



"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, AUGUST 9, 1894.

NUMBER 32.

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.

MULTITUDES of people in the United States are wondering and perplexed in beholding how widespread and how persistent is the spirit of violence and lawlessness throughout the land.

To those, however, who have been carefully considering public movements in the last two or three years, there is nothing to wonder at nor to be perplexed about in all this, or *even more than this*, that has appeared.

INDEED, to those who have been carefully studying the public movements of the last two or three years, this widespread spirit of violence and lawlessness has been expected; and now, instead of expecting it to end at the limits that it has reached, widespread though it be, it is expected to become universal.

As a matter of fact, in these two or three years just passed, the Government of the United States has been surrendered to the principle of violence and lawlessness. This being so, it is not at all to be wondered at that violence and lawlessness should prevail almost constantly throughout the land and should become universal. Instead of being anything strange, it is the most natural thing in the world.

LET us recite the facts in the case: From 1888 till 1892 the combined churches, Prohibition party, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, tried their best to get Congress and the whole Government of the United States to do what the leaders of the combination knew to be an unconstitutional thing, and which, being done, they have again declared to be unconstitutional; that is, to espouse the Sunday-Sabbath cause. As Congress did not respond readily enough to suit them, they added threats to their "petitions" and their former efforts. These threats of the

combined "Protestant" religious element of the country, were to the effect that they pledged themselves and each other that they would never again vote for or support for any office or position of trust any member of Congress, either senator or representative, who should refuse to do their bidding to pass the church-instituted provision closing the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—the "Christian Sabbath," the "Lord's Day," etc.

EVERYBODY knows, or at least has had a chance to know, that Congress surrendered to these threats and publicly advertised that it did not "dare" to do otherwise. And when an effort, based upon the Constitution, was made to have Congress undo its unconstitutional action and place itself and the Government once more in harmony with the Constitution, this same religious combination renewed their former threats and added to these such others as suited their purpose best. The result was that the congressional committee that had the matter in charge, and that thus acted for the whole Congress, definitely excluded the Constitution from its consideration and deferred exclusively to the demands of that religious combination. And we have the words of two of the committee to the effect that this was done because this church combine would do more mischief and damage to the Exposition if they did not have their own way than they or anybody else would if they did have their own willful, threatening way. These words are worth setting down again. Here is the statement of Representative Reilly:—

The present agitation, if continued, can only result in injury to the Fair. Attempts to have the law repealed only result in stirring up animosity toward the Fair and creating antagonism on the part of the church people. They can do the Fair much harm if they decide to carry out the threats they have already made, and I think the friends of the Exposition who favor Sunday opening would act wisely in ceasing their efforts.

And Representative George W. Houk wrote a letter on this subject to President Higinbotham, of the Exposition, which was printed in the *Chicago Tribune*, February 5, 1893. After stating his "deliberate conviction that Congress was and is without any constitutional power or authority whatever to impose such a condi-

tion upon the grant of the appropriation," he states the case thus:—

From the nature, extent and character of the opposition, based as I think it is, upon an erroneous though conscientious sentiment, rather than upon a deliberate and rational judgment, it occurs to me that in case it were possible to have the existing law repealed, it might after all ultimately result in serious detriment to the final success of the Exposition.

It is of the first importance, in my judgment, to the final success of the Exposition that there should be a harmonious coöperation on the part of all the people of the United States in its support. If the present law requiring the gates to be closed Sundays to the public, should be repealed by a vote of a majority in both the House and Senate, which does not seem to me at all probable, and the act should receive the sanction of the President, which seems to be equally improbable, it is certain that the religious element of the country, through all its organizations, would be deeply offended and would array itself in antagonism to the Fair.

It is not a question whether such a course would be reasonable or not; and, while such action might be regarded as an exhibition of religious fanaticism, most remarkable under the circumstances, it is nevertheless true that a large number of good, conscientious, Christian people throughout the country, in their excited state of feeling upon this question, would be likely to pursue that course.

I am in a position to have reliable information in regard to this matter, and although I firmly believe that the refusal to permit the Exposition to be opened to the public Sundays under the regulations I have suggested, will be a most deplorable mistake, I am also fully persuaded that the repeal of the existing law closing its gates would array the whole religious element of the United States (Protestant at least) against it.

The question now to be decided by the management is, whether it is advisable further to urge a doubtful contest, upon a matter that is aggravating an already extensive and bitter hostility against Chicago and the Exposition, which even if ultimately successful, would be as likely to be fraught with disaster as benefit to the enterprise.

Now, the Constitution of the United States is the only thing in existence that gives to any member of Congress, either senator or representative, any power or authority. He owes his very existence, as a member of that body, to the Constitution. The Constitution defines his powers and sets the limitations of the exercise thereof. This is his only legitimate guide. To take any other thing as his guide in legislation is to repudiate the Constitution and to put that other thing in its place, and is to rob the people of all the governmental authority which, by the very idea of a written constitution, they have retained in their own hands, and is to make this other thing the governing power

instead of the people. In this case that other thing was the combined churches of the country threatening political ruin and the boycott, if their will was not conformed to in the doing of a confessedly unconstitutional thing. This, therefore, was only to recognize the principle that the caprice and arbitrary will of a clamorous and threatening few shall be the guide in legislation and governmental affairs, instead of the deliberate judgment of the majority as expressed in the Constitution.

NOR is it in Congress alone that this principle has been recognized. It has been given a place in the judicial procedure of the United States courts. In 1891, the United States Circuit Court for the western district of Tennessee, in giving legal sanction to the practice of persecution to secure the recognition of Sunday, said:—

By a sort of factitious advantage, the observers of Sunday have secured the aid of the civil law, and adhere to that advantage with great tenacity, in spite of the clamor for religious freedom and the progress that has been made in the absolute separation of Church and State. . . . And the efforts to extirpate the advantage above-mentioned, by judicial decision in favor of a civil right to disregard the change, seem to me quite useless.

The court was composed of Circuit Judge Howell E. Jackson, now a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, and District Judge E. S. Hammond. The opinion was written by Judge Hammond, and was filed August 1, 1891. Then in the *Memphis Appeal-Avalanche* of August 30, there was published a four-column article by Judge Hammond, dated August 12, and entitled "The Sunday Habit," which is little if anything else than a defense of the decision that had been rendered on this subject August 1. In this article the Judge confesses that "the logic of this [his] position may lead to a union of Church and State undoubtedly;" but that the support of Sunday by the civil power, and by persecution, "is a necessity of statesmanship" upon "the policy of securing the public peace." The danger to the public peace, and the source of it, if Sunday laws were disregarded by those who have a "distaste for, or a disbelief in, the custom;" or if they were attacked by a proposal to abolish them, is set forth as follows:—

We have lived so free of it in modern days that we forget the force of religious fanaticism, and he who supposes that its fury cannot be again aroused may be mistaken.

