear my words and believe not I judge him not." John 12:47. Even if he had told man to observe the first day of the week as the Sabbath (which he never did), he would not in this life condemn them for not believing it was the Sabbath or for not keeping it. And yet, though he never gave such a command, men desire to have Congress and State legislatures step in and not only command what Christ never commanded, but condemn other men for not obeying what Christ would not have condemned though he had commanded it.

Furthermore, Paul says, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23. Sunday laws, whether made for barbers or any other class, are always enacted to compel somebody to keep Sunday who does not believe in keeping it, or who has not enough faith in it to keep it. Then it

must be evident that to force such to keep it can only be to force them to sin.

To his disciples Christ said: "Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ." If he is our Master, we are his servants. But Paul said, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. . . . So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God." Rom. 14:4, 12. In religious matters, then, the individual is responsible alone to God, and not to the Government.

4. Such legislation is also contrary to the principles of Protestantism. The birth of Protestantism was in the year 1529 at the second Diet of Spires, when the Christian princes, in response to an intolerant decree that was sought to be imposed upon the Reformers, said:—

Let us reject this decree. In matters of conscience the majority have no power.

Out of this council, says D'Aubigne, grew "a new order of things," and this new order of things was the principle of liberty in religious matters, of absolute separation of Church and State, the principle upon which the Government of the United States was founded. And this is the interpretation of the Latin phrase on the reverse side of the Great Seal of the United States, *Novus Ordo Seclorum*, "a new order of things."

The Protestants said:—

We pledge, therefore, our obedience to the Emperor in all civil matters; but as for the Word of God, it is liberty that we demand.

And Luther, the great champion of the Reformation, thus affirmed:—

I would not resort to force against such as are superstitious, nor even against unbelievers. Whosoever believeth let him draw nigh, and whoso believeth not, stand afar off. Let there be no compulsion. Liberty is the very essence of faith.

I am ready to preach, argue, write,—but I will not constrain any one: for faith is a voluntary act.

The enforcement of the Sunday Sabbath, or any other religious institution, is therefore contrary to the principles of true Protestantism.

Rev. Thomas F. Cashman, a Catholic priest of Chicago, in the *Chicago Evening Journal*, of April 8, 1893, well observed that,—

The position of coercion taken by so many of the Protestant clergy—the position that although they are admittedly in a hopeless minority of all the people of these United States, they would compel all the rest of us to accept their Sunday dogmas by recourse to law and other methods—is a grievous departure from their old battle-cry of civil and religious liberty.

5. The passage of such bills as the one under consideration is class legislation. The barbers stand no more in need of such measures than street-car drivers, butchers, merchants, etc. They all can rest on Sunday if they wish to. What is not prohibited is admitted. No man ever starved to death for resting one day in seven, not even an observer of the seventh day, as unpopular as that makes one, and surely no Sunday observer would admit for a moment that Sunday-keepers, as a class, stand a poorer chance in life, or are poorer bread-earners than seventh-day keepers.

And the exemptions in it are still further class legislation, and are but acts of toleration. They simply say that the State will *allow* certain things which men have an inalienable right to do anyway. But, as Madison held,—

To grant to the State the power of tolerating is implicitly to grant to it the power of prohibiting.

And Philip Schaff states the same truth when he says:—

Toleration is a concession which may be with-

drawn; it implies a preference for the ruling form of faith and worship, and a practical disapproval of all other forms.

6. There is a compelling, persecuting spirit behind these laws. The following is from a report of an interview which a reporter of the Chicago *Evening Journal*, of April 8, had with Rev. Frederick A. Noble, pastor of the Union Park Congregational Church, Chicago:—

If Sunday observance as you advocate it is considered oppressive by a majority of the people, would you still enforce it?

Exactly as I would enforce the law in any other respect. The Supreme Court has declared this to be a Christian country, and the foundations of the country were laid in Christian truth.

The same reporter interviewed Rev. Dr. Withrow, pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church (Chicago), with the following result:—

Would you compel others to observe Sunday in your way?

Never! I believe in the fullest religious and civil liberty. But neither civil nor religious liberty means lawlessness on the part of any portion of the community. There is a Sabbath observance law on the Statute books of this and most of the other States, and the Supreme Court has lately recognized the Christian Sabbath. Sunday observance is the law of the land, and that law must be enforced the same as any other law. Anything else than that would be anarchy.

