

The American Sentinel 10 (1895)

January 3, 1895

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 10, 1 , p. 1.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is the only paper in the United States wholly devoted to combating Romanism, and its image in apostate Protestantism, with the only effective weapon—the Word of God.

THE Reformation of the 16th century, which jostled the papal throne, was accomplished with the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. The SENTINEL will wield that sword against the vital doctrines of the papacy during the year 1895, with the increased power which the conflict demands, and which the God of battles has promised for this very time.

LET all friends of true Protestantism now rally "to the help of the Lord against the mighty." Indifference is sin. Not to make every effort to prepare for the struggle is disloyalty to "the King of kings and Lord of lords." To fail to warn your neighbors by every available means,—and the SENTINEL is a God-appointed means,—is to bring the blood of their ruin upon your garments.

"But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand. So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me. When I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand. Nevertheless, if thou warn the wicked of his way to turn from it; if he do not turn from his way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul." Eze. 33:6-9.

WORK while it is day, for "the night cometh when no man can work."

"Nine Years' Experience" *American Sentinel* 10, 1 , pp. 1-3.

TO-DAY the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the tenth year of its work.

The paper was named the SENTINEL because it was intended from the beginning to occupy the place and do the work of a *sentinel*. It is the duty of a sentinel to be ever on the watch with every faculty alert to detect any movement of an enemy, or any danger of any kind, and sound the alarm.

For many more than ten years the people who publish the AMERICAN SENTINEL had seen what they knew to be a serious danger to the American people and to the world; but until 1886 we had no paper devoted particularly to the study and exposure of the workings of this dangerous element. We refer, of course, to the organized attempt, first represented in the National Reform Association *alone*, and later, in the solid combination of the popular Protestantism of the whole country, to fasten upon the National Government the recognition and maintenance of the forms of religion,—to accomplish the union of religion and the national power.

As we knew that the doing of such a thing at any time and anywhere could be nothing else than the setting up of a religious despotism; and as we knew that such a thing could not be done in the United States without the subversion of the Constitution and of every fundamental principle of the Government, we knew that this movement, in every possible phase of it, meant only evil and that continually to all the people of the nation. We knew also that the evil wrought by this would not be confined to the people of this nation.

We knew that the principles of the absolute separation of religion and the State upon which this nation was founded, were, and were intended to be, the light and glory of the world. We knew that by the splendid results of these principles, as manifested in the bright example of America, the whole world was being enlightened and drawn more and more toward the right principles of the rights of men and the freedom of mankind.

Knowing all this, we knew full well that the subversion of these national principles and the reversal of the "New Order of Things" in the course of this nation, would surely react upon the other nations, and so swing the whole world back into the evil tide of the old order of things, arrest the progress of mankind, and cause the world to perish in the stagnation and corruption of an enforced religion which is only enforced hypocrisy.

Therefore our paper was not only called the SENTINEL, but the AMERICAN SENTINEL; because we knew that the maintenance of American principles in their integrity was the gain of the world, and

that the forsaking or subversion of these principles could be nothing else than the everlasting loss of the world.

These American principles are the principles announced by the Lord himself for the guidance of nations. In the establishing of this nation, "time's noblest offspring," these principles were made the foundation for the benefit of all mankind; and the disregard or subversion of them on the part of the nation can work nothing but the irreparable injury of mankind.

These being Christian principles, to disregard them or to set them aside is to erect antichristian principles in their stead. Not only is this true in the philosophy of the case, but as in the making of the National Government, its establishment upon these principles was expressly declared to be that we might not be brought under the domination of the church of Rome nor be afflicted by persecution, the plain practical consequence of the disregard or subversion of these principles could not possibly be anything else than the setting up and carrying out of the

2

principles of persecution—principles of the church of Rome,—which are nothing else than antichristian principles.

In the very beginning, we told the people that there was danger that the National Reform movement would succeed, and that by this the National Government would be brought under the domination of the church power. By every right means, and in every possible way, we exposed the principles of National Reformism and clearly showed them to be antichristian principles alone—by whomsoever carried into practice. For seven years also we ceased not to tell the people, and to warn the National Reformers themselves, that as surely as the National Reform movement should succeed, the triumph of the church of Rome in this country would certainly follow.

At the end of these seven years, the National Reform movement *had succeeded*. In 1892, the Government of the United States, in all three of its branches, was surrendered to the church power; and in January, 1893, this surrender was confirmed. And since *that* time we have had sufficient to occupy our space in pointing out the progress of the church of Rome in fastening her tentacles upon the nation, until now we are obliged to state that she has, in her arrogance, taken possession of the country, and proposes to deal with it and run it, as "a Catholic country." So open and plain has this now become, that the organ of the National Reform conspiracy from the beginning, some

time ago was constrained to exclaim that "if the American people realized the extent to which the Catholic Church had gained a hold upon the National Government, they would turn white with fear and wrath."

Let us recall the steps that have been taken by the papacy since the National Reformers succeeded in subverting the American principles and setting up in their place the principles of the papacy by the National Government.

Even in 1892, in the very period of the successful culmination of the National Reform aims upon the Government, the plan of Leo XIII. concerning the United States was made public, in which it was announced that "what the church has done in the past for other nations she will now do for the United States."

In 1893, Satolli was sent to this country with the command from Leo to the Catholics of America, and he announced it to them in the World's Catholic Congress in Chicago, in September: "Bring your country into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness—Christ and his church." And at the same time he promised them "aye! an hundred-fold" reward upon their efforts as they should "go forward" to the fulfillment of this command.

About a month later, when the Catholic Church was heard in the World's Parliament of Religions, in the paper by Prof. O'Gorman of the Catholic University of Washington City, this country was claimed as a Catholic country "by right of discovery and colonization" and by right of "its Christian character and principles." In the same month—October—at Cardinal Gibbons' jubilee, Archbishop Ireland announced the union of the Catholic Church and the United States, and congratulated the assembly in the banqueting-hall upon their having the privilege of seeing this union "typified" in the arrangement then before their eyes in which "the Vice-President of the United States comes and takes his seat at the right hand of the cardinal."

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.*

This is his hope, and toward it all his remarkable energies are bent.

Two days after this a long dispatch was sent through the Association Press of the country, in which it was stated that Bishop Keane was "the bearer of a rescript from Pope Leo XIII.," of which the purport is given in the following words:—

The papal rescript elevates the United States to *the first rank as a Catholic nation*. Heretofore this country has stood before the church as a "missionary" country. It had no more recognition officially at Rome than had China. . . . By the new rescript the country is freed from the propaganda *and is declared to be a Catholic country* in whose people the pope has amplest confidence and on whom he confers the rights of self-government, subject only to the holy see on matters of faith. In a way this remarkable action of the Roman pontiff may be looked on as the most astonishing of all the stupendous effects wrought in the world by the American Republic. The United States is considered by the pope as *the most promising field in the world for the church*.

The importance, not only to Catholics, but *to all citizens of the United States*, of this radical change in the relations to Rome of the church in America, can scarcely be overestimated.

That it should be authoritatively announced that the pope of Rome is bending all his energies to the union of the Catholic Church and the "power" of the United States, and that the United States is now declared to be a Catholic country—surely this of itself *is* of "importance to all citizens of the United States" even without the papacy saying so. But when the papacy goes so far itself as to publicly announce that the importance of this step "to all citizens of the United States" "can scarcely be overestimated," then it is evident that the papacy intends that this procedure *shall be* of the greatest importance to all citizens of the United States.

And note, too, the words that are used. It is not said that this is of importance to *the people*, nor even to *all people*, of the United States; but to all *citizens* of the United States. "Citizens" is wholly a *political*, a *governmental*, phrase. It is impossible that that word can have any other than a political bearing. And this makes it perfectly plain that this procedure on the part of the papacy in declaring this "to be a Catholic country," and elevating it "to the first rank as a Catholic nation," is intended to have none other than a political bearing and meaning. This does indeed make the thing of such important to all citizens of the United States as can scarcely be overestimated. Is it any wonder that seeing this, the fruit of their own efforts, and so soon, too, the National Reformers should begin to "turn white with fear and wrath"? And they will turn whiter yet with fear and wrath, and perhaps some other color with vexation, before they get done with the fruit of their doings.

Having fixed the United States in her plans as a Catholic country, and even exalted it to the first rank as a Catholic nation, it is but

natural that the papacy should at once proceed to treat it as a Catholic nation and its people as Catholics. For what is a Catholic nation for, if it is not to be subject to the will of the papacy, and to be used to further the designs of the papacy both in that country itself and in the world?

Accordingly, the next thing mapped out by Leo is to proceed to the use of this nation as a Catholic nation for Catholic purposes, and by it to gain new life for the Catholic power throughout the world. For some time the pope has been, and even now is, engaged with his "chief thought" upon what the authoritative reports call, "The Encyclical to the Americans," and, "The Encyclical to the American People." And that it is intended, indeed, to be addressed to the Americans or the American people themselves rather than to the Catholics in America, is made plain in the forecasts that have been given of it. And this form of address is in perfect papal keeping with that which has already been done in elevating America "to the first rank as a Catholic nation." Having made America a Catholic nation, he will now count the American people Catholics and will address them accordingly, signifying to them his will which he will expect them to accept and respect accordingly.

But let us take a glance at this coming "Encyclical to the Americans," as it has been outlined in advance, that all may see for themselves just what ground it is proposed that the thing shall cover. Under date of "Rome, October 14," to the *New York Sun*, and reprinted in the *Catholic Standard* of November 3, 1894, "*Innominato*" furnishes a column of matter, from which we take the following:—

The United States of America, it can be said without exaggeration, are the chief thought of Leo XIII. in the government of the Romans and Universal Catholic Church; for it is one of the choice intellects of the Old World who are watching the starry flag of Washington rise to the zenith of the heavens. A few days ago, on receiving an eminent American, Leo XIII. said to him: "But *the United States are the future*; we think of them incessantly." The inattentive politician, the superficial observer, in Europe as in America, is astonished at this persistent sympathy for the American people and care for *its general interests*. But those who know the ardent soul of the pope, restless for what is good, eager for all that is great and fruitful; the philosopher who sweeps over the whole intellectual, social and religious horizon; the statesman who judges matters by the light of central and governing ideas; these all read in the heart of the holy father the motives for his unbending resolution and his devotion to American ideas. This ever-ready sympathy has

its base in *the fundamental interests of the holy see*, in a peculiar conception of *the part to be played and the position to be held* by the church and the papacy *in the times to come*.

That is why Leo XIII. turns all his soul, full of ideality, to what is improperly called his American policy. *It should rightly be called his Catholic universal policy*. . . . It is in this perspective, wide as a great world and lasting as a whole epoch, that the coming American encyclical must be viewed. To make the delegation independent and sovereign, with a supreme ecclesiastical tribunal; to support Monsignor Satolli and make his mission permanent and successful; *to point out the means of increasing influence and liberty*; to continue this policy of moderation and adaptability which has brought peace to the nation; *to deal, in a word, with all the important questions of the day* and to fix for good the ecclesiastical type—the model of life which Leo XIII. wishes, little by little, to bring within the reach of the weakening peoples of the Old World—that is, *the sublime inspiration of the encyclical to the Americans*.

To say more would be indiscreet; let us wait for events. The United States, after a century of civil greatness, will have the privilege, unequalled in history, of giving to a whole continent examples and lessons. A nation full of vigor and an authority full of lifespings can alone be strong enough to carry out this historic task.

Such is the use that the papacy proposes now to make of this "Catholic nation." And as this scheme is proposed and will be insisted on as the essential thing for the salvation of the nation, it will be but an easy step to pass on to the proposition that whoever opposes this scheme will, of necessity, be aiming at the destruction of the nation and must therefore be dealt with as an anarchist. And as the scheme is to be worked through this "Catholic

3

nation" for the everlasting benefit of mankind, it will be an easy conclusion that those who would oppose it will thereby show themselves the enemies of the human race, and whom, in the interests of the race, it will be doing God service to put out of the world. And thus it will come true indeed that not only what the papacy has done in the past for other nations she will now do for the United States, but also what she has done *with individuals* who opposed her schemes in the past she will do with those who oppose her schemes now.

For we expect nothing else than that this grand scheme of the papacy for the United States and for the world, *will succeed* both in the United States and in the world. In fact we know that it will

succeed; and we never expect to say anything else. This may not be believed by very many people; but it will surely be *seen* whether it is believed by many or not.

We never expected anything else than that the National Reform movement would succeed in its design of having the National Government committed to the support of "Christianity," and especially of Sunday as the badge of that "Christianity." We always said that that movement would succeed; very few of the people believed it, however. Now everybody can see that we were right all the time, whether they believe we knew anything about it or not. We also said all the time that when that movement did succeed, by it the papacy would be exalted and given power in this nation and greater influence with the world than even in the Dark Ages, as there is more of the world now than there was in the times of the Dark Ages. None of this, however, would any of the National Reformers believe; but now they are compelled to see and bemoan the first part of it at least, and we know that all the rest of it will as certainly be seen.

Yes, the scheme of the papacy for the United States and for the world, substantially as mapped out by Leo XIII., will be a complete success so far as the world is concerned. And by this success, for an hour as it were, the papacy will triumph over the world. And then—*then* "in one hour" shall her judgment come. This triumph of the papacy over the world, will mark her certain destruction out of the world and from the face of the earth. This *apparent* triumph of the papacy will mark the *assured* triumph of Christianity *over the papacy* for evermore.

And now, just as we expected the National Reform movement to succeed, so we expect this movement of the papacy to succeed. Just as we expected the success of the National Reform movement to assure the renewed exaltation and short-lived triumph of the papacy, so we now expect this renewed exaltation and short-lived triumph of the papacy to mark the day of her utter destruction. And as we always expected that we ourselves should see the success of the National Reform movement, and so to see it give renewed power to the papacy, so now we expect that we ourselves shall see the success of this papal movement and in it the apparent triumph of the papacy once more over the world, *and then* her swift and everlasting destruction. This we expect to see as certainly as we shall live the natural course of a man's life. In saying this we do not say that we shall see it in seven years nor in ten years, as we have seen the

other we do not pretend to say in what year nor in what number of years we shall see it. We only say that we certainly expect to see it. And as we have certainly seen the other, as we expected, surely we have ground for confidently expecting to see this which is now on the way.

It was upon the authority of the Scriptures that we knew the other was certainly of the Scriptures that we now know that this is certainly coming. It was by the scripture of Rev. 13:11-17, saying that they would make "an image to the beast," that we knew that the National Reform movement would certainly succeed, and we always said so. And now it is on the authority of the scriptures of Rev. 13:8; Dan. 8:21, 22; and Rev. 18:7, that we know that the papal movement, mapped out by Leo XIII., will certainly succeed. And it is upon the authority of Rev. 18, and many other passages of scripture, that we certainly know that this success of the papacy will be her utter perdition.

There in Rev. 18, is pointed out the time when "all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath" of the fornication of "Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth;" when she is glorifying herself and living deliciously; and when the kings of the earth are committing fornication and living deliciously *with her*; and when, because of this, she congratulates herself and "saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." And then the very next word, without a break, is: "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord God that judgeth her." The reader can read the whole chapter and the nineteenth too, and know the whole story for himself.

We always called upon the people to separate entirely from all connection or sympathy with the National Reform movement, in order, not only that they might be on ground from which they could consistently, and with all their might, oppose the other evils which were certain to follow the success of this. And now, we say to all people, Separate utterly from all that is in any way connected with either the National Reform combination or with the papacy, in order that when "the beast and his image," "Babylon the great," both mother and daughters, sink in everlasting perdition by the just judgment of the Lord, you may rise in the triumph of the everlasting salvation of the righteous power of God. And as the scheme of Rome embraces the world and all that is of the world, this simply calls for

the complete separation from the world and from all that is in the world or of the world—separated unto God in an everlasting covenant that shall not be forgotten, and by the power of an endless life.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL has always had a mission in the world and a message for the world; and it has this yet. Our message is briefly comprehended in "the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. . . . Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. . . . If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God." "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."

As for seven years we ceased not to call attention to the workings, and expose the evils both present and prospective, of the National Reform movement; so now, for the rest of the time, we shall not cease to call attention to the workings, and expose the iniquity, of this last grand papal movement.

"National Reform' Convention" *American Sentinel* 10, 1 , p. 4.

THE National Reform Association, which for a time was apparently eclipsed by the American Sabbath Union, seems to be renewing its youth, and has entered upon a more vigorous propaganda than ever before.

Formerly, the National Reformers have contented themselves with holding a single convention each year; but a series of such meetings has been arranged for the present winter, and large results are anticipated by the pseudo-reformers.

The keynote of the present campaign was sounded in the opening meeting of the convention held at New Castle, Pa., December 18029, 1894; it was this: "Men will heed God's argument." R. C. Wylie, the speaker who used the words quoted, was telling of the progress made by National Reform. He said not much had been accomplished in the way of modeling the Constitution of the States and of the nation after the divine(?) plan, but that great progress had been made in

making converts to the "Christian theory of civil government." Some, he said, had been convinced by the Bible argument; some by the philosophical argument; but very many resisted both these arguments. There was, he said, one other argument. "We cannot use it," said he, "but God can, and is using it." He referred to the calamities which have come upon this nation. Men, he said, would be convinced by this argument. And so, municipal corruption, strikes, riots, bankruptcies, defalcations, a depleted national treasury, and general hard times, are all to be pressed into the service of so-called National Reform as never before. Doubtless Mr. Wylie is right in thinking that men will be influenced by this line of argument. Selfishness springs eternal in the human breast, and men will readily believe anything which promises them temporal prosperity.

And truly God has a controversy, not only with this nation, but with all nations, but not upon the issue raised by the National Reformers. God calls upon *men* everywhere to repent; National Reform calls *nations* to *profess* repentance. The difference between the two is as wide as that between sincerity and hypocrisy. God wants hearts; National Reform proposes to give him statutes and constitutions.

January 10, 1895

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 10, 2 , pp. 9, 10.

ON the 15th of June, 1520, Pope Leo X. issued a bull condemning Luther and the Reformation.

ONE of the forty-one propositions extracted from the writings of Luther, and condemned by Leo X., reads thus: "To burn heretics is contrary to the will of the Holy Ghost."

EVERY one of the forty-one gospel propositions condemned by Pope Leo X., on the 15th of June, 1520, are condemned by Pope Leo XIII. to-day, Jan. 10, 1895, although three hundred and seventy-five years with their opportunities for enlightenment have passed. Rome never changes.

ON the 10th of December, 1520, Martin Luther burned the bull of Leo X., and the next day addressed the students of Wittenberg as follows: "If you do not contend with your whole heart against the impious government of the pope, you cannot be saved. Whoever takes delight in the religion and worship of popery, will be eternally lost in the world to come. If you reject it, you must expect to incur

every kind of danger, and even to lose your lives. But it is far better to be exposed to such perils in this world than to keep silence. So long as I live I will denounce to my brethren the sore and the plague of Babylon, for fear that many who are with us may fall back like the rest into the bottomless pit of perdition."

MARTIN LUTHER is dead. And the churches of the Reformation "keep silence" and "fall back."

IN Germany, the home of Martin Luther, it is to-day a criminal offense, punishable with fine and imprisonment, to preach against Catholicism, or as Luther terms it, "the plague of Babylon." In the United States, it is against the law of "propriety," "good policy," and "good taste," to preach against Romanism. Instead, a Methodist minister in Ohio says, "God bless the Roman Catholic Church of to-day." Another in Iowa holds a union service with a Roman Catholic priest,—the priest doing the preaching, of course. A Catholic priest is requested to tell the students of the Union Theological Seminary how to preach. He is introduced by a Presbyterian minister, who terms Luther's "plague of Babylon" the "great mother church of Christendom," and says that the recent encyclical of Pope Leo XIII., inviting princes and peoples back to the belief that to burn heretics is in harmony with the Holy Ghost, "breathed a spirit like that of the Master."

THE *Churchman*, a Protestant Episcopal paper, under date of Dec. 15, 1894, criticises the propriety of inviting Catholic priests to teach Protestant candidates for the ministry how to preach, and for this faint echo of the Reformation, Bishop Potter, of the same church, promptly and severely rebuked the editor of the *Churchman*. The *Outlook*, a Presbyterian paper, in its issue of Dec. 29, prints the Bishop's rebuke, under the title, "Bigotry Rebuked," with the following editorial comment: "The *Outlook* was about to call its usually genial and courteous contemporary, the *Churchman*, to account for a bit of bigotry in connection with the lecture of Father Doyle at the Union Theological Seminary, when Bishop Potter stepped in and administered a rebuke more effectively, and, for the *Churchman* at least, more authoritatively, than the *Outlook* could possibly have done. Bishop Potter has said many brief things and preached many telling sermons, but we believe he has set no better lesson to be learned by a good many religious people in these days than that contained in the brief communication which we reprint herewith."

THOUGH the professedly Protestant denominations of America have ceased to protest against the papacy, Protestantism is not dead.

THE people who publish the AMERICAN SENTINEL believe the words addressed by Luther to the students of Wittenberg, and "with a firm reliance on the protection of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we mutually pledge to each other and to the world, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor," to uncompromisingly contend with the "whole heart against the impious government of the pope." From the cowardice of others we only gather courage, warmth from their coldness, and loyalty from their treason. While the Protestant world flatters and caresses the system which tortured and burned its ancestors, we will cease not to denounce its errors and faithfully warn the world of the on-rushing, overwhelming billows of the See of Rome.

LET it be ever remembered that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is opposing the papal system, not the individual. For the individual Roman Catholic we have only thoughts of love; and we are daily manifesting that love in this great center of population and poverty, by carrying food to the homes of destitute Roman Catholics, and watching by the bedside of their sick and dying.

WHAT can the little handful of less than fifty thousand souls who represent the constituency behind the AMERICAN SENTINEL do as against the millions upon millions of Roman Catholics and millions more of Romanizing Protestants? "You are alone," says the enemy. "You are in the minority. The great and the wise are not with you." We reply with the answer of Martin Luther: "Moses was alone at the departure from Egypt; Elijah was alone in the reign of King Ahab; Isaiah alone in Jerusalem; Ezekiel alone in Babylon. God never selected as a prophet either the high priest or any great personage; but ordinarily he chose low and despised men, once even the shepherd Amos. *In every age*, the saints have had to reprove the great, kings, princes, priests, and wise men, at the peril of their lives. . . . I do not say that I am a prophet, but I say that they ought to fear, precisely because I am alone and that they are many. I am sure of this, that the Word of God is with me, and it is not with them. . . . The majority has ever been on the side of falsehood, and the minority

with truth. Truth has ever caused an outcry."

ROME dreads true Protestants, however few in number. She could not endure the Waldenses, though few and hidden by the rugged

Alps. They were a Mordecai in the gate, and refusing to bow to papal dogma they were tortured and burned.

ROME sees in Seventh-day Adventists a Mordecai in the gate. Consistent Protestants are dreaded by the papacy as much now as of old; hence "Father" Elliott, whom the papacy has sent out to gather up the fragments of collapsed Protestantism, has come in contact with this people whom the *Catholic Mirror* terms the only consistent Protestants, and in writing of his experience with them in Michigan in the August number of the *Catholic World*, says: "The sect is the most venomous enemy of Catholicity in these parts." "Seventh-day Adventists . . . are making a propaganda of much energy—and not without results." Again he terms them "the narrowest of sects, shown by their literature to be the most bitterly anti-Catholic," and concludes by saying, "I thank God that '*consistent Protestantism*' is narrowing down into this concentrated essence of bigotry." Again, writing from Ohio, in the December number of the *Catholic World*, he says: "These new sectarians are making converts in many places full of deadly hatred of the Catholic Church." "In the question box our only abundant matter was furnished by the Seventh-day Adventists." "I dread their fanaticism."

THANK God that there is a remnant of consistent Protestantism which the papacy dreads. But what a responsibility rests upon this remnant before God and the world!

"Rome Attempts to 'Corner' Secret Societies" *American Sentinel* 10, 2, p. 10.

IT is the policy of Rome to destroy what she cannot control. Especially is this true of any factor which effects the control of the masses. When the secret labor organizations came into being it was a question with her whether she should attempt to kill or control them. She decided to control. And in pursuance of this plan the Catholic priest, Dr. Buntsell, has been commissioned by the pope to promulgate papal principles within labor organizations, gather statistics and report to headquarters.

Other secret organizations have fared differently. The society of Odd Fellows, Knights of Pythias, and Sons of Temperance have been condemned, as the following letters from Rome and Washington indicate:—

Most Reverend and Illustrious Sir: Your excellency cannot fail to know that the archbishops set over the various ecclesiastical

provinces of the Republic of the United States of America have, in more than one of their assemblies, taken counsel with respect to three societies which have grown up in the aforesaid Republic; namely, the Odd Fellows, the Sons of Temperance and the Knights of Pythias. And you must be also aware that the foresaid archbishops unanimously decided that the whole question as to these societies should be submitted to the judgment of the Apostolic See.

His holiness therefore committed this question to eminent and most reverend cardinals of the Holy Roman Church and to the inquisitors generally. These, then, in general congregation, had on Wednesday, June 20, 1894, confirming a decision previously made as to the aforementioned societies, decreed that all the ordinaries throughout the United States must in every way strive to keep the faithful from becoming members of any of the said societies and must not fail to admonish their people to that effect, and that any thus admonished must be debarred from the sacraments should they fail to abandon or keep aloof from the same societies.

This decree his holiness fully confirmed and gave it complete effect. It is therefore communicated to your Excellency that through you it may be transmitted to all the archbishops, bishops and other ordinaries of the United States, and for the due custody of the souls of the faithful may be by these ordinaries carried into effect.

In the meantime I beseech Almighty God to bestow upon you all benefits and blessings.

R. CARDINAL MONACO.

Rome, Aug. 20, 1894.

To the Illustrious and Most Rev. Francis Stolle, Delegate Apostolic.

Washington, D. C., Dec. 4, 1894.

Your Eminence Illustrious and Most Reverend:

By letter transmitted to me on the 20th of November last, through Cardinal Rampolla, his holiness urges that the decree of the holy office, sent to me by Cardinal Monaco, and herewith delivered to you, shall be made public. The sovereign pontiff, therefore, wills that the decree in question shall be communicated by the archbishops to the respective suffragans and by them it may be promulgated.

With all reverence and affection, I remain. Your Eminence Illustrious and Most Reverend, your faithful servant in Christ.

FRANCIS (Archbishop) SATOLLI.

Delegate Apostolic.

To His Eminence, Illustrious and Most Reverend James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL is not the champion of secret societies, but points to this condemnation as one of the signs of the times.

The church of Rome condemns secret societies, while at the same time it is itself the most secret of all secret societies. The very same day that the press published the condemnation of those secret societies, it published an official announcement of a Roman Catholic synod for the diocese of Brooklyn, which contained this paragraph:—

The proceedings will open with a pontifical high mass, which will be celebrated by the bishop, and immediately afterward the synod will go into session. Members of the laity may attend the mass, but the proceedings of the synod will be *secret*.

This is a part of the grand policy of the church to control the mass. She proposes to get a "corner" on the whole secret society business and control it to accomplish her grand scheme for the supremacy of the world.

"On Their Knees to the Pope" *American Sentinel* 10, 2 , p. 10.

ONE of the significant signs of the times is the way non-Catholic American citizens tumble over each other in their efforts to get on their knees to the pope. The officers of the United States cruiser *Detroit*, which returned the Vatican relics exhibited at the World's Fair, requested an audience with the pope which was granted Dec. 26. The spokesman informed [*sic.*] the pope that no American citizen considered a visit to Rome complete without an audience with his holiness. The cabled report of the audience which appeared in the *World* of Dec. 27, quotes the following from the address of the pope:—

I feel a lively satisfaction to see the progress America makes steadily among civilized nations, which it outstrips, although younger. While I am happy to see your nation advance in numerous branches of civilization, I am particularly pleased to observe her religious progress. The Catholic Church flourishes there and I desire to see it still more flourishing.

