



"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 31, 1894.

NUMBER 22.

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. HOLLMAN,
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

"WHATSOEVER is not of faith is sin."
Rom. 14:23.

FAITH is of God and not of ourselves (Eph. 2:8); therefore whatsoever is not of God is sin.

WHATSOEVER is of God is righteousness: faith is the gift of God: and whatsoever is of faith is therefore righteousness, as certainly as that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

JESUS CHRIST is the Author and Finisher of faith (Heb. 12:2), and the Word of God is the channel through which it comes and the means by which it operates. For "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10:17. Where there is no word of God there can be no faith.

THE word of God is the most substantial and most powerful thing in the universe. It is the means by which all things were produced. It carries in itself creative power. For "by the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." "For he spake and it was; he commanded and it stood fast." Ps. 33:6, 9. And when this world was thus made, and darkness covered all the face thereof "God said, Let there be light: And there was light."

THUS the word of God is self-fulfilling, and of itself accomplishes the will of God in every one who receives it as it is in truth the word of God. "When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." 1 Thess. 2:13. Thus to receive the word of God; to yield the heart to it that thus it may work in the life; this is genuine belief, this is true faith. This is the faith by which men can be justified, made righteous indeed. For by it the

very will of God, as expressed in his own word, is accomplished in the life by the creative word of him who has spoken. This is the work of faith. This is the righteousness—the right doing—of God which is by faith. Thus "It is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Thus the character, the righteousness, of God is manifested in the life, delivering from the power of sin, to the saving of the soul in righteousness.

THIS is justification by faith alone. This is justification by faith, without works. For the faith being the gift of God, coming by the word of God, and itself working in man the works of God, needs none of the work of sinful man to make it good and acceptable to God. The faith itself works in man that which is good, and is sufficient of itself to fill all the life with the goodness of God, and needs not the imperfect effort of sinful man to make it meritorious. This faith gives to man good works, instead of being itself dependent upon man for "good works." It is not expressed by "faith and works;" but by "faith which works," "for in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but *faith which worketh* by love." Gal. 5:6. "Seest thou how *faith wrought*?" Jas. 3:22. "Remembering without ceasing, your work of *faith*;" "and the work of *faith* with power." 1 Thess. 1:3; 2 Thess. 1:11. And, "This is the *work of God*, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." John 6:29. This is "the faith of God" which Jesus exhorts us to have (Mark 11:22, margin); which was manifested in him; and which by his grace is a free gift to every soul on earth.

Now of this faith it is the boast of the Catholic Church that she knows nothing. This is the very doctrine of faith, and of justification by faith, which produced the Reformation and made original, genuine Protestantism. And of this faith, and of the Reformation which was produced by it, the Catholic Church speaks thus:—

As in revolutions the leaders try to gain the people over by the bait of promised independence, so at the time of the so-called Reformation—which was a revolution against church authority and order in religion—it seems that it was the aim of the Reformers to decoy the people under the pretext of making them inde-

pendent of the priests, in whose hands our Saviour has placed the administering the seven sacraments of pardon and of grace.

They began, therefore, by discarding five of these sacraments. . . . They then reduced, as it appears, to a mere matter of form, the two sacraments they professed to retain, namely, Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. To make up for this rejection, and enable each individual to prescribe for himself, and procure by himself the pardon of sins and divine grace, independently of the priests and of the sacraments, they invented an *exclusive means, never known in the church of God, and still rejected* by all the eastern churches and by the Roman Catholics throughout the world. . . . They have framed a new *dogma, not to be found in any of the creeds, or in the canons of any general council; I mean, the new dogma of Justification by Faith Alone, or by Faith only.*

Luther invented, as we have said, this doctrine, and was the first to affix such a meaning to the word *faith*. . . . And from that period only there existed men who saw in the word *faith*, occurring so frequently in Holy Scripture, that which has never been seen by the fathers, doctors, saints, and by the whole Church of God.—*Catholic Belief, pp. 365, 366, 374.*

These extracts are enough to show, and they declare plainly enough, that the Catholic Church does indeed know nothing of the faith which is of God, and which, because it is of God, bears in itself sufficient power and merit to justify and save the sinner who will allow it to work in him the righteousness of God. What meaning then does she affix to the word *faith*? Here it is:—

These texts, all of which refer to saving faith, prove beyond a doubt that not trust in Christ for personal salvation, but the *faith of the Creed, . . . is the faith availing for justification.*—*Id., p. 370.*

But who made the creed?—Men, and men only. Constantine was the chief agent in the making of the original Catholic creed, the Nicene creed. Men being the sole authors of the creed, and "faith" being "the faith of the creed," it follows at once that that faith is solely of themselves, of their own manufacture, and not the gift of God at all, and is therefore not true faith at all. For the true faith, the faith that really saves, is "not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." And as men only made the Catholic creed, and as Catholic faith is only "the faith of the creed," it is as certain as anything can be that the Catholic faith is a base counterfeit that she would pass off upon all the world, and by force too, to supplant the true faith.

It is not enough, however, to say that

it is a mere human invention: it comes from lower down than that. And she herself has given us the means of tracing it to its original. Here it is:—

By *faith* is not meant a trust in Christ for personal salvation, but evidently a firm belief that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ, the Son of God, that what is related of him in the Gospel is true, and that what he taught is true.—*Id.*, p. 369.

Now there are recorded in the Scriptures several examples of this same identical "faith" here defined. And now, as we read these examples, and have the plain word of God as to what they were who held this "faith," we can have no difficulty in knowing the real nature and origin of the Catholic faith, "the faith of the creed."

Here is one: "And in the synagogue there was a man which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice, saying, Let us alone. What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him." Luke 4: 33-35.

Here is another: "And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And he straitly charged them that they should not make him known." Mark 3: 11, 12.

And here is another: "And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way. And, behold, they cried out saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" Matt. 8: 28, 29.

And yet another: "Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth. And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, which did so. And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" Acts 19: 13-15.

In these examples there is every element of the "faith" above defined and set forth as the "saving faith" of the Catholic Church. Every one of these devils showed "evidently a firm belief" and actually proclaimed it, "that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ, the Son of God!" And that legion of them that found a home with the hogs and set the whole two thousand of them crazy, showed also "evidently a firm belief that what is related of him in the Gospel is true." For from the beginning of the gospel in this world it had been related of him that he should bruise the devil's head; and it was indeed related of him that he should destroy the devil. And that this legion of devils had "evidently a firm belief" that this is true is clearly shown by their terrified inquiry, "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" They thoroughly believed that this time of torment was coming, as it had been related; and what they feared now was that it was to befall them "before the time."

Not only do these examples supply every element of that which is authoritatively defined and set forth as Catholic "saving faith," showing it to be but the faith of

the devils; but the Scripture plainly states that that is just the kind of faith that it is. Here are the words: "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: *the devils also believe, and tremble.*" Jas. 2: 19. There is the plain word of the Lord, that this "faith" that is proudly set forth as the Catholic faith is simply the faith that the devils have. And *it does not save them.* It has no power to change their lives. They are devils still. And moreover, Jesus forbade them to preach this "faith."