But Mr. Fairchild, in his "Moral Philosophy," has truly said:—

Intolerance and oppression are not made tolerable by being in strict accordance with the law.

7. The real object underlying all Sunday legislation is to settle a religious controversy and elevate Sunday, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath, in the place of Saturday, the seventh day, which God himself has declared is the Sabbath of the Lord our God. The United States House of Representatives, in its Sunday mail report of 1830, recognized that such was the case. It said:—

If Congress shall, by the authority of law, sanction the measure recommended, it would constitute a legislative decision of a religious controversy, in which even Christians themselves are at issue.

The State can not afford to take sides in a religious controversy. When it does, it thereby sets itself up as the enemy of those on the opposite side from that to which it adheres, and thus deprives itself of the power to keep the peace.

And finally, all the Sunday legislation in all the world can not settle the Sabbath question, or make Sunday the Sabbath. Sunday is not the Sabbath, and both Catholics and Protestants admit the fact. The Chicago Catholic priest already quoted, Rev. Thomas F. Cashman, in the Chicago *Evening Journal*, of April 8, 1893, gives the Sunday case all away in the following words:—

The church insists, remember, upon a proper observance of Sunday in commemoration of the resurrection of her Head and the descent of the Holy Ghost. *But that is church law, not divine. There is no command in the Bible which directs the observance of Sunday.* That is canon law, and though our Protestant neighbors have borrowed the day from us, we have no desire to meddle with them in its enjoyment in their own peculiar fashion. At the same time we don't want them to meddle with us. Now, as to Sunday being a Christian institution, an error loudly proclaimed; in the strict sense of the word, it was not instituted by Christ or his Church. It is not ordered by divine law nor was it ordered by the church. Constantine decreed the observance of Sunday in order to give the Christians a chance to compete with the pagans, and recognizing it was a good thing, the church in her subsequent councils adopted it.

And the American Sabbath Union, an organization started and supported by the leading Protestant denominations in the United States, in its "Pearl of Days Leaf-

lets" No. 3, entitled, "Saturday or Sunday—Which?" makes the following sweeping and fatal confession:—

But our opponents declare, "We are not satisfied with these inferences and suppositions; show us where the first day is spoken of as holy, or as being observed instead of the seventh; we must have a direct and positive command of God." We admit there is no such command.

Such was in brief the line of argument presented at the hearing.

In response to Mr. McGinley's statement that were it not for Sunday laws men could not exist, and there would be no church steeples "kissing the blue-tipped clouds," the gentleman was asked how it was that men existed before Constantine's Sunday law of 321 A. D., which history tells us was the first Sunday law, either ecclesiastical or civil, which the world ever saw, and how it is that California has church steeples kissing the skies, notwithstanding the fact that that State has no Sunday law. These and many other items of interest came up, and questions were poured in from all quarters almost without number. Thus is the Sabbath question coming before legislative assemblies.

W. A. COLCORD.

What Next?

It takes men of moral backbone to stand up stiffly against a wrong, and especially if it be in the face of a large majority of the people. Martin Luther was such a man. The combined powers, political and ecclesiastical, of the whole empire of Germany could not intimidate him in the least. Like a giant he stood in defense of the work committed to him, and came off victorious. The ruling spirits of any reformation are men of this stamp. But they are made of different material, or by the power of God made into different material, than the majority of mankind. An apparent evil may call out a protest from men, who when they see that their protests seemingly have only the effect of strengthening the bands of wickedness, and calling down upon themselves ridicule or abuse, leave that work to another.

Thus it has been in this Sunday closing of the World's Fair. When the question was first sprung, there was a storm of protests from all over the land, and the almost unanimous verdict was that such a thing as closed gates of the Columbian Exposition could never occur. No one had any idea it would come as it did, but being sprung as it was on the highest legislative body of our land, and in the way it was, on the face of it, a palpable violation of the Constitution of the United States, there arose another storm of protests, this time, not from the populace alone, but from the legislators themselves, there being at that time not more than half a dozen in both bodies who would openly champion the Sunday-closing proviso of the governmental appropriation to the World's Fair. But when the flood of petitions and protests came from the religious element of the country, threatening boycott, and fairly calling down divine vengeance on the heads of those who dared stand up against the wicked thing, one by one these protests ceased, and some of those who were loudest in denouncing the evil were the first to fall in line with the mandates of the "American Sabbath," explaining their action in such words as these: "My constituency

demand such action," and to do otherwise than to accede to their demands "would not be wise statemanship."

