



"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."

Vol. 10. No. 49.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 12, 1895.

Price, 3 cents.

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,
CALVIN F. BOLLMAN,
LEON A. SMITH,

EDITORS.

ASSISTANT EDITOR.

THE RUIN OF THE STATE.

WE considered last week the inevitable outcome of the movement now in progress in our land to unite religion, as represented by religious organizations, with politics, as affecting the interests of the Church. It was shown that that outcome must be the ruin of the Church. If we consider its bearing upon the State, we shall find it to be equally fraught with ruin.

When the Church becomes a political power, and when by her immense influence and her vote she shall dictate what men shall be chosen to positions of representative office, and what legislation shall be passed in the "interests of morality and religion," then will this Government have ceased to be "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and will have become a religious despotism not different in kind from any of those which were the scourges of mankind during the Dark Ages.

Honesty in public office is a prime requisite of good government; but when hypocritical men fill the Church and pose as moral reformers to secure her aid for the furtherance of their ambitions, then will official integrity, none too prevalent under the best conditions, rapidly disappear from our land. The tremendous power of the Church will appeal irresistibly to unprincipled seekers for official trust, and greatly stimulate the flow of human depravity through the channels of public life.

But that which will most surely work the ruin of the State, is the stifling of human liberty which must result from such an alliance with the Church. For the very purpose of the Church in seeking to control the State power is to put down all opposition to herself. Of course, she does this for the "benefit" of mankind, but history furnishes many a terrible warning against the kind of "benefit"

to be derived in that way. The aims and motives of the church leaders in this matter may be very good, but all history plainly shows that no church can with safety to human liberty be entrusted with civil power. Considering the frailty and the limitations of our nature, it is evident that the most pious and upright man upon the earth to-day could not safely be entrusted with secular power to promote the religious welfare of his fellows, even were it possible, and in harmony with the divine plan, that Christianity should be established in the earth by force.

It was, seemingly, a very good and pious motive which moved Augustine, in the earlier days of the Church, to inaugurate that which resulted directly in the establishment of the Inquisition. That motive he himself stated, with his justification of the same, thus:—

It is, indeed, better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to the Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain the highest grade of religious development.¹

Of this the Church historian, Neander, says:—

It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition.²

And still in the minds of many men to-day there exists this baleful "germ" within which, like the oak in the acorn, is contained the "whole system" of that hellish institution of the Middle Ages. It only waits for conditions favorable to its growth, and these will be supplied as soon as the religious and civil powers shall have come to an agreement. The idea that the civil law, with its pains and penalties, while not the best means of leading sinners to righteousness, is still a method not to be neglected, has a large following in this nineteenth century and in these United States.

Religion affects human nature at its fountain head. It touches the most deeply-lying springs of desire and emotion. Let it be

sought to dominate these by force, and human nature is roused to its utmost, and becomes imbued with the spirit of the martyrs. On the other hand, let the bigot become conscious that civil power reposes in his hands for the propagation of morality, and the temptation to use it to enforce his own religious belief upon others, is too great for him to resist. The fervent Roman Catholic who would care but little about the succession of earthly rulers or any possible variations within the sphere of civil or political affairs, considered by themselves, would give his life to see the world become Catholic; and the same might be said of the Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Baptist of our own land. Men will endure more and attempt more in the cause of their religion, than in any other. All history testifies that this is so.

Men will recognize the propriety of human laws to regulate the outward conduct of individuals, so far as may be necessary for the preservation of their common rights; they will sustain such laws and such government, and only the anarchist and the vicious person will plot against them. But when it is known that the machinery of the civil power has been placed at the disposal of the highest or most powerful bidder in the religious world, and when the religious organizations shall be grasping for that power and employing such portions of it as they can command against those they desire to suppress, then will there be plotting and sedition, confusion and strife, upon every side. And then will human liberty cease to find stable support in earthly government, and become again the plaything of chance.

This nation has been greatly prospered in her short but imposing career as the champion of civil and religious freedom. The eyes of the world have been upon her land as a place of refuge and rest for the oppressed of other lands. And when she shall withdraw those guarantees of liberty which have drawn all nations to her shores, and shall take the lead in the work of oppression, the cause of liberty will be given a wound from which it will not recover.

By exchanging her civil power with the Church for the latter's spiritual power, by making an alliance with the forces of religion as represented by the predominant bodies of Christendom, this nation will proceed upon

¹ Schaff, "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, sec. 27, par. 12.

² "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. 2, Sec. 2, div. 1, last par.

the principles which prevailed in the Dark Ages, and made of civil government a religious despotism, crushing liberty and arresting human progress; and a like despotism will be the result in our land. But there will be some features not seen in the despotisms of those days, for great and rapid changes have taken place in the religious world, and new forces have arisen which will be heard from in the contest for supremacy. At this point let us note some predictions contained in the writings of prophecy. In the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, beginning at verse 11, we find a prophetic outline of the work of a power which was to be prominent in the last days, as follows:—

And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men; and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword and did live.

This power is to work "great wonders" in the sight of men; and there is a modern wonder-working agency which had its origin and has attained its greatest development in the United States; namely, Spiritualism,—a religion, based upon what purport to be communications between the living and the dead, and whose fundamental doctrine,—that of the inherent immortality of the soul,—is held by nearly all Christendom. As the dead are supposed to know a great deal more and to possess such greater powers than do the living, it is quite natural that intercourse with them should result in the manifestation of "wonders,"—of phenomena beyond our human powers and comprehension.