Though I express a special paternal solicitude for American Catholics, I receive you with peculiar pleasure because you are Americans.

I hope to publish in a few weeks an encyclical to the episcopacy of the United States and Montreal, conveying the sentiments of my special affection for your country. Meantime I bless you all, and when you return to your Fatherland tell your families that the pope blesses them with the paternal affection which will accompany you

in the midst of the fatigues of the long voyage you are about to undertake.

The report adds:—

Although there was only one Catholic among them all the cruiser's officers received the papal benediction kneeling.

Shame on such truckling to the representative of that system that has murdered millions of men and women because they were loyal to an enlightened conscience. At one time this act of non-Catholics kneeling before Pope Leo XIII. would have misrepresented America, but not so now. They have fairly represented the fawning and truckling of American Protestantism and statesmanship to the arch-enemy of Protestantism and liberty.

"The National Reform Association and the Pennsylvania Sunday Law" *American Sentinel* 10, 2 , pp. 10, 11.

ACCORDING to Dr. H. H. George, the one "really practical" theme discussed at the recent National Reform Convention in New Castle, Pa., was "The Present Crisis of the Pennsylvania Sabbath Law."

This discussion was opened by Mr. J. W. Houston, of Pittsburg, a gentleman who has been very prominent in enforcing the Sunday law in Pittsburg and Allegheny.

Mr. Houston explained the nature of the present Sunday law of the State and the manner of its enforcement, its penalty, etc. The law was passed in 1794, and provides a penalty of four dollars (one-half to go to the informer), to be recovered before any justice of the peace or other magistrate having concurrent jurisdiction with a justice of the peace, such as police justices, mayors, etc. Some years ago the penalty was, by a special act, increased to twenty-five dollars in Allegheny County.

At the last session of the Pennsylvania legislature an effort was made to so modify the law as to permit the publication and sale of Sunday papers and the sale of cigars, soda water, etc. The bill also provided for a uniform fine of four dollars throughout the State, repealing the special act making the fine twenty-five dollars in Allegheny County. This bill passed both houses of the legislature, but was vetoed by Governor Pattison, who has shown himself the pliant tool of the National Reform forces.

At the recent election a new governor was elected, and the man—Mr. Walter Lyon—who, above all others, was instrumental in securing the passage of the amendment which the Governor vetoed, was

elected Lieutenant-Governor. Mr. Lyon was pledged to use his influence to secure certain modifications of the act of 1794, and for this cause the Sunday forces opposed his election. His ticket was however successful by an overwhelming majority, but owing to the religious boycott declared against him, Mr. Lyon ran behind his ticket about ten thousand votes. This would represent ten thousand voters in Pennsylvania who cared more for the maintenance of the Sunday law of 1794 than for the success of their party. These ten thousand voters are now styling themselves the "best people of the State," the "law-abiding people of the commonwealth," etc., and are demanding that instead of being modified in any degree the law of 1794 shall be so amended as to increase the penalty to twenty-five dollars throughout the State. To this end peti-

11

tions are now being circulated and signed all over the State. These will be presented to the legislature at an early day and an effort will be made to secure the proposed legislation.

On the other hand, the forces opposed to the law of 1794 are determined to secure important changes in the law. The first thing they propose is to take away from justices of the peace and other magistrates, the power of summary conviction in cases arising under the Sunday law. Violators of the Sunday law will then have to be prosecuted, if at all, before the higher courts, and the chances of conviction will be materially lessened. In the first place, complaining witnesses must attend court from day to day awaiting the pleasure of the grand jury, and this at their own expense. Then, when an indictment is found and the case set for trial, the prosecuting witnesses must again attend court day after day until the case is called. Then, if for any reason the accused is not convicted, the prosecutor must pay the costs; and it is manifest that in many cases there would be no conviction, because it is only reasonable to suppose that upon almost every jury there would be at least one man not in sympathy with the law or at least in sympathy with the accused. Thus the friends of the Sunday-law would find themselves laboring under great difficulties.

But it is not expected that this change in the law can be accomplished without a sharp contest; and as a sop to the Sunday-law advocates the anti-Sunday-law forces will probably consent to an amendment raising the fine to twenty-five dollars throughout the entire State. The effect of this will be readily seen: those who are not

conscientious in the matter and have "influence," or who are willing to avail themselves of devious ways to escape the penalty of transgression, will nine times out of ten escape punishment, while the Seventh-day Adventist, who will not deny working on Sunday, but who, on the contrary, avows his right to labor on that day, will fall an easy prey to the amended law with its increased penalty. We do not say that this is the design of either party to the Sunday-law controversy in Pennsylvania, but it will be the inevitable result.

Another point of attack upon the Sunday law will be an amendment permitting the publication and sale of Sunday papers, and the running of Sunday trains, etc., and the sale of cigars, soda water, etc., on Sunday. This amendment will be opposed first, last and all the time by the Sunday-law forces. The Sunday paper is declared to be the chief enemy of the "Sabbath;" the "principal offender against the Sunday law;" the "foe of Christian morality," etc. The Sunday papers and their publishers were denounced in unmeasured terms in the New Castle convention, and it is evident there can be no compromise between them and the National Reformers.

The people of New Castle were informed that petitions had been prepared and would be sent to every pastor in the State, and would very shortly be presented to the people for their signatures. Dr. H. H. George said in substance: "Let every man and woman sign these petitions. Sign them every chance you get. Let even the children, who are old enough, sign them." Doubtless this advice will be followed; the experience gained in the matter of the World's Fair petitions has prepared the way for all sorts of unscrupulous methods in securing signatures to petitions asking for religious laws. The motto seems to be: "The end justifies the means."

Another matter that excited much enthusiasm in the convention was a proposition to establish in Washington City a "Bureau of National Reforms," or in other words, a National Reform lobby, modeled after the Roman Catholic bureau of Indian schools. It was Dr. H. H. George who proposed this, and he explained the work that could be done by the proposed lobby. One object would be to keep the "Christian people" informed in regard to every measure introduced having any bearing upon religion or morality, so that "proper" influence in favor of "good laws and against bad ones" might be brought to bear upon members of Congress by means of petitions, letters, and telegrams. He said that the "Christian people" of the

country had but recently learned their power, and how to influence legislation; and declared, "We can secure from Congress anything we ask." The scheme is to establish a permanent bureau from which information and appeals can be sent out to every church and pastor in the United States, thus securing in favor of any scheme in which the churches are interested the united influence of "orthodox" churches. Congress will be deluged with letters, petitions and telegrams, until members will be made to believe that the demand for religious laws is well nigh universal; in short, the dishonest methods pursued so successfully in intimidating and cajoling Congress in the matter of closing the World's Fair, are to be made a permanent feature of National Reform tactics. This association, which for a time seemed to be overshadowed by the American Sabbath Union, appears to be destined to exert a far-reaching influence in perfecting the papal image in this country; and the spirit manifested in the New Castle convention, especially by Dr. H. H. George and a few others, shows that the men who would burn bodies to save souls are not all dead. The spirit of the Inquisition still lives; does the spirit of martyrdom likewise survive? Yea, verily; men are not wanting who would die for their faith, even as some have already gone to prison and into the chain-gang "for the Word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ."

"Abridging the Freedom of the Press" *American Sentinel* 10, 2 , pp. 14, 15.

ONE of the most dangerous measures ever introduced in Congress is a bill to amend and to reînact section 3,877 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. The bill was introduced by Mr. Weadock, of Michigan, and is now in the hands of the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads.

Section 3,877, which it is proposed to reînact and amend, defines second class mail matter and Mr. Weadock's bill proposes to add to the existing provision the following:—

Any newspaper or other matter of the second class which advises, abets, or suggests the commission of any offense against any law of the United States, or any State or Territory, or any country with which we are at peace, shall be excluded from the mails.

It is incredible that such a bill should ever become a law in "free America," and yet equally strange things have happened within the

last half decade; and nobody can feel sure that Mr. Weadock's bill will not pass. But whether this bill passes or not, the fact that it has been introduced and is being seriously considered is ominous. An official censorship of the press is a thing utterly repugnant to the spirit of our free institutions, and yet that is just what this bill proposes to establish.

Already inroads have been made upon the First Amendment to the Constitution, and this bill proposes a still further attack; for whereas the First Amendment provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press," this bill proposes to put a bridle upon the press by excluding from the mails every publication of the second class which in the estimation of the postmaster-general shall *advise, abet, or suggest* the commission of any offense against any law of the United States, or of any State, or of any country with which we are at peace.

For instance, the AMERICAN SENTINEL says that Seventh-day Adventists cannot consistently obey Sunday laws. It would require no great stretch of the authority

15

sought to be conferred by this bill for the postmaster-general to hold that the SENTINEL, indirectly at least, both advises, abets, and suggests offenses against the laws of every State having upon its statute books a Sunday law, and to therefore order its exclusion from the mails.

Again, the *American Hebrew*, which raised the fund for the release of W. B. Capps from jail, and which in common with the SENTINEL and many other papers denounced his imprisonment as religious persecution, and insisted that Mr. Capps had a right to work on Sunday, might be held to have abetted in the offense against the law of Tennessee, and so be excluded from the mails. In fact, there is scarcely any limit to the power which it proposes to confer upon the postmaster-general by this bill. It is a most dangerous and significant measure.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 2 , p. 16.

THE *Evangelist*, a leading Presbyterian paper published in this city, contained the following paragraph, under date of Dec. 27th:—

The new secretary of the Papal Legation in this country, Father Rooker, recently appointed by the pope to succeed Dr. Papi,

appears to have been nominated in accordance with a recognition of this relative condition of things. Father Rooker is an American and of the liberal school represented by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland and the brilliant Paulist Father who recently lectured to the students in Union Seminary. His choice appears to be a good omen for America, and for the church of which he is a representative.

"A good omen for America!" Blind, indeed, must be the American Protestant who can see a good omen for America in the appointment of any Roman Catholic to secretaryship of the Papal Legation at Washington. The more he is like "Archbishop Ireland and the brilliant Paulist Father who recently lectured to the students in Union Seminary," the sooner will the scheme of Rome be realized. Shades of Martin Luther! Are American Protestants drunk? Yes, drunk with the wine of Babylon.

THE real spirit of National Reform was well exemplified in the recent New Castle convention by the means used to counteract the influence of certain religious liberty publications, distributed there prior to the meeting. These publications were, "Limitations of Civil Authority from the Standpoint of Natural Right and Divine Obligation;" and, "Why Do Seventh-day Adventists Suffer Imprisonment Rather Than Keep Sunday?" Reference was made to these publications several times, and always in a way to prejudice the people against them. But the climax of misrepresentation was reached when Mr. D. McAllister exhibited a copy of the *Truth Seeker* to the audience, and calling attention to the cartoons on the first and last pages, said that such was secularism gone to seed; that such was the logical conclusion of opposition to their movement, etc.; and classed the AMERICAN SENTINEL with the paper he was exhibiting. This was grossly unfair, for the SENTINEL has nothing in common with the *Truth Seeker*, except opposition to National Reform, and even this is from so widely different a standpoint that it can scarcely be said to be in common.

But unfair and misleading as was Dr. McAllister's statement, it was not sufficiently so to satisfy Dr. H. H. George, and he arose in the convention, and referring again to the religious liberty publications, said, "They all emanate from the same source and are of the same character." *Nothing could be more false*, for while the *Truth Seeker* is intensely hostile to all revealed religion, the tracts to which reference has been made are consistently Christian, and breathe a spirit of genuine Christian piety; and this every honest man must admit,

whether he agrees with the conclusions reached or not. The statements made were nothing short of palpable violations of the ninth commandment, and especially is this true of that made by Dr. George; indeed, it is hard to believe that his was not a deliberate purpose to deceive the audience as to the character of the tracts in question.

But is infidelity "opposition to National Reform gone to seed"? Is it the logical conclusion of opposition to the so-called "Christian theory of civil government"? By no means; for as we have repeatedly shown in these columns, National Reform is itself anti-Christian. Moreover, it is no more logical to class the *Truth Seeker* and the AMERICAN SENTINEL together because they both oppose National Reform, than it would be to class the *Truth Seeker* and the *Christian Statesman* together because they both oppose Romanism. The Roman Catholic can just as consistently argue that infidelity is simply opposition to Romanism gone to seed, as the National Reformers can argue that infidelity is simply opposition to National Reform gone to seed. Either is a begging of the question and is unworthy of honest men. Let the National Reformers meet and refute, if they can, from the Scriptures to which we constantly appeal, the arguments of the SENTINEL. Yea, let them clear themselves of the charge that their so-called reform is not subversive of the very foundation principles of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ which they profess to serve.

IN a speech to the pontifical household, Dec. 24, as reported by the *World*, the pope said:—

The faith is reviving among the nations, which have come to recognize that civil virtues and laws are not sufficient to restrain the masses. It is of great importance, therefore, that all work together to make religion a forced in public as well as in private life. It is the duty of rulers to lend their support to religious creeds.

The one great scheme which the pope is working to being the world in submission at his feet is here briefly stated. "The masses cannot be controlled with religion. The Protestant religion commenced in anarchy and ends with anarchy. The only religion which can restrain the masses is the Roman Catholic religion." Therefore, "it is the duty of rulers to lend their support to religious [Roman Catholic] creeds." Rome breeds anarchy in her followers by telling them that the nation which does not recognize the Roman Catholic creed is a heretical nation, unstable, and must sooner or later come to ruin. When this teaching bears fruit in social unrest, riots and Coxeism, she points to these social disturbances and

charges it upon a failure to recognize the papal creed, and offers to calm the troubled waters in exchange for power. The *Catholic World* of August last, closed its observations on the Coxey movement which were similar to the statement of the pope here quoted, with the significant remark: "What possibilities there are in the old church!" This game of the pope will succeed and that soon, but this very success will preface the everlasting overthrow of this anti-Christian system. See Revelation, chaps. 17, 18, and 19.

January 17, 1895

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 10, 3 , p. 17.

ONE of the most significant signs of the times is the reception accorded in all lands,—not excepting even our own,—to representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. The *Catholic Universe* of Dec. 7, 1894, has this editorial note illustrative of the foregoing remark:—

Detailed reports of Monsignor Satolli's visit to Albany make it clear that the apostolic delegate was received by ecclesiastics and the highest officials of New York State, with every mark of distinguished consideration, rarely accorded even to eminent functionaries of Church or State. The fact may appear alarming to those narrow minded fanatics who believe Monsignor Satolli to be a leader of the Jesuits, but level headed folk, Catholic as well as Protestant, understand that the respect shown to the illustrious visitor, is nothing more than the due of the *accredited representative* of the *acknowledged spiritual ruler of Christendom*.

Such "distinguished consideration" is never shown to representatives of other churches; why, then, do the officials of New York show such consideration to Monsignor Satolli? It can be for no other reason than because Satolli represents not merely an ecclesiastical, but a political power. The papacy insinuates itself into the politics of every country; and it is for this reason that the officials of an American State deem it "wise statesmanship" to accord him such a rare reception.

"The Papacy in Europe" *American Sentinel* 10, 3 , pp. 18, 19.

THE prestige and power of the papacy is rapidly growing in other countries as well as in the United States, and in those very countries too that have always been supposed to be particularly Protestant.

Germany and Switzerland are the two countries in which the Reformation worked with the greatest power and took the strongest hold, and yet in a single number of the *Catholic Standard*, Dec. 23, 1894, we find three items which show that practically both of these countries are to-day Roman Catholic control once more. We reprint all three of them, for the situation which they present is worthy the sober consideration of all. Here is the first one:—

Once more the Center or Catholic party holds the balance of power in the German parliament, and most properly announces that in the coming struggle over the anti-Socialist bill they will use that power to a two-fold purpose. Unless the Falk laws are wholly repealed so as to allow the Jesuits to come back in full standing, they will defeat the measure in any form; and even if this just concession be granted to them, they will not support the bill in its present drag-net form, but will insist on its being amended so as to make it bear at least the semblance of fair play and regard for constitutional rights. Thus once more do Catholics stand out prominently as the champions of true liberty and equal rights for all.

Another one, the complement of this, is as follows:—

It would certainly be noteworthy were Prince Hohenlohe to be instrument in wiping out the last trace of the Bismarck Falk anti-Catholic laws in Germany. When they were enacted, and thus called into existence the powerful Center Party, he, though a practical Catholic, held aloof and failed to identify himself with the Catholic movement that has won such glorious fame. But now that he is chancellor, in succession to the real author of those laws, he finds himself in need of the Catholic vote in order to be able to enact the anti-Socialist bill into a law. Without it the measure is doomed to defeat, and accordingly there would be good reason for supposing the report to be well founded that the new chancellor has offered valuable inducements to the Catholics in return for their support. Time brings its revenges.

With a Catholic party in the German parliament, that is able to dictate legislation and force the acceptance of its will; and with a Catholic Chancellor of the empire who is one with it in spirit and ready to play into its hands politically, it is evident enough that the papacy once more has control of Germany.

As to Switzerland, the pointer is as follows:—

The country that, over twenty years ago, most closely followed the example of, and even sometimes surpassed, Germany in waging the famous "Culturkampf" war against the Catholic Church, was Switzerland; and the imitation seems to be kept up. Last month a Catholic, even though he be but a "Liberal" one, became chancellor of what Bismarck wanted to make *the* Protestant empire

of the world; and last week a Catholic, and a staunch one, Dr. Zemp, of Lucerne, was elected president of the Swiss republic. This is truly a wondrous world. We may yet hear of Signor Crispi restoring the temporal power of the pope!

Yes, this is a wondrous world indeed. And in view of the situation as thus revealed, it is pertinent to ask whether the Reformation was indeed a mistake.

The papacy once had control of these countries. Was that control such a blessing that it is above all things to be desired again? If so, then assuredly her claim is justified—that the Reformation was so entirely an uncalled-for thing as not to deserve in any sense the title of "Reformation," but, on the contrary, should be condemned as an unwarranted and mischievous innovation. But if, as is the fact, the control of these countries by the papacy before, was, as it always is in any country, *a constant blight* and a *withering curse*, it cannot possibly be anything else now; and therefore the Reformation was called for, and was in every sense a proper and righteous thing.

And the Reformation being a proper and a righteous thing when it delivered these countries from the domination of the papacy; and now these countries being once ore dominated by the papacy; it follows that the people of these countries are more imbued with the principles of the papacy than with the principles of the

19

Reformation. And in that case it is only the logical consequence that the papacy should dominate these countries; for whenever a people become imbued with the principles of the papacy, *whatever their profession* may be, it is then a mere question of *time* as to that people and their country being dominated by the papacy in fact. And of this truth the United States is no less a striking illustration, than are Germany and Switzerland.

"What National Reform Really Is" *American Sentinel* 10, 3 , p. 19.

WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA is the habitat of National Reform in the United States, hence it is there seen in its best, or rather, worst aspects.

It was in western Pennsylvania that Alexander Campbell battled against the "Moral Societies," the National Reform Association of three-quarters of a century ago; and it is in western Pennsylvania that the most radical National Reform utterances are heard to-day.

In the recent National Reform convention in New Castle, Dr. R. J. George, a leading light in National Reform circles, spoke on the "Duties of the State to the Church." He said:—

The State is subservient to the Church. The nations and kingdoms which do not serve God shall perish.

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

The State should perform the true Christian religion. The Church is to teach the State God's message. The Sabbath mail service is an assault upon the Church, because it is trampling upon the sacred day appointed by God for his service.

The State must have its moral system maintained in its legislation. It is the duty of the nations of the world to protect the Church in its work among missions. The State should bestow national gifts upon the Church and thus testify the sincerity of her attachment to the gospel.

The State erects jails and gallows, but gives nothing to the Church.

The very first proposition in the quoted paragraphs shows the true nature of National Reform, and is a confusion of all that has ever been charged against the system. Webster defines subservient as, "Fitted or disposed to subserve; useful in an inferior capacity; serving to promote some end; subordinate." It follows that, according to Dr. George, and according to National Reform, the State exists only to serve the Church; and as service means obedience, it follows that the real governing power is the Church, and that the State exists only to enforce the laws and decrees of the Church. And this is simply the papacy over again, a veritable image of the papacy.

Again, National Reform asserts that the State should profess the "true Christian religion;" but before the State can profess the true Christian religion, it must decide what the true Christian religion is; and this must be an authoritative decision, binding upon the several units which compose the State, for the State is simply the people in their aggregate capacity. But the action of the people in their aggregate capacity is only the action of the majority, or more frequently, of an organized minority having control of legislation; and under the National Reform scheme this majority or a united minority having control of legislation, must decide for the whole people what is the true Christian religion. But to decide for another what is the true Christian religion is to assume the prerogative of infallibility, and thus again National Reform leads us back to the papacy,—to the church of

Rome; for this usurpation of authority to decide what is the true Christian religion, is the very groundwork of the papacy.

This Government was at the first framed upon the principle of equal civil and religious rights to all. It was not opposed to religion, nor to its free exercise, but only to any profession of religion by the Government, because in the very nature of the case any profession of religion by the civil government must of necessity trench upon the freedom of the individual. It very properly held by the framers of the Constitution that the "greatest service any government can render religion is to let it alone." This is Protestantism, and it was after this principle that our Government was fashioned. But now comes National Reform and demands that the fashion of our institutions shall be changed; that instead of remaining as our fathers made it, this Government shall be imaged after the papacy; that it shall assume the prerogative of infallibility and define and profess "the true Christian religion." Is not this a fulfillment of the prophecy of Revelation 11:14, "Saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast [the papacy], which had the wound by the sword and did live"?

And is not this virtually what has been done by the action of the various departments of the Government? First, in February, 1892, the Supreme Court decided that "this is a Christian nation;" then followed the World's Fair legislation, in which Congress assumed to define at least one dogma of the "true Christian" faith, by declaring that Sunday, the first day of the week, is the Sabbath according to the fourth commandment; and this at the demand of the churches, thus giving "the church" the place claimed for her by National Reform, namely, that of lawgiver to the State.

The principle contended for by National Reformers has certainly been admitted by the Government. Over and over again it had been plainly stated by Dr. H. H. George, as it was in the New Castle convention, that the church can have anything she demands from Congress. "The Christian people have learned their power; they can mould legislation as they will." Such is the boast of National Reform to-day; and this being true, the State being, by its own acknowledgement, subservient to the Church, have we not in this country a perfect image to the papacy, a church dominating the civil power and using it to further her own interests and to enforce her dogmas? We certainly have.

Certainly, if Dr. George's theory were correct, if the State should have a religion, it should support it. And this is National Reform as one finds it in western Pennsylvania, and as it in fact obtaining in every part of our land once the house of liberty of conscience, but now the seat of the image to the papal beast, the home of that iniquitous system whereby the Government . . . itself to the combined churches to enforce upon the consciences of all men the unscriptural dogma of Sunday sacredness.

"Rome Condemns Free Inquiry" *American Sentinel* 10, 3 , p. 19.

THAT Rome is opposed to the right of private judgment, is evident from this editorial note from the *Catholic Times* of Dec. 15:—

Not Protestantism, but indifferentism, is the chief obstacle to the conversion of Americans to the Catholic Church. The whole spirit of the country is in favor of looking upon religion as a personal opinion. You are at perfect liberty to change your religious opinions as you do your coat and hat. . . . The only church with a shadow of a claim to unity and universality is the Roman Catholic. We should impress upon our countrymen the logical position which the church holds, and show them that it is not based on bigotry or intolerance, but upon the essential nature of truth, which must be exclusive. If there is only one true religion, any creed or opinion contradictory of that must be false; and if we can find out the one true religion, we need not prolong our investigations into anything that calls itself a church.

Yet all signs point to a wider diffusion of the false idea of religion as a private and personal opinion, which it is every man's birthright to choose, hold and reject at pleasure. This is the outcome of the spirit of free inquiry and private interpretation which was created and fostered by the Reformation. It is the glory of Protestantism, of which it has also been the bane.

There is no mistaking the spirit of this utterance. It is opposed to the right of private judgment is not to be exercised, it must be repressed, and that by force; there is no other way. And yet Rome poses as the champion of civil and religious liberty! But let it never be forgotten that in the terminology of the papacy, religious liberty is the right to "worship God according to the dictates of a right conscience;" and a "right conscience" is a conscience controlled by the Catholic Church.

"Dr. Mullally Opposes the Endorsement of Dr. Parkhurst's Methods"
American Sentinel 10, 3 , pp. 19, 20.

AMS is well known, there was quite a thorough political revolution in this city at the election last November. As is also well known, Dr. Parkhurst, by political and immoral methods, had a considerable share in bringing this about. Tributes of honor have been paid to Dr. Parkhurst by different secular organizations. Dr. Parkhurst is a Presbyterian in religious connection, and a member of the "Presbytery of New York." Some, at least, of this Presbytery think that Dr. Parkhurst's political work is so much of a Presbyterian affair that the Presbytery, as such, should

20

honor him for it. To this end a resolution was introduced at the regular monthly meeting of the Presbytery in December,—the first after the election. But Dr. Mullally (all honor to him), braved the opprobrium that he could not help but know must come upon him for such a thing, and openly challenged the proposition. The report says:—

Dr. Mullally (he was careful to tell the reporters to spell his name with four l's) does not believe that a minister is called to preach civic righteousness; he would draw a sharp line between duties to the State and duties to God, and he would exclude from "the court of Jesus Christ" all civil and social methods. If the members of the Presbytery want to give recognition to Dr. Parkhurst's work they ought, he contends, to adjourn as a Presbytery and meet as citizens. Of course they did not want to do this, and so put the resolution over for a month.

This is perfectly sound and Christian doctrine. And yet the *Independent* cannot pour contempt enough upon Dr. Mullally for having done this. And the *Independent* makes great pretensions to being in favor of separation of Church and State! Now if Dr. Parkhurst's political and immoral work was done as a Presbyterian; and if this work was in the regular line of the work of the Presbytery of New York, then of course it is proper enough that the Presbytery as such, in regular course of its Presbyterial business, should pass a resolution in commendation of him and his work; *and then, too*, it follows that the *Presbytery* of New York counts its interests and work as identical with the interests and work of the *city* of New York, and that, therefore, there is a *union* of the Presbytery of New York with the city of New York; in other words, *a union of Church and State*.

Dr. Mullally consistently advocates the separation of Church and State in the Presbytery of New York. The *Independent* professedly

believes in the separation of Church and State, and at the same time scathingly condemns Dr. Mullally. Therefore from this, one of two things as certainly follows as that two and two make four; namely, either the *Independent* does not really believe in the separation of Church and State, or else it does not know what the separation of Church and State is. And in the United States there are entirely too many people who are just like the *Independent*.

"Wrangling" *American Sentinel* 10, 3 , p. 20.

"PHYSICIAN, heal thyself," is most applicable to the Sunday-enforcement champions. While posing as reformers and attempting to cure the Sunday-breaking malady, it is ever and anon apparent that they themselves are in dire need of a cure for selfishness, private ambition, and carnality in their chronic stages.

The last meeting of the Pennsylvania Sabbath (Sunday) Association, held at Williamsport, Nov. 29, 1894, was marked with a disgraceful contention between leaders over the distribution of territory, the term "wrangling" being applied by each party to the other's conduct.

However, the latest wrangle among these self-appointed custodians of other people's morals is between "Rev." Edward Thompson, "general manager of the Sunday League of America," and "Rev." J. H. Knowles, secretary of the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union. Mr. Thompson, who has been operating in the West, recently came East, as it would appear to look for a job, and in order to aid in securing one, commenced distributing Sunday League literature and availing himself of every opportunity to speak and "lift a collection." Soon after, Mr. Knowles met Mr. Thompson on the streets of New York and challenged his right to invade his territory. Mr. Thompson replied as follows,—if Mr. Knowles' public statement before the New York Methodist Ministers' Monday morning meeting (Jan. 7), in the presence of Mr. Thompson, can be believed:—

Oh, this is only a temporary affair. You see I am seeking a pastorate East, and this is one of the ways I have of getting known.

Mr. Thompson was very angry at his brother for thus publicly betraying his confidence, and said:—

I did not know that what I said to him in confidence he would blabber all over the city and injure me in preventing me from getting a hearing before the more important churches.

