

"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 10.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 7, 1895.

NUMBER 6.

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.

THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL.

He Asks for the Church the "Favor of the Laws and the Patronage of the Public Authority."

THE Papal Encyclical promised some weeks since, and referred to in these columns in our issue of January 3, has been made public by Mgr. Satoli.

This encyclical is addressed "To our venerable brethren, the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States of North America;" but as we previously indicated, it is designed really for the people of the United States.

That our estimate of the scope and design of the encyclical was not a mistaken one is evident from the language employed in many places. Referring to the World's Fair, the pope says:—

Nor were we on that occasion content with offering prayers at a distance for your welfare and greatness. It was our wish to be in some manner present with you in your festivities. Hence we cheerfully sent one who should represent our person.

To the people and not to the archbishops and bishops of the United States belonged the World's Fair; hence to the people, and not alone to the archbishops and bishops of the United States, does the pope "play" in this the latest of his numerous encyclicals.

At an early stage in his letter Leo reasserts the claim of the Roman Catholic Church to this country for the reason that its discoverer was a Catholic, and because "when America was as yet but a newborn babe, uttering in its cradle its first feeble cries, the church took it to her bosom and motherly embrace."

And thus nursed at the breast and dandled upon the knee of Rome did the United States become a Catholic country; "for," in the words of Leo XIII., pope of Rome,

"as the ark of Noah, surmounting the overflowing waters, bore the seed of Israel, together with the remnants of the human race, even thus did the barks launched by Columbus upon the ocean carry into regions beyond the seas as well the germs of mighty States as the principles of the Catholic religion."

But be it remembered that it was not until, as the fruit of years of patient efforts of well-meaning but misguided "Protestants" to "Christianize" our Government, the Supreme Court declared this to be a Christian nation, basing its decision upon the fact that the country was discovered and settled by Christians; that Rome going only a step further proved(?) by the same token that it is a Catholic Christian nation. And from that hour until the present moment Rome has not ceased to assert her spiritual proprietorship of the people of this country, and by every means in her power emphasize the declaration that this is a Roman Catholic "Christian nation."

It was in September, 1894, that the pope elevated this country "to the first rank as a Catholic nation," and just prior to this action, Sept. 22, 1894, Bishop Keane, returning from Rome, announced that "the policy of the pope . . . is the union of the church with the great democratic powers of the future—that is, *America and France*." And this purpose is clearly seen in the present encyclical. Of the relations of Church and State, and the prosperity of the church in America, the pope says:—

The church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and Government of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance. Yet, though all this is true, *it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the church; or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced*. The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed his church; in virtue of which, unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself; but *she would bring forth much more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority*.

The people of the United States not drunken with the wine of the wrath of Babylon's fornication, not stupefied by the

poison that distills from the deadly upas tree of Church and State, not already doing homage to the papal beast in his own proper person or to his image (referred to on page 42 of this paper), will thank the pope for this candid utterance, this bold avowal of the wish and purpose of the papacy concerning the Government of the United States. It is clearly the purpose of the Roman hierarchy to make this a Catholic country, not in the sense that it is no longer regarded merely as a mission field, but in the sense that the Roman Catholic Church shall enjoy "the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority;" in the sense that the Government and people humbly bow to the papal church accepting her as the spouse of Christ and her visible head, the pope of Rome, as the vicar of Christ.

American Romanists have steadfastly denied this. In "The Faith of Our Fathers," chapter XVII., Cardinal Gibbons labors to convey the impression that the Catholic Church asks no special favors in the United States, and he has at least once publicly made the statement that he did not want to see the Church and the State in the United States more closely united than at present. But whatever may be the private opinion of the cardinal, according to her own confession, yea, according to this bold avowal of the pope, Rome asks not equal but exclusive rights. Her priests and prelates in America have been telling us that Catholics demanded only equality before the law; that the Roman Catholic Church desired only the free right to make disciples where and when she could; that she neither sought nor desired any closer union with the State than now existed; yea more, that she was the true friend and defender of rights of conscience; that she it was who planted upon our shores the first colony which guaranteed religious liberty to every man. But now the pope, the infallible head of the Roman Catholic Church, gives the lie to all this fair profession as well as to his own past professions of love for American institutions, by saying plainly that "it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the church; or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for

Church and State to be dissevered and divorced."

Verily "Rome never changes;" and what she has done in the past for other nations she stands ready to do, yea, is doing for the United States. And every so-called Protestant who adopts papal principles for the advancement of "Protestantism," is aiding her in her nefarious work.

Rome as the Guardian of the Peace.

WE have frequently called attention to the scheme of Rome to make herself of necessity the arbiter of disputes between capital and labor, between constituted civil authority and a riotous people, and between contending nations—in fact, the international peacemaker, the arbiter of the world. This is the settled, published programme of the papacy, and its representatives utilize every opportunity for furthering this scheme.

An opportunity was offered in connection with the recent street-car strike in Brooklyn.

After the strike had become riotous, and the State militia were called out to preserve order, a Roman Catholic delegation from Greenpoint, Brooklyn, headed by "Father" O'Hare, called upon Mayor Schieren, and told him if he would withdraw the soldiers from Greenpoint, they would promise to prevent rioting; and, astonishing to tell, the mayor agreed and withdrew the militia and left that portion of the city to the protection of the Roman Catholics. What followed is related in the *World* of January 26:—

The mob began a war dance about this tangle [of collided cars], the two motormen and two conductors shivering on the platforms.

Soon a third car bore down and was stalled, then a fourth, and so on until there were eighteen cars standing in a long row, with thirty-six of the "unconverted" powerless to escape from the earnest missionary work which straightway began.

The police made a sally and banged a few heads before they decided that it was better to retreat than to shoot. Then the missionaries [strikers] opened up. The work began with a shower of bricks and stones, bottles, clubs, fence posts, and assorted building materials. These broke all the windows and bruised up the thirty-six [non-union street car employes] and got them into a submissive frame of mind.

When every window was broken the missionaries drew near, surrounded the cars and fell to cursing and swearing at the motormen and conductors. They shook their fists at the poor wretches; they told them to come off the cars and go away or lose their lives. The leaders of the rioters got on the platforms and argued, putting a fist and a bank-note under the nose of each man with whom they argued. The "bank-note" horn of the dilemma was soon accepted by most of the men.

Some one had gone down to the parish house of St. Anthony's and had told Father O'Hare what was doing. The priest came on the run, and the crowd, bowing respectfully as he pushed through, ceased cursing and threatening, but kept on with the bank-note form of argument. They offered \$5 and \$10, and before many minutes all the thirty-six had deserted except one man.

Many of the rioters must have been Roman Catholics, and the Roman Catholic committee under whose protection the mayor of Brooklyn placed a considerable portion of the city, must have known that the rioters were Roman Catholics, or they would not have dared to promise to control them. That there was a large element of Roman Catholics engaged in the riots is evident also from the subservient manner in which the priest was received by the mob. The published account goes on to tell how the priest finally succeeded in quelling the riot by bribing the one remaining motorman to leave his car. The Roman Catholic government of Greenpoint was however only partially success-

ful in preserving order, and consequently the mayor addressed the following letter to the priestly government of Greenpoint:—

The Rev. J. J. O'Hare, Pastor of St. Anthony's R. C. Church—

Dear Sir: I am directed by his honor the mayor to call your attention to the fact that at the interview he had with the delegation, of which you were one, on Wednesday, assurances were given that if the Greenpoint cars were started without protection of the military there would be no interference with their operation. Complaints have been made to me that there has been such interference. He would deeply regret the necessity of calling upon the troops in order that the cars may be run, and asks that you will exert your influence to prevent further interference.

