



"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, DECEMBER 6, 1894.

NUMBER 48.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 48 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
Entered at the New York Post-Office.

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

CARDINAL VAUGHN, archbishop of Westminster, according to the *Catholic Review* of Nov. 24, "authoritatively" instructed the Roman Catholic voters of London to vote for the Tory candidates for school trustees and against the Liberals, because the former are in favor of teaching religion in the public schools, and the latter opposed to it.

Now we rise and respectfully ask the *Catholic Review* to explain the difference between this action of Roman Catholic officials in England and the action of the A. P. A. in America. The whole Catholic Church of the United States is posing before the country as martyrs, the victims of the persecuting A. P. A. This organization is opposed to just such Roman Catholic ideas of the relation of Church and State as are illustrated by the cardinal's position in favor of teaching religion in the public schools with public money; and consequently votes against Roman Catholic candidates for public office. This, say Roman Catholics, is persecution.

WHAT, we again inquire, is the difference between an organized political Catholic boycott of candidates in England because they are in favor of the separation of religion and the public schools, and an organized political Protestant boycott of candidates in America, because they are in favor of the union of religion and the public schools? It will not do to answer that the one is secret and the other not, for the Roman Catholic Church is the most thoroughly secret organization in the world.

A CARDINAL's oath reads thus: "I, ———, cardinal of the holy Roman Church, do promise and swear that . . . I will never knowingly and advisedly, to their injury or disgrace, make public the counsels intrusted to me by themselves [the

popes], or by messengers, or letters"¹ [from them]. A bishop promises that "the counsels which they [the popes] shall intrust me withal by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice."²

Now that the charge of secrecy is disposed of in advance, we again repeat our request to the *Catholic Review* to tell us the difference between a Roman Catholic political boycott in England and an A. P. A. boycott in America. The SENTINEL is not an advocate of A. P. A. methods, as its readers well know, but it desires an answer to its question nevertheless.

Did the Roman Catholic Church Ever Persecute?

ROMAN CATHOLICS persistently deny that "the church" ever persecuted. Upon this subject Cardinal Gibbons says in "The Faith of Our Fathers":—

I here assert the proposition, . . . that the Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty; and that whenever any encroachments on these sacred rights of man were perpetrated by professing members of the Catholic faith, these wrongs, far from being sanctioned by the church, were committed in palpable violation of her authority.

In like manner, *Donahoe's Magazine* for September, 1894, says of the Roman Catholic Church: "She has never sanctioned or approved religious persecution of any kind."

Abundant evidence has been published in these columns very recently to disprove this claim in behalf of Rome; but much more can be said; and that it should be said is evident from the fact that that church is now posing before the world, not as a penitent for past wrongs, but as the infallible custodian of the truth of God, and the defender of both civil and religious liberty in all ages of the Christian era.

The quotation given in this paper last week from a cardinal-indorsed Roman Catholic work, entitled, "Half Hours With the Servants of God," shows that the Inquisition was a creature of the Roman Catholic Church. Nor was this all; according to her own confession, Rome

not only "forged" that diabolical weapon, but she appointed her own agents to use it, and compelled the civil power to inflict the penalties and execute the sentences of that most dreadful of all human tribunals.

But even before the erection of the tribunal known as the Inquisition, the Roman Catholic Church persecuted. According to "A Catholic Dictionary,"¹ article, "Albigenses," Innocent III., in 1208, "proclaimed a crusade or holy war with indulgences against the Albigensean heretics, and requested Philip II., the king of France, to put himself at its head." The Catholic historian continues:—

The king refused, but permitted any of his vassals to join it who chose. An army was collected, composed largely of desperadoes, mercenary soldiers, and adventurers of every description, whose sole object was plunder. Raymond, in great fear, not only promised all that was demanded of him, but assumed the Cross himself against his protégés. The war opened in 1209 with the siege of Béziers and the massacre of its inhabitants. Simon de Montfort, the father of the famous Earl of Leicester, was made count of the territories conquered. The war lasted many years and became political; in its progress great atrocities were committed, Languedoc was laid desolate, and the Provençal civilization destroyed. Peace was made in 1227, and the tribunal of the Inquisition established soon after.

It will be noted that this was, according to this Roman Catholic authority, a "holy war," proclaimed by a pope of Rome against "heretics." Its object was the extirpation of "heresy," though it afterwards "became political." But the very first act in this war was the pillage of a city and the massacre of the inhabitants. And though it is asserted that it "became political," one of its direct results was the establishment of the Inquisition. And no wonder, for that fiend incarnate, Dominic, who was the inventor of the Inquisition, was likewise instrumental in no small degree in inaugurating that so-called "holy war."

Upon the same subject, Du Pin, a Roman Catholic author, says:—

The pope and the prelates were of opinion that it was lawful to make use of force, to see whether those who were not reclaimed out of a sense of their salvation might be so by the fear of punishments, and even of temporal death. There had been already several instances of heretics condemned to fines, to banishments, to punishments, and even to death itself; but there had never yet been any war proclaimed against

¹ The Papacy by Dr. J. A. Wylie, p. 122.

² *Id.* p. 138.

¹ Published in this city in 1893, by Benzinger Brothers, "printers to the holy apostolic see."

them, nor any crusade preached up for the extirpation of them. Innocent III. was the first that proclaimed such a war against the Albigenses and Waldenses, and against Raymond, Count of Toulouse, their protector. War might subdue the heads, and reduce whole bodies of people; but it was not capable of altering the sentiments of particular persons, or of hindering them from teaching their doctrines secretly. Whereupon the pope thought it advisable to set up a tribunal of such persons whose business it should be to make inquiry after heretics, and to draw up informations against them: and from hence this tribunal was called *The Inquisition*.—Vol. ii, p. 154.

The same work previously referred to, "A Catholic Dictionary," article, "Dominicans," says:—

In 1204 and 1205 the Bishop of Osma was sent into France on the affair of a contemplated marriage between King Alfonso IX. and a princess of the house of La Marche; Dominic accompanied him as his chaplain. The southern provinces of France were then teeming with heresies of the numerous sects which pass under the general name of Albigenses, and the peril seemed imminent that large numbers of persons would before long, if no restraining influence appeared, throw off the bonds of religion, social order, and morality.

The death of the princess referred to ended the bishop's mission, and he turned his attention to combating heresy. The pope strongly approved of the object, but refused to allow the bishop to be absent from his diocese beyond two years. The result was that Dominic was finally left alone in the work of converting "heretics." It was thus that he was brought into contact with "heresy," and his zeal for the "true church" and the "true faith" fired to that extent that his life was given to the extirpation of "heresy," first, by the preaching of what he probably supposed was truth; second, by the so-called "holy war;" and third, by torture inflicted under the forms of civil law. On this point Rev. Samuel Edgar says:—

The holy office as well as the holy war showed Dominic's cruelty. The Inquisition, indeed, during his superintendence, had no legal tribunal; and the engines of torment were not brought to the perfection exhibited in modern days of Spanish inquisitorial glory. But Dominic, notwithstanding, could, even with this bungling machinery and without a chartered establishment, gratify his feelings of benevolence in all their refinement and delicacy. Dislocating the joints of the refractory Albigensian, as practiced in the Tolosan Inquisition, afforded the saint a classical and Christian amusement. This kind operation he performed by "suspending his victim by a cord, affixed to his arms that were brought behind his back, which, being raised by a wheel, lifted off the ground the suspected Waldensian, man or woman who refused to confess, till forced by the violence of torture." Innocent commissioned Dominic to punish, not only by confiscation and banishment, but also with death; and, in the execution of his task, he stimulated the magistracy and populace to massacre the harmless professors of Waldensianism. "His saintship, by words and miracles, convicted a hundred and eighty Albigenses, who were at one time committed to the flames."—*The Variations of Popery*, p. 267.