After much bitter contention Dr. J. M. King, president of the Law and Order League of America,—the inquisitorial annex of the Sabbath Association,—raised applause by declaring, with much warmth, "Dr. Knowles needs no certificate of character from this conference, and any son of a bishop or of Gabriel who comes here to offer attacks on Dr. Knowles has come to the wrong market with his wares."

All this is very fitting; these builders of the American image of the papacy act their part well. How all this reads like the rows of the Roman Catholic bishops when in the councils of the early centuries they legislated on what men should believe and thereby built the papacy.

"Rum and Romanism" *American Sentinel* 10, 3 , p. 21.

"FATHER" ELLIOTT, the Catholic priest who is fishing for Protestants in Ohio, has gotten into trouble with his financial backing. It takes money to conduct his propaganda, and consequently, the managers of the enterprises called upon the Roman Catholic beer brewers, distillers, and saloon-keepers to donate for the conversion of heretical Protestants to the true Catholic faith. The drunkard makers contributed liberally and then seated themselves comfortably in "Father" Elliott's congregation to watch the priest convert Protestants. But the priest is fishing for Protestants, not papists; and consequently he baits for fresh water fish with a temperance bait. Seeing how popular Protestantism palavered over what they foolishly thought was a temperance victory in the Satolli-Watterson decision, Priest Elliott hastened to add a "temperance night" to his programme. The result is told as follows in the *Wine and Spirit News*, under the "scare head," "The Liquor Men Bled and then Roasted:"—

One of the most outrageous, and to say the least, most *ungrateful* acts ever perpetrated upon the liquor traffic of the State of Ohio, and purely a money-making scheme, is that which is now being engineered under the supervision of one styling himself Father Elliott. So bold have become his operations that the *Wine and Spirit News*, the official organ of the Ohio State Liquor League, deems it necessary that every person engaged in the liquor traffic in the State should be made fully acquainted with the facts, and be in a position to protect himself against this skin game when approached by one or more of its advocates. Prompted, perhaps, by the successful operation in the robbery line, by the Rev. Howard Russell, superintendent and general chief schemer of the so-called Anti-saloon League, Father Elliott has concluded to take the road.

Although his mode of operation is, to a large extent, similar to that employed by the Rev. Russell, Father Elliott has introduced a new scheme to fatten his purse. One of the first cities to be called upon by Father Elliott and his followers was Toledo. The programme for the sic evenings' entertainment was published, but good care was taken not to include anything derogatory to the liquor interests. The *church committees* were soon in the field with their subscription books, and the very first persons called upon were those engaged in the liquor traffic. The liquor men, as all other business men ever ready to assist any project looking to public interest, subscribed liberally, most of the donations ranging from five to ten dollars each. The brewers, wholesale and retailers, were called upon alike, and seldom was the committee sent away empty-handed, and when totally summed up it was found that the liquor traffic defrayed the entire week's expenses. A large number of the liquor men who had so liberally donated to the affair, attended the lecture at St. Francis de Sales Church, on Cherry Street last Thursday evening, and their reward was the most damnable tirade against their business.

These Roman Catholic dealers in "fire water" are evidently not trained Jesuits, or they would have stoically swallowed the bitter pill while comforting themselves with the papal maxim, "the end justifies the means." However, they seem to feel justified in making an "end" of contributing "means" to support Priest Elliott's propaganda.

January 24, 1895

"A Courageous Protest" *American Sentinel* 10, 4 , pp. 25, 26.

THE New York Presbytery at its last meeting was the scene of a struggle between truth and error, between one man and a multitude, which vividly recalls the historic description of Martin Luther's experience at the Diet of Worms.

The occasion of the struggle was the introduction of resolutions indorsing Dr. Parkhurst's well-known methods of reform. Steps to this end had been taken at the preceding meeting, but Rev. Francis P. Mullally, D.D., had vigorously opposed them as contrary to the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, and contrary to the gospel; and inasmuch as most of the members of the Presbytery had already left the meeting, the matter was postponed until the next meeting. Following the postponement of the matter the daily press announced that the New York Presbytery had failed to indorse Dr. Parkhurst's reform methods. This enraged the members, as it brought upon them the denunciation of the church crusade, which is in a fever of

enthusiasm over the work of Dr. Parkhurst. Then followed published statements from the members of the Presbytery in which Dr. Mullally was shamefully abused.

In the meantime Dr. Mullally was not idle. He mailed to each member a statement of his position with quotations from the constitution of the church, expressly forbidding it to take action upon any but ecclesiastical questions, with arguments against the proposed action, based on the jurisdiction of the Church of Christ. The agitation of the matter filled the assembly room at the regular meeting of the Presbytery held Jan. 14. As an instance indicating the temper of the assembly, when the moderator had announced the order of business for the day, and before he could finish his sentence, the aforetime dignified clerk of the meeting jumped excitedly to his feet and moved to make the matter of indorsing Dr. Parkhurst the first matter of business instead of the last, which motion was carried with a thundering affirmative.

This much of an introduction is necessary to explain why the assembly room was crowded last week, and to give the reader an idea of the temper of the audience which the doctor faced when he arose to oppose the resolutions.

Dr. Lullally stands six feet four inches high, with broad shoulders and a voice in proportion with his powerful frame; but better than all, he had the consciousness of possessing the truth, and the courage of his convictions, which enabled him to look with a steady eye into the faces of his audience whose only expression was that of mingled pity and disgust.

Dr. Mullally began his address by showing from the minutes of the last General Assembly that members of the New York Presbytery who were present before him had expressed at that time, touching other questions, sentiments in favor of the very same principle for which he was contending. He also read from the church constitution which explicitly confines the jurisdiction of the church to ecclesiastical questions, and then summarily but logically disposed of the claim that Dr. Parkhurst's work involved morality and was therefore within the scope of the Christian minister and within the realm of the legitimate work of the Presbytery; after which he continued as follows:—
[Reproduced by Dr. Mullally for the SENTINEL by request. Italicized by the Editor.]

"The end of the Church is regeneration, not reform, to resurrect, not merely to embalm the spiritually dead, not to stay the process of corruption, but to give a new transforming life.

"The only means appointed to the Church, and which it is competent for her to use, *is the Word of God*; but Dr. Parkhurst's appeal is to the *sword of the civil magistrate*.

"There are but three opinions touching the nature of Church power,—the Erastian, the Romish, and the Evangelical. The first makes the Church the mere agent of the State; the second makes the Church the substitute for Christ, and teaches that she may do or declare anything which Christ could do or declare were he still here in the flesh; the third holds that Christ is the head of the Church, that without him acting in her, she is a headless, impotent corpse, and that he exercises his headship only by his Word. Hence, when this stops, the Church must stop. If this Presbytery indorses the reform work of Dr. Parkhurst, *it will be imitating Rome* and assuming an authority as the substitute of Christ, when the legitimate function of the Church, as a Church, is *only to voice the mind of Christ, as revealed in the Scriptures*.

"But I object to the proposed resolutions on another ground. In reference to this, I will observe the utmost delicacy and reserve. Nor is it necessary to enter into detail or description, even if such a course were permissible in open court. The very gentleman who has zealously urged the taking up of this matter out of its order on the docket said, after the close of our last meeting, in the hearing of several brethren, that no member of the Presbytery approved Dr. Parkhurst's detective work. The member alluded to is our permanent clerk, and ought to know whereof he affirmed. I content myself with saying, that in view of Dr. Parkhurst's methods, this Presbytery cannot identify itself with him in his reform enterprise without virtually *accepting* and *approving* the pernicious principle that we may do evil that good may come, or, that the end justifies the means.

"My third objection is, that the action proposed would be utterly inconsistent with the overture for organic union with our Church, made to the Southern Presbyterian Church, by our last General Assembly. The distinctive characteristic of the Southern Church is, fidelity to, and insistence upon, the importance of the legislation of our confession touching the purview of judicatorial jurisdiction; and the adoption of these resolutions by the large and influential Presbytery of New York, will widen the breach between the two churches, and put back their union at least a hundred years."

And now, that the reader may get an idea of the character of the speeches made against Dr. Mullally's logical, scriptural, Protestant, protest, we print two speeches

characteristic of the arguments(?) adduced. Dr. Henry M. Field, editor of the *Evangelist*, a leading Presbyterian paper of this city, said:—

I do think that we owe something to ourselves. . . . , we are told, was pointed . . . to the streets of Florence as the man who had been in Dr. Parkhurst has been down into . . . to drag up some of the poor unfortunates from it. I knew that at the beginning of his work a great many clergymen passed by on the other side. But his work was necessary, and it was splendidly done. I asked Commissioner . . . , the only honest police commissioner—whether Dr. Parkhurst's work was needed, and he replied, "Dr. Parkhurst did exactly right." [What an argument!]

I say that Dr. Parkhurst not only . . . within his duty, but that never did he perform his duty so well as in this. He has done more to purify the city of New York than all the rest of us put together.

This childish attempt at argument, by an editor of a representative Presbyterian paper, was greeted with loud applause on the part of the gray-haired and proverbially conservative members of the Presbytery, as was also the following speech by Dr. Shiland:—Christ went among publicans and sinners to bring them under the influence of his gospel. we must not forget that. I may not approve of all that Dr. Parkhurst has done, but I believe that his work should have a monument higher than the Egyptian obelisk in the Park.

It would be indelicate, as Dr. Mullally intimated, to refer to some of Dr. Parkhurst's methods for the purpose of contrasting them with the association of our Saviour with publicans and sinners and his methods of saving them, by way of replying to Dr. Shiland.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the following resolutions were put to vote, and received a roar of "ayes," while the negative received Dr. Mullally's single but firm, clear, resonant "no"—

Resolved, That the Presbytery of New York express the gratitude for, and its pride to, the persistent, noble and successful efforts of our fellow-Presbyter, Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D., in the interest of greatly needed municipal reform.

Resolved, That we rejoice in the success which he has had in arousing the Christian young men of the city to a realizing sense of their moral and religious duties as citizens, and in binding them together in efforts for the purification of our civil and social life.

Resolved. That we recognize the gospel of Christ as the supreme remedy for every form of evil, and the Church of Christ as the agency by which the world is to be regenerated and saved, and, therefore, we believe that the moral teachings of Christ must be applied to every sphere of life, and that the Church should bear her testimony for righteousness and purity in all human affairs.

We heartily commend Dr. Parkhurst for the faithful, heroic testimony which he has borne. We thank God for the favor which has made his efforts for reform successful. And we implore God's blessing upon them, that they may be permanent and completely triumphant.

Immediately upon the passage of the resolutions, Dr. Mullally entered a formal, written protest involving the points of his address which will be recorded on the minutes of the meeting. After the protest was entered the moderator, Dr. Robert R. Booth, who by his impartial rulings and respectful attention to Dr. Mullally's speech and protest evinced the only sympathy for his position, then asked if it was desired to enter the customary reply to the protest. The question was answered by a chorus of disdainful "noes." One Presbyter added, "It answers itself," which was followed by loud laughter.

We will not have space in this issue to comment upon these resolutions. Suffice it to say that they completely unite the Presbytery of New York, both as to functions and methods, to the civil government of New York; and besides, they indorse the immoral methods of Dr. Parkhurst, and petition for the blessing of God on the immoral methods and the unholy union.

The writer has witnessed many scenes involving the fall of the Protestant churches from the exalted platform of Protestantism to the theory and practice of papal methods, but never one so complete and impressive. Verily the apostate Protestant "image" of the papacy, as predicted in chapters 13 and 14 of Revelation, is fast preparing to accomplish its predicted work.

"Preposterous Claims of the Papacy" *American Sentinel* 10, 4 , p. 26.

THE Roman Catholic press of the United States, evidently by preconcerted action, is attempting to convince Americans that they are indebted to the Roman Catholic Church for religious freedom. This is a part of a great scheme to hypnotize Americans until the Catholic Church gets in a position to strike the final, fatal blow to crush religious freedom.

The *Monitor*, a Catholic paper claiming to have the largest circulation of any religious paper on the Pacific Coast, concludes an article entitled, "Religious Liberty," with the following ridiculous claim:

And it remains a supreme and significant fact that we owe all the blessings of religious freedom to the influence of a Catholic

nation [France] and the teaching of a prelate [Bishop Fenelon] of the church of Rome.

As silly as is this statement, there is something more silly, and that something is a Protestantism that believes just that kind of nonsense, and is fawning and flattering Romanists while rebuking as a bigot, him who fearlessly exposes the wiles of Rome and holds the "mother of harlots," drunk with the blood of the saints, rigidly to the logic of her claim that "Rome never changes."

Were it not that there are so many non-Catholics who accept such nonsensical assertions, the SENTINEL would not stoop to notice them. But the situation demands that they be refuted with facts.

In refutation of the statement that America borrowed her religious liberty principles from the French nation, it is enough to state that there never has been a separation of Church and State in France like that inaugurated by the founders of the American Constitution; and if there had been, it would have been accomplished in opposition to the Roman Catholic Church, rather than by its aid.

If any wish to read of the attitude of Roman Catholic France to the principle of religious freedom, let them read the history of Roman Catholic France. Let them read of the fiendish slaughter of Albigenses; the satanic torture of the Waldenses; and the unutterable crimes committed against the Huguenots; all of which were instigated by Roman Catholic popes, engineered by French Roman Catholic rulers, and enacted by French Roman Catholic soldiers. Roman Catholic France the author of religious freedom? No, no more than was the devil the author of the sermon on the mount.

The second claim, that America is indebted to Bishop Fenelon, a French prelate, for its principles of religious freedom, is equally absurd. Fenelon, according to the *Monitor*, wrote his religious liberty ideas in 1745, but the *Monitor* ought to know that Martin Luther and the Augsburg Confession, more than two centuries before, had reannounced to the world the primitive Christian truth of separation of Church and State.

It would be indeed amusing if it did not involve serious considerations, to see the frantic efforts of Roman Catholic authorities in America to manufacture for themselves a certificate of character. After passing all the popes, cardinals, and archbishops in the whole history of the church, they finally claim to have found a bishop in France who was opposed to burning men's bodies to save their souls. Eureka! Let Americans calm their fears; the Roman Catholic

Church is the author and conservator of religious freedom in America and the world.

Never mind the incessant thunderings of infallible popes against religious freedom; never mind the warning of more than a thousand years of papal torture, inflicted upon dissenters by sword and flame, dungeon and rack; never mind all this, we have found a bishop in France who was opposed to proselyting by the sword. Never mind the fact that for holding these views, he was charged by his brother prelates with being a Protestant, never mind all this, just keep your mind on the thought that America owes its liberties in religion to the Roman Catholic Church.

We just now think of an imaginary parallel. It is like the late Jesse James asserting that he was the author and conservator of public safety, and as a reason why everybody ought to believe it, and elect him president of the United States, he should refer to a dead second cousin who never killed anybody. Americans, don't be fooled by this religious liberty song of the papists. It is composed and sung exclusively for Americans. Whenever it is sung, meet it with a dirge composed from the groans of tortured Protestant men and the wails of outraged Protestant women.

"A National Reform Assumption" *American Sentinel* 10, 4 , pp. 26, 27.

ONE of the assumptions of National Reform, and of governmental religion under any name, is that by a profession of Christianity a nation is made better.

In the late New Castle convention it was repeatedly said that "our officers ought to be Christian men," and that "then we should have no Lexow Committees and no such revelations of corruption as those in New York that so recently shocked the moral sense not only of the United States but of the world."

Of course the idea was that under the administration of Christian men, corruption would not exist. This is quite true. If it were possible to have a government carried on by *Christian* men, it would of necessity be honestly administered; for it is the Christian rule to "provide things honest in the sight of all men." A dishonest man is not a *Christian* man; and this applies not only in private life but in official position as well. Every *Christian* must take his religion into public office *to the extent that it must make him an honest man*; but not in the sense of using political power to further the ends of his creed or

church, or of using political power to enforce his religion upon others. The very foundation principle of Christianity forbids any such use of civil power. The one all-comprehensive rule which must govern the real Christian in all his dealings and relations with his fellowmen is, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." And this forbids all use of official position or of civil power for the

27

propagation of religion or of irreligion; for no man wants the power of the State used to disseminate views with which he is not in harmony; hence no man has, according to the Golden Rule, any right to use such power to propagate views that others do not believe.

But while it is true that really Christian men would administer a government honestly, is a profession of Christianity by the government any guarantee of Christian administration?—Certainly not. Everybody knows that dishonest men will profess anything for pecuniary advantage. To make a profession of religion a qualification for holding office is only to put a premium upon hypocrisy, and to multiply S. C. P. Breckinridges in the church. He was a man prominent in religious circles, a leader in his church, the father of one of the Sunday bills that has been before Congress during the past five years, and a lecturer on social purity; and yet at the time violating every principle of Christianity, living a life of deliberate, persistent sin; a veritable moral leper. And his is not an isolated case. How many embezzlers and defaulters as well as corrupt civil officials are members of churches, superintendents of Sunday schools, etc. Everybody knows that the list of such offenders is painfully long, and that a profession of Christianity is no guarantee of honesty. Among the twelve apostles was one Judas, and the proportion of evil men professing godliness has certainly never been less, except as persecution may at times have burned the dress out of the church, leaving only the genuine; and it is certainly very much greater whenever a premium is placed upon mere profession.

We have only to go to Russia to see the practical workings of a government in which a profession of religion is an essential to office holding. Russia professes a religion, the "Christian" religion, and office holders in that country must be members of the Orthodox Church. But are they honest? Is the government honestly administered?—Certainly not. It is notorious that Russian judges are

bribe-takers, that Russian tax collectors are thieves, and that Russian officials, almost from the highest to the lowest, are extortioners.

It follows, therefore, that a mere profession of religion does not make men honest, but mere profession is all that any human government can possibly secure; nay, more; the more any government has to do with religion, the more of false profession there will be. Therefore the greatest service that human government can possibly render true religion is to let it absolutely alone. Government can foster religious formalism and hypocrisy, but not genuine Christianity.

France, just preceding the great Revolution, affords a striking illustration of a government controlled by men making a profession of religion for worldly gain. The sequel was the Reign of Terror. Men seeing the falsity of governmental religion, and revolting against Sunday, extortion, and all kinds of ecclesiastical corruption, went to the other extreme and repudiated all religion. They said, If this is religion we want none of it. The trouble arose from a failure to distinguish between Christianity and that which was called Christianity. But who was to blame? Where but to the Church is the world expected to look for true Christianity? And is it not natural that it should accept as Christianity that which the Church says is Christianity? The Reign of Terror is continually pointed to as an awful exhibition of the effects of infidelity; it is also an awful example of the results of false profession and of governmental religion.

"Enforced Idleness" *American Sentinel* 10, 4, p. 27.

THE new Constitution of the State of New York, which went into force the first day of this January, has a provision which establishes practically the keeping in idleness of the State prisoners. Of this provision, William R. Huntington, D.D., Rector of Grace Church, this city, writing on the eve of the late election, justly remarks as follows:—

It so happens that just at present there is impending over the prisoners of the State of New York a calamity to which injustice, ignorance and inhumanity may be said to be contributing in about equal portions. The people are presently to be asked to approve a constitutional provision—in other words, to make it the law for twenty years to come—that the inmates of our prisons shall be kept idle, for

fear, forsooth, that their engagement in useful and remunerative occupations may injure the market for free labor.

I suppose there is no question among political economists of repute that this is bad political economy; I suppose there is no question among the masters of ethics that this is bad morality; I suppose there is not question among students of the New Testament that this is bad religion; and yet, it must needs be put into the same lump with other measures plainly desirable lest the labor vote should be offended. Could civil cowardice on the part of educated men much further go? . . .

The practical working of the thing will be that hundreds, and perhaps thousands of criminals, who only hope of reformation, humanly speaking, lies in their befog kept usefully occupied, will be thrown into an enforced idleness, sure to drive some of them to madness, some in suicide, and some to the patient devising either of methods of escape or of plots of revenge.

Can a State which knowingly consents to such a scheme for putting convicts to the torture—for that is just what it is—can a State, I say, which knowingly consents to such a scheme as this, look the King in the eye, and expect to hear him say, "Come, ye blessed of my Father"?

This is sound doctrine from beginning to end. And yet there is a demand made throughout this whole nation, and Dr. Huntingdon is a party to it, that the whole people shall be required by State and National law to submit to idleness a whole day in every week—that is, every Sunday in the year. It is true that this does not propose to put all those in prison-idleness; they are to be allowed to be at large if they will submit to it. But if they will not submit to this, then they are to be put in prison, and to be required to spend the idleness there. But the principle is the same, whether the enforced idleness be in prison or out of prison—and especially so when it inevitably follows in prison if it is not submitted to out of prison.

Enforced idleness, whether in prison or out of prison, whether on every day or only on Sunday, *is* bad political economy; it *is* bad morality; it is bad religion. And it is only injustice, ignorance, and inhumanity that contributes to it. And *how* can a State, or an individual, that knowingly consents to such a scheme as this, look the King in the eye and expect to hear him say, "Come, ye blessed of my Father"?

And yet Seventh-day Adventists everywhere are denounced, persecuted, fined, and imprisoned, for steadfastly refusing to sanction, or knowingly consent to, this same evil thing of enforced

idleness. They are threatened with outlawry, for their refusal to accept this principle of bad political economy, bad morality, and bad religion, or to join in this contribution of injustice, ignorance, and inhumanity. They are hated and persecuted by professed Christians for refusing to consent to a scheme which forbids their looking the King in the eye with any expectation of hearing him say, "Come, ye blessed of my Father."

Let it be so. The Seventh-day Adventists are right in this thing. Let the State commit suicide if it will, by enforcing bad political economy; but the Seventh-day Adventists and all others are right who refuse to sanction the proceeding. Let courts which assume the championship of a bad morality, aid in the suicide of the State by enforcing bad political economy in the interests of had morality, if they will; the Seventh-day Adventists and all others are right who refuse to respect such decisions of such courts. And let professed religionists support a bad religion by demanding such decisions from such courts to the death of the State, if they will; the Seventh-day Adventists and all others are right in refusing forever any respect to any such procedure on the part of any such religionists. It is better to be denounced, and persecuted, and fined, and imprisoned, and outlawed, because of good religion and good morality, which in themselves are a sufficient preservative of the State, than to have the highest honors of the State, and at the same time be working the certain ruin of self, society, and the State, by enforcing or respecting a bad religion, on account of a bad morality, in support of a bad political economy.

Let the Seventh-day Adventists and all others forever refuse to consent to a scheme which forbids their looking the King in the face with the expectation of hearing him say, "Come, ye blessed of my Father." And let all the people say, Amen?

"A Consistent Baptist" *American Sentinel* 10, 4 , pp. 27, 28.

BY permission, we publish the following from a private letter received from Dr. E. T. Hiscox, author, with other works, of "The Baptist Church Directory," a standard work among Baptists. Dr. Hiscox, as the reader will see, applies the great principle of religious freedom for which Baptists have contended so nobly, to the compulsory Sunday observance epidemic. It is difficult to find a person who is not avowedly in favor of religious liberty, but too many stop short in their logic. Especially is this true when the question of

prosecuting Seventh-day Adventists and others for laboring on Sunday, is under discussion. Dr. Hiscox, like a consistent Baptist, consistently, scripturally, and courageously applies the principle to Sunday laws as well as to other matters:—

The "Baptist position," in respect to the relation of religious and secular affairs, is this; there should be no union of Church and State, but an entire separation between them in all matters pertaining to the administration of religious affairs. They represent two kingdoms, with distinct spheres, and diverse functions, which cannot be united without injury to both. The State has no right of authority or of dictation in matters of faith and worship, which are questions of conscience and principle that lie between the individual soul and God. The State is bound to protect its citizens in the free exercise of their religious faith, without harm or hindrance, so long as they do not interfere with the rights of others. Christians should be good citizens, supporting the government which protects them, honoring the rulers and obeying the laws under which they live, so long as such laws are not contrary to the Word of God. The Church should sustain no organic relation to the State, and receive no patronage or support from it, since to do that would imply the right of supervision and dictation by the State. The support of religion belongs to those who profess it, and to allow fellowship and ac-

28

cept patronage from the State, never fails to secularize the spirit and to corrupt the purity of the Church. The civil authorities have no right to enforce or demand any form of faith, any manner of worship, nor yet to establish by law or compel the observance of a Sabbath, or any religious institution. It has no right to force conformity, or to punish dissent. Baptists to-day are loyal to their traditions through all the past. What they have demanded, labored for, and suffered to secure, is not toleration, but *liberty*; liberty in all concerns of conscience and of faith. The enactment of civil laws for the control or the curtailment of religious liberty, or for the infliction of civil penalties for non-conformity and the exercise of religious liberty, is wrong, unjust, contrary to the spirit of the gospel and to the genius of Christianity. It is also in conflict with the spirit of the age, and that more intelligent and beneficent civilization which Christianity has developed.

We respectfully submit this consistent Baptist utterance to those Baptist papers which are defending the prosecution of seventh-day observers for refusing to observe the State Sabbath, and which are criticising the *Examiner* for denouncing these persecutions.

"Satolli on Education" *American Sentinel* 10, 4 , pp. 28, 29.

AT a reception recently tendered Monsignor Satolli in this city, the pope's delegate presented a paper on education. The following are quotations from the published address:—

Education of the young is as important a safeguard of the nation as are courts and armies. It is of great moment, then, that we should understand in what true education must consist.

In what does this educational safeguard consist? Let the delegate reply:—

The young should be educated both in mind and heart, according to the constitution of the State, according to the great principles of morality and according to a true religious spirit.

But what are the "great principles of morality," and in what does the "true religious spirit" consist? Here it is:—

I will add that it is well that young men should have from their earliest days, a just idea of what the pope is, how lofty his dignity, how great his authority, how beneficial his actions. His dignity and his power come directly from Christ, and the exercise of this power can only be for the benefit, religious and social, intellectual and moral, temporal and eternal, of humanity.

It therefore follows that the safeguard of the United States lies in teaching the

29

young that Jesus Christ has delegated his power on earth to the pope, and that the exercise of this power is for the benefit, religious and social, intellectual and moral, temporal and eternal, of humanity. But we know that to teach the youth this is to undermine the safeguards of society. We know that the exercise of this "great" "authority" of the pope has always been and ever will be the *curse*, religious and social, intellectual and moral, temporal and eternal, of humanity.

But the delegate anticipated dissenters, and remarked in this connection that—

One who cannot see or would venture to deny the justice of these considerations would merit no attention from reasonable and well-thinking men.

We cannot see the justice of these considerations and therefore venture to deny them; and although we may not "merit" attention, we are very certain we will ere long receive attention.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 4 , p. 30.

CHAMBERS. W. MILLER, a seventh-day observer of Wampum, Pa., informs us that he has recently been notified by a committee composed of a Presbyterian minister, J. C. Rukens, and a Methodist minister, G. B. Carr, to close his stationery and confection store on Sundays, and told that a violation of the command would be followed by his prompt arrest. It looks now as if Pennsylvania would join Massachusetts in introducing the Sunday-slavery crusade into the northern States.

THOSE who oppose our scriptural prediction of a general persecution for non-observance of the Sunday dogma, have always remarked that the previous persecutions were confined to States south of Mason and Dixon's line, and were the result of local conditions. But we have always responded that the human heart is the same on both sides of the line, and that, at an early date, these persecutions would be seen in the North. We were not mistaken.

A GOOD illustration of the illogical and absurd religious test which some States require of witnesses as a qualification to give testimony, occurred recently in Tennessee, where a witness is required to believe in a God and in future rewards and punishments. A witness against the men who recently lynched six negroes in Tennessee, to escape testifying against the lynchers, boldly denied his belief in a God. His father testified that he had never before heard his son express atheistic sentiments. The judge after mature thought decided that the young man was lying and did believe in a God, and was therefore thoroughly qualified "to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," and he was required to testify. Comment is unnecessary.

