



"If any Man Hear My Words, and Believe not, I Judge him not: for I Came not to Judge the World, but to Save the World."

VOLUME 9.

NEW YORK, MAY 3, 1894.

NUMBER 18.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

EDITOR, ALONZO T. JONES.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

To reject truth is to deny the Author of truth. That he might lead men to deny God and his Word, Satan has sought, from the beginning, to bring the divine statutes into contempt. This he has done by subtle perversion of truth; thus establishing in the minds of men erroneous views of the character of God, and incorrect ideas of the teaching of Scripture.

THERE can be no peace between truth and error. That conflict admits of no armistice. The armies of truth carry no flag of truce. There can be no cessation of hostilities. The contest is to the end. It is a strife between the statutes of man and the divine law of Jehovah, between the religious truth of God's Word and the religious error of human fable and tradition. What will be the result? Truth will win. Error will be vanquished. The eternal ages of God will be ushered in.

Romanism the Religion of Human Nature.

THERE is great need that all who claim to be Christians should take the Scriptures as they read. There is need of arriving at right conclusions as to what the Scriptures mean in reference to the man of sin, who thought to change times and laws. He had no real power to change the time and the law of God, but he thought himself able to do this work; for he "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." He is an imitator of the first great rebel, the originator of sin. In heaven Satan thought to change the laws of God, and for this purpose he changed his character and his position in the heavenly courts, and influenced others until they united with him in the work of rebellion against God; but he did not succeed in changing the law of God. God did not alter or

change his form of government to suit Satan's ideas, but made it manifest that the foundation of his government in heaven and earth is as unchangeable as is the throne itself.

When Satan could not induce all the angels to rebel against the law of God, he made the earth the scene of his rebellion, and through the man of sin seeks to carry out his diabolical purpose. Through the papacy,—the Roman power, the man of sin,—the purpose of Satan is carried out among men; the law and the time of God are set aside. In this we see that Protestantism is giving encouragement to popery; and false systems of worship, against which our fathers manfully opposed themselves, imperilling even property and life, are fostered and cherished and encouraged to extend and gain wide influence. Protestants do not search their Bibles as they should, and do not heed the warning that has been given concerning the work of the man of sin. The Roman Church claims that the pope is invested with supreme authority over all bishops and pastors, and this claim of supremacy was once denied by Protestants. They took the position that the Bible, and the Bible alone, constituted the rule of faith and doctrine, that the word of God is the only unerring guide for human souls, and that it is unnecessary and harmful to take the words of priests and prelates instead of the word of God.

To the Romanist the Bible is a forbidden book, because it plainly reveals the errors of the Roman system; and whoever searches the Bible with an enlightened understanding, cannot long be in harmony with Romanism. He who searches the Bible to understand the truth, will find no authority in the Word of God for the assumption of power on the part of popes and cardinals. There is no word of God that sanctions their assumed superiority or supremacy over their people, as there is no word to sanction the claim that Lucifer made in heaven of superiority over Christ. The claim of the papacy to superiority is made under the influence of the first great usurper, who so persistently urged his right to supremacy over the host of God.

Through the Dark Ages,—that long night of ignorance and superstition,—the

claim of the papacy to superiority and supremacy was conceded by emperors and kings, although God sanctioned no such concession, and raised up men to dispute the claim, and to break the Romish yoke from the church of God. Through his appointed agencies God summoned the church to reassert her independence, and in the strength of God she stood forth in the liberty wherewith Christ had made her free. She broke away from the papal yoke, and with the Word of God in her hand, met the giant evil of Romanism, even as David met Goliath in the name of heaven, using his sling and a few pebble-stones. The defier of Israel was slain before the man of faith; and while men cling to the Word of the Lord, they cannot affiliate with the great system of error.

The Lord has pronounced a curse upon those who take from or add to the Scriptures. The great I AM has decided what shall constitute the rule of faith and doctrine, and he has designed that the Bible shall be a household book. The church that holds to the Word of God is irrevocably separated from Rome. Rome never changes. Her principles have not altered in the least. She has not lessened the breach between herself and Protestants; they have done all the advancing. But what does this argue for the Protestantism of this day? It is the rejection of Bible truth which makes men approach to infidelity. It is a backsliding church that lessens the distance between itself and the papacy.

It is souls like Luther, Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, and the thousands of noble men who were martyrs for the truth's sake, who are the true Protestants. They stood as faithful sentinels of truth, declaring that Protestantism is incapable of union with Romanism, but must be as far separated from the principles of the papacy as is the east from the west. Such advocates of truth could no more harmonize with the man of sin than could Christ and his apostles. In earlier ages the righteous felt that it was impossible to affiliate with Rome, and, though their antagonism to this system of error was maintained at the risk of property and life, yet they had courage to maintain their separation, and manfully struggled

for the truth. Bible truth was dearer to them than wealth, honor, or even life itself. They could not endure to see the truth buried under a mass of superstition and lying sophistry. They took the Word of God in their hands, and raised the standard of truth before the people, boldly declaring that which God had revealed unto them through diligent searching of the Bible. They died the cruellest of deaths for their fidelity to God, but by their blood they purchased for us liberties and privileges that many who claim to be Protestants are easily yielding up to the power of evil. But shall we yield up these dearly bought privileges? Shall we offer insult to the God of heaven, and, after he has freed us from the Romish yoke, again place ourselves in bondage to this antichristian power?

The voice of Luther, that echoed in mountains and valleys, that shook Europe as with an earthquake, summoned forth an army of noble apostles of Jesus, and the truth they advocated could not be silenced by fagots, by tortures, by dungeons, by death; and still the voices of the noble army of martyrs are telling us that the Roman power is the predicted apostasy of the last days, the mystery of iniquity which Paul saw beginning to work even in his day. Roman Catholicism is rapidly gaining ground. Popery is on the increase, and those who have turned away their ears from hearing the truth are listening to her delusive fables. Papal chapels, papal colleges, nunneries, and monasteries are on the increase, and the Protestant world seems to be asleep. Protestants are losing the mark of distinction that distinguished them from the world, and they are lessening the distance between themselves and the Roman power. They have turned away their ears from hearing the truth; they have been unwilling to accept light that God shed upon their pathway, and are therefore going into darkness. They speak with contempt of the idea that there will be a revival of the past cruel persecution on the part of Romanists and those who affiliate with them. They do not recognize the fact that the Word of God fully predicts such a revival, and will not concede that the people of God in the last days shall suffer persecution, although the Bible says, "The dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

Popery is the religion of human nature, and the mass of humanity love a doctrine that permits them to commit sin, and yet frees them from its consequences. People must have some form of religion, and this religion, formed by human device, and yet claiming divine authority, suits the carnal mind. Men who think themselves wise and intelligent turn away in pride from the standard of righteousness, the ten commandments, and do not think it is in harmony with their dignity to inquire into the ways of God. Therefore they go into false ways, into forbidden paths, become self-sufficient, self-inflated, after the pattern of the pope, and not after the pattern of Jesus Christ. They must have the form of religion that has the least requirement of spirituality and self-denial, and as unsanctified human wisdom will not lead them to loathe popery, they are naturally drawn toward its provisions and doctrines. They do not want to walk in the ways of the Lord. They are alto-

gether too much enlightened to seek God prayerfully and humbly, with an intelligent knowledge of his Word. Not caring to know the ways of the Lord, their minds are all open to delusions, all ready to accept and believe a lie. They are willing to have the most unreasonable, most inconsistent falsehoods palmed off upon them as truth.