Christians would become alarmed, and they might substitute for the stars and other symbols of civil freedom upon the banners of their armed hosts, the symbol of the cross of Christ, and fight for their religion at the expense of their civil government. They have done this in times that are passed, and they could do it again. And he is not a wise statesman who overlooks a possibility like this, and endangers the public peace.

The civilian, as contradistinguished from the churchman, though united in the same person, may find in the principle of preserving the public order a satisfactory warrant for yielding to religious prejudice and fanaticism the support of those laws, when the demand for such a support may become a force that would disturb the public order. It may be a constantly diminishing force, but if it be yet strong enough to create disturbance, statesmanship takes account of it as a factor in the problem.

This statement and those of representatives Reilly and Houk, are the deliberate opinions of representative men, and officials in official place: men who were in position not only to know, but in which they were obliged to consider the question in all its bearings. And when, having so considered the question, they set forth this as their deliberate conclusion, then noth-

ing more is needed to demonstrate that the church element, that is managing and supporting the Sunday cause in the United States, is one of the *most dangerous elements in the United States*.

THIS thought was so well presented before the House Committee on the Columbian Exposition, January 12, 1893, by Mrs. Marion Foster Washburne, of Chicago, that her earnest and weighty words are worthy to ring in the ears of all the people in the nation. In referring to the speeches and the representations of the clergy before the same committee the day before, she said:—

Moreover, they threatened—and of all things, the boycott! The very tactics they preach against from their pulpits. And one man said that the "religious boycott was justified by the deep prejudices of the people."

I have a profound respect and reverence, as all fair-minded people must have, for the man who believes in his religion and stands upon it against the world; but I have precious little respect for the clergyman, who, when he wants to win a worldly advantage, uses a worldly argument, making the admission that the heavenly one is insufficient for practical purposes. The man who claims to have faith in prayer, and yet descends to the boycott!

I know that we cannot possibly make as good a showing as some church societies, and the reason is that we are not organized as they are. The great mass of liberal and thoughtful people all over the country are not so organized that they can act as one, before such a committee, but their numbers may be—may are—even greater than those contained in the societies here represented. They are simply quiet and tolerant private citizens, who, for the most part, are rather amused that any one should be intolerant. But while this organization of the evangelical churches gives them an advantage in being able to present petitions and speakers, it is, gentlemen, a danger! Our forefathers foresaw the danger of an organized minority coercing an unorganized majority, and forbade this country a standing army; there is as much danger, or, as the history of religious persecution shows, more danger, in the interference of an organized body of churches in the affairs of the State, than in a standing army.

Yet in the face of the indubitable evidence that the element that manages the Sunday cause is of such dangerous proclivities that the Government of the United States must be surrendered to it in order "to preserve the public peace," these same ones take great pride in advertising and exalting themselves as "the best people of the land," and the "law-abiding people of the country"!

THE truth is, however, that this claim, like the claim of their Sunday-Sabbath, is absolutely fraudulent. The undeniable fact is that these very ones are of the *least* law-abiding people in the United States. They have demonstrated that they have no respect for any law but such as their own arbitrary will approves. For without the slightest hesitation, yea, rather with open persistence, they have *knowingly* disregarded and overridden the supreme law—the Constitution—of the United States. They have set the example, and established the principle, of absolute lawlessness.

THESE facts demonstrate that instead of their being truly the law-abiding portion of the people, these men are among the chiefest law breakers in the land—the most lawless of all the nation. Nor is this at all to be wondered at. For, in order to accomplish this their bad purpose, they "gladly joined hands" and hearts with the papacy—that power which the Lord designates as the "lawless one" and as the very "mystery of lawlessness" itself. 2 Thess. 2:3, 7 (R. V.).

In view of such an example as this,

should it be thought surprising that lawlessness should be manifested by others throughout the whole country as never before, and that violence should cover the land from ocean to ocean?

In view of such an example as this set by "the best people" of the land, should it be thought strange that the example should be followed by the "Industrials," "Commonwealers," "Coxeyites," the "Debsites," or the "worst" people of the land?

If it is proper for the preachers and churches of the country to threaten Congress till their confessedly unconstitutional demands are complied with, why is it not equally proper for the "Commonwealers," Debs and his followers, and everybody else, also to threaten Congress or anybody else, till *their* demands are complied with?

If Congress can guarantee to the people religion, even on Sunday, why shall it not also guarantee to the people money, or work, or whatever else may be demanded, on every day of the week?

When the principle of petition by threat, and legislation by clamor, and the surrender of governmental prerogative to preserve the public peace, has been once recognized in favor of one class, then why shall not the principle be applied in behalf of any and every other class, on demand?

Why should Coxey, Browne, Kelly, Frye, and company, be denounced, prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned, while simply following the example of Crafts, Cook, Shepard, George, and company, in which these latter were listened to, and honored by the preference of Congress and the United States Circuit Court?

It was because of this evil example of "the best people of the land," this principle of violence and lawlessness, forced upon the Government by the combined churches of the country—it was because of this that we have expected nothing else than that violence and lawlessness would spread through the land, and that we still expect it to become universal. This is not to say that the particular *phases* of lawlessness that have of late been manifested in so many parts of the country, have been carried on by the human actors therein in conscious and intentional pursuance of the example of lawlessness set by the churches; but it is to say that *there is a spirit of things* that must ever be taken into account. There is the Spirit of order, and there is the spirit of disorder. And when the Spirit of order has been so outraged, and the spirit of disorder chosen and persistently followed instead, as it has been in this case—and that too by the very ones who profess to be the representatives of the Spirit of order in the earth—then things are given over to the spirit of disorder and lawlessness, and nothing remains but that this spirit shall prevail and increase until it becomes universal. And we have no hesitation in saying that every man and woman who took part in this movement of the church-combine upon the Government is responsible for the consequences, violent and lawless as those consequences may be.

No Longer Astonished.

THE worst phase of the present situation is that nothing surprises any one. Senators are examined as the pupils in a school when a pocket-book is stolen, every one called up and searched! All departments are being investigated and evidences of

corruption are appearing on every side; what would once have set the country on fire with righteous indignation and fear are now stated as matters of everyday occurrence.

"And what will ye do in the end thereof?"—*New York Christian Advocate*.

And worse yet, nobody is righteously indignant. The only reason such things are questioned at all is to make political capital for the party making the exposé.

The Definite Seventh Day.

WHEN God said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work," he designated a definite day to be observed alike by all men. To suppose, as some claim, that the Sabbath of the Lord has not a particular, specified place in the succession of days which make up the months and years of time, but is any one day out of seven which men may chance to select for rest and worship, is to charge God foolishly. "God is not the author of confusion;" nor has he left it to the caprice or self-interest of man to determine the day upon which his Sabbath shall be kept. Of this he has given us abundant evidence in his word.

