



"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, JULY 19, 1894.

NUMBER 29.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.
CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, }
A. F. BALLENGER, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

SINCE Easter Sunday last, the attention of the people of the United States has been stirred, watching the armies of the "Industrials," the strikers and their consequent violence, and the calling out of armed troops because of the troubles in a connected line of States reaching from the Pacific to the Atlantic,—California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Seeing these things carried on so continuously, every man is asking his neighbor, "What does this mean?" "What is to be the end of this matter?"

THESE things are not meaningless; they are full of meaning in many more senses than one, but there is one meaning that they have above all others. And, seeing these things that everybody sees, let us inquire at the source of all truth, what they really do mean; for if the Word of God has spoken on these things and told us anything as to what they mean, then we may be certain of that meaning, whatever other meaning may be in it all. And the Scriptures have spoken in more than one place, describing the condition of things which is now before the eyes of all people, not only of the United States, but of all the world.

Turning first to James, fifth chapter, there is the description of a time, and a condition of affairs, in which the rich are afraid of what is coming, and hold together their treasure in heaps in which the gold and silver is cankered; while on the other hand, there is a cry of the laborers against the rich, and of real distress, indeed, because their wages are kept back; and while these are in distress and are crying out because of it, these same rich ones are nourishing their hearts and living in pleasure and wantonness.

Now any one can see plainly enough

that this exactly describes the situation as it is all over the United States to-day; and every one knows that this situation has been brought about by precisely the methods here described. There is certainly no room for any difference of opinion in this. The strife between the laborers and the rich, between "capital and labor," has been brought on by the insatiable desire of those who are already rich, to gather together all that was possible. Men whose income has been a million a year, when there was any sign that that income might be lessened a little, would cut down the wages of the laboring men a few cents more or less all around, while in most cases these wages were already so low that they would no more than supply the necessities of life.

Now it is hardly too much to suppose that a man with an income of a million could subsist on a half or three quarters of a million a year, or such a part of a year as might tide over a period of business depression, thus allowing the balance of the million income to remain in payment of the wages of laborers. If all the wealthy men of the country had done this from the beginning, there would to-day be no more of a contest between capital and labor, no more of a cry of the laborers against the rich, than there would be a cry of the earth against the rain.

FOR more than a year there has been all over this land a continuous cry of "hard times," caused by the scarcity of money, while, as a matter of fact, all this time there has been more money in this country than ever before. In the summer of 1893, when so many banks were closed, and when there was the greatest "scarcity of money," there were hundreds of millions of dollars simply on deposit in the banks of New York City alone, to say nothing of the other great cities of the country. The trouble is not that money is scarce in itself, but what there is is hoarded, and it is this hoarding of the money that makes the scarcity.

And being so hoarded, the money is cankering. In the month of May, 1894, some workingmen in a money vault, employed in recounting the money there, were in danger of being drowned in a flood of silver of which the canker had eaten

up the strong sacks in which it was stored. Money that can have a chance to circulate will never canker; but to-day, although there is so much money, it is hoarded and held so closely together it can only canker. And this Word says that the cankering of it will be a witness against those who have so hoarded it and held it back from circulation while the cries of distress are heard throughout the land.

AND those who have the money so hoarded, even as this Word also says, are living in pleasure and even wantonness. And when a woman will give a grand reception, costing hundreds of dollars, *in honor of a dog,** while almost within hearing from her doors are the cries of hungry people, certainly such a course is fitly described as "wanton." This may be an extreme case; but admitting that it is, it is only an extreme case in a long series of like though perhaps not identical wantonness on the part of the over rich.

And yet it is said that "capital is shy" and will not venture forth when there is so much disturbance and such an unsettled state of public affairs generally. But if this capital would only venture forth in legitimate investments, instead of venturing so much in selfish pleasure, and such wantonness as giving grand receptions in honor of dogs, there would be no such unsettled condition of affairs as would cause capital to be afraid to venture in legitimate and beneficial enterprises. This is not, however, in any way to sanction or excuse the violence that so largely attends the laborers' side of the controversy, any more than it is to sanction or excuse the wantonness of the rich.

HOWEVER, we are not discussing the question of capital and labor, or their relations or antagonisms, we are simply inquiring of the Scriptures, What is the meaning of the present condition and course of things? And every one knows that the foregoing statements exactly describe the situation as it is. Well, then, this being the situation as described in this scripture, what does the scripture say as to the time when this shall be? This same scripture answers plainly that this was to be in the "last days." And every-

* This was actually done in the winter of 1893-94, in this city.

body sees now the very things that are set forth in this scripture. Then every person has before his eyes, and held irresistibly upon his attention, the positive proofs that we are in the last days.

The Scriptures having spoken of the rich and of the poor; of the hoarding of wealth and the keeping back of the wages; of the fear of the rich and the cries of the laborers—having spoken of these two classes, it now speaks of a third, or rather, to a third, thus, "Be patient, therefore, brethren." These are the Lord's people who are now spoken to, for he said, "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Matt. 12:50. So in the times described in the previous verses, in the last days, the Lord gives a word of counsel to his own people, and he gives this counsel *because* of the times that are here described; so he says, "Be patient, therefore, brethren." And what further?—"Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord."

Then the great meaning, above all other meanings, which all these things bear to the people of the world to-day is, that the Lord is coming. These are signs, evidences, clear and plain, of the coming of the Lord, that are being held before the eyes and upon the attention of all the people, so that it is impossible that they should not see them. Whether the people will believe that these are signs of his coming, or not, is for the people themselves to decide. The Lord has fixed upon these things in his Word, and says that that is what they are. And those who would be the brethren and the people of the Lord, must see in all these things that meaning which the Lord says is there; namely, that the Lord is coming.

The scripture continues: "Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it until he receive the early and the latter rain." As certainly as the sowing of the seed by the farmer means a certain result, and the farmer certainly expects that result, so certainly these things which are described in this chapter, and which all the people now see, mean a certain result, and mean that the people seeing these things can as certainly expect that result as the farmer may expect the result from his sowing. Then, just as the farmer, when he has planted his grain, waiteth patiently for the harvest, so the Lord would have his people wait patiently for that harvest, which is to be the end of this sowing, and "the harvest is the end of the world." Matt. 13:39.

Consequently the scripture continues to counsel of God, "Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the Judge standeth before the door." Then the coming of the Lord is so near, and the Judge, standing before the door, is so nearly ready to open that door and call all men to account, that it is too late to indulge grievances, complaints, and grudges against others. Of course, there is never time for any such thing as that, but now, of all times that there have ever been in the world, there is the least time for such things and the greatest risk in indulging them. "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh," "the Judge standeth before the door," and as "every one of us" is to "give account of himself to God," and as that account is about to be

called for, the thing to do is for every one to have his account so squared up each day and each hour, that if the Judge should open the door and call for the account, it can be rendered with joy and not with grief.