The culmination of all this is to be reached in the visible performance of "miracles," and especially in the great wonder of bringing "fire down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men." The words take us mentally back to the days of the prophet Elijah, to that memorable occasion when he appeared before all Israel on the top of Mount Carmel. A great controversy was in progress,—a great question was to be decided; namely, Who was the true God, Jehovah? or Baal? We quote from the narrative given in the eighteenth chapter of 1 Kings:—

And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word. Then said Elijah unto the people, I, even I only, remain a prophet of the Lord; but Baal's prophets are four hundred and fifty men. Let them therefore give us two bullocks; and let them choose one bullock for themselves, and cut it in pieces, and lay it on wood, and put no fire under: and I will dress the other bullock, and lay it on wood, and put no fire under. And call ye on the name of your gods, and I will call on the name of the Lord; and the God that answereth by fire, let him be God. And all the people answered and said, It is well spoken.³

So the people did as Elijah said, and the prophets of Baal danced and shouted all day around the bullock on the altar of Baal, and called upon him, and cut themselves with knives; but "there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded." Then Elijah repaired the altar of the Lord, which was broken down, and arranged the sacrifice upon it. "And it came to pass at the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that Elijah the prophet came near, and said, Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel,

and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word. Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again. Then the fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the burnt sacrifice, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench. And when all the people saw it, they fell on their faces; and they said, The Lord, he is God; the Lord, he is God."⁴

Thus was decided at that time the question whether Jehovah or Baal was the true God. But that was not the final end of the controversy. A like controversy is agitating the religious world to-day; *the same question is again before the people*; for while nothing is now heard about "Baal," the religious world is full of a false worship which is in essence the Baal worship of old. "Baal" was a title, not a specific name, and its meaning was "lord" or "possessor," in the language of the ancient idolatrous Canaanites. But there is a particular feature of that idolatry, or Baal worship, which demands our notice. We quote the words of an authority upon this point:—

Baal is, without doubt, a sun-god. . . . He is very frequently called Baal Chamman; and Chamman, "hot," is applied to the sun in Hebrew. So, also, Baalbek was called by the Greeks Heliopolis (city of the sun). It is also noticeable that the Greeks and Romans identified Melkart, the Baal of Tyre, with Hercules (Hercules) the sun-god. At Beth Shemesh (the sun-temple) was there an altar to Baal: and it does not militate against this identification when Baal and the sun are distinguished as separate divinities (2 Kings 23:5); for Apollon was originally a sun-god, but afterward was distinguished from the sun.⁵

Baal worship was "lord" worship, in the form—principally at least—of homage paid to the sun. In other words, they worshiped a god of whom they knew only what is expressed by the title "lord," and of whom the sun was the visible representation. The sun, as chief luminary of the heavens, became naturally the chief objective of heathen worship. There was "the venerable day of the sun," to which the Emperor Constantine referred in his notable edict given A. D. 321, while not even professedly a Christian, enjoining rest by those in towns and cities on Sunday. As the knowledge of the true God became lost, his worship became perverted; and there is no difference between perverted or false worship and the worship of a false god. The worship of Jehovah must be "in spirit and in truth."⁶ The Saviour said, "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."⁷

The Israelites in the time of Elijah had in great measure lost the knowledge of the true God, and had drifted naturally into the worship of Baal.

There is an institution which points men to the true God, the Creator of heaven and earth. That institution is the "Sabbath of the Lord," which is enjoined upon all men by the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. That commandment says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work." And the reason is given, "for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."⁸

But the great majority of those who profess the Christian religion are observers not of the

seventh day, but of "the venerable day of the sun," albeit they allege for it a professedly Christian reason. But "reasons" count for nothing in justification of worship unless they are given by God himself; and nowhere does his Word furnish us with a reason or command for making Sunday the Sabbath.

There is now a conflict, the sound of which is everywhere heard, between the true Sabbath and the false, between the day of the Lord and the day of the sun; and this conflict is fast growing in intensity. There is a question which has been forced upon the attention of statesmen and politicians and the public generally, until it is now almost the leading question of the day, and that is the question of sabbath (Sunday) observance. And this controversy, this question, constitute nothing else than the old issue which in Elijah's day took the form of a contest between Jehovah and Baal. For Sunday observance, while professedly a tribute to Christ, is in reality a tribute to that god in whose worship Sunday observance had its origin. And that observance being but a commandment of men, resting only on tradition, can have no place in the worship of the true God, however worthy the motives of those who engage in it.

The State is now beginning to take part in this religious controversy. Already Congress has voted (August, 1892) that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the Christian Sabbath; and while the vote was pending, Senator Quay called for and had read before the Senate the fourth commandment, and Senator Hawley and others made speeches calculated to impress the Senate with the idea that such a vote was a matter of divine obligation upon them.

The State and the Church are fast forming an alliance, by which the Church is to give the State her vote and political influence, in return for legislation which she asks; and what she asks most loudly and persistently is legislation to secure the observance of Sunday.

The seventh-day Sabbath is stated by God himself to be his "sign" between him and his people. "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between Me and you, *that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.*" Eze. 20:20. The observers of God's Sabbath point to that observance as the evidence that they are worshipers of the true God. But Sunday observers also claim to be worshipers of the true God. Thus the issue is drawn, and the question of which class are worshipers of the true God is up again for settlement.

But not now, as anciently, will it be decided by the miracle of bringing down fire from heaven; for miracles will be wrought in support of error and for the purpose of deceiving "them that dwell on the earth" into supporting and enforcing the first-day sabbath, and to supply the lack of evidence for the Sunday institution in the Word of God. And among other such "proofs," will be the miracle described in Rev. 13:13.

Let it be noticed also that Spiritualism is not the only religious power which claims to exhibit wonders through the agency of the dead. The papal church stands conspicuous in making a like claim. She points to many miracles claimed to have wrought by her dead "saints" and certain "relics" of the dead which she places at times on exhibition. And no reader of current news can have failed to note the marked revival of superstition and of belief in the supernatural which is taking place as the result of these exhibitions and claims, and of the work of individuals who manifest what seems to be miraculous powers of healing, and the like.

With all this the State will join itself in an alliance with the forces of religion. There

³ Verses 36-39.

⁴ Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Art. Baal.

⁵ John 4:24.

⁷ Matt. 15:9.

⁸ See Ex. 20:8-11.

¹ 1 Kings 18: 21-24.

will be not only a union with the papacy, but with this wonder-working power of recent development in the spiritual domain. So that not only will there be the religious despotism resulting from the adoption of papal principles, but this will be reinforced by the tremendous influence upon the public mind of miracles wrought for the support of its evil doctrines and demands. In this miracle-working power is introduced the direct agency of the devil; and with these forces united for the enforcement of religious legislation and the extermination of religious and civil liberty, the State will be plunged into ruin as utter and complete as the devil himself can make it.

Will the State draw back from the proposed Church alliance and avert the threatening ruin? To this end we work and plead.

A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION.