The Sabbath is God's rest day. It was instituted at creation; for, "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." From the creation, therefore, each recurring seventh day has been the day upon which God rested, and therefore the Sabbath day; for any day upon which God did not rest could not be his Sabbath. While any day can be one day out of seven, only one day can be the one on which he rested; and that day, as he tells us, is the seventh day.

Notice also the language of the Sabbath commandment: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." God rested on the first seventh day, and thus pointed out and fixed the seventh day in the calendar of our first parents, Adam and Eve. The children of Adam and Eve did not inaugurate a new reckoning, but learned from them which day was the seventh day, and thus it has been with all the people of God from that day to this, for each parent would, in obeying the Sabbath commandment, be obliged to instruct both son and daughter, manservant and maidservant, in their duty to refrain from work on the Sabbath day. So long as the commandment was observed by parents, there could be no question about which day was the Sabbath in the minds of the children; and had the commandment not been violated, no question of that nature could ever have arisen. But God has always had at least a few faithful followers in all ages of the world, and through these the definite Sabbath day has come down to us, which God pointed out at creation.

During the forty years' wandering of the children of Israel in the wilderness, God designated by miracles the day which was his Sabbath; for on the sixth day he sent a double portion of manna from heaven, and withheld all manna on the seventh day, and preserved what was kept

over from the sixth day to the seventh, so that it was not corrupt, as it would have been on other days. If there had been any disposition on the part of the Israelites to select their own Sabbath day,—to choose any one day in seven, as some people claim the right to do now, it must have been effectually corrected by this emphatic testimony from the Lord. And that testimony has lost none of its force at the present time. If the Sabbath was a particular, definite day then, not left to be determined by the choice of man, it must be so now. God does not change, his law does not change, and the obligation of man to his law does not change with the lapse of years.

The seventh day has never lost its identity from creation down to the present time. The day, marked by the unchanging revolution of the earth, and the week, marked by the six days of creation and the seventh day Sabbath, are divisions of time marked off by God himself; and they have continued unchanged through all the ages. The seventh day of the week in the days of Adam, is the seventh day of the week at the present time, as it ever has been. "The Sabbath day according to the commandment," which followed the "preparation" day and immediately preceded the first day of the week at the time of the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ (Luke 23:54-56; 24:1), is the Sabbath day according to the commandment now. And happy is he who is willing to accept and observe the day God has designated, rather than a day that has been chosen by man.—*Present Truth, London, England*.

Is Man Immortal?

THE following letter demands respectful consideration because of its candid tone:—

"ORTHODOXLY INSANE."

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL:—In an editorial of July 5th, under the above title, you have—unconsciously no doubt—laid yourself liable to the criticisms of many thoughtful readers. In attributing the murder and suicide referred to, to the "orthodoxy" of the demented father, you certainly forgot that a very prominent article in the creed of "orthodoxy" is that "No murderer hath eternal life abiding in him," so that true "orthodoxy," had he possessed it,—or rather, had it possessed him, would have prevented the shocking tragedy you mention.

Your quotations from Ecclesiastes—"The dead know not anything," and from Job—"His sons come to honor and he knoweth it not," and from the Psalms—"In that very day his thoughts perish," come far short of teaching the unconscious condition of man after the body crumbles back to its native dust, even if there were not numerous declarations of the Scriptures positively teaching the opposite view, as Eccl. 12:7—"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."—Before you reply that the term "spirit" means nothing but the mere "breath" or air that, in one sense keeps man alive, please examine Job 15th chapter and 18th verse, compared with the latter part of the 25th verse of the same chapter, where it is plain the speaker refers to the spirit of man as meaning *man himself*, instead of his "breath." Let us read: "Thou turnest thy spirit against God, and lettest such words go out of thy mouth," verse 13. And in verse 25—"He stretcheth out his hand against God, and strengtheneth himself against the Almighty." Here there can be no question as to the identity of "spirit" with *man himself*. Again, Isa. 57:15, "I dwell . . . with him that is of an humble and contrite spirit." Is it possible for mere "air" or the "breath" of men to be spoken of as having *humility and contrition*? If your view is tenable, it must be so.

In Prov. 16th chapter, 18th verse, and in Psalms 32:2, and in 51:10, as well as in many other parts of the Word, the "spirit" of man is spoken of in such a manner as to make it absolutely impossible to understand the meaning as limited to the narrow bounds contended for by you. Take any Concordance, and look over the various passages referred to under "spirit," and you will see at a glance that very few, if any of them can be properly interpreted as you and your writers are in the habit of doing.

And now as to the meaning of the passages you quoted as to the dead not "knowing anything," etc., I think a careful examination of the several contexts will satisfy any ordinary reader (who is not committed to, and influenced by, some special theory), that the passages in question simply teach this and nothing more, that after death men are so separated from their former surroundings and associations in this life as to know nothing concerning the things with which they were once interested, as in Job: "His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not." C. W. SWARTZ.

Hillsdale, Mich.

It is true, as Mr. Swartz says, that so-called orthodoxy teaches not only the immortality of the soul, but also that "no murderer hath eternal life abiding him." But this is nullified very largely by the definition given to the term "eternal life." Life and death are not by "orthodoxy" permitted to have their natural and obvious meaning, but are made to mean misery and happiness. In this fact lurks the evil. Clothe a man with eternal life and he will readily take the chances on his condition in eternity. This argument prevailed with our first parents. It was when assured by the serpent that they should not surely die, but should be as gods that they took the forbidden fruit. The Lord says (Ezk. 13:22): "With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not turn from his wickedness, by promising him life." "Orthodoxy" departs from the truth far enough to accept as one of its tenets Satan's first great lie. Is it strange that many who accept this tenet go one step further and imagine that life a happy one?

We do not claim that in the Scriptures the term "spirit" always means "breath or air." It sometimes means life; but it does not follow that consciousness attaches to that life. Life—animal life—is often present when there is no consciousness, as in sound sleep, injury to the brain, etc.

When God created man he "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." There was life, or spirit, if you please, in that breath; but the same thing was given to the lower animals for we read in Gen. 7:21, 22: "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died."

Just what this life is nobody knows, but when it leaves the body, whether of men or of beast, it returns to God who gave it. That this is so will appear from a comparison of Ps. 104:24-29 and Job 34:14. The first of these texts asserts what occurs when God gathers to himself the breath of the beast; the second asserts substantially the same thing of man. While Eccl. 3:19 says plainly: "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preëminence above a beast: for all is vanity." And in the twenty-first verse the question is asked: "Who knoweth if the spirit of the children of Adam ascend upward, and if the spirit of the beasts descend downward?" (Douay Version.)

Our correspondent is clearly wrong in asserting that "spirit" sometimes means man himself; this is true of soul, but not of spirit. Nor do the verses to which he refers prove that the spirit is man himself any more than they prove that the "hand" is man himself. It is clear that in this case spirit means disposition or will; and

that this is so is evident, for by substituting either of these words the sense is perfectly preserved. God dwells with the man who is of a humble disposition, a submissive will. There is in Isa. 57:15 not the least evidence of immortality. Our correspondent is here beating the air. He has set up a man of straw which he very valiantly knocks down.