Respectfully yours,

W. M. PALMER,
Secretary to the Mayor.

In all this there is a miniature representation of one of the last acts in the great drama that will close the history of the world. What these Roman Catholics of Greenpoint proposed to do for that portion of the city of Brooklyn, the pope of Rome proposes to do for the world. The Roman Catholic Church is constantly declaring, as does Leo XIII., in his encyclical to Americans, just published, that political order and civil government cannot be maintained without the acceptance of the Roman Catholic religion, and that fast increasing political unrest, is the result of a failure to acknowledge and enforce that religion. And the turbulence and rioting of the uncontrollable masses will yet persuade the nations of the world, as they persuaded Mayor Schieren of Brooklyn, to give the Roman Catholic Church the place and power she demands with the hope that she will preserve order as she declares she can; and when she fails, as did the priests in Greenpoint, the nations of the earth, in disappointed rage, will visit upon her the retributive judgments predicted in the symbolic words of Rev. 17:16: "And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire."

Which Pope Shall It Be?

THE *Christian Statesman*, the representative *par excellence* of the American papacy—the image to the Roman papacy—is still turning "white with fear and wrath"—or more properly speaking, with envy—at the aggressions of the "man of sin," the "mystery of iniquity," the self-styled vicar of Christ, who from the banks of the Tiber appeals to his followers throughout the world to demand with united voice the restoration of his temporal power.

In its issue of Jan. 19, the *Statesman* has a long editorial upon the "Campaign for the Pope's Temporal Sovereignty," in which are discussed the papal claim to independence, and to sovereignty over, the nations of the earth. In conclusion, the question is asked, "Is it not time for loyal Americans to understand just what these claims mean?" It is indeed time that Americans of every description understand not only the meaning of these claims of the Roman papacy, but that they likewise understand the significance of like claims made by the American papacy, the image to the papacy of the pope.

In the recent National Reform convention at New Castle, Pa.; Rev. R. J. George, D.D., laid down as sound National

Reform doctrine (and the editor of the *Statesman* who was present uttered no word of protest) these propositions:—

The State is subservient to the Church.

It is the highest dignity and honor of the State that it has been placed under the authority of the Church's head.

Now it is evident that the only question between papist and National Reformer is, Who is the Church's head? They both agree that the head of the Church is the ruler of nations; hence, the only question between them is one of fact. The National Reformer says Christ is head of the Church and ruler of nations. The papist says, Christ is head of the spiritual, the invisible church, but the pope is head of the visible church, the church to which the commission was given to disciple all nations; hence the pope is the head of the church under whose authority the State has been placed. Therefore the pope is superior to all nations and answerable to no human law.

The question is, therefore, one of fact; in other words, in such a case, one of opinion; which is only saying that in governmental affairs, it is one to be decided by the majority, or by those having the power in their hands, whether a majority or an organized and aggressive minority. If therefore the Roman Catholic Church can gain enough adherents in this country to so shape legislation, and so mould the Government, as to give practical recognition to the faith of that church upon this question, the *Christian Statesman* will have no right to find fault. It is certainly right that the majority should rule in the settlement of all governmental questions; and if this question of the headship of the Church is one that concerns the State, one which the State must answer by according certain recognition to the head of the Church, then certainly the majority, or at least those having control of the Government, must decide it according to the best light they have; and all others must abide by the decision; for in all things coming properly under civil jurisdiction it is the duty of all men to obey the powers that be, for they "are ordained of God."

But suppose that the decision were favorable to the view entertained by the *Christian Statesman*; suppose that it were decided by the Government that Christ himself is the head of the Church and ruler of nations, and that the pope's claim to be his representative is not valid; who then is to represent Christ? He is not personally present. There is no general, much less any universal agreement, as to his will. Who then is his proper representative upon earth, if not the pope of Rome?

The question raised is already answered by National Reform: "The Church is to teach the State God's message." This too was stated in the New Castle convention as a fundamental National Reform truth; and the editor of the *Christian Statesman*, himself a leading spirit in that convention, was evidently in accord with the declaration. What then is the difference between National Reform and the papacy?

The papacy teaches that the pope, the visible head of the visible Church, is the vicar of Christ, authorized by him "to teach the State God's message," to announce his will to the governments of the earth.

National Reform teaches that "the Church is to teach the State God's message," to announce to the governments God's will; and that the State must obey under

penalty of the divine displeasure and divine judgments.

What, if any, difference is there then between these views? In either case it is the Church that teaches "the State God's (?) message." The Roman Catholic Church does this through its visible head, the pope; the so-called Protestant Church does it through its several representatives, its authorized teachers, and by resolutions and official utterances of its representative bodies—the church courts—synods, assemblies, conferences, etc. But according to the National Reform theory, the State is under obligation to hear and heed this message; for the Church speaking in this way is, according to the National Reform view, speaking with authority, not only to the State but to the individuals which compose the State; hence the mere manner of speaking, or the medium through which the speaking is done, does not change the principle. In any event the right of private judgment is denied. It is only a question of one pope or a number of popes, a composite pope as it were. Under the papal scheme a single man interposes himself between God and the individual, and speaks for Him, thus sitting "in the temple of God showing himself that he is God;" while under the National Reform scheme, a number of men acting together do exactly the same thing. The principle is the same; the one is the papacy, the other is the image of the papacy.

And this is not mere theory of what may some day be. Already the churches of the United States have assumed to teach God's message to the State, and the State, the Government, has heard and obeyed. By petition, by resolutions, by threats of political boycott and by all the arts known to the American papacy, the composite "Protestant" pope declared to the Government of the United States that Sunday is the Sabbath, that it is enforced by the fourth commandment, and that it is the duty of the State to recognize this fact and to require all men to recognize it. The State heard and obeyed by enacting the World's Fair Sunday legislation; and now this "Protestant" pope boasts that the churches have the Government so well in hand, so entirely under their control, that they can get anything they ask for. That this is true in a measure must be admitted, but the power of the American pope is limited by the wiles of the other pope, the man of sin on the Tiber; for the image to the beast now doing its work in this country is dependent in large measure upon the beast itself, and can go only so far as the beast permits. True, the image aspires to supreme authority, but the beast not only refuses to abdicate but greedily snatches from his double the fruit of every victory gained; thus strengthening his own power while the makers of the image "turn white with fear and wrath" at the aggressions of Romanism, but continue nevertheless in the same evil course, casting up a highway over which the beast rides in triumph, and will continue to ride until destroyed, with its image, by the coming of the true head of the true Church, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Papal Influence in French Politics.