When this vantage ground was gained, then came the cry of "anarchists" against those who opposed this unconstitutional act. That silenced many more, for an anarchist is in disrepute in the United States. Thus things went on till the time for opening had arrived, when the report went out that in spite of everything the gates would be opened on the first Sunday, and there was general rejoicing among the masses, and on the other hand dire threatenings on the part of the religio-political leaders. But when the crucial test came, the gates closed against everybody and everything, even to one of Uncle Sam's mail wagons. It is stated also that a Frenchman presented himself at the gate and offered the keeper a twenty-dollar gold piece if he would let him inside, but that he was refused, whereupon he exclaimed: "And this is what you call personal liberty!"

The thing they wanted has been, for a moment at least, accomplished—closed gates—though already the indications are that the closing rule is not to be adhered to. But how are those looked upon who still remonstrate and protest? Dr. Lawrence, a Baptist minister of Chicago, preached a sermon on the subject Sunday, and denounced as *treasonable* all efforts that are now being made to open the Fair on Sunday. First they were "anarchists," now "traitors." What is the penalty for treason? And what may those expect who persist in this opposition to these encroachments? The prophet's ear of eighteen hundred years ago heard the fiat, and it was that "the beast should both speak and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." Are we not almost there now? And who will be able to stand?

W. E. CORNELL.

A Letter from the Capital.

408 Mass. Ave., N. W.

Washington, D. C., May 14, 1893.

AMERICAN SENTINEL: By an accident for which I shall be forever thankful I recently came into possession of the argument of Prof. A. T. Jones, delivered before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in 1888, on the cover of which I find some information respecting the aims and principles of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. I read this argument very carefully, and am persuaded that it is the most masterly defense of the Christian religion and the American Constitution ever set forth. Hence I write to you at this time.

In an address delivered recently, near this city by the Rev. Father Thomas O'Gorman, of the Catholic University of America, at the laying of the corner stone of Carroll Chapel, by His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, the orator, referring to the subject of temporal support for the ecclesiastical power, said: "I do not mean to say that such aid and support from the civil powers are unworthy of them or of the Church. *To them, it is a glory and a duty; to her, it is an homage and a right.*" This address is published in the *Church News*, of May 13, 1893; and in the editorial columns of the same respectable journal I find the following:—

Washington has once more been disgraced by the harangues of a so-called converted priest who, in imitation of low variety performances, flooded

the streets with obscene dodgers. One of these blasphemous advertisements being shown to the president of the Carroll Institute, Mr. Ed. J. Hannan, that gentleman and Mr. M. I. Weller, chairman of the committee on Catholic interests, called on the District Commissioners to protest against permission being granted for the vile lecture, the character of which was indicated by the dodger.

In another editorial on the same subject, the editor says:—

The sudden appearance of these disreputable scoundrels in so many cities shows a preconcerted movement on the part of the A. P. A., and we may expect that the nuisance will continue until it be suppressed by the police authorities, as other nuisances and obscene performances are prohibited.

What is the meaning of all this? The District Commissioners and the police are invoked to keep some poor ex-priest, hired, as is intimated, by the American Protestant Association, from *insulting* and *disturbing* the authorities of Carroll Institute and the committee on Catholic interests. But let me quote from Prof. Jones' speech: "A union of Church and State is where the ecclesiastical power controls the civil power, and uses the civil power in its own interests."

This is in harmony with our Federal Constitution. Now, that Constitution is the fruit of Protestantism and is exactly in line with the bill for establishing religious freedom in Virginia, which has been called the civil definition of Protestantism. It was written by Thomas Jefferson, and is one of the three things mentioned in the inscription on his tomb; the other two being the founding of the University of Virginia and the writing of the Declaration of Independence. It is in the twelfth volume of Hening's Statutes at Large, and is as follows:—

1. WHEREAS Almighty God hath created the mind free—that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy Author of our religion who, being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as it was in his almighty power to do.