The State and the Ten Commandments.

THE Lord made the earth, and as Creator he is Proprietor. He has not given any man or nation a monopoly of the world, but has created all men free and equal, and holds all responsible for doing his will. Those that do his will are given eternal life, while those that do not, perish. God's will is expressed in the ten commandments, hence it is every man's right to keep these commandments.

If a community of men associated together in a State forbids its citizens to keep these commandments, or makes laws which render it impossible to keep them without loss in fines or imprisonment, it then becomes a question with the individual of obeying God or man. Under such circumstances, the man that is true in obedience to God is compelled by the State to stand in society as a transgressor, and is punished as such. By making laws that produce such conditions, the State exceeds its province in that it takes from man a right that God has bestowed upon all alike.

According to the Scriptures, the province of the State is to punish *evil doers*, and not those that do well. Rom. 13:1-3. By keeping God's commandments one is doing well, not evil, and should have praise of the State instead of punishment. In making laws that hinder its citizens from keeping the commandments, the State sets itself up in direct opposition to God. It forbids and punishes as *evil* what God pronounces *good* and the duty of all men.

This is precisely what is brought about by Sunday laws. Such laws make it impossible to keep the ten commandments without suffering under the pious-gloved hand of the State as an evil-doer, for God's law requires men to keep the *seventh* day (Saturday) and work the other six days. Men may say that Sunday-keeping is meant to fulfill this Sabbath law; but it does not. God's law plainly says the seventh day, and what right have we to make such wholesale changes in the divine law? To assume the right to change the law is to claim to be above the law giver. The papacy claims the right to change God's law; and for this reason the Bible represents the papacy as exalting itself above God. 2 Thess. 2:1-4. Any power, civil or ecclesiastical, that takes the same course is guilty of the same sin; and God solemnly warns men against doing it.

In civil courts the judge holds to the letter of the law; he will not allow one word to be changed, and is careful to get at the true meaning of every word. If man is thus particular with his own law, should he be less so with God's? Or, if while he is so exact with his own law, he allows, and even advises, wholesale changes in God's law without God's sanction, does he not show much more regard for his own law than God's? And if Christians consent to such a course, are they not equally guilty? God's law is binding on all men, whether they acknowledge it or not; all will be judged by

it, and eternal life depends on standing in this judgment. Can we hope to stand if we knowingly change this law, and live according to our change in preference to God's plain requirement?

In proportion as one values eternal life, he will jealously cling to the letter of this law. If men make laws which require him to depart from the explicit command of God, he is called upon to choose between obeying God or men. To obey men under such circumstances is to do it at the peril of eternal life. By clinging to the letter of God's law the individual does not endanger the interests of the State; on the contrary, his course is for the good of the State. It is possible for the State to make such laws as would lead to its own ruin, and it is the duty of every true friend of the State to oppose such laws. If he does so by refusing to obey in order to keep God's commandments, and suffers punishment in consequence, he becomes a martyr to protect the true interests of the State.

All laws enacted by the State infringing one's right to keep God's law according to his word are against the interests of the State and should be opposed by every true citizen for two reasons. First, because he cannot endanger his eternal interests by not exercising his right to keep God's commandments; and second, because he desires the good and the preservation of the State. H. P. HOLSER.

Basle, Switzerland.

The Mark of the Beast.

THE Bible says that "the secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever." Deut. 29:29. The last book in the Bible is called a Revelation, something revealed, hence it is intended to be studied and understood by the people of this world and their children. And a blessing is pronounced upon all who study it. "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand." Chap. 1: verse 3.

In the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, two great powers are brought to view, which, as the agents of Satan, are to complete the drama of this world in its rebellion against God. These two powers are represented by two distinct symbols in the form of beasts. They are to exist at the same time, although the career of the second power is to be short as compared with that of the first. The second beast is to perform miracles in the sight of the first beast (verse 14), which it could not do unless it existed at the same time. It is to form a partnership with the first beast for the purpose of enforcing the worship of that beast. Both are persecuting powers.

The characteristics of the first beast, together with the fact that he received his power and authority from the dragon (verses 1, 2), show that this power is a persecutor by nature; hence it is no surprise that it should "make war with the saints." But that the second power should persecute is a matter of greatest astonishment. For the symbol represents it as having the appearance of a lamb, and it is contrary to the nature of a lamb to persecute. Who could make one believe that a lamb would do him harm? Yet the Scriptures say that this power, so lamb-like in appearance, will speak as a dragon.

Of course, it will be as hard work to make the people realize and believe this as it would be to make them believe that an innocent lamb possessed the blood-thirsty nature of a dragon. See Rev. 12:17. In this way the people's own ideas of things will stand directly in the way of their understanding the prophecy. They will insist that this power has so many characteristics of the lamb that persecution would be impossible.

That the first beast represents papal Rome is the truth. It alone has fulfilled all the specifications of the prophecy. Concerning this symbol, Dr. Adam Clarke says: "The beast here described is the Latin Empire, which supported the Romish or Latin Church; for it has upon its horns ten crowns, *i. e.*, is an empire composed of ten distinct monarchies in the interest of the Latin Church." Dr. Scott says of this power: "In process of time, it (Rome) was divided into ten kingdoms. These are indeed reckoned up in several ways by different writers, according to the date assigned to the enumeration; but in general it is clear that the principal kingdoms in Europe, at this day, sprang from them and comprised them." And many of these kingdoms continue to support the Romish Church and to enforce her decrees upon their subjects.

Pagan Rome was a terrible persecutor. But when Rome professed to be Christianized, and the government adopted Christianity (so-called) as the national religion, it became the most frightful persecutor the world has ever known. When the church had grown corrupt enough to ask for civil power, and the government had grown reckless enough to give her this power, then followed the death-knell of liberty all over the empire.

That what was done by the first beast was to be done over again by the second beast, we shall learn by reading the description of that beast:—Rev. 13:11-17—"And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast which had the wound by a sword, and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."

It is not our present purpose to prove the identity of this power, which is the United States of America; nor to discuss the formation of the "image," which can be nothing else than the establishment of Christianity as a national religion; we desire simply to call attention to "the mark of the beast," showing what it is, and what its enforcement means.