THE new president of France, M. Faure, is a Romanist. A press despatch from Paris says:—

While the voting was in progress, M. Faure's friends were actively canvassing for votes and with apparent success until a rumor was started that he was a Protestant. This for a time had bad effect upon his can-

didacy, but a deputation instantly approached M. Faure and questioned him upon his religious persuasion. M. Faure, who was greatly excited, said in reply to a question on the subject: "No, I am a Catholic."

This reassured his supporters, and they went to work with renewed vigor.

Another despatch, dated Rome, Jan. 18, says:—

The Vatican is entirely satisfied with the election of Faure, the French president.

"How does all this comport," asks an exchange, "with Bishop Keane's assertion that the Catholic Church has no political purpose? What has the Vatican to do with the President of France any more than the President of the United States? Why did Faure have to declare himself a papist in order to reach the presidency? And how long will it be before this country is in the condition of the French Republic? All these are timely questions."

Drifting Romeward.

Not long since the Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary of New York, invited a Roman Catholic priest, "Father" Doyle, to address its candidates for the ministry on the subject, "Methods of Preaching."

Our readers will remember that the *Churchman*, a Protestant Episcopal paper, questioned the propriety of inviting Roman Catholic priests to teach Protestant candidates for the ministry, and for this faint echo of the Reformation, the *Churchman* was severely rebuked by its superior, Bishop Potter, and the *Outlook*, a Congregational paper, heartily indorsed and printed the rebuke.

So well pleased was the *Outlook* with the papal priest's preaching prescriptions, that it requested the priest to contribute an article for its columns on the subject, "The Making of a Missionary."

And now we want our readers to see what a professedly Protestant paper publishes from the pen of a Romanist, for the edification and instruction of its readers. We quote one paragraph from the priest's article in the *Outlook* of January 12:—

To fit a young man to campaign in this spiritual warfare, a discipline is resorted to far more severe than a West Point cadetship involves. It continues through six years after he has taken his degrees at college. It means daily rising at five o'clock, with two half-hours of meditation or silent prayer to make the truths of religion more vivid, constant examination of conscience that the mirror of the soul may be kept bright, weekly confessions that the soul may be purified from all sin, a yearly "retreat" of eight days in solitude without any conversation with another, the constant recourse to the literature of ascetic theology and hagiology to stimulate in the service of God by precept and example, three years of metaphysics as a basis of knowledge, three years of dogmatic theology with Holy Scripture and concurrent studies, and along with dogma three years of moral theology to cultivate one's practical judgment of sin and its remedies—with this training, and a repertory of thirty well-prepared sermons that grasp the very marrow of the subject discussed, a young missionary is equipped for the battle-field.

It will be noticed that the "Holy Scripture" hardly escaped being left out altogether from this papal preacher's curriculum. It comes in as a side-dish in one of the courses. "Dogmatic theology with Holy Scripture;" roast turkey with cranberry sauce; and even then this "Holy Scripture"-side-dish sauce is pumped through the Roman Catholic sewer of "infallible" interpretation.

And now that apostate Protestants are inviting papists to feed their people through pulpit and press, with papal pap, let the gospel preacher feed the people

with the "sincere milk of the word." "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." 2 Tim. 4:1, 2.

Fawning Upon Rome.

THE *Idaho Daily Statesman*, published at Boise City, gives a glowing account of a recent reception tendered to Archbishop Gross of Portland, Oregon.

"On the stage," says the *Statesman*, "were seated a number of prominent men, among whom being Senator Shoup, whose appearance was greeted with generous applause, Gov. McConnell, Mayor Sonna, T. J. Jones and others."

"The distinguished guest of honor was escorted to his chair by Bishop Glorieux, and gracefully acknowledged the applause that followed."

"T. J. Jones welcomed the archbishop, whom he characterized as one of the distinguished men of our country, and whom the State of Idaho felt proud to honor as her guest."

"The applause that greeted the bishop as he came forward to respond lasted for some moments."

"At the close of the archbishop's address Governor McConnell welcomed the visitor in behalf of the State, and Mayor Sonna extended a welcome in behalf of the city."

Such receptions are significant, for they are tendered not to an individual, but to that which the individual represents. Had Archbishop Gross been a Methodist, no such reception would have been thought of. Had he been a representative of any other church or system of religion other than Rome, neither the governor of the State, nor yet the mayor of the city, would have felt called upon to extend him an official welcome. It is as the representatives of a religio-political system that priests and prelates of Rome are thus welcomed by American officials supposed to act for the people only in civil, secular things. If governors and mayors as individuals see fit to toady to Rome, they have a perfect right to do so, but in such things they have no authority to speak for the whole people. That they usurp the function is ominously significant.

Roman Catholic Ideas of Religious Liberty.

HON. CHAS. J. BONAPART of Baltimore, a Roman Catholic, recently delivered an address before the Catholic Union of Boston, which was published in the *Boston Herald* of January 10. We quote two sentences from the address because they illustrate so briefly and clearly the Roman Catholic idea of religious liberty:—

We are in fact essentially a religious people, but we do not deem the civil government competent to determine the comparative merits of different faiths. That function is reserved to the individual citizen, and wherever public opinion ceases to be practically unanimous as to questions of belief or morals, the State's province ends.

The Roman Catholic idea of religious liberty is that it is the function of the individual to determine the comparative merits of different faiths except where public opinion is *practically* unanimous, as was the case in most countries of the world previous to the Reformation, and as is now the case in Spain and South American countries. Then the province of the State begins, and woe to the dissenter. The speaker did not define what he meant

by "practically unanimous," and we will have to decide the meaning of the term by the practical usages of the Roman Catholic Church, as exemplified in the murder of Waldenses, Albigenses and Huguenots. Nothing is more evident than that Rome is calmly waiting and patiently working for the time when in her opinion public opinion shall be *practically* unanimous in the United States, and then she will proceed to put into effect the statement of the *Catholic Review* of June, 1865, which reads as follows:—

Protestantism has not, and never can have, any right where Catholicity has triumphed.

It is this viper that popular Protestants have warmed and caressed; it is from this harlot that during a thousand years of murderous midnight revelry, drank herself drunk with the blood of the saints; it is from this harlot that apostate Protestantism, the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union and the popular churches, asked help to stab to the heart the goddess of American liberty.

Has the Blessing Slipped.

"AND God blessed the *seventh* day and sanctified it." Gen. 2:3. This blessing and sanctification made it God's "holy Sabbath." Neh. 9:14. Man was commanded by God's own voice, and this command was written by his own finger on stone, to "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Ex. 20:8 and 34:4, 28. All of God's holy patriarchs, prophets and apostles regarded the blessing God had placed upon the seventh day. Jesus regarded it, and continued to bless men on that day by removing the physical effects of the curse, and by endeavoring to bless every one by turning them away from their iniquities. Acts 3:26. And the holy women at the sepulchre were in harmony with the holy Sabbath God had made, for "they prepared spices and ointment and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56. All the holy men of Bible times were in harmony with God's holy day, and so were all the Christian church until the great apostasy took place; and then did the blessing slip from the seventh day because the Church went back into heathenism? This blessing had held firmly to the seventh day all through more than four thousand years of earth's dark history, and now *did* it quietly slip on to another day? Did God set his blessing so lightly on his "holy day" that an apostate church could by its decree remove it to another day? And if the blessing of God has slipped off the seventh day onto the first day, is it so firmly fixed now that it will not slip back again? Is it a sense of this loose sacredness, or sacred looseness that causes all these efforts we see at "civil Sabbath legislation"? Do they hope thereby to rivet the blessing on Sunday so it may not be slipped back again onto the seventh day? And now *if* this Sabbath blessing could be slipped off the seventh day over onto Sunday by an apostate church, why cannot the faithful people of God slip it back again onto the seventh day? And pray tell, after all, when time was moving forward so rapidly, how this blessing slipped forward to Sunday instead of backward onto Friday? There are some queer things about this loose Sabbath blessing.