WHY is it that Roman Catholics point to the appointment and election of members of their church to the premiership of Germany and the presidency of Switzerland as a triumph of Catholicity over Protestantism?—Because it furnishes an opportunity for these papists to carry out the programme outlined by Pope Leo XIII., communicated in 1885 to the faithful in all lands, but especially in America. It furnishes an opportunity to "do all in their power to cause constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled in the principles of the true [Roman Catholic] church." And when American citizens oppose this programme and attempt to prevent in America what Roman Catholic papers in this country declare to be a triumph of the papacy in Europe, this effort is denounced as persecution! Yea, verily, everything is persecution! Yea, verily, everything is persecution in the

mind of the papist that interferes with the scheme of Rome to again dominate the world and punish heretics.

January 31, 1895

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 10, 5 , pp. 33, 34.

WHY is it that now in the last half of the last decade of the nineteenth century the papacy is triumphing over Protestantism in the very countries where in the first half of the sixteenth century the Reformation triumphed so gloriously? Why is it?

IT is not because there are fewer professed Protestants now than then. There are a thousand now to one when the protest of the princes was announced. It is not because Bibles are scarcer now than then. There are a thousand Bibles in Germany now where there was one then. It is not because it is more dangerous to read the Bible and practice its precepts now than it was then. Then why is it?

THE answer is easy. The German Reformation began in the heart of Martin Luther and so wrought upon his affections that he was willing to sacrifice his position, his honor and his life in order to profess and promulgate its principles.

SINCE the Reformation was born and promulgated at the cost of such devotion to principle, it follows that if it is to be kept alive and vigorous it will be at the cost of similar devotion to principle.

WHAT were the principles underlying the Reformation? Let the historian of the Reformation answer:—

"The reformers and the apostles set up the Word of God as the only light, as they exalt the sacrifice of Christ as the only righteousness. By mingling any authority of man with this absolute authority of God, or any human righteousness with this perfect righteousness of Christ, we vitiate both the foundations of Christianity." ¹¹

And now we maintain that these principles which were the life of the Reformation have been in effect abandoned by popular Protestantism. On this point we quote and indorse the words of Rev. R. Salliens, Paris, France, in the *Missionary Review of the World*, for October, 1894. After pointing out the reaction toward Rome in France, Germany, Russia and England, the writer says:—

"In Protestant countries we are afraid the main cause is the weakness and loss of power of the evangelical churches. As they have grown rich and prosperous, the Protestants have forsaken, to

a great extent, that puritanic spirit which was the strength of the Reformation. From their primitive simplicity of worship they have come down to elaborate services, beautiful and luxurious buildings which are imitations of Roman Catholic medieval architecture, and thus have led their sons and daughters to the very threshold of Rome, with which Protestants will never be able to compete, try as they may, for finery, music, and display. Moreover, it is sadly evident that, in Great Britain especially, the work of the Reformation did not go deep enough, and that many Romish errors—such as baptismal regeneration and apostolic succession—were left in the prayer-book as seeds for future apostasy. Wherever a notion of a *visible universal church* is entertained, logic must lead to the Roman Catholic position.

"But we believe that the main cause of this reaction toward Rome in Protestant lands lies in the fact that the Bible does not hold in those countries the same place that it did three centuries ago. *Then* people turned away from the infallibility of a man to the infallible Book; but *now* the Book is no more deemed infallible; the 'higher' criticism has submitted it to an ordeal as severe as that of the Inquisition in times past. The Inquisition burned the Bible, but the higher critics are tearing it to pieces. And yet there is a craving in the human soul, and especially in the soul which has come into contact with the gospel, for a moral certainty, for a divine, infallible authority.

"As I am writing these lines, our daily papers are publishing an encyclical letter of the pope—his swan's song, as some say—which exhibits that wonderful craftiness of which I have just spoken. It is an appeal for reunion, specially directed to the Greek and Anglican churches. 'Speaking to those nations which have for the last three centuries been separated from the church, the pope shows that there is no certain rule of faith and authority left to them. A large number among them have overthrown the very foundations of Christianity by *denying the divinity of Christ and the inspiration of the Scriptures.*'

"Is it not the wonder of wonders that the man who incarnates that awful system by which the Bible has been burned, and its disciples, even to this day, persecuted to death; that system which has established tradition above *the Bible*, has contradicted every Bible doctrine and tried to silence every Bible preacher, should now dare to stand before the world as the advocate of the Bible against—the Protestants! And yet, it is, alas! but too true that *Protestantism to a large extent is no more the religion of the Bible. This accounts for the boldness of Rome, and for her success.*"

After so clearly giving the cause of Roman Catholic triumph in Protestant countries, he points out the one and only remedy, as follows:—

"But how shall we oppose her growing power?

"I am fully convinced by my experience as a missionary for twenty years among my own people, that *it will not be by clumsy imitations of her gorgeous display*, but rather by a return to the primitive simplicity of worship manifested in the upper room. To worship God in spirit and in truth, and not in beautiful temples, the cost of which would support two or three missionaries for a whole lifetime; to invite, and not to exclude, the poor, the sinner, the outcasts, who now find it so difficult, even if they would, to sit in our refined places of worship—such seems to me the imperative duty put upon us if we do not wish to see the masses go to Rome, which to them appears so much more democratic than ourselves.

"I have also a deep conviction that it is only through *the Bible*—as the Reformers did—that we shall withstand popery. *Anything, however pious in tone, that helps to destroy the people's faith in the Bible as an infallible book, works on behalf of Rome.* I have no time to dilate on this point, but I beg the readers to

34

reflect on it. It is to me the vital question, and I do not see any other alternative but this: *the Bible or the pope.*

"Finally, let us preach Christ, his free forgiveness, his atoning blood. Ethical, political, or social preaching—"sermons for the times," as they are sometimes termed—will not prevent the drift of the masses toward the old system. But the upholding of the Crucified!—I have seen it, thank God, hundreds of times—will always prove the power of God unto salvation. Rome has many weapons—money, genius, traditions, beauty of forms. It appeals to the lower nature of man, dispenses with the necessity of a second birth, renders sin easy. It deifies mankind, as all heathen religions do. It must, therefore, have a great measure of success, as it corresponds so marvelously to man's natural cowardice and depravation. But if we are faithful to *the Bible* and to the *crucified*, we need not fear defeat; all true Nathanaels, all the sincere and noble hearts who are seeking a real Saviour, will come out of Rome to meet us. The true sheep know the Shepherd's voice, and, hearing it, follow it."

This is the remedy which the SENTINEL has prescribed and will prescribe for the universal Romanizing malady. But the remedy will not be accepted and applied, and therefore the drift Romeward will continue until Rome shall once more, but for the moment only, sit as queen over the conquered nations of earth.

No political opposition will stay the progress of Rome when the *vital life* of the Reformation has disappeared from the minds and hearts of men. The "Iron Chancellor," Bismarck, may bid political defiance to the pope, and refuse to go to Canossa, but he will eventually go, and a Roman Catholic chancellor will take his place, as is now the case in aforesaid Protestant Germany. Oh, that popular Protestantism would return to its first love, take up again its discarded weapon, "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God!" "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." 2 Cor. 10:4.

"Rome's 'Religio-Political Affairs'" *American Sentinel* 10, 5 , p. 34.

THE Protestant Episcopal Church is planning to centralize its power in the United States by erecting a cathedral in Washington, D. C.

On this project the *Catholic Review*, of January 19, furnishes the following information:—

Our Episcopal friends are thinking of building a grand cathedral in Washington, D. C. Rev. Dr. Geo. W. Douglas, one of the trustees, says of it: "We know it's a great scheme, but we feel the need for it in our national capital, and we are willing to put our shoulders to the wheel and try to make it a reality. The site given for it is near the centre of the city and not far from the Capitol. The former owners of the property have told me that it was the site first desired by the Roman Catholics for their university. The merits of a cathedral, as we look at it, are three in number. They are: (1) An association in labor and a division of labor. (2) Centralization. (3) Education. This is an age of centralization. The Romanists appreciate it and are ready for it. I respect them for it, for their strong organization, their power of devotion, their concentrative energy. And I do not believe that the American Church should propose to rely upon the old idea of parochialism in the face of the Romish Church, its perspicacity, its steadfast devotion and its energy. In the face of organized Romanism we ought to show that Protestantism can be organized."

Upon this utterance of Dr. Douglas, "The *Catholic Review*, a Weekly Journal for Catholic Families, Commended by His Holiness, Leo XIII., the Archbishop of New York," etc., makes this plaintive and significant comment:—

The Catholic Church does not desire to be placed unnecessarily and offensively in face of organized Protestantism at a time when the Kingdom of Christ in the Republic is in face of organized Cesarism, of organized anti-Christian secret society movements, of

organized plans for the exile of God from the national life of the country by the complete secularization of all its institutions. If Protestantism does care for the Lord and does not desire to be used as an ally of Lucifer in the war of devilish forces against Christian principles, it will not take pains to organize itself in face of "the Romish Church," but will direct its energies against radical atheistic tendencies and influences now operative in the nation. It can do much to antagonize and to hamper the Catholic Church in politico-religious affairs, but if it does so, it will play the part of Samson, and will find out, when too late, that it has irretrievably involved itself in the general ruin.

The *Catholic Review* here candidly acknowledges that the Catholic Church has schemes to work out in America, termed "politico-religious affairs," which she entreats Protestants not to "antagonize" or "hamper." This religio-political scheme is further explained to be an effort to prevent "the exile of God from the national life of the country by the complete secularization of all its institutions." What the *Review* means by the exile of God from the national life of the country is the exile of the hand of the Roman Catholic Church from the national treasury and the rescue of the public school and the nation itself from Romanish control.

The nation can bear much of this kind of "exile" and "secularization" both as regards Roman Catholic and popish-Protestant control, without playing the part of Samson. Protestantism will not, by consistently opposing Romanism in our Government, involve itself in the general ruin. It is when it attempts to control the Government in the interests of *itself*, and thereby unites *itself* to the State, that it pulls down the pillars of the national edifice and involves itself, Samson-like, in the general ruin.

"Priest Elliott's Propaganda" *American Sentinel* 10, 5 , p. 34.

PRIEST ELLIOTT is still engaged in his "Mission to non-Catholics," and gives in the *Catholic World* for January a glowing account of his meetings at Marvin and Ely, Ohio.

One feature of these "missions" is good singing. In this the priest is copying the popular revivalist. Good music has great drawing power.

At Marvin, the Opera House, seating twelve hundred persons, was much too small for the audiences which greeted the priest, and "many Protestants were unable to get in at all after the opening." "If we had had three thousand sittings," says Mr. Elliott, "we could have filled them some evenings."

Mr. Elliott mentions that a regular attendant at his meetings was "the president of a bank" and "one of the leading men of the city." This man, it is related, stopped the resident priest in the street one day and assured him that the "lectures were timely, and were beneficial to the people."

One lady, "a sort of a preacher," living some miles out of Ely, "attended every evening, sitting in front and paying strictest attention." Of her, Mr. Elliott says: "She has been gradually working and thinking and praying and preaching herself towards the church, and will, doubtless, soon place herself under instruction—at least so we judge from her conversation."

Priest Elliott concludes his account of his "mission" at the latter place by saying: "We had many requests from non-Catholics to return and give another course, and we hope to do so. In that case it might be well to choose a different line of topics; expounding, for example, the fundamental moral principles; or, perhaps, treating of the higher spiritual and mystical life of the soul."

Now all this is significant. It shows a settled purpose on the part of Roman Catholics to make proselytes. The church of Rome is no longer on the defensive in the United States, but has assumed the offensive, and is "pressing the battle to the gate." Protestantism was never less able to resist this onslaught than at the present moment. Having lost the real spirit of Protestantism and degenerated into a dead formalism, tens of thousands are in just the condition to be captivated by the elaborate ritual of Roman Catholic worship. Having lost faith by which alone man can live "as seeing the invisible," they are ready to listen favorably to the claims of a church which caters to this demand of the natural heart for the visible, and which gives not one but many tangible objects of worship.

Moreover, the Paulist lecturer, conducting "missions" for non-Catholics, does not represent Romanism as it really is, but in a way to make it attractive. "The Faith of Our Fathers," by Cardinal Gibbons, is a fair illustration of the Romish manner of presenting popish doctrines to credulous Protestants. In that book the Inquisition is explained away, so far as Rome is concerned; the massacre of St. Bartholomew is denied as having any religious significance, and the real position of the Catholic Church in regard to liberty of conscience is concealed under a skillful and deceitful use of words. Religious liberty is defined as "the free right to worship God according to the dictates of a right conscience." And only the critical reader will discern that the church

deserves the right to say what is a "right conscience." This is, however, the fact. Rome always has been, and is at this moment, opposed to the exercise of private judgment.

It is a sad thing that the Protestants of to-day have forgotten the history of the past and are so ready to listen to the siren song of the "mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

"War Between the Beast and the Makers of His Image" *American Sentinel* 10, 5 , pp. 34, 35.

THE following question and answer appeared in the *Christian Statesman* of Jan. 12:—

Question 23. F. L., Utica, N.Y. "I am greatly pleased with the *Christian Statesman*. It is preëminently the reform paper of our country. But does it not antagonize Roman Catholics too much? Would it not be better to secure their coöperation as possible in the great cause of Christian government as against infidel and atheistic secularism?"

Answer. This paper does not oppose any friend of Christian government, be he a member of any church, or of no church. It does oppose every principle or system that denies the right and duty of the nation to take the law of Christ as its supreme rule of conduct. This right and duty require the nation to take the Word of God as its authoritative law book, and to interpret and apply it for itself. Romanism antagonizes this right and duty of the nation. It puts the interpretation of moral law by the "infallible" head of the Romish system in the place of Christ's own

35

immediate authority over the civil power. This system is one of the gravest dangers threatening our land to-day. Fidelity to the cause of Christian civil government demands that this dangerous enemy of our civil and religious liberties shall be vigilantly opposed.

Under another head attention has been called to the change of attitude on the part of the *Christian Statesman* cohorts from the position of fawning suppliants for fraternal coöperation with Rome, to that of open and avowed enemies of the system. In this article we call attention to the similarity of the contending systems. For years the system inaugurated by the *Christian Statesman* begged the Roman Catholic Church in the United States to aid it in securing from Congress some legislative action which would commit the Government of the United States to religious legislation, and thereby break down the American idea of complete separation of Church and State, which the National Government had maintained for more than

a hundred years, but which the *Christian Statesman* system assailed as "political atheism." Seeing their opportunity to accomplish a long-cherished object similar to that of their Protestant petitioners, the leading prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States joined forces with what we will call apostate Protestantism, and influenced Congress to do that which it had persistently refused to do (enact a Sunday law), and which the Senate in refusing to do in 1829 said:—

Should Congress in legislative capacity adopt the sentiment it would establish the principle that the legislature is a proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God. It would involve a legislative decision on a religious controversy, and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced, it will be impossible to define its bounds.²¹ . . .

Let the national legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for the usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country, which has been the desolating scourge of the fairest portions of the Old World.³²

Now that these combined forces have accomplished that fatal thing; now that Congress has presumed "to determined what are the laws of God" at the dictation of this combine; now that it has performed "an act which involves a religious controversy;" now that it has "passed its legitimate bounds;" now that the precedent is "established and the foundation laid for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country, which has been the desolating scourge of the fairest portions of the Old World," the rogues which accomplished the ruin have fallen out. But why fall out? Are not their objects the same? "Aye, there's the rub." Their objects are the same; both want to be pope, and infallible interpreter of the "Word of God" "in the place of Christ's own immediate authority over the civil power,"—over our captive Republic. And now, to show that this is the case with the system voiced by the *Christian Statesman's* answer previously quoted, we will proceed to dissect it.

It says that it is "the right of the nation to take the law of Christ as its supreme rule of conduct. This right and duty require the nation to take the Word of God as an authoritative law book, and to interpret and apply it for itself." But who make up the nation?—The people. Are the people all agreed on the same interpretation of the "law of Christ,"—the "Word of God"?—No; their interpretations are legion.

Does not the *Christian Statesman* element know this?—Yes. How, then, does it propose that the nation shall interpret and apply the law of Christ for itself?—It doesn't propose that it shall. This was strikingly illustrated in the recent political struggle in Pennsylvania. Mr. Lyon was candidate for the office of lieutenant-governor, and his interpretation of the "law of Christ" regarding Sabbath observance, did not agree with the interpretation held by the popular Protestant churches as voiced by the *Christian Statesman*. What did this *Christian Statesman* element do?—It interpreted the law of Christ regarding the Sabbath, and told Mr. Lyon that if he did not accept the infallible interpretation of this apostate Protestant pope, they would knife him at the polls. He refused, and this new pope proclaimed a political church boycott against Mr. Lyon; and although he was elected, he ran considerably behind his ticket. What this element tried to do in Pennsylvania in 1894, it succeeded in doing in 1892 when it bulldozed Congress into legislating its interpretation of the "Word of God" upon all the people of the nation, and later boasted of it in this fashion:—

What did Congress do last summer on the Sabbath question?—It did just what the Christian people asked it to do. . . . Representatives in Congress are anxious to do what the people [these popish preachers] want done. They are waiting for instruction; they ask for it. . . . Who is to give this instruction?—Only those who have it can give it [meaning themselves]. Have not Representatives been chosen without much reference to what moral light or character they had in themselves? ⁴³

Thus it is evident that this apostate Protestant element, a small minority but well organized, arrogates to itself the right to act as pope, to interpret the "Word of God" for the "nation," and then instruct representatives of the nation in this interpretation, and in case these statesmen desire to follow their own interpretation, it is the duty of this new pope to compel submission under penalty of political ruin.

And now, to show the similarity between the Roman Catholic pope and this apostate Protestant pope, we print their claims in parallel columns:—

The Roman Catholic pope claims:—

The apostate Protestant pope claims:—

That it is the right and duty of the nation to take the "law of Christ" as its supreme rule of conduct.

That it is the right and duty of the nation to take the "law of Christ" as its supreme rule of conduct.

That the individual should not be permitted to interpret that law for himself.

That the individual should not be permitted to interpret that law for himself.

That he is divinely authorized to interpret the "law of Christ" for the individual and for the nation; and to enforce that interpretation by civil pains and penalties.

That he is divinely authorized to interpret the "law of Christ" for the individual and for the nation; and to enforce that interpretation by civil pains and penalties.

Is there a single statement in the above conclusion that can be successfully controverted? If not we then ask, is there not a complete likeness between the Roman Catholic pope and the apostate Protestant pope? And is there any wonder that two infallible popes, both contending for the control of the American Republic, should quarrel? Is there any wonder that the apostate Protestant pope should turn "white with fear and wrath" on beholding the Roman Catholic pope in possession of the prey, the captive Republic, which it petitioned that pope to help it capture?

"Priest and Parson Act Together" *American Sentinel* 10, 5 , pp. 35, 36.

THE Detroit *Daily News* of January 16, contains the following account of a confederacy between Protestant ministers and Roman Catholic priests, which we reprint, including the *News'* significant headlines:—

MEET IN LOVE. PREIST AND PARSON ACT TOGETHER

A MOST REMARKABLE MOVEMENT IN BAY CITY,
That Joins Catholic and Protestant Together.

All Said to Be Members of the Same
"Mystical Body."

BAY CITY, MICH., Jan. 17.—The Bay City ministers will not carry on a social crusade in the Saginaw or Little Parkhurst style, but on the contrary announce that they do not sympathize with the methods employed in a majority of these movements. They have, however, organized a movement that will be farther reaching in its effects.

The avowed objects of this association are to promote "Christian unity" and arouse a feeling that all Christian churches are engaged in one great object. Prejudice and intolerance are especially denounced and are to be opposed by the association.

The matter has been brewing since Thanksgiving day, when Rev. C. T. Patchell preached a strong sermon on the subject. Monday, a meeting was held at the rectory of St. James' Catholic Church, at which nearly all of the Catholic priests and a number of the leading Protestant ministers were present. Christian unity was the object of the gathering, but church unity was not thought of. After thorough discussion the following was adopted as embodying the sentiment of those present:—

"The aim of this meeting is to instill into every Christian heart the necessity of mutual love and respect among the members of the mystical body of Christ. It is unnatural that members of the same body should tear one another to pieces. They should protect and assist each other.

"The means to attain this end are of two kinds: (a) fraternal meetings of the ministers of the different churches, with a view to becoming better acquainted, and for devising means whereby to carry on our *mutual work*; (b) public lectures on 'Christian unity,' 'Christian tolerance,' 'Christian charity,' and kindred subjects, said lectures to be delivered alternatively by priest and minister.

"It must be well understood that the presence of a minister or a priest at one of our meetings does not in the least affect his distinctive religious principles. Each remains what he is, prejudice and its consequences expected."

The memorial is signed by the following pastors: Rev. Wm. H. Clark, First Presbyterian Church; Rev. H. Schneider, Zion Reformed Church; Rev. T. W. McLean, Trinity Episcopal Church; Rev. M. Matkowski, St. Stanislaus Kostka Catholic Church; Rev. R. C. Johnson, Second Baptist Church; Rev. J. G. Sanson and Rev. Jos. Shrembs, St. Mary's Catholic Church, West Bay City; N. Rutenik, German Reformed Church, West Bay City; Rev. M. C. Hawks, Madison Avenue M. E. Church; Rev. Thomas Rafter, St. James

Catholic Church; Rev. C. T. Patachell, First Congregational Church;
Rev. John G. Wyss, St. Boniface Catholic Church; Rev. Jacob
Braun, German Methodist Church.

What a confederation! Presbyterian, Reformed, Episcopalian,
Baptist, German Reformed, Methodist, Congregational and German
Methodist ministers uniting with

36

Roman Catholic priests, as members of the "mystical body of Christ,"
"in mutual love and respect," "to carry on" "our *mutual work*"! Shades
of Protestantism, of Wycliffe, Martin Luther, John Knox and John
Wesley! The founders of every one of the Protestant churches here
represented, boldly and scripturally declared that the Roman Catholic
Church is the anti-Christ of Scripture. The Roman Catholic Church, a
part of the "mystic body of Christ"! Where then is anti-Christ? Catholic
and Protestant ministers uniting to "protect and assist each other" in
"our mutual work"! Has it come to this, that Protestant churches have
become so blinded by a false charity that they can unite to protect
each other in a "mutual work" with the "infallible" papal church—"drunk
with the blood of the saints"? There is not "mutual work" between true
Protestantism and the papacy. "Be ye not unequally yoked together
with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with
unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?
And what concord hath Christ with Belial?" 2 Cor. 6:14, 115.

Philip Melancthon, at the Diet of Augsburg, undertook to unite the
Reformation with the Roman Church "in mutual love and respect,"
with the view to carrying on a "mutual work;" but the God of saints
and martyrs used Martin Luther to prevent the fatal compromise, and
Luther wrote to Melancthon:—

There can be no concord between Christ and Belial. As far as
regards me, I will not yield a hair's breadth. Sooner than yield, I
should prefer suffering everything, even the most terrible evils. ⁵¹

Writing again, he said:—

I learn that you have begun a marvelous work, namely, to
reconcile Luther and the pope; but the pope will not be reconciled,
and Luther begs to be excused. And if, in despite of them you
succeed in this affair, then after your example I will bring together
Christ and Belial. ⁶²

But popular Protestantism has lost the spirit of the Reformation,
and the uncompromising attitude of the leading Reformers so much
praised in denominational books of fifty years ago, is now repudiated
and their noble work discounted, if not by direct declaration, by an
attitude of compromise, with the enemy of the Reformation.

And it is just this kind of a confederation of papists and apostate Protestants which the SENTINEL has looked for. We have never expected that there would be an organic union of either the popular Protestant sects, or these sects with the papacy; but we have looked for a confederation of papists and so-called Protestants to accomplish certain "mutual work," prominent among which is the enforcement of the Roman Catholic Sunday. Already we have seen Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland indorsing petitions for Sunday legislation prepared and circulated by the popular Protestant churches. Why is it that Rome refuses to compromise on the dogmas of the church, and yet eagerly joins with these churches in exalting Sunday?—It is because when Sunday is exalted, the papacy which instituted the Sunday Sabbath, is exalted. When Cardinal Gibbons added his name to the petition for a national Sunday law, he had penned the following words, found on page 111 of his book, "Faith of Our Fathers:—

Is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday, and to abstain on that day from unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most prominent of our sacred duties? But you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.

And now we venture to predict that one of the first acts of "mutual" performed by this confederacy of the papists and compromising Protestants will be the enforcement of the Sunday institution,—the badge of the papal beast of prophecy.

"Ignorant or Traitorous, Which?" *American Sentinel* 10, 5 , pp. 36, 37.

THE *Christian Statesman*, the spokesman of the National Reform Association,—that organization which gave birth to, and faithfully fostered that un-American combination of popular Protestantism, which forced from the Congress of the United States, in 1892, the first distinctive religious legislation ever enacted by our National Legislature,—has something to say in its issue of January 12, on the Roman Catholic question, that will interest our readers.

In order that we may get the point in question quickly and sharply before the reader, we will print in parallel columns several utterances of the *Statesman*, together with the one referred to:—

1884.

1894 & 1894.

This common interest [interest of It becomes us, Americans, to look at religious people in the legal enforcement once into the secret plottings of this of Sunday observance] ought to political church [Roman Catholic]. They strengthen both our determination to are striving with mighty energy to gain work and our readiness to co-operate control of the whole Government of with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. America. National and State, as well as We may be subjected to some rebuffs in municipal. The assertion is ventured our first proffers, for the time is not yet without much fear of mistake, that they come when the Roman Church will have already succeeded to an extent that strike hands with other churches, as if it were known to the people, would such; but the time has come to make turn our faces white with fear and wrath. repeated advances and gladly accept –*Christian Statesman*, Sept. 1, 1894. co-operation in any form in which they This system [Roman Catholic] is one may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the gravest dangers threatening our the necessities of the situation. land to-day. Fidelity to the cause of –*Christian Statesman*, Aug. 31, 1884. Christian civil government demands that Whenever they [Roman Catholics] this enemy of our civil and religious are willing to co-operate in resisting the liberties shall be vigilantly opposed. Our progress of political atheism, we will readers would do well to obtain a book, gladly join hands with them. to which we call attention in another –*Christian Statesman*, Dec. 11, 1884. column –"Romanism Analyzed." This gives a comprehensive view of the system which has been of necessity a curse to every land where it has prevailed. –*Christian Statesman*, Jan. 12, 1895.

Question: Were the leaders of the "National Reform" element ignorant, in 1884, of the character and aims of the Roman Catholic system? It cannot be that they were, for they are D.D.'s and LL. D.'s, and are men with gray hairs. More than that, they are Covenanters, and who, if not a Covenanter, ought to know what that system has done to crush liberty? That they did know is apparent from the expression, "It is one of the necessities of the situation." We are therefore impelled to the conclusion that the managers of the movement to secure the control of the National Government in the interests of enforced Sunday ob-

servance and kindred objects, were hob-a-nobbing with the Roman Catholic system, and suffering rebuffs to secure its co-operation; and were courting a system which they knew to be "a curse to every land where it has prevailed," and "the greatest danger threatening our land to-day,"—a system that was "plotting to gain control of the whole

Government of America, National and State, as well as municipal." It therefore follows that since these men were not ignorant of the most patent facts of history, they must have been treacherously and traitorously joining forces with that system which is the "enemy of our civil and religious liberties," "a curse to every land where it has prevailed."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 5 , p. 40.

H. P. HOLSER, a Seventh-day Adventist minister and manager of the denominational publishing house at Basel, Switzerland, who was recently imprisoned for permitting work to be done in the publishing house on Sunday, called at our office last week on his way to attend the international conference of the denomination at Battle Creek, Mich. He informs us that similar prosecution have been begun against the Seventh-day Adventist publishing house in Christiana, Norway; and that their London house is also threatened. We have expected that these persecutions would become world-wide, and are not surprised; but we are deeply impressed with their bearing on the fulfillment of the "sure word of prophecy."