The Bible says that "the dead know not anything." Our correspondent says that they "know nothing concerning the things with which they were once interested." We may be excused for believing the words of God rather than our correspondent's interpretation of those words. "The dead know not anything;" for, as the same Word declares (1 Tim. 6:16), God "only hath immortality." We know this because God says so, and we believe his word.

The Sabbath Question in the Dominion Parliament.*

(Concluded.)

THE honorable gentlemen must remember that in proposing his bill he acts not only contrary to the constitution which I read a moment ago,† but also contrary to the general understanding which prevails in this country and which was summed up in a proclamation by Her Majesty the Queen in 1858, which is as follows:—

Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects. We declare it to be our royal will and pleasure that none be in anywise favored, none molested or disquieted by reason of their religious faith or observance, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects, on pain of our highest displeasure.

These are the words not only of the Queen, but of the Parliament of Great Britain. This is the rule which should be recognized in this country. We should not interfere with the religious belief of our neighbors. Everybody should enjoy complete liberty, provided that liberty does not interfere with the liberty and civil rights of others. But the honorable gentleman wants to force those who are not of the same belief with himself to observe as the Sabbath some other day than that which they believe to be the Sabbath, and even to force those who, like himself, desire to observe Sunday, to observe it in the way he believes in, and not in the way they believe in themselves. That is not protection of civil rights; it is interference with civil rights. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up too much of the time of this House, but I have given briefly the reasons why I oppose the bill: First, because the bill is unconstitutional; † second, because it is useless if it were constitutional, because the provinces take charge of these matters; and third, be-

cause the bill is an undue interference with the belief of others.

‡ By this bill we claim jurisdiction in religious matters. I have objected to that already, but being in the minority, I can do nothing but submit for the moment. In the second place, by this bill we assert that Sunday is the Lord's day. I have already given the name of a very respectable religion which holds the contrary view, and I challenge the mover of the bill to show where in the Bible he finds that Sunday is the Lord's day. I quoted the Old and the New Testament against the honorable gentleman's contention. Will he allow this opportunity of answering the challenge to pass—he who is the champion in this House, the athlete, fighting in favor of a principle? Will it be said all over the Dominion and the world, that a member of the legislature in this House could not find in the Bible any text to authorize his assertion that Sunday, or the first day of the week, is the day chosen by our Lord for a day of rest? It is all very well for the honorable gentleman to remain silent, but he thus gives a victory to his adversaries. The Seventh-day Adventists will cast up at him, wherever he may be, that he was not able to defend himself against one who is not a member of his religion. I have proved by the Old Testament that the Sabbath is on Saturday, and not on Sunday, that God did not rest before his work was done but after it was done, and I have challenged him to find any passage in the New Testament where the Son of God gave orders to celebrate the first day of the week instead of the one chosen by his Father. I challenge the honorable gentleman in the name of the Seventh-day Adventists and of the Jews, to reply. Is he impotent? It is all very well for honorable gentlemen to laugh, but there is the weak point, and if he is not able to answer, it must be said that the champion of this House, advocating the keeping of the Lord's day, could not furnish any good ground for his advocacy.

As I have said, by this bill we are assuming to have jurisdiction in religious matters. I contend that it is the provinces, and not the Parliament, which has such jurisdiction. In the second place, while the honorable gentleman asserts that the work on the Lord's day is against the law, by this amendment, § to which he consents, he says: "The law of God is all very well, but we will not follow it whenever we think it is not in our interest to do so. God said: 'You must observe the whole of Sunday.' That is all right, but we will cut the day short, and take from the Sunday the amount of time required for our business; and the governor in council || will have the power, four weeks in advance, to say that three weeks hence there will be such a press of business that we will have to disobey the law of God and let prevail the law of man." For my part, I am against all this legislation. I believe it is not our duty here to occupy ourselves with religious legislation. That

has been left to each individual. Each individual has the right to worship his God as he thinks proper, provided he does not interfere with the liberty of any one else.

Satoli, Sunday Laws, and Salvation.

THE "Delegate Apostolic," Mgr. Satoli, has just rendered a decision which involves the eternal damnation, so far as the Catholic Church controls this deplorable destiny, of all saloon keepers who violate the law forbidding the sale of "liquid damnation" on Sunday. It came about thus: Bishop Watterson, of the diocese of Columbus, Ohio, addressed a letter to the Catholic clergy of his diocese, in which he withdrew his approbation "from any and every Catholic society" "that has a liquor dealer or saloon keeper at its head, or any where among its officers," and refused to approve all new societies or new branches of old societies having saloon keepers either as members or officers.

The letter further says:—

If there are saloon keepers in your parish who call themselves Catholics, and yet carry on their business in a forbidden and disedifying way, or sell on Sundays, either openly or under any sort of guise or disguises; in violation of civil law, and to the hurt of order and religion and the scandal of any part of the community, you will refuse them absolution, should they perchance come to receive the sacraments, unless they promise to cease offending in these or other ways and to conduct their business blamelessly if they can, or get out of it and keep out of it altogether.

An appeal was taken from this action of Bishop Watterson to Mgr. Satoli. The ablegate decided in favor of the bishop. The decision sums up as follows:—

Therefore the delegate apostolic sustains Bishop Watterson's action and approves of his circular letter and regulations concerning saloons and the expulsion of saloon keepers from membership in Catholic societies.

The religious press, professedly Protestant, has joined in a chorus of congratulations to the ablegate for this great temperance(?) decision. The *Independent* goes so far as to say that "Archbishop Satoli, the apostolic delegate, has given a decision for which Protestants will thank him as heartily as his warmest Catholic supporters."

Protestants will do no such thing. An examination of the case reveals the fact that the decision favors the legal enforcement of the papal Sunday more strongly than it favors temperance.

According to Bishop Watterson's letter, Catholics may manufacture and sell the soul and body destroying liquor and still belong to the already organized Catholic societies. The Catholic saloon keeper can for six days out of the seven deal out to his fellow-creatures "distilled damnation," rob men and women of their reason, make widows and orphans, rob mothers and children of bread, and still be a member of the Catholic Church and receive absolution from the hand of the priest. All this he can do for six days, but should he continue this death-dealing work on the first of the seven days, and "sell on Sunday, either openly or under any sort of guise or disguise, in violation of civil law," then heaven is to be closed against him,—absolution, the pardon of sins, is to be refused, which means to the Catholic eternal destruction. Therefore it is not the selling of this liquid death to men and women that brings down the severest discipline on the Roman Catholic saloon keeper, but his selling on *Sunday*. The decision exalts the papal Sunday, the mark of papal power, but falls far short of a

* Delivered in the House of Commons, Wednesday, May 30, 1894, by Hon. G. Amyot, Member from Bellechasse, P. Q., and printed in the unrevised "Hansard" No. 49, and in the revised edition columns 3503-3507. Published by the International Religious Liberty Association as No. 23 of the *Religious Liberty Library*, and for sale at this office. Price, 1½ cents. Usual discount in quantities.