But all this folly is set at naught by the fact that God never makes mistakes. That same blessing placed on the seventh day

at creation will remain upon it in the new creation, *all flesh* will come up on that day to worship before the Lord. Isa. 66:22, 23. Then God's blessing is now upon the seventh day and will ever thus remain, and no earthly power can remove it, and all opinions of men that regard it lightly are rebuked by the promise in Isa. 58:13, 14: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on *my holy day*; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." G. D. BALLOU.

"That's True."

THE managers of the American theocracy are becoming more arrogant. They recently closed a number of rival Sunday night entertainments in Boston, called "sacred concerts." One of the theocrats, Dr. Bradley, pastor of the People's Temple, in his sermon, Dec. 30, explained why he favored this action. We quote from his sermon, as published in the *Boston Globe*, of Dec. 31:—

One reason why these concerts should be abolished is that they employ a great deal of talent that should be used for better purposes. The men and women who exhaust themselves at these so-called sacred concerts should be using their powers of song and eloquence in the service of the Lord.

It is quite true that all men should use their power of song and eloquence in the service of the Lord, but it by no means follows that it is the right and the duty of the State to prohibit under the pains and penalties of civil law, all song and eloquence not so used. "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth," "for the Father seeketh such to worship him." Civil law cannot create such worshipers. The Inquisition tried it and failed.

But the doctor has another reason why the State should prohibit the so-called "sacred concert." Here it is:—

The great reason why the concerts should be stopped is because they are deceptive.

The title "sacred" has no application to their songs.

But who is to decide whether these concerts are deceptive, and whether the songs sung are "sacred" or "secular"? Surely not the civil authorities. They are representatives of a secular government, and are no more qualified to decide whether these concerts are "sacred," or whether they are "deceptive," than they have to decide whether Dr. Bradley's preaching is "sacred" or "deceptive." Each individual must decide that question for himself, and it is the business of civil government to protect him in so deciding and acting upon his decision, so long as his actions do not invade the rights of others. There are millions of professed Christians, besides the millions more of those not professed Christians, who believe that Dr. Bradley's preaching is not only not sacred but deceptive; but this is no reason why Dr. Bradley's "sacred" concerts and discourses should be suppressed; but it is just as good a reason as the doctor gives for suppressing the "sacred" concerts of his rivals—the theaters.

Dr. Bradley further explains why the "sacred" concerts are not sacred:—

Perhaps you do not know that "Sally in our Alley" is a favorite offering of the artists who sing it at these so-called sacred concerts.

No doubt Sally was a dear girl, and was charmingly situated in her alley, but that is no reason why she should be dragged out every Sabbath night to be doted upon by young men and old men, who would better be engaged in the service of the Lord.

Then there is "Annie on the Dee." We can easily imagine Annie as buxom and rosy-cheeked, and as lovely a creature as one would care to see, but that is hardly sufficient reason for her being memorialized on Sunday evenings.

This last quotation is introduced, not so much to present the doctor's objection, as to furnish an idea of the character of the "sacred" services furnished by him. It will be noticed that the doctor tried to be funny, and that, too, on Sunday night, after he had succeeded in closing up all his rival fun-makers—the theaters. But right here is where the trouble lies. The popular ministry is not proclaiming the gospel of Jesus Christ in its purity and power, but are attempting to tickle the ears of their hearers with "sanctified" secular jokes, and when the people prefer the original jokers and patronize them, the "sacred" jokers get mad and invoke the secular arm to close a rival business. On this point Dr. Bradley said:—

Some people may think I object because I run an opposition business and want to get the crowds that go to the concerts to come here.

That's true. My trade is going up the hill to heaven, though, and the theater managers' customers are going down the road of degradation to hell.

As arrogant and tyrannical as are these statements from the doctor, we can but admire his frankness. This whole Sunday-closing crusade is for the purpose of closing up an "opposition business," but the crusaders are not usually so willing to confess it. But it is an open question whether the doctor is going up the hill to heaven or not. He may think he is, as did the old Pharisees in the days of our Saviour's earthly ministry, and he has a right to think so, but he has no right to call to his aid the strong arm of the law to close all other trades and roads, but his "trade" and "road." Dr. Bradley next announced that "at seven o'clock a concert is offered for your delectation—warranted to be sacred;" after which the following resolutions were presented by the doctor and adopted by the "customers" of his "trade":—

WHEREAS, Our most sacred national institution, the Sabbath, has been flagrantly profaned in the theaters of our city by the so-called grand sacred concerts, and

WHEREAS, Certain worthy and honorable members of the police committee and aldermanic board have issued a decree in the city of Boston that such outrageous desecrations of the divine day in certain theaters must cease; therefore,

Resolved, That we, the congregation and members of People's Temple in said city, on this Sunday night, 30th of December, 1894, do return our sincere appreciative thanks to the members of this committee and board who have done so noble and salutary a deed; and furthermore, be it

Resolved, That we will indorse, encourage and support these official gentlemen in still further efforts for the suppression of every other attempt to turn the holy day of God into a secular holiday.

Resolved, That in doing this we are persuaded we are following not only the command of the Almighty Father of all, but also our deepest and most sacred promptings of conscience for the good of not only ourselves and children, but also for the highest benefit of the whole body of our fellow-citizens.

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolutions be sent to the police committee and board of aldermen.

We leave our readers to comment on these resolutions, and close by asking if the great Teacher found it necessary to petition the mayor and alderman of Jeru-

salem to close up all places of amusement that he might get the attention of the crowds! On the other hand the Pharisees appealed to the civil authorities to prohibit the Saviour's teachings that they might once more get a hearing from the people. Oh, that the follower of the great Teacher would cease appealing to governors and mayors, aldermen and legislators for the sword of civil power with which to reach the masses, and instead grasp the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," and wield it in the strength of the Master. But they never will, that the prophecy might be fulfilled which saith, "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Tim. 4:3, 4.

What Rome Did for Europe Prior to the Reformation.

[From "History of the Reformation" by D'Aubigné, Book 1, chapter 3.]

LET us now see what was the state of the Church previous to the Reformation.