That the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them upon others, has established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time.

That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagations of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

That even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness; and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporary rewards which, proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, is an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labor for the instruction of mankind.

That our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, any more than our opinions in physics or geometry, and therefore the proscribing of any citizen as unworthy of public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which in common with his fellow-citizens he has a natural right, and that it tends only to corrupt the principles of that religion which it is meant to encourage, by bribing with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments those who will externally profess and conform to it; and while indeed those are criminal who do not withstand such temptation, yet neither are those guiltless who lay the bait in their way.

That to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion, and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy which at once destroys all religious liberty, be-

cause he, being of course judge of that tendency, will make his opinions the rule of judgment, and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; and it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order.

And finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to itself; that it is the proper and sufficient antagonist of error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition disarmed of its natural weapons, free argument and debate—errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them.

2. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly, that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion; and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.*

3. And though we well know that this Assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding assemblies constituted with powers equal to our own; and that therefore to declare this act to be irrevocable would be of no effect in law; yet we are free to declare that the rights hereby asserted are among the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present, or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right.

I submit this Act as a reply to the *Church News* and to Father O'Gorman. It is a weightier document than the Declaration of Independence—weightier than the Augsburg Confession—weightier than any other deliverance heard in this world since those mighty words in reply to the Pharisees were uttered: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things which are God's." In fact, it is the American interpretation of the words of Christ by the greatest statesman who has lived in the world since the death of Christ. It ought to be familiar to every American citizen. It ought to be bound up in the same volume with Prof. Jones' great speech and scattered broadcast.

JOSEPH BRADFIELD.

A Law Without a Penalty.

CONGRESS passed a law closing the gates of the World's Fair on Sunday. But the law has no penalty. Hitherto a law in this Nation destitute of a penalty, had no legal or civil force. It remains to be seen whether this one closing the Fair will have any force or not. There is seemingly a penalty attached to the law if the gates of the Fair are opened on Sunday. But a more than strange feature of the penalty is that if the Board of Managers should open the gates on Sunday, they would not be held for the penalty, but Congress would withhold the \$2,500,000 appropriation. Or in other words Congress imposes a fine of \$2,500,000 on itself if the religious ideas of Congress are not carried out. But dissenters from this congressional Christianity need not borrow any trouble about the real penalty that will soon follow. As the law making Sunday the Sabbath of the Nation was unconstitutional, the penalty must also be unconstitutional. The civil power has been surrendered to the churches, chief of which is the Roman Catholic, and they can and will manufacture penalties to suit every emergency and boycott them through, the same as they boycotted the Congress of the United States. But outside of, and beyond, the penalty to be visited upon all

those who dissent from such a mongrel deformity, there is a penalty that the Nation will pay, namely: the downfall of the Nation. In the making of this a "Christian Nation," the Nation is divided against itself. Lincoln said that American slavery divided this Nation against itself and that slavery or the Nation must fall. And so it was. Slavery died and the Nation lives. But you may ask how the establishment of a national religion affects the destiny of a nation. The answer is easy. The Supreme Court violated the spirit of the Constitution in deciding that this is a "Christian Nation," and the churches and Congress did the same thing to establish a national religion. The result is that Congress and the churches and the Supreme Court are arrayed in deadly antagonism against each other, and one or the other or all together will die in the terrible struggle for supremacy. A greater than Lincoln said: "A kingdom divided against itself can not stand." The words of Jesus are more enduring than earthy kingdoms and thrones, more so than heaven and earth, for these shall pass away with a great noise, but his word abideth forever. The Constitution is practically dead—a thing of the past. Without the consent of the American people, Church and State have been united, and the image to the beast—the papal power, a national hierarchy of religion, sits enthroned in power, where once sat our proud queen of nations. Our proud bird is dead, our brilliant stars have faded from their azure sky, our triple bars,—the red white, and blue,—have faded to a "scarlet colored beast," in the tide of persecution that is inundating the land.

T. A. OPFY.

Greeley, Colo., May 6, 1893.

Sunday Observance.