The second beast is to force all the peo-

ple under its jurisdiction to worship the first beast; hence it is the worship and the mark of the first beast that is to be enforced (compare Rev. 13:12; 15:2; 19:20). What, then, does the papacy set forth as its mark or sign? Let us first consider what is the leading characteristic of this power. In the New Testament we find the papacy described as "that man of sin . . . who 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." Now, let us read Dan. 7:25: "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." The Douay Bible reads: "He shall think himself able to change times and laws." Dr. Clarke says: "Among Protestant writers this is considered to be the popedom."

To show that the statements of that church agree with the predictions of prophecy, we quote from a standard Catholic authority, the "Roman Decretalia," as follows:—

The pope's will stands for reason. He can dispense above the law, and of wrong make right by correcting and changing laws.—*Pope Nicholas, Dist. 96.*

The pope has power to change times, to abrogate laws, and to dispense with all things, even the precepts of Christ. He can pronounce sentences and judgments in contradiction to the right of nations and to the law of God and man.—*Decretal de Translat. Episcop. Cap.*

We have found that, according to the Scriptures, as well as the teachings of the church, the leading principle of the papacy is self-exaltation. This principle is carried so far that they even claim the power and the right to change the law of God. Of course they want everybody to acknowledge the authority which they claim. They want the people to admit that the Catholic Church not only has the power to make laws which it is sin to disobey, but that she has the right to require obedience to her laws in preference to the laws of God. To this end the church exhibits to the world a sign or mark of her law-making and law-changing power. The "Doctrinal Catechism," page 174, has the following:—

Question. Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept? Answer. Had she not such power . . . she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority.

Again, we read in a book entitled, "Plain Talk for Protestants," page 213:—

The observance of Sunday by Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the (Catholic) church.

Probably the organ of Cardinal Gibbons, the *Catholic Mirror*, is the most representative Catholic paper in America. The editorial columns of a recent issue contained the following:—

The Catholic Church, for over 1,000 years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday.

The Protestant world, at its birth, found the Christian Sabbath too strongly entrenched, to run counter to its existence; it was therefore placed under the necessity of acquiescing in the arrangement, thus implying the church's right to change the day, for over 300 years. The Christian Sabbath is therefore to this day the acknowledged offspring of the Catholic Church as spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.

The Reformers, Luther, Melancthon, and others, speak of the Catholic Church, thus:—

They allege the Sabbath changed into Sunday, the

Lord's day, contrary to the Decalogue, as it appears neither is there any example more boasted of than the changing of the Sabbath day. Great, say they, is the power and authority of the church, since it dispensed with one of the ten commandments.—*Augsburg Confession, Art. 28.*

Much more testimony could be given upon this point, but this should suffice. The fact is, that the Romish Church has for centuries set forth the Sunday institution as the chiefest evidence of her power. It is the great monument, the sign, the mark, the symbol, the test of her pretended authority to change the times and laws of God.

That the majority of professed Protestants have adopted the mark, and thus acknowledged the power of the beast, is proven every Sunday by their observance of the day. And they regard it as the chief institution of their religion. This is proven by the fact that they make greater efforts to secure its recognition than they do to secure the recognition of any other part of their creed. Archbishop Ireland styles Sunday "the sacred symbol of our Christianity," and professed Protestants vie with him in applying to it similar titles. Witness the following:—

This day is set apart for divine worship and preparation for another life. It is the test of all religion.—*Dr. W. W. Everts, in Elgin Sunday Convention.*

The Sabbath (Sunday) is the corner-stone of Christ's kingdom. Let us recognize each recurring Sabbath as the sign of God's covenant. By this sign the world largely judges the depth of our Christian character, and by this sign God judges us.—*Mrs. J. C. Bateham, Sabbath Leaflet, No. 33.*

When the people, through their representative, legalize the first day of the week as a day of rest and of worship for those who choose so to observe it, it is the sign of the Christian nation.—*From a sermon reported in the Christian Oracle, January 12, 1893.*

For nothing were the noble men who planted true Christianity and an Evangelical Church in the wilderness, now constituting the United States, more distinguished than for their reverence for the Sabbath. It was quite a prominent feature in their character—a sign between them and the heathen world around—and, to a large extent, it has continued to be a mark of American religion to the present day.—*Rev. J. G. Lorimer, in the Christian Treasury.*

Yes, Sunday is the "mark of American religion," "the sign of the Christian nation." The mark of the beast has become the mark of the image to the beast. The Roman government, by recognizing Christianity as a national religion, developed the "beast," the so-called "Christian nation." The United States Government, by recognizing Christianity through the action of its Supreme Court, developed the image to the beast. And they call it a "Christian nation." And just as Sunday became the sign of that "Christian nation," so it has become the sign of this Christian nation. The action of the Roman government created a union of Church and State, and the action of the United States Government likewise created a union of Church and State. And just as the first beast persecuted those who refused to adopt the governmental interpretation of the Bible and to observe Sunday, so the second beast will become a persecuting power. The Scriptures say, "He exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him."

That the Sunday managers intend to do the very things pointed out in prophecy is proven by their declarations everywhere. Hear what Dr. McAllister said at Lakeside, Ohio, July, 1887: "Let a man be what he may,—Jew, seventh-day observer of some other denomination, or those who do not believe in the Christian Sabbath,—let the law apply to every one, that there shall be no public desecration of the first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath,

the day of rest for the nation. They may hold any other day of the week as sacred, and observe it; but that day which is the one day in seven for the nation at large, let that not be publicly desecrated by any one, by officer in the Government, or by private citizen, high or low, rich or poor." With this compare Rev. 13:16: "And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads."

The civil power in this nation will be exerted to the utmost to cause all to recognize the Sunday; but there will be a few who will refuse to worship the beast or his image, or to receive his mark. Compare the following scriptures, and then "choose you this day whom ye will serve:"—"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." Rev. 14:9, 10. "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God." Rev. 15:2.

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

As He Is, So Are We in This World.

THE commandment is a lamp and the law is light. Prov. 6:23. Christ was the true light. John 1:9. His life was the light of men—that is, the light or law that was in his heart (Ps. 40:8) was manifested through his life. Now our Saviour says to us, he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life (John 8:12), or the law in our hearts. How is this?

Love is the fulfilling of the law. Rom. 13:10. Love cannot fail to render entire obedience just as far as the law is understood. But the natural, carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Rom. 8:7. In order to keep God's holy, just and good law, the carnal heart must be changed; right here we begin to realize our helplessness, for when we would do good evil is present with us, and we cry out: O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death? With Paul, it is our blessed privilege to thank God for victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Rom. 7:12, 21, 24, 25. He it is who says to us, Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments (laws), and do them. Eze. 36:25-27.