† Mr. Amyot contended in the first part of his speech that the proposed legislation was unconstitutional because the British North American Act, clause 92, subsection 13, says:—

"Property and civil rights in the provinces will be the exclusive right of the Provincial Legislature."

Since the honorable mover of the bill had declared in a speech at the introduction of the bill that the measure was "designed to secure for the people of this country their civil rights," Mr. Amyot argued that, therefore, the Dominion Parliament was forbidden by its constitution to legislate concerning the matter.

‡ Delivered in the House of Commons, 4th of June, 1894, by the Hon. G. Amyot; published in the unrevised "Hansard," No. 52, and in the revised edition, columns 3640 and 3641.

§ No canal belonging to the government of Canada shall be operated for traffic on Sunday, except between the hours of midnight on Saturday, and six o'clock in the morning of Sunday, and from and after the hour of nine o'clock at night on Sunday.

|| In the case of urgent necessity arising from the pressure of business caused by an interruption of traffic, or by the approach of the close of navigation, the foregoing provision may, from time to time, be suspended or varied by order of the governor in council; but such order in council shall only continue in force for four weeks at most, from the making thereof, and may be made applicable to any one or more of the canals.

temperance measure. It is no wonder that professed Protestants who still wear the badge of Rome—the Sunday-Sabbath—should “thank” Rome “heartily” for this decision; but no true Protestant will join in the thanksgiving.

An Interesting Question.

THERE is in Potterville, Mich., an Adventist who is a blacksmith. He was formerly a Methodist. He has not, since becoming an Adventist, done much work in his shop on Sunday, but works if he has anything urgent to do. His shop is one-fourth of a mile from the nearest meeting-house and several rods from any dwelling. He also muffles his anvil on Sunday so that no one can be disturbed by the noise. But recently the village council decided that he must stop Sunday work and he was so notified by the constable, while at work the following Sunday. The work went on, however. We have not yet learned the result, but this man certainly has in Michigan, not only a God-given, but a statutory right to work on Sunday. The statutes of that State provide:—

SECTION 7. No person who conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and actually refrains from secular business and labor on that day, shall be liable to the penalties provided in this chapter, for performing secular business or labor on the said first day of the week, provided he disturb no other person.

In States where there is no clause exempting from the penalties of the Sunday law observers of the seventh day, the plea of the Sunday people is that “the law must be enforced.” In such cases the law, or that portion of it rather, is most sacred; to disobey it is to become an enemy of Christian civilization and a traitor to his country. But, lo! when the law is the other way and does not serve their bigoted ends they are ready to override all law in the interests of the Sunday idol. This shows that not love for law, but love of power is their ruling passion.

Church and State.

The Law of the Sabbath Interpreted by Mortals.

AT a National Reform convention held in 1873, the Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., said: “We want State and religion and we are going to have it.” And Prof. C. A. Blanchard in another convention said: “Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion.” And Rev. D. A. Gault, a district secretary of the association, said: “We propose to incorporate in our national Constitution the moral and religious command ‘in it [the Sabbath] thou shalt do no work,’ except works of necessity, and by external force of sheriffs we propose to arrest and punish all violators of this law.” Here is a clear statement of their intentions. Let these ideas be put into concrete form as they desire, in the law of the land, and anathema would soon follow against all dissenters. They deny any desire for a union of Church and State, but deny as they may, the above is an absolute confession.

But suppose the law of the Sabbath, the fourth commandment, should be incorporated in the law of the land, what would be the result? It would then become civil law; and civil law must be interpreted by the courts, by Congress, by judges, and juries. This would be to pre-

sume that the Creator could not give a law in an intelligent manner, and so must be left to the wisdom of man to decide its meaning. And then not to man in his individuality to recognize or refuse the claims of his Creator; but it would place courts and Congress above individual rights, above individual conscience, above God himself, for God has left these free to all men to exercise each for himself. It would take away the right of private judgment. It would destroy man’s individuality, his responsibility to his God. It would make the State supreme. It would destroy man’s independence of character, and make him a servile slave to a religio-political despotism. It would revive the terrors of the Inquisition.—*H. F. Phelps, in Renville Star-Farmer, Minn.*

Equal Rights.

Do all men have equal rights? if not, why not? If the great and just Creator of men bestowed inalienable rights, then all men must be equal in this respect; for we read he is no respecter of persons. The right to worship God according to the dictates of one’s own conscience, without let or hindrance, by any man or set of men, is an inalienable right of every person in all the world. We have often heard the boast in this land of this privilege. This right is God-given, like the right to live. No man, or set of men, can deprive a person of this right. They may put shackles and hooks on him; they may ignore the principle and trample it under foot, yet the principle still exists; they may destroy the man, but the principle is indestructible. These rights are part and parcel of man’s very being, and are necessary in order to his development and accountability. The untrammelled exercise and use of these rights is also necessary to his safety and happiness. The great Creator has so ordered and arranged things that when any one exercises his rights and pursues them in their proper channel, there is no clashing.

The exercise of one man’s rights does not necessarily interfere with any other man’s. Every man may exercise all of his inalienable rights to the fullest extent without encroaching upon his neighbor. The exercise of any man’s right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, or not to worship any god at all, should not, can not, and does not interfere with any other man doing, or not doing, the same thing. The untrammelled exercise of one man’s rights does no more interfere with that of another than does the breathing of the free air by one man interfere with that of another. A man is born with the right to breathe, and there is air enough for all. If every person was left to the fullest legitimate exercise of his rights, then truly this would be in truth the “land of the free and home of the brave.” It takes valor of a very high type to practically concede to every man all the rights that one claims for himself. Pure and undefiled Christianity alone does this.

When this Government was established, John Adams said “there was a great point gained in favor of the rights of mankind.” From a Christian and constitutional standpoint, no man can be deprived of the exercise of his inalienable rights. And the fact that there are good citizens that are deprived of their inalienable rights or the exercise of them rather, is because the principles of Christianity

and of the Constitution of the United States are disregarded. We make this query: Are there any persons in this country thus treated? We have only to refer to the States of Maryland, Tennessee and Georgia. Do these persons have equal rights with the rest of the people? They do constitutionally, but seem not to have judicially. To worship God as we please is an inborn right. These persons have been arrested, fined, imprisoned, and worked in the chain-gang for no other reason than because they have done that very thing, and which is perfectly harmless and innocent in itself.