Satan's masterpiece of deception is popery; and while it has been demonstrated that a day of great intellectual darkness was favorable to Romanism, it will also be demonstrated that a day of great intellectual light is also favorable to its power; for the minds of men are concentrated on their own superiority, and do not like to retain God in their knowledge. Rome claims infallibility, and Protestants are following in the same line. They do not desire to search for truth, and go on from light to a greater light. They wall themselves in with prejudice, and seem willing to be deceived and to deceive others.

But though the attitude of the churches is discouraging, yet there is no need of being disheartened; for God has a people who will preserve their fidelity to his truth, who will make the Bible, and the Bible alone, their rule of faith and doctrine, who will elevate the standard, and hold aloft the banner on which is inscribed, "The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." They will value a pure gospel, and make the Bible the foundation of their faith and doctrine.

For such a time as this, when men are casting aside the law of the Lord of hosts, the prayer of David is applicable,—“It is time for thee, Lord, to work; for they have made void thy law.” We are coming to a time when almost universal scorn will be heaped upon the law of God, and God's commandment-keeping people will be severely tried; but will they lose their respect for the law of Jehovah because others do not see and realize its binding claims? Let God's commandment-keeping people, like David, reverence God's law in proportion as men cast it aside and heap upon it disrespect and contempt.—*Mrs. E. G. White.*

The Writing on the Wall.

THE foreign correspondent of the *New York Observer*, after speaking of a company of six hundred Russian convicts destined for Siberia, says:—

But far sadder bands of prisoners than these exist in Russia. I allude to the wretched Stundists and Baptists who are in jail for the sake of their religion, and who are sent in larger or smaller detachments, and in company with ordinary criminals, either to remote districts of transcaucasia or to Siberia, there to expiate their heresy. Considerably over a hundred of these faithful people, poor peasants, with a mighty empire banded against them, are in prison as I write, on charges of a most trumpery description. Most of them are not even charged with any misdemeanor; they are in prison because they are suspected, or because some priest or policeman has reported against them. And without trial of any sort, and at the bare word of the governors of the provinces, their homes will be broken up, their children taken from them, and they themselves transported for a term of five or six years to one of the most inhospitable regions of the whole empire. I often wonder how long this state of affairs is to continue. It still continues and in as marked a manner as ever, notwithstanding the protests of Europe and America, notwithstanding the exposure made of perhaps the most iniquitous persecution since the Middle Ages.

Is it remarkable that Russia should fail to be moved by the protests of Europe and America? What right has either Europe or America to protest? Have

they yet plucked the notes from their own eyes? Indeed they have not. Let that country cast the first stone at Russia, which has no union of Church and State,—no religious laws, and no enforcement of religious forms by legal enactment. They may all look in fear at the writing in the sand, knowing well that it will soon be the writing on the wall.

W. H. M.

Legal Religion Always Papal.

THE *Christian Statesman*, of April 21, has a three-column editorial on the "Political Aspect of the Roman Catholic Problem," of which the following is one paragraph:—

Here is a man who says, "I am the representative of the Almighty God in the world, and claim whatever of authority God claims." The American Government disputes that claim, and refuses to recognize his authority. Then the pope must either withdraw his claim, and thereby confess himself a pretender, and so relinquish control of all who have recognized him, or contest it with this Government. The only reason he does not wage a more open warfare with us, and issue his bulls of deposition and anathema against our authorities, is because he thinks the plan he is following is the better one for the attainment of his ends—the subjection of the nation to his authority. He does claim the authority to release every Roman Catholic in this country from his allegiance to this Government. That follows of necessity from his claim as the representative of God in the world. He can do anything God can do. This brings to view the utter antagonism between the papal theory of human government and the Protestant theory. It is the old controversy as to the "divine right of kings," with the assumption on the part of the antagonist that the pope of Rome is the king. This doctrine is destructive, of course of human liberty as we understand human liberty. The Romanist may tell us that we would be a great deal better off if we accepted his doctrine and submitted to his "sovereign," but that is the point of controversy. He may tell us that our ideas of human liberty are all at fault, and are subversive of the rights of the church, the rights of the individual, the rights of God himself; but that is the question. We agree with him, however, that they differ radically from the doctrines of his church, and if he is right we are at war with the Almighty.

It is interesting to see in this the misconception of the subject to which the views, which the *Christian Statesman* defends, necessarily lead it, and how, in following up the question, and expressing the reasons for its antagonism of Roman Catholicism, it necessarily refutes all its own positions as to the relations between civil government and religion.

In the first place the *Statesman* is in error when it assumes that, properly, the American Government disputes the claim of the pope that he is the representative of Almighty God in the world. The American Government cannot rightfully take any cognizance whatever of any such claim. Neither can this Government enter into an investigation as to whether certain of its citizens recognize the pope as their religious head and the vicegerent of God, and predicate from that their treasonable attitude towards governmental authority. If those who have acknowledged the pope's claim of divine authority should be found levying war against the United States, and adhering to its enemies and giving them aid and comfort, and should confess to this in open court, or the overt act be proved against them by the testimony of two witnesses, then this Government could deal with them individually. For the United States, in its governmental capacity, to give any such recognition to the claim of the pope to infallibility and to a divine right to rule the world, as would be involved in disputing it, would be to assert the same claims for itself over its own citizens;—whereas the decision as to the infallibility of the pope and the pro-

priety of his claims to divine right rests with each individual. There is no difference in principle between the assertion of divine right to rule by a pope, a king, or a congress. The *Statesman* properly denies the divine right of the pope or of kings, and declares that doctrine to be contrary to the theory of Protestantism and destructive of human liberty. In saying this the *Statesman* is expressing a truth. But in denying the propriety of the claim of the pope and refusing to acknowledge the divine right of kings, the *Statesman* leaves no foundation whatever for the doctrines which are the sole reason for its existence. If there is no divine right of kings and they cannot speak as by the mouth of God, neither can congresses or legislatures voice the commands of God, interpret his word, and enforce formal obedience to their interpretation of his laws. If this is so, there is no further reason for the publication of the *Christian Statesman*.

The truth is, that all enforcement of religion by law is papal in its character. It is impossible to uphold the legal enforcement of religion without logically upholding the papacy. It is impossible to antagonize the papacy without logically antagonizing all coalition of religion with the State, and opposing every religious statute and ordinance. W. H. M.

Shall We Obey the Laws of the Land?

SHOULD we obey all laws of the Government implicitly without questioning their rightfulness?

Every civil law that does not conflict with God's law should be obeyed. When a State or nation enjoins through its laws a religious duty, whether that duty be scriptural or anti-scriptural, it is not to be regarded one whit more because enacted by civil authority. Any man that obeys a religious law because enforced by the Government, pays undue homage to the law-enacting authorities. Any religious duty commanded by God through the Scriptures is paramount to all other commands and ought to be so treated by every man. When this is done direct honor is paid to God; the individual is connected with him by faith, and acceptable obedience rendered.