WHILE so much is being said and done in nearly every State of the Union to turn back the tide of human progress in liberty of thought and practice toward the religious despotism of the Dark Ages, it is pleasant to note here and there a break in the current, which gives evidence that the principles of religious freedom still live in the hearts of men, and that many minds in high stations are still bent toward that human liberty which was the goal of the efforts of our forefathers. Such an incident was the recent passage by the Georgia House, of the following resolution, introduced by Representative Hurst:—

Resolved by the House, the Senate concurring, That any movement either in this State or in the United States tending towards a union of Church and State is deprecated and condemned, and in our opinion is contrary to the principles of our government and the Constitution of the same.

This resolution was introduced in the Georgia legislature two years ago, and has been carefully fostered by its promoters ever since. It passed the House by a good majority, which result is believed to be largely due to the influence of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, which has been regularly supplied to the members during the past year.

It is to be hoped that this action by the Georgia House, with the check recently put upon Sunday prosecutions in Tennessee, will do something to stem the tide of religious persecution, temporarily at least, in that section of our country.

YOUR RIGHT TO THINK.

AN individual's right to think is inseparable from his right to act in accordance with the dictates of his best judgment and of his conscience. If he has no right thus to act, he has no right to think.

By this it is not meant that an individual's proper liberty in this respect is unlimited. No person has any right, under the plea of liberty, to invade the rights of another. Rights do not conflict. When a person's liberty, so-called, would lead him to encroach upon the rights of his neighbors, he has passed from the sphere of liberty to that of license; he has passed beyond the domain of his own rights, and beyond what reason or necessity require of any individual.

But there is a sphere of natural individual rights, which we cannot too carefully consider. "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty,

and the pursuit of happiness." These are the rights of every individual. Governments are instituted to preserve these rights, but not to prescribe the manner of their exercise. In other words, the civil government is not instituted to do the thinking for individuals. Our Government is supposed to be a government of the people and by the people, as much as for the people. Its actions should represent the thought of the people.

God himself, who is all-powerful and all-wise, does not invade any person's liberty of thought. He it is who has given each one the power, and with it the right, to think for himself. But power and liberty of thought would be a curse rather than a blessing without the accompanying right to carry that thought into execution. An individual judgment and a conscience would, without that right, be but the means of torture to their possessor. It is not for such a purpose that a loving and all-wise Creator has thus endowed the human mind.

God will neither compel man's mind, nor relieve it of the necessity of action; and he has not delegated to any lesser being the right to do that from which he himself abstains. The Creator wants *men* in his world that he has made, not automatons or slaves. He wants virtue, honesty, and all the traits of true manliness, and not imbecility. Therefore he wants his creatures to think, and think for themselves, and has given them minds in order that they may think, and that they may act for themselves as well. He who ceases to act for himself will soon cease to think for himself, and he who does not think for himself is fit only to become the inmate of some institution of charity.

When we surrender the right to act for ourselves in all matters which do not involve a violation of the rights of others, we logically surrender our right to think. Reader, are you ready to make this surrender?

TURNING ON THE SCREWS.

It is evident that neither the recent political victory of Tammany nor the experience of a period of strict enforcement of the New York Sunday "law," has weakened the intention of the present city government to proceed the full length of the statute in the direction of enforced Sunday observance. Commissioner Roosevelt's threat that should Tammany win at the polls, he would turn the screws (of Sunday legislation) on harder than ever, is in process of execution.

The situation at present is outlined by the following, published in the *Mail and Express*, of Nov. 30:—

In consequence of the decision of Judge Allison, in General Sessions on Tuesday, when he dismissed an indictment against Peter Peiser, a delicatessen dealer, of 1361 Third ave., who had been arrested for selling sausage on Sunday, there has been some doubt as to what course the police would pursue in enforcing the Sunday law.

Acting Chief Conlin to-day made a plain statement regarding the matter. He said: "In the case of the man Peiser, I understand the indictment was dismissed because the evidence was weak. I shall enforce the Sunday law just the same as before. Bakeries and delicatessen stores can sell up to 10 o'clock in the forenoon. After that hour they cannot sell anything excepting prepared food to be eaten on the premises. There are many bakeries where light lunches are served, like coffee and cake. In these places there will be no police interference after 10 o'clock, providing what they sell is not carried away, but eaten right there.

"The situation is the same regarding delicatessen stores. They can sell until 10 o'clock A. M., but after that if they sell any prepared food it must be consumed in the place. If they sell goods to be taken away after 10 o'clock, they will be arrested for violating the Sunday law. Section 267 of the Penal Code

is very plain and covers the point. It says that all manner of public selling or offering for sale of any property on Sunday is prohibited, except that articles of food may be sold and supplied at any time before 10 o'clock in the morning, and except also that meals may be sold to be eaten on the premises where sold or served elsewhere by caterers. The captains have instructions to enforce the Sunday law under the provisions of this act."

The "law" is to be enforced a step at a time; and its demands having been secured on one point, attention will be given to the next in the logical sequence of Sunday enforcement. But where will the process end? Doubtless the logical end of this crusade is not discernible to most of those engaged in it, perhaps not to any; but we may learn from Scripture what it will be. The culmination of the process of the restriction of buying and selling, by the force of popular deference to that institution to which the papacy—the apocalyptic "beast,"—points as the sign of her authority,—the Sunday sabbath, is thus foretold: "And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that *no man might buy or sell*, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." Rev. 13: 16, 17.

At present the general public are rather slow to see the propriety and reasonableness of the demands of the Sunday statute, and very naturally so, since neither reason nor justice affords a foundation for such legislation. Indeed, the features of the "law" strongly remind one of the ancient Jewish legislation on the Sabbath question, by which they loaded the Sabbath institution with numberless requirements and distinctions altogether without support in either reason or revelation. But what they produced was simply the result of human legislation concerning an institution with which no human power has any business to meddle. Their work—the pharisaical sabbath—stands as a type of the product of human legislation upon Sabbath observance.

But in process of time—and that not long—public sentiment will doubtless acquiesce in the various proceedings required by the anomalous features of the Sunday statutes; and when once such proceedings become the custom, few people with whom they do not interfere will stop to ask whether they are reasonable or just. The Sunday Juggernaut is in motion, and is designed to crush all such as will not pay homage to the institution of the "beast."

A SUMMONS UNDER THE "CIVIL" SUNDAY "LAW."