The love of God is then shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us. Rom. 5:5. The Lord puts his laws into our minds and writes them in our hearts. Heb. 8:10. And the love which is in our hearts makes the law a great delight, we exclaim with David: "Oh, how love I thy law!"

Does the Lord do all this without our coöperation? Oh no; by grace are ye saved through faith. Eph. 2:8. The grace, unmerited favor, of God, does the work; but our faith first sees and accepts his promise to do it. We shall receive no more than our faith grasps. Having been sanctified by the very God of peace, he preserves us blameless, actually keeping his whole law unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Thess. 5:23. This is true *Christian liberty*—freedom from sin. If we do the will of God we have the precious privilege of committing the keeping of our souls to him *in well-doing* (that is, keeping his royal law), as unto a faithful Creator. 1 Peter 4:19. Peter does not call him merely a Preserver; God *creates* the souls of those who trust him in well-doing, more and more into his own divine image. M. E. STEWARD.

In the Midst of Alarms.

JUST now we are beset with a host of alarming manifestations, in our own population. Through a variety of causes a condition of our industrial forces has been superinduced, which threatens to convert a peaceful army of bread-winners, scattered through our cities and hamlets, into an army of maddened and persistent petitioners congregated at the nation's capitol, whose demand must be patiently considered, or blood will flow as the consequence. From nearly every point of the compass an industrial army with increasing force, is marching upon Washington, intent upon demanding that the Government shall do something to furnish employment to the now unemployed thousands of the land. Will these men content themselves with peacefully petitioning the Government authorities, or will they resort to violence? Herein is the alarming feature of the case.

Anarchists keep Europe in a continual state of alarm, especially the republic of France, and break out in deeds of violence occasionally here, to remind us of their presence.

Another source of anxiety to us now is the wide-spread strikes prevailing in our land. The Great Northern, and the miners' strike, as well as the threatened street car strike, not only throw vast numbers of men out of employment who, together with those dependent upon them, greatly need their earnings, but promise to breed greater mischief in the future, as the feeling of bitterness they engender becomes more intense.

In the midst of these alarms, nothing so becomes us as American citizens, as loyalty to the Government. It must be upheld at all hazards. There must be no compromise with open violence or rebellion. But the right of all to petition for redress of supposed grievances must be kept intact. We should know no difference between the poor laborer who comes any way he can come from west or east to petition the Government concerning his supposed wrongs, and the millionaire who comes in his sumptuous private car, to lobby with congressmen or the officers of the general Government respecting some scheme from which he hopes to realize a few million dollars. If one is received and listened to, the other should be and must be.

The critical character of the approaching crisis is now becoming apparent to all. The press that treated Coxey's Army as a huge joke, now takes on a tone of serious

contemplation of an event which nearly all acknowledge may become a turning point in the nation's history. It is well that it should be soberly treated. It demands the most careful consideration and the most careful manipulation.—*The Independent Patriot*.

State Aid to Religion.

It is a matter which must cause sorrow and shame to every true Protestant that the Protestantism of to-day is going back on the noble stand made by the reformers in the sixteenth century, which gave birth to Protestantism itself. The protest of those noble men at the Diet of Spire in 1529 contained the very essence of Protestantism, and gave to the reformed church its name.

But this protest was a disavowal of the theory that the State should have supervision of religion or anything to do with religion. They said, "In matters of conscience, the majority [the State] has no power." And this is yet true Protestant principle. But it is a matter of deep regret to see many of those churches which claim to be Protestant repudiating this principle, and advocating the enforcement of certain religious customs, such as Sunday observance, by law; the teaching of religion by the State, and the appropriation of government funds to religious and sectarian purposes. This is a virtual repudiation of Protestantism, and the adoption of the papal theory bodily.

True Protestantism is not simply a protesting against the Romish Church having anything to say about governmental affairs or receiving governmental aid, but at the same time attempting to dictate to the government, and doing all in its power to receive State aid itself. No: this is not genuine Protestantism in any sense of the word, but simply another papacy under another name. True Protestantism repudiates the *principle* of any Church and State union whatever, irrespective of what government or what church it may be. It says that the consciences of men are above the State, and that the religion of Jesus Christ is not in need of State aid.

To say that there should be no connection between the Romish Church and the State, but that Protestantism should be the favored religion, is not a repudiation of Church and State union. It is simply to argue that the State should decide between the various religions in the world as to which is true and false, and champion the one selected as the true. But this is simply the idea of the bigot, and not of the man who esteems the religion he professes as too sacred to become connected with the State, or to be submitted to any such test in determining whether it be the genuine or not. It is the same style of reasoning that Macaulay refers to in his essay on "Sir James Mackintosh." He says:—

The doctrine which, from the very first origin of religious dissensions, has been held by all bigots of all sects, when condensed into a few words, and stripped of rhetorical disguise, is simply this: I am in the right, and you are in the wrong. When you are the stronger, you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.

But the doctrine of the reformer is that the State is ordained for the government and protection of *all the people*, irrespective of their attitude toward religion; and that all religions should stand upon an equal

footing as regards the State, none favored, none suppressed, but all free to be propagated and believed or disbelieved by the people as they may see fit. This is the only sure antidote to Church and State union with all its evil results. It is neither tolerance nor a doctrine born of indifference to religion, but one born from a sense of equality and true liberty.—*Bible Echo, Melbourne, Aus.*

How They Will Talk.

In the formation of a union of Church and State, little by little the Church encroaches upon the domain of the State, until she finally obtains and usurps full control. The demands are mild at first. A law touching only one point is all that is asked, and this in a very mild form, and perhaps for ostensibly humanitarian reasons. But this *one*, though small in appearance, is big with results. By it the precedent for religious legislation, is established. This furnishes a foundation for all the like legislation that may follow. By and by another law is wanted, or the first one to be made a little more stringent.

This was indicated in the report of the hearing granted by the Premier of New South Wales, February 16, to the deputation from the Council of the Churches which waited upon him, to ask for the enforcement of the law prohibiting admissions being charged at Sunday concerts and amusements. The Rev. Dill Macky said, "By and by they would want the law a little more stringent." Yes; by and by, after a few concessions have been granted them, they will demand that the law shall be made more stringent. Seeing that they have gained control of the legislature, they will cease to petition and pray for what they desire; they will threaten and command.