The nations of Christendom no longer looked to a holy and living God for the free gift of eternal life. To obtain it they were obliged to have recourse to all the means that a superstitious, fearful, and alarmed imagination could devise. Heaven was filled with saints and mediators, whose duty it was to solicit this mercy. Earth was filled with pious works, sacrifices, observances, and ceremonies, by which it was to be obtained. Here is a picture of the religion of this period transmitted to us by one who was long a monk, and afterwards a fellow-laborer of Luther's—by Myconius:—

The sufferings and merits of Christ were looked upon as an idle tale, or as the fictions of Homer. There was no thought of the faith by which we become partakers of the Saviour's righteousness and of the heritage of eternal life. Christ was looked upon as a severe judge, prepared to condemn all who should not have recourse to the intercession of the saints, or to the papal indulgences. Other intercessors appeared in his place:—first, the Virgin Mary, like the Diana of paganism, and then the saints, whose numbers were continually augmented by the popes. These mediators granted their intercession only to such applicants as had deserved well of the orders founded by them. For this it was necessary to do, not what God had commanded in his Word, but to perform a number of works invented by monks and priests, and which brought money to the treasury. These works were Ave-Marias, the prayers of Saint Ursula and of Saint Bridget: they must chant and cry night and day. There were as many resorts for pilgrims as there were mountains, forests, and valleys. But these penances might be compounded for with money. The people, therefore, brought to the convents and to the priests money and every thing that had any value—fowls, ducks, geese, eggs, wax, straw, butter, and cheese. Then the hymns resounded, the bells rang, incense filled the sanctuary, sacrifices were offered up, the larders overflowed, the glasses went round, and masses terminated and concealed these pious orgies. The bishops no longer preached, but they consecrated priests, bells, monks, churches, chapels, images, books, and cemeteries; and all this brought in a large revenue. Bones, arms, and feet were preserved in gold and silver boxes; they were given out during mass for the faithful to kiss, and this too was a source of great profit.

All these people maintained that the pope, "sitting as God in the temple of God,"¹ could not err, and they would not suffer any contradiction."²

In the church of All Saints at Wittenberg was shown a fragment of Noah's ark, some soot from the furnace of the Three

Children, a piece of wood from the cradle of Jesus Christ, some hair from the beard of St. Christopher, and nineteen thousand other relics of greater or less value. At Shaffhausen was exhibited the breath of St. Joseph that Nicodemus had received in his glove. In Wurtemberg you might meet a seller of indulgences, vending his merchandize, his head adorned with a large feather plucked from the wing of St. Michael.³ But it was not necessary to travel far in search of these precious treasures. Men who farmed the relics traversed the whole country, hawking them about the rural districts (as has since been the case with the Holy Scriptures), and carrying them to the houses of the faithful, to spare them the trouble and expense of a pilgrimage. They were exhibited with pomp in the churches. These wandering hawkers paid a stipulated sum to the owners of the relics,—a percentage on their profits. The kingdom of heaven had disappeared, and in its place a market of abominations had been opened upon earth.

Thus a spirit of profanity had invaded religion; and the holiest recollections of the Church, the seasons which more particularly summoned the faithful to holy mediation and love, were disgraced by buffoonery and heathenish profanation. The "Revels of Easter" held a distinguished place in the records of the Church. As the festival of the resurrection of Christ ought to be celebrated with joy, the preachers studied in their sermons everything that might raise a laugh among their hearers. One imitated the note of the cuckoo; another hissed like a goose. One dragged to the altar a layman robed in a monk's frock; a second related the most indecent stories; and a third recounted the tricks of St. Peter, and among others, how in a tavern he had cheated his host by not paying his reckoning.⁴ The lower clergy took advantage of this opportunity to ridicule their superiors. The churches were converted into a mere stage for mountebanks, and the priests into buffoons.

If such was the state of religion, what must have been the state of morals?

Undoubtedly the corruption was not at that time universal. Justice requires that this should not be forgotten. Nevertheless, the evil at this period wore a character and universality that it has not borne subsequently. And, above all, the mystery of iniquity desolated the holy places, as it has not been permitted to do since the days of the Reformation.

Morality had declined with the decline of faith. . . . The doctrine and the sale of indulgences were powerful incentives to evil among an ignorant people. True, according to the Church, indulgences could benefit those only who promised to amend their lives, and who kept their word. But what could be expected from a tenet invented solely with a view to the profit that might be derived from it? . . . All that the multitude saw in them was, that they permitted men to sin; and the merchants were not over eager to dissipate an error so favorable to their sale.

What disorders and crimes were committed in these dark ages, when impunity was to be purchased by money! What had man to fear, when a small contribution towards building a church secured

him from the fear of punishment in the world to come? What hope could there be of revival when all communication between God and man was cut off, and man, an alien from God, who is the spirit and the life, moved only in a round of paltry ceremonies and sensual observances, in an atmosphere of death!

The priests were the first who yielded to this corrupting influence. By desiring to exalt themselves they became abased. They had aimed at robbing God of a ray of his glory, and placing it in their own bosoms; but their attempt had proved vain, and they had only hidden there a leaven of corruption stolen from the power of evil. The history of the age swarms with scandals. In many places the people were delighted at seeing a priest keep a mistress, that the married women might be safe from his seductions.⁵ What humiliating scenes did the house of a pastor in those days present! The wretched man supported the woman and the children she had borne him with the tithes and offerings.⁶ His conscience was troubled: he blushed in the presence of the people, before his domestics, and before God. The mother, fearing to come to want if the priest should die, made provision against it beforehand, and robbed her own house. Her honor was lost. Her children were ever a living accusation against her. Despised by all, they plunged into quarrels and debauchery. Such was the family of the priest! . . . These were frightful scenes, by which the people knew how to profit.⁷

The rural districts were the scene of numerous disorders. The abodes of the clergy were often dens of corruption. Corneille Adrian at Bruges,⁸ the abbot Trinkler at Cappel,⁹ imitated the manners of the East, and had their harems. Priests, consorting with dissolute characters, frequented the taverns, played at dice, and crowned their orgies with quarrels and blasphemy.¹⁰

The council of Shaffhausen forbade the priests to dance in public, except at marriages, and to carry more than one kind of arms: they decreed also that all who were found in houses of ill-fame should be unfrocked.¹¹ In the archbishopric of Mentz, they scaled the walls by night and created all kinds of disorder and confusion in the inns and taverns, and broke the doors and locks.¹² In many places the priests paid the bishop a regular tax for the woman with whom he lived, and for each child he had by her. A German bishop said publicly one day, at a great entertainment, that in one year eleven thousand priests had presented themselves before him for that purpose. It is Erasmus who relates this.¹³

If we go higher in the hierarchical order, we find the corruption not less great. The dignitaries of the Church preferred the tumult of camps to the hymns of the altar. To be able, lance in hand, to reduce his neighbors to obedience, was one of the chief qualifications of a bishop.

¹ Nicol. De Clemangis, de Præsulib, Simoniacis.

² The words of Seb. Stor., pastor of Lichstall in 1534.

³ Füsslin Beytraege, ii, 224.

⁴ Metern, Nederl. Hist. viii.

⁵ Hottinger, Hist. Eccles. ix, 305.

⁶ Mandate of Hugo, Bishop of Constance, 3rd March, 1517.

⁷ Müller's Reliq., iii, 251.

⁸ Steubing, Gesch. der Nass. Oran. Lande.

⁹ Uno anno ad se delata undecim millia sacerdotum palam concubinariorum. Erasmi Opp. ix. 401.

¹ 2 Thess. 2:4.

² Myconius, History of the Reformation; and Seckendorf, History of Lutheranism.