It should be borne in mind that the concluding sentence of the paragraph quoted from Mr. Edgar's work, is a literal translation from a Catholic authority; thus, again, is Rome condemned out of the mouth of her own witness.

Turning again to the "Catholic Dictionary," previously quoted, we find this testimony:—

Hussites. The followers of the Bohemian John Huss, rector of the university of Prague, who was burnt for heresy at the Council of Constance. . . . Several crusades were preached against them.

Again, under "Indulgences," the same Roman Catholic authority says:—

The period of the Crusades marks a turning point in the history of indulgences, for they were given more and more freely from that time onwards. In the first place it is to be noted that indulgences were given for wars analogous to the Crusades. For example, at the Council of Siena, in 1425, a plenary in-

dulgence was offered to those who took arms against the Hussites; while wars against the Waldenses, Albigenses, Moors and Turks were stimulated by the same means.

Such evidence might be greatly multiplied, but enough has been given from Catholic writers and authorities, to show conclusively that the rack, the stake, the torch, and the sword, have all been employed in the interests of the Roman Catholic propaganda, and this at the instigation of Roman Catholic sovereigns, prelates and popes.

How then can Rome hope to escape the odium of the bitter persecution of the Middle Ages?—In the same manner that so-called Protestants of to-day seek to shirk responsibility for the persecution of those who differ from them in religious faith and practice; namely, by asserting that it is not religious persecution, but only the enforcement of civil law, and that the State and not the Church is responsible.

It was argued then, as it is now, that religion was essential to morality, and that morality was essential to good citizenship, and that, therefore, it was the bounden duty of the State to foster good morals by protecting the Christian faith. Note the language previously quoted from "A Catholic Dictionary," concerning Dominic's first acquaintance with the Albigenses:—

The southern provinces of France were then teeming with the heresies of the numerous sects which pass under the general name of Albigenses, and the peril seemed imminent that large numbers of persons would, before long, if no restraining influence appeared, throw off the bonds of religion, social order and morality.

It is the same to-day. Rev. Robert Patterson, D. D., says in defense of Sunday laws:—

It is the right of the State to protect by law such a fundamental support of government. This attack on the Sabbath is treason against the very foundations of government. As such, let it be resisted by every American citizen. The American Sabbath is essential to American liberty, to our Republic, and to God's religion.—*The American Sabbath*, by the Rev. Robert Patterson, D. D.; Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, 1867.

In like manner, Judge Robinson, of Maryland, before whom several Seventh-day Adventists have been tried and convicted for Sunday work, said recently, in substance: "Why, if we let these people go on, all restraint will be broken down and the way will be opened for horse-racing, gambling, etc., on Sunday."

This was only putting into slightly different phrase the papal "argument" of the thirteenth century in justification of the Albigensian Crusade and the Inquisition. It is neither better nor worse now than it was then. Then the Roman Catholic faith was regarded as the bulwark of social order, and so to be protected by civil law; now the Sunday institution is declared to be essential to good government and so, to be jealously guarded by the State. In these Sunday law persecutions, history is simply repeating itself.

But the fact remains that while it was the civil power that inflicted the death penalty, the laws which authorized such things were enacted and promulgated in response to the demand of the church, just as Sunday laws and kindred measures are to-day enacted and enforced in response to the united demands of the several "Protestant" sects. Rome did persecute; first, by means of the civil power; and second, by means of her own court—the Inquisition; and in like manner the Protestant churches of to-day are persecuting, by means of the "civil" Sunday laws of the several States, and by their own

secret courts of inquisition, the "law and order leagues," "Sabbath unions," etc. The likeness is complete.

"Obey the Law Until Repealed."

ARE Seventh-day Adventists justified in disobeying the laws of the land, enforcing idleness on Sunday?

To every member of the denomination this question has become of vital importance. His honor, Judge Robinson, in passing sentence upon Mr. Robert R. Whaley, now confined in the county jail at Centreville, Md., said it was Mr. Whaley's duty to obey the law until he could secure its modification or repeal.

This has been the unanimous admonition of judges from the village magistrate to the United States Circuit Court. It is the argument advanced against them by the organizations which are straining every nerve to maintain existing Sunday laws where endangered, and the enactment and enforcement of more stringent laws wherever possible. The following conversation recently occurred between an editor of the SENTINEL and a Sunday-law champion:—

Ques.—Are you in favor of the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists for laboring on Sunday as now in progress in Tennessee, Maryland, and other States?

Ans.—Seventh-day Adventists, as law-abiding citizens, should obey the Sunday law until they can secure a repeal of the law.

Ques.—Are you, then, in favor of repealing the Sunday laws under which they now suffer?

Ans.—I am not.

Ques.—Then you would oppose the repeal of the laws by which Seventh-day Adventists are imprisoned?

Ans.—I certainly would.

It is very evident that in many cases this counsel is not given in good faith; but there is reason to believe that it has been offered by those who are sincere and who desire to see the oppressive laws repealed. An evidence of this has just come to hand. This advice is given by a Lutheran minister with whom we have corresponded for some time and whom we know to be a friend of the cause of complete separation of Church and State, even to the extent of repealing all Sunday laws. But had the course here advised been followed by the heralds of truth in all ages, the whole world would now be enveloped in the blackness of heathen darkness.

Daniel did not lobby to secure the repeal of the law, but opened his windows toward Jerusalem as aforetime, and prayed, in the face of a law of the world-conquering empire of Babylon, and the one great Lawgiver of the universe sanctioned the violation of that law, "and stopped the mouths of lions." The three Hebrews when ordered to bow down before the golden image, stood up, and violated the law of the empire, and again the Supreme Court of heaven ratified the violation and they emerged from the fiery furnace unharmed.

And then the Chief Justice of the supreme court of the universe came to earth in the person of his Son and violated the "civil Sabbath laws" of the Jews, his chosen nation, and faithfully kept the "Sabbath of the Lord," his own holy day, though hounded and persecuted by the Pharisees and Herodians, the Sabbath association and law and order league of Jerusalem; thus "leaving us an example that ye should follow in his steps." He

² Fuerunt aliquando simul exusti CLXXX hæretici Albigenses, cum antea et verbis et miraculis eos S. Dominicus convicisset. *Bell. de Loic. III. 22. Velly, s. 435. Giannon. XV. 4.*

then commanded his disciples, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," "and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." To obey this command was to disobey the laws of that empire which ruled "all the world" with an iron hand, and which forbade the worship of any "new or foreign gods unless they are recognized by public laws." They did not attempt to get Christianity recognized by public law, or the existing law modified, but threw themselves into the yawning chasm of persecution until, like Napoleon's famous cavalry at Waterloo, they had bridged the ravine with human lives, and made it possible for those who followed to cross in safety.

When the blood-bought victory had been bartered for a mess of pottage,—human power; when the world was again plunged into the midnight darkness of the Middle Ages, there arose men like Wycliffe, Huss, Jerome, and Martin Luther, who said *No* to the laws of earth's mighty nations, and purchased anew,—by throwing themselves again into the jaws of death,—that liberty of conscience that has blessed the world for more than a hundred years.