This compulsory attitude which these religio-political organizations take on after they have become successful in their plans is well illustrated in a speech recently made by the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union. He said:—

All denominations of any note are now united in this movement, Catholic and all, and we have succeeded in getting the cooperation of all labor unions, temperance associations, and other societies, political and ecclesiastical, to unite in one solid move on Congress to force them to pass a national Sunday law. We are prepared to make Congress understand that this is a Christian nation. We would be a set of fools to give up the battle now, after gaining the victory over Congress in the World's Fair movement. We must have a Sabbath day as we want it. The States have Sunday laws, but this is not enough. We are going to have a national law, and I think, I am sure, we shall have it before the first session of this Congress is closed. Measures are now effected to besiege Congress with representative men from every organized body in the land, and they will not dare refuse us. The Church should use the power of Congress to control the sins of the nation, and if she does not do so, blood will be upon her garments.—*Review and Herald, Jan. 16, 1894.*

This is plain enough. One victory was gained in the World's Fair movement, and now they propose to force Congress to pass such a law as they want. And under such a mighty combination they expect Congress to bend; "they will not dare refuse us," say they.

A union of Church and State is said to exist "where the Church usurps control over the State, as on the Romish theory, or where the State assumes to establish and control the Church, as in England." The union involved in such movements as are now on in the United States and Australia is evidently of the Romish kind.

The victory in the World's Fair matter was not a victory of Congress, but a victory "over Congress." The plan proposed is that "the Church should use the power of Congress" to control affairs and do her work. Plainly enough this is Church domination that is intended. It is the papacy over again; a veritable likeness, or image, of what that was in the days of its supremacy. And as men would shrink from seeing the days of proscription and persecution revived, and the Dark Ages lived over again, so should they shrink from giving countenance or support to this thing. Like causes cannot fail to produce like results. This law is still inexorable. Where are the wise men to foresee the evil and act with discretion? Who with pen and voice will sound the alarm? W. A. COLCORD.

Sunday Not the Christian Sabbath.

Manley, Iowa, March, 1894.

AMERICAN SENTINEL: I was prompted to write this from reading the article of Thomas Hodge in the SENTINEL some weeks ago. He claims that the first day of the week, or Sunday, is the true Christian Sabbath because of the resurrection of Christ on that day.

I have always believed, until recently, that a person or community might observe any day they chose, so it was the seventh day after six consecutive days of labor. But as Sunday, being the universally observed day by all Christians, it was more convenient to keep that day than any other. But I am now led to believe otherwise, and from the very arguments advanced to sustain the Sunday theory.

I was reading, a few days ago, in "The Life of Christ," by Geikie, page 805, wherein the author says, "A whole week elapsed before the next appearance [of Christ] recorded. On Sunday, known henceforth as the 'first day of the week,' in contrast to the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day, and as, especially, 'the Lord's day,'—the eleven, having once more assembled, as they had done daily through the week and continued to do, Jesus, honoring his resurrection day, once more stood in the midst of them. But Thomas, not having been present on the Sunday before, had doubted. But now, 'on this first Lord's day after the resurrection, however, his doubts were forever dispelled.'"

Now, thought I, this is conclusive evidence that Sunday is the true Christian Sabbath. But just then it occurred to me that it was a wrong construction, and that the facts disproved the theory, even though it was against my inclination to believe it, and that I had better investigate further before deciding. Hence I find in Gen. 2:1, 2: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made."

Now I infer from the foregoing that God was at perfect rest on that day. But it does not prove that his labors were ended, or that he did not resume them on the eighth day, or the first of another series of six days' labor.

Now I find a parallel in John 19:30, "When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished; and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost." Now as God rested on the seventh day

after finishing the creation, and so established the Sabbath, so Christ rested on the same Sabbath, or seventh day, after finishing his labors for the purpose for which he came on the earth. And on the first day of the week he arose to commence his second life and resume his labors incident thereto.

Christ was crucified on the sixth day of the week. His life and necessary labors up to that time were finished and he rested on the seventh day or Sabbath. Was it by chance that he was crucified on the sixth day, or by design, that he might rest on the Sabbath, and so the day become doubly consecrated thereby? The people who were Jesus' companions before the crucifixion kept that Sabbath in the usual manner, Luke 23:25, 26. "And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. And they returned and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment." But the next day, the first day of the week, they resumed their ordinary duties and labors. And that same day as Cleopas and another were going to Emmaus, Jesus walked with them and conversed with them, and they, then, knew him not, and he sat at meat and did break bread with them. And after that, the same day, he appeared to the eleven at Jerusalem. And after eight days he appeared unto them again at Jerusalem. And again he showed himself to the disciples at the Sea of Galilee.

Now there is no record of anything happening at any of these meetings to justify any one in changing the Sabbath, or to indicate that Jesus especially designed to honor his resurrection day more than any other. His other life and labors were closed, finished, at the crucifixion on the sixth day of the week and on the seventh, or Sabbath, he lay in the sepulchre at rest. But early in the morning on the first day of the week, he arose to take up a new life, as it were, on the earth for a while, and a work that he could not do in the other life, before the crucifixion; the work of impressing upon his disciples the very fact of the resurrection. He could not do that until after the crucifixion and the resurrection had taken place. And it took place very early on Sunday, first day of the week, and he immediately commenced the work necessary to accomplish his purpose.

Would it not be more appropriate for Christians to keep the seventh day, or Sabbath, as a holy day because of the fact that Christ kept it in the manner he did? Or if we must keep Sunday, would it not be more appropriate to keep it as a holiday with feasting and rejoicing, because of Christ having risen from the dead on that day to resume his life and work attending it? D. P. KISNER.

Foolish Protestants.

THE convent can be made so entrancingly lovely to the rich girl, during the period in which influences so easily become powerful, that in after years when fortune is in her hand, it is simple work to secure large gifts. Miss Caldwell gives a quarter of a million dollars to start the great Catholic University at Washington. But who is Miss Caldwell? She is a relative of Congressman Breckinridge of Kentucky, and belongs to an old Presbyterian family. When a child, on the death of

one of her parents, influence was exerted to place her in a convent. That was all that was necessary. The convent did the rest. Miss Drexel bestows what is represented as a million and a half upon a Catholic institution. Who is Miss Drexel? She comes from a Methodist ancestry on one side, and a Baptist on the other. Protestant parents who send their girls to convent schools are placing them in the power of the best organized evil ever uncovered by history. It is a crime against their own offspring. How intelligent fathers can commit such a stupidity is little less than a marvel.—*S. F. Hershey, in St. Louis Presbyterian.*

More Religious Persecution in Tennessee.

THE following statement of facts is from the appendix to No. 16 of the *Religious Liberty Library*, recently issued:—

Religious Persecution in Tennessee.