³ Müller's Reliquien, vol. iii, p. 22.

⁴ Oecolampad, De Risu Paschali.

Are Sunday Laws Religious?

THE pendulum of public opinion which swung over our fair land, bringing us the glorious charter of our liberty, that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence, and our peerless Constitution, has already begun to swing backward to the Dark Ages, as is evidenced by the clamor of the clergy and of the church for Sunday laws and the enforcing of such laws where they do exist; and the courts, under the pressure of a real or supposed public opinion, declaring such laws constitutional, although they give one class of religionists an advantage over others, as stated in the decision of Judge Hammond in the celebrated King case. In this article I do not pose as the advocate or champion of *my* rights, or *my* religion, but to plead for *equal* rights of all men of every nation, color, and creed.

Are Sunday laws religious? I answer emphatically, Yes, from first to last.

Sunday is a religious day. It is so held by the majority of Christians and observed as such. They call it the Lord's day. Laws enforcing a religious institution must be religious laws. Hence, Sunday laws are religious.

Sunday is one of the days of the *week*. The week is not a natural division of time. There is nothing in nature to reveal or suggest it, or make it discoverable to the human mind. Hence it could not originate in the human mind, but must come to it by revelation from its Author. The Bible reveals the origin of the week, and the weekly cycle stands as an enduring and unshaken monument of the Creator's work and rest, as recorded in Genesis 1 and 2, before the fall of man, before he needed physical rest. Man's labors were to cease that he might worship, not rest from weariness or work or toil. Nature knows no Sabbath, and hence can reveal none.

Rest is not based on the physical constitution of the animal, vegetable or mineral kingdoms. It is solely and essentially religious in character, was instituted for worship, and the remembrance of God. It was made by the Creator for man and adapted to his religious nature; a time set apart for the cultivation and exercise of his spiritual nature. Hence rest was enjoined that he might be free for devotion and worship. Therefore, laws enforcing a weekly day of rest, grow out of, and are based on the religious character of the institution. Hence arises the serious question: What right has the State to enforce idleness upon the physical man, when it can furnish no employment or exercise for man's spiritual nature. The man who observes the weekly day of rest on religious grounds in obedience to the divine law, is furnished by its Author with employment and exercises adapted to the character of the day, and the needs of his spiritual nature. But when the State enforces rest from secular labor, and prohibits innocent amusements, it leaves the irreligious man without honest employment, and thus would foster vice and crime which are almost sure to follow in the wake of idleness.

Sunday laws are urged most zealously and persistently by church people and clergymen. This is a signal fact. Why? Because they regard Sunday as a sacred day and wish to secure it from desecration.

Some have changed tactics. Does change of name or title change the nature of the

institution? Does calling Sunday the civil Sabbath take away its religious character? Is it not religious still?

They aim to divert attention from the religious character of the day and the legislation they ask for it, by calling it the Civil Sabbath, the American Sabbath, the Weekly Independence Day, etc. All of a sudden they have become very patriotic. The nation will go to ruin unless Sunday is preserved as a day of rest and worship. If Sunday is the Christian Sabbath or the Lord's day, as they claim it is, why do they not appeal to the Lord to protect and preserve it, instead of appealing to the State? Do they have more faith in the power of the State than they have in the power of God? Our beloved country, with its free Constitution as our fathers framed it, without an established religion, with a complete separation of Church and State, stood forth as the prodigy of the nations; the freest, the richest, the grandest, the best.

The Declaration of Independence declares that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and this was a basic principle in our great Republic. This grand principle is now denied by a powerful church element, and the claim is set forth that the power is derived from God; hence the rulers must enforce the law of God; and thus a great American hierarchy is established on precisely the same theory which gave rise to the papacy with its Holy Inquisition and its horrible cruelties. The people were no worse then than now. When religionists have the power they will use it, whether they be Jews or Pagans, Protestant or Catholic, whether it be in the 9th or 19th century. For those who seek power will use it every time, and when they govern and rule for God, the enemies of God, the heretics, those who differ from them in faith, have to suffer under the grinding despotism of a gigantic religious monopoly or "Sacred Trust." (*Lincoln*). Beware of the danger that lurks in this movement for the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws.

Sunday-law advocates manifest a great interest and sympathy for the working-man. They set forth his sad condition in touching language; they talk of Sunday slavery under the pressure of grinding monopoly and soulless corporations. You would think to hear them talk that they had real love and sympathy for the laboring classes. But it is not so; their love is for Sunday. They expatiate on the evils of intemperance and their hostility to the Sunday saloon, but it is not so much because they hate the liquor traffic, as because they love Sunday.

When there is no law enforcing a day of rest, all are free to work or rest as they choose. Does one man's work hinder another man's rest? Our yearly Independence Day is one of privilege; we celebrate, we recreate, we rest or we work, as we choose, and no one is disturbed or shocked; and why? Because it is not a religious day, and there is no law to enforce its observance; hence it is a day of privilege for all as every truly American institution will be. Sunday will be a day of privilege when all classes of citizens, whether Christian or infidel, can labor or worship, rest or recreate, as they may choose, without a law compelling its observance in accordance with the demands of a class of religionists in deference to their religious principles.

Why do labor and amusements on that

day disturb and shock the sensibilities of a certain class? Because of the religious idea which they attach to the day. Hence laws enforcing rest and prohibiting secular labor and amusements, are laws in the interest of religion in response to the clamors of a religious class; therefore religious laws. Without Sunday laws, the observers of Sunday are just as free to rest or worship on Sunday as the observers of Saturday are to rest and worship on Saturday without Saturday laws. Why should not all religions, why should not all classes, be satisfied with absolute freedom and equality in the matters of rest and worship? When Sunday laws are passed and enforced at the clamor of Sunday-keepers, they have a "corner" in the religious market, and those not in the combine, who do not form a part of their "Sacred Trust," must suffer the consequences in fines, imprisonments and chain-gangs, as illustrated in Arkansas, Tennessee, Georgia and Maryland. Why should the non-Christians and the observers of the seventh day pay tribute to the religions of another class? How would the Sunday-law advocates regard a law enforcing rest on Saturday? With holy horror they would exclaim, "Religious persecution!" And yet they profess to be the followers of Him who taught "all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

But some generously propose to grant exemption from the operation of their Sunday laws to those who religiously observe some other day. Indeed, to exempt a religious class from the operations of a law, stamps it as a religious law and is a tacit admission that without such an exemption clause, it would be unjust and oppressive to that class. And further, if the State has a right to exempt a religious sect from the operation of a law, it has a right to repeal such exemption.

Then it is argued that the laboring man needs weekly rest for his health as a sanitary measure; and hence a Sunday rest law is needed. Can he not rest when he needs rest without forcing him to do it by a church hierarchy or a paternal government? Is not daily rest as essential to the health and as important as a sanitary measure as weekly rest for the wagger? Yes, indeed, far more essential and important. Then why do not the Sunday-law advocates clamor as vehemently for a law enforcing daily rest? Oh, simply because they are not interested in sanitary measures and the protection of the health of the poor working man, except as such measures harmonize beautifully with their religious faith and practice. Wonderful coincidence! I wonder if it has any significance.