When "Charles, the fifth of the name, by the grace of God emperor elect of the Romans, always august, king of Spain, of the two Sicilies, of Jerusalem, of Hungary, of Dalmatia, of Croatia, etc.; archduke of Austria, duke of Burgundy, count of Hapsburg, of Flanders, of the Tyrol," etc., etc., had issued an edict against the humble Luther, in which he charged him with having "rushed like a madman on our holy church and attempted to destroy it by books overflowing with blasphemy," and with "setting aside all authority," and with being "but Satan himself under the form of a man," and demanding that "on the expiration of his safe conduct, immediate recourse be had to effectual measures to check his furious rage;"—when all this and more had become the law of the empire, Luther addressed this letter to the man of many titles:—

God, who is the searcher of hearts, is my witness, that I am ready most earnestly to obey your majesty, in honor or in dishonor, in life or in death, and with no exception save the Word of God, by which man lives. In all the affairs of this present life, my fidelity shall be unshaken, for here to lose or gain is of no consequence to salvation. But when eternal interests are concerned, God will not that man shall submit unto man. For such submission in spiritual matters is real worship, and ought to be rendered solely to the Creator.¹

And, then, faithful to himself and his God, and in the face of the law of the empire, he continued to fill Germany and the world with what the edict declared were "books overflowing with heresy."

Later, when a new edict was proclaimed, prohibiting the preaching of any other doctrines except the dogmas of Rome, the Reformers stood up in the face of the law of the empire and said:—

We are resolved, with the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only word, such as is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding anything thereto that is contrary to it. . . . For these reasons most dear lords, uncles, cousins and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we PROTEST by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, and Redeemer, and who will one day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people, neither consent nor adhere in any measure whatsoever to the proposed decree in any thing that is contrary to God, to his holy word, to our right conscience [and], to the salvation of our souls.²

And what shall we more say, for the time would fail us to tell of Tyndale and Latimer, and Ridley and Knox, and Bunyan and Wesley in the Old World, and Roger Williams and Holmes also, and the Baptists and others in the New, who, through faith, subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, and stopped the hand of persecution. They were stoned, they were scourged, they were burned, were slain with the sword, they wandered in deserts and in mountains, and in the dens and caves of the earth. All these have obtained a good report and the Protestant world to-day applauds these violators of law from Daniel in Babylon to Roger Williams in America. More than this, they declare that their courage and faithfulness in violating human law has bequeathed to the world the liberty of conscience so long enjoyed.

But the enemies of Daniel said, "Daniel . . . regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed." Or, in other words, Daniel is an anarchist. The enemies of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, said: "These men, O king, have not regarded thee; they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."

The Sabbath association and the law and order league of Jerusalem and "all the best people" in Israel charged the Son of God with being a "malefactor," and said, "We have a law and by that law he ought to die."

Luther was charged in the emperor's edict with having "incessantly urged the people to revolt, schism, war, murder, robbery, incendiarism," etc. Bunyan, from the standpoint of his cotemporaries, was a "lawless fellow." Roger Williams, in the eyes of the "best people" of his time, was one who was attempting "to subvert the fundamental State and government of the country." Thus it has ever been. One generation murders its prophets, and the next builds their monuments. A prophet is not without honor save in his own country and time. The historian of his own day records that the faithful reformer was a malefactor, but it is chiseled on the monuments of a later period that he was a martyr.

Our own day is no exception to this rule. The sectarian press of the popular religious denominations of the country, with a single exception, indorse the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists for Sunday labor, and, like all the persecutors of the past, deny that they are the victims of persecution, or that there is any conscientious principle involved. To this point we will address ourselves in our next issue.

Persecuted But Not Cast Down.

[The following letter from the wife of one of the imprisoned Maryland Adventists was sent to the local organ of the denomination, published in this city, from which we take it.]

Church Hill, Md., Nov. 24.

DEAR RECORD: It is with a thankful heart that I address you to-day. For some time I have wanted to write to the friends through you, and tell them what the Lord had done for me. We have had a sweet season of prayer to-day in our Sabbath school. Although two of its members are absent, being imprisoned for their faith, yet the Lord has promised to be with us wherever two or three are gathered together. I know I have the prayers of all Seventh-day Adventists, and have found brothers and sisters among

them. I realize to-day more than ever what the dear Saviour suffered when he was here on earth. Since they have taken away my husband and put him behind prison bars, I have consecrated myself to God and am trusting in his Word; and although I may have to suffer very much on account of the treatment I receive from people here, God is preparing for me an eternal home, where I shall never know want. Although I have nothing in this world to call my own, Christ is mine and I feel as rich in his love as if I had all this world contains. I have two children sick at present; one is quite ill, but God is able to bring them through. Pray for your humble sister in the Lord.

ELLA R. WHALEY.

Spiritualism.

SATAN beguiles men now as he beguiled Eve in Eden, by flattery, by kindling a desire to obtain forbidden knowledge, by exciting ambition for self-exaltation. It was cherishing these evils that caused his fall, and through them he aims to compass the ruin of men. "Ye shall be as gods," he declares, "knowing good and evil." Spiritualism teaches "that man is the creature of progression; that it is his destiny from his birth to progress, even to eternity, toward the Godhead." And again: "Each mind will judge itself and not another." "The judgment will be right, because it is the judgment of self. . . . The throne is within you." Said a Spiritualistic teacher, as the "spiritual consciousness" awoke within him, "My fellow-men, all were unfallen demigods." And another declares, "Any just and perfect being is Christ."

Thus, in place of the righteousness and perfection of the infinite God, the true object of adoration; in place of the perfect righteousness of his law, the true standard of human attainment, Satan has substituted the sinful, erring nature of man himself, as the only object of adoration, the only rule of judgment, or standard of character. This is progress, not upward, but downward.

It is a law both of the intellectual and the spiritual nature, that by beholding, we become changed. The mind gradually adapts itself to the subjects upon which it is allowed to dwell. It becomes assimilated to that which it is accustomed to love and reverence. Man will never rise higher than his standard of purity or goodness or truth. If self is his loftiest ideal, he will never attain to anything more exalted. Rather, he will constantly sink lower and lower. The grace of God alone has power to exalt man. Left to himself, his course must inevitably be downward.

To the self-indulgent, the pleasure-loving, the sensual, Spiritualism presents itself under a less subtle disguise than to the more refined and intellectual; in its grosser forms they find that which is in harmony with their inclinations. Satan studies every indication of the frailty of human nature, he marks the sins which each individual is inclined to commit, and then he takes care that opportunities shall not be wanting to gratify the tendency to evil. He tempts men to excess in that which is in itself lawful, causing them, through intemperance, to weaken physical, mental, and moral power. He has destroyed and is destroying thousands through the indulgence of the passions,

¹ Gen. 3:5.

¹ D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, Book VII, Chap. 11.
² *Ibid.* Book XIII, chap. 6.

thus brutalizing the entire nature of man. And to complete his work, he declares, through the spirits, that "true knowledge places man above all law;" that "whatsoever is, is right;" that "God doth not condemn;" and that "all sins which are committed are innocent." When the people are thus led to believe that desire is the highest law, that liberty is license, and that man is accountable only to himself, who can wonder that corruption and depravity teem on every hand? Multitudes eagerly accept teachings that leave them at liberty to obey the promptings of the carnal heart. The reins of self-control are laid upon the neck of lust, the powers of mind and soul are made subject to the animal propensities, and Satan exultingly sweeps into his net thousands who profess to be followers of Christ.