LOUISVILLE is mildly excited over the question of the observance of Sunday. Two distinguished clergymen recently visited that gambler-ridden town and addressed the meeting of the American Sabbath Union, which, notwithstanding its name, insists on observance of the first day of the week instead of the seventh. But the addresses were earnest if neither eloquent nor abounding in new ideas and the meeting adjourned in the determination to keep up the agitation. It is true there is some quasi amiable criticism of the fact that the sum of \$250 was levied on the meeting for the purpose of defraying the expenses attendant on the visit and addresses of the two gentlemen, and because one of the two took occasion to advertise the fact that the other had published a book and was the editor of a paper for both of which he solicited subscribers, and offered at special rates; but that stroke of business is, perhaps, not to be condemned—it was a matter of propriety of which the reverend gentlemen must be the judges.

The principal Sunday violation to which the attention of the meeting was called was the Sunday newspaper. Rev. Mr. Crafts announced that the Sunday paper was being rapidly suppressed in his city, Pittsburg, under a law which prohibits secular labor, and Rev. H. H. George advised that it be placed under a ban of the civil law. Rev. George was the companion of Mr. Crafts and was the gentleman who called attention to the book and newspaper of his colleague and the advantageous club rates, failing,

however, to explain why it was that the Sunday paper should be put under the ban of the law, when, as Mr. Crafts said, it was being rapidly suppressed, and under a law now in force and which was accomplishing the ends so devoutly wished by the two missionaries to darkest Louisville. Why ask for another ban when one at hand is doing the suppressing act?

The fact is there is law enough, if there were a public sentiment demanding enforcement; and not all the laws of colonial times, nor of this bustling age will suppress the Sunday paper, nor any other thing until the public can be brought to believe the object of attack is harmful; and the Sunday paper is not more harmful than the paper of the other days of the week; neither is the labor of the printer on the Sunday more harmful, in itself, than the labor of the servants of the gentlemen of the convention who prepare their comforting and comfortable Sunday dinner.

If the attack is to be made let the gentlemen attack the paper of Monday morning to which they expressed no objection and which they read; yet the news is gathered for it on Sunday, written up and set up on that day requiring an army of reporters, editors, telegraph operators, messenger boys, printers, proofreaders, firemen and engineers. Why did the convention neglect to take action on the slavish condition of these men at the time its tenderest solicitude was being exercised on behalf of the men who work on Sunday papers and whom they denominated slaves, yet whose work is nearly all done on Saturday? Were they, are they, afraid of the Sunday newspaper as a competing influence? If so the remedy is with themselves—at least the fault is.—*Kentucky Journal, May 11.*

YOUNG PEOPLES' LIBRARY.

SERIES I.



Every volume in this library contains choice, wholesome, instructive reading, and, while designed for the young, it will be equally interesting to every member of the family. Each volume has 160 pages, is fully illustrated and substantially bound in fine colored cloth, handsomely embossed in jet and gold.

Series I contains six volumes, which are as follows:—

1. FIJI AND SAMOA.—Jottings from the Pacific, No. 1.
2. JACK THE CONQUEROR.
3. SAVONAROLA, the Florentine Martyr.
4. THE TONGA ISLANDS AND OTHER GROUPS.—Jottings from the Pacific, No. 2.
5. LETTERS FROM THE HOLY LAND.
6. AMONG THE NORTHERN ICEBERGS.

The set, in cloth, in a box, sent, post-paid, for \$3.60; single volumes, 60 cents each; paper, 25 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
12th & Castro Streets, OAKLAND, CAL. | 43 Bond Street, New York.

Abiding Sabbath And Lord's Day.

BY ALONZO T. JONES.

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

HEALTH FOODS.

PURE CRACKERS AND BISCUITS,
and Cereal Coffee

MANUFACTURED BY THE BATTLE CREEK BAKERY COMPANY

ESTABLISHED IN 1881.