The real ground or basis of Sabbath laws is religion; they may clothe them in secular dress, and give them civil titles, to deceive the unwary and quiet the fears of the people, but they are religious still, and would never have been thought of or clamored for if Sunday was not regarded as a sacred day. This conclusion is clear, logical and absolutely necessary when the facts are duly considered.

Sunday laws prohibit secular work and civil things. Is it possible to class honest labor and innocent amusements with murder and theft and adultery, as crimes against man and breaches of civility? Absurd! If they are crimes on Sunday, why are they not crimes on Monday? Why is labor adjudged wrong on Sunday? Simply because of the religious character

of the day, and Sunday laws have come down to us a heritage from the Church and State governments of the Old World, in which the idea prevailed that it was the duty of the State to foster and cherish religion and religious institutions for its own preservation.

It is a demonstrated truth that although the Church and the State has taken a Sabbath institution which requires rest for its proper observance, and labeled it civil and called it a sanitary measure, and enforced it avowedly in the interest of man's physical nature and the welfare of society, yet it still remains a religious institution. The Government by calling it civil, has not taken away its religious character. The character and nature of a bottle of poison is not changed by changing the label on it from "poison" to "food." A British coin with the image of the Queen on it would not become a United States coin by erasing the image and stamping an eagle upon it. No one would have the right to do such a thing. It would be a fraud and a counterfeit, because it would not be a United States coin although so stamped. So the Sabbath is a divine institution revealed alone in the Scriptures: hence religious in character. Therefore, for any human government to take it or its rival Sunday and stamp it civil and enforce it as a day of rest, is to usurp the place of God, and as a usurper exercise authority in enforcing a religious institution under the false and deceptive plea that it is civil because called so.

H. M. BROWN.

Religious Liberty Violated.

THERE is deplorable ignorance as to what constitutes religious liberty. To a large proportion of the human race, religious liberty means "the right to believe as I please, and to act accordingly." Others mistake religious toleration for liberty. Great Britain grants toleration, but not liberty or equality. France grants a larger degree of religious liberty, but still lays a tax upon every one, of whatever belief or unbelief, for the equal support of every form of religious worship whose professors ask for this State aid.

In not a few of our States religious liberty is grossly, wickedly, infamously violated, through abuse of what are called the Sunday laws. The International Religious Liberty Association, Battle Creek, Mich., publishes a pamphlet entitled, "Religious Persecution," from which we gather a few facts. At Springdale, Washington county, Ark., Elders Wellman and Scoles, Seventh-day Adventists, held meetings which resulted in the organization of a Seventh-day Adventist Church. Elder Scoles gratuitously painted the meeting-house, which was out of sight of all public roads.* On Sunday he did a small strip of painting. For this he was arrested and convicted. Mr. James, another Seventh-day Adventist, did some carpenter work on the house of a poor widow, as an act of charity. The widow was to be thrown out of the house in which she lived, and had no other shelter; so he worked in the rain on Sunday. He too was arrested and fined. He would have been imprisoned, but for the fine being paid by others. Mr. Armstrong, for working in his garden, was arrested and locked up in jail with another prisoner, with only a little straw and a blanket

about thirty inches wide for both of them. And all this time, Sunday trains were running, Sunday excursions were advertised, men and boys were shooting squirrels in the woods, without check. So eager were the prosecutors that men were arrested and fined and imprisoned when the alleged offense was committed *previous* to the enactment of the law.

In Tennessee Sunday gaming and shooting have not been interfered with, but when a lawless mob fired into a congregation of Sabbath Adventists, the crime went unnoticed. Men cut their wheat and rafted logs on Sunday, untouched by the law, but those who had conscientiously observed their Sabbath were put into the chain gang. From the windows of the jail where they were confined, on Sunday they saw a train load of workmen passing in the streets not thirty feet from the jail, going out to work. We have already spoken of the case of William B. Capps of Weakley County, Tenn. He says: "During my imprisonment I saw work done on Sunday that was followed every other day in the week. Bees were killed and hauled through the town to the place of sale. Dry goods were sold." *The American Hebrew* of New-York made a plea for Mr. Capps, and raised money among the Hebrews for the payment of his fine, whereupon he was released. Similar persecutions have occurred in Maryland and Georgia. A similar case occurred in western Pennsylvania. A few years ago a Seventh-day Baptist deacon, who had run a cultivator through his corn on Sunday, and had worked his planing-mill, far from any habitation and from any place of worship, was arrested, imprisoned and fined.


All these are in violation of the principle of religious liberty, which is that the State takes no cognizance whatever of any one's religion or lack of religion—that the State has nothing to do with religion, except to see that no one's religious rights are interfered with. No one under whatever guise has a right to disturb the Sunday worship of his neighbors. No one has a right, on Sunday, to go through the streets with a band of music, or to cry his wares; but any work done that day that does not interfere with the rights of others, is utterly out of the proper reach of the law.

It is amazing how good people fail to understand what are the principles in this matter. At the last quarterly meeting of the Philadelphia Ministers' Union the writer proposed a resolution to the effect that the Pennsylvania Sunday law of 1794 should not be used for the violation of religious liberty in the case of quiet and conscientious citizens, who having observed the seventh day as a day of rest and worship, perform on the first day of the week such labor as does not interfere with the religious rights of their fellow-citizens. This resolution was opposed by one speaker on the ground that it was very dangerous to open the door at all, or in the least to relax the requirements of the law; by another, on the ground that very few cases of hardship occurred under the law; and by another, on the ground that if this resolution were adopted, it would be necessary also to exempt those who observe Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or any other day of the week. At last a master stroke was effected. A member called the attention of the chairman to the fact that the hour of adjournment had already passed, and thereupon the chairman ruled that the body was no longer in

session. It is this sort of thing that brings reproach upon Christianity. It is just such religious persecution as would make the Lord's day an offense.—*The Examiner and National Baptist*, New York, Jan. 31, 1895.

"I AM SURPRISED,"

Says Prof. E. A. Sheldon, President of the New York State Normal School, Oswego, "that so much that is valuable for one to know is brought into so small a compass, and sold for so small a price." Yes,



The NEW WEBSTER DICTIONARY and COMPLETE VEST-POCKET LIBRARY

is full of happy surprises.

It successfully combines in one small volume of vest-pocket size,

- A Dictionary of 45,800 words,
- A Complete Parliamentary Manual, (Based on Roberts' and Cushing's)
- A Literary Guide, etc.

FOR THE VEST POCKET OR THE WRITING DESK.

Simple, - - Handy, - - Reliable.

Just what everybody needs for every-day use. DO NOT DELAY TO ORDER. Sent post-paid as follows:—

- FINE SILK CLOTH, Red edges, - - - 25 cents.
- MOROCCO, Gold edges, - - - 50 cents.
- EXTRA MOROCCO, With Perpetual Memorandum, Three-Years Calendar, Stamp Holder, etc., - - - 60 cents.

All three styles are indexed.

—ADDRESS—
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
43 Bond St., New York City.

History of the Doctrine of the Soul, among all races and peoples, ancient and modern, including theologians, philosophers, scientists, and untutored aborigines, carefully brought down to the present time. 136 pp., 12mo., 75 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 BOND STREET,
New York City.