WE have received from A. O. Burrill, the Adventist Elder at Chatham, Ont., a copy of the summons served upon him, Nov. 29, by the civil authorities for working on Sunday. It reads thus:—

SUMMONS TO DEFENDANT.

Canada: Province of Ontario, County of Kent.

To A. O. Burrill, of the Township of Chatham, in the County of Kent.

WHEREAS, you have this day been charged before the undersigned, Geo. A. Watson, a justice of the peace, in and for the said County of Kent, for that you on the third day of November, A. D. 1895, at the Township of Chatham, in the County of Kent, did exercise worldly labor, being the Lord's day (the sabbath day), by working at the carpenter and mason work.

These are therefore to command you, in her Majesty's name, to be and appear before me on Thursday the fifth day of December, A. D. 1895, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, at the Old Town Hall, Ridgeway, or before such other justice or justices of the peace for the same County of Kent as shall be there, to answer

to the said charge and to be further dealt with according to law. Herein fail not.

Given under my hand and seal this twenty-second day of November, in the year 1895, at Ridgetown, in the county aforesaid.

GEO. A. WATSON, J. P.

Mr. Burrill adds: "We were at work erecting a new church building at Darrell. The Methodists, who have a church building about one mile away, formed a league and appointed a committee to watch us and lay complaints, which they did." The reader will see that Pastor Burrill's violation of the Sunday statute was of a very aggravating nature,—assisting in the erection of what the Methodists regarded as a rival house of worship. The reader will also observe that this summons affords clear(?) evidence of the purely civil nature of the Sunday statute. Yet the law-enforced Sunday is just as much a civil institution in Canada, as it is in the United States.

Our next issue will probably contain a report of the trial of Mr. Burrill and three other members of the Adventist Church of Darrell, who are under similar arrest.

THE A. P. A.

THE purpose of the A. P. A., in so far as it means the preservation of American civil freedom and American civil institutions from the encroachments of religious bigotry, is a worthy one; but the methods of the organization cannot be commended. As an illustration of the latter we notice the following press report of recent A. P. A. work in a Kentucky town:—

The emissaries of the A. P. A. have been successful in re-introducing religious services in the public schools at Bellevue, Ky. The motion was a surprise to the majority of the school board, and though many protested against it, when the time to vote came, in addition to Rev. Chas. M. Gallimore, who introduced the motion, and Mr. Burgdorf who seconded it, Messrs. Peacock and Vance voted in favor of it, leaving Mr. Mayer's vote the only dissenting one. When those in favor of the sectarian resolution were asked about the motive of their action, they said: "We did it to annoy the Catholics and keep their children away from the schools."

No good can come from such methods of work. No good can come from opposing evil with evil; no success can come from fighting the devil with fire. When Rome's methods are used to oppose her, Rome will gain the victory.

There is but one way to overcome evil, and that is, "Overcome evil with good." That is the rule laid down in the Word of God. Do not fight the devil with fire, but oppose him with that inspired Word. Thus it was that the Saviour of the world opposed and conquered him; and it is very sure that weak, erring mortals of this day cannot successfully meet him otherwise. The Word of God is all-powerful, and therefore nothing can stand against it.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL exists for the purpose of opposing the encroachments of Rome, and also of Romanized Protestantism, upon the liberties and rights of the people. It wishes the American Constitution preserved as it came to us from our honored ancestors of the days of Washington, Madison, and Jefferson. It wishes American institutions to be maintained as bequeathed to us by those forefathers, disconnected from all religious questions and considerations. It wishes to see maintained the principle which has found its fullest national expression in our land, of the separation of Church and State. And to this end it is opposing error with the truth, both as found in the Scriptures of truth and in those eternal principles of right and justice

which were implanted in the heart of man by his Creator.

In adopting the methods of Rome, the A. P. A. is in reality, though unwittingly, playing into Rome's hands; for thereby Rome's methods are justified, and whenever this is done Rome's hands are strengthened. We regret most deeply the waste of an amount of energy and effort which might, rightly directed, do much to stay the rapid encroachments now being made upon that liberty which is the birthright of all men.

MEANING OF THE OATH OF OFFICE.

[By Addison Blakely, Ph. D., Lecturer in Political Science and History, University of Chicago.]

It is an important political fact that our free Government with its Constitution and Declaration of Rights is the result of a hundred struggles for freedom and a century of battles for liberty. Never did a generation pass but what the authorities in control have attempted either to infringe upon or to override the rights of the people. Treason has been a cloak to shield a myriad of governmental crimes. When the Constitution was adopted it had yet been scarce a hundred years since Rev. John James, a Seventh-day Baptist preacher of England, had been hanged, drawn and quartered for his "treasonable" ideas in opposition to the religious views of the persons then having charge of the State. Not only that, but "after he was dead, his heart was taken out and burned, his quarters were affixed to the gates of the city, and his head was set up in Whitechapel on a pole opposite the alley in which his meeting-house stood."*

The Constitution of the United States, for the purpose of preventing any such crimes against opponents of Sunday laws or others in America, very wisely provided that "treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." The enthusiastic Sundayist, no matter how many statutes he may use to throw Sabbatarians in jail, has been stripped of one of his most important weapons of the past.

But the Constitution goes further. It exacts of every official,—legislative, executive, and judicial,—an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, any "law" or statute to the contrary notwithstanding. It imposes this oath not only upon the judge who applies the law to the case before the court, but it imposes the oath upon every officer through whose hands any accused person may go. Any member of the legislature who knowingly votes for an unconstitutional Sunday bill, any officer who wittingly arrests a person under an unconstitutional Sunday statute, or any justice who understandingly condemns one under such a "law," is a violator of his oath of office and a perjurer before God and the law. The law attempts to protect all in their equal rights, and it attempts to throw around each person ample Constitutional safeguard. It is therefore that every person delegated to enforce the law in any position, high or low, swears to support the Constitution.

The provisions concerning the oath of office under the United States are as follows:—

The senators and representatives before-mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by

oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

The oath of office in the State of Illinois is as follows:—

I do solemnly swear (or affirm, as the case may be) that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the State of Illinois, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of ——— according to the best of my ability.