This is precisely "the faith of the creed." It is of themselves and not of God. And being only of themselves, it is impotent to bring to them any virtue to change the life: it is powerless to work in them any good. Being incapable of working, it is a faith that is dead. And those who hold it, realizing that it is lifeless and so unable to do anything for *them*, are obliged to give it the appearance of life by doing great things for *it* in the multiplication of dead works. For, works that are not of faith, that are not wrought by the faith itself, are dead works. They are worse than valueless, for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Any faith that is not able of itself to produce, to work, the works of God in him who professes it, is a dead faith. It is "the faith of the creed." It is the "faith" of the devils. It is the "faith" of the papacy. And when such "faith" is passed off for Christianity, it is the mystery of iniquity, wherever it is found. And therefore it is that the Scripture, immediately after describing this "faith" of the devils, exclaims: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" And then cites Abraham and calls to all, "Seest thou how *faith wrought* with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" Jas. 2: 20, 22. Thus the works by which faith was made perfect, were wrought by the faith itself. When the faith is living, the works of faith appear just as certainly as when the tree is living the fruit appears in its season.

The only thing that will be accepted in the Judgment is *works*. The only works that will be accepted in the Judgment are works of *righteousness*. And the only righteousness that will be accepted or countenanced in any way whatever in the Judgment is the righteousness of *God*. And this righteousness is a free gift to man, and is wrought in man by faith alone—"even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference."

It is true that "the Church" says that "this faith," "the faith of the creed," this faith of the devils, "leads to trusting in Christ, and to all other virtues." But it is a notable fact that it has not done this for the devils. And it is just as notable and just as apparent that "this faith" has not, in all these hundreds of years, led the Catholic Church to trusting in Christ nor to any other virtues.

BUT she gives an illustration to show the difference between the faith of Christ and "the faith of the creed," and here it is:—

To show the unfairness of taking the word *faith*, occurring in the Holy Scripture, in this new Protestant sense of trust in Christ for pardon, to the exclusion of any other dispositions or means, and not in the Catholic sense of belief in revealed truths, allow me to use the following illustration: Suppose a man afflicted with a grave disease sends for a physician

of repute. The physician comes and prescribes, and, to inspire the patient with more confidence, tells him, "Only believe in me and you will be cured." Can we suppose that the poor sufferer, on the departure of the physician, would say: "I shall take no medicine, for the physician said: 'Only believe and you will be cured.'" This way of reasoning and acting seems impossible to be adopted in regard to the cure of the body, but respecting the cure of the soul it is an unhappy matter of fact that thousands of persons fall into this sad mistake.—*Catholic Belief*, pp. 374, 375.

Now there is not the least doubt that this statement perfectly illustrates the difference between the faith of Christ and Catholic faith, for it proceeds altogether upon the view that there is no more power or virtue in the word of *God* than there is in the word of *a man*; that the word of Christ, the heavenly Physician, has no more power to cure than has the word of an earthly physician. And that is indeed just the difference between true faith, the faith of God; and Catholic faith, "the faith of the creed"—and of the devils.

True faith finds in the Word of God, the word of the heavenly Physician, the living—creative—power of God to accomplish all that this word says. When the centurion asked Jesus to cure his sick servant, Jesus said, "I will come and heal him." But the centurion said, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." And Jesus himself declared this to be "faith," and even "so great faith" as he had not found in Israel, and then said to the centurion, "Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour." Matt. 8: 5-13. A nobleman also came to Jesus beseeching him, "Sir, come down ere my child die. Jesus saith unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man *believed the word* that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way." And when the man neared his home "his servants met him, and told him, saying, Thy son liveth. Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. So the father knew that it was at the *same hour in which Jesus said* unto him, *Thy son liveth*: and himself believed, and his whole house." John 4: 46-53.

This is faith, genuine faith. It finds in the word of God itself all sufficiency to accomplish all that the word expresses. And over and over again, in fact in all the cases recorded in the New Testament, it was believing the word spoken and thus receiving the power of that word to accomplish of itself the thing that was spoken—it was this faith that healed the sick, restored the palsied, made the impotent to walk, and *forgave the sinner*. This is believing God. This is faith.

But when the word of God is held to be as powerless as the word of a man; when the word of Jesus Christ is held to be as empty of healing virtue as is the word of a mere human physician; when the word of the living God is thus reduced to the level of the word of men, and to all intents and purposes is received as the word of men, and the words of men themselves, formulated into a creed, are really put in the place of the word of God; then such belief, such faith, is only of themselves and is as powerless and as empty of saving virtue as are the men themselves. It is the same story over again, of the effort of men to save themselves by themselves from themselves. And this "faith" that is altogether from men themselves, that stands only in the words and wisdom of men, this "faith of the creed" that is

identical with the "faith" of the devils—this, by her own showing, by her own boast, and by her own illustration, is the faith of the Catholic Church. Very good. We accept her showing in the case. Undoubtedly it is the truth. The illustration is perfectly satisfactory.

THERE is another statement that she makes which so clearly reveals again the essential nature of the "faith" which is held, and the salvation that is offered, by the Catholic Church, that it is worth quoting. Here it is:—

We seem to hear Jesus, our heavenly Physician, say: I died for all, and thereby prepared in my blood a remedy for all. If you would have the merits of my passion and death applied to you, to free your souls from sin, you must believe that I am what I declare myself to be, and believe what I teach. *Do also what I have told you to do, and then you shall have the merits of my passion and death applied to you and you shall be justified.*

This is in very substance, and even in terms, the old covenant. It is identical with the covenant "from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage." Gal. 4:24. Here are the terms of the old covenant, the covenant from Sinai: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation." "And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Ex. 19:4-6, 8. Their agreement to obey his voice, indeed, was an agreement to keep the ten commandments indeed. For when his voice was heard from Sinai the ten commandments alone were spoken. And of these it is written: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. So that in substance this covenant from Sinai, just as certainly as this Catholic statement says, I have done this great thing for you. Now, if you would have the benefit of it, believe what I teach, *do also what I have told you to do, and then you shall have it and you shall be justified.* And the people all said they would do it, and this, too, *with the hope of being justified.* These two statements are identical in substance and in doctrine. The thought of both is that man must do righteousness in order to be righteous, instead of first being righteous in order to do righteousness.

It will not do though to say that as the Lord made the statement from Sinai, therefore this statement from Rome is truth. The Lord had a purpose in this covenant from Sinai, even though it did then "gender to bondage." That covenant from Sinai corresponds to Hagar in the family of Abraham. The children of that covenant, the people who entered into it, correspond to Ishmael the child of Hagar. As Hagar was a bondwoman, so the child that was born of her was a bondchild. And thus she gendered to bondage. As Hagar represents the covenant from Sinai, and her child was a bondchild, so the covenant from Sinai gendered to bondage and the children of that covenant were bondchildren.