The Grand Trunk Railway OF CANADA

AND THE

Chicago & Grand Trunk Railway

Form the GREAT THROUGH LINE to all Points in the West,

AND OFFER TO THE TRAVELING PUBLIC THE ADVANTAGE OF THROUGH TRAINS WITHOUT TRANSFER, AND A VIEW OF

THE ST. CLAIR TUNNEL,

"THE LINK THAT BINDS TWO GREAT NATIONS."

It is the greatest submarine tunnel in the world, extending from Port Huron, Mich., under the St. Clair River to Sarnia, Ontario, and connecting the Grand Trunk Railway System of Canada with the Chicago & Grand Trunk Railway. It has just been completed at a cost of \$2,700,000.

The tunnel proper is a continuous iron tube, nineteen feet and ten inches in diameter, and 6025 feet, or more than a mile, long. The length of the approaches, in addition to the tunnel proper, is 5603 feet, making all told a little over two miles.

Trains of the Grand Trunk and Chicago & Grand Trunk Railways are hauled through this tunnel by engines specially constructed for the purpose. They are said to be the largest engines in the world. The entire weight of the engine and tender rests upon ten drive-wheels. The weight of one of these monster engines in actual service is found to be approximately one hundred tons.

N. J. POWER, G. P. & T. A. C. & G. T. Ry.,
G. P. A. Grand Trunk Ry., Montreal, Canada.
W. E. DAVIS, G. P. & T. A. C. & G. T. Ry.,
Chicago, Ill.

FRANK P. DWYER,
Eastern Passenger Agent, G. T. Ry.,
271 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY.

* The work, not the building, was out of sight of all public roads.—EDS. SENTINEL.



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 7, 1895.

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, "Religious Liberty Violated," on page 47 of this paper. All honor to the *Examiner* and its courageous editor.

OUR illustrated issue of January 17 has had a most encouraging sale. We have sent out one hundred and twenty-five thousand copies. Once more we call attention to this valuable number. Order before the fifteenth of February. This is the "third and last call."

It is positively stated that the pope has determined to make an appeal to the Anglican Church, and will summon the Catholic bishops of Nottingham, Salford and Southwick to Rome to consult with him in regard to a plan of reunion between the English and Roman churches.

REFERENCE was made in these columns last week to a very remarkable and significant movement recently inaugurated in Bay City, Mich. The *Detroit Free Press* of January 21 gives some additional particulars, as follows:—

A second informal meeting of the clergymen of Bay City and West Bay City was held in the parlors of the First Presbyterian Church this morning at 10 o'clock. There were nine ministers and six priests present. Since the meeting last Monday an effort has been made to get more of the Protestant ministers out, but the success in that respect was not encouraging. It is expected, however, before the next meeting more of them will wheel into line and work with those who are already in the movement. It is a matter of surprise that certain prominent clergymen have not attended the meetings. Everything was harmonious this morning. An earnest desire was expressed that all clergymen in both cities attend the next meeting to be held in the vestry of Trinity Church Saturday morning at 10 o'clock. At this meeting some definite arrangements looking to a realization of the objects which gave rise to the Christian unity movement will be settled upon.

The "object" is stated to be not "church union," but "Christian unity." That is, not organic union but union of influence; not a union upon truth but a union of error. But the word of the Lord is, "Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary."

The priests and the popular preachers are alarmed because their influence is waning. They have lost the power of the gospel, and instead of seeking by humble repentance to recover this, they confederate themselves together that they may by

united action secure for themselves the power of the State; thus not the Lord but the State is their sanctuary. Truly, "Babylon is fallen"!

THE House Committee on Indian Affairs has recommended that the appropriation for sectarian schools be diminished 20 per cent. annually for the next five years, and after that discontinued entirely.

Now that the House Committee on Indian Affairs has recommended that the Government discontinue the policy of appropriating money for sectarian schools, we will be able to test the power of the papacy in American politics.

THE Roman Catholic Church bitterly opposes the present attempt to cut off Government appropriations for the Indian schools. Even the pope is watching the struggle with intense interest. Bishop Keane relates that the pope received the news of the last failure to dislodge the Catholics from the United States treasury with great satisfaction.

WE are informed that warrants will soon be issued upon the twenty indictments found against Seventh-day Adventists at Graysville, Tenn., for Sunday work, and that probably the cases will be called for trial at the March term of the Circuit Court of Rhea County. It has been suggested however that these cases can be compromised by the Adventists paying a part of the costs. But as Adventists, like Baptists of old, choose to suffer imprisonment rather than compromise the principle at stake, we may expect to see the State authorities surrender, or enter upon the work of imprisoning a whole church of peaceable, industrious Christians.

THE papal encyclical of January 6th, briefly commented upon on the first page of this paper, is the most remarkable production of the kind in modern times. It shows more clearly than anything else could, the real purpose of Rome concerning the United States and the world. It is specially significant in view of previous utterances. In 1885, in an encyclical addressed especially to the Roman Catholics of the United States, Leo XIII. said:—

All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate, wherever possible, in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert the utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usages of liberty from going beyond the limits of God's fixed laws. [The laws of the Roman Catholic Church.] All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled in the principles of the true church.

In his latest encyclical the pope tells plainly what "the principles of the true church" are as concerns the relations of Church and State. The two encyclicals in effect command American Catholics to do all in their power to bring about in

the United States such a union of Church and State as will give the Roman Catholic Church "the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority." But after all the gravest danger that threatens our free institutions is from Protestants who have proved recreant to their principles, and who, by invoking in behalf of the Church the influence and power of the State, have mightily strengthened the hands of the papacy in its assaults upon American principles.

THE *Evangelist* (Presbyterian), in commenting on the pope's encyclical, says that "it needs but a superficial comparison of the Roman Catholic Church in America with that in European States to show that the spirit of that church in this country is essentially different from the traditional spirit as exemplified in France, or Austria, or Italy, or Ireland." The *Evangelist* is quite right; only a superficial, a very superficial, comparison, would show this difference. The Roman Catholic Church is a unit the world over; what she is in France, Austria, Italy, Ireland, or even in Spain, she is in spirit and purpose in America.

"VICK'S FLORAL GUIDE" for 1895 has reached our table, and as usual brings with it a ray of sunshine, the scent of flowers and a breath of summer, even in the depth of winter. As in former years, the "Guide" is sent to any address for ten cents, which sum is deducted from the first order for seeds, so that the "Guide" is really free to all of Vicks' customers, no matter how small their orders may be. The Vicks are well-known and reliable and need no recommendation from us. Their customers are sure of receiving good seeds and honorable treatment. If you are in any way interested in growing either flowers or vegetables, you can scarcely do better than to so send ten cents to Vick's Sons, Rochester, N. Y., for a copy of the "Floral Guide."

VOLUME III. of the *Religious Liberty Library* has reached our table. Like Vols. I. and II., it is a book of about five hundred pages, neatly and substantially bound in cloth, with gilt letters. The three volumes now out contain all the numbers of the *Library* from 1 to 26 inclusive, and are indeed a religious liberty library. Everybody ought to have these volumes. They sell for 75 cents each. Address, International Religious Liberty Association, Battle Creek, Mich.

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.