THE *Catholic Review* of January 19 publishes a call for the organization of an association in the United States whose object shall be to create sentiment for the restoration of the pope to temporal power. Similar associations are organizing in the leading countries of the world, and the organization in the United States is a part of an international movement.

How this association is to work in America for the restoration of Rome and the papal states to the control of the pope, is explained in a work first published in England but afterward published by Catholic houses in New York, Boston and Montreal. In explaining why citizens of a foreign country should work to make the pope the *civil* governor of Rome, the author says:—

Suppose it be said, "I acknowledge the *spiritual* authority of the Holy Father; but why am I, an Englishman [or American, we may add], to come forward in a *political* way, to use all my exertions to protect *the temporal* rights of a *foreign prince*?" My answer at once is plain. *The pope is not a foreign prince to any Christian, to any human being.*⁷¹

And now let Americans understand that this new organization proposes "in a *political* way" to use all its exertions to make Pope Leo XIII. political ruler of Rome, the United States and the world.

THE following significant paragraph appeared in the *Catholic Reivew* of Jan. 26:—

Six more bishops in Italy have been granted the royal *exequatur* that entitles them to receive *their official income*—the bishops of Carpi, Possuoli, Penafro, Luvera, Anglona, and Nuseo. The government does not fear religion now; it seeks the strength of the church against revolution. It cannot conquer the turbulence it bred.

This means that the government of Italy has given these bishops the right to tax the people in their districts for the support of the Catholic Church. And the last two sentences explain how the church won the victory, and it is the great international scheme of the papacy to secure universal dominion. First, teach her people that the government that refuses to acknowledge the pope is unstable and must sooner or later end in "turbulence" and "revolution;" and when this teaching bears fruit, then she offers to conquer the turbulence in exchange for political support.

IT is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that priests are not properly subject to the civil authorities like other men, but that no matter what crime a priest may commit he is amenable only to "the church," unless "the church" sees fit to degrade him, strip him of his vestments, recall his ordination so that he is no longer a priest, and then turn him over to civil power for condign punishment. "Father" Phelan, editor of the *Western Watchman*, had the temerity to challenge this dogma some months ago, and to maintain that a priest was properly subject to civil law just as other men. The bishop of his diocese demanded that he retract the offensive statement upon pain of having his paper place under the ban of "the church." The doughty priest at first refused obedience, but finally yielded and made a meek submission to the bishop. From a Roman Catholic standpoint,—the end justifies the means,—this was not strange; but how "Father" Phelan can maintain his self-respect and say what he does in the *Western Watchman* of Dec. 27, 1894, is more than we can imagine. He says:—

We have been in the business of editing and publishing a newspaper for thirty years. We have built up a large newspaper properly. During those thirty years we never heard it stated, nor was it ever intimated to us by any ecclesiastical authority, that we could not give free expression to our opinions, provided the language was respectful and the convictions honest.

It is thus cheerfully that the minions of Rome write themselves down knaves at the behest of "the church." And this is what Rome would do for the press of the entire country.

A GREAT many people seem to really believe that Sunday laws have a substantial basis; that they are not enacted as religious measures, but for good and sufficient civil reasons. Instead, in some instances, courts of justice have given color to this view of Sunday statutes, though they have signally failed to define the so-called civil basis of such legislation.

But the question is being simplified very much by the attitude of those who are foremost in demanding the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws. The basis of the American Sabbath Union is the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, and that organization is clamoring more and more for Sunday laws, upon religious grounds. Reduced to its lowest terms, their demand is for the legal recognition and enforcement of Sunday as the Sabbath of the Lord, upon the basis of the fourth commandment. Their published utterances show that this is so.

This thought was made very prominent in the late National Reform Convention at New Castle, P. In a speech in the convention referred to, Rev. R. C. Wylie, for years a leader in National Reform thought and work, said: "Formerly, the demand for Sabbath laws was based largely on humanitarian grounds. It was said that we should have such laws because men needed to rest one day in seven. But some of us said that will never do; that is not the correct basis for such legislation. And now Christian people have come to the conclusion that we must have a Sabbath law because God has one."

Such expressions as this do much to open the eyes of the people to the true nature of Sunday legislation.

February 7, 1895

"The Pope's Encyclical" *American Sentinel* 10, 6 , pp. 41, 42.

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. Satolli.

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 it, 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 not 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 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

42

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.

"Which Pope Shall It Be?" *American Sentinel* 10, 6 , pp. 42, 43.

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 of, 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 head-ship 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 government God's will; and that the State must obey under

43

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, 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.

"Drifting Romeward" *American Sentinel* 10, 6 , p. 43.

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 readings 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 battlefield.

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 feel 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" *American Sentinel* 10, 6 , p. 43.

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 Glorioux, 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" *American Sentinel* 10, 6 , pp. 43, 44.

HON. CHAMBERS 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 when 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.

"That's True" *American Sentinel* 10, 6 , pp. 44, 45.

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 son 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 Dot." We can easily imagine Annie as buxom and rosy-checked, 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 made 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 not 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-

saalem 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.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 6 , p. 48.

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"!

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 ever in Spain, she is in spirit and purpose in America.

February 14, 1895

"Christianity Against Ritualism—The Bible Against the Papacy"
American Sentinel 10, 7 , pp. 49, 50.

THE *Monitor*, a Catholic paper published in San Francisco, in its issue of January 12, contains an editorial notice, nearly a column in length, of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, with especial reference to our "Nine Years' Experience," as related in the first number of the present volume. As the *Monitor* betrays a sad lack of understanding of the real purpose and work of the SENTINEL, and as it seems disappointed that we did not "enlighten" it upon certain points in the articles referred to, we shall endeavor to help our contemporary to a clearer understanding of things.

First, the *Monitor* says that the SENTINEL'S "*ritual*" is summed up in the observance of the Saturday instead of Sunday; its *belief* is a wild and incoherent jumble of the Book of Daniel and the Revelations of St. John the Divine; and its *morals* consist in steady and unlimited

abuse of the pope of Rome and the loudly dressed lady who sat on seven hills."

This is incorrect in all its statements. First, as to ritual: In the sense in which the *Monitor* knows and uses the word, we have no ritual at all; for we have Christ, and he abolished in his flesh all ritualism. He abolished in his flesh the law of commandments contained in ordinances,—ceremonies, rites (Eph. 2:11-18),—in a word, all ritualism and ceremonialism; and to all who are in him all ritualism is abolished.

He who has Christ has the very life and substance of all the forms of service and of worship which he has appointed; then these cease to be mere ceremonies or rites, and become the expression of the living presence and power of Christ himself in the life of the believer. This is the end of ritualism, of ceremonialism; the end of "a *form* of godliness" without the power; the end of any employment of the form of baptism, or the form of the Eucharist, etc., as "means of grace," as they are employed in the Catholic system.

"The law came by Moses, but the reality and the grace came by Jesus Christ." John 1:17 (Syriac). Now, the whole Roman Catholic system is only one of forms, of ceremony, of ritual. In that system all such things are used as means,—as "means of grace"—with the hope of *thereby* obtaining Christ; while with us any such things are used altogether as *the expression* of the grace, the presence, and the power of Christ *which we already have* by faith. Rome's is a system of salvation—justification—by works; while ours is the divine truth of salvation—justification—by faith.

Therefore it is that we say that in the sense in which the *Monitor* knows and uses the word "ritual," we have no ritual at all. We do observe the seventh day—the Sabbath of the Lord—it is true. But at the same time it is only as the sign and expression of the living Christ who dwells within the heart and life by faith. This is what Christ appointed it for (Eze. 20:12, 20); and this is truly what it is. Without the real presence of Christ himself in the heart and life *by faith* alone, the keeping of the seventh day—Saturday—or the performance of any other service, is nothing. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but *faith which worketh* by love." Gal. 5:6.

To propose to keep the Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day, Saturday—without the living presence of Christ in the heart, by faith, is but to bear the sign without the thing signified; is but to have the form

without the reality,—the form of godliness without the power,—and is formalism, ceremonialism, ritualism *only*, and is precisely of the same *nature*, if it differs in degree, as is the Catholic system throughout. Ours is not this. On the contrary, it is the faith which takes Christ first of all as the most precious gift of God, and which finds *in him* the beginning and the end, the first and the last, *the sum* of all things good or right; in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily; and in whom alone all they that are of faith are complete. This is not ritual: it is life itself, the life of Jesus made manifest in mortal flesh. 2 Cor. 4:10, 11. And this is the difference between the Roman Catholic system with which the *Monitor* belongs, and the Christian system with which the SENTINEL belongs. The Catholic system is ritual and iniquity; the Christian system is Christ and the righteousness of God. The Sabbath of the Lord is the sign of the Christian system; the Sunday of the papacy is the sign of the other—the sign of ritualism.

As for our *belief* being "a wild and incoherent jumble of the Book of Daniel and the Revelations of St. John the Divine," the truth is, that we simply take the books of Daniel and Revelation, with all the other books of the Bible, as they read, and believe just what they say. If, therefore, what those books say is "a wild and incoherent jumble," then what we *believe* is also that; for we believe precisely what those books say.

We rather suspect, however, that what the *Monitor* says our "morals consist in," had something to do with its decision that our belief of the books of Daniel and Revelation is "a wild and incoherent jumble;" for it says that our "morals consist in steady and unlimited abuse of the pope of Rome and the loudly dressed lady who sat on seven hills."

Now, as a matter of fact, we have not indulged in any such abuse at all. We have quoted the scriptures of the books of Daniel and Revelation which apply to the papacy. If that is abuse, then of course we have engaged in abuse; but in that case the *Monitor* ought not to lay the accusation against us. It ought to lay this charge against the Author of the Scriptures, for all that we have done has been to quote these.

Of course the *Monitor* does not want to lay that charge directly against the Author of the Scriptures. Yet, knowing that these scriptures do apply to Rome, and not being ready directly to charge the Lord with "steady and unlimited abuse" of Rome, the *Monitor* would escape the dilemma by deciding that our *belief* (from which of

course spring our morals) "is a wild and incoherent jumble of the Book of Daniel and the Revelations of St. John the Divine." We have no particular ob-

50

jection to this charge of the *Monitor*; it has a perfect right to think as it chooses, and to say what it thinks. And so long as we simply use the Scriptures as *they* speak about the papacy, we can well bear the charge of *abuse* of the papacy, for we are in good company.

Aside from the Scriptures which speak of the papacy, the only mention that we have had occasion to make of the pope has been in connection with his scheme to unite the Roman Catholic Church with the power of the United States Government, to do with this nation now as "the church" has done with other nations in the past, and so to bring Europe and all humanity once more under the power of the papacy; and in doing this we have only stated the facts as given from the pope through Catholic channels. These plain facts, however, plainly stated, set the papacy in such a wicked light in its dealings with our country that it is easy enough for Catholic papers to see in it only "steady and unlimited abuse of the pope of Rome."

The second, and only other occasion that we have had or used to discuss the pope was when, last year, he addressed "the Princes and Peoples of the Universe," and gravely informed us all that "WE [that is, himself] hold the regency of God on earth." And a mere analysis of the term "regency," as applied by the pope of Rome to God, showed the statement of Leo XIII. to be so absolutely blasphemous that to a believer in the thing we do not wonder tht it should be termed abusive toward the pope of Rome.

On that point we said: "Now, what is a regency?—This is what it is: A regency is the office and administration of a regent; and a 'regent is an administrator of a realm during the minority or incapacity of the king;' 'one who rules or reigns, hence, one invested with vicarious authority; one who governs a kingdom in the minority, absence, or disability, of the sovereign.'

"Now, if there are any princes or peoples in the universe who think that God is in his minority and is therefore too young, or that he is old enough but is afflicted with some disability and is consequently unable to conduct the affairs of the universe; or who think that he is all right himself, but has gone off somewhere outside of the universe; and if, in addition, those princes and peoples think that the Lord *has left Joachim Pecci* to run the universe during the period of his 'minority, disability, or absence;'

then of course it is to be expected that *such* princes or peoples will listen respectfully to what Mr. Pecci says when he addresses the princes and peoples of the universe. For, as a matter of course, if Mr. Joachim Pecci occupies the throne and conducts the affairs of the universe in the place of God, it follows plainly enough that when he speaks he speaks to the universe, and must be listened to accordingly.

"But if any person believes that God is what he is, 'the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God,' then that person knows that it is impossible that such a thing could ever occur as his 'minority, absence, or disability;' that therefore it is impossible that there ever could be any such thing as a 'regency of God;' and that, consequently, the idea that Joachim Pecci or any other man should 'hold the regency of God on earth,' or anywhere else, is too ridiculous for serious consideration if it were not supremely blasphemous. NO; Vincent Joachim Pecci, as 'Leo XIII., Pope,' has no more right or authority to assert or claim to hold any 'regency of God,' and from such position speak to the princes and peoples of the universe, than has any other Italian or any Hottentot."

This is what we said as to that. And we say it yet. We have no kind of retraction or apology to make respecting any part of it. And there is no kind of abuse in it anywhere. If this simple analysis of it seems to the *Monitor* to be abusive of the pope, it should not attack *us*. Let the *Monitor* turn its attention to the pope, rather than to us, on this matter; for when the pope sets forth for acceptance by "the universe" such claims on his own part that the mere analysis of the terms used subjects us to the charge of abuse of him, then the proper thing for the *Monitor* to do is to ask the pope to stop making such claims, instead of charging with abuse those who simply analyze the claims.

As for what the *Monitor* calls "the loudly dressed *lady* who sat on seven hills," we have never spoken of her as a "*lady*." That term does not properly belong to her. It is not the term that the Lord uses in referring to her. The Scripture says that she said *of herself*, "I shall be a lady," and that she would be *called* "The lady of kingdoms;" but what the Scripture itself calls her is a term that is absolutely incompatible with any suggestion of a lady. We shall not *quote* the scriptures which describe her, lest the *Monitor* and other Catholic papers should not only charge us with abuse, but worse. We shall therefore cite chapter and verse, and the *Monitor* and all others can read the words for themselves as the Lord has spoken them; and then let them make their charges as they choose. Here they are: Rev. 17:1-6, 15, 16; 18:2, 3; 19:2.

And that the *Monitor* may the better be prepared to understand the application of these scriptures, we also cite the two standard and popular Roman Catholic authorities—"The Faith of Our Fathers," p. 131; and "Catholic Belief," p. 323—both of which say that the Babylon referred to by Peter—1 Peter 5:13—and the early Christians, *is Rome*. And when the Lord says that she is a harlot herself, and "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," it is not abuse when we say or anybody else says that that is what she is.

When the plain statements of the Word of God seem to any person to be abusive, then the only proper thing for such person to do is so to change his attitude that that Word will not seem so, but can be accepted as the exact truth. To the Scribes and Pharisees it no doubt seemed to be very great abuse when Jesus told them that they were hypocrites, whited sepulchres, serpents, and a generation of vipers. It was the truth, though, and instead of persecuting and crucifying him, it would have been far better for them to have acknowledged that it was all true, and changed their course from that of disobedience to that of faith.

It is altogether likely that the devil would rather still be called Lucifer—Lightbearer—than to be called Satan—the adversary—and Diabolus—the slanderer. It may be that he thinks the Lord is engaging in "steady and unlimited abuse," when he insists in continually referring to him by these titles. But be that as it may, it is certain that these titles define precisely what he is; and the Lord, in constantly using these terms, is not in any sense abusing him—he is simply telling the truth.

It is just so as between us and the papacy. We have no doubt that the Catholic Church would much rather that we, like most other people, would always refer to her as "the true church," "a Christian church," "a branch of the Christian church." "the Holy Catholic Church," etc., instead of speaking of her, as the Lord does, as "the man of sin," "the mystery of iniquity," "the son of perdition," "the great harlot," "Babylon, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," "the beast." But all these latter things are just what the Lord calls her, and *he* is right; in all this he simply tells the truth. The Lord is not abusing her when he constantly speaks thus of her—he is simply telling what she is in truth; and neither are we abusing her when we use the terms, and only the terms, which he uses in describing her.

We do not intend to abuse the papacy nor anybody else. But we *do* intend to tell the truth. We do intend to proclaim the truth of God as it is in the Word of God, the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. We do intend to proclaim this truth precisely as it is, whether it be concerning the papacy—the beast—or whether it be concerning apostate Protestantism—the image of the beast. If this *truth*—the truth of God—should seem to any one to be abusive, let him change his attitude toward the truth, and then it will cease to appear to be abuse. The change must be in him, for the truth of God *cannot* change nor be changed.

The rest of the *Monitor's* complaint we must postpone to other numbers. This much was necessary to be noticed, not only upon the merits of the case, but also to "clear the decks" for all our future action.

"What's in a Name?" *American Sentinel* 10, 7 , pp. 50, 51.

IN view of the recent massacre at Port Arthur, it seems strange to read in one of the most influential religious papers of this city, the statement that "the civilization which Japan has accepted *is wholly the product of Christianity*," and again, that in a few years, "we have seen old prejudices dissolved, old civilization utterly discarded, *and Christian civilization adopted in its place*." But we may not understand just what is meant by "Christian civilization." Certainly the massacre at Port Arthur was as far from being Christian as anything could be, and it was equally foreign to what civilization bearing the name Christian could be. However, if we condemn the civilization of Japan, we likewise condemn the civilization of Europe; for have not European soldiers committed just as grave offenses against civilization? Even as recently as the British occupation of Matabeleland, the atrocities committed by the soldiers of the British South African Company were scarcely less disgraceful than was the Port Arthur massacre; though we believe that actual prisoners were not murdered, and probably women and children were not ruthlessly killed. But the so-called war was little more than a slaughter of helpless people. The following lines recently written by Robert Buchanan, the Scottish poet, aptly describe alike the slaughter of that campaign and the motive

of the Chartered Company in waging the war:—

Just study my dear, the records here of the mighty deeds we've done.

The hundreds *en masse* mowed down like grass, to our English loss of one.

Then loot, loot, loot, as we stab and shoot, 'mid the shrieks of the naked foe.

When murder and greed on the fallen feed, up, up, my stock must go.

And the best of the lark, you'll be pleased to mark, is the counter-jumper's cry.

As he clutches his shares, and shrieks his prayers, to the Jingo god on high.

With Bible and gun the game is won, at home and over the sea.

Now I've turned myself, in the reign of the Guelph, to a Chartered Comapnie.

Nor did the iniquity cease with the carnage. Had that been the end of it, we might dismiss it as due to the heat of human passion, and quite apart from human greed; but after events show that so-called Christian men—men standing high in the councils of a "Christian" government, and by that government clothed with plenary authority—deliberately reduced to abject poverty and to virtual slavery a whole people, by robbing them at once of both their lands and their cattle. Elder S. N. Haskell, a missionary writing from Matabeleland to the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, says:—

The Chartered Company that conquered the Matabeles in the late war, claim their cattle as well as their land to pay expenses.

The cunning Matabeles, however, have secreted many thousand head in the bush, which from time to time are found and sold by the Chartered Company.

And this was done, not by heathen Japanese in the excitement of war and smarting under indignities done to their fellow-soldiers, but done deliberately by "Christian" men, the representatives of a "Christian" government, professedly in the interests of so-called Christian civilization. Truly there is little in a name; and with "Christians" persecuting Christians in America, in Europe, and in Australia, with Greek "Christians" massacring Roman Catholic "Christians" in Russia, as was done only a year or two ago; and with "Christian" soldiers of a "Christian" power slaughtering helpless natives in Africa and robbing them of all their living; we can only stand in silence and contemplate the massacre of Chinese by Japanese, and the massacred of Armenians by Turks, and realize that after all it is not the name that makes men Christians indeed, but having Christ formed within; and that without this, to wear the name or to give it to

this or to that system that obtains in lands where the gospel is preached, is only to bring reproach upon the name of Christ and to put him to an open shame.

"Sunday Arrests in New York City" *American Sentinel* 10, 7 , p. 51.

SUNDAY, February 3, forty-seven men were arrested in this city for violation of the Sunday law, their offense being playing billiards or being present in a room where such a game was in progress.

All the arrests were made in two billiard rooms on Broadway. The games were being conducted in a quiet manner, and it is not charged that the places are in any sense disorderly resorts, or that liquor is sold in them contrary to law; the only offense charged being violation of the Sunday law.

The arrests were made on the complaint of a man who refused to give his name, and who merely told the sergeant at the station-house that the Sunday law was being violated at the two rooms mentioned.

When the forty-seven men were arraigned in the police court on Monday, Justice Taintor discharged all but the two proprietors of the two billiard rooms, holding that as the other prisoners had been arrested under the section of the code against disturbing the peace on Sunday, and there was no evidence to that effect, there was nothing to do but discharge them.

The two proprietors were bound over to answer in the special sessions for keeping their rooms open on Sunday, and their attorney declared that he would carry the case into the highest courts if satisfaction was not received in special sessions.

The arrests have created quite a sensation, as billiard rooms have not previously been interfered with on Sunday. The *World* of Tuesday says editorially:—

A Sunday-law Outrage

A number of persons were arrested on Sunday, in this city, for playing billiards. The arrest was possibly, though doubtfully, in accordance with the letter of a puritanical statute, but it was none the less an outrageous invasion of personal liberty.

It is not pretended that these people were disturbing the peace in any way or that their private indulgence in a harmless game of skill injured or could possibly injure anybody. It is even doubtful whether their play was in fact a violation of any law. Section 265 of the Penal Code, under which the arrest was made, prohibits "shooting, hunting, fishing, playing, horse racing, gambling, unequal, oppressive law, a law in restraint of reasonable liberty, but it is very doubtful indeed whether it covers the quiet playing of a game of billiards in an orderly billiard hall.

Whether it does or not it is a law that ought to be repealed. It is not the business of an American State to prescribe or enforce religious observances or to regulate them in any way except to protect every citizen in his right to do as he please respecting them.

All laws to enforce the Sabbatarian observance of Sunday are violative of the fundamental idea of American institutions. They invade that liberty of conscience which lies at the very root of our system. Yet curiously enough in our Penal Code they are grouped together, as if in irony, under the title, "Crimes Against Religious Liberty and Conscience."

Again, the same paper remarks:—

It is remarkable but unfortunately not extraordinary, that in a city like New York, a police sergeant on the complaint of somebody or anybody, can have fifteen or twenty respectable and orderly citizens dragged through the streets as criminals and law-breakers. Could the Russian police show any greater disregard of the unalienable right every inoffensive person has to freedom from police violence?

The *Evening World*, of the 4th inst., characterized the action of the police as "disorderly," and says:—

It has long been the custom of billiard-room proprietors to keep their places open for Sunday players. Yesterday the police raided the establishments run by Maurice Daly, at Broadway and Thirty first street, and George Slossen, at Broadway and Twenty-second street, at an early hour of the evening, and marched forty-five prisoners, players, spectators and employÈs, guarded by about sixty policemen, through the streets to the station house. They were all bailed out after a brief detention, their bondsmen being Daly and Slesson, the proprietors of the raided rooms.

Without reference to the question of Sunday billiard-playing, which is prohibited by the Penal Code, it certainly seems to have been quite unnecessary, and by no means in good judgment to have made such a raid. It was well known to the police that the proprietors have been in the habit of opening their rooms on Sundays, and a notification to them that it would not be allowed as being against the law would have remedied the evil without any scandalous public exhibition.

The scene was disgraceful to the city and caused more riotous demonstration in the streets and more disturbance of the peace than would have been occasioned by Sunday billiards in years.

The *Recorder* remarks that "Sunday billiard-playing is not yet a felony under the law," and adds that "it is probably owing to somebody's forgetfulness." Doubtless there are not wanting those who will endeavor to have this "defect" in the law corrected, now that attention has been called to it. If "the venerable day of the Sun," honored alike by pagans, papists and misguided Protestants, is not effectually protected by civil law, it will not be the fault of the modern "reformer."

New York's reform mayor, who has declared himself in favor of Sunday liquor selling, is credited with saying that he is opposed to Sunday billiards. "The best clubs in the city," says his honor, "veil their pool tables on Sunday." But the members drink their liquor just the same; for this reason the mayor thinks the saloons ought to be permitted to sell at certain hours, so that rich and poor may be on an equal footing before the law. But to play billiards on Sunday one must be able to own his own table! We are not billiard players, but we can see neither good morals nor good sense in such views, nor yet in such arrests. Billiards can be prohibited on Sunday more than on other days only out of deference to the religious character of the day, and with that the State has of right absolutely nothing to do.

"A Very Suggestive Movement" *American Sentinel* 10, 7 , pp. 51-53.

THE following article from the *Sun* of this city, January 18, 1895, is self-explanatory as to the movement and the purpose thereof which it outlines:—

ARMS FOR SCHOOL-BOYS

Forty-seven Governors Agree with Lafayette Post.

Military Drill in Schools and Colleges to be Recommended in Messages to Legislatures—A Big Conference Coming.

Having got the American flag raised over nearly every public school-house in the country, Lafayette Post, G. A. R., of this city is at work with enthusiasm and determination to build up beneath those flags something which shall sustain them in all stress under all circumstances, and against all opposition. They promise to

create this sustaining force through military instruction in the schools.

The widespread increase of this movement started by Lafayette Post, has been little less than amazing. It would be wholly so if the sentiment invoked were anything else than patriotism.

At a lunch given at the Lawyer's Club yesterday for the discussion of certain features of the movement, Post Commander Henry H. Adams displayed letters from the Governors of forty-seven States and Territories expressing not only sympathy with the objects of the movement, but urgently requesting more particulars concerning the means whereby it is proposed to secure military instruction in schools and colleges. In at least half the letters the governors writing had asked for immediate additional data for the purpose of submitting them to the legislative bodies of the various States now in session.

The movement is to have a national boom on the 25th of this month, when three important events relating to it will take place in this city. At 1 o'clock in the afternoon of that day, the governors of New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, and probably Massachusetts; six ex-governors, Gen. Miles, and probably ex-President Harrison, will meet in conference in the Hotel New Netherland to consult with a committee of Lafayette Post on the subject. The conference will have the legal advice of Joseph H. Choate and Chauncey M. Depew as to what legislation, national, State and municipal, should be advised to bring about the general instruction it is aimed to secure in public schools, State colleges, and universities under State and Federal supervision.

At half-past four o'clock the conferences will adjourn, and its members will be driven in carriages to the Seventh Regiment Armory, where several battalions of school children, who are receiving military instruction in our public schools, will be drilled for the purpose of giving to the visitors from other States a demonstration of the degree of excellence in drills public school-children are capable of acquiring. The kind of marching the visitors will see was thus commented on by ex-President Harrison:—

"In the Centennial parades in New York, in April,

52

1889, the best marching I saw was that of some of your school-children. The alignment of the company front was better than that of the regulars or of the Seventh Regiment."

After the drill the visitors, being fortified by dinner, will attend the principal event of the day. This will occur in the evening in Carnegie Hall, where Mr. Choate will talk on "What is a Vote?" and show that a vote in the hands of a man who has been taught to love his country, to recognize the value of obedience to law, and to toe out and hold his chin up, by military instruction, is a safe vote for the

country. Chauncey M. Depew will talk on "Citizenship and Patriotism," as they are affected by school military instruction; Gen. Benjamin, if it is possible for him to be present, will talk directly to the main question, "Military Instruction in Schools and Colleges;" the Hon. John S. Wise will speak on "A United Country;" Gen. Miles will ask and answer "What Does the Flag Signify?" and the Hon. Seth Low will calm the minds of doubtful parents by proving that the best-drilled boys are the best book students in his address, "Influence of Military Instruction on the Student."

The Lafayette Post committeemen who are so enthusiastically at work on this matter, invited a number of newspaper men and others to meet them at lunch in the Lawyers' Club yesterday to discuss the present aspect of the movement.

Post Commander Adams said that although when the movement was first started the country at large was ignorant of the practical object in view, and New York City was indifferent; now the country was awake to the importance of the movement, and New York was zealously alive in promoting it. He had been assured that on next Decoration Day there will be a parade here of 10,000 perfectly drilled public-school children. Only six weeks ago Lafayette Post began the attempt to bring about a concert of action between all the States, and the manner in which the attempt has been received was shown by the forty-seven letters from as many governors referred to above. At the Carnegie Hall meeting three governors at least will attend with their military staffs in full uniform. . . .