Moreover, Ishmael was "born after the flesh." And as Ishmael represents the children of that covenant, so they were "after the flesh" and knew only the birth of the flesh. Knowing only the birth of the flesh, and minding only the things of

the flesh, they thought themselves capable of fulfilling all the righteousness of God. The Lord knew full well that they could not do it; but they did not know it, and they would not believe that they could not do it. In order to convince them that they could not do it, and enable them to see it so plainly that they themselves would confess their inability to do it, the Lord gave them a full and fair opportunity to try. Within forty days they had fully demonstrated their utter inability to do what the Lord had told them, and what they had freely promised to do. They were in deeper bondage than ever. They were then willing to have the Lord deliver them from the bondage of sin to the liberty of righteousness, by his own power through his own word in his own promise, even as he had delivered their father Abraham. In a word they were then willing to attain to righteousness, to be justified, *by faith*, instead of trying to obtain it by works. They were willing to be children of promise, instead of children of the flesh. Having found by this experience that "the minding of the flesh is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God neither indeed can be," they were willing to be born again and of the Spirit of God, rather than to trust longer to the ways of the birth of the flesh. Having found that by this old and temporary covenant they were lost, they were willing to be saved by the new and everlasting covenant which is this: "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." In this covenant there is no "if." It depends not upon what we shall do, but upon what God will do "unto all and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference. For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

Such was the covenant from Sinai, such was its nature, and such its purpose. And that the recording of it with the nature and experience of those caused it to be made and who entered into it, was necessary for future ages is demonstrated by this repetition of it in the Catholic system of "faith." That covenant was faulty; but this repetition of it is infinitely faulty and altogether bad, as compared with the original example. For there, although it was their own sinfulness and self-righteousness that led to the making of it, yet through the sad experience of it God would draw them away from themselves to the knowledge of Christ. While here and in this, the papacy takes the very revelation of the gospel of Christ itself and perverts it into the old covenant, and through this perversion draws men away from Christ to the exaltation of self. It puts Sinai in the place of Calvary. It puts the old covenant in the place of the new. It puts works in the place of faith. It puts bondage in the place of freedom. It puts ceremonies in the place of Christ. And it puts man in the place of God. And yet the professed Protestantism of to-day counts itself "one in essentials" with this organized iniquity!

This is the papacy, and this her doctrine of "faith." And as God said of Hagar and Ishmael in the family of Abraham,

and of the covenant from Sinai and its children in the family of Israel, so he says of this same wicked thing as it would be in the family of Christianity: "Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." Gal. 4:30.

There never was a truer description of the papacy than that given in a quotation in these columns a few weeks ago, in the words that pronounced it "a method of forgetting God, which shall pass as a method of remembering him."

A. T. J.

The Movement Against Church Patronage in England.

It is well known that the right of presentation to livings in the Church of England belongs, in a multitude of cases, to lay patrons, and that this fact has repeatedly given rise to grave scandals. Not only have avowed atheists and notorious blacklegs—the late Marquis of Ailesbury was an example—exercised the power of bestowing, as free gifts, life appointments to rectorships, but such appointments have been made the subject of sale at public auction.

The necessity of checking these glaring abuses has long been recognized, and it has been emphasized by the recent introduction of a bill to disestablish the Anglican Church in Wales. A palliative measure, which has the approval of the bishops and the clergy, is now pending before Parliament, and although it has been criticised by Sir William Harcourt and by representatives of Nonconformism on the ground that it does not go far enough, it seems likely to become a law. The proposal in question has three main features. First, it prohibits the sale of the next presentation to a living, thus providing that the advowson or perpetual right of presentation to a living, whenever a vacancy occurs, shall hereafter be exercised only by way of gift. Secondly, although the advowson itself may be sold, there must be a complete transfer of the right, and no mortgage or encumbrance of any kind must be imposed on the advowson or the living. Finally, the bill enumerates six reasons for which a bishop can refuse to institute a clergyman to a living. These are, that the clergyman has not been ordained one year; that he is unfit through physical or mental infirmity; that he is in great pecuniary difficulties; that he has been guilty of misconduct or neglect of duty in the offices which he has previously filled, or that there is a grave scandal or evil report affecting his moral conduct. A right of appeal, however, is given to the patron and presentee from the bishop's decision to the archbishop.

In the debate on the second reading of this bill a Nonconformist denounced it as a half-hearted measure, and declared that the evil complained of could be abolished only by prohibiting the sale of advowsons altogether. Sir William Harcourt called the bill a sham, because it left untouched the persons who dispense most of the spiritual offices. It forbade a poor man, who happened to own an advowson, to sell the next presentation; but it did not prevent a peer, or other rich person, from distributing livings as free gifts, and thus forming a sort of spiritual oasis by taking care that all the rectors in his neighborhood should be in agreement with himself. Sir William agreed with the Dissenters in thinking

that neither lay patrons nor the bishops ought to have the whole power of appointment to clerical office. A bill, to be thorough-going, ought to give the parishioners some such power of effective control over the choice of their clergyman as is in force in Scotland. It was pointed out that the recent growth of the Church of England had taken place for the most part in the large towns, where it was practically a voluntary church, the clergyman depending to a large extent on the approval of his congregation. Another speaker hit the mark exactly when he said that the scandals associated with lay patronage would be entirely shaken off when the Church of England's connection with the State should be dissolved.

Meanwhile, there seemed to be a general feeling that half a loaf was better than no bread at all; and so the bill passed the second reading, and will doubtless be carried through its subsequent stages.—*N. Y. Sun.*

An Observer in Coxeys Camp.*

ON April 28th I visited the main "Army of the Commonweal," encamped at Rockville, Maryland. My purpose was the study of this popular uprising of the nineteenth century, while the army was at peace in country districts and just before its exciting entry into Washington.

These men are not tramps, but for the most part unskilled, uneducated workmen; men just above the tramp class, who are the first to suffer during times of financial depression and the last to regain employment. They were doing things which tramps never do except under dire compulsion.

The first thing which impressed me strongly after entering the Rockville camp was the youth of most of the four hundred men—mere boys, a large part of them. They showed few signs of physical degeneracy or undervitalization. On the contrary, very many of them seemed like men whom a recruiting sergeant would be glad to enlist for the regular army. Many of the men were playing ball, surrounded by an admiring audience. The sheds used for the housing of live stock in fair time had been appropriated by the army for bedrooms, and many men were peacefully slumbering upon hay and straw.

Chickens and turkeys were wandering within the precincts of the camp, and their owners apparently did not fear for them a speedy ending in the pot. I was almost the only visitor present that afternoon; and during the two days in which I mingled freely with the Coxeys men I heard but one man swear.

The following letter to Mr. Coxeys from Mr. William V. Bouie, a well-known lawyer of Rockville, adds strength to my conviction that the main Army of the Commonweal was, as its leaders intended it should be, an army of peace, resolved to obey the laws even when they considered them unjust. This letter, which Mr. Coxeys exhibited with pride, was, in part, as follows:—

As a life-long citizen of the town of Rockville, thoroughly interested in the best welfare of my people by the ties of blood and business interest, I feel that it is but a just tribute to say that no more peaceable assemblage than that led by you ever took place in our town. Before your arrival the movement was viewed by our citizens with apprehension partaking somewhat of hostility; but your gentlemanly conduct and the

law-abiding conduct of your men made for you hosts of sympathetic friends.