It should be noticed that his oath of office binds him to support only the Constitutions. All obligations resting upon him he derives from that document. He can receive no power or authority of any kind whatever from any statute or pretended law not made in pursuance of that high authority. And as he is bound to the best of his ability to carry out his oath, he is constitutionally bound to the best of his ability to judge whether he is obeying the Constitution when he is called upon to enforce some statute, or execute some act in connection with the office which he holds.

In other words, the very purpose of this oath of office was to make the Constitution supreme. In the first place, every member of the legislature swears to support the Constitution, and in voting for what law shall be, is bound to vote only in harmony with the supreme law. But legislatures have, in the past, usurped authority, and therefore the Constitution, in the second place, exacts of the officer who is to execute the law an oath that he will enforce only statutes in harmony with the Constitution. He must take notice, according to his oath, whether or not they conflict with the supreme law. If the legislature has overstepped its legal power, he is bound to stick to the Constitution, and not to such unlawful statute. And in the third place, the same principle applies to the judiciary.

Under our system of government there is a threefold guard placed around the Constitution and the rights of the people. These are (1) the oath of the legislature—the body whose office it is to declare the law; (2) the oath of the judiciary—the body whose office it is to apply the law in the particular cases that may arise of violation; and (3) the oath of the executive—the body whose office it is to enforce the law. Each body, however, is legally independent of the other, all receiving their authority from a common source—the Constitution.

No one department takes any oath to obey or support the acts of any other department, and it is their duty to do so only so far as such duty is laid upon them by the supreme law itself. It is therefore evident that the support or enforcement of any Sunday statute or any other unconstitutional "law" can never become a legal duty; but on the contrary, every official swears that he will not support them because opposed to that fundamental law which is his sole official guide. Such "laws" to him must be as though they were not.

AGAINST SUNDAY STATUTES.

Views of a Prominent Southerner.

THE New Orleans *Times-Democrat*, of Nov. 28, 1895, quotes as follows the substance of a recent interview of a committee of the Ascension and Donaldsonville (La.) Board of Trade, with Hon. Wm. P. Miles, in which the latter expressed himself strongly against all legisla-

* "People's Cyclopaedia," page 1598.

tion of the nature of Sunday "laws." Mr. Miles said in substance:—

I am opposed to all religious legislation of whatever character. All religions and creeds in our free country should stand upon an equal footing, and it is not right to compel an observance of the Christian sabbath by the Israelite or the followers of Confucius. If we have a Sunday law it should bear equally upon all, which is not the case with the existing statute. I am inimical to all legislation of a puritanical character or tendency; and although a church member, I have no objection to trading on Sunday by those who find it more convenient and profitable to do so on that day.

Theaters and other places of amusement are permitted to be open on Sunday, and it is right that they should be; and if a merchant chooses to keep his store open on that day, I think he should have that privilege just as the other merchant who so prefers may close his store and observe the day as one of rest or recreation.

Being asked if he regarded the Sunday law undemocratic, Mr. Miles replied that he did not consider it a political question in any manner, and did not see how it could be made so unless one party assumed the pretension of greater sanctity than its opponents, and he did not anticipate that the Democratic party contemplated taking any such stand. He confessed that from a standpoint of personal interest, sugar planters might be disposed to favor the Sunday law, as it had relieved them in great measure of the drawback formerly experienced of laborers getting drunk on Sunday and not being able to do a fair day's work on Monday; but he regarded the principle of such legislation as utterly wrong, and hence had no hesitation in announcing himself opposed to the Sunday law and favorable to its repeal.

It will be observed that this expression of opinion leaves room for doubt as to whether Mr. Miles would not favor a Sunday statute which would "bear equally upon all." This constitutes a weak point in the views of many who are in general opposed to Sunday legislation. The truth is, that a Sunday "law" is in its very nature an unequal thing. It cannot be made to fit into the conditions which have always prevailed and must prevail among men, so as to bear equally upon all. And even equality, while abstractly a virtue, loses its good character in such a case. Equality of application can never justify a thing that is in its very nature an evil.

In nearly every case of persecution that has arisen under the Sunday statutes, it has been claimed by their advocates that they bore equally upon all classes. But so long as there are people left in the world who keep the law of Jehovah,—that law which says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," there will be those upon whom a Sunday statute must of necessity bear with much greater severity than it will on others.

In many cases an effort is made to equalize matters by an "exemption" clause releasing from the demands of the statute such persons as conscientiously observe another day than Sunday as the Sabbath. But if a Sunday "law" is right, if it is a proper law for the civil power to enact, why should it exempt a certain class of citizens on account of their religious belief? This only adds another inequality to the "law," and helps to demonstrate the fact that under the existing status of human society, no Sunday statute is possible which can present in its working the essential features of consistency and equality of application.

THE LOGIC OF IT.

[Sabbath Recorder, Dec. 5, 1895.]

The tide seems to be setting in very heavily in favor of a union of Church and State, a sentiment that to the majority hitherto has been very repugnant. This effort now appears to have only a partial application, and would not be tolerated at all were it not for the purpose of enforcing the observance of Sunday

and thus overriding the conscientious convictions and guaranteed rights of many loyal citizens. To carry this one point of religious legislation, Protestants unite with Roman Catholics, reformers with conservatives, and political organizations consort together to compel all men to bow to the will of the majority in matters of conscience. Carried out logically in States where Baptists happen to be in the majority, a law may be passed compelling all who would enter into church relationship to be immersed, forbidding infant baptism by methods now acceptable to pedo-baptists. Then, when the latter is in the ascendancy it would be easy to secure legislation forbidding baptism by immersion, since sprinkling is believed to be more convenient, and accompanied by less exposure. Therefore as a health measure, for the public good, immersion would be ruled out. Just such a condition now exists in Saxony (Europe.) where Baptists are forbidden to immerse or do anything to disturb the quiet of the Lutherans.

ENFORCING THE LAW OF GOD.

BY E. J. WAGGONER.

"FOR we know that the law is spiritual." Rom. 7: 14. Then there can be no fulfilling of the law save in the Spirit. "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Sometimes people talk about keeping the spirit of the law without the letter, but there is nothing in the Bible about keeping the spirit without the letter. By that expression men mean that they will keep what they think the law means, regardless of what it says. But God knows that the thoughts of man are vain. We are to forsake our own thoughts, as well as our own way. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." Isa. 55: 8, 9. God is a Spirit; therefore they that worship him must do so in the Spirit which he supplies. He supplies the means, and does not ask us to worship him in our spirit, or in our conception of his law.