Commander Adams read from some collated data the committee has gathered which show that there are in the schools of the United States 1,800,000 boys between the years of 12 and 18 who are able to handle a cadet rifle. He read from the report of a principal of a school in which military instruction had been given for several years. The report stated that the general deportment of the scholars and their physical condition had greatly improved since the introduction of military instruction. The military companies are recruited only from scholars in good standing, and so the buttons become a badge of excellence.

This grand "boom" announced for the 25th came off according to program. In the proceedings of that day there was nothing in addition to what is announced above, except that there was a company of school-*girls* who went through the soldierly drill in the armory, after the boys had exhibited their efficiency in it. And this shows that the movement is not to be confined to the *boys* in the schools of the country. Indorsements were received from all the governors in the country.

There is one result that must inevitably follow the carrying out of this movement that is thus begun. That inevitable result will be *the separation of every genuine Christian from any allegiance to the Government*. If the thing shall be made in any way compulsory, it will force upon every Christian the direct issue of allegiance to Jesus Christ or to the Government of the United States. For all know that the principle of Jesus Christ is *peace, meekness and humility*; while the principle of this thing is *war, pride and ambition*.

The song of the angels that ushered Christ the Saviour into the world, a little child, is "Peace on earth, good will to men"—not war and warlike emulation. His word is, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart." But this thing says, even to the children, "Take the arms and accouterments of war upon you and learn the 'art' of strife, and contention, and of killing men." Christ humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, and therefore it is written, "Be ye clothed with humility;" while this proposed movement says, "Exalt yourselves; be clothed with pride and arrogance."

And therefore we say that if this thing is made in any way compulsory in the schools, it will force upon all the Christian parents of the country for immediate decision, the straight issue as to whether they will hold themselves and their children in allegiance to Christ and his principles at the risk of being counted unpatriotic, and even disloyal, toward the Government of the United States (for it is proposed to do all this in the interests of "patriotism"), or whether they will yield to this demand of the spirit of war and worldly ambition, with the certainty of severing allegiance to Jesus Christ and the kingdom of God.

If this beginning is carried into practice according to the proposition, the line will thereby be clearly drawn upon this issue and every Christian will be forced to decide. Of course the genuine Christian will have no difficulty in deciding the question: his allegiance is everlastingly settled uncompromisingly upon Jesus Christ. And this allegiance holds at the expense of every earthly consideration, even life itself. Therefore we say, and say truly, that as certainly as this thing is carried out, the inevitable result will be to separate every genuine Christian from allegiance to the Government. In view of the situation, it is time for those who profess to be Christians in the country to ask themselves: "Am I indeed a Christian? Will I hold fast my integrity to the principles of Christ and my allegiance to him? or

will I compromise and surrender my children to the rule of the spirit of war?"

We have used the expression, "If this shall be made in any sense compulsory in the schools." But without its being made compulsory by law, it will yet be in a certain sense compulsory if it shall be generally introduced into the schools; for then every boy physically and otherwise qualified for it, *who shall refuse it*, will instantly be ostracised. There will be enough compulsion about it to make a clear test of the Christian principle of both parents and children.

It is no answer to this to say that ministers and prominent church-members indorse it; or that the churches have really taken the lead in the movement, in their organizing of the "Boys' Brigade;" for instead of this being any valid argument or evidence in its favor, it is in fact only a positive evidence of the apostasy and anti-christian spirit that is pervading the professed Protestant churches of the land.

Christ is peace. The spirit of Christ is the spirit of peace. The kingdom of Christ is the kingdom of peace. Christ himself is the King of peace. The war-spirit in those who profess to be Christ's, is antichrist. To bring to the support of the movement the like action and example of the churches, is the greatest condemnation that could be given it. For "this wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." James 3:15-18.

Shall the spirit of Christ, or the spirit of war prevail in the Christian families of the land? This is the question which, by this "amazing" movement, is forced upon all the Christians in the land.

Another sure result will be that this thing will be greedily adopted by the papacy in the United States as the means of crowding herself forward to the highest place as the grand exemplar and chief conservator of "patriotism," and of "love" for the flag. The Catholic Church has had her Cadets, and Hibernian Rifles, and such like, for some time. All this militia-ism is directly in her line of things. For the last two or three years the papacy in this country has been making great boasts of her ability and efficiency as the "inculcator of patriotism;" and now that this movement for military training of the school-children is professedly grounded on "patriotism," and is to be

the great means of cultivating "patriotism," it will be taken by the papacy as a perfect godsend, and will be grasped and used accordingly for the purpose of lifting herself to the chief place before the country as a respecter of the flag and the guardian of the nation.

Indeed we are not sure that any one would be far wrong in suspecting that the papacy is at the bottom of the scheme itself. We do not certainly know that this is the case; but we know that there is ground for a good strong suspicion of it. And that ground is this: We have in our possession a series of resolutions adopted by the Catholic Club of Newark, N.J., on the night of September 26, 1894, and reported in the *Catholic Mirror* of October 6, 1894, report and all reading as follows:—

The Catholic Club of Newark, at its meeting last Wednesday night, adopted a set of resolutions asking the Legislature to make provision for the introduction of military drill in the public, parochial and other schools within the State, in which boys are taught. The resolutions are as follows:—

"*Resolved*, That in the judgment of the Catholic Club of Newark, N.J., the military resources of our country should not now be neglected, but should be developed as fully as a reasonable economy will allow; and be it

"*Resolved*, That we therefore suggest respectfully to the Legislature of our State that military instruction for the boys in our public schools ought to be provided for, and may without a doubt be secured very cheaply through the agency of members of the Grand Army of the Republic and of the National Guard of the State; and be it

"*Resolved*, That we also suggest to the Legislature the propriety of providing for similar instruction in all the other schools in this State in which boys are taught; and be it

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the clerk of the Senate and another to the clerk of the House of Assembly."

It is to be hoped that such a law will come in vogue, as it will be of great benefit to the boys in many ways.

That we consider sufficient ground for the suspicion that the Roman Catholic Church is at the bottom of this movement now definitely set on foot throughout the nation by Lafayette Post, G. A. R., of this city.

But whether this suspicion is correct or not, these resolutions are positive proof that she will enter heart and soul into the movement; that she will use it for all that it can be made to be worth in her own

interests; and that she will use it in one way at least for the purposes which we have here pointed out.

So certainly will this be found to be true, that as certainly as the movement shall be carried out, it will be a test upon all the people as to whether or not they will play into the hands of the papacy. To support it will be to support the papacy, and to help forward her designs to control the nation. It will be to help toward the consummation to which "all the re-

53

markable energies of Leo XIII. are bent," namely: "the union of the Church with the power of America."

And thus again the inevitable result of the movement, if carried out, will be to force upon all the people the straight decision as between Christ and antichrist.

"Papal Politics" *American Sentinel* 10, 7 , p. 53.

THE following editorial from a leading Roman Catholic paper of Boston, presents that paper's view of certain events connected with Vatican politics in the East, that will interest our readers:—

A New Advocate of Papal Independence

The splendid presentation of the politico-religious situation in Italy made last spring by Arthur Warren in the *Boston Herald*, quoted everywhere in America as it was, has done much for the cause of papal independence in showing to non-Catholic Americans the reasonableness of the pope's claim and the impossibility of a "United Italy" while that claim remains unsettled.

The course of events in Europe within the past few months, however, brings the papal question still further to the front, and foreshadows Russia as likely to force the hand of Italy to relax its grasp on the territory of the church.

"An American Traveller," writing from Milan to the *New York Sun*, brings the papal question and Russia's powerful interest in it up to date.

It is not easy to exaggerate the significance of the formal accrediting of an envoy to the holy see by the late czar, a few months before his death; and the extraordinary mission of Prince Lobanoff, charged by the new czar, Nicholas II., to present an autographic letter, notifying his accession to the throne, to the pope at the Vatican.

They are, in effect, the recognition of the pope's claims by the strongest power in Europe.

The czar has recently bestowed especial honors on Archbishop Kozloffski, the Metropolitan of the Catholics of the Latin Rite in Russia; and is, in general, softening the situation for the heretofore oppressed Catholics in his vast dominion.

Moreover, his attitude is strongly influencing France in a similar policy towards the pope.

Russia has practically broken up the Triple Alliance. There is nothing to hinder her from carrying out her determination to hold the balance of power in the Mediterranean, by getting her great war-fleet into it, through the Bosphorus and the Cardanelles. England and Germany together cannot back Italy against united Russia and France; so that, when it pleases these latter powers to ask for papal independence as the price of their good-will, Italy must needs grant it for her own safety.

Why the Czar of Russia, the official head of a schismatic church, whose very existence is a protest against the pope's spiritual sovereignty, should concern himself to recognize or to restore the pope's dominion as a temporal ruler, is a problem especially difficult to the non-Catholic American mind.

But Mr. Warren, who, in the article above alluded to, foreshadowed the restoration of papal independence through the action of the great European powers, thus suggests an explanation:—

"The religious power of the church has not waned in the ages. It has changed in some respects, but it has not decreased. The church has been in the past, and it is to-day, strong, because it is elastic. . . . It adapts itself to the spirit of each succeeding age, and to the spirit of each country in which it finds a home. It has at its head to-day a man who is equally great as a priest and as a statesman, a man of liberal ideas, whose one aim is to use the power which is vested in him for the good of humanity. However one may differ with his theology, one must concede the greatness of his mind, his nature and his purpose.

"Leo XIII. is a master of men. . . . He is, after all, the most important personage on earth; he wields an influence wider than that of any emperor, or president, or parliament, and his word is capable of exerting a greater influence than the word of any other human being."

The relations now begun between Russia and Rome, and daily growing more close and cordial, cannot fail to hasten the reunion of the "Orthodox" Russian Church, and the schismatical churches of the East with Rome; and who can over-estimate the effect of this reunion on the whole question of the reunion of Christendom?—*The Pilot, Feb. 2.*

We understand from this that "the reunion of Christendom" is to follow "papal independence," and papal independence is to be

secured by political wire-pulling. Therefore the "reunion of Christendom" is to be accomplished through the agency of politics. This kind of "union of Christendom" is the only kind of which the papacy has any knowledge, and political methods are its chief methods. But the Roman Catholic Church has no "corner" on this method of advancing the kingdom of Christ in the earth. Popular Protestantism is fast adopting it. Ministerial delegations, or "Christian lobbyists," now hover about Congress and State legislatures, to urge religious measures with a view to hastening the dawn of the millennium; and the president of the largest organization of women professing the Protestant Christian religion, in her annual address in 1887, declared that "the kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics."

"Look on This and Then on That" *American Sentinel* 10, 7 , p. 53.

THE *Catholic Review* of February 3rd publishes the pope's encyclical to America. The same issue contains an editorial, entitled, "The Real Meaning of the Union of Church and State;" and this editorial plainly contradicts the pope's encyclical. To make manifest this contradiction, the conflicting statements are printed in parallel columns:—

<p>FROM THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL. The church among you, unopposed by the Constitution and Government of your nation, fettered 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 <i>very erroneous</i> to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of these churches; or that it would be universally <i>lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced</i>. 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 more abundant fruits if, <i>in addition</i> to liberty, she enjoyed the <i>favor of the laws</i> and the <i>patronage of public authority</i>.</p>	<p>FROM THE "CATHOLIC REVIEW." The Catholic Church is able to stand alone and is, therefore, opposed to the union of Church and State. They [Protestants] see that the church is going ahead and making converts on all sides; that it appeals to the intelligent, the thoughtful, the conservative and truly religious inclined portion of the community. They see that it <i>asks no favors</i>—that it has a compact organization—that it stands out in bold contrast to the disintegrating, fragmentary, decaying members of Protestantism, and they are alarmed at it. It is not that they really fear a union between the Catholic Church and the State. They know there is no danger in that direction. <i>Catholics do not desire it. We are better without it.</i> We do not wish for any entangling alliances. <i>All we ask is a free field and fair play.</i></p>
---	---

We have here given an evidence of the way papists in America misrepresent the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church on the question of separation of Church and State. The pope has decided that the time has come to definitely denounce, as unlawful, the American theory of separation of Church and State. The *Catholic Review*, "A Weekly Journal . . . commended by His Holiness Leo XIII.," published in New York City, thinks that the time has not come to throw off the mask, and therefore while publishing the pope's demand for a union of the American Government with the Roman Catholic Church, in the same issue gives the lie to the pope and says Catholics do not want what the pope say they do want. While the pope declares that a union of Church and State is "desirable" in America, the *Catholic Review* says, "Catholics do *not desire it*;" while the pope asks "in *addition* to liberty," "the *favor of the laws* and the *patronage of the public authority*," the *Review* says,—"it [the church] asks no favors;" "all we ask is a free field and fair play." The *Review*

here attempts to quiet the fears which it knew the pope's statement would arouse. And there are a great many professed Protestants in the United States who are just gullible enough to believe that the *Review* represents the true attitude of the Roman Catholic Church to American institutions, and that the pope is a heretic. And they will continue in their blindness until the Roman Catholic Church in America shall fully possess what the pope says is desirable, and what the *Review* will then openly indorse as desirable.

This is a part of that Janus-faced policy of Rome described by the prophet Daniel in the words, "And he shall destroy the mighty, and the people of the saints, according to his will, and craft shall be successful in his hand." Dan. 8:24, 25 (Catholic version).

"Terrible Revelations of Cruelty to Convicts in Georgia" *American Sentinel* 10, 7 , p. 54.

SAVANNAH, GA., Jan. 31.—The Grand Jury, after making investigation, returned a sensational presentment to-day with regard to the county chain-gang, made up of petty offenders. Twenty-one men are disabled, most of them permanently, from fearful exposure in recent freezing weather. A number were made to break ice in the canal and work in freezing water without shoes and with nothing but their trousers to protect them. Few of the men have been brought to the hospital in this city, and seventeen, the report says, now lie on hard board beds in the convict camp wrapped in blankets, emaciated and disabled. The report continues:—

The convicts in the hospitals can neither stand nor walk. They are unable to wear shoes; they lie chained and huddled together, suffering from what, in this climate, is a most unusual affliction, but which is a slow and certain torture. Some of them will lose fingers and toes. Their feet are swollen and discolored, large gaping wounds are discharging blood and mucus, and in two or three instances the men show signs of prostration.

Of the convicts in the city hospital one or more will lose a leg.—*New York World, Feb. 1, 1895.*

One can but shudder as he reads this and remembers that under the Sunday law of Georgia, conscientious Christian men, whose only offense is working on Sunday after having kept "the Sabbath according to the commandment," are liable to be subjected to the indignities and tortures incident to the inhuman system of leasing convicts in vogue in that State. But whether Christian men or

hardened criminals are the victims, such cruelty is utterly abhorrent to every feeling of humanity, and the men responsible for such barbarities should be severely punished. Until such things cease we should, as a people, cease to boast of our nineteenth century civilization.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 7 , p. 56.

A PRESS dispatch speaking of the pope's encyclical says:—

The pope tells the American Catholics that it is their duty to cherish the Constitution of their country, and says that it does not interfere in any way with their duties to their church.

We do not so read the encyclical. On the contrary, the pope distinctly tells "American Catholics that it is their duty to cherish" the principles of Romanism, and 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 State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced." This is the very opposite to telling "American Catholics that it is their duty to cherish the Constitution of their country."

TWENTY Seventh-day Adventists are under indictment in a single county in Tennessee for Sunday work, the cases to be tried in March. In all such cases in Tennessee where the accused have been convicted, they have refused to pay their fines and have gone to jail. Now the legislature of that State has before it a bill to establish a whipping-post for the punishment of minor offenses. A Tennessee paper remarks: "While such a law smacks of barbarism, yet we think it would be a good thing. For a small offense take the culprit and give him a severe chastisement, which will teach him to go and sin no more, and will also rid the country of expenses caused by his incarceration."

We do not say nor do we think that there is any connection between the facts stated and the proposed legislation; but with such a law upon the statute books, how long will it be ere Tennessee will be whipping Seventh-day Adventists for exercising their God-given right to work six days after having kept the seventh day "according to the commandment"?

From page-proofs of the *Arkansas Reporter* kindly forwarded us, we learn that Arkansas has revived its persecution of Seventh-day Adventist, notwithstanding seventh-day observers are exempted by the statute from the penalties of the Sunday law of the State. The

victim this time is J. W. Huddleston of Ft. Smith, who was arraigned before the Justice of the Peace, January 30, and fined one dollar and costs (amounting to \$17.00) for hauling wood on the previous Sunday. The case has been appealed. The Justice is a Roman Catholic, and was under the influence of liquor when he rendered the decision. However, these latter facts are cited as mitigating circumstances; but when we say this we wish thereby to emphasize the fact that this same terrible sin against God, and crime against man, is committed, in other States, by professed *Protestant Christians* while *sober*, and *soberly* defended, with few noble exceptions, by the denominational press of the country.

IN an article in the *Catholic World* for February, Priest Elliott, referring to the work of the Salvation Army, says:—

If a bishop and one or two able priests would start street preaching, assisted it might be by men or women of the laity, the results would be marvelous. Some of us little dream that there is a distinct class of street people, grown in later years into many thousands in every great centre of population. They live on the street as much as the climate allows, they read their penny papers on the streets, they are taught by their petty leaders on the streets—the street is a roomier place, a freer place, and just as clean a place as where they are supposed to live, but where they only sleep. When the Catholic Church takes to the streets with its representatives high and low, it will reach these street people. They are not all bad, many of them are fairly good Catholics, and these would secure a respectful hearing—but that is certain anyway. And meantime our highly educated and zealous priesthood would simply revolutionize for good the street life which at present is often a menace to public order, and is addressed on religious topics by men and women who play soldier and beat bass drums.

This suggestion shows how thoroughly alive the Roman Catholic Church is becoming to the possibilities that are before her in this country. Rome has entered upon an active propaganda in the United States. Hitherto it has been her policy to work quietly, to make proselytes simply of those who were thrown directly in her way; but now it is proposed that she go out in the streets and openly invite to her communion the rich and the poor. No longer content to grow simply by immigration and by the natural increase of the Catholic population, she proposes to compete with Protestantism for the floating masses that have no church relations; or who, if they have,

as a rule, know nothing of the power of a living faith, and so can be beguiled by the arts of Rome.

IN the *Catholic World* for February, Priest Elliott, in describing his "Mission to Non-Catholics," has this to say of his "Question Box":—

The questions were not numerous and far from interesting, at best to the lecturers. One old gentleman insisted night after night on our explaining the prophecies about the scarlet woman, the Babylon on seven hills, the abomination of desolation, and the man of sin. We informed him and the audience that he was behind the times, as contemporary Protestant commentators did not generally affirm the Catholic Church to be the fulfillment of these prophecies.

The old gentleman might as well have saved himself the trouble of pressing his question. Roman Catholic priests will not discuss that subject. But it does not settle the matter to say that "contemporary Protestant commentators do not generally affirm the Catholic Church to be the fulfillment of those prophecies." The question is not what weak-kneed, so-called Protestants of to-day affirm, but what did genuine Protestant commentators of past generations *prove* by the most indisputable evidences?

THE *Catholic Mirror* has made a wonderful discovery, namely, that Luther is responsible for the prevalence of suicide in this the nineteenth century; it says:—

It is a lamentable fact that *suicide* is but too common, and is said by statisticians to be steadily increasing. Without Christian faith it is, indeed, true that life in certain conditions would be insupportable; among heathen nations it is as we know of little value. There appears to be also, as was recently pointed out by a writer, a growing debility of nerve among people of the present generation and a physical incapacity to endure misfortune or suffering which did not formerly exist. . . . *The feeling of despair really began with Luther's reformation* and the extent to which it has deepened and increased since can be readily traced.

This is indeed remarkable; the preaching of justification by faith instead of by works induces such a feeling of despair that men hasten to take their own lives. Profound thought!

February 21, 1895

**"The 'Monitor,' the Prophecies and the Beast" *American Sentinel* 10,
8 , pp. 57, 58.**

IN further consideration of the complaints made by the *Monitor* against the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and commented upon in these columns last week, we notice first that it says:—

The prophecies though are the most alarming characteristic of the sect [to which the SENTINEL belongs]. Ordinary people and politicians are compelled to wait for the morrow to see what it will bring, but the AMERICAN SENTINEL can pierce the future, and by chapter and verse construct the horoscope of the next century.

Why should the prophecies be an alarming characteristic of any sect, or of anybody, or of anything? Is not the greater part of the Bible made up of prophecies? To respect the prophecies is only to respect the Bible. To believe the prophecies is to believe the Bible. To despise the prophecies is to despise the Bible. To make light of the prophecies is to make light of the Word of God. Is it then that the prophecies are an alarming thing to the *Monitor*, because the Bible is an alarming thing to Catholicism and the papacy altogether?

As for our not being compelled to wait for the morrow to see what it will bring forth, like ordinary people and politicians, but by chapter and verse being able to know the future, why should that be counted a reproach to us or anybody else? It is written: "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." Amos 3:7. Then when God has revealed things, why should it be considered an alarming or a reproachful thing that somebody should know them? And if "ordinary people and politicians" do not know the things that are revealed by the Lord, and therefore do not know what the morrow will bring, is it not because ordinary things and politics, rather than the wisdom of the Lord, occupy their minds and attention? When God has revealed the things that the morrow will bring, then ought not ordinary people and politicians to know as well as anybody else what the morrow will bring, and ought not all to know, who have any respect for God and his Word?

The Lord has been revealing the things of the morrow ever since the day in which he told Noah of the coming flood—yes, even from the day when Enoch, "the seventh from Adam," prophesied, saying: "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of *all their hard speeches* which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." Jude 14.

In the book of Daniel the world-powers are described, and the history of the world is outlined, from the days of Babylon of old until

the last day and the end of the world itself. There is clearly pointed out the then coming succession of the empire of Medo-Persia to that of Babylon; the succession of the empire of Grecia to that of Persia; of Rome to Grecia; the division of Rome into the ten parts, caused by the barbarians; the rise of the papacy as a world-power among these, and its uprooting of three of them; and the continuance of the papacy until it shall be destroyed and given to the burning flame at the coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven. Now it would have been perfectly easy for any man who lived at any time in these periods, who had these prophecies *and believed them*, to know and to tell what would be in succeeding centuries; and this, not from any wisdom or knowledge of his own, but simply by believing the Word of God.

In the book of Revelation the field of prophecy is opened with Rome at the time of Christ's sojourn upon the earth; and, with many particulars added, the time is again covered till the end of the world and the destruction of the papacy in flaming fire at the coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven. And to anyone who will read these prophecies and believe them, it will not be at all difficulty to know what the morrow will bring. We confess that we do carefully study these prophecies; and we do implicitly believe them; and we are happy to be able to say that by them we do know what the morrow will bring. But with him to whom some of these things were first revealed, we freely say, "But as for me, this secret is not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have more than any living" (Dan. 2:30); it is open and free to all equally with us, and, equally with us, all can know who will read the prophecies and believe them. The *Monitor* would do far better to study and believe these prophecies than to be publishing that "the prophecies are the most alarming characteristic" of any sect, or sneering at the ability of anybody to pierce the future and know what the morrow will bring.

Quoting from the SENTINEL, and commenting as he goes, the editor of the *Monitor* continues as follows:—

The SENTINEL was established in 1886 to combat the organized attempt, first represented in the National Reform Association *alone*, and later, in the solid combination of the popular Protestantism of the whole country, to fasten upon the National Government the recognition and maintenance of the forms of religion—to accomplish the union of religion and the national power.

The establishment of the paper was a most peculiar move, as we are told on the next page that the editor knew that the

movement—whatever it was, we haven't the faintest idea—would succeed, and what is more, would be followed by the triumph of the church of Rome.

Yes, we did know from the beginning that that movement would succeed, and that its success would be followed by the triumph of the church of Rome in this country, and through this triumph it would triumph in Europe and all the world; and this we announced long before Leo XIII. had publicly announced his scheme to accomplish this very thing in this very way.

How it can be that the editor of the *Monitor* "has not the faintest idea" of what this movement was, immediately after having quoted our statement of just what the movement was, is a question worth asking; but that he may be fully informed on this point, we will say that there is a book now on the press which gives the full history of the movement and its success, and the first steps of the papacy toward her coming triumph upon the success of that movement, and as soon as this book is ready we shall send a copy to the *Monitor* for the editor's special information and use.

Concerning the establishment of the SENTINEL being "a most peculiar move," in view of the fact that "the editor knew that the movement would succeed," it must be remarked that this is another queer notion of the editor of the *Monitor*. What would be the use of starting a paper to oppose a movement that had in it no element of success? The SENTINEL was started to oppose the movement,

58

not with the expectation of preventing its success, but to save men from the ruin involved in the movement. Noah knew that the wicked movement of his day would succeed in ruining the world; but he opposed that movement, not with the expectation of preventing it, but to save men from that ruin. Jesus Christ knew that the wicked movement of his day would result in his death and the awful destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, and yet he opposed that wicked movement that he might save men from its terrible consequences. Paul knew that the "falling away" from the truth of the gospel, begun in his day, would result in the establishment of the "man of sin," the "mystery of iniquity"—the papacy; yet he devoted his life to opposing that movement, not because he expected to prevent its success, for he knew it would continue until destroyed "with the brightness of His coming," but with the hope of saving men from the soul-destroying deceptions of that movement. So now, the AMERICAN SENTINEL is opposing the same movement with the

same knowledge that it will succeed, and with the same object, the salvation of men—including the editor of the *Monitor*—from the ruin involved in a connection with the movement.

Yes, we knew the movement would succeed, *and it has succeeded*; and the papacy is now making vast use of the advantage which this success has given her. Upon this the *Monitor* further remarks:—

This startling information is all derived from the Bible. "It was by the scripture of Rev. 13:11-17, saying that they would make 'an image to the beast,' that we knew that the National Reform movement would certainly succeed, and we always said so." He does not enlighten us on the name of the "beast" whose image was made, but there is no doubt in our minds but he refers to the Columbian postage stamp.

Yes, this information, startling or otherwise, was derived from the Scripture at the place referred to—Rev. 13:11-17. No, the beast referred to, to which the image was made, is not the Columbian postage stamp. It may be that in the article referred to by the *Monitor*, we were not sufficiently explicit in naming "the beast" to make it perfectly clear to the mind of the editor of that paper. And as we want never to leave anyone in doubt or uncertainty, especially upon this most important point, we shall occupy a little space in the endeavor to make it so plain that even the *Monitor* may not mistake. And lest the editor should again "have no time to look up the references," we shall do all we can to aid him, by printing here in full *and from the Roman Catholic Bible*, the scripture in which "the beast" is described. Here it is:—

And I saw a beast coming up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten diadems, and upon his heads names of blasphemy. And the beast, which I saw, was like to a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion. And the dragon gave him his heads as it were slain to death; and his death's wound was healed. And all the earth was in admiration after the beast. And they adored the dragon, which gave power to the beast: and they adored the beast, saying: Who is like to the beast? and who shall be able to fight with him? And there was given to him a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemies; and power was given to him to do two and forty months. And he opened his mouth unto blasphemies against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them. And

power was given him over every tribe, and people, and tongue, and nation. And all that dwelt upon the earth, adored him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb, which was slain from the beginning of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear.

There is the Lord's own description of "the beast;" and anybody who knows the A B C of the history from the writing of this passage till now, knows full well that the description exactly fits the papacy, and will not apply to any other thing that was ever on the earth.

For from the time when that was written, what power but that of the papacy has there been on the earth that was of such standing that it could be truly said that "all the earth was in admiration" [Greek *ethaumasem*—wonderment] after it?

What world-power except the papacy has there ever been from that time till now, of which it was said to could be said in wonder, "Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?"

What power ever existed that spoke such great things and blasphemies as the papacy has spoken over and over?