Leaving the privates of the Commonweal Army, I went to "headquarters," a tent, where I found Marshal Carl Browne. A great, big, strong fellow, with a hearty bass voice; part fakir, part religionist, part wild West cowboy, and withal a natural leader of men. On the ground outside were heaped the banners of the Commonweal, all the work of Browne's artistic hand and paint brush. The one carried at the head of the army on the march was a picture of Christ. Above were the words: "Peace on Earth, Good-will toward Men," and underneath "But DEATH to INTEREST on Bonds!" This was the official standard of the Commonweal.

Carl Browne has been trying from the first to awaken religious enthusiasm among his followers, who are manifestly lacking in any strong, cohesive principle. They seem fitting subjects for Salvation Army treatment, yet have not caught the religious infection from Browne to any marked degree. Their minds are apparently too full of economic questions. Still, this strange commingling of crude Theosophic with Salvation Army ideas is an interesting phase of the movement. Carl Browne believes that portions of the soul of Christ are reincarnated in Brother Coxeys and himself.

And that the remainder of the soul of Christ has been fully reincarnated in thousands of people throughout the United States to-day, and that accounts for the tremendous response to this call of ours, to try to bring about peace and plenty to take the place of panic and poverty. To accomplish it means the second coming of Christ, and I believe in the prophecy that he is to come, not in any one single form, but in the whole people. Now you have the reason for the banner of peace with his figure as a central painting, and that is why we start out on this mission on Easter Sunday for "He hath risen."

In the evening I listened to speeches by Browne and Coxeys in front of the town hall. Browne mounted upon his panorama wagon, and got the crowd into good humor by telling them stories in parable form, illustrating the Commonweal movement and its objects. Mr. Coxeys followed with a serious speech, supporting the two bills which he has had introduced before Congress, commonly known as the "Coxey Good Roads Bill" and the "Coxey Non-Interest Bearing Bond Bill."

The first of these bills would secure the immediate issue of five hundred million dollars of legal tender treasury notes, to be expended under the authority of the Secretary of War at the rate of twenty million dollars per month, for the improvement of roads throughout the United States. Eight hours shall constitute a day's work, and wages for common labor shall not be less than one dollar and fifty cents per day. Said Mr. Coxeys:—

Do you not see that this would do away with unemployment, solve the labor problem, and secure the eight-hour labor day, for which organized labor has been striving unsuccessfully for many years? No one will consent to toil for less than \$1.50, or longer than eight hours a day, when Government offers these terms freely to all who seek them.

The argument is essentially socialistic, as is the whole Coxeys movement. If Government is bound to furnish every man with work fitted to his capacity, and pay him enough to support life in comfort, then the ideal of individual responsibility, one of God's grandest gifts to men, is utterly overthrown. Why should a man take trouble to fit himself for work which the world needs, and which he will be best able to perform; new work, per-

haps, which requires hard thought and constant exertion to attain success, when right here at hand is work found for him, with sure pay and no need for anxiety or brain weariness? Men love to escape from their responsibility, but without it there is no upward growth for the individual or for humanity. The man entirely without a sense of responsibility is less man than beast.

Mr. Coxeys and his followers are firm believers in the power of Congress to make them all happy by issuing sufficient paper money, and attribute most of their woes to the Shylocks of the national banks and particularly the bankers of England. The greenback heresy has them firmly in its clutches.

Such ideas as these are widely current among American workmen to-day. The Philadelphia contingent of the Coxeys army contained the best class of commonwealers and the largest proportion of trade workers. One of its leaders summed up this phase of the Coxeys movement in a single sentence: "It means the nationalization of credit." He himself seeks also the establishment of "a coöperative commonwealth."

The story of the Labor Day procession at Washington is well known. I had every facility for observing it thoroughly. The Army of the Commonweal, some five hundred strong, preserved the attitude of peace, the respect for law which it had always promised and practised. Good order and almost absolute silence prevailed throughout the ranks, in which not more than fifteen gray-haired men were to be seen.

A peaceful display of force on the part of the police was sufficient to preserve decent behavior among the spectators and the Army of the Commonweal. Instead of this the police felt called upon to club unoffending people right and left. Some of this I witnessed myself, and the following quotation from the *Evening Star* of May 1st, supports my assertions:—

When the police had escorted Coxeys to his carriage, pushing him by the shoulders, but not seizing him, they released him. He clambered into the carriage, where his wife sat, with "Legal Tender" in her lap, and as he stood there a fierce cheer was sent up from the surrounding crowd. Then the police seemed to lose their heads, and, falling upon the luckless colored men and women nearest them, they clubbed the negroes lustily.

The *Washington News* thus reports the affair:—

The crowd became so thick about the Coxeys carriage that the leader could hardly get to it, and in attempting to clear back the people the police became rattled and struck right and left with their clubs. The mounted officers charged into the crowd and pushed, struck and shouted.

The white palfrey on which Miss Coxeys was mounted became frightened and attempted to run away, but was held back by a young man, who bravely clung to the horse's bridle, despite the efforts of a panic-stricken policeman to knock him down with his baton.

Such action on the part of the police was utterly foolish and unnecessary; and I believe Mr. Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, was right in saying: "Clubbing may subdue Coxeys or Browne, but it will not drive thought out of the people's mind. A club will subdue one man, but it will recruit one hundred for the cause he represents." Mr. Gompers here voices the thoughts of workers all over this broad land. I have taken pains to investigate this matter, and have been amazed to find both skilled and unskilled laborers, hotel proprietors, small shopkeepers and business men in such

* Abridgment of an article by A. Cleveland Hall, of Johns Hopkins University, in the *New York Independent* of May 17.

earnest sympathy, not perhaps with the extreme demands of Coxe, but with the organized movement of the suffering unemployed and the demand for public work, not charity, to keep their families and themselves from starving. There is space but for a single instance here. In the camp of the Commonweal, after the parade, a well-dressed man handed a labor union card to Mr. Coxe and said: "There are 1,700 of us, and we all sympathize with you. Possibly we can help you with money, but at any rate we are all with you in this movement, even if we are Government employes."

A few weeks ago it looked as if 60,000 men would be marching to Washington, and a major-general in the United States Army said: "This is the most dangerous movement since 1861."

The march to Washington has been a great school to the men engaged in it. They entered the army with ideas vague and confused, knowing that times were very bad with them, but uncertain why. Now they think they know why. There are many differences of opinion; but their ideas are becoming fixed, and, unfortunately, fast grounded in socialism. The Commonweal camp is undoubtedly a socialist school; but any attempt to suppress it while its members are law-abiding, would result in infinitely greater evils than does its continued existence.

Seventh-Day Observers, Give Heed!

[Under the title, "Seventh-day Baptists, Give Heed," Rev. A. H. Lewis contributes the following article to the *Sabbath Recorder*. While Dr. Lewis does not realize that the "Collapse of recent efforts to save Sunday by civil law" is only apparent, and that in reality all the legislative and judicial functions of the country have been immediately committed to its support, yet the logical development of the argument for the support of first-day observance is just what he has pointed out,—necessarily ending in the doing away with the authority of the Scriptures and making the Bible only a book of general principles, necessarily ending in a papacy as its infallible interpreter.]