But none need be deceived by the lying claims of Spiritualism. God has given the world sufficient light to enable them to discover the snare. As already shown, the theory which forms the very foundation of Spiritualism is at war with the plainest statements of Scripture. The Bible declares that the dead know not anything, that their thoughts have perished; they have no part in anything that is done under the sun; they know nothing of the joys or sorrows of those who were dearest to them on earth.

Furthermore, God has expressly forbidden all pretended communication with departed spirits. In the days of the Hebrews there was a class of people who claimed, as do the Spiritualists of to-day, to hold communication with the dead. But the "familiar spirits," as these visitants from other worlds were called, are declared by the Bible to be the "spirits of devils."² The work of dealing with familiar spirits was pronounced an abomination to the Lord, and was solemnly forbidden under penalty of death.³ The very name of witchcraft is now held in contempt. The claim that men can hold intercourse with evil spirits is regarded as a fable of the Dark Ages. But Spiritualism; which numbers its converts by hundreds of thousands, yea, by millions, which has made its way into scientific circles, which has invaded churches, and has found favor in legislative bodies, and even in the courts of kings—this mammoth deception is but a revival, in a new disguise, of the witchcraft condemned and prohibited of old.

If there were no other evidence of the real character of Spiritualism, it should be enough for the Christian that the spirits make no difference between righteousness and sin, between the noblest and purest of the apostles of Christ and the most corrupt of the servants of Satan. By representing the basest of men as in heaven, and highly exalted there, Satan says to the world: "No matter how wicked you are; no matter whether you believe or disbelieve God and the Bible; live as you please; heaven is your home." The Spiritualist teachers virtually declare, "Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment?"⁴ Saith the Word of God, "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness."⁵

The apostles, as personated by these

lying spirits, are made to contradict what they wrote at the dictation of the Holy Spirit when on earth. They deny the divine origin of the Bible, and thus tear away the foundation of the Christian's hope, and put out the light that reveals the way to heaven. Satan is making the world believe that the Bible is a mere fiction, or at least a book suited to the infancy of the race, but now to be lightly regarded, or cast aside as obsolete. And to take the place of the Word of God he holds out spiritual manifestations. Here is a channel wholly under his control; by this means he can make the world believe what he will. The Book that is to judge him and his followers he puts in the shade, just where he wants it; the Saviour of the world he makes to be no more than a common man. And as the Roman guard that watched the tomb of Jesus spread the lying report which the priests and elders put into their mouths to disprove his resurrection, so do the believers in spiritual manifestations try to make it appear that there is nothing miraculous in the circumstances of our Saviour's life. After thus seeking to put Jesus in the background, they call attention to their own miracles, declaring that these far exceed the works of Christ.

It is true that Spiritualism is now changing its form, and, veiling some of its more objectionable features, is assuming a Christian guise. But its utterances from the platform and the press have been before the public for nearly forty years, and in these its real character stands revealed. These teachings cannot be denied or hidden.

Even in its present form, so far from being more worthy of toleration than formerly, it is really a more dangerous, because a more subtle deception. While it formerly denounced Christ and the Bible, it now professes to accept both. But the Bible is interpreted in a manner that is pleasing to the unrenewed heart, while its solemn and vital truths are made of no effect. Love is dwelt upon as the chief attribute of God, but it is degraded to a weak sentimentalism making little distinction between good and evil. God's justice, his denunciations of sin, the requirements of his holy law, are all kept out of sight. The people are taught to regard the Decalogue as a dead letter. Pleasing, bewitching fables captivate the senses, and lead men to reject the Bible as the foundation of their faith. Christ is as verily denied as before; but Satan has so blinded the eyes of the people that the deception is not discerned.—*Great Controversy, Vol. 4, pp. 554-558.*

By Law.

THE Council of the Churches, the Christian Elector's Association, the Evangelical Alliance, the Lord's Day Observance Society, and the like, are associations organized quite recently for the purpose of protecting Sunday as a day of rest and worship—*by law.*

They desire to secure, as far as possible, the coöperation of all churches, Sunday-schools, Young Men's Christian Associations, Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, Epworth Leagues, Labor Unions, political parties, and individuals everywhere, who believe in preserving Sunday as a day of rest and worship—*by law.*

They see a growing disregard for Sunday as a day of rest and worship, and

they desire that this shall be remedied—*by law.*

Believing secular work on Sunday—though legitimate enough in itself—to be irreligious, they ask that this shall be discontinued—*by law.*

They fear also that many are working too hard for their health, and therefore wish to persuade them to take more rest—*by law.*

They complain that Sunday trains, Sunday newspapers, and Sunday amusements interfere with church attendance, and consequently recommend that all places of business—except churches—be closed on Sunday—*by law.*

They do not intend by this, they say, to compel any one to attend church, but simply to extend a cordial invitation for such attendance—*by law.*

From the growing carelessness in regard to Sunday observance, and the laxity in church attendance, they see that many are becoming irreligious, and they simply desire to stop this irreligious tendency—*by law.*

Hence, they urge all persons who believe in upholding this weekly rest-day—by law—to do all in their power—by law—to create sentiment in favor of—*such laws.*

They do not intend to persecute, but simply to compel others to conform to their ideas of religion—*by law.*

In short, they believe in moral suasion—*by law.*

Therefore they pray the Lord to assist them in this work of inducing the people to keep Sunday—*by law.*

They petition the legislature to help them on—*by law.*

They ask civil magistrates to teach the people that Sunday is the Sabbath—*by law.*

They ask for everything but—a *divine Sunday law.*

This they know is not to be found, and hence they ask Parliament to pass—a *Sunday law.*

So readeth the first and last chapters of Sunday legislation. W. A. COLCORD.

Melbourne, Australia.

Alexander Campbell on Sunday Laws for Sunday Worshipers.

[In 1820 there was organized in West Middletown, Washington Co., Pa., a society, called the West Middletown Moral Society. The principal object of the society was to enforce the Pennsylvania Sunday law of 1794, which is still on the statute books of the State. This Moral Society was organized by the United Presbyterians, the same people who, later in 1863, organized the National Reform Association. Alexander Campbell, the founder of the Christian or Disciple Church, ably opposed the society in a series of articles published in the *Reporter*, of Washington, county seat of Washington County. His articles were signed "Candidus." A United Presbyterian minister, by the name of Wylie, attempted to defend the society, and signed himself "Timothy." The discussion continued from April 17, 1820, the date of Mr. Campbell's first article, to February 22, 1822, during which time almost every phase of the compulsory Sunday law question was treated. As a result the Moral Society perished, not to appear again until 1863 when it was revived by the same denomination under the name, National Reform Association. Every word of Mr. Campbell's invincible logic and withering denunciation is applicable to the association, resuscitated under the name, National Reform Association, and kindred organizations, such as the American Sabbath Union, the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association, etc.]

MR. TIMOTHY complained that I have not noticed his *seven* arguments in favor of coercing certain persons to pay some regard to the first day. I did not think that he called them arguments until his last numbers appeared. We shall, since he has defined them with this title, ex-

² Compare Num. 25: 1-3; Ps. 106: 23; 1 Cor. 10: 20; Rev. 16: 14.

³ Lev. 19: 31; 20: 27.

⁴ Mal. 2: 17.