What power was there in the world that blasphemed God, and his name, and his tabernacle—that is "His church and His saints,"⁸¹—and them that dwell in heaven, as has the papacy, and as the papacy still does? Look at that word that Leo XIII. lately set forth to "the princes and peoples of the universe," claiming to "hold the regency of God on earth;" is not that blasphemous enough, of itself, to fulfill the prophecy and meet this description of the beast? Look also at the claim of infallibility on the part of the Pope of Rome—the assumption of the essential prerogative of the Creator himself;—is not this also enough to meet the description of the beast?

What power ever made such war, and so long continued, and so implacable, against the saints, as has the papacy?

Rev. 12:9 says that "the dragon" is "that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan;" and in this description of "the beast" it is said that "the dragon"—"the Devil and Satan"—gave him his own strength and great power. Now to what system or organization that was ever on the earth has the devil ever given so much of his own strength and great power as he has given to the papacy? Why to the papacy has he given so much of "his own strength" and great power, that one historian was driven to say of the bishops of Rome that they "have deluged Europe and Asia with blood;" another declares that "among the contrivances that have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place;" and these

statements are exactly true—they are simply the response of history testifying that the prophecy relating to "the beast," is fulfilled to the letter in the evil working of the papacy in the sight of all the world. So that any person who will study this prophecy and believe it, can say truly and without hesitation that "the name of the beast whose image was made" *is the papacy*.

It will not do to say that this prophecy concerning "the beast" refers to pagan Rome; for pagan Rome and its instrumentality in the hands of Satan against Christ and his Church is noticed in chapter 12:4, 5. For it was through Herod, a Roman appointee, and the representative of Roman power, that Satan sought to "devour" the "man child" "as soon as it was born." And it was by the orders of Pontius Pilate, *the Roman governor*, that Christ was put to death, from which death he "was caught up unto God, and to his throne." There is pagan Rome and her place in the account.

But after pagan Rome had passed, there came another power which Satan used against the Church, against the saints, and against God and his Christ. To this other power the dragon "gave his own strength and great power." This is the power described in Rev. 13:1-8. It was after pagan Rome had been used by Satan. It came as the successor of pagan Rome. And this *was and is the papacy—papal Rome*. And by every consideration it is demonstrated that *this* is "the name of the beast whose image was made."

"True and False Theocracy" *American Sentinel* 10, 8 , pp. 58, 59.

THEOCRACY is the highest, the most perfect form of government known to man; for it is government by the direction or administration of God himself. Had man never fallen, there never would have been any other kind of government; and in the earth redeemed from the curse, God will be King; for it is written: "the tabernacle of God" shall be "with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." This can mean nothing less than a perfect divine government of willing subjects.

Primarily, theocracy means government by the immediate direction or administration of God, as in Eden before the fall; it is also applied to the exercise of political authority by priests representing the Deity. It is not enough to constitute a *true* theocracy that rulers *profess* to represent God; it must be even so, as it was in the case of Samuel.

But in its *highest* and *most perfect* sense a theocracy has never existed in this world since the fall; for man in his fallen condition has never yielded true and undivided allegiance to God. And only for brief periods has political authority been exercised by men truly representing God. It is declared that "Moses verily was faithful in all his house." The Lord was also with Joshua even as he was with Moses; but after the death of Joshua the intervals were indeed brief in which the children of Israel walked in the counsel of the Most High; and with the crowning of Saul the theocracy proper ended; for one of the essential elements to a true theocracy was lacking, namely, the consent of the governed; for while the Lord designated Saul to be king, he declared to Samuel, "They have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." 1 Sam. 8:7.

Two things are absolutely necessary to the existence of a true theocracy: (1) God himself must be the governor; and (2) the subjects of the government must consent to be governed by him, or by those directly chosen and directed by him. God himself having made man a free moral agent,—a being endowed with power of choice,—recognizes the great truth that in all things civil, *governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed*. The Creator himself exercised civil power only so long as it was the choice of the people that he should exercise it. When God became the recognized governor of the children of Israel, it was by their unanimous consent. "And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Ex. 19:8. And when God abdicated the throne, so to speak, and gave the government into the hands of Saul, it was likewise in deference to the practically unanimous demand of the governed, *i.e.*, of the people.

But though the children of Israel rejected God as their ruler, "and would none of his counsel," his merciful providence was still over them. They were to be preserved a separate people for a special object, and even their rebellion could not defeat the purpose of God concerning them. The divine mould was still upon their laws, and a divine providence still protected them from utter extinction as a nation.

God's promise to David was "that of the *fruit of his loins*, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne" (Acts 2:30), and it was necessary that the nation should continue until the Promised One should be revealed. Nevertheless when the people

rebelled against God, he permitted them to reap the fruit of their doings. When they repented and sought him, he delivered them, and they were still called by his name. But while he permitted them to retain in a measure their religio-civil laws, and to administer them by a semi-ecclesiastical court, he never restored the theocracy which they had rejected. And with the overthrow of Zedekiah the descendants of Abraham ceased to be an independent nation and became a dependency of another power. "Ichabod" had long been written on the Jewish escutcheons, but they did not fully realize the fact, and most persistently did they from time to time endeavor to restore the ancient polity and rehabilitate themselves with divine power. But it was not to be. They preserved their ecclesiastical organization, but their political power was limited by the will of a foreign ruler. God still cared for them, but foreigners ruled over them restrained only by his providence. The word of the Lord was:—

And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, Thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him. Eze. 21:25-27.

The divine fiat had gone forth canceling forever any special right of any man or of any set of men to rule in civil things in God's name. It is true that the Jewish rulers never ceased to claim divine right to rule, and that in fact they represented Deity. Down until the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, the Sanhedrim clung to the delusion that they were God's representatives in both civil and religious affairs, but the Lord did not so recognize them; and our Saviour utterly repudiated the claim of the people to civil authority by refusing to accept a throne at their hands, declaring that his kingdom was not of this world,—that is, it was not of a temporal nature, neither was his authority to be conferred by the powers of this world, but by his Father only. And again did the Saviour humble the pride of the Jews and rebuke their assumption by reminding them, in the incident of the tribute money (Matt. 22:15-21), that Cesar was their ruler, and that they themselves recognized his authority by using coins bearing his image and superscription. The Apostle Paul likewise disdained the civil authority of the Jews when he appealed unto Cesar. And even the Jews themselves in their made frenzy declared, "We have no king but Cesar." And in this they spoke truly, for God had declared that civil

power should no more be exercised in his name, till he should come whose right it is—come, till he should come whose right it is—come, not to die for sinners, but as "King of kings and Lord of lords."

At the date of the prophecy of Eze. 21:25-27, already quoted, the Jewish people were subject to Babylon. The first overturning left the kingdom subject to Medo-Persia; the second placed it under the dominion of Grecia, while the third and last gave it to Rome. "And it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is." Who he was to whom the promise was made we learn from Luke 1:31-33:—

And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.

But it is plain that this promise does not refer to an earthly, temporal kingdom. To Pilate, Jesus declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." John 18:36. While to his disciples he said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Luke 22:29, 30. And he did not leave them in doubt as to the enduring nature of that kingdom, or when they should enter upon it; he said: "In the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Matt. 19:28. When it is that Christ shall "sit in the throne of his glory" is told in another text. It is "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his cheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say to them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. 25:31-34.

These texts make it positive that a theocracy can exist no more in this world until the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, with power and great glory, and that anything which professes to be a theocracy, or to partake of the nature of a theocracy, is simply a usurpation of the divine prerogatives and in defiance of the will of God as plainly expressed in his Word.

"The 'Pilot' Attacks the 'Sentinel'" *American Sentinel* 10, 8 , pp. 59, 60.

THE *Pilot*, a Roman Catholic paper of Boston, publishes the following in its issue of February 9:—

Judging from the utterances of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, an organ of the Seventh-day Adventists, on "Romanism," and its diatribes against Protestants who believe in keeping the Christian Sabbath holy, it is easy to guess how tolerant the Seventh-day fanatics would be if they had the power of making the Sabbath laws. Woe to the Jew who did not keep Saturday, to the Mohammedan who observed Friday, and to the Christian who rested on Sunday. A little toleration of others would be becoming in people who shriek so loudly against the "intolerance" which compels them to respect their neighbor's religious views on one day of the week.

Now, this is interesting indeed. A Roman Catholic paper, in the role of champion defender of Protestantism against Seventh-day Adventists! It is said that politics sometimes makes strange bedfellows, but politics never accomplished so great a feat in that direction as has been accomplished by Seventh-day Adventists in their advocacy of the Bible Sabbath. By the last sentence we are given to understand that Roman Catholics sympathize with the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists, because they neglect to pay to the dominant religion a tribute of one of the "six working days" which God has given them.

Seventh-day Adventists have never been prosecuted for an actual disturbance of any person's Sunday-rest. Of the hundreds of witnesses against them in the forty-four cases in which they have been punished for laboring on Sunday, only *two* have sworn that they were disturbed by the work. One testified that though he did not see or hear the work done, he was disturbed by the *mere knowledge* that it was being done. The other witness swore that he was "*shocked*" on seeing the Seventh-day Adventist hoeing in his field, while acknowledging, under oath, that at the same moment that he was so "shocked" with the seventh-day observer's Sunday hoeing, he, with his hired hand, was driving home a cow which they had gone to a neighbor to procure. The kind of disturbance and disrespect which Seventh-day Adventists have inflicted on these Romanizing Protestants is the same kind of disrespect which Huss and Jerome paid to the religion of their Roman Catholic murderers,—they taught and practiced contrary to the religion which, as Pope Leo XIII.

expresses it, enjoyed the "favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority."

The *Pilot* thinks that Seventh-day Adventists would be just as intolerant as itself and its Protestant imitators if they had the power. We can understand this. It is an absolute impossibility for a papist to understand how a man can enjoy his religion and not desire to force it upon his neighbor, or at least compel him to cease opposition to it. This is not because the Roman Catholic is by nature any more perverse than other men, but it is because his religion teaches him a principle totally at variance with the spirit of the gospel. He who understands the spiritual nature of the gospel will not attempt to compel any man to accept it or to pay a hypocritical respect to it. God himself does not and cannot force the will of man to accept salvation. He woos him by his Spirit, and when he rejects his tender pleadings, he says: "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life."

The papal system is a stranger to this spiritual nature of the gospel. We therefore pity the editor of the *Pilot*, because he is the victim of an antichristian system, and we are making every effort to present the gospel in its true nature, with the hope of winning Roman Catholics by its infinite beauty, love and mercy.

The *Pilot* charges us with abusing Protestants because we tell them the truth about the papal Sunday. It has been regarded as abuse to tell and live the truth ever since Cain killed Abel "because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous." Jesus, during his earthly ministry, spoke and acted the truth about the Sabbath, and those who violated the Sabbath and exalted the traditions of the church above the law of God, sought to kill him because of it.

We have never used, and never will use, as severe language in telling Protestants that Sunday is a Roman Catholic institution as papists are themselves using in telling the same truth. Here are paragraphs from editorials which appeared in Cardinal Gibbons' organ, the *Catholic Mirror*, of September 9 and 23, 1893. The editorials in question are two of a series of four articles which appeared in the *Mirror* of September 2, 9, 16 and 23, 1893, and were afterwards published by the *Catholic Mirror*, Baltimore, Md., in a pamphlet which has not reached its fifth edition. The pamphlet is entitled, "The Christian Sabbath the Genuine Offspring of the Union of the Holy Spirit, and the Catholic Church His Spouse. The Claims of Protestants to any Part Therein Proved to be Groundless, Self-Contradictory and Suicidal."

On pages 13 and 14 of the pamphlet we find the following:—

Thus, it is impossible to find in the New Testament the slightest interference by the Saviour, or his apostles, with the original Sabbath, but, on the contrary, and entire acquiescence in the original arrangement; nay, a *plenary indorsement* by him, whilst living; and an unvaried, active participation *in the keeping of that day and no other by the apostles*, for thirty years after his death, as the Acts of the Apostles have abundantly testified to us.

Hence the conclusion is inevitable, viz., that of those who follow the Bible as their guide, the Israelites and Seventh-day Adventists have the exclusive weight of evidence on their side, whilst the Biblical Protestant has not a word in self-defense for his substitution of Sunday for Saturday.

60

Here follows the language to which we call the *Pilot's* special attention (pp. 31, 33):—

Let us now, however, take a glance at our second proposition, with the *Bible alone* as the teacher and guide in faith and morals. This teacher *most emphatically forbids any change in the day for paramount* reasons. The command calls for a "*perpetual covenant.*" The day commanded to be kept by the teacher *has never once been kept*, thereby developing an apostasy from an assumedly fixed principle, as self-contradictory, self-stultifying, and consequently as suicidal as it is within the power of language to express.

Now are the limits of demoralization yet reached. Far from it. Their *pretence* for having the bosom of the Catholic Church was for apostasy from the truth *as taught in the written Word*. They adopted the written Word as their sole teacher, which they had no sooner done than they abandoned it promptly, as those articles have abundantly proved; and by a perversity as willful as erroneous, they accept the teaching of the Catholic Church in direct opposition to the plain, unvaried, and constant teaching of their sole teacher in the most essential doctrine of their religion, thereby emphasizing the situation in what may be aptly designated "a mockery, a delusion, and a snare."

Should any of the reverend parsons, who are habituated to howl so vociferously over every real or assumed desecration of that pious fraud, the *Bible Sabbath*, think well of entering a protest against our logical and scriptural dissection of their mongrel pet, we can promise them that any reasonable attempt on their part to gather up the *disjecta membra* of the hybrid, and to restore to it a galvanized existence, will be met with genuine cordiality and respectful consideration on our part.

But we can assure our readers that we know these reverend howlers too well to expect a solitary bark from them in this instance.

And they know us too well to subject themselves to the mortification which a further dissection of this anti-scriptural question would necessarily entail. Their policy now is to "lay low," and they are sure to adopt it.

And now we suggest to the *Pilot* that here is a field for missionary effort. Let the *Pilot* complain to the pope that Cardinal Gibbons and the *Catholic Mirror* are abusing Protestants. However, we believe that such an undertaking would be fruitless. The Cardinal and the *Mirror* would doubtless insist that they had told the truth and refuse to recant. However that may be, the AMERICAN SENTINEL and Seventh-day Adventists will continue to tell the truth about "Romanism" and a Romanizing Protestantism, and we do it with the knowledge that it will result as indicated by the *Pilot's* utterances, in compelling Catholicism and apostate Protestantism to make common cause against us. We have expected this for years. The *Pilot's* warning is to us a most important sign of the times.

"Hebrew National Reformers" *American Sentinel* 10, 8 , p. 60.

IT is frequently the case that persecution for opinion's sake makes people tolerant of the opinions and practices of others, but it seems that some of the Jews in this city have not learned the lesson. The *Sun* of the 10th inst. has the following, illustrative of this fact:—

The extreme rigor with which the Orthodox Russian Jews living here keep the Sabbath was illustrated by a trial reported in yesterday's *Sun*. One of them offended his co-religionists by smoking a cigar in the street on the Sabbath; his brethren remonstrated with him, set upon him, smote him in the face, and wounded him in such a way that his smoking was brought to an end for one Sabbath. His assailants were brought to trial last Friday; he could not prove his case; they were acquitted; and, after their acquittal, as reported in the *Sun*, "half a hundred or more of the Orthodox gathered around them and kissed them."

It seems to us that they interpreted the fourth table of the law of Moses too strictly. We do not see that cigar smoking, or the inhaling and exhaling of tobacco smoke, can properly be regarded as working, or as breaking the Sabbath, or as violating the command to hallow it; and yet we admit that, if the chief rabbi of the east side so regards it, there is an end to the controversy, so far as his many followers are concerned.

As further bearing upon the subject, we can say with certainty that the original Puritan settlers of New England would have

rejoiced over the smiting and flooring of any man who smoked on the Sabbath kept by them, which was Sunday.

From one standpoint it seems strange that a people who have suffered as much from intolerance and religious prejudice, as have the Russian Jews, should retain in their practice, or in their feelings even, any of this evil. But we must remember that intolerance is innate in the human breast. It is human nature. It was intolerance that caused Cain to kill his brother; and from that day to this the same wicked thing has been causing men to maltreat, to imprison, and to kill their fellowmen. It was the moving spirit of the Inquisition as it is the inspiration of National Reform and American Sabbath Unionism.

"The Fundamental Law of the United Presbyterian Church" *American Sentinel* 10, 8 , p. 60.

THE United Presbyterian Synod of Ohio is troubled with heresy. J. K. Andrews of Antrim, Ohio, has come to disagree with the 59th Article of the creed of that church.

The United Presbyterian Church has, like most other churches, substituted a man-made creed for the divine Word of God. This creed is known as the "Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly." The following are some of its questions and answers:—

Q. 9. What rule hath God given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him?

A. The word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him.

Q. 14. What is sin?

A. Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God.

Q. 40. What did God at first reveal to man for the rule of his obedience?

A. The rule which God at first revealed to man, for his obedience, was the moral law.

Q. 41. Wherein is the moral law summarily comprehended?

A. The moral law is summarily comprehended in the ten commandments.

Q. 44. What does the preface to the ten commandments teach us?

A. The preface to the ten commandments teacheth us that because God is the Lord, and our God and Redeemer, therefore we are bound to keep *all* his commandments.

Q. 57. Which is the fourth commandment?

A. The fourth commandment is: "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, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: 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.

Mr. Andrews believes that this much of the catechism is in harmony with the Bible, but now comes a statement that he believes contradicts not only the Bible, but all we have quoted from the catechism:—

Q. 59. Which day of the seven hath God appointed to be the weekly Sabbath?

A. From the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath; and the first day of the week, ever since, to continue to the end of the world, which is the Christian Sabbath.

Mr. Andrews believes, and rightly too, that this article contradicts the Bible in that the Bible teaches that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," and does not teach that God appointed the first day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath from the resurrection of Christ to the end of the world. He believes that it contradicts the catechism in that the catechism teaches that "the word of God, which is contained in the Old and New Testaments, is the *only rule* to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him," while this portion of the catechism teaches that to glorify him one must keep the first day of the week, which thing is not only not commanded in that "*only rule*," but is contrary to it.

Mr. Andrews, after reforming his practice to correspond with the "only rule," started out to reform his brethren, and as a result, was tried for heresy by the session of his church and excommunicated. He appealed to the Presbytery, and was allowed thirty minutes to argue his appeal. He maintained that Christ came to redeem man from the curse of a broken law, and that a law could not be broken before it was made; and since, according to the 59th Article, the law of Sunday sacredness was made *since* the resurrection of Christ, therefore Christ did not die to redeem men from Sunday desecration.

The Presbytery refused to sustain the appeal from the decision of the session, which was as follows:—

WHEREAS Mr. J. K. Andrews believes that the seventh day of the week should be kept as the holy Sabbath, and that there is no

Bible authority for keeping the first day of the week, and has so stated his belief in presence of this session: And whereas he further states that he feels morally bound in a public manner to advocate his belief, thereby making determined opposition to the principles of the United Presbyterian Church as contained in *shorter* catechism, question 59, thereby following a divisive course; therefore,

Resolved, That faithfulness to the laws of the church [not faithfulness to the law of God] requires that Mr. J. K. Andrews be suspended from the privileges of the church until he cease opposition and consent to follow the things which make for peace.

Mr. Andrews then appealed to the synod of Ohio, which recently convened at Wheeling, W. Va. This synod first passed a gag rule allowing Mr. Andrews but three minutes to argue his appeal, and then disposed of the matter, with the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That the appellant, by his plea against his own public profession [the catechism], against the public profession of his church [the catechism] and her fundamental law [the catechism], can claim no rights under a law that he has renounced, and can have no standing in this court, or any court of the United Presbyterian Church.

2. That this petition can in no sense be construed as an infringement upon the appellant's personal liberty or his rights of conscience.

Not a single reference to the Bible is to be found in the resolutions condemning Mr. Andrews. No attempt was made to sustain the action against him with Scripture. And this is the course pursued by a church claiming to be Protestant.

The resolutions declare that this actions is not an infringement upon personal liberty or his rights of conscience. Doubtless Mr. Andrews considered his liberty infringed when he was confined to three minutes in arguing his appeal. But the attack on personal liberty and the rights of conscience is an after act. The United Presbyterian Church is doing everything in its power to secure the enactment and enforcement by the United States and by the several States, of laws enforcing the 59th Article of their creed—Sunday observance—upon all men, so that after excommunicating a member, they can, like the papacy, hand the offender over to the civil authorities for punishment. Mr. Andrews was refused an appeal to the Assembly, but will appear and enter a complaint.

"Will Try Moral Suasion" *American Sentinel* 10, 8 , p. 61.

A FEW days since, the Woman's Sabbath Alliance, so-called, of this city, adopted the following pledge, which the members of the society are required to sign:—

To resist by precept and example whatever tends to undermine the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship, such as the Sunday secular newspapers, social Sunday entertainments, and Sunday driving and traveling for personal convenience, gain or pleasure; and we further pledge ourselves to exert our influence to create a right sentiment on all aspects of the Sunday question, especially in reference to traffic of every kind on that day.

Commenting upon this pledge, the *Sun* says:—

No fault whatever can be found with that pledge, on the ground that it proposes any invasion of personal liberty or any interference with the rights of anybody. . . . They simply bind themselves together "to create a right sentiment on all aspects of the Sunday question" as it seems to their own consciences, and to resist by their personal example and by their precept the present tendency "to undermine the Sabbath." They pledge themselves not to read a Sunday newspaper nor to attend "social Sunday entertainments," and not to drive and travel on that day for convenience or pleasure; but they do not assume to deny those privileges to anybody else. They will only try to induce other people to refrain from them, in obedience to their understanding of the Mosaic commandment.

This, these women have a perfect right to do. Of course they err greatly in supposing that Sunday is the Sabbath. The Bible says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath," and everybody knows that Sunday is not the seventh day but the first day. But the women of the Woman's Sabbath Alliance have a perfect right to believe that the first day is the seventh, or that the Lord has changed his mind, or that he transferred the Sabbath to another day and neglected to tell anybody about it, or to believe any other absurdity they wish to believe; moreover, they have a perfect right to persuade everybody whom they can influence, to believe and practice as they do. But if they stop here they will indeed be unique among so-called Sabbath reformers. The logic of error is to compel everybody to obey, and in this the Sunday-sabbath advocates are not peculiar. Having no divine law they seek human legislation; having no divine judgments to declare against those who disregard the first day, they uniformly appeal to human law and to civil penalties. We shall confidently expect to see, ere long, this so-called Sabbath Alliance going the way of the American Sabbath Union in this matter, namely, appealing to the civil law.

"Bones, Stones, and Miracles" *American Sentinel* 10, 8 , p. 61.

THE beginning of the Reformation marked the decline of the veneration of relics and the miracles attributed to them, even among devout Romanists themselves. But now that the Reformation is disappearing from the minds and hearts of men, it logically follows that "shrines," "relics," and "miracles" should increase. And they are increasing. New York City has a shrine in which it is seriously asserted that there is to be seen a fragment of St. Anne procured of Pope Leo XIII. The press frequently announces the cure of some "incurable" case. Some imagine that these professed cures are confined to the obscure and ignorant, but this is not entirely true. The following clipping which is going the rounds of the press, announces the cure of a veteran policeman of this city at a shrine located at Auriesville, Montgomery Co., New York, under the control of the Jesuits. No one can fail to discover the patent medicine advertisement enterprise that inspired the publication of this article, and that it is published at this time with a view to drumming up next summer's trade; but it is nevertheless serious because it is seriously put forth by that "infallible" church which is just now so deeply interested in the conversion of Americans and America to the "true church" and to a belief in the efficacy of "holy water" and pulverized stone as a cure for human ills:—

"I have been cured by his divine intervention, where all the doctors had failed to relieve me," said Policeman Michael Griffin yesterday. Griffin wears five blue stripes on the sleeves of his uniform, showing that he has served more than a quarter of a century on the Metropolitan police force. He has been attached for several years to the Ordnance Department. After his health had been shattered by disease and exposure, he was transferred from active patrol duty to the comparative quiet of the courts.

The policeman had never been well since he first joined the force. He had malaria in his spine that at times caused him most horrible suffering. He had consulted many physicians, but none of them had been able to effect a cure, and as the time passed his infirmities increased and it became more and more difficult for him to attend to his duties.

Many of the members of St. Francis Xavier's Church planned a pilgrimage to Auriesville, Montgomery County, last August, and Griffin arranged to take his vacation at the time, so as to join the other pilgrims at the shrine of the Mother of Martyrs, to worship with the on Lord's Day and to remain for a week.

Auriesville is in a charming section of the Mohawk Valley, about one hundred and seventy-five miles from this city. Twelve acres of land—a hill over-looking the railroad station, and with the shrine on its summit—belong to the Jesuit fathers. Some improvements have already been made and many others are in contemplation, including a beautiful chapel on the hilltop and rows of trees in place of corn fields.

The shrine marks the spot where Father Isaac Jogues, a missionary priest, was slain by Indians more than two hundred years ago. His associate, Rene Goupil, a scholastic, was murdered at the same time near by, and tradition has it that his remains were covered by a huge boulder. In any event, the body was never found, but pilgrims have long assumed that a rock weighing three or four tons in a ravine not more than five minutes' walk from the hill, had been rolled over him. A little stream passes through the ravine when the winter snows thaw, but dries during the warm weather.

The rock is probably three feet high and rounded on the sides; the flat surface looks as though it had been the base, but had been overturned by some giant force.

Father Jogues' piety and good deeds gained him wide fame, and one of the Indian maidens whom he converted, and who subsequently suffered martyrdom, is, it is said, to be canonized. Pilgrims have been going to the shrine for several years, but never were there as many as last summer. Griffin estimates that on August 15 there were one thousand from Amsterdam, N.Y., eight hundred from Albany and Troy, and probably one thousand others from different points in this State and Pennsylvania. There were impressive ceremonies, including a procession of pilgrims up the Hill of Prayer to the shrine, and teaching sermons, glorifying the martyrs.

After the service the pilgrims scattered, and many of them broke off pieces of the rock under which Rene Goupil's body was said to have been crushed.

Griffin kept part of the stone he had brought to the city. He recently heard that one of the pilgrims who had been a cripple had been wholly cured, and he determined to test the efficacy of the stone in his own case.

He crushed a portion of it in holy water from St. Ignatius' about a month ago and applied it that night to the open wound, praying to God to help him in his affliction.

The sore miraculously disappeared and Griffin became more robust than he had been for many years.

His aches and pains were gone, and he recovered the light step and heart of his youth.

He determined to test the efficacy of the stone on another sufferer. His landlady, Mrs. McDonald, was afflicted with many of the ills brought by old age. She had become blind, and pains racked her limbs. Her worst trouble consisted of cramps or spasms in her legs at night, that made sleep impossible.

She had found temporary relief by applications of hot bricks, and her daughters were compelled to get up frequently to prepare them for her comfort.

Griffin told Mrs. McDonald what the relic had done for him, gave her some of the powdered stone in holy water, and when the pain attacked her, her daughters rubbed her legs with the marvel-working preparation.

She was immediately quieted and fell into a peaceful slumber, and since then she has had no cause to complain of any ache.

"She is very, very old," said Griffin. "I should say she is from seventy-five to eighty years old, and has long been entirely confined to her house, but she now hopes to soon be able to go to St. Francis Xavier's Church, that she used to attend regularly.

"She next rubbed the stone and holy water on her sightless eyes, and when she sat down at the table with her daughters she cried, 'Glory be to God, I can see my cup!'

"When she was helped upstairs she was able to see the banister on which she had to bear for support. I went to the house last night, and Mrs. McDonald held out her hand to me. I was not standing directly opposite her, but just a little to one side, and I asked her if she could see my hand. She could, and she demonstrated the fact by grasping it in her own."

Griffin says God in his ineffable way has positively revealed to his faithful ones that the rock marks the place where Rene Goupil, the scholastic, became a martyr. Other miracles, he reports, have been accomplished through the agency of the stone, and are known to the fathers of the church.

There will be another pilgrimage to the beautiful Mohawk Valley next summer, and it will be far larger than the last one.