We are not to worship God as we think him to be, but as he is. And no one, as stated in the text just quoted, can comprehend God, or define the bounds and limits of his will. Then no man can lay down a rule for another, or even for himself. Here is the unlimited word. No man can put a limit on the word of God, or say of any text that he has fathomed its depths, and that he has all the truth there is in it. No; the word is spiritual, and no man can fathom the depth of the mind of the Holy Spirit. For this reason no man, and no body of men, is at liberty to put any construction on the word of God, or to change it, or to hold or teach that it means anything different from exactly what it says.

The knowledge of this shuts out everything like religious coercion, persecution, or the laying down of rules for people to follow; for true worship must be rendered in the Spirit which God alone gives. The word must be taken, not in our own spirit, but in the Spirit of God, and that must lead us into larger and larger ideas, and work in us that which we do not know ourselves. Men have secret faults of which they are utterly unconscious. Not only so, but no man knows the depths of any sin which is brought to his attention, or the fullness of any command which is enjoined upon him.

It is plain, therefore, that no man can

measure his own righteousness, nor his own sin. He can simply know that he is a sinner, and that the righteousness of God is given to him. The more of the Lord he knows, the greater sinner he will realize himself to be. Therefore no man or body of men, whether in Church or State, can lay down rules by which a man can live; because the field of God's requirements is as unbounded as his own life, and must therefore ever keep increasing to our vision; and though men filled the world with books in the attempt to define everything, there still would be something omitted.

The Spirit of God must work its own life in every man. This takes the matter out of the realm of civil government entirely. No human authority whatever can impose the Spirit upon any man, or define the mind of the Spirit. The law of God, which is his righteousness, is the one thing which men are to seek. Christ said, "I know that his commandment is life everlasting." John 13: 50. We also are to know the same thing. The law itself is spiritual; it is life everlasting. But life is not a figment, a fancy; it is real, and wherever there is life there must be something living. When we read that the commandment is life everlasting, it does not mean that the written characters are life. They simply declare the fact. Everlasting life is in Jesus Christ. "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5: 26. He is the fountain of life. Ps. 36: 9; Jer. 2: 13.

The commandment or law of God is everlasting life because it is his own life. Then it is the life of the Spirit of God; and putting the Spirit of God into the hearts of men puts the life of God there. It is the law of the Spirit of life in Christ, that gives freedom and peace with God. "The Spirit is life, because of righteousness;" and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. 8: 1, 2, 9, 10. Nothing less than the life of Christ is the law of God; and anything contrary to the life of Christ is condemned. Then we can leave the *right* of any body of men to enforce the law of God entirely outside of the question. It is merely a question of *power*. Has it the power to enforce the law of God? Has any government on earth power to take the life of God and put it into the hearts of its subjects? Certainly not.

Then when men do make religious laws, and enforce religion upon people, it is certain that they are not enforcing the religion of Christ. Therefore when they do that, those who are loyal to Christ can have no complicity with it whatever. It is paganism, no matter what form of truth there may be. It is but the form without the power or life. If such enforcement is put in the very terms of the Bible, it is only the more thoroughly pagan; for it is paganism trying to palm itself off as Christianity.

The attempt to enforce the ten commandments, even just as they read, would be the greatest dishonor men could offer to the Lord. It would be saying that the law of God is no better than any man may be of himself. It is the same as saying that a man is all right if he keeps the law so that no man can find fault with him. But the man who merely refrains from outward violations of the law may be worse than the man who utterly disregards it, and knows he is guilty. In the latter case the man has nothing wherein to trust, while in the other, the man is building himself up in his own righteousness, and thinks that he is all right as long as he keeps the letter so far as men can discern.

But the law is spiritual, and only the power of the Spirit can work righteousness in an

individual. The recognition of civil government as having anything to do with the law of God, is directly opposed to the idea of justification by faith. To lay down a rule or law requiring obedience to the law of God, with a penalty for disobedience, is to say to a man, "You could keep it if you would try; but you will not try, and so we will compel you to do it." This is putting man on an equality with God. Anything less than the life of God is sin, and therefore for any power to attempt to enforce any of the precepts of Christ is simply an attempt to compel people to sin, and to hold them in sin.

THE AIM OF THE W. C. T. U. AS STATED BY A FRIEND.

[Signs of the Times, Nov. 21, 1895.]

WE have sometimes been thought uncharitable because we have said that one of the great objects of the W. C. T. U. was to bring about a man-made theocracy, a union of Church and State, not in the sense of any particular church, but in the sense that religious organizations would control legislation, pervert it to selfish ends, etc. In proof of this we have quoted extracts like the following, declared in the Union's national convention of 1887:—

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, state, national, and world-wide, has ONE vital, organic thought, ONE all-absorbing purpose, ONE undying enthusiasm, and that is that CHRIST SHALL BE THIS WORLD'S KING; yea, verily, THIS WORLD'S KING in its realm of cause and effect,—king of its courts, its camps, its commerce,—king of its colleges and cloisters,—king of its customs and constitutions. . . . THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST MUST ENTER THE REALM OF LAW THROUGH THE GATEWAY OF POLITICS.

If this does not mean union of church and state in its broadest sense, we do not know what language can express it. The New York Voice of November 7 has an article on "The W. C. T. U. and Its Critics," in which it defends the Union against the charges of inconsistency with reference to union with other reform parties. The most of this editorial is immaterial to the point we are discussing, but the closing paragraph is peculiarly to the point. The Voice says:—

But the truth is, most of the criticisms of the W. C. T. U., both now and heretofore, proceed on the assumption that the union has but one object, namely, prohibition. The W. C. T. U. holds no less firmly to that object than it did at the start; but it has broader aims to-day than it had at first. It has been growing and developing, for these many years; and to-day its purpose, whatever may have been the case at first, is not included in the one word prohibition. The purpose now, as we view it, may be broadly stated as the application of the laws of God to political affairs; to carry the standards of morality and religion into national life; to bring about, not a union of church and state, but a harmony between them, and to make the acts of the citizen conform to his acts as a Christian.