The Bible does not command one thing, which, if obeyed to the fullest extent, would be the least infringement upon any one's rights. Civil authority, then, has no just claim for prohibiting the full exercise of any religious duty enjoined by the Scriptures. Now the sacred Word imperatively commands, under pain of eternal death, the observance of the seventh day of the week. The same command also enjoins that we labor upon the first day of the week. If this is obeyed it cannot possibly be an infringement upon the rights of any, provided the seventh-day observer does his work upon the first day as commanded by God. A law that interferes with a man's convictions respecting the observance or non-observance of any day is an unrighteous law, and no man is under any obligations to respect or obey it in any way. No government can reward its subjects for outward Sabbath observance, neither has it any right to punish them for disregarding the day.

Those who have been so clamorous for Sunday observance, when confronted with the definite seventh day, have repeatedly said that all God required was a seventh

part of the time, leaving the individual to choose the day to be observed. But whenever the Sunday law has been enforced this seventh part of the time theory has not stood the test. In Georgia, Tennessee, and Maryland men who conscientiously rested upon the seventh day were arrested and committed to prison for quietly laboring on their own premises on Sunday. They had observed one-seventh part of the time, and the very seventh part that God sanctified and commanded to be observed. But this would not do. They were told that the seventh day people could keep the Sabbath if they chose, but they must not work on Sunday. Thus a two-sevenths part of the time theory was brought into practice, and required of those who keep the Sabbath of the Lord; one-seventh to satisfy the conscience of the Sabbath observer, and one-seventh to satisfy the conscience of his Sunday-keeping neighbor. How unjust! How these indefinite time observers stultify themselves when their theory is reduced to practice. The day is declared to be indefinite when commanded by God's law, but made definite when commanded by man's law. What an insult to the God of heaven!

But Rom. 31:1, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers . . . the powers that be are ordained of God," is urged to prove that all governmental laws, whether civil or religious, should be obeyed. Let us see if this has always worked well. All will admit that Christ the Creator of all things ordained the powers that be; and yet it is plainly recorded in Acts 4:26 that the powers that he ordained stood up against him. The passage reads, "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ." Were the governments of earth acting within the sphere that God ordained them to act when they stood up against him? or had they overreached the limits of their governmental jurisdiction? It is very evident that they surpassed their limit.

That governments ordained of God have frequently overreached their proper limits can easily be demonstrated from both history and the Scriptures. For want of space but one instance will be cited and that from the Bible. It is found in the book of Acts. It appears that Peter and John had healed a cripple in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, which caused great excitement among the rulers, etc. The magistrates were influenced by the ministers of those times to apprehend and imprison the apostles. When brought before the civil authorities (the power ordained of God) they received the following command, "And they called them and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus." Acts 4:18. Peter and John paid no attention to this command of the magistrates, but continued to speak and heal in a much more powerful manner. With rage the civil authorities remanded them to prison, determined that their mandate to speak no more in Jesus' name should be obeyed. But God was determined that it should not be. He sent his angel to instruct the apostles not to obey the magistrates. "But the angel of the Lord by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth, and said, Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life." Acts 5:19, 20. Civil government told them not to speak, God told them to speak.

"We ought to obey God rather than men," said Peter, and so they did.

The above citation is sufficient to show that when any government enacts laws contrary to the Word of God, that it is not only the privilege of the people to disobey, but it is the duty of all to disobey. What God's Word requires of one man is required of every man. God instituted the seventh-day Sabbath in Eden, enjoined it from Sinai with a voice that shook the earth, and it was reiterated by Christ in his sermon on the mount, when he indorsed the law commanding the day, in the words, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5:18.

Now when State or national government enacts a law that we shall observe Sunday, the very day God began his work of creation and commands us to labor thereon, should we obey God or men? Would it not be following apostolic example to preach and teach against such a usurpation of divine privilege upon the part of any civil government? There is no reason why all Sunday laws which are so diametrically opposed to divine command should not be treated the same as Peter and John treated the decree of the magistrates not to speak or teach in the name of Jesus—openly disregard them. By disobeying all laws which conflict with the law of God, we make ourselves subject to the higher powers—the Government of heaven. E. HILLIARD.

A Peculiar Agreement.

THE following unique document is printed in the *Scott Valley News*, published at Fort Jones, California:—

Agreement.

TO BE PLACED IN THE HANDS OF A. B. CARLOCK, FORT JONES, CALIFORNIA.

We, the undersigned, firms and individuals, doing business in the towns of Fort Jones, Etna, Callahans, and the adjoining towns of Scott Valley, appreciating the fact that one day's rest should be accorded in each week to every one, and that the custom of doing business on Sunday is one that is far behind the times and should be abolished; that the closing of our respective places of business on Sundays will not be any detriment to our patrons or ourselves, have hereby entered into the following agreement, to wit:

1st. To not sell any goods on Sundays after Sunday, May 13, 1894, except in case of sickness, death, accident, or some unforeseen circumstance, when it would become an actual necessity, or a case of urgency, where it would be inflicting a wrong to refuse.

2nd. That if the above agreement is broken by either of the parties whose names are hereto attached, said party or parties agree to pay into the hands of A. B. Carlock, Fort Jones, the sum of one hundred dollars as a fine or penalty for such violation of this agreement; the party accused of such violation to have, if requested by him, a hearing before three of the parties whose names are subscribed to this instrument—one from each of the three above-mentioned towns, to be appointed by Mr. A. B. Carlock, said hearing to be held in the town where the accused does business, at a time to be agreed on between the accused and the committee appointed for said hearing; the decision of this committee to be final and binding on the accused party.

3rd. That any party to this agreement can cancel his connection thereto by notifying every party to same in writing or by publication in the *Yreka Journal*, said cancellation not to take effect less than thirty days after date of said written notice or publication. The violation of said agreement before the expiration of the said thirty days to be subject to penalty or fine as above described.

4th. This agreement to be in force from the 13th day of May, for the term of one year.

5th. That all parties signing this agreement shall immediately after signing same give proper notice to their patrons and the public that this agreement has been entered into.

6th. That at any time during the term of this agreement above stated (one year), if two-thirds of the firms or individuals signing this article agree at a meeting to be called at two weeks' notice in writing from any

firm or individual whose name is hereto attached, each firm to be represented by one person only, shall vote that this agreement come to an end in not less than sixty days from date of such meeting, then this agreement shall be null and void.

The meeting thus called to be held at the town of Etna, it being the most central point.

7th. This agreement not to be binding until signed by all of the following firms and individuals: Alex. Parker & Sons; George Buchner, Joseph Stephens, and E. Miller, of Etna; J. Camp & Co., H. J. Diggles, J. W. Wheeler, and E. F. Reichman & Co., Fort Jones; Denny Bar & Co., Callahan; John Quigley, Oro Fino.

8th. That this agreement be presented to all persons doing business in the towns above described, and their signatures solicited, also for all adjoining towns and their cooperation also solicited.

9th. That if any penalties are imposed according to this agreement, said money shall be used for some public benefit to be determined on by at least a four-fifths vote of all the parties to this agreement, one vote for each party.

10th. That a copy of this agreement be published in the *Freka Journal* and *Scott Valley News*, and that pay for same be made by an equal assessment on all parties hereto subscribed, and that each one agrees to pay his share of same.

Where there is no boycotting or combining to force others out of business because they themselves do not desire to do business, there can, of course, be no valid objection to such a mutual understanding, provided individual business men or firms see fit to agree among themselves regarding the closing of their stores or shops on Sunday or any other day. This agreement is reprinted as an example of a remarkable development of the spirit of organized Sunday observance in a State which has no Sunday laws.