⁵ Isa. 5: 20.

amine every one of them. We shall take up one of them now. His first argument is (No. 7), How could men enjoy the privilege ("of worshiping God in public on the Sabbath") if all those who do not count it *their* privilege were permitted to pursue their ordinary business on the Sabbath? How could those who inhabit large cities worship God without disturbance amid the clinking of hammers and rattling of drays, etc.? Hence the necessity of coercion. I ask, How do the Presbyterians of all sects, Episcopalians, and Catholics in all our large cities go through all the forms of their devotion on the fast days, preparation Saturdays, and sacramental Mondays? How do synods, presbyteries, councils, meet and worship, and transact ecclesiastical business on week days, amidst the common business of the cities? How do they worship God in their families, morning and evening, every week day, amidst the same confusion? If they can worship in these circumstances one day they may another, I argue; and I argue that if it is *right* to oblige all the citizens to make no noise on the Lord's day, that we may have the privilege of worshiping in quietness, then it is *right* to oblige them to abstain from business on all our week day meetings, and while we worship in our families, lest we should be disturbed in our devotion. I argue that if the Presbyterian should oblige us to be quiet on his fast day, then the Episcopalian should oblige us to observe his Christmas day, the Catholic his Good Friday, and the Jew his seventh day. Where is Mr. T.'s first argument now? I wonder how the primitive Christians in Jerusalem, in Rome, in Corinth, in Ephesus, in Antioch, populous and pagan cities, could worship God on the first day in the church for so long a time! Shall I pursue the argument further? No, it's vanished. The civil law should protect all congregations on *any* day from insult or unnecessary interruption, but all beyond this, is unjust and oppressive.

I proceed to a third argument against the system I oppose. It has been said that if faith be a duty of all men, then going to hear the word preached is a previous duty. But the Scriptures say, "The word preached did not profit, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." So that the Scripture presupposes faith as a prerequisite to hearing the word to advantage. We fully admit that "faith," too, "comes by hearing the Word of God." Yet we cannot admit the propriety of teaching that the unbeliever's first duty, in order to faith, is to go to sermon. The commission under which all true preachers act makes it *their* duty to go out to all places, into all the world, and to announce the gospel to every creature, not to give out that it is the duty of unbelievers to come to wait on them. Again, parents, who are Christians, are bound to acquaint their children in due time with the gospel, to bring them up in the training or nurture and admonition of the Lord, so that in a professing country every child may, and the majority have an opportunity of hearing the gospel before they are able or capable to understand a learned divine. As soon as the gospel is once announced to any, he is commanded to believe it upon its own evidence; and not to believe it, when fully stated, on its own evidence, is to increase the guilt and aggravate the condemnation of the hearer.

All duties are either *mediate* or *immedi-*

ate, that is, duties that should be done just now or hereafter. Every man in the world is in duty bound to do everything that God requires of him, but every duty is not to be done at once. A man must first be a husband before it becomes his duty to love his wife; a father before it becomes his duty to love his children; a master before he becomes bound to render unto his servants that which is just and equal. Yet every man is bound to do all these things when he comes into those relations. To say that under the gospel any duty was prior to faith, is to say that infidel duties are prior to faith; to say that hearing, repenting, or reforming are prerequisites to faith, is to say that infidel or faithless hearing, infidel or faithless repenting, infidel or faithless reformation is the *immediate* duty of all men, and faith the *mediate*. But if faith be not the *immediate* duty of all men, then *no man can be condemned for not immediately believing*. A man might as correctly be told to love his wife who is not yet a husband, as to be told to observe the first day of the week who is not yet a Christian. From all which, it follows: Faith is the immediate duty of every unbeliever to whom divine revelation comes.

But divine revelation has come to every citizen in Pennsylvania. Therefore faith is the immediate duty of every citizen in Pennsylvania who has not yet believed.

If faith be the immediate duty of all unbelievers, then the observance of the Lord's day is not the immediate duty of any unbeliever, for there cannot be two immediate duties.

The gospel commands no duty that can be performed without faith in the Son of God, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

But to command men destitute of faith to observe any Christian institute, such as the Lord's day, is commanding duty to be performed without faith in the Son of God.

Therefore, to command unbelievers, or natural men, to observe in any sense the Lord's day is anti-evangelical or contrary to the gospel.—*Candidus (Alexander Campbell), in Washington (Pa.) Reporter, Sept. 17 and 24, 1821.*

Sabbath Reform(?).

The following is a correspondence from New York to the Dallas *News* of last Sunday:—

The New York State Sabbath Association held its third annual meeting last night in Brooklyn. Among the other things which the association is trying to bring about is the abolition of all Sunday traffic, Sunday excursions, and Sunday newspapers. The address on the Sunday newspapers was delivered by Dr. Theodore L. Cuyler, who announced himself a true friend of the daily press, which he held responsible for much of the good accomplished in the world, and thought that all the Christians should unite in demanding the suppression of the Sunday newspapers. "Why," he asked, "should the newspaper men be allowed to carry on their business when all other trades are required to suspend trade on Sunday? There is no need of the Sunday press. We got along very well without it in the olden days and we could again. While there is no reason why we should have the Sunday papers, there are many reasons why we should be delivered from them. From the cleanest papers issued there are sporting and other topics which are not considerate subjects on the Sabbath. Ministers have to dig out their parishioners from under the avalanche of blanket sheets which are every Sunday launched upon the public."

The sentiment contained in the above article, if spoken fifteen years ago, would have been denounced by all liberal and fair-minded people, as outrageously com-

mandatory in a land where its people boasted of possessing the privilege of following the dictates of their own consciences in matters of religion and the observance of God's laws. For is not the observance of the Sabbath one of God's laws and not man's? Then to whom are we accountable? Not man, certainly. And is it not blasphemy, then, for one man to endeavor to force another to observe a certain form of worship just because he construes it in that light? Christ forbid civil interference on the Sabbath question time and again, and when the Pharisees consulted him on the compulsory observance of that day, we believe his answer was, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." In this it is clearly shown that Christ meant that the Sabbath was a divine and not a civil law, in the enforcement of which, Cæsar had no rightful power. Be charitable, allow your neighbor the same right in his form of worship as you should and do demand for yourself in this grand country of freedom and liberty. Just such laws as the above article indorses, caused the destruction and fall of the Roman empire, one of the grandest and richest kingdoms the world has ever known.—*Brandon (Texas) Messenger.*

The Baptists and Contract Indian Schools.

[The following is a communication from Hon. T. J. Morgan, touching a letter from Mr. Armstrong, of the Interior Department, published in the *SENTINEL* of recent date, relative to appropriations received by Baptists for conducting schools among the Indians.]

THE following letter from the Indian Office is going the rounds of newspapers, attracting a good deal of attention and provoking a great many inquiries as to the facts in the case:—

Department of the Interior,
Office of Indian Affairs,
Washington, Sept. 12, 1894.

ALLEN MOON,
President International Religious Liberty Ass'n,
728, 9th Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.
Str.—Referring to our conversation of the 11th inst., relative to contracts for the education of Indian children with the Baptist Church, you are informed that I find records of contracts from the year 1879 to 1884 between this office and Henry L. Morehouse, of New York City, secretary of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, for the freedmen of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians, in the Indian Territory, as follows:—

In 1879, six day schools, at \$875, for six months.
In 1882, one boarding school and eight day schools, at \$2,250.
In 1883, one boarding school and eight day schools, at \$2,750.
In 1884, four day schools, at \$700, and again in the same year, for six schools, at \$1,500.