I DESIRE to call the attention of your readers, and especially of all Seventh-day Baptist ministers, to a new phase of the Sabbath controversy which has been pushed to the front within two years past. It is the third phase which has appeared within the memory of your readers who are forty years old. The original Puritan theory of the "change of the day" was still prominent in the most orthodox and religious circles twenty-five years ago. When the more exhaustive treatment of that phase was entered upon by Seventh-day Baptists and others it soon yielded, and the "no Sabbath," "any day," "seventh part of time," theory was rushed to the front. This is still presented in various ways because it seems to afford the nearest retreat when men are pressed by the demands of the Sabbath. But the leaders of thought see that the escape is not complete until the Bible is silenced as a book of definite and specific authority. Hence, in military phrase, they are building a new position for their "long-range guns." It is this:—

The Bible is only a book of general principles, and not an authoritative source of specific rules. These general principles may be applied according to individual choice and to fit changing circumstances.

This is the most favorable form of statement. It is not made by non-Christian opponents of Sunday, but by Christian leaders who oppose the Sabbath. They say: "You Seventh-day Baptists are right, so far as the Bible is concerned, but the latest investigations and the 'Higher

Criticism' show that God never intended the Bible to be accepted as to specific rules." Of course this theory sweeps away the Sabbath, baptism in any form, the Lord's Supper, and in the end the organized church; and many announce themselves ready to accept such an issue. This new theory, or perhaps I should say tendency, is a compound of Quakerism, no-lawism and Roman Catholicism; the amount of each element varying according to circumstances. There is enough truth in the mixture to make it more attractive, and, considering the present state of the public mind, more dangerous than any phase of the Sabbath question which has arisen within the last three hundred years. It is also equally dangerous to Christianity as represented in history. It is another form of the lawlessness which compelled men to the Protestant movement.

No form of organized Christianity is so directly affected by this issue as that represented by the readers of the *Recorder*, and by other Sabbath-keeping Christians. Baptists come next in order; while the Roman Catholic fold is created and conducted so as to welcome the flood-tide which will come under the supremacy of such a theory. It has always said: "The Bible is authoritative only as interpreted by the Church."

Three prominent factors have united to develop this new position on the part of the enemies of the Sabbath.

(a) The strength, persistency and thoroughness with which the defenders of the Sabbath have marshalled the facts of history in support of the Seventh-day Baptist position.

(b) The better knowledge of what the Bible actually teaches. The most earnest and intelligent students of the Bible have learned that Sunday observance has no place in that book. Many of them openly acknowledge this. Others continue to assume that it does, while they are seeking new forms of retreat from the facts which they know, but do not openly avow.

(c) The collapse of recent efforts to save Sunday by civil law. The various failures connected with Sunday law movements at Washington and elsewhere, and the success of "Sunday opening" at the World's Fair, have greatly disheartened the advocates of more stringent laws by which to save the "Imperiled American Sabbath," although they keep up a desultory firing and make much of the slightest regard for Sunday law which appears anywhere, their tendency to retreat cannot be covered.

(d) By no means the least of these factors is the growth of the Roman Catholic doctrine among Protestants, that the authority of custom, based on the decrees of the Church, supersedes the "letter of the Bible." This is most significant, since it evinces the fundamental agreement of popular Protestantism with its ancient enemy.

The most casual observer must see that this new issue touching the Sabbath involves that new era, which must come in Protestant history, unless the Protestant movement has already seen its brightest and strongest days. It must not be forgotten that Protestantism has not yet reached a final and successful issue. The vigor of its earlier history has not been wholly retained. The fundamental principles on which it was based, have a wider development and a grander future, or ignominious defeat.

It is here that Seventh-day Baptists must be awakened to the fact that, as in the early times of their existence, and of Protestantism, so now their position involves the fundamental elements of that movement. Their past history and present struggles are a foolish whim if nothing more than mere "denominationalism" is involved. The greatest danger that threatens the cause which God has entrusted to the readers of the *Recorder* is indifference to the greatness of present issues, and a shrinking from the labor and anxiety which are necessary in order to understand and meet them. If their birth-right and their work is not measurelessly larger than the "day of the Sabbath," as ordinarily understood, it is not worth even a "mess of pottage." If it is what I have indicated above, it involves even more than the early stages of Protestant dissent did. Sleepy-eyed men with narrow vision are of no value in such a struggle.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE

SUPREME COURT.

STATE OF TENNESSEE

VS.

JACKSON, APRIL TERM, 1894.

W. B. CAPPS, IN ERROR.

Brief and Argument of W. L. Carter, of Counsel for the Defense.

STATEMENT OF CASE.

DEFENDANT was indicted and convicted in the Circuit Court of Weakley County, Tennessee, for following his usual vocation of life, that of farming, on Sunday,—to "the public nuisance of the community," etc.

Two witnesses only, testified to having seen the defendant labor on his farm on Sunday. One saw him splitting timber, but not within twelve months before the finding of the indictment. The other saw him at two separate times, once in May, 1892, cutting stalks in defendant's field several hundred yards from the witness's house, but in sight; the other time, the same witness went to defendant's house to see him and found him plowing in some land that was left uncultivated in a field of corn. Neither instance was in sight of a public road or other public place.

The deputy sheriff also testified that when he arrested the defendant, he said that he was in the habit of working on Sunday, because he kept Saturday, or the seventh day of the week, as the Sabbath, as he believed the Bible required; that he was a Seventh-day Adventist, and having kept the Sabbath he thought he had the right to work on Sunday, if he disturbed no one.

THE OFFENSE CHARGED IS THAT OF A NUISANCE.

It will not be contended that any indictment will lie in this State for simply laboring on Sunday; for the statute (code sec. 2289) defines and fixes the penalty for Sunday labor at three dollars, to be recovered before a justice of the peace, one half to the person suing and the other half to the county. The statute reads as follows:—

If any merchant, artificer, tradesman, farmer, or other person, shall be guilty of doing, or exercising, any of the common avocations of life, or permitting the same to be done by his children or servants, acts of real necessity or charity excepted, on Sunday, on

due conviction before any justice of the peace of the county, shall forfeit and pay three dollars, one half to the person who will sue for the same and the other half for the use of the county. (Code, sec. 2289.)

The statute having defined and fixed the penalty for Sunday labor, by the well known rule of construction, the law existing before the statute, if any, is abrogated. *Lorry vs. State*, 7 Bax., 95; *State vs. Boocer*, 71 Mo., 631; *Sedgwick on the "Construction of Statutes"*, 2d ed., p. 105.

TENNESSEE DECISIONS ON THE SUBJECT.

The decisions in Tennessee as to whether repeated or habitual secular labor on Sunday will constitute a nuisance at the common law, are in conflict.

In the case of *Lorry vs. State*, 7 Bax., 95, Chief Justice Nicholson, in delivering the opinion of the court, says:—

The question, then, is whether the defendant is indictable for a common nuisance in carrying on his trade, barbering, on Sunday. If this be so, then every other person who carries on his ordinary business, openly and publicly on Sunday, may be indicted for a nuisance. The occupation of the barber stands on the same platform with the merchant, mechanic, or professional man. It is . . . in no respect a nuisance, unless it becomes so by the simple fact that it is carried on on Sunday. The legal definition of a nuisance is "that which incommodes or annoys—something which produces inconvenience or damage." It cannot be said that a barber shop is something which incommodes or annoys, or which produces inconvenience or damage to others. . . . To hold that it becomes a nuisance when carried on on Sunday is a perversion of the term "nuisance." All that can be said of it is that when prosecuted on Sunday it is a violation, and subject to be proceeded against as provided by the statute, but not subject to indictment as a nuisance. Thus the court held that the carrying on of one's business openly and publicly on Sunday was not, and could not constitute a nuisance simply because it was done on Sunday. *Lorry vs. State*, 7 Bax., 95.