The True Ground of Opposition.

WE are prepared to believe that the record of popery, both in the remote and immediate past, is such as to warrant the belief that it has not given up the design of subjecting the governments of the earth to the triple crowned head of the Catholic Church. It is moreover apparent from the special favors extended to the French Republic, the unusual grace bestowed by the pope upon our great national enterprise, the World's Fair, and the specially friendly tone in which he has spoken of all republics, both by himself and through his delegates for several years last past, that his hope, desire and design are to secure a nucleus for gathering temporal power in some republican land. But though we are thus persuaded of his deliberate purpose, we do not by any means look with favor upon an organized effort to destroy the Catholic Church, or deny them the privileges we claim for ourselves.

The true ground of opposition to the claims of temporal sovereignty and papal infallibility, is the genuine and broad liberality embraced in the Golden Rule. One kind of threatened bondage can not be successfully averted, by accepting and placing ourselves in the power of another kind of bondage. It has been said, as the result of years of judicial experience, that hard cases make bad precedents; and hence we should not seek to bend the general principles of freedom and open, manly warfare, to make them fit to our notions of the papal case. Apply to it what we apply to all other cases of kindred character, and there stand until the battle for freedom and right has ended in the consummation devoutly to be wished—the disenthralment of the world.

Whenever people find it necessary to band together in the dark to accomplish their purposes, and considerable numbers of our citizens are found thus banded together, the times are rife with danger; and the more the disposition to thus se-

cretly and darkly work becomes apparent, the more should those who love light get right out into its full blaze, and refuse to be compromised, hampered, corrupted, or misled by any methods, organizations, petty plans, or influences, which do not love the light, and do not seek open and manly encounters, in the presence and knowledge of the world.

Herein are safety and consistency to be found.—*The Patriot*, April 12, 1894.

Offended Feelings.

A SPANISH correspondent reports that the Protestant churches in some of the provinces have been closed, and a church in Madrid has been required to close its front entrance, and use the side door, as the open doors on the street constituted an offense against the religious sentiments of the people.

Offended feelings have played a great part in the history of religious persecutions. It is human nature to take offense because some one has the temerity to differ from its opinions; and because the great majority of men in all ages have clung to the natural disposition, religious history—Catholic and Protestant alike—has to record manifestations of intolerance in every chapter.

In an old volume, published about a century ago, Rev. John Macgowan, of London, gave some of the shifting scenes in modern Church history. In answer to the question, "Has any sect besides the papists been found to persecute those who differed from them?" he says:—

Yes, every sect who has, at any time been happy enough to grasp the reins of government for the time being. The worthy papists bore the bell of orthodoxy for the space of twelve hundred and sixty years, during which time much blood was shed by open massacres, secret assassinations, pretended judicaries, acts of bloody faith; and at last to finish the bloody reign of antichrist, England, France, the Netherlands, and the valleys of Piedmont swam with the gore of such who would believe the Bible sooner than the voice of the priests. Queen Mary's reign furnished the orthodox in her day, with a fine opportunity of discovering their zeal for the Church, by murdering those who believed and obeyed the Bible; but her reign being short, and Elizabeth ascending the throne upon her demise, the other scale rose uppermost, and the Protestants, in their turn, became orthodox, *i. e.*, got the government into their hands.

Oh, the violence of reputed orthodoxy! Those same gentlemen were no sooner emerged from prison than they also let the world know that they were not to be differed from with impunity; that the formula of their faith and worship must be regarded with as implicit obedience as that in the former reign imposed by the papists. Now the Presbyterians, Independents, and other Congregationalists felt the weight of their rage, or, if you please, zeal for orthodoxy and the good of the Church. Now the prison-keepers and their friend, Master Ketch, had pretty near as good a run of trade as in the reign of Mary. And now the wilds of America began to be well peopled with English Protestants who oppressed dissenters; and the good Episcopalians at home kept the fleece to themselves and had all the good of the Church before them.

But those said Presbyterians and Independents had no sooner crossed the ocean for conscience' sake, and found themselves secure from Episcopalian rage, than they themselves commenced orthodox, and set up their own formula as the standard of religion, to which they required as implicit submission from others as the good bishops of England had ere while done for themselves; and now the poor antipedo-Baptists and Quakers were taught, that a mittimus is a mittimus whether it is signed by a papist, an Episcopalian or a Presbyterian, and that sentence of death is to be dreaded as much from the mouth of the latter as of the former. Those same dissenters who had so lately found Old England too hot for themselves, by the glowings of priestly zeal for orthodoxy, soon made New England too hot for the poor Quakers and antipedo-Baptists; who, to escape the rage for presbytery, fled, the one to Pennsylvania and the other to Rhode Island, that they might not be compelled to worship God according to other people's consciences and contrary to their own.

This is human nature, and a sorry pic-

ture it makes. Yet nowadays we hear about offenses against religious sentiment even in professedly Protestant circles. The tendency toward regulating people's conduct by law in religious observances is increasingly manifest. It is now urged that men must be made to respect Sunday, just as it was formerly thought that respect for the communion or baptism must be enforced.

Religious sentiment may be offended and provoked to retaliation, but Christian sentiment never. Can we imagine such a thing of the Saviour, as that he should become offended and make somebody feel the penalty of differing from him? He was meek, gentle, long-suffering. He gave his back to the smiters, and his cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; nor did he hide his face from shame and spitting. This is the spirit which is given to those who will let the human nature die, and become partakers of the divine nature. This is Christianity. Is it not time for Christians to follow Christ?—*Present Truth*, London, Eng.

Application of the Principles of Equity.

IN favor of the exemption of churches from taxation, a favorite argument urged is that the edifice and property are sacred and hence beyond the reach of ordinary claims on individuals or corporate bodies. The error arises from the confusion of two ideas which should always be kept separate and distinct, *viz*: the Church as a divine institution, a religious cult, and the church as a number of individuals united in opinion and brought together either for worship or the inculcation of certain doctrines. Upon the former the State can have no power, for it is established in the heart and soul of man, and has neither habitation nor outward visible form. It is a spiritual principle and can no more be taxed than can air, light, the odor of flowers, or the singing of birds.

But the individuals, under whatever name known, who occupy property or buildings for worship or for the spread of their religious opinions are amenable to all the claims, dues and penalties exacted from any other body. When a church is weak in numbers and cannot afford to erect a house of worship no one dreams of opposing the just payment of rent for a suitable place of meeting. When an evangelist holds religious services in a public hall, who would ask that he be given the privilege of rent free? When that weak congregation has increased in numbers, or this evangelist has secured a sufficient following, and a church building is required, a site is solicited and paid for, the edifice is erected and also paid for. The lot was taxed when in possession of its former owner, but lo, when the building is opened for worship by a number of such individuals, the taxes cease, and have to be paid by the remaining portion of the community. Now, by what chain of reason can such a system be justified? The building is admittedly set apart for sacred purposes, but it is for the convenience, not of God, who dwells not in temples made by hands, but of a class of the community who have sufficient money to pay for the luxury of meeting within a building, rather than in the open fields. The members do not cease to be citizens by becoming worshippers, and do not leave their duties as such behind them at the church door. That lot and that building are owned by individual men and women, and hence liable

to the taxes due from any other similar lot or building. Let any one attempt to interfere with these vested rights and he will soon learn that such is also the view of those who now set up a fraudulent claim to exemption.