PLOWING A TURNIP PATCH ON SUNDAY IN THE MIDDLE OF A FIELD OF FULL-GROWN CORN SENDS AN INOFFENSIVE CITIZEN TO JAIL FOR OVER A YEAR.

On June 26, 1894, W. B. Capps was locked up in the county jail at Dresden, Weakley County, Tenn., for performing common labor on his farm on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

The first time he was seen at work, he was cutting corn stalks in his own field. The witness's farm is adjoining, and he could see Mr. Capps at work from his house a few hundred yards away. This was on a Sunday, in May, 1892.

In the fall of the same year the same witness went to Mr. Capps's house on Sunday to see him about a note on which he was surety, and found him plowing a piece of uncultivated land in the middle of a field of grown corn, in which he designed to sow turnips. The witness informed Mr. Capps that his father, the payee, expected him to send the money, though in his testimony the witness denied that he went to see the defendant about the note. This secluded spot in which Mr. Capps was quietly following the leadings of his conscience by tilling the soil on the first day of the week, was not only shut in by full-grown corn, but was three quarters of a mile from any public road.

At another time Mr. Capps was seen on Sunday splitting rails. Before the day was over, two of his neighbors came along, took up the maul and ax, and assisted him for a time. The neighbors were not interfered with in their liberty.

Mr. Capps was arrested June 8, 1893, and at his trial before the Circuit Court of Weakley County, June 27, 1893, he was fined \$10 and costs, amounting in all to \$51.80. His case was appealed to the Supreme Court of Tennessee, which affirmed the judgment of the lower court, May 24, 1894, at Jackson, fixing the costs at \$58.63; making as a grand total the outrageous sum of \$110.45, to be served out by the criminal (?) at the paltry rate of twenty-five cents per day. This will necessitate the confinement of the prisoner 442 days, or one year and nearly three months.

The Supreme Court did not write any opinion, but simply said: "There is no controversy as to the facts in this case [as of course there was not], and we find no error in the record; therefore the judgment of the court below will be affirmed." It gave no reasons, and did not attempt to meet the convincing arguments raised by the defense. Plainly the principles contended for by the defense are correct, and cannot be controverted.

Mr. Capps has a wife twenty-four years of age, and four children, the eldest being only six years old, and one of them sick at the time of its father's imprisonment. His family is left all alone in the woods a quarter of a mile from any house. He is a poor man and unable to support his family during his confinement. He does not deny working on Sunday, but did so because he had rested the day before according to the Bible; because he recognized his God-given right to labor six days in the week, beginning on the first, as did his Creator; and because in acceding to the demands of the State to rest on Sunday, he would be denying his Lord.

Hence he refuses to pay the fine and costs, regarding them unjust, since the State is attempting to enforce upon him a dogma of religion, with which it can of right have nothing whatever to do. Therefore he has gone to jail, though a physician stated that he could never live in that unhealthy place the time required by the enormity of the State's assessment.

Where is a clearer case of religious persecution?

The facts stated in this leaflet should be

known by everybody. It is indeed a clear case of religious persecution; but the fact that the work done by Mr. Capps was at a distance from any public road and not in a place likely to be observed really cuts no figure in the matter. Mr. Capps, or anybody else for that matter, whether an observer of the seventh day or not, has just as much right to work on Sunday as anybody else has to work on any other day. Of course, everybody should at all times do as they would be done by, and this Mr. Capps does: he works when he pleases and is willing that others should do the same. But as Mr. Capps' neighbors want him to refrain from work when they do, they ought likewise to rest whenever Mr. Capps does. Mr. Capps does not work on Saturday, the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord. Now, if he must rest on Sunday because his neighbors do, why should not they also rest on the Sabbath because he does? And as long as his Sunday work does not interfere with them what right have they to say that he shall not work on that day?—Clearly no right at all, except the right of brute force.

Christianity Legally Defined in Rome.

IF the mutual flattery of Constantine and the bishops, described briefly in these columns last week, had concerned only themselves, it would have been a matter of very slight importance indeed; but this was not so. Each side represented an important interest. Constantine merely represented the State, and the bishops the Church; and their mutual flattery was only the covering of a deep laid and far reaching scheme which each party was determined to work to the utmost, for its own interests. "It was," as Draper remarks, "the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics; it was the hope of every bishop in the empire to make politics a branch of theology." Consequently, in their mutual toadyism were involved the interests of both the Church and the State, and the welfare of human society for ages to come.

Therefore, to the reign of Constantine the Great must be referred the first union of Christianity and the State and the commencement of those dark and dismal times which oppressed Europe for a thousand years.

When the alliance was formed between Constantine and what was represented to him as Christianity, it was with the idea on his part that this religion formed a united body throughout the empire. As has been shown, this was true in a certain sense, because the persecution as carried on by Galerius under the edicts of Diocletian, was against Christianity as a profession, without any distinction whatever as to its phases, and this caused all the different sects to stand together as one in defense of the principles that were common to all. Therefore the essential unity of all the professions of Christianity he supposed to be a fact; and from all his actions and writings afterward it is certain that representations had been made to him by the bishops in a stronger measure than was true, and in an infinitely stronger measure than he found it in practice to be.

The alliance with Christianity on Constantine's part was wholly political, and merely a part of the political machinery by which he designed to bring together again the divided elements of the empire

into one harmonious whole. It being represented to him by the bishops who met him in Gaul in A. D. 311, that Christianity was a united body which, if he would support it, would in turn be a powerful support to him, he accepted their representations as the truth, and formed the alliance solely as a part of his political designs, and to help him to forward his declared "mission to unite the world under one head."

But, although the alliance was formed with what was supposed to be Christianity as a whole, without any respect to internal divisions, it was very soon discovered that each particular faction of the Christian profession was ambitious to be recognized as *the one* in which, above all others, Christianity was most certainly represented. The bishops were ready and willing to represent to Constantine that Christianity was one. They did so represent it to him. And although he entered the alliance with that understanding, the alliance had no sooner been well formed than it devolved upon him to decide among the conflicting factions and divisions just where that *one* was to be found.

The Edict of Milan ordered that the church property which had been confiscated by the edicts of Diocletian, should be restored to "the whole body of Christians," without any distinction as to particular sects or names. Thus runs that part of the edict:—

And this we further decree, with respect to the Christians, that the places in which they were formerly accustomed to assemble, concerning which also we formerly wrote to your fidelity, in a different form, that if any persons have purchased these, either from our treasury, or from any other one, these shall restore them to the Christians, without money and without demanding any price, without any superadded value or augmentation, without delay or hesitancy. And if any have happened to receive these places as presents, that they shall restore them as soon as possible to the Christians, so that if either those that purchased or those that received them as presents, have anything to request of our munificence, they may go to the provincial governor, as the judge; that provision may also be made for them by our clemency. All which it will be necessary to be delivered up to the body of Christians, by your care, without any delay.