The only way to keep harmony between Church and State is to keep them, in the words of U. S. Grant, "forever separate." But the aim of the W. C. T. U. will result in the strongest union of the two, which will form the weakness and ruin of both.

Union Means Ruin and Death.

There are certain foods, both nutritious and palatable when eaten separately, but which form an unwholesome and loathsome dish when mixed together. There are certain chemicals which alone are harmless and useful, but which combined form powerful explosives or poisons. So it is with Church and State. Each is of divine origin, yet both came in consequence of sin. The church is the body of Christ, and designed to be his means of gathering out from the world of sin those who desire the eternal salvation to be found in him. Its source of power, strength, life, wisdom, and

authority are all direct from Christ. In the world, it is not of the world. The civil power, or the state, is ordained of God to protect the rights of all irrespective of class or religious belief. It came in as a consequence of sin, to protect the weak and to punish the uncivil. Each (church or state) has its appointed place in the divine plan. Separated, they will always be blessings, but united they form a virulent poison in the body politic, and mine deadly explosives underneath the dearest and most sacred rights of the people. Strange that the great masses of the people can not see this in our land to-day. The blindness of death seems to be upon the people. They do not know; hence the work of destruction goes on in our own land. The Jews and powers of earth in Christ's time did not know, "for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." "It is high time to awake."

THE ADVENTIST'S TRIAL.

[Clay County (Ill.) Advocate, Nov. 29.]

THE case of the People vs. Ross Foll, John Foll, George Dunlap, J. C. Schnell, and Charles Schnell was called Thursday morning at Olney. It was a test case, Ross Foll being the defendant, the others being bound. The selection of a jury was not an easy matter, as it took nearly three hours to impanel it. It was made up of the following sects: Methodist 1, Christian 2, Baptist 1, Catholic 1, German Reformed 2, United Brethren 1, non-professors 4.

H. G. Morris, attorney for State, and Hon. R. N. McCaulay, of Olney, and Judge G. A. Hoff, of Flora, for the defendants.

The case was tried under the Sunday statute, Criminal Code, par. 317, sec. 216, chap. 38, which reads as follows:—

Whoever disturbs the peace and good order of society by labor (works of necessity and charity excepted) or by any amusement or diversion on Sunday, shall be fined not exceeding \$25. This section shall not be construed to prevent watermen and railroad companies from landing their passengers, or watermen from loading or unloading their cargoes, or ferrymen from carrying over the water travelers and persons moving their families, on the first day of the week, nor to prevent the due exercise of the rights of conscience by whomever thinks proper to keep any other day as a sabbath.

THE PROSECUTION.

The prosecution produced evidence claiming that the minds of the witnesses were disturbed by seeing defendant plowing on Sunday, July 28. He claims to have been disturbed by the defendant talking to the team. He is not a member of any church. He also admitted that the defendant was of good moral character. He denied on cross-examination that he was guilty of making a bee-hive on the same date and "was not at home after 9 o'clock that morning."

The second witness had substantially the same yarn to spin. He also belongs to no church.

The third witness was a woman, and her only complaint seemed to be that she hated to see a good man like the defendant work on Sunday.

The fourth witness allowed her prejudice to get the better of her in the following tirade: "Those that were good Christians before the 'cranks' came are now 'cranks,' and violating the laws of God, the State of Illinois, and the Constitution of the United States. I want to raise my children [she has none at the present time, so it is said] in the proper manner." Her conscience hurt her so at the sight of a nice boy working on Sunday that she has not been able to sleep since.

THE DEFENSE.

The defense then placed Ross Foll on the stand, and he admitted that he worked six days (including Sunday) and rested on the Sabbath (Saturday) according to the commandment. He believes in the teachings of the Seventh-day Adventists.

The second witness testified that he assisted the prosecuting witness in making a bee-hive on the same Sunday. (The prosecuting witness denied this charge in his examination.)

The third witness testified that he knew the defendant to be a quiet Christian boy and his character above reproach.

The fourth witness lives on the same farm as the defendant, was with him on the sabbath in question, but did not hear the noises which the prosecution claim.

The attorneys on each side consumed fifty minutes each in citing the law and reviewing the testimony to the jury, and after five hours deliberation they returned a verdict of guilty, fining defendant \$1.

The case will be taken to the higher court.

WRESTING THE SCRIPTURES.

OUR attention was recently called to an illustrated book for children, in which was related the story of some of the works of mercy done by our Lord on the "Sabbath;" and in this connection the names "Sabbath" and "Sunday" are used interchangeably, with at least the seeming purpose to lead the children to believe that Sunday is the Sabbath, and that the Saviour so regarded it. This is nothing short of a wicked wresting of the Scriptures. Such writers should heed the injunction, "Lie not against the truth."

Sunday is not the Sabbath, and never was, and to substitute that name for "Sabbath," and to tell how "Christ healed on Sunday because it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath," cannot be too strongly condemned. The child so instructed is apt to sustain a rude shock when he learns, as he must sooner or later, how his credulity has been imposed upon; and to say the least, his confidence in his religious instructors is destroyed and his faith in the Scriptures weakened in a like degree.

Sunday is a false sabbath and it ought to have a monopoly of false support. But we are sorry to say that it has not, for some people, in their zeal for the true Sabbath, sustained as it is by a "Thus saith the Lord," many times repeated, resort to methods and "arguments" no better than that instanced as used in behalf of Sunday. One of these more than doubtful "arguments" is the effort to show that Christ did not rise from the dead on the first day of the week; just as though it made any difference.

Another even more objectionable attempt to steady the ark of divine truth, came under our notice recently; it is nothing less than an effort to prove by bringing together the 4th and 11th verses of the 18th chapter of Acts, that Paul held seventy-eight Sabbath meetings at Corinth! Even a child who would take the trouble to read from the 4th to the 11th verses inclusive ought to know better. The Sabbath, resting as it does upon the immutable word of God, needs no such "support."

It is doubtful if the Apostle Paul spent the entire "year and six months" of Acts 18:11 in the city of Corinth. One writer says:—

It is recorded that Paul labored a year and six months in Corinth. His efforts, however, were not exclusively confined to that city, but he availed himself of the easy communication by land and water with adjacent cities, and labored among them both by letter and personal effort. He made Corinth his headquarters,



NEW YORK, DECEMBER 12, 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.