We manufacture a choice line of these goods, entirely free from lard and all adulterations, at the following prices:—

"A"	Fruit Biscuits, white flour, - sweetened, per lb.	15c
"B"	whole wheat flour, " " " "	15c
	Fruit Crackers, not sweetened, " " " "	15c
	Lemon Cream Biscuits, " " " "	12c
	Graham " " " " " "	12c
	Oat Meal " " " " " "	12c
"A"	Graham Crackers,.....slightly sweetened	10c
"B"	" " " " " "not sweetened,.....	10c
"D"	Graham Cracker, (water crackers for dyspeptics	10c
"A"	Oat Meal " " " " " "slightly sweetened	10c
"B"	" " " " " "not sweetened,.....	10c
	Whole Wheat Crackers,.....	10c
	White " " " " " "very palatable,.....	10c
	Carbon " " " " " ".....	15c
	Gluten " " " " " ".....	30c
	Cereola, a prepared grain food, in bulk,.....	10c
	(The same as formerly advertized under the name "Granola.")	
	Pure Gluten,.....in bulk,.....per lb.	40c
	Wheat " " " " " ".....	20c
	Cereal Coffee, prepared from grains only, a very choice and healthful drink, in one and a half lb. packages (Once used, never again refused),.....	25c

Goods to the value of eight dollars, will be sent on the receipt of six dollars, being 25 per cent. discount.

We are now prepared to supply in large quantities the small round Butter Crackers, purely butter shortened, and dealers wishing to handle such will do well to write us for prices, stating how many barrels they wish to purchase, etc. The price per barrel of about 50 lbs. is seven and one half cents per lb.

Cereola and Gluten are prepared foods, thoroughly cooked and ready for use by the addition of some fluid, as milk and cream, fruit juice or water, as best agrees with the individual. Cereola is a *universal* Health Food, and is calculated for use

both in sickness and health.

In ordering, please remember that the rate of freight on 25 lbs. will be the same as on 100 lbs.

Remit by Bank Draft, Money Order, Express Order, or Postal Note. No private checks accepted.

During the month of November last we have added new and improved machinery to our plant and otherwise increased our manufacturing facilities. Therefore, with these superior advantages, we promise the consumers of Health Foods a nicer and more palatable article in this line than has ever before been produced.

Write us for special rates on large lots.

REFERENCES.

To whom it may concern:

We, the undersigned, residents of Battle Creek, Mich., take pleasure in stating that Mr. Joseph Smith, manager of the Health Food Department of the Battle Creek Bakery Co., has resided in Battle Creek for nearly 20 years, and is a competent and responsible man, and of long experience in his line of business, and one whose goods we can heartily recommend to the public.

- URIAH SMITH, Editor *Review and Herald*.
- HON. W. C. GAGE, Ex-Mayor.
- J. B. KRUG, of Krug's Business College.
- THOMAS H. BRIGGS, M. D.
- HON. GEORGE WILLARD, Pub. *Journal*.
- S. S. FRENCH, M. D.
- R. T. KINGMAN, Vice-President City Bank.
- M. RORABACHER, M. D.
- HON. W. H. MASON, postmaster.
- HON. J. W. BAILEY, Ex-Mayor.
- T. E. SANDS, M. D.

Address, BATTLE CREEK BAKERY CO., Battle Creek, Mich.

THE BATTLE CREEK SANITARIUM

For more than sixteen years the Battle Creek Sanitarium has maintained a Health Food Department, at first for the benefit of its patients and patrons, later, and for more than a dozen years, with increased facilities, to supply the general public. Within the last year **More Than 150 Tons** of the following named foods have been manufactured and sold:—

- Oatmeal Biscuit, Rye Wafers,
- Medium Oatmeal Crackers,
- Fruit Crackers, Carbon Crackers,
- Plain Oatmeal Crackers,
- No. 1 Graham Crackers, Avenola,
- No. 2 Graham Crackers, Granola,
- Plain Graham Crackers (Dyspeptic),
- Wheat Granola, White Crackers,
- Whole Wheat Wafers,
- Gluten Food, No. 1, Gluten Wafers,
- Gluten Food, No. 2, Infants' Food.

Granola, The Gem of Health Foods.

Our Granola, which has now been manufactured by us for nearly seventeen years, is unquestionably the finest health food ever devised, and is greatly superior to any of the numerous imitations to which its success has given rise.

We are constantly improving our foods, and adding to our list as the result of experimental researches conducted in the Sanitarium Laboratory of Hygiene and our Experimental Kitchen. For the latest descriptive circular and price list, address,

SANITARIUM HEALTH FOOD CO., BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

HEALTH FOODS.