And since the Christians themselves are known to have had not only those places where they were accustomed to meet, but other places also, belonging not to individuals among them, but to the *right of the whole body of Christians*, you will also command all these, by virtue of the law before mentioned, without any hesitancy, to be restored to these same Christians, that is, to their body, and to each conventicle respectively. The aforesaid consideration, to wit, being observed; namely, that they who as we have said restore them without valuation and price, may expect their indemnity from our munificence and liberality. In all which it will be incumbent on you, to exhibit your exertions as much as possible to the aforesaid body of Christians, that our orders may be most speedily accomplished, that likewise in this provision may be made by our clemency, for the preservation of the common and public tranquillity. For by these means, as before said, the divine favor with regard to us, which we have already experienced in many affairs, will continue firm and permanent at all times.

But that the purpose of this our ordinance and liberality may be extended to the knowledge of all, it is expected that these things written by us, should be proposed and published to the knowledge of all. That this act of our liberality and kindness may remain unknown to none.*

This was proper enough in itself. But Constantine and the bishops had formed an alliance for *political purposes*. The bishops had lent to Constantine their support, the fruit of which he was enjoying; and now they demanded that the expected return should be rendered. Accordingly, the restoration of the property of the Christians, under the Edict of Milan, had no sooner begun, than the contentions which had been raised before the late per-

* Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book x, chap. v.

secution, between the Church of Rome and the churches of Africa, were not only made to assume new and political significance, but were made an issue upon which to secure the imperial recognition and the legal establishment of the Catholic Church. As the rule had already been established that all who did not agree with the bishops of the Catholic Church were necessarily heretics, and not Christians, it was now claimed by the Catholic Church that therefore none such could be partakers of the benefits of the edict restoring property to the Christians. The Catholic Church disputed the right of heretics to receive property or money under the Edict of Milan, by disputing their right to the title of Christians. This forced an imperial decision upon the question as to who were Christians. The dispute was raised in Africa. Anulinus was proconsul in that province, and to settle this question, Constantine wrote thus to him:—

It is our will, that when thou shalt receive this epistle, if any of those things belonging to the Catholic Church of the Christians in the several cities or other places, are now possessed either by the decurions, or any others, these thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to their churches. Since we have previously determined, that whatsoever these same churches before possessed, shall be restored to their right.*

Thus it was made evident that the imperial favors were only for the Catholic Church. But was it enough that Constantine should decide that all his favors were for the Catholic Church; he must next decide which was the Catholic Church. This he did in 313 in another letter to Anulinus, thus:—

It is my will that these men, within the province intrusted to thee in the Catholic Church, over which Cæcilianus presides, who give their services to this holy religion, and whom they commonly call clergy, shall be held totally free and exempt from all public offices, to the end that they may not, by any error or sacrilegious deviation, be drawn away from the service due to the Divinity, but rather may devote themselves to their proper law, without any molestation. So that, whilst they exhibit the greatest possible reverence to the Deity, it appears the greatest good will be conferred on the State.†

Following this two councils were called by the emperor to settle disputes between those claiming to be the proper representatives of the Catholic Church—the first was held October 313, the second, in August of the following year. They both decided in favor of Cæcilianus and the party presided over by him.

The question as to which was the Catholic Church having been decided, Constantine, in his next epistle, could add yet another distinguishing title. As we have seen, the Edict of Milan—March, A. D. 313—ordered that the churches should be restored to the Christians—"the whole body of Christians"—without distinction. When the Catholic Church asserted its sole right to the designation "Christian," and backed its assertion with political reasons, which were then peculiarly cogent, the imperial epistle ran—March, A. D. 313—"to the Catholic Church of the Christians." When the emperor wrote to Melchisedes appointing the first council under the imperial authority, his epistle ran—autumn, A. D. 313—"the holy Catholic Church." When he wrote to Chrestus—summer, A. D. 314—summoning him to the second council under imperial authority, he referred to the doctrine of the Catholic Church as embodying the "most holy religion." When it had been decided which was "the most holy Catholic religion," he addressed an epistle to

Cæcilianus—A. D. 316—announcing imperial favors to "the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion," and empowered Cæcilianus to assist the imperial officers in preventing any diversion from the most holy Catholic Church.

It was thus that that which on its face appeared only innocent and highly proper—indeed a necessary act of justice, restoring to its rightful owners property unjustly confiscated, resulted inside of three years in the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church as the religion of the empire.

They Can Do Nothing Against the Truth.

SOME weeks ago Elders J. O. Johnston and E. W. Webster, two Seventh-day Adventist ministers, pitched a tent at Brushy Creek, N. C., and began a series of meetings. They had continued about four weeks when they were served with the following notice, which we give *verbatim et literatim*:—

June 16 94

Rev. Johnson, Co. We Will give you Wone week to get away if you dont you haft to take what follows wee mean what wees say

Good Bey

The man who left the notice disturbed the meeting by asking questions and making threats, but all went well for a week, and then came a mob to wreck the tent and to drive the Adventists away. But owing to the good offices of the man who owned the lot on which the tent was pitched, and several other of the best citizens, their rage was quieted and no harm was done. As usual in such cases the agitation only increases interest to hear what the Adventists have to say, and they are making friends right in the neighborhood where violence was threatened only a few days before.

A LATE Belfast paper has this item of news under the heading, "A Curious Case":—

Justice Mathew, in the Queen's Bench to-day, tried a case in which Mr. H. Reid, on behalf of the Lord's Day Observance Society, sought to recover penalties, under the Act of George the Third, from Mr. E. Wilson, solicitor to the liquidators of the Leeds Colosseum, and Mr. Ward, ex-mayor of Leeds, the former for allowing lectures at the colosseum, and the latter for presiding at such lectures on the Sabbath day. The defending counsel contended that the lectures were intended to convey instruction in a pleasant and profitable way. The judge suggested to the observance society whether in attempting to protect the Lord's day, they were not aiding in filling rival institutions. The jury found for the plaintiff, but expressed the opinion that this law should be repealed. The judge concurred. Points of law remain over for further consideration.

It is only a few weeks since we printed the particulars of two cases in Australia under an old English statute. Is it not a little strange that such cases are coming up all over the world, and that men are being prosecuted under statutes that have for more than a century slumbered in innocuous desuetude?