In the case of *Parker vs. State*, 16 Lea, 476, it was held that the carrying on of the business of a blacksmith, openly and publicly, was a nuisance and was indictable as such, and that the proof need not show that any one was disturbed thereby. In delivering the opinion in that case, Chief Justice Deadrick uses the following language, quoting from 4 Blackstone's Com., 42 *et seq.*:—

Regarding Christianity as a part of the law of the land, it respects and protects its institutions, and assumes likewise to regulate the public morals and decency of the community.

He then proceeds to place Sunday labor on the same footing with obscenity, profanity, etc., and then proceeds:—

The statute makes it unlawful for any of the enumerated class to follow his ordinary, secular avocations on the Sabbath day, because it is immoral and is of pernicious effect; and though it may be conceded that a single offense may be liable only to the penalty prescribed by the statute, yet a succession of such acts becomes a nuisance and is indictable.

He bases this statement on 1 Bishop's "Criminal Law," sec. 1055, from which the latter part of the statement is quoted. But the quotation from Bishop was to show that though the statute might provide for the punishment of single acts of an immoral nature, yet when such acts were carried on to such an extent as to become a nuisance, they were indictable as such, notwithstanding the single act might be subject only to the penalty provided in the statute. The learned author, Bishop, was treating of acts that were immoral within themselves, such as obscenity, bawdy-houses, exposure of the person, adultery, lewdness, etc., but does not mention Sunday labor under this head at all. Bishop's "Criminal Law," Vol. 1, sec. 500-506. The Chief Justice then proceeds:—

See also Bishop's "Criminal Law," Vol. 2, sec. 939,

where it is said that the doctrine has been laid down in Pennsylvania that although a single act of Sabbath-breaking is punishable by the statute, there may be such a repetition of acts of the same sort as will amount to an indictable offense.

He then says "that such a succession of acts is shown in this case," and decides that although the proof did not show that any one was disturbed by the acts of the defendant, that it was a nuisance and punishable as such.

Bishop does not place Sunday labor under the head of immoral offenses at all, nor does any other law writer. They all place Sunday laws under "offenses against God and religion." 1 Bishop's "Criminal Law," sec. 499; 4 Blackstone's Com., 65; 2 Wharton's "Criminal Law," 2384; Ringgold's "Law of Sunday," 47.

No writer, not even Bishop, states that a repetition of acts of Sunday labor will constitute a nuisance, but says it has been so held in Pennsylvania. And this, Chief Justice Deadrick, in the Parker case as stated, quotes as authority for holding that case to be a nuisance. Bishop says that the Pennsylvania case held that there might be such a succession of acts of Sunday labor as would constitute a nuisance. But the Pennsylvania judge does not use the word nuisance at all. He says, "There may be such a succession of acts of the same sort [Sunday labor] as would amount to an indictable offense."

The language of the Pennsylvania judge (Thomason) is:—

The offense complained of here is a disturbance of the public peace; and the worldly employment, the manner and time of it, is only evidence of the offense charged. Traveling, or riding for recreation is not a breach of the Sabbath, and persons may not be arrested for riding along the streets for such purposes. The disturbances, if any, occasioned by the vehicle would be only for an instant, and not soon recurring. This is very unlike the carrying of passengers in vehicles along the same route every six minutes as was intended by the company on the day the arrest was made.

Continuing he says:—

The worldly employment, if carried on in such a manner and in such places as to disturb the public peace and quiet, and the religious exercises of the community, either in the churches or at home or in places of worship, may or may not be restrained by the imposition of the penalty defined in the act. Do not such circumstances constitute a disturbance of the public peace of the Sabbath, and may not the offender or offenders, be held to bail to keep the peace? Commonwealth vs. Jeandell, 2 Grant, Pa. 506.

I have quoted freely from this case because it is cited as the case and the only case of Sunday labor that sustains the Parker case. It was held in First Lea, 129, 130, that hunting and fishing became a nuisance when done on Sunday if done in such a manner as to disturb others. Hence it is seen that it not only fails to sustain the Parker case but is strong authority against it. The decision in that case was the disturbance and annoyance of the public in their homes and places of worship by running railroad cars along the street adjacent thereto every six minutes, thereby making such noise and confusion as would amount to a breach of the peace; while the Parker case is based upon the "example" which is said to be "immoral" and of "pernicious" effect, and therefore a repetition of the acts becomes a nuisance or is indictable, though a single act is not.

The Parker case therefore stands unique and alone,—the only case that holds that Sunday labor, because of "the evil example" that is of "immoral and pernicious effect" when repeated, becomes an indictable offense independent of statutory provisions, in the United States.

Except the Parker case it is believed

there has never, been a case in the United States holding that Sunday labor is indictable at the common law at all, either as a nuisance or otherwise, except the Jeandell case cited, that holds it to be a breach of the public peace so to run street-cars as to disturb worship. While it has been held not only that it was not an offense at the common law (4 Ired., N. C., 400), but has been decided by eminent judges that the legislatures of States having constitutions similar to ours, could not pass a statute making it an offense to labor on Sunday. Thomason's case, 15 Ind., 449; Benjamin's case, 2 Strob., Cal., 508; Newman vs. State, 9 Cal., 502; Bish. "Crim. Law," 499; Ringgold's "Law of Sunday," 78.

While the great weight of authority is that a State may pass a Sunday law as a civil or police regulation, it is significant that some of the ablest jurists have held otherwise. And none have held that it was punishable at the common law except the Breach of the Peace case in Pennsylvania, and the Parker case in Tennessee; and they are based upon separate and distinct grounds,—the Pennsylvania on "disturbance of the public peace" because of the noise and confusion of operating street-cars along a route every six minutes, and the Tennessee case on the grounds that the example is "immoral and of pernicious effect." Thus we see the Parker case is entirely unsupported by precedent.

CAN THE PARKER CASE BE SUSTAINED ON PRINCIPLE?

The grounds given for the decision are:—

First: Christianity is a part of the law of the land, and it respects and protects its institutions.

Second: Sunday labor is immoral and of pernicious effect, and therefore, a repetition of such acts constitutes a nuisance.

Are these propositions true? As to the first, the learned Chief Justice quotes Blackstone's Commentaries, Vol. 4, sec. 42, as follows:—

Regarding Christianity as a part of the law of the land, it respects and protects its institutions, and likewise assumes to regulate the public morals and decency.

It has been questioned by high authority, as to whether Christianity was ever a part of the law of the land, even in England, in the sense that it would attempt to enforce its precepts or dogmas, as such. In the case of *State vs. Chandler*, 2 Har., Del., 553, Justice Clayton says:—

Even in England, Christianity was never considered a part of the common law so far that for a violation of its injunctions, independent of the established laws of man and without the sanction of any positive act of Parliament made to enforce these injunctions, any man could be drawn to answer in a common-law court.