TO THE PUBLIC: This certifies that the Battle Creek Sanitarium Health Foods, manufactured by the Sanitarium under the name of the Sanitarium Food Company, are made under my direction and supervision, and that Granola and the other special foods manufactured by this company, are not made or sold by any other firm or person except their duly authorized agents.
J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

Our goods are shipped to every part of the world—to Australia, New Zealand, India, Persia, and other foreign countries, as well as to all parts of the United States; and in every instance they have demonstrated their wonderful keeping properties. The following are a few of the hundreds of testimonials received from persons who have for years made use of our foods.

MICHIGAN.

I have for three years used the "Health Foods" in my family, and can heartily recommend them, both for purity and health-giving properties.
C. F. PORTER, D. D. S.

INDIANA.

Your "Health Foods" are the wonder of the nineteenth century. I have used Granola but a short time, but have already experienced relief from indigestion and acid, or flatulent dyspepsia. I also find the Zwieback nourishing and toothsome.
D. M. KAUFFMAN.

I have personally tested your excellent food known as Granola. It is highly pleasing to the taste, easy of digestion, and the most nutritive cereal production with which I am acquainted.
DR. R. W. BULLA.

NEW YORK.

Your Granola is the best selling invalid food I have ever handled. I have already sold nearly two thousand pounds.
A. J. BROUGHTON.

CONNECTICUT.

We have used your "Health Foods" in our family for three years and can not get along without them. Having been troubled with dyspepsia and chronic inflammation of the stomach, I found that your Granola, Avenola, Wheatena, and Gluten are the only foods that I can eat with safety.
Wm. M. MERWIN.

OHIO.

Our baby is a testimonial to Sanitarium food. She is ten months old, weighs twenty-eight pounds, and is as ruddy and healthy a specimen as can be seen. She has actually gained flesh while cutting her last two teeth. Her flesh is firm and sound, and she is very strong.

MINNESOTA.

We have twins, and the little fellows are thriving nicely. The food agrees with them perfectly, and I have recommended it to many who are bringing up babies "by hand."
D. W. McCOURT.



NEW YORK, MAY 25, 1893.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample Copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

On another page will be found an article written by a Seventh-day Adventist, in jail in Chestertown, Md., on complaint of a Methodist minister, for husking corn in his own field on Sunday. The article substantiates that which we stated last week, namely, that Adventists can not observe Sunday, by habitually refraining from labor or business upon that day, without violating what they believe to be a divine command.

We had hoped to be able to give our readers a letter this week from our own correspondent at Chicago, but we have been disappointed. We trust that hereafter we shall have something each week during the continuance of the Fair. These letters will not be descriptive of the Fair but will discuss from a World's Fair standpoint those questions to which the SENTINEL is devoted. Probably not one in a thousand realizes the influence that the Fair and the Congresses to be held in connection with it will have in the development of governmental religion. Already the Sunday-closing agitation has made the right of Congress to legislate upon religious questions the supreme issue of the hour.

A CATHOLIC paper complains that "the persecution of the Catholic clergy in Russia still continues with increased ardor on the part of governors and their officials. The new Governor of Wilna, Mr. Orgiefsky, has inaugurated his appointment by sending off three priests into exile for from two to six years."

No specific charges were brought against the priests, but they were exiled simply on the general charge that their presence was a menace to the peace of the district. Another priest, it is asserted, has been confined in one of the convent prisons for, inadvertently, not standing up while his brother priests were taking the oath to the Emperor. "It is the old story," remarks our Catholic contemporary, "of the wolf and the lamb. Every pretext is seized that ingenuity can conceive to harass the Catholic priesthood."

All this simply confirms that which we have frequently remarked, namely, that religious intolerance seeks in every country to hide its ugly head behind substantially the same subterfuges. Russia professes to tolerate all sects that avail themselves of certain provisions, and so does not avowedly persecute Roman Catholics on account of their religion, but upon va-

rious charges of a "civil" character. This is the same method adopted by the authorities of Tennessee and Maryland in dealing with Seventh-day Adventists. They are not openly proceeded against for being Adventists, but upon the pretext that they are inimical to the peace and quiet of the community, and that their practice of doing secular work and business on Sunday is subversive of good morals. Bigotry in America does not differ materially from the same wicked thing in Russia.