Again, this building and property is used for concerts, lectures and bazaars to make money, not for the community that grants the exemption, but for the sake of those who use the particular building, for payment of the pastor's salary, the expenses of heating, lighting, etc., the furnishing of more elegant carpets or upholstery, a new organ or other articles of pleasure or luxury.

By all means, religion should be free, untrammelled and untaxed, but not the structures that men rear for the gratification of their taste, for comfort or individual opinion. In this advocacy we have not in mind any sect or denomination, but hold the principle universally true, from the humble "upper room" of the brethren to the lofty and imposing cathedral. . . .

One often reads of the wealth of this or that church; what does this mean? Why simply that a number of wealthy individuals compose its membership and give liberally of their means for its maintenance. They also contribute liberally to their political club or party, to musical and other societies. Why are the latter contributions, or the investment of them, subject to taxation and the former not?

The fact of a custom being ancient is no proof that the custom is right, in fact all history is but a protest and struggle against hoary custom, and in proportion as a nation throws off the incubus of custom, merely as such, does it progress. Radicalism usually consists in viewing an old truth from a new standpoint. The view that exemption from taxation is unjust, is but the application of the ordinary principles of equity, and such a broadening of the horizon as to include within its sweep more than had formerly been the case.—*American Standard*.

Ignorance or Malice, Which?

A SEMI-WEEKLY paper, called *The Bugle Horn*, published at Salamanca, New York, notices an address, delivered in the town hall of Salamanca, by a Seventh-day Adventist minister, and makes this editorial comment:—

If the Seventh-day Adventists were as strong in America to-day as Romanism, there would be more oppression and more overthrow of law than there is under present conditions. At least they wish to have everything their own way now, and they are a small people numerically.

At the National Reform Convention held at College Springs, Iowa, March 13 and 14, a speaker Rev. T. P. Robb, of Linton, Iowa, is reported as saying of Seventh-day Adventists:—

They are entirely dependent upon their almanac; for their Sabbath begins exactly at six o'clock. Adventists were the loudest clamorers for Sunday opening of the World's Fair. In most respects they are honest, conscientious, law-abiding citizens, but they are doing all in their power to break down our Sabbath and institute theirs.

Does not this man know the difference between the Bible and the almanac? Does he not know what the biblical division of time is,—has he not read, "And the evening and the morning were the first day?" Does he not know that Seventh-day Adventists have no more need of an almanac to remind them of the approach of the Sabbath than did Adam and Eve? If this man does not know that, according

to the natural order established at creation, the day begins at sunset and ends at the following sunset, he would do well to read the first few verses of the first chapter of Genesis,—and if he does not know, that, following this division of time, Seventh-day Adventists observe the Sabbath from the setting of the sun to the setting sun, he would do well to become acquainted with and observe their practice before speaking with such assurance.

That "Seventh-day Adventists were the loudest clamorers for Sunday opening of the World's Fair," is another misstatement, as marked and inexcusable as the previous. It shows that this man presumes to publicly judge a people and define to the world their positions without having taken the least trouble to inform himself what their positions are. That is, he sets up a man of straw, gives it a bad name, attaching to that the title Seventh-day Adventist, and then takes great credit to himself for publicly knocking it down. Every man who is sufficiently well informed on these matters to warrant his expressing himself, even in private conversation, knows that no one who intelligently opposes legislation upon religious subjects and legal compulsion in the observance of religious forms, ever clamored for Sunday opening of the World's Fair. There is a vast difference between the attitude of those who strove to close the World's Fair on Sunday by congressional enactment, by statute, by the policeman's club, and were even anxious to invoke the bayonet,—and the position of those who declare that none of these have any authority in the matter, either to open or close, but that it was a matter of individual responsibility to God, whether as an exhibitor, each should close his exhibit or open it, whether he should work, or rest, or play, or worship, and that in this nothing could rightfully govern but each man's own personal free will.

Mr. Robb continues his strange misrepresentation by saying, "they are doing all in their power to break down our Sabbath and institute theirs." What does Mr. Robb mean by saying such a thing as this? Mr. Robb may claim Sunday as his Sabbath if he choose,—it certainly is not God's Sabbath. Seventh-day Adventists do not claim that the seventh day is their Sabbath,—their claim is that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, in consonance with the words of the commandment; and they are not "doing all in their power to institute theirs." They observe the Lord's Sabbath instituted by him at creation and needing not to be instituted or even defended by any man,—only obeyed.

The seventh day is not the Sabbath of the Seventh-day Adventists, but the Sabbath of the Lord,—they did not institute it and do not strive to institute it,—they only obey and go forth to preach the gospel to all the world. If Sunday, the first day of the week, is Mr. Robb's Sabbath, no man has any authority to deprive him of his choice, his only contest is with the God who says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

The same spirit which influences the Iowa minister animates the editor of the *Bugle Horn*, and his misconceptions and misrepresentations are similar. If his supposition were realized, and were correct, that "the Seventh-day Adventists were as strong in America to-day as Romanism" and from them there should result "more oppression and more over-

throw of law than there is under present conditions," that would simply prove that they had forsaken the principles of the gospel which they now preach, and were no longer filled with the love of God and man which they now advocate.

No better thing could be done for the spiritual well-being of the editor of the *Bugle Horn* than to give him a commission to search throughout the world for one Seventh-day Adventist whom his description will cover. He would learn, as they have learned, not to wish to have everything his way, but God's own way. He would learn, as they have, that to love God, and one's neighbor as oneself, is not to usurp the prerogatives of God and assume to control the religious life of one's neighbor,—but that love of God is shown by glad obedience, in all simplicity, to his word; and love to man by doing unto others as we would be done by, and defending and protecting the rights of others as we would that they should defend and protect ours. W. H. M.

The Breckinridge-Morse Sunday Bill.

In the Fifty-first Congress, January 6, 1890, W. C. P. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, introduced in the House of Representatives this bill:—

A B I L L

To prevent persons from being forced to labor on Sunday.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation, or employé of any person or corporation in the District of Columbia, to perform any secular labor or business, or to cause the same to be performed by any person in their employment on Sunday, except works of necessity or mercy; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or services performed or rendered in violation of this act.

Any person or corporation, or employé of any person or corporation in the District of Columbia, who shall violate the provisions of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than one hundred dollars for every such offense: *Provided however,* That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest.

Again, in the Fifty-second Congress, Mr. Breckinridge reintroduced the same bill.

Now again, in the Fifty-third Congress, Mr. Morse, of Massachusetts, has introduced a similar bill, in the following terms:—

A B I L L

To protect the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on the first day of the week, known as the Lord's day, set apart by general consent in accordance with divine appointment as a day of rest and worship, it shall be unlawful to perform any labor, except works of necessity and mercy and work by those who religiously observe Saturday, if performed in such a way as not to involve or disturb others; also to open places of business or traffic, except in the case of drug stores for the dispensing of medicines; also to make contracts or transact other commercial business; also to engage in noisy amusements or amusements for gain, or entertainments for which admittance fees are charged; also to join in public processions, except funerals, which last shall not use music; also to perform any court service, except in connection with arrests of criminals and service of process to prevent fraud.