Very respectfully,
FRANK C. ARMSTRONG,
Ass't Com.

Some years ago, as a part of General Grant's so-called "peace policy," various Indian reservations were parceled out among the several religious denominations of the country who were requested to nominate men to take charge of agencies under the Interior Department, and to be paid, of course, by the Government. It was hoped that this method would bring to bear upon the solution of the Indian problem more of religion and less of politics. The scheme was ultimately abandoned as impracticable.

Under this plan the Baptists nominated a man to have charge of the Union Agency, embracing the five so-called civilized tribes in the Indian Territory. There were in this agency between four

and five thousand negroes who had been the slaves of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians, but who had been freed by the exigencies of the war. They were not adopted into the Indian tribes and consequently they were political orphans, having no political rights among those who had been their masters, having little property of their own, without schools or any educational facilities whatever. They were ignorant, poverty-stricken, degraded, helpless, and largely hopeless. Their situation was brought to the attention of Rev. Dr. S. S. Cutting, then corresponding secretary of the Home Mission Society, and by him the matter was presented to the secretary of the interior. The result of the correspondence was an invitation from the Government for the Home Mission Society to provide a system of public schools for these people for their secular education, the schools to be established and supervised by the Home Mission Society, but the salaries of the teachers to be paid by the Government.

From the statements from the Indian Office, above cited, it appears that these schools were chiefly day schools, that they continued only for a brief period, that the entire amount of money paid by the Government on their account was \$8,075.

From these facts it seems that these schools were not Indian schools at all, but negro schools; they were not mission schools, but public schools; they were part of a general scheme then in operation acquiesced in, apparently, by everybody. There were at that time no other schools for these negroes maintained by the Government.

With the present system of Indian Contract Schools the Baptists, we believe, have had no connection whatever, and have not received from the United States Government a penny in aid of their Indian mission work. They have not asked for, or desired, to participate in the scheme, but have strongly protested against it. Without an exception, so far as we know, the voice of the denomination is clear, explicit, and emphatic in asking that the entire contract system be done away with, because now that the Government schools have been increased and brought to a high degree of efficiency contract schools are unnecessary; because the system is a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution of the United States; because it is antagonistic to the recognized American doctrine of complete separation of Church and State; because its operation involves an invidious partiality for one denomination as against others; because it establishes a vast corruption fund utterly demoralizing in its operations; because it introduces into American politics sectarian bitterness which is greatly to be deprecated; and because it menaces the integrity of the public school fund and the permanence of the entire school system.

It is a significant fact that the great religious denominations, Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, and Episcopalian, which have heretofore been sharing in these public subsidies, have by their action condemned the system as un-American and withdrawn from it, leaving the Roman Catholic Church almost solitary and alone in this advocacy of it. This church, during the ten years ending June 30th, 1895, will have received from the public treasury, for the prosecution of its missions among the Indians, more than three millions of dollars and is

apparently tenacious in its advocacy of the continuance of this great abuse of public money which should never be used for private or sectarian purposes.

But the contract Indian school system is doomed. It is un-American, unconstitutional, impolitic, needless, and harmful. At its last session Congress virtually condemned it by directing the secretary of the interior to report to its next session whether it cannot be entirely done away with.

T. J. MORGAN.

The SENTINEL was the first paper to publish the facts which have called out Hon. T. J. Morgan's letter, and we are of course very willing to insert this statement from him as a representative Baptist. Sept. 14, 1893 we published a statement to the effect that "the Methodist, the Episcopalian, the Congregationalist, and the Baptist churches" had "all refused to take any more" money from the Government for the support of their Indian schools. When our attention was first called to the statement last September we were persuaded that a mistake had been made. Consequently a frank acknowledgment of what we had come to believe was an injustice to the Baptist denomination was prepared and put in type, but after the matter was in page proof, and but an hour before going to press, the letter from Mr. Armstrong, of the Indian Office, received and forwarded to us by Mr. Moon, came to hand. Of course it changed the complexion of the matter and was inserted instead of our recantation.

Now we have inserted Mr. Morgan's explanation, and the reader can judge for himself as to the part the Baptists have taken in the matter of receiving Government appropriations for work done among the Indians. It is evident that the Baptist denomination received money from the Government under President Grant's administration for some kind of supervision over Indian tribes, and also at a later period it received money for conducting schools for negro freedmen residing among the Indians of the same territory.

Now if there can be such a thing as a religious denomination exercising a purely civil supervision over Indian tribes, and if this is what the Baptist denomination did;—and again, if a religious denomination can conduct public schools entirely on the secular basis, and if this is what the Baptist denomination did, then the Baptist denomination has not violated in this matter the principle of complete separation of Church and State.

One thing is certain, the Baptist denomination has consistently refused to participate in the more recent disgraceful violation of American and Christian principles carried on under the contract school system by all the other leading denominations, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, and has strongly protested against the practice. Let all friends of religious liberty note this fact and give the denomination due credit.

We do not take the hopeful view of the immediate discontinuance of the un-American system which Mr. Morgan does. The Roman Catholic leech, encouraged by "Protestant" example, has embedded itself deeply into the American body politic and will not be easily shaken off. But we shall see what we shall see.

"THE Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

The Religious Liberty of the Roman Catholic Church.

At the present time the church of Rome is posing as the defender of civil and religious liberty, and many are liable to be deceived by her pretensions. It is therefore important to have an exact knowledge of the kind of liberty represented by her. Cardinal Gibbons has given us the following definition of religious liberty: "A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshipping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God."*

An exemplification of this kind of liberty was shown recently in Genoa, Vernon Co., Wis. A young lady, member of a Catholic family, who was of age, left home to work for her own maintenance. She had for some time last year been in the employ of a Methodist minister as a domestic. She became somewhat disaffected toward the Catholic Church, and it was reported to her parents. They, of course, set about to the best of their ability to remedy it. In order to get her in their power, and away from her place of work, her mother represented to her that, if she would go and tell the priest what religion she wanted to choose, she should be free afterwards from any obligation to the Catholic Church; but instead of setting her free when she came to him, he declared her to be insane, and preparation was made to take her to the convent at La Crosse, where she could be under surveillance. With team and wagon they started for La Crosse. Three persons went with her,—two women and one man,—to see her safe in the convent. The poor girl had no way of escape, but did the best she could under the circumstances. On the road to La Crosse, they happened to meet the stage going to De Soto and other places with the mail. She called on the driver for protection, and after a hard struggle with her three guards, she escaped from the wagon and took refuge in the stage. They still tried to retake her, but the driver finally drew his revolver and threatened to shoot if they touched her. They desisted, threatening that they would yet have her in their power.

The girl was taken back to her place of work, where she now is, and no evidence of insanity can be seen in her. The only insanity(?) about her is her desire to change her religion. Of course, her conscience was not right and she was not practicing a form of religion most in accordance with her duties to God, according to the idea of the Roman Catholic Church, and so her conscience must be made right, and the practice of religion made to accord with Roman Catholic ideas of her duties to God.

The history of the Catholic Church in all lands and at all times, when her power has not been curtailed, testifies to her faithful adherence to this doctrine. When petty persecution, deception, threats or boycott fails, recourse must be had to more severe means. If Rome will commit this outrage on liberty of conscience now, what will she do when she gets the power which blinded apostate Protestants are putting in her hands? The spirit that seeks to imprison a Catholic girl in a Wisconsin convent because she became a Methodist, is the same spirit that imprisons an ex-

* "Faith of Our Fathers," pp. 264, 265.