See also letter of Thomas Jefferson to Cartwright, where it is shown that the statement of Blackstone is founded on a mis-translation of a decision by Chief Justice Prisot in 1458. "Works of Thomas Jefferson," Vol. 7, page 359.

But, if it is or ever was true of England, where there is a Church established, and supported by law, and courts with ecclesiastic powers and a Parliament unhampered by a bill of rights or constitutional limitations, it never was, and in the nature of our Government and institutions, never can be true in the State of Tennessee.

"The common law of England, as it stood in 1775, such as was applicable to the new state of things in this country in so far as they were not inconsistent with our institutions and Government, or were not repealed by statute, were adopted as

the common law of this State." Porter vs. State, Martin and Yerger, 226. Or, as stated by Judge Thurman of Ohio: "The English common law, so far as it is reasonable in itself, suitable to the conditions and business of our people, and consistent with the letter and spirit of our federal and State constitutions and statutes, . . . may be said to constitute a part of the common law of this State." Bloom vs. Richards, 2 Ohio State, 387.

Section 3, art. 1, of the constitution of Tennessee, is as follows:—

That all men have an indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; that no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or maintain any minister against his consent; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship.

If Christianity is a religious establishment or mode of worship, it cannot be made a part of the law without violating the above clause of the constitution; because that would be giving it preference over other religious establishments or modes of worship. If the institutions of Christianity are protected to the extent that persons are made to observe them without their consent, it would be a violation, in that it would be giving a preference to that religion, and also in that it would violate the conscience of him who was forced to observe its institutions against his consent.

These propositions seem to be so plain as to need neither authority nor argument for their support.

(Conclusion next week.)

Dangerous Combinations.

In 1829 there was a united effort on the part of a number of religious denominations in the United States to secure from the national Government a Sunday law. Many petitions and memorials were sent to Congress. The committee to whom the matter was referred in the Senate, rendered a very able report, in which occur these words:—

Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. All religious despotism has commenced by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate on the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes us an awful warning of the consequence.

From what must be apparent to every one, it is evident that the danger here pointed out is an actual one in the Australasian colonies,—extensive religious combination to effect a political object. The "Council of the Churches," the "Christian Electors' Association," the "Lord's day Observance Society," and the "National Scripture Education League" are witnesses to this fact. Matters here have started on the road to religious despotism. We wait to see how long before the civil power bends under these religious combinations and this influence. But we expect to work while we wait, and do all in our power to warn every one of the danger herein involved, and to rouse the people to a sense of the value of the privilege of religious liberty heretofore enjoyed.

W. A. COLCORD.

Melbourne, Australia.

THE inevitable result of believing God's Word is to obey his law.—*The Ram's Horn.*

Apples of Gold Library

ENVELOPE SERIES

THIS is the title of a little monthly publication recently started by the Pacific Press, and is designed especially for use in personal correspondence. It is printed on thin paper, and one or two numbers can be put in a No. 6 envelope, with an ordinary letter, without increasing the postage.

The following numbers have already been issued:—

- No. 1. Looking unto Jesus.
- " 2. The Christian's Privilege.
- " 3. The Sure Promises of God.
- " 4. How to Get Knowledge.
- " 5. The Church and the World. (Poetry.)
- " 6. The Elect of God.
- " 7. How Esther Read Her Bible.
- " 8. The Thief on the Cross.
- " 9. The Eleventh Hour.
- " 10. Benefits of Bible Study.
- " 11. Righteousness; Where Is It to be Found?

Five copies for one year, postpaid, 50 cents; or 12 copies for \$1.00. Single subscriptions are not desirable, for two reasons: (1) The numbers being so small they are liable to be lost in the mails. (2) If they are used in correspondence, as recommended, more than one copy would be necessary.

Single or assorted numbers of the *Library* will be mailed in quantities at the following rates: 50 cents per hundred, or \$4.00 per thousand copies. Always order by the NUMBER.

IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

BY THE
Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,
Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

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

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States,

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

Is Outlined in the Prophecies of Holy Scriptures,

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

Paper Covers, - - - 25 Cents.
Cloth Covers, - - - 60 Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

The Law of God as Changed by the Papacy

Is the title of a large Chart just issued, which shows in a striking manner the blasphemous pretensions of the Papal power. The testimony of the *Best Catholic Authorities* is given, and shows, by quoting their own words, that Sunday is a child of the Catholic Church. These quotations, together with admissions from standard Catholic works, are arranged in parallel columns on either side of this Chart, while the center column contains the Ten Commandments as taught by the Catholic Church. The whole forms a collection of extracts of incalculable value for every Bible student.

The Charts are three by four feet in size, and are printed on heavy map cloth in bold type, easily read across the largest room.

Price, Post-paid, \$1.00.

A fac-simile edition on thin paper, size 5½ x 7½ inches, suitable for missionary distribution, has been prepared, and will be sent post-paid at 50 cents per hundred, or \$4.00 per thousand.

Address Pacific Press,
43 Bond Street, New York City.
or Oakland, Cal.

MAKE BREAD, GEMS AND CAKES OF EUREKA HEALTH FLOUR.

A WHOLE WHEAT FLOUR

Which competent authorities recommend as

"THE BEST FLOUR MADE."

It contains three to four times more of Bone, Brain, Nerve and Muscle building elements than ordinary white flour. Invaluable for dyspeptics, all invalids, and growing children. Everyone likes it. Used by the largest sanitariums.

Special Offer.—Half barrel, \$3.25; one barrel, \$6.00; freight paid. Usually retailed at \$7.00 to \$10.00 per barrel. If not perfectly satisfactory return at my expense and get your money. Agents wanted. Wholesale and retail dealers supplied. Circulars and recipes, for stamp.

F. W. BARTLE, Sales Agent,
Oxford, N. Y.

BARTLE'S SEEDLING POTATOES. NEW VARIETY.

Extra Quality. Very Thrifty. Practically Rot Proof.

Very early and as good late. Good keepers. Sold all I had. Have secured a few more. Sent postpaid, 30 cents per lb. By express or freight, 50 cents per package.

Plenty of time to plant them yet.

F. W. BARTLE,
Oxford, N. Y.

STEPS TO CHRIST,

By Mrs. E. G. White.

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

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

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

Address Pacific Press,
43 Bond Street, New York City.
or Oakland, Cal.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES,

A SIXTEEN-PAGE

Weekly Religious Journal.

Doctrinal, Practical, Earnest,
Protestant, Scriptural, Christian.

This really two dollar paper will be furnished at the following

PRICES OF SUBSCRIPTION:

Single Copy, One Year, Post-paid,	\$1.50
Single Copy, Six Months, Post-paid,	.75
In Clubs of Ten or More to One Address, Post-paid,	1.25
To Foreign Countries in Postal Union, Post-paid,	(\$2) 8s.

Address, *Signs of the Times,*

12TH AND CASTRO STREETS, OAKLAND, CAL., U. S. A.

CHANGE OF TIME

ON THE

WEST SHORE RAILROAD.

Commencing Sunday, May 20th, the WEST SHORE RAILROAD will inaugurate its new Spring Schedule.