Any law that would forbid the doing any innocent and harmless thing, certainly is based upon unsound principles. For the State or national Government to make it a misdemeanor to work on Sunday, certainly gives one religious denomination the advantage over another. To debar a man from work or any other civil pursuit on Sunday or any other day of the week, by civil law, is assuming that he is not capable of self-government. If it is done for a moral reason, it implies that morals or religion can be propagated by civil law. The Sunday law idea annihilates individual rights of conscience; and when that is done all acceptable worship or service is destroyed.

There is no way for civil government to settle the question, Which day is the Sabbath? Congress, while discussing the bill to close the World’s Fair on Sunday, said, the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. But the commandment says the seventh day is the Sabbath. Congress certainly read between the lines, and so read into the commandment something that God never put there.

The Constitution says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Most of the States have followed the example of the Federal Government in this regard. Congress shall set up, found, or ordain no religious establishment. Wherever any State, or Federal authority, has enacted laws favoring the idea that Sunday is the Sabbath day, and prohibiting all ordinary work on that day, there, to all intents and purposes, we have a law made respecting an establishment of religion, and prohibiting the free exercise of religion. We have a national confession of faith now in embryo. Congress has accepted the *thesis* that Sunday is the Sabbath, and defended it by argument, and established it by law. The dogma that Sunday is the Sabbath, is one of the articles of faith. Should a “Christian amendment” be passed by Congress, and ratified by the requisite number of States, then we would have another tenet of the national creed.

The acknowledgment of God in the Constitution would not guarantee fidelity to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and to the Constitution as it reads.

How can a man that loves his neighbor as himself, and worships God according to the dictates of his own conscience, favor the idea of prosecuting a brother, or a fellow-citizen, for doing the very same things? The great Teacher said, “And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.” When any professed Christian gives his sanction and approval to the arrest and persecution of any man who conscientiously keeps the seventh day and works the other six days

of the week, he certainly cannot claim that he is in harmony with the Golden Rule, or that he loves his neighbor as himself. Then his Christianity becomes "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

"Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity vaunteth not [is not rash] itself." To compel a man to keep Sunday when he conscientiously believes Saturday is the Sabbath day, is the same thing as compelling him to keep two days.*

An intelligent Christian certainly will not surround his neighbor with such circumstances as to force him to disregard the law of his country or the law of his God. All will admit that it is better to disregard man's law than the law of God. Let us suppose that it takes all of six days in every week devoted to labor, in order that a man may be able to maintain himself and family, which no doubt is the case with a great many wage workers, and that the same man believes the seventh day is the Sabbath, as the commandment puts it, which no doubt is the case in some instances, and the Sunday law compels him to rest or be idle on the first day of the week, then we have a man that is robbed of the inalienable right of the pursuit of happiness and is compelled to either disregard the law of the land or the law of God in order to get a living. *O tempora! O mores!!*

J. W. HANNER.

Another "Faribault Scheme."

THE controversy which has taken place at Syracuse, N. Y., in regard to leasing a building, which has just been erected by the Roman Catholics, and which is designed for school purposes, is a reminder that the Church of Rome is still endeavoring to advance the interests of that church at the expense of the public school system.

Last fall St. Lucy's parish completed the erection of a school building. Shortly after the completion of the building a written proposition was submitted to the Board of Education requesting them to make use of the building for public school purposes, for which a nominal rental of one dollar per year was to be paid by the city. The Board of Education was requested to pay the salaries of teachers and meet the other expenses of maintaining the institution as a public school. The original proposition was that only Catholic teachers should be employed in the school, but the written proposition submitted to the board contained no such limitation. The principal argument adduced in favor of the proposition to employ Catholic teachers was that it was a hardship upon the Catholic portion of the community to be compelled to contribute toward the support of the public school system, and also to provide for the maintenance of parochial schools for the religious education of their children. The written proposition brought out so much opposition and so much feeling was developed over the affair that the advocates of the measure saw that it would not receive the sanction of the Board of Education, and the day before the proposition came to a vote, the vicar-general stepped in and withdrew the whole proposition.

An effort was also made by several of the teachers to introduce the reading of

*But it really makes no difference whether the individual keeps any day; a man has a civil right to keep any day or no day. It would be just as bad to require an infidel to submit to immersion as to require a Presbyterian to be immersed. The fact that the latter had been previously sprinkled would not add to the enormity of the outrage.—Ed.

the Catholic version of the Bible in their divisions. The board requires that teachers read daily from the Holy Scriptures, without specifying particularly the version to be used; and although copies of the authorized version are supplied to all the schools with the expectation that they would be used, several of the Catholic teachers interpreted this requirement of the board as giving them the right to make use of any version they saw fit, and substituted the Catholic Bible. Upon being questioned concerning it, some of the teachers stated that they had been told by the vicar-general that he understood there would be no objection to their using the Douay version. When the matter was considered by the board, it was decided that only the authorized version could be used, and the teachers were instructed to use the Bible provided by the State, and if any change was desired, application must be made to the board for permission to make such change.

E. E. PARLIN.

Hoist with Their Own Petard.

AN interesting case of mob rule bringing grief on its promoters is reported crisp and fresh from Maryland, where in the past so many instances of bigotry have gone unchecked. The facts are these:

Two Seventh-day Adventist ministers, named respectively Jones and Howard, moved their tent in which meetings are conducted, and their household goods, by boat from a point near Annapolis to Kent Island, Md., landing at the wharf of the Chester River Steamboat Company. After paying for the use of the dock one of them proceeded to the village of Stevensville, three miles distant, to secure a lot for pitching the tent, while the other remained to care for the goods. A farmer with his team was engaged to haul the tent and fixtures, and one load accompanied by one minister was soon deposited on the rented plot of ground in Stevensville, the other man remaining with the rest of the baggage on the wharf waiting for the return of the wagon. No sooner had preparations begun for putting up the tent, than a mob of rough men came on the lot and in coarse language commanded the work to stop, and demolished what had been done. The local magistrate was one of the gang, and, in fact, seemed to be the leader. Of course, the minister expostulated with them and protested that he had come to preach the good news to them; but he was compelled to desist from further efforts to provide his family with even the shelter of a tent from the coming darkness and storm. One man at last opened his house for them to stay during the night. The driver of the wagon was afraid to do anything more, and the minister on the wharf remained all night guarding the property in his charge. Early the next morning he was made acquainted with affairs at the other end of the line by the appearing of his brother minister. Together they consulted what step to take next, and the same faithful guardian remained by the stuff while the other started for Middletown, Del., to get further instructions and advice from the president of the conference under whose direction they labor.

Part of the first seven miles of the journey from Stevensville to Ford's Store was made on foot through deep dust and under a broiling sun, and then a ride was secured by paying fifty cents. A large

church of Seventh-day Adventists live at Ford's Store, and here the minister had a good brother take his horse and drive to Centreville, twelve miles farther on, where he could get a slow train to Middletown. It was nearly night when he arrived there, and after a few hurried words with the presiding officer he returned to Kent Island. By good fortune he met on the way the sheriff of the county where the trouble occurred and to him related his case and received assurance of protection the following morning in putting up the tent. Several brethren of the Ford's Store Church went over, and with their assistance the work was done; but the sheriff did not appear as promised. By a continual watch the rest of the day and the following night, only two ropes were cut on the tent by the angry mob that surrounded the little band.