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

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

This bill the House Committee on the

District of Columbia has referred to the District Commissioners for their approval or disapproval, and they in turn have submitted it to the attorney for the District. He has reported that in his opinion there is no special need for the passage of this particular measure, but that it is in proper form if the commissioners are of the opinion that the "District stands in need of further moral legislation."

On February 18, 1890, the House Committee on the District gave a hearing upon Mr. Breckinridge's Sunday bill for the District. Much that was then said is just as applicable to the measure that Mr. Morse has introduced in this Congress. The following is an extract from the address of J. O. Corliss, at that time Elder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Washington. In reply to the question of the chairman as to whom he represented, Mr. Corliss said:—

"I reside in this city, sir, with my family. I speak in behalf of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Washington, of which I am, at present, the pastor; as a citizen of the United States, and as a resident of this District, I appear, not, as has been affirmed before you, to speak in behalf of a Saturday Sabbath. Far from it, gentlemen of the committee. If this bill, No. 3854, were to have incorporated in it, instead of 'Sunday, or the first day of the week,' the words 'Saturday, or the seventh day of the week,' there is no one who would oppose it stronger than I. And I would oppose it just as strongly as I do in its present form, for the reason that it is not sectarianism that calls us here to-day; but we see in this bill a principle of religious legislation that is dangerous, not to our liberties in particular, but to the liberties of the nation. For, as you perceive, this bill has an exemption clause providing that 'this act shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in, and observe, another day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest.' This fact gives us more courage to oppose the measure, because we know that all fair-minded people will be able to see that our opposition arises from a broader and higher motive than that of self-interest. There are then, sir, good reasons why we maintain the attitude in which we are found to-day, and which we will shortly proceed to lay before you."

After further preliminary remarks in reference to the title of the bill which are not applicable to this present bill as entitled, Mr. Corliss continued:—

"But," it is asked, "has not Congress the same right to pass a law making six days a week's work as it has to make eight hours a legal day's work?" That may be done, but it would not be in the same line with the legislation this bill proposes. This bill enforces a penalty upon him who works on Sunday, but Congress does not say that the man who works more than eight hours a day shall pay a hundred dollars' fine. If this bill were only to make six days constitute a week's work, permitting any one to labor more if he choose, there would be a similarity; but, as the bill reads, you all recognize the difference between the two points.

"This bill, instead of having a civil character, is a purely religious document, as you will notice by an examination of it. A civil bill can make provision for only civil matters, but this one enjoins the observance of a day, the non-observance of which is no incivility to any one. Sun-

day observance originated in religious worship, and has ever been regarded as a purely religious rite. Civil offenses are those which invade the rights of property or person, but if one labor on Sunday, he invades the rights of no human being. He robs no one of any property or of a single personal right. His neighbor may observe the day if he choose, just the same as if the other man were doing so. It is not the day on which an act is performed which makes it civil or uncivil. It is just as wrong to strike a man on Monday as to do it on Sunday. It is just as wrong to drink whisky on Monday as to drink it on Sunday. If it were true that the day itself could constitute an act a civil offense, then it might be argued that labor on Sunday is a civil offense. But just as soon as the position is assumed that labor is a civil offense (no matter on what day it is performed) then labor is made a crime. Therefore, by the terms of this bill, honest labor becomes a crime, for it expressly forbids any one to perform honest labor. It may be said that labor only becomes a crime by being performed on Sunday; but if labor be a crime when done on one day of the week, it is a crime on every day of the week, since it is not the day on which a deed is done that constitutes a crime, but the deed itself must be the crime (if crime it is) on whatever day it is performed. So, then, if the courts of the country recognize the principle that labor done on one day of the week is a crime, when on all other days of the week the same labor would be lawful, then they really legalize crime on every day of the week except that one. This shows the falsity of the claim that this bill is a civil one.

"But it may be said that it is the disturbance to others, by the performance of Sunday labor, that constitutes it a crime. But why should Sunday labor disturb another any more than that which is done on any other day of the week? Manifestly, only because it is thought to be religiously wrong. In other words, such disturbance can only be of a mental character. For instance, when I go out into my garden and quietly work, or even go out on the street and work on Sunday, I have taken nothing from any man. I do not deprive him of his right to keep the day. Then wherein is the disturbance?—Certainly not in the deprivation of rights. It must then only be in a mental disturbance. Upon this point allow me to cite the decision of Judge Walton, of Lewiston, Maine, in a case where a man was prosecuted for drawing cordwood through the streets on Sunday. In his charge to the jury, the judge said that his impression was that the complaint could not be maintained, for the defendant had quietly and in an unobtrusive manner hauled his wood, without coming into the immediate neighborhood of a meeting. The prosecuting attorney suggested that it might have been where people were returning home from church. But the judge decided that that would be but a mental operation, a matter of the mind, of conscience, because they *thought* it wrong, that it did not look right. 'For my part,' he says, 'I do not see why any one driving quietly along with his load on one day of the week should cause any more disturbance than on any other day of the week. It only disturbs people because they think it wrong.' And this is the basis of all Sunday legislation. People think Sunday work to be wrong, and are therefore dis-

turbed because some one else does not believe just the same as they do in the matter.

"But if mental disturbance constitutes a civil offense, then the preaching of opinions diverse from those of the majority of people is also a civil offense, and is indictable in the courts of the country, for, as you have seen to-day by the personalities indulged in, there are men who are more or less disturbed by such work. It is thus easy to see that such reasoning would quickly deprive the minority of all their religious rights. Let such a bill as this pass, and it would be but another step to make all *mental disturbance* on Sunday a crime. Then woe betide the man who dared publicly to proclaim any religious views on that day, not in harmony with his neighbor. There is danger in taking the first step in religious legislation. It is every one's privilege to keep the Sabbath—not as a civil duty but as a religious duty. That is, however, a matter belonging wholly to individuals, as a right of conscience, with which the courts have nothing to do except to protect each one from disturbance in his devotions. But this bill is not necessary for that purpose, for every State and territory in this Union has already a law providing that religious meetings held on any day of the week shall be protected from disturbance.

"I wish here to reiterate the statement that Sunday was set apart only for a religious reason; and I will submit on this point an extract from the argument of Rufus King, made before the superior court of the Cincinnati Board of Education, which was tried to decide the question as to whether or not the Bible should be taught in the public schools of that city. Mr. King was attempting to show, in support of having the Bible taught as part of the public education, that it was the province of the State to enforce religion. And to prove his position true he cited the Sunday law of that State, saying:—

"The proviso of the Sunday law exempts those only who *conscientiously* observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath. Why are they exempted? Why, but because they *religiously* observe another Sabbath? Why then does the law of Ohio enforce the observance of Sunday?—Manifestly because it is religious.

"Then he says upon the same point: 'The same law makes it a penal offense to profanely swear by the name of God, Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost.' This last statement of his is to show that the Sunday law of Ohio is wholly religious.

"In this connection let me say, gentlemen, that the District of Columbia has just the same kind of a Sunday law as that of Ohio. This law of the District of Columbia was in force when this book was issued which I hold in my hand, which was April 1, 1868; and I am told that this law (which I will read) was re-enacted in 1874. I now quote from the law. Section 1 provides that—

"If any person shall deny the Trinity, he shall, for the first offense, be bored through the tongue, and fined twenty pounds; . . . and for the second offense, the offender being thereof convict as aforesaid, shall be stigmatized by burning on the forehead with the letter B, and fined forty pounds; . . . and for the third offense, the offender being thereof convict as aforesaid, shall suffer death, without the benefit of the clergy.