THE "Christian" nations of Europe would put a stop to the slaughter going on in Armenia, which is shocking the whole civilized world, for they have plenty of power; only they are too jealous of each other, and each is too fearful that the others will get the advantage of her, should she give them the least chance to do so. This is national "Christianity."

ON another page we print an account of a recent trial and conviction at Olney, Ill., under the Sunday statute of that State, as viewed by one not an observer of the seventh-day Sabbath. The paper from which the report is taken says editorially: "The trial of a Seventh-day Adventist for breaking the sabbath, which occurred in Olney the past week, met with but one general verdict in the minds of the masses,—'persecution.'"

READER, for which of two things do you entertain most respect,—for a statute enacted by men? or for justice? If you respect the law, do you respect it merely because men have enacted it? or because you deem it just? If you deemed it unjust, would you consider it more entitled to respect than that which would be justice in the same matter? If you respect a statute simply because it is the "law," though unjust, do you think that in passing such a "law" men have legislated justice out of existence upon that point? Then is there not always a divine law of justice covering every case? and ought not the primary consideration with respect to all human legislation to be not, What is the statute? but What is the law of justice?

WHILE there is in our country an almost universal sentiment against a "union of Church and State," it is unfortunately true that the meaning of the expression is, in the popular conception, decidedly vague; and, what is worse, it is in many minds altogether different from what is meant by a union of the State with religion; so that while there would be an almost unanimous expression of opinion against a union of the State with some one religious body of Christendom, there would be very much less opposition to an effort to unite the work of the State with the inculcation of the "general principles" of the Christian religion. In the one case the opposition might spring wholly from a selfish motive of jealousy on the part of other denominations than the particular one chosen to be the recipient of State aid, and not from any opposition to the inherent injustice of the scheme. Such sentiment constitutes no safeguard to reli-

gious freedom. The true champion of human liberty acts from a love of liberty itself, and from a desire to see all mankind in the enjoyment of their common, God-given heritage.

THE *Evening Sun*, of this city, had in its issue of the 25th ult., this item of news:—

Jacob Levy, of 145 East Broadway, was arraigned in the Essex Market Police Court this morning by Policeman Holland, of the Madison Street station on a charge of having sold an overcoat yesterday in violation of the Sunday law.

The policeman was passing Levy's place yesterday when he saw a woman and a boy in the store. The boy had a new overcoat on, and the policeman concluded that it had just been purchased. He arrested the proprietor.

Magistrate Wentworth, after hearing the case, discharged Levy.

The same policeman also arraigned Louis Samuelson, of 49 East Broadway, on a similar charge. The prisoner said that he always observed Saturday as his Sabbath. He said that he did not know that he was violating the law. He was discharged.

The same paper told of the arrest of John Stimmel, proprietor, and Max DeWinter, a waiter, for selling a glass of soda-water. They were both held for trial in General Sessions.

Such arrests simply illustrate the absurdity of Sunday legislation.

SUNDAY "LAW" PROTECTION IN ENGLAND.

UNDER the working of the Sunday "law" of England which applies to labor done in factories, the publishing office of the *Present Truth*, 451 Holloway Road, North London, has been obliged to close its manufacturing department, owing to repeated fines and seizures of property used in operating the plant.

The "law," which says that women and minors must not work in factories on Sundays, was designed to protect this class of individuals from the unscrupulous greed of factory owners and operators. Its purpose was thus a very good one. But this good purpose, sought to be carried out by a Sunday "law," has resulted in some strange proceedings, and in injury to the ones whom it aimed to benefit.

For several years the publishing house in question, all whose employes regularly rest on the seventh day, observing it as the Sabbath, was permitted to do its work unmolested; the officials knowing that no hardship or oppression at which the law aimed existed within it. But latterly they or their successors became seized with an inspiration to apply the Sunday "law" to the case; and this brought before the operatives the following alternatives:—

1. They could renounce Christianity and become Jews, or proclaim themselves such, and continue their work as usual; the "law" containing an exemption for Jews. This the visiting officials repeatedly urged them to do.
2. They could comply with the law, and rest on Sunday, thus violating their conscientious convictions of right and duty as defined by the fourth commandment, besides suffering

the financial loss involved by Sunday idleness; or,—

3. They could continue to work as usual, adhering to their convictions of duty, and suffer whatever consequences their disregard of the "law" might bring upon them.

They chose the latter alternative, and the machinery of legal compulsion was speedily set in motion, with the result which has been stated.

Formerly, for several weeks, the employes affected by the statute, ceased work on Sundays, in the endeavor to conform to its demands. Some of them felt keenly the hardship of the loss of a whole day's wages each week from their limited income; but they could comfort(?) themselves with the thought that they were "protected"! Now they are thrown out of employment altogether (unless they have found new employment, which in England is a matter of great difficulty) and are brought face to face with all the hardships of enforced idleness, without the means of support; but—they are "protected"!

Speaking of the seizures which have resulted in closing their manufacturing department, the *Present Truth*, of Nov. 28, says:—

We have no words of reproach for those who are engaged in this work of spoliation. They are to be pitied rather than blamed. We are sure that personally they dislike the business, but are moved by a mistaken sense of duty. They are in the toils of the papal system, which has infected all nations, and which puts earthly governments in the place of God, and so they imagine that they are "compelled" to enforce laws regardless of how much they conflict with the law of God.

The end is not yet. God is not dead, nor asleep, nor indifferent. "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness." Then that divine law, which is now so lightly set aside by legislators and judges, will be the accuser, and "the Lord alone will be exalted in that day." "The mighty man shall cry there bitterly." Who will be wise in time to have God's truth a protection instead of a destruction?

We may well beware of the Sunday "law" and its "protection."

NOTICE.

PROMPTLY at the close of this year we will have a limited number of complete volumes of the SENTINEL for 1895, bound in the usual styles: Manilla paper cover, \$1.50; Cloth, leather back and corners, \$2.50. Mail or express, prepaid.

Let those who desire a copy order at once, that the supply may be regulated in some degree by the demand. In past years we have not been able to fill all orders on account of the limited number of volumes reserved for binding. The same may be the case this year, so order promptly, as orders will be filled in the order they are received.

A moment's reflection will call to your mind the important matter that has appeared in the SENTINEL during 1895. Hence the importance of obtaining a copy for reference.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and is 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