In the meantime several men of the village who claimed to represent the public feeling, came as a committee and demanded as the only condition of peace and safety to persons and property, that the men and tents leave the island. The ministers took their names and agreed to consult again with the president of the conference by letter and a truce was declared for a little season.

The sheriff and his deputy arrived on the scene at this juncture, and on learning that the committee had kindly left their names, he promptly announced his determination to arrest every one of them and take them back to Centreville. He soon had the committee before him, and then they were informed that they had made themselves liable to his authority and of his purpose to prosecute them to the full extent of the law. At last he consented to let the ministers themselves say whether or not the committee should be arrested, and, taking the leader, the local magistrate, he marched him into the presence of his terrible foes, and said that just what the ministers said in the matter should be done. Of course, the preachers said, "Let the men go; we don't want to trouble them. We want to preach the gospel of peace, and so, do not arrest these men." The sheriff then informed the abashed "committee" that they would be held responsible if any further damage was done, and let them go—not exactly rejoicing, but glad to get out of the hole so easily. The consequence is that these men must now see that no harm comes to the preachers or the tents, else they will have to give an account to the sheriff. While the poor ministers sweetly sleep in peace after their hard experience, the ever vigilant committee must sit up and guard the men they tried to drive out of town. It is needless to say that under the guardianship of such a force inspired by the lofty feeling of self-preservation from the county jail, the "public sentiment" they claimed to represent is fast changing in favor of the Seventh-day Adventist preachers.

The following reply from the president of the conference was received by the committee soon after the sheriff's visit, and it is hoped they have read it with profit:—

Middletown, Del., July 28, 1894.

TO THE COMMITTEE,
Stevensville, Kent Island, Md.

DEAR SIR: I have received the proposition made by your body to Messrs Jones and Howard, ministers of the gospel and licensed by the Seventh-day Adventist Conference, which I have the honor to represent as president. From their statement of the kind manner in which you requested them to leave the place and offered to refund some items of expense incurred by

them in moving, we are persuaded that you are gentlemen of candor and that the course you recommend is one in which you desire to protect us, as well as the public, from any difficulty. You will therefore be able to appreciate our statement and reply, as follows:

We are not our own masters in these matters. We profess allegiance to Christ, whose servants we are. He bids us to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He tells us that persecution will be the lot of those who do his bidding, but that he will be with us to the end of the world. We have no option to seek the favor of men on one hand or to escape their hatred on the other. Our business is plain and simple and we cannot vary from it without denying our Saviour and proving unworthy of the name we bear through him. For this, the highest of all reasons, we cannot agree to leave that to any other locality without giving the knowledge we are commissioned to impart. When persons, individually, refuse to hear our Master we have no more to do and will quietly leave them, but we cannot recognize the right of any committee to decide this question for others. If the people are not willing to search the Scriptures to see if these things are so we will soon leave, but till then we must offer them the bread of life and no promises or threats will change our steadfast purpose. Millions of martyrs have died for the principle we hold and we are willing to meet the same end if God wills it so. What would the Methodists of Kent Island think if a proposal was made to them to close up their churches and send their ministers away? In the past they suffered as Seventh-day Adventists suffer now, but this did not hinder them and neither will it deter us.

Religious prejudice in both cases was what made the trouble. We are confident that we have a work to do similar to that done by John Wesley and his followers of the past. We therefore ask, in the name of our common Master, that we be permitted to preach the message that all may decide what to do.

Another reason for declining to leave Kent Island as proposed by you, is that we have the same civil right to peaceably go and come and labor in your midst as any other individuals. We are quiet, upright citizens of a common country. It is an insult, though not intended, to ask us to leave the community like characters dangerous to the welfare of our fellow-men. We are not criminals and shall not accept to be treated as such without protest. We will appeal to the authorities to protect us in the inalienable rights of all men. Our fathers fought for the freedom of this land and we still claim it for ourselves and everybody else. We have no more privileges than others, but we are entitled to the same. Would either of the gentlemen of the committee consent to be driven from his lawful labor either by bribes or intimidation? His answer is ours. We may possibly suffer for our faith but we cannot yield and still at heart be men. Civil and religious liberty are involved and we will sacrifice the principle of neither to save ourselves trouble from persons who ignore the God-given right of all men.

Permit me to make a suggestion that will obviate the difficulty feared and the truth not be compromised. Let them, each and all, as men of influence and reputation in the locality, take an open and decided stand against the lawless persons who seek to injure us in our legitimate rights and thus destroy the peace of the public. With such assistance from you, gentlemen, we will have good order and I trust a true Christian spirit may be seen among us all. If you will labor to restrain the acts of violence contemplated instead of urging us to yield to it and violate the divine rights and duties before mentioned you will find us ready to second every effort made for harmony.

Trusting that you will see the justice of our claim and stand true to principle with us, I am

Yours very respectfully,

H. E. ROBINSON,

Pres. Atl. Conf. Seventh-day Adventists.

At this writing no reply has been made to President Robinson's letter, and no further violence has been offered to the ministers.

The Connecticut Blue Laws.

To the Editors of The Outlook:

I note on page 30 in your issue of the 7th inst., under heading of "The Connecticut Blue Laws," you say, in answer to your correspondent, that they "owe their origin to a certain Hugh Peters."

I think this a fresh evidence that "even respectable newspapers sometimes make mistakes," as you say in the beginning of the same article.

The first publication of the celebrated "Blue Laws" was in a book published in London, England, in 1781, entitled "A General History of Connecticut; by a

Gentleman of the Province." The authorship was then attributed to, and afterward acknowledged by, the Rev. Samuel A. Peters, LL.D., who was known as "The Tory Parson." He was born in Hebron, Conn., 1735; graduated at Yale, 1757; ordained in England, 1759; rector of Episcopal Church in his native town 1760-1774, when he fled to England, returned to this country in 1806, died in New York City in 1826. His body rests in the churchyard in his native town.—B., in *The Outlook*.

A Correction.

In the first notices that appeared in regard to the imprisonment of W. B. Capps, it was stated that he would be imprisoned for a year and nearly four months. But when the severity of the sentence was fully realized, and the papers began to comment upon it, it appears that the clerk of the supreme court looked over his records to see whether some mistake had been made, and on second calculation he found that the fine was not so heavy.

The figures as published were based upon the official statement of the clerk of the supreme court, which statement is now on file in our office; but a later statement from the same official tells us that the aggregate fines and costs in both the supreme and lower courts amount to \$68.65 which will reduce the term of his imprisonment to about nine months instead of a year and four months, as at first stated.