"Section 10 of the same law has this:—

"No person whatever shall do any bodily labor on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, . . . and that every person transgressing this act, and being thereof convict by the evidence of one sufficient

witness, or confession of the party before a civil magistrate, shall forfeit two hundred pounds of tobacco.

"Now, gentlemen, that law has never been repealed—

"MR. GROUT.—Don't you think that law ought to be repealed?

"MR. CORLISS.—I think all Sunday laws are unconstitutional, and should not exist. But I was about to say that this law does still exist, and, by reference to the statutes of the District of Columbia, it will be seen that the police of the city of Washington are obliged to enforce that law. I read:—

"It shall be the duty of the board of police, at all times of the day or night, within the boundary of said police district, to see that all laws relative to the observance of Sunday are promptly enforced.

"Now why has not this law been enforced? Certainly not because there is no such law, but because it is a part of a statute savoring so strongly of the Dark Ages as to make every one ashamed of it. But it is this kind of company in which Sunday laws were originally found, and that is where they belong, for they are but a relic of the old system of Church and State. Indeed this law now in force in the District is as near to representing a Church and State power as it could well be.

"Again: If this bill contemplates only a civil law, what right has it to exempt from its penalty a person simply because he may hold a certain *religious faith*? According to the provisions of this bill, a man who has a certain religious faith may do what another man without such a religious faith cannot do. This shows that it is religious and not civil. It matters not what a man's religious faith is, it cannot exempt him from the penalties provided by law against civil offenses, for the reason that man's religious faith cannot determine his innocence in such a case. It is just as wrong for a professed Christian to be found fighting in the street as for an avowed infidel; and it is no greater offense for an infidel to be thus engaged than for a Christian. These things are recognized by the courts. Take for example the law against polygamy; it does not exempt a man who happens to have a peculiar religious faith in relation thereto. Not by any means. One who believes it is right, religiously, to violate that law, gets no mercy because of his religious belief. Why is this?—Simply because the law against polygamy is held to be purely a civil law. In fact, a civil law can do nothing else than to hold every offender guilty, whoever he may be, or whatever may be his religious faith. Any exemption in a law, in favor of a certain religious belief, immediately stamps that law as religious. But, according to this bill, a law may be enacted which will recognize one man as a criminal because he lacks certain elements in his religious belief, while another man having these elements may be considered a good citizen, even though he has done the very same act by which the other man was adjudged guilty; and the framers of this bill must be marvelously dull of comprehension not to see it.

"THE CHAIRMAN—When was this old law enacted, to which you refer?

"MR. CORLISS—In 1723.

"THE CHAIRMAN—Before the formation of the District?

"MR. CORLISS—Yes, sir; and it was re-enacted in 1874.

"A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE—Yes,

and a man was tried under that law six years ago.

"MR. CORLISS—More than this, it is admitted by many of the friends of this measure, that it is for a religious purpose. . . . To show you that the sum of it all is that these people want a religious law, I quote from the official document which I hold in my hand, containing the 'Notes of a Hearing before the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate, December 13, 1888.' At that hearing Mr. Crafts submitted a paper which purports to be 'questions' by workmen to himself, and his answers. One of these workmen asks him the question, 'Could not this weekly rest-day be secured without reference to religion, by having the workmen of an establishment scheduled in regular order for one day of rest per week, whichever was most convenient, not all resting on one day?' Answer—'A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land, except upon the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out, and you take the rest out. Greed is so strong that nothing but God and the conscience of a man can keep him from capturing all the days for toil.' That settles the question, gentlemen."

Religion and Politics.

A WRITER in the *Central City Democrat*, speaking of the election next Tuesday from a Christian and temperance standpoint, admonishes the "Christian voters" that Jesus Christ will sit over against the ballot box and see all that is put therein. . . . "Christian voters!" Why make this distinction? Are "Christian voters" any better than any other voters? We hear some people railing against Church and State, but they never see anything out of the way in such talks as that of this correspondent. They never can see any Church and State unless there is a crucifix, a cowl, or something of that sort in it. But they should be able to see that all this raising of such distinctions, all this urging that religionists should vote in a particular way because they are religionists, is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution and the teachings of the fathers. Having said to a man that he should vote this way or that because he is a Christian, how natural and easy it would be to take the next step and tell him that he should not vote for a certain candidate because that candidate was not a Christian, and then we should have practically the setting up of a religious test for office, which is contrary to the plain letter of the Constitution. Unless we desire and mean revolution, the only safe way and the only right way is to keep religious issues entirely out of politics.

A man may have as much religion as he pleases in his own personal politics, that is his own private matter, but let him not attempt to inject any of his religion into the politics of others.—*Silver Creek Times*.

THE power of Rome must be curbed in this country or the Republic will suffer. No better method could be adopted than to convert her followers to pure Christianity and right ideas of the duties and obligations of citizenship.—*Rev. J. A. O'Connor*.

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.
THE TEST OF DISCIPLESHIP.	FAITH AND ACCEPTANCE.
THE WORK AND THE LIFE.	GROWING UP INTO CHRIST.
THE PRIVILEGE OF PRAYER.	KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.
	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.

PUBLICATIONS ON THE SABBATH QUESTION.

READ the following and see if there is not some publication among them which you desire to read, or which will benefit some friend:—

The Abiding Sabbath. By A. T. JONES. No. 9 of the *Bible Students' Library*. This is a review of two Sabbath "prize essays," one of \$500, and one of \$1,000. It contains mighty arguments on the Sabbath question; 174 pages; price, 15 cents.

Is Sunday the Sabbath? No. 24 of the *Library*. A brief consideration of New Testament texts on the first day of the week; 8 pages; price, 1 cent.

Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. By J. H. Waggoner. No. 54 of the *Library*. Clear and strong in argument; price, 10 cents.

Sunday; Origin of its Observance in the Christian Church. By E. J. Waggoner. No. 80 of the *Library*. The testimony given with reference to Sunday is wholly Protestant. All Protestants should read it; price, 15 cents.

Who Changed the Sabbath? No. 107 of the *Library*. What God's Word predicted; what Christ says; what the papacy says; what Protestants say. A most convincing document; 24 pages; price, 3 cents.

"The Christian Sabbath." No. 113 of the *Library*. A reprint of four articles in the *Catholic Mirror*, the organ of Cardinal Gibbons. What Catholics have to say to Protestants on the subject; 32 pages; price, 4 cents.

Christ and the Sabbath. By Prof. W. W. Prescott. The spiritual nature of the Sabbath, what true Sabbath keeping is, and the relation of Christ to the Sabbath in both creation and redemption. A most important tract. No. 14 of the *Religious Liberty Library*; 38 pages; price, 5 cents.

The History of the Sabbath. By John N. Andrews. A complete history of the Sabbath and first day of the week in religious life and thought, from the earliest ages to the present time, and especially during the Christian dispensation; 550 large octavo pages; price, cloth, \$2.00; library binding, \$2.50.

Any of the above may be obtained post free on receipt of price by addressing Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal.; 18 W. Fifth Street, Kansas City, Mo.; 43 Bond Street, New York City. Works on all phases of Bible truth. Send for catalogue.