Methodist in Maryland because he became a Seventh-day Adventist.

O. OPPEGARD.
La Crosse, Wis., Nov. 20, '94.

Significant Paragraphs.

[We publish under this heading paragraphs more or less significant, without either approval or dissent, and without comment. The careful observer of the signs of the times will readily discern the pertinent facts and opinions, and will know how to turn them to account in the great controversy between truth and error.]

Tolerance or Indifference—Which?

THE very splendid obsequies of the late Czar of Russia are partly the expression of the faith of the Eastern Church, and perhaps more fully the outflow of the density of European civilization, requiring large expression, needing much time for utterance. For weeks the members of royal families were held under the spell of funereal surroundings, while the great powers of the world mourned and prayed in concert on the day of burial in many lands and cities. The most solemn services were concurrently held. All nations have recognized and worshiped with the Russian Church. This is itself a Christian alliance, a religious union. Coming so near the conference between the Greek and Latin churches at the Vatican, the whole world is impressed. A new feeling of human brotherhood is awakened; a revival of religious sentiment which is at once deep and tolerant of others has had place among men.—*The Evangelist*, Nov. 22, 1894

Seventh-day Baptists Fined in New Jersey.

BRIDGETON, N. J., Nov. 24.—Three Seventh-day Baptists living in Stoe Creek township, were arrested a few days ago for gunning on Sunday. They were Joseph Fogg, Edward Thomas and Richard Rainer, and it was expected that when their cases came up before Justice Woodruff they would resist and make an interesting test of the law. The men were charged with having gunned on Sunday, Nov. 11, the day the season for rabbits, quail, etc., opened. As they observed the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and as a special provision of the law permits them to gun on their own premises on the first day of the week, the gunners declared that they were innocent of any violation of the statute.

At the hearing it was shown that the offenders had gunned off their own property, and Justice Woodruff imposed a fine of \$20 each upon the trio. Rather than take the matter up to a higher court the men paid the fines.—*Philadelphia Record*, Nov. 25, 1894.

RELIGIOUS persecution is not restricted to a few States in our own country, as Pennsylvania, Maryland and Tennessee, but now we have word from Switzerland that the sturdy and conservative Germans are waking up to the dangers of having honest, conscientious observers of the Lord's Sabbath in their midst! Pastor H. P. Holser, the American representative of the Seventh-day Adventists in Central Europe, and the director of the publishing house at Basel, is now undergoing a term of sixty-one days' imprisonment in that city for allowing work to be done in his office on Sunday. While this punishment is being inflicted, just across the street from the printing office soldiers parade and practice target shooting on Sunday.

This pastor was taken from his home October 25th and confined in the city prison. But such exhibitions of intolerance are more in keeping with the spirit of most monarchical governments than in a republic where religious liberty is one of the promised blessings and boasted privileges. Our citizens should not be too severe in their strictures on the inhumanity and intolerance of Russia even, until they are sure their own hands are washed from the stains of attempted legislation in favor of Sunday as against the Bible Sabbath and its conscientious observance. Americans should not allow their zeal to so far outstrip their judgment as to equal, if not excel, the intolerance of the land from whence their forefathers fled, seeking religious liberty, nearly three hundred years ago.—*The Sabbath Recorder*, Nov. 22, 1894.

Played Marbles on Sunday.

IT SHOCKED GOOD MR. SCHUMWAY AND HE HAD THE BOYS ARRESTED.

MR. FRANKLIN SCHUMWAY is a bald-headed Sabbatarian who doesn't allow his little boys to play marbles on Sunday, and does his best to prevent other people's little boys from so enjoying themselves.

Five of these desperate criminals, ranging in age from ten to fourteen, had the temerity to play with "agates" and "long taws" Sunday afternoon in full view of Mr. Schumway's windows, at No. 263 West Fortieth Street. He went out and got Policeman Quinn to arrest them. Quinn protested that they were peaceable, but finally took all five—Edward Ferns, Willie Donovan, Johnnie Byrne, Freddie Barnes and Crawford Pyne—to the West Thirty-seventh Street police station. Then they were taken to the Gerry Society's rooms.

Yesterday Mr. Schumway left his wholesale notion store at No. 51 Lispenard St., long enough to appear in Jefferson Market Police Court to prosecute the boys. To Mr. Schumway's visible dissatisfaction, Justice Hogan didn't seem to realize the enormity of their crime. He merely said: "You had better not play marbles where it will annoy this gentleman. Go home now."

Mr. Schumway was asked what he had to say about one of the little boys who would lose his place as an errand boy through the arrest. He said that was a matter which didn't concern him.—*Morning Advertiser*, Nov. 20, 1894.

DURING the month of March last four hundred books, mostly Italian works, were placed upon the *Index Expurgatorius* by the sacred congregation of the Roman propaganda. However, the once dreaded "Index" has become a mere farce in Italy. Most Italians read what they like, but for those who have conscientious scruples, and even for the priests themselves, there is an easy way out of the difficulty. Any one paying three dollars can obtain a special dispensation, which, for a certain number of years, allows him to read any and everything proscribed by the "Index." A new Italian opera—"The Medici"—which was given without question in Italy, was prohibited in Vienna theaters because it contained allusions that were considered offensive to the papacy.—*Foreign Mission Journal*.

HEREAFTER the politician who brings corruption in must answer to the preacher.—*Rev. Dr. McIntyre, of Denver, in the Denver News*, Nov. 12, 1894.

BOOKS FOR THE CHILDREN.

WE offer the following three books as the best of their kind we have been able to find. They are profusely illustrated, and the stories are told in a very simple yet highly entertaining manner. The books cannot fail to be exceedingly helpful to children in an educational way, and should be found in every home:—

LITTLE FOLKS' BIBLE GALLERY

Has nearly 100 pages, and contains 43 Bible stories, each illustrated with a full-page picture. Size, 7x9 inches, bound in board lithograph covers. Price, by mail, post-paid, \$1.00

BIBLE PICTURES AND STORIES

Has 45 full-page illustrations and an equal number of well told Bible stories. Same style and size as "LITTLE FOLKS' BIBLE GALLERY," and is really a companion volume to it. Price, post-paid, \$1.00

A mother, than whom none can be more careful and particular as to what her children have to read and study, speaking of these two little books, says: "Really it is a pity that any little child should not have the privilege of seeing these beautiful full-page pictures and hearing the well-told stories."

Both "LITTLE FOLKS' BIBLE GALLERY" and "BIBLE PICTURES AND STORIES" will be sent to one address, post-paid, for \$1.75


The Good Shepherd:

The Life of the Saviour for Children.

Beautifully Illuminated Covers!

Fifty-three Illustrations!

Interesting Reading!



Ninety-six pages,

Large print,

Good paper,

Strong binding.

This book, which is 8x10½ inches and ¾ inch in thickness, tells the story of the life of Christ in a way that cannot fail to interest the little folks. It is exceptionally free from doctrinal errors, and should be in every family where there are children to be taught a Saviour's love. The illustrations add very much to its educational value. Price, only 50 cents.

— ADDRESS —

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY

Abiding Sabbath And Lord's Day.

BY ALONZO T. JONES.

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



A SELF-MOVING LOCOMOTIVE, 15 CENTS.