A. O. TAIT,

Cor. Sec. of the I. R. L. Association.

PUBLICATIONS ON THE SABBATH QUESTION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET.

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

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

PRICES.

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

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

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.

JAMES CHALMERS, Missionary and Explorer of Raratonga and New Guinea—By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

WILLIAM CAREY, the Shoemaker who became a Missionary—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

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

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.

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.



NEW YORK, AUGUST 9, 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.

No Paper Next Week.

As a volume of the AMERICAN SENTINEL consists of fifty numbers we omit a paper next week, and thus give the employés of the office a week's vacation. No. 33 will bear date of August 23.

THE Sunday edition of the Toronto *World* is issued about 9 P. M. Saturday night, because as the *Christian Statesman* boasts, its publishers do "not dare to issue it after midnight." All the more shame to Toronto.

WE begin in our next number the publication of the best exposé of the dogmas of papal infallibility and the primacy of St. Peter, ever written. Every Protestant should read it. Nos. 33, 34 and 35 will contain this valuable matter.

THE Nashville *Christian Advocate* pertinently remarks: "There is many a Jesuit who has never put on the outward garb of the order. Even among Protestants it is possible to find men whose confused moral notions fit them to be disciples of Loyola."

SEVENTEEN members of a baseball club were recently fined at Dayton, Ohio, for playing ball on Sunday. "The Christian people of Dayton," says a National Reform paper, "declare their intention to put a stop to playing on Sabbath." That is they mean to use the civil law to enforce their counterfeit Sabbath upon all the people.

THE *Sun*, one of the most influential papers of this city, if not the most influential, had in its issue of Sunday, July 15, this significant paragraph:—

But if the unification of all the forms of Christianity by ecclesiastical ties and through an acceptance of a common body of doctrine, may be deemed impracticable, there is no doubt that the era of religious rancors and sectarian antipathies has almost passed away, the only vestiges of it being the persecution of the Jews in eastern Europe, and the occasional foolish attempts to excite suspicion and jealousy of the Catholic Church in Canada and the United States. Unquestionably the time is ripe, or soon will be, for a moral coöperation of all men calling themselves Christians, against revolutionary teachings which threaten the destruction alike of religion and of civilization. The necessity of such a combination against anti-social forces has been repeatedly affirmed by Leo XIII., and is proclaimed with special anxiety and fervor in what perhaps will prove to be his last encyclical.

This is just the direction that events are taking. The Catholic Church sets itself

forth as the great conservator of society, the preserver of social order, the only power that can control the masses. In the dire distress that is coming upon the nations, they will turn to this wicked power for salvation; and they will imagine that they get it too, and will then cry "Peace and safety;" but then sudden destruction shall come.

THE number of cheap Sunday excursions on railroads centering in Pittsburg, Pa., has been greatly increased this season. This is a boon to the poor laboring people who cannot get out of the city on any other day. But it is none the less distasteful to those who have a religion that cannot be maintained without law. Mr. Crafts says that "religion cannot be maintained without the Sabbath, or the Sabbath without law." It follows that such religion is dependent on civil law for existence, and hence is not the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, for that not only has been maintained without civil law, but in spite of such law.

DEFENDING the prosecution of Adventists under the Sunday law of Tennessee, not as made by the legislature but as made by the courts, the *News*, of Paris, Tenn., says:—

The fact of the matter is that all denominations are right, looking at it from each peculiar standpoint. But if a man or the people do not see as others do, the people or the courts of the State should not be slandered because of that fact. The time will never come when any religious denomination can force its teachings upon the people if they do not want to receive such doctrines. Let the law be enforced upon all alike.

When, let us ask, have the wicked Adventists tried to force their teachings upon the people? That is just what they complain of in the State of Tennessee, namely, that the civil law is there invoked to force upon them the Sunday institution in which they have no faith. They know that it is antichristian, but the courts of Tennessee declare Sunday to be a Christian institution, that it must be observed for that reason. It is the State of Tennessee that is trying to force its religion upon the Adventists, and not the little handful of Adventists in Henry County who are trying to force their religion upon the State, or people, of Tennessee.

Again, the *News* says: "Let the law be enforced alike upon all." Then why is it not done? Why are Adventists the only victims? The editor of the *News* knows, if he is not blind, that the Sunday law of Tennessee is violated every week in his own town; but how many of the violators have been prosecuted since the advent of the *News* to Paris? If the courts of Tennessee are zealous alone for the majesty of Tennessee law, why does not their wrath strike some of the larger offenders as well as the Adventists in their retired country homes?

THE St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* gives the following particulars of a case alluded to in these columns a week or two since:—

Charles O. Cedarquist, private, Company A, Second Infantry, stationed at Omaha, Neb., has been found guilty of disobeying his superior officer in refusing, because of religious scruples, to attend target practice on Sunday, and to-day the court-martial jury returned its verdict, and the accused was sentenced to be confined at hard labor for a period of six months and to forfeit to the United States \$10 per month of his pay for the same period. This is the first time such a case has arisen in the annals of the army, and the decision and finding of the court-martial established a precedent for future cases of similar nature. The case has attracted a great deal of attention in army and religious circles.

The defense was practically limited to the contention that the order, in respect of which disobedience was charged, was an unlawful one in that, first, it enjoined a duty to be performed on Sunday, in violation of orders and regulations limiting Sunday labor in the army to the measure of strict necessity, and, second, that the act required to be done would have been a violation of Section 241 of the Criminal Code of Nebraska. The decision says:—

"That a commanding officer has a discretion under existing orders to require target practice by his command on Sunday in case of necessity is undoubted. The evidence in this case fails to fix upon the commanding officer any abuse of discretion in the issue of the order complained of by the accused. The legality of that order and the obligation of the accused to obey it when duly transmitted to him cannot be questioned. It was not for him to judge of the necessity for the issuance of the order. The discretion pertained to his commanding officer as to whether one existed, and, whether erroneously or not, it was the duty of the accused to obey. It is conceded that soldiers stationed at Belleview Rifle Range, Nebraska, who, as individuals, engage in hunting and shooting on Sunday would be within the provisions of the sections referred to and liable to its penalties, but after careful consideration the reviewing authority is of the opinion that the State could not make, nor has it by this section or any other legislation to which his attention has been called, attempted to make the performance on Sunday of target practice or any other duty pertaining to the instruction and discipline of the army a criminal offense."

The occasion is deemed opportune for inviting the attention of the department to the fact that the obligations of military service will never permit a soldier to refuse obedience to an order because in his judgment it is unnecessary.

It does not appear whether or not this man took the proper course in endeavoring beforehand to be excused from attending target practice on Sunday; but if he did, the officer is clearly in the wrong. The man had a perfect right to keep Sunday, and in time of peace there is absolutely no reason why he could not have been permitted to do so. The Government has no more right to require men to render such service in violation of their consciences than it has to require them to keep Sunday when they don't want to.

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.