It seems probable at this writing that the entire World's Fair will be thrown open to the public on Sunday, owing to the fact that if deprived of the possible Sunday gate receipts the enterprise is certain to be a financial failure. Thus far the average daily attendance has been but little over 17,000, whereas to pay the running expenses alone the average should be 90,000.

BUT even with Sunday opening it is by no means certain that the Fair will be any better off. While there is little doubt that a majority of the people of the United States are in favor of Sunday opening, or at least not opposed to it, there is a large and aggressive minority who are so bitterly opposed to what they term a "desecration of the Christian Sabbath," that they will do all in their power to ruin the Fair in the event of its being opened on Sunday. The question of Sunday opening will probably be definitely settled before this note comes under the eye of the reader.

BUT whether or not the Fair opens on Sunday the Government stands committed on the Sunday question; it has decided that Sunday is the Sabbath and that when the fourth commandment of the Decalogue says the seventh day it means the first day. In accordance with the action of Congress, the World's Fair Post-Office will be closed on Sunday even if the Fair itself is open. On the 16th inst, Attorney-General Olney rendered a decision that the law of Congress requiring the Fair to be closed on Sunday, prohibits the opening of the post-office within the grounds upon that day.

REV. J. H. KNOWLES, General Secretary of the American Sabbath Union, was interviewed recently relative to the attitude of the union toward the Fair in event of its being open, or partially so, on Sunday. Mr. Knowles said:—

Our union proposes to do all in its power to bring about the result it has been working for nearly three years. In case the directors do not accede to our request there will be thousands of people who will stay away from Chicago on purely religious grounds. Just what action our union will take in that event I can not say. There will be no boycott, for we do not like the word boycott. It sounds rather cheap.

"Do you mean no effort will be made to keep people away from Chicago during the Fair?" asked the reporter.

"Oh, no. Organized Christianity will show the world that there is some religious sentiment in this country. It is probable that ministers all over the country will be asked to advise their congregations not to go. No doubt this would have a powerful effect and keep away thousands, and perhaps hundreds of thousands of people from the Fair."

That is, it will be a "Christian" boycott—a boycott in effect but not in name. That is about as honest as dubbing Sunday the Sabbath, when the name belongs as every body knows, to another day. There is a good deal of humbug about the so-called American Sabbath Union; and the name is not the least part of the fraud. It is fitting that it should call its boycott something that it is not.

WILBUR F. CRAFTS, and the so-called American Sabbath Union forces generally are almost wild over the action of the local Directory in deciding to open the gates of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday; they are even demanding that the President shall order United States troops to Chicago to enforce the Sunday-closing proviso. This shows to how great lengths this gigantic combination for uniting Church and State is ready to go in their nefarious work.

A LATE dispatch from Rome says: "It is understood that Mgr. Satolli has represented the hierarchy and leading Catholic laymen in the United States as anxious to start a movement in favor of establishing an American Legation at the Vatican. The movement would be so directed as to bring all possible influence to this end to bear upon the Washington Government."

THE Seattle, Wash., Missionary Society, can use a large number of copies of the SENTINEL, Signs, Review, Youth's Instructor and Little Friend in the ship work. Persons having unsoiled copies of these papers for which they have no use, will do well to send them, carriage paid, to E. T. Cornell, Seattle, Wash.

Battle Creek Sanitarium Health Foods.

THE unequalled health foods manufactured by the Sanitarium Health Food Company are neither made nor sold by others than their authorized agents. The Rural Health Retreat, St. Helena, Cal., is authorized to manufacture our granola and most of our other health foods for the Pacific Coast. The Union College is authorized to manufacture granola in Lincoln, Neb., and to supply members of the Seventh-day Adventist Conference living in that State. Our granola and other special health foods are not manufactured by any other parties.
SANTARIUM HEALTH FOOD CO.
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single copy, per year, - - - \$1.00.

In clubs of	5 to 24	copies to one address, per year,	- -	90c
	25 to 99	" " " " " "	- -	80c
	100 to 249	" " " " " "	- -	75c
	250 to 499	" " " " " "	- -	70c
	500 to 999	" " " " " "	- -	65c
	1000 or more	" " " " " "	- -	60c
To foreign countries in Postal Union,			- -	5 shillings
Address,	AMERICAN SENTINEL, 43 Bond Street, New York City.			