It is stated that the Wesleyan minister at Hobart, Mich., has withdrawn from the connection, giving as a reason the position of the Wesleyan Church on the National Reform question. He says that hereafter he is an advocate of religious liberty.

FATHERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. BY E. J. WAGGONER.

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

HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE

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

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

is alone worth the price of the book.

Fine English Cloth, Substantially Bound,

CONTAINS ABOUT 400 PAGES,

Will be Sent Post-paid for \$1.00

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.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET.

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

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

PRICES.

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

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

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

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 2 cent stamp. Indorsed by the SENTINEL. PRISON LIGHT, 40 Green Street, Brattleboro, Vt.

* *Id.* + *Id.*, chap. vii.



NEW YORK, JULY 19, 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.

READ "More Religious Persecution in Tennessee," on page 230 of this paper.

A SPIRIT of unrest is upon the people; distrust whispers to every man; stagnation has seized business; want stalks abroad in the land, and on every hand is heard the question: "What will the end be?"

JULY 12, the Orangemen were not permitted to parade in Brooklyn. The reason for this action was, of course, that a disturbance might be occasioned. That is, an Orange parade is very annoying to the feelings of Irish Catholics.

THE hoarded millions of the rich on the one hand and the groans of oppressed labor on the other, speak in thunder tones of the soon coming of the Just One. If you want to know how this is, read the first page article in this paper.

ELDER S. B. HORTON, the Seventh-day Adventist minister, warned to leave Church Hill, Md., by some of his law-abiding(?) neighbors, is still there, and has thus far suffered no violence from the would-be regulators of the religion of the neighborhood.

LET no reader of the SENTINEL forget for a moment that in the State of Tennessee a man is languishing in prison for no other crime than doing ordinary farm labor on Sunday, on his own place; or rather we should say, for no other crime than observing the Sabbath of the Lord, and disregarding the Sunday of the papacy.

THE *Bugle Horn*, "for prohibition and equal suffrage," published at Salamanca, this State, says:—

If a person were to read the AMERICAN SENTINEL, he would be led to conclude that there was only one commandment, and that for the observance of the Sabbath. . . . Are there not other things in the Decalogue? Where are the nine? By what right does the SENTINEL select one, as above the rest?

This is too bad! but we can scarcely blame the editor of the *Bugle Horn*, for he has only judged us by himself. Evidently he has forgotten, at least one of the commandments. Without doubt he has overlooked the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Will our contemporary please bear in mind that there are ten commandments?

and that "whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all"? It is just as wicked to lie as it is to steal. We have never intended to be partial in the law, but have especially emphasized the fourth commandment because it is specially disregarded. Does not the editor of the *Bugle Horn* conduct a prohibition paper for a similar reason?—Certainly. Why then does he "darken counsel without knowledge"?

JULY 9, Mr. Weadock (Dem., Mich.) introduced in the House a bill amending the statutes relative to second-class mail matter so as to read as follows:—

Mailable matter of the second class shall embrace all matter exclusively in print and regularly issued at stated periods from a known office of publication without addition by writing, mark, or sign. Any newspaper of the second class which advises, abets, or suggests the commission of any offense against any law of the United States, or any State, or Territory, or any country with which the United States are at peace, shall be excluded from the mails.

This is a very far-reaching provision. There are times when disobedience to law becomes a sacred duty. Who now believes that the infamous Fugitive Slave Law ever ought to have been obeyed? Many people disobeyed it as a matter of conscience, and many papers counselled disobedience. Similar cases may arise in the future.

Notwithstanding the ordinance of civil government, God is still the great moral Governor; to him every soul is responsible; to him every free moral agent must give account. There never can be any conflict between a *legitimate* exercise of civil authority and the claims of the divine law. And yet the fact remains that there have been many and serious conflicts. Civil governments have frequently required of their subjects that which the divine law forbids, and have forbidden that which the divine law requires. What then shall the Christian citizen do in case the civil law requires that which the law of God forbids? His invariable answer to all such demands must be, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

Nor is this the expression of religious fanaticism. The principle thus stated is known and recognized by the best and most enlightened thinkers everywhere. In his work on moral philosophy, President Fairchild says:—

It is too obvious to need discussion, that the law of God, the great principle of benevolence, is supreme, and that, "we ought to obey God rather than men," in any case of conflict between human law and the divine. There are cases so clear that no one can question the duty to refuse obedience. In all times and in all lands such cases have arisen. In a case of this kind, either of two courses is possible; to disobey the law, and resist the government in its attempt to execute it, or to disobey and quietly suffer the penalty. The first is revolutionary, and can be justified only when the case is flagrant and affects such numbers that a revolutionary movement will be sustained. . . . The second course will, in general, commend itself to considerate and conscientious men. It is a testimony

against the law as unrighteous, and, at the same time, a recognition of government as a grave interest.

Apply this principle to the Sunday laws of several of the States. These laws require all to observe Sunday. With some to do this is as veritably to render an act of homage to a heathen deity as it would have been for the three Hebrew worthies to have fallen down before the great image set up in Babylon. To obey is to sacrifice conscience. Suppose that some paper in such a case publishes this extract from President Fairchild's book, what then? Under this proposed amendment to the postal laws such a paper could be excluded from the mails, and even the book itself could be regarded only as incendiary matter, dangerous to the welfare of the State. Is not the amendment too sweeping in its terms? The times are evil, but they demand no such drastic and dangerous measure.

THE *Christian Advocate* of this city says of the second coming of Christ:—

There is not a vestige of evidence that goes to show that He will appear in a thousand years from now, Not even the angels in heaven know when He will come.

But these words are themselves an evidence that the event is near. Says the scripture: "There shall come in the last days scoffers, . . . saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." 2 Peter 3:3, 4.

The *Advocate* confesses total ignorance of the coming of that day, but the Word of God says that sudden destruction shall come upon those who say, "Peace and safety," and adds, "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." 1 Thess. 5:3, 4. Those who know nothing about it will be destroyed because they don't want to know and willfully turn away from the truth. The Lord says of the signs of the second coming of Christ: "Now learn a parable of the fig tree: When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. *Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.* Matt. 24:32-34. And yet the *Advocate* says it may be a thousand years distant, and that we can know nothing about it!

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

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

In clubs of	5 to 24 copies to one address, per year,	- - - 90c
"	25 to 99 " " " " " "	- - - 80c
"	100 to 249 " " " " " "	- - - 75c
"	250 to 499 " " " " " "	- - - 70c
"	500 to 999 " " " " " "	- - - 65c
"	1000 or more " " " " " "	- - - 60c
To foreign countries in Postal Union,		- - - 5 shillings

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
43 Bond Street, New York City.