No great railroad in America offers the advantages for summer travel and enjoyment equal to the

WEST SHORE RAILROAD.

Starting from New York (around which are clustered more pleasure resorts than any other city in the world), paralleling the grandest river on the continent, it traverses valleys celebrated in song and story, reaches many crystal lakes reposing like gems in their mountain settings, furnishes access by branches and connections to the magnificent forests of the Catskill and Adirondack Mountains, terminating at the World's Wonder, Niagara Falls.

PRISON LIGHT Edited by one sending the Third Angel's Message to the perishing in prisons all over the land. Agents wanted, 50 per cent. commission. Trial year 20 cents. Terms and sample copy 3 cent stamp. Indorsed by the SENTINEL. PRISON LIGHT, 40 Green Street, Brattleboro, Vt.



NEW YORK, MAY 3, 1894.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

A BILL has passed the legislature to annex Gravesend to Brooklyn and is creating quite a stir, particularly in Coney Island, because of the fact that it is believed that annexation will result in the Sunday closing of Coney Island resorts.

THE Stundist movement which began in Russia in 1865, has progressed so rapidly that there are now more than two millions of Stundists in the empire of the czar. The Stundists are simply Bible readers and Bible believers,—Biblical Christians.

THE case of Edgar Price, a Seventh-day Adventist, of Millington, Md., who was on trial at Chestertown, for Sunday labor, has been dismissed by Judge Wickes on the ground that the case was not properly before the court. The judge took occasion, however, to uphold the constitutionality and propriety of the Sunday law.

THE spirit which animates the Russian persecution of the Jews is very clearly evidenced by the words of a Russian paper when it says: "No restrictions of the Jews' civil rights can outweigh the scandal of their religious privileges." That is the same feeling which can be looked for in this country when mistaken religious zealotry shall have completed its work and left a free field for prejudice and bigotry to fulfill their mission.

THE religious press gives continual evidence of the development of the principles of Spiritualism in the popular churches. In addition to the unconscious Spiritualism with which all so-called orthodoxy is permeated, there is a growing element within the churches which they themselves recognize as Spiritualistic. This is in the line of the progress of the fulfillment of prophecy. Spiritualism will be one of the chief factors in the last great deceptions.

MONDAY, April 16, the Essex Market Police Court was again the scene of attempted wholesale Sunday prosecution. The *World* notes it among its news items thus:—

Fifty small storekeepers on the East Side were arraigned in Essex Market Court yesterday, for violation of the Sunday law, in selling goods on Sunday. The defendants claimed that they observed their own Sabbath on Saturdays. They denounced their arrest as an outrage. Many had been unable to furnish bail and had passed the night in Eldridge Street station. The arrests were made by policemen under Captain Cortright. Justice Hogan held about twenty and discharged the others.

There is a grim humor in the inconsis-

tency of the police department attempting to make up for its lapses in official duty, and failures to clear out centers of actual criminality within speaking distance of the doors of its own station houses, by zealous attention to an unconstitutional statute, the enforcement of which is religious persecution.

THE *Open Court* says:—

An edict of universal tolerance would hardly terminate the heretic-hunts of the Russian Empire; and though the Constitution of the United States protects the religious privileges of our Jewish fellow-citizens, their main guarantee of freedom is, after all, the superior general intelligence of the American public.

It is true that ignorance and bigotry have been cotemporary, and from that the inference is drawn that only in periods of intellectual darkness can there be religious persecution, but the time is close at hand when it will be shown that "superior general intelligence" is not a trustworthy guarantee of freedom. It is the misdirected "intelligence" of this country which is laying deep and sure the foundations for religious persecution, which is now beginning in several States of the Union.

At a National Reform convention held at College Springs, Iowa, during March, Wm. Weir, a district secretary of the National Reform Association, said:—

National Reform means a nation, with all its laws and customs, kneeling at the feet of Jesus, and no person eligible to any office of trust unless he be a Christian, by profession at least. A large majority of the people are Christians, and they should let the politicians know what is wanted of them.

This is an ingenuous statement of the purpose of the National Reformers,—to establish a religious test for all offices in the gift of the people or the Government. It is their unmistakable intention to abrogate completely those principles of the Constitution which have been the distinctive safeguards of the people of this country.

REV. T. P. ROBB, of Linton, Iowa, is reported to have said at a National Reform convention, in Iowa, in March:—

This nation has no Sabbath. It tried to purchase one, but failed. Congress paid \$2,500,000 to procure it during the Fair, but was cheated out of it by a vile plot,—an underhanded game; and, notwithstanding all this iniquitous work to procure the appropriation, and the proceeds of the Fair on Sunday too, many Christians attended who had voted for Sunday closing. Adventists were the loudest clamorers for Sunday opening. In most respects they are honest, conscientious, law-abiding citizens, but they are doing all in their power to break down our Sabbath and institute theirs.

This is a peculiar mixture of frank acknowledgment of the mercenary methods used to secure a national recognition of Sunday observance, and a consequent union of religion and the State, and a veiled misrepresentation, perhaps through ignorance, of those who opposed Congress so committing itself, or making any such wicked bargain. As Rev. Mr. Robb so aptly puts it, Congress did try "to purchase" the observance of Sunday by the *World's Fair* and the representatives of all the earth there present, but he is utterly in error when he says that Advent-

ists were "clamorers for Sunday opening." The position of Seventh-day Adventists—as of all who oppose religious legislation on correct principles and from proper motives, is strictly and invariably negative;—that neither Congress, nor any other civil authority, has any right to decree either one way or the other in any religious question. In religion human law must be neutral. For man to attempt to enforce religion is blasphemy towards God, and unflinchingly works iniquitous hardship upon men.

THE *Mail and Express* says editorially:

All citizens, irrespective of religious convictions and sectarian affiliations, must be required to pay their full share of public school taxation. If any citizen prefers to send his children to private or church schools, he has a perfect right so to do, but the extra expense incident to such a choice must not be made the ground of a protest against the so-called "injustice of double taxation." He is simply paying for a luxury that he thinks he can afford. The State has no right to pay for the gratification of his personal preferences as between schools, much less for the indulgence of his personal prejudices on the score of sect or creed.

It is a great and unexpected satisfaction to be able to quote approvingly from the *Mail and Express*. In this and the defection from the Sabbath Union doctrine shown in its prohibition editorial, of April 9, there is enough leaven of truth and sound doctrine to yet leaven the whole lump, if it only be allowed to work.

On Sunday, April 22, for the first time in the city of London, a picture gallery was open for Sunday exhibition. There were so many desirous of availing themselves of the opportunity of viewing the pictures, that throughout the day long lines waited admission to the overcrowded hall. The Sunday opening of art galleries in London has been even more earnestly discussed than the Sunday opening of the Museum of Art in this city. The great success of this first opening, it is said, will insure its continuance, and cause other art galleries in London to open also on Sunday.

THE Boston *Advertiser* quotes the New York *Christian Advocate* as saying, "To introduce the name of 'Jesus Christ our Lord' into the Constitution of the country would be a step towards the union of Church and State, which, so long as we wish liberty of conscience, we can never advocate. An agitation such as this can simply arouse opposition where it is now slumbrous, and lead to the unrestrained utterance of sentiments provocative of irreverence and irreligion."

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,
48 Bond Street, New York City.