For the accommodation of suburban residents along the historic and picturesque Hudson, many fast trains have been placed in service.

The time of through trains heretofore so popular with the traveling public going to points in Central and Western New York, Toronto, Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis and the West, has also had the attention of the management.

Copies of the new Time Tables can be had upon application to any ticket agent.



NEW YORK, MAY 31, 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.

Two more arrests for Sunday labor have been made in Maryland. As usual the subjects are Adventists. One is a preacher, who, after having raised up a small church of that faith, at Shady Side, Md., was preparing to move to a neighboring locality for another series of meetings. We are not informed as to the exact status of the cases at this time.

MAY 16, Charles Wood, a barber of Jamestown, this State, was arrested, charged with violation of the Sunday law. The arrest was made upon complaint of the Barbers' Union. Wood agrees to close his shop pending the trial, which has been set for June 28. Sunday closing, it is claimed, does not reduce the receipts of the barbers as they do more business on Saturday.

WRITING in the *North American Review* of "Anarchy and the Napoleonic Revival," Karl Blind remarks, "taking into account the widespread alarm created by a series of anarchistic outrages, the national characteristics make for a vague desire to see a commanding personality—a 'saviour of society'—at the head of affairs." And this "vague desire," not alone in France but in other countries is being turned to account by Rome to establish the pope as arbiter of nations.

READ on page 173 the brief of Attorney W. L. Carter, of counsel for the defense in the Capps case before the Tennessee Supreme Court. At this writing a decision has not yet been handed down, but Mr. Carter is confident that the Parker case will be reversed. He has certainly made a strong plea. This case has enlisted not only Mr. Carter's ability as a lawyer, but his sympathy as a man. He argues not for fees but from conviction of the justice of his cause.

THIS sample of Sunday arrests in the city of New York was recorded in the *New York World* of Monday May 21.

"I want to pick out a nice bonnet for my wife," said Policeman Tucker, of the Madison Street station, as he stepped into the millinery store at No. 35½ Division Street yesterday. He was shown some bonnets, and then he told pretty eighteen year old Henrietta Eisner, who waited on him, that she was his prisoner on a charge of violating the Sunday law. Justice Hogan declined to accept the policeman's complaint in the Essex Market Court. Miss Eisner was discharged, and she flashed a look of contempt at the policeman as she left the court. "I wonder why he didn't arrest a saloon-keeper," she said, "there are lots of them doing business all around the neighborhood."

It will be noticed that the name of this

dangerous criminal, who was destroying the peace and good order of the community by a willingness to sell what the representative of civil authority was desirous of buying, is evidently that of a German Jew. Who ever heard of a Sullivan or an O'Flaherty being arrested for Sunday selling?

THE *Catholic Review* has this to say about the influence of the papacy:—

The wonderful manner in which the political eclipse of the papacy by the deprivation of its civil sovereignty has tended to the enhancement of its spiritual authority, continues to excite among its enemies a surprise which Catholics, accustomed as they are to the manifestations of a special Providence in its behalf, cannot feel. . . . It may safely be said that the personal influence of the pope as the universal father of Christendom, was never so great as at the present day, when the faithful flock to his throne in ever increasing numbers, as a protest against the indignities to which he has been subjected. . . . The moral power of the pope, far from being annihilated, is a thousand times greater than that of all crowned heads taken together, because he has still the power of winning and enthraling the masses, whom kings and emperors now leave, it not hostile, cold and indifferent.

Much that the *Review* says is true, but not strange. The Word of God has foretold (Rev. 13:8) that "all shall worship him [the papal beast], whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." But of this same power, under another figure, it is written (Rev. 18:5, 8): "Her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."

As an example of the representative religion of legislative bodies, the following is worthy of note:—

WASHINGTON, MAY 2.—The bill for the suppression of lottery traffic through national and interstate commerce and the postal service was, on motion of Mr. Hoar (Rep., Mass.), taken up in the Senate to-day. A protest was made by Mr. Vest (Dem., Mo.) against the extension of anti-gambling laws to religious fairs, where articles are raffled off for charitable purposes. To a question by Mr. Gray (Dem., Del.) whether church members should be exempted from the operation of the law, Mr. Vest replied that if any senator thought that church and charity fairs should be placed on the same footing as the Louisiana or the Havana lottery, he was welcome to his opinion, but he thought the question hardly worthy the senator from Delaware.

Mr. Gorman (Dem., Md.) coincided with the views expressed by Mr. Vest, and suggested that the bill should be laid over until there was more time to consider it.

Mr. Hoar said that no officer, he supposed, would interfere with church or charity fairs. Whether officers should do so or not was a question which might be discussed. But no provision of law could be made that would prohibit the offense of gambling and at the same time contain a provision that church members and amiable people might gamble a little for pious purposes. It was not practicable and would be mischievous legislation.

Mr. Gorman said that there was not a charitable institution in Maryland, created up to twenty years ago, that had not been the creation of lottery systems by law, and that two-thirds of the revenues of the hospitals in Washington and the institution of the Little Sisters of the Poor came from those innocent frauds.

There was no demand or necessity, he said, for such legislation.

Mr. Hoar spoke of Mr. Gorman's argument as calculated "to poison the youth of the District. If the pending bill was impolitic, all the lottery legislation was impolitic."

The bill went over without action.

It is interesting indeed to see the conflicting and inadequate ideas of religion held by the representative men of the great National Reform religious council at Washington. Such a discussion as this, and that which took place in the House, on April 30, in reference to chaplains of the army, is worthy of a legislative body which voted to buy the Sunday closing of the World's Fair with the people's money.

A REGULAR correspondent of the European edition of the *New York Herald*, writing from Rome, says:—

I am in a position to give more and positive information about the new encyclical which Pope Leo is about to publish, and which was first announced in the *Herald*. It will be, I am assured, the most important document of the Pontificate of Leo XIII.

The exceptional importance of this new encyclical lies in the fact that, reviewing the whole policy of the Vatican since his holiness ascended the pontifical throne, it will form the political testament of the present pontiff. In it his holiness will explain all the reasons for his acts, will frankly confess all the hopes which he had and has for the triumph of his principles and policy all over the world, will point out the attitudes taken by the holy see in various questions, and the relations established with the different powers.

The greatest interest will lie in the portions relating to the Kulturkampf in Germany, the Irish question, the agreement with France, and the action of the Roman Church in the United States, especially in the years which comprise Mgr. Satolli's mission. A full explanation of the pope's views on the school question in America will be given. Pope Leo will take this opportunity to again show his interest in the United States and the importance he attaches to the progress of Catholicity there.

Nobody doubts the pope's interest in the United States; an encyclical is not necessary to prove it. But why is Leo so intensely interested in this country? Simply because he sees here abundant promise of the greatest triumph of "Catholicity." The pope's interest in this Republic is much the same as the wolf's interest in the lamb.

"THE intolerant majority of the London School Board," remarks the London correspondent of the *New York Sun*, "is beginning to find religious inquisition difficult and embarrassing. Over 3,000 of the 7,800 teachers in London have thus far given notice of their refusal to teach the new creed prescribed in the recent circular. This reduces the situation to a farce, and the next step of the inquisitors is awaited with curiosity."

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.		