Handsomely finished, made of metal, strong wheels, gilt boiler, black smoke stack, bright colored cab with 4 windows. When wound up runs long distance across floor. Great amusement to children. By far the cheapest locomotive made, and a marvel of strength and beauty. Parents should buy one for the children. Mention this paper, and send 15 cents in stamps and we will send Locomotive, and our story paper, 3 months, post-paid. A. A. WHITNEY, Box 8189, Boston, Mass.

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, DECEMBER 6, 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 the article on the first page of this paper, entitled, "Did the Roman Catholic Church Ever Persecute?" It contains information that everybody ought to have.

EMBOLDENED by the indifference of the people, the priests of Rome are to-day denying that "the church" ever persecuted. The Inquisition, it is asserted, was a civil or political tribunal rather than an ecclesiastical court, and that "religion had nothing to do with the massacre" of St. Bartholomew's day in France, but that "Coligny and his fellow Huguenots were slain not on account of their creed, but exclusively on account of their alleged treasonable designs."—*Faith of Our Fathers*, page 298.

BUT be it understood that where Rome rules, "heresy" is treason. Rome's denials and apologies are alike disingenuous. She charges treason and means by it dissent from the dogmas of popery. She talks patronizingly of religious liberty when she means only freedom to believe and practice as "the church" teaches. Cardinal Gibbons says: "A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshiping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God." "This religious liberty," the cardinal says, "is the true right of every man." This sounds well; but Rome claims for herself a divine commission to say what is a "right conscience," and consequently, authority to determine when any man is entitled to freedom of faith and practice. Rome is, and always has been, the foe of genuine liberty, both civil and religious; for "Rome never changes." The Roman Catholic Church of Dominic and Innocent III. is the Roman Catholic Church of the silver-tongued Gibbons and of the crafty Leo XIII.

W. T. GIBSON, a Seventh-day Adventist, of Everett, Mass., was recently arrested at the instigation of the mayor, for selling merchandise in his store on Sunday. He appeared in his own defense and pleaded not guilty to the charge of violating the Lord's day. We will favor our readers next week with his plea which is good, because the Lord, according to his promise, spoke through him words which his adversaries could neither gainsay nor resist. He was, however, convicted and sentenced to pay fine and costs or go to

jail. He appealed his case, and we hope to give our readers the results of the appeal in our next issue.

IN our last issue we stated that the *Pennsylvania Grit*, published at Williamsport, Pa., which so courageously and effectively gave battle to the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association, at its recent invasion of its beautiful city, was under "liberal Roman Catholic management." This is a mistake. The *Pennsylvania Grit* is a strictly non-sectarian, non-partisan paper.

A NUMBER of American papers have commented upon the imprisonment of Elder H. P. Holser, in Basel, Switzerland, for refusing to close on Sunday the publishing house, of which he is manager. The gist of a few of these comments we give.

The *Standard*, Toronto, S. D., says in its issue of Nov. 22:—

Then, by police force was he, a Christian minister of the gospel, taken from his work and confined behind prison bars in a room 12x13, for no other reason than because he claimed the right and did worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

The *Free Press*, Mount Pleasant, Iowa, Nov. 15, gives the main facts and says:—

Even in the pure mountain air of Switzerland there seems to be a spirit dominant that would make a residence almost intolerable.

The *Sharon* (Pa.) *Telegraph*, of Nov. 14, says of Mr. Holser's case:—

There are very peculiar things that transpire in the older countries as well as here in this, and this is one of them.

The *Star*, South Bethlehem, Pa., thinks the imprisonment of Elder Holser "an exhibition of intolerance which would seem to be out of place in this age, and particularly in liberty-loving Switzerland," and says:—

It is a poor illustration of freedom when a man is at liberty to do as his conscience dictates only when it leads him to do as others think he ought to do. We hope Pastor Holser may be released and indemnified, in deference to the spirit of religious liberty.

The opinions thus far quoted are all from secular papers, and we are sorry to say that in such matters the secular press puts to shame the religious press. The *Christian Observer*, a Presbyterian paper, published in Louisville, Ky., has the following in reference to this case, and its sentiments are quite worthy of the Dark Ages:—

A society calling itself the International Religious Liberty Association sends us the following item of news, with a request that we comment upon it:—

"Word comes to this country from Switzerland, that Pastor H. P. Holser, the American representative of the Seventh-day Adventists in Central Europe, and the director of their publishing house in Basel, is now undergoing a term of sixty-one days' imprisonment in that city for allowing work to be done in the office on Sunday. This seems all the more strange, because the 'Continental Sunday' is observed in Basel, as elsewhere in Europe, with noisy revelry. Across the street from the Adventist printing office is the *Schutzenplatz*, where soldiers parade, and practice target shooting on Sunday. But they have a law, ostensibly and designedly favoring workmen, which forbids ordinary labor on Sunday. Religious bigotry is able to use this to prevent the free exercise of the conscience."

If it be a fact, as is stated in the paragraph, that very little respect is paid to the Sabbath in Switzerland, and the day is given up in large measure to revelry and amusement, this is no justification for men

who profess to be religious to send their agents there to undermine and destroy the remnant of respect which is still paid to the Lord's day by a deliberate violation of those laws of the State which forbid all labor on that day. The anarchists who come from Europe to this country, and who claim that their consciences teach them that it is right to defy the laws of this country which protect property and life, are justly punished for breaking the laws. These religious anarchists who send their agents to foreign countries to inaugurate the practice of laboring on Sunday, in defiance of the Sunday laws which are intended to protect the working men, should be just as severely dealt with. All honor to the authorities and the courts of Basel who have the courage, so strangely lacking in some of our American citizens, to enforce the laws for the protection of the Sabbath and to imprison those who deliberately violate them.

No comment can add to the bitter words of the *Christian Observer*. The same paper has a note relative to the recent massacre of Armenians by Turks, with the remark that "it is the spirit of Mohammedanism." But how much better is the spirit manifested by this so-called Christian paper? Is its spirit that of Christianity?—Nay, verily; it is the spirit of the papacy, the spirit of antichrist, the spirit that has in all ages persecuted men for conscience' sake; that in the Middle Ages slaughtered men and women by the tens of thousands for their faith; which in the early days of our own country hanged Quakers, whipped Baptists, and banished Roger Williams. And it is this same spirit that will yet decree that as many as will not worship the image of the papacy shall be killed. See Rev. 13.

"Now in Jail for Conscience' Sake" is the title of the November number of the *Religious Liberty Library*. It is an 8-page tract giving an account of the trial and imprisonment of Robert R. Whaley and W. G. Curlett, Seventh-day Adventists, of Queen Anne's Co., Md., for doing "bodily labor on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday." This tract ought to have a wide circulation, not only in Maryland, but in every State in the Union. One State tract society has already ordered twenty-five thousand, and another 10,000 copies. Let the good work go on. Single copy, one cent; usual discount in quantities. Order of this office.

Sabbath-School Lesson Pamphlets.

THE Sabbath-school lesson pamphlet for the first quarter of 1895 is now ready for distribution and orders should be sent in early so that there shall be no delay in supplying the pupils the last Sabbath in the present quarter.

The subject of the lessons is "The Sanctuary of the Bible," a most important and timely topic.

The pamphlet contains 40 pages and will be supplied at the usual price by the publishers. Address, Pacific Press, 43 Bond Street, New York City; 18 W. Fifth Street, Kansas City, Mo.; or Oakland, Cal.

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.

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