"If God spares me, in his mercy, till then," says Griffin, "I shall go to Auriesville for my vacation. Last year's pilgrims assemble at a special mass at half-past six on the morning of the 15th of each month, when there are many prayers uttered to the everlasting glory of the Mother of Martyrs."

Now all this did not come in France, Spain, South America, or the province of Quebec, but it is claimed that it occurred in the Empire State and in the American metropolis.

There are several questions which are suggested by this account. What will be done when the pilgrims have chipped away all this stone? If it is so efficacious it will not last long. And suppose after the

stone has disappeared they do not find Rene Goupil's body? Would it not be safer to take a pick and dig under the stone and thus ascertain for certain whether the body is there, rather than to trust to "miracles" to sustain the supposition?

One of two things is true; either these people are the victims of a designing priesthood which is making merchandise of the bodies and souls of men, or if the priests believe that miracles are actually wrought, and these cures are real, then the deception is still deeper and they are all the victims of the devil who, according to Scripture, was to work with "all power and signs and lying wonders" before the second coming of Christ. It cannot be that miracles are wrought in the name of Rene Goupil, for "there is none other name under heaven give among men, whereby we must be saved" except the name of "Jesus Christ of Nazareth."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 8 , p. 64.

PROF. G. W. COLCORD, President of the Seventh-day Adventist academy at Graysville, Tenn., is one of the twenty now under indictment there, charged with violating the Sunday law. The six charges against him are for permitting students to labor on the college premises on Sunday. Since the indictments were found, a strong local sentiment has developed against these prosecutions, led by the editor of the Dayton (Tennessee) *Leader*, and the result is left in doubt. Meanwhile the accused manifest a meek and quiet, yet courageous spirit.

THE *Christian Statesman* of Feb. 9, contains the following editorial paragraph:—

Popery affirms its interpretation of God's law through its so-called infallible head to be binding upon the consciences of all men. It leaves no room for dissent. It compels, so far as it has the power, acceptance of its interpretation. It denies the blessing of Christ to all who do not accept its interpretation as the one and only sound and valid interpretation of the divine law. However sure we may be that our views of truth and duty are scripturally sound, we are following in the foot-steps of Romanism the moment we assume to judge brethren in Christ in any such way as directly affirms or indirectly implies that they have not the same right to interpret and apply God's law for themselves, and to expect his blessing in their honest and sincere endeavors to do his holy will.

The element represented by the *Christian Statesman* interprets the law of God to mean that the first day of the week and not the seventh

day is the Sabbath, and is leaving no stone unturned in the effort to force this interpretation on all men by means of civil law. It denies the right of men "to interpret and apply God's law for themselves" and is therefore, according to its own definition, "following in the footsteps of Romanism."

THE *New York Observer*, of Jan. 24, 1895, attacks the Roman Catholic mass on this wise:—

There is not, in all the Word of God, a passage that can be quoted in support of an early and fasting communion.

The *Catholic Union and Times*, of Buffalo, replies as follows:—

Neither is there a single text of Scripture to authorize you to change the Lord's day from the seventh to the first day of the week. Why have you done so? Because the Catholic and Apostolic Church, from earliest Christian days, has substituted Sunday for the Jewish Sabbath, for solid and resplendent reasons.

Of course, the *Observer* replied to this retort by maintaining the customary silence. What a pity that Protestants should stultify themselves and destroy their ability to wield the Word of God against papal errors by tenaciously clinging to one of the most fatal of these errors.

THE reason why the pope is so anxious to hitch America to his chariot is clearly stated by O. A. Brownson, in his work, "Conversations on Liberalism and the Church." The author is a convert to Romanism from Protestantism, and so highly is he esteemed among them that steps have been taken to erect a monument to his memory. Mr. Brownson says:—

All heresies and infidelity are disintegrating and destructive, if you will, but really hostile to progress. They interrupt the work of the church, they interpose obstacles to her influence, deny or obscure the principles of progress, and as far as their power extends, so prevent their development and practical application, and not only peril souls, but hinder or retard the progress of civilization. Heretical nations [like the United States] are running the same career the ancient Gentile nations ran, and their influences, aided by the flesh, the world and the devil, extends even to orthodox nations, and neutralizes, to a fearful extent, the power of the church to apply her principles to her own children, so that these nations became almost as unprogressive as heretical nations themselves.—Page 170.

Yes, the religious liberty principles of the Constitution of this heretical nation have neutralized to a fearful extent the "power" of the Roman Catholic Church over her own children, so much so that she has stopped burning them for heresy. There was no United States

Constitution to "interpose obstacles to her influence" on Huss and Jerome and the millions of others murdered by her "influence;" hence the earnest solicitude of the pope and the papacy to capture the United States Government and obtain "the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority."

WHAT the papacy will do for all nations and all people when the scheme of the pope is realized, is to be learned from a study of the history of the Dark Ages. There are people who are just foolish enough to believe that the "infallible" church has come to regard her cruel, medieval history with becoming abhorrence. All such should read the following, quoted from Brownson's work, which the writer purchased within a week, from the Catholic publishing house of D. & J. Sadler & co., 31 Barclay St., New York:—

Christian nations alone are living and progressive nations. And never have Christian nations advanced in all that makes the true glory of civilization so rapidly as they did from the downfall of Rome to the rise of what you [Protestants] call the Reformation.—Page 170.

No real progress of civilization since the epoch of the Reformation.—Page 176.

Always will the period from the sixth to the end of the fifteenth century stand out as the most glorious in the annals of the race.—Page 182.

Comment is unnecessary.

THE *Evangelist* comments quite numorously [*sic.*] upon the recent papal encyclical, making in a pleasant way several good points against it; and turning each of them likewise against the assumption of papal power by the Presbyterian General Assembly. The *Evangelist* concludes its criticism with these words:—

We have no quarrel with the pope; he lives "near St. Peter's," and has authority. To Leo's credit, be is said, he uses his authority discreetly, and on the side of morality and civil order. The pope we fight is the self-made dictator of Presbyterian opinion and law, whether he be one or many; the creature which, like self-perpetuating prosecuting committees, creates and inquisition and forges instruments of torture for the miserable "minority."

This is valuable from the standpoint of the SENTINEL, chiefly because of the recognition of the fact by the *Evangelist* that the pope that is to be feared is not merely the pope of Rome but the popish spirit; that the man who is dominated by that spirit is a pope wherever he is or whatever position he may occupy. It is this spirit that appeals

to the civil power to enforce Sunday-keeping, demands exemption of church property from taxation, etc.

February 28, 1895

"Babylon's Triumph and Ruin" *American Sentinel* 10, 9 , pp. 65, 66.

WE have in two previous articles replied at some length to certain strictures upon our methods and work by the *Monitor*. A few points yet remain to be noticed. Continuing to quote from us and commenting thereon, the *Monitor* says:—

That the pope is going to take possession of America is also prognosticated for the same reason. "It is on the authority of the scriptures of Rev. 13:8; Dan. 7:21, 22, and Rev. 18:7, that we know that the papal movement mapped out by Leo XIII. will certainly succeed." We have no time to look up these references or we would explain how the thing is made out, but it must strike ordinary people as very foolish that the AMERICAN SENTINEL should go into a losing fight.

Lest the *Monitor* should still "have no time to look up these references," we shall tell what they say, so that they can be seen at once. The first one cited says that "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him [the beast], whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb." The second one says that he "made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; *until the Ancient of days came*, and judgment was given to the saints of the most High: *and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.*" The third one shows that the kingdoms of the earth once more united in illicit connection with the papacy—Babylon the great—and live deliciously with her to such an extent that, instead of lamenting her widowhood and the loss of her power, as *now* she is doing, she glorifies herself and lives deliciously, and "saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see now sorrow."

Then it is also that she will be so pleased with herself as to exclaim, "I shall be a lady forever." This, her day, is coming shortly. And when it does come—then, and "*therefore* shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." No, no; the AMERICAN SENTINEL is not engaged in a losing fight. Ours is a fight for victory all the way along, and of triumph at the end; for when this Babylon, Rome, the papacy, thus sinks and is annihilated under

the fiery judgment of the Lord, then also it is written: "I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten *the victory over the beast*, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God."

The *Monitor* continues:—

Of course we have the comforting assurance that the pope's visit to America will only be for one day. His voyage across the Atlantic will be fatal to him. This is proved by Rev. 18; and after that happy event there will be no use for the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

The SENTINEL has never said a word about the pope coming to America. This suggestion is altogether gratuitous on the part of the *Monitor*; for we have not only not said anything about the pope coming to America, but we have not said anything that could be fairly construed to mean any such thing.

It is true that when this Babylon sinks, when "the beast" is destroyed, there will be no use for the AMERICAN SENTINEL; but *now*, and for some time to come, there is, and is going to be, great use for the SENTINEL and for a number of other papers devoted to the same cause.

With the following attempt at wit the *Monitor* closes:—

Now, considering that all this is going to happen anyhow, and to happen soon, for the editor remarks, "We certainly expect to see it," we can't imagine why the AMERICAN SENTINEL is making such a noise. It would be a great deal more comfortable, for instance, if the editor should go to sleep until the event comes off. The only danger to suffering humanity is that he might talk in his dreams. If his utterances when awake are of such an inflammatory character, it is appalling to contemplate what he might say in his sleep.

Yes, we do certainly expect to see it, and that is precisely why we are "making such a noise." It is the *duty* of a sentinel to make a noise at even a *distant* sign of danger; but when the danger is imminent, as this is, then he is not only to make a noise by crying out an alarm, but he is also to "fire off his piece." The ruin of Babylon means the ruin of all who may then be in any way connected with her; and therefore the message from heaven now is: "Go out from her, my people: that you be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and the Lord hath remembered her iniquities." Rev. 18:4, 5. (Catholic Version.)

Against ancient Babylon, the Lord by the prophets, denounced judgment even unto her utter ruin. See Jeremiah 50 and 51. Many of God's people were held in captivity there; and to escape the doom of

Babylon which was certainly fixed, they must flee out of the midst of her. And so it was written: "Go out of the midst of her, my people: that every man may save his life from the fierce wrath of the Lord." Jer. 51:45. And that every one might know that this ruin was so near that he must certainly leave her if he would save his life, the Lord told them that there would come *two rumors* in the land, and the rumors would be a year apart. And thus it was written: "A rumor shall come in one year, and after this year another rumor: and iniquity in the land, and ruler upon ruler." Verse 46. When that second rumor should come, then every one who respected this word would flee out of Babylon and so escape the destruction that came with her fearful fall.

Accordingly, in the spring of the year 539 B.C., the Medo-Persians armies started from Ecbatana under the command of Cyrus. Then the first "rumor" spread to Babylon; but any one could take his time to leave the doomed city, as the danger was not pressing till the second rumor should come *in another year*. At the river Gyndes Cyrus tarried with his army until the next spring, and then again took up his march toward Babylon. The second rumor spread rapidly to Babylon. This meant her utter destruction. This was the token which God had named; and now every one must flee and escape from Babylon if he would escape the ruin that was certain to fall upon her and that quickly. (Daniel the prophet of the Lord remained in the city, and for a purpose: see Dan. 5.)

Now this is a type of the situation as it *now* exists with respect to this latter "Babylon, the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." God would have healed her: but she would not be healed. Therefore her doom is fixed, and her ruin is certain. By the prophecies the word of the Lord has gone forth upon her. Long ago this was settled. And, as in the case of ancient Babylon, there were to be two rumors of the fall of this Babylon—not one year, nor any particular set number of years apart. The first of these is recorded in Rev. 14:8, and the second and last one is

this one in the 18th chapter, which we have already referred to—"Go out from her, my people: that you be no partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and the Lord hath remembered her iniquities. . . . She saith in her heart: I sit a queen, and am no widow: and sorrow I shall not see. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and

mourning, and famine, and she shall be burnt with the fire: because God is strong, who shall judge her."

The first of these two rumors was sounded, and was heard, some time ago. The second and final rumor is now being sounded through the earth with a loud voice; and it means that the everlasting ruin of Babylon, mother and daughters, is near and hasteneth greatly; and whosoever would save his soul alive and escape from the fiery judgment of the Lord upon Babylon, must separate from her and all that is connected with her in any way.

This is why the AMERICAN SENTINEL "is making such a noise." And we are not going to stop the "noise" till the work is done; for it is written: "Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen all the day, and all the night, *they shall never hold their peace.*" Isa. 62:6. Whether the people will believe and escape is for them to decide: ours is to sound aloud the rumor. "Again the word of the Lord came unto me, saying: Son of man, speak to the children of thy people, and say unto them: When I bring the sword upon a land, if the people of the land take a man, one of their meanest, and make him a watchman over them: and he see the sword coming upon the land, and sound the trumpet, and tell the people: then he that heareth the sound of the trumpet, whosoever he be, and doth not look to himself, if the sword come, and cut him off: his blood shall be upon his own head. He heard the sound of the trumpet, and did not look to himself, his blood shall be upon him: but if he look to himself, he shall save his life. And if the watchman see the sword coming, and sound not the trumpet: and the people look not to themselves, and the sword come, and cut off a soul from among them: he indeed is taken away in his iniquity, but I will require his blood at the hand of the watchman." Eze. 33:1-6.

We do not deny that it would indeed "be a great deal more comfortable" for the *Monitor*, for Catholicism, and for the papacy—for Babylon and the beast—if the SENTINEL and all others who are bearing a like testimony "should go to sleep until the event comes off." But this cannot be; for now and upon this subject, it is as it was that time before—"If these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out." And in that case it might be indeed "appalling to contemplate" what would be said. But in any case it is certainly appalling to contemplate the situation of the world under the impending ruin, and the listlessness and unbelief of the people in the

presence of the solemn warnings so fully given in the prophecies of the Word of the Lord.

"True and False Theocracy" *American Sentinel* 10, 9 , p. 66.

UNDER this heading, we showed last week that a theocracy can exist no more in this world until the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. This is the plain teaching of the Word of God. The disciples understood, after the Saviour's resurrection, that the promise of a kingdom had reference not to this mortal state but to the everlasting immortal kingdom, and they were content to bide their Lord's time; but it was not so with the selfish, designing men who came into the church in later years. These reasoned that of right all power belonged to Christ. He was not personally present to claim it, but were they not his representatives? and could they not, year, should they not, exercise not only ecclesiastical but civil power as well, in his name and for his glory and the upbuilding of his kingdom in the earth? To ask the question was, in their minds, to answer it as well—hence the theocratic theory which began in the third century to be quite general in the church, and hence also the grasping after civil power to replace the loss of spiritual power due to apostasy from the true faith, and to corrupting alliances with the rulers of the world.

The Saviour sent his disciples forth into a hostile world under the commission: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:19, 20. The only guarantee of success given the apostles was the promise of the presence of their Lord by his Spirit; and by the power of that Spirit they went forth making converts not only without the aid of the civil power but in the face of the most bitter persecution.

But the power of the Spirit of God could be used only in harmony with the mind of God. The Lord Jesus Christ made no provision for self-seeking among his followers. On the contrary, when on one occasion certain of his disciples sought preferment for themselves, he said:—

Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will

be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. Mark 10:42-45.

And again we have these words of our Lord:—

But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted. Matt. 23:8-12.

But these injunctions were not obeyed. Even in Paul's day the "mystery of iniquity" was at work as the apostle declared in 2 Thess. 2:7. Unconsecrated men, like Simon the sorcerer, joined themselves to the church for self-aggrandizement; but the power of the Spirit of God was not for such as they. Power, however, they would have, and so they sought it by usurping authority over their fellows. The humble office of elder, bishop, or overseer—for the terms are in the Scriptures used interchangeably, and all mean the same thing—was magnified, or perverted, rather, so that ambitious men instead of being servants of the church became "lords over God's heritage."

But position was not power, and power they would have. And as it was to be had from the Lord only by those who would use it to his glory, these false shepherds sought it at the hands of civil rulers. At first they simply bartered ecclesiastical influence for political power; but subsequently they claimed that the power belonged to them of right. Of the progress that had been made in this direction in the fourth century, Neander says:—

There had in fact arisen in the church . . . a false theocratical theory, originating not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments, which . . . might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way.

The result was the full-grown papacy with the bishop of Rome as "Vicar of Christ," claiming power to depose kings and to set up kings; and following this in natural order, the history of the long and bloody persecution in which over fifty millions of people perished—sacrificed on the altar of popish ambition. Only evil came of an attempt to establish a theocracy then; only evil can come of such an attempt now.

"The Catholic Clergy in Politics" *American Sentinel* 10, 9 , pp. 66, 67.

UNDER the above head the *American Ecclesiastical Review* for January contains a most significant article. The *Review* is an authorized organ of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States and is "devoted to the diffusion and interpretation of practical theology, more especially in its bearing upon church administration in the United States. It deals with questions of the day only in their principles and special application to the priestly and pastoral function."

The reason given for the discussion of this topic at this time is as follows:—

Recent occurrences brought about by the elections in the United States have directed public attention to this subject, and thus render its discussion particularly opportune at this time.

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States has hitherto professed non-interference in politics. Of course everybody knows, or ought to know, that, notwithstanding this profession, the church has had a tremendous influence in American politics. This influence, however, has not been openly exerted, as in Germany for instance, but has been exercised through the wire-pullings of the individual priest, the organized lobby, and the Catholic Indian Bureau at Washington.

But in the opinion of the prelates of the church, as voice in the *American Catholic Review*, the time has now come when it is opportune to take a more active part in American politics.

To prepare the way for this change the *Review* sketches briefly the attitude of the pope and the Catholics of other countries toward the subject under discussion as follows:—

Considering the fact that the present attitude of the Catholic clergy toward national politics differs very widely in various countries, it may seem at first sight impossible to find principles, universal, and founded alike in reason and faith, which would justify apparently opposite forms of action. For, at the very time when a stinging protest is sent forth from the altar by a respected American bishop⁹ 1 against the intervention, in purely political matters, of another no less popular prelate,¹⁰ 2 we find bishops of other countries raise their voice to arouse their clergy and people to the exercise of their political rights. Nay, on this very point we see Leo XIII. in Italy, directing what might seem two opposite courses of political action. In regard to the Chamber of Deputies and the

Legislative Assembly of the Kingdom established since the spoliation of Rome, the holy father advises clergy and people to maintain the political principle laid down by Pius IX.—*Ne electi ne ellettori*, that is "we neither vote nor stand as candidates for election." At the same time the pontiff strongly counsels Catholics to take active part in the municipal elections, and he encourages the clergy to exercise their influence in behalf of the establishment of conservative *regime* in the large towns, and particularly in Rome. . . .

Everybody knows the history of the "Catholic Association" in Ireland at the beginning of this century, and what a stand the bishops and clergy, individually and collectively, have taken in the struggle for emancipation, a struggle which has been carried into our own days with the sympathy of every lover of justice and freedom. Here, too, whilst we find Leo XIII. counseling the clergy to be watchful lest the claim of rights in the political order would interfere with that

67

of the moral order, we see him approving their zeal for liberty, and thus indorsing their activity in behalf of political rights.

In England, too, the Catholic clergy have had repeated occasions since the restoration of the hierarchy to assert their influence in the domain of politics, when there was question of obtaining equal rights with the members of the Established Church, especially in the matter of elementary education.

The "Kulturkampf" period in Germany is fresh in the memory of the present generation, and the French AbbÈ Kannegiesser, in his lately published instructive work, "Les Catholiques Allemands," has taken particular pains to point out to his countrymen that the success of the "Centre" party in Germany during the religious struggle of the last twenty years was due as much, if not more, to the exertions of a patriotic clergy, than to the noble leadership of such men as Reiehensperger, Mallinckrodt, and Windthorst. The parliamentary party in Germany has always counted a considerable number of the ablest clergy among its ranks, and at this present moment there are more than a dozen priests following as members of the Reichstag in the footsteps of the late Mgr. Ketteler, Archbishop of Mayence, or the present Archbishop of Posen, Mgr. Stablewasky.

In the Austria-Hungarian empire select members of the national hierarchy and mitred abbots have long since enjoyed the right of a seat in the Upper Chambers of Vienna and Budapesth. If under the present administration the Liberals have gained the ascendancy [*sic.*] in the actual government of the country, the cause may be sought to a great extent in the lack of interest and activity, partly forced, partly voluntary, of the clergy. This circumstance is openly

regretted by the truly conservative element in the Austrian empire, and the clergy may have learned some useful lessons from the bitter experience which the Catholics of Hungary have but recently met with through the liberal and *laissez-faire* methods of some of their spiritual leaders.

But of all countries in Europe, Belgium has best demonstrated the beneficial results of a judicious, courageous intervention on the part of the clergy in its national politics. Ever since the establishment of the kingdom, the clerical element has been strongly represented in the "Constituante." The celebrated Canon de Haerne did not cease to the last days of his active life to urge upon the legislative body of the country the necessity of granting "true liberty for all" in conformity with the constitution, amongst the signers of which his name will always be honorably remembered. The AbbÈ Pottier received but a short time ago the grateful testimony of popular confidence by a proffered candidacy to the *Chambre*, whilst the valuable services rendered to the national cause by a simple country priest, the AbbÈ Keesen, were publicly recognized by his election as a senator of the kingdom in the Catholic province of Limbourg. There can be no doubt that the overwhelming victory of the Catholic party in the late general elections is mainly due to the exertions and loyal vigilance of the clergy, who, in the political crisis of the time, proved to be equal to their social duties. Moreover they did not fail to exercise the right of the so-called *vote plural*, established by the late legislature, in virtue of which nearly all the members of the clergy are accorded a triple vote, viz.: as citizens, as representatives of the learned professions, and as tax-payers.

Let us here mention the neighboring kingdom of Holland, which, like Belgium, small in territorial extent, enjoys more constitutional liberties than any other State of Europe. If, in this Protestant land, the Catholic minority has succeeded in exercising so marked an influence upon the laws passed within the last few years, the credit is mainly due to the Rev. Dr. Schaepman, whose reputation not only as a poet and orator but as a member of Parliament, has gone far beyond the limits of his native land. . . .

As for our neighboring country, Canada, everybody knows that the clergy are recognized as a potent factor in legislating for the two million Catholics among its inhabitants. If Canada possesses to-day, perhaps, the best educational system and institutions of varied learning supported by the State, it is entirely due to the exertions of an intelligent priesthood interested in the common welfare of their people.

From the rapid and imperfect sketch of the foregoing facts regarding the participation of the clergy in politics under

circumstances widely different in character, we are enabled to draw several important conclusions:

1. The members of the clergy enjoy the political *rights* accorded to every other citizen.

2. Generally speaking—that is to say, abstracting for a moment from particular places, times and circumstances—the character and profession of the priesthood, is not obstacle to the *exercise* of the political rights accorded to every citizen; on the contrary the moral and intellectual advantages secured him by reason of his profession, give him a distinct title to fulfill his social mission by the salutary exercise of his political rights. This exercise gives to his efforts in behalf of the common good the mark and seal of true patriotism.

3. There are places, times and circumstances when the assertion and exercise of his political rights becomes a positive obligation on the part of the priest. He may even, as the legitimate guide of his people, take an active part in purely political movements when their results affect the temporal as well as spiritual welfare of the flock entrusted to him. In this case, it is needless to say, his conduct must be guided by the law of prudence.

4. This same virtue of prudence, looking above all things to the methods best calculated to promote the salvation of souls, which is the principal object of our holy ministry, may, on the other hand, oblige the priest, under certain circumstances, to use his political right with discretion or even to abstain wholly from its exercise.

Following this summing up, the *Review* concludes with the promise "to examine in detail these different conclusions" in future issues.

From all this the careful observer of the signs of the times will expect to see the Roman Catholic priest in the United States take a more open and "active part in purely political movements when their results affect the temporal as well as spiritual welfare of the flock entrusted to him." And since the "temporal as well as spiritual welfare of the flock" requires that the Government continued its appropriations to Catholic Indian schools, commence to divide the public school fund,—in short, requires that the church, as Pope Leo puts it, "enjoy the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority" "*in addition to liberty*,"—we may expect to see the church in the near future enter upon open and aggressive political action.

But why not? Have not the popular Protestant churches and societies already done so? Have they not publicly combined and boycotted legislators into giving them the legal power to compel all

men to submit to their interpretation of the fourth commandment? If Roman Catholic priests follow their example in the interests of their church and beat them at their own game, as they surely will, they will have no one to blame but themselves.

But between the upper and nether millstone of Roman Catholicism and apostate Protestantism what will become of "the land of the free"?

"A Delaware Sunday Bill" *American Sentinel* 10, 9 , p. 67.

IN the legislature of the State of Delaware on Wednesday last an "Anti-Sunday-Work Bill" was introduced, the representative presenting it stating that he did so at the request of the Wilmington branch of the International Plasterers' Association. The bill is so sweeping in its provisions that we give it in full:—

SECTION 1. That chapter 131 of the Revised Code of this State be amended by inserting the following between the first and second paragraphs of section 4, and immediately after the word "hours:" "If any person, corporation, or firm engaged in business of any kind shall carry on or operate the same, or shall attempt to carry on or operate the same on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, or shall engage, employ or hire any person to carry on or operate the same on the Lord's day or Sunday, he, it or they shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall pay a fine of \$100 and costs of prosecution for each and every such offense and may also be imprisoned one month in addition to such fine and costs. And any person, corporation, or firm engaged in business as aforesaid that shall carry on or operate the same clandestinely, or that shall lock or fasten up the entrance or means of ingress thereto for the purpose of concealing their operations or work, or shall compel or coerce their employÈs by threats or suggestions of discharge or other disadvantage, injury or loss because such employÈs refuse or decline to work on the Lord's day, shall be guilty in like manner and punished accordingly. And besides and in addition to such prosecution such offender shall forfeit and pay a fine of like amount to any one who may within one year sue for the same either before a justice of the peace or in the superior court."

Never before in our nation history has there been such a universal demand for more rigid State Sunday laws as there is this winter. By general agreement the church agitators for national Sunday legislation have practically abandoned Washington and are now engaged in a State crusade. With a view to concealing the religious character of legislation demanded, much work has been done among

labor organizations with a view to enlisting their co-operation. This is the published plan of Dr. Crafts' "Sabbath Reform Committee in Affiliation with the National Bureau of Reform," under the sub-heading "Securing Co-operation of Labor Unions;" and the plan is succeeding.

Since the above was written we have learned that the proposed bill was defeated at its second reading on motion of Representative Pyle who introduced it. Now Mr. Pyle may expect to be boycotted by a certain religious element which is the real "power behind the throne" of all such measures.

"Sunday, the Saloons, the Priests, and the Preachers" *American Sentinel* 10, 9 , pp. 68, 69.

THERE are two bills pending in the Senate of this State and five in the Assembly, the purpose of which is to legalize the sale of intoxicating liquors in New York and Brooklyn on Sunday.

Four of these bills provide for the sale of liquors during certain hours of the day and evening, presumably at such hours as might be supposed to interfere least with attendance at church services; and all of them provide that the front doors must be closed and the blinds drawn.

One of these bills provides that "there shall be no noise or disorder permitted therein calculated to disturb the quiet and peace of the Sabbath day." And it is such examples of pious cant that should open the eyes of everybody to the impropriety of all Sunday legislation.

Of course the popular preachers are up in arms against all these bills. The churches are almost with one voice demanding the defeat of the proposed measures. And strange as it may seem to some, a large number of Catholic priests are opposed to the contemplated legislation.

But strange as it may seem, it is only what might be expected. Sunday is an institution of the Roman Catholic Church, and of course Rome will honor her own. Sunday evening, February 10, a "Catholic pastors' meeting" was held in this city to consider this subject, "Rev. A. P. Doyle of the Paulist Fathers," presided. "The meeting," says the *World* of Monday, "was a remarkable one. Although announced only yesterday, every seat was filled long before the hour of opening, and hundreds of late comers were compelled to stand. It was an enthusiastic audience, too, and heartily applauded the vigorous language used."

The *World*, to which we are indebted for the facts, continues:—

Seated on the stage with Father Doyle were the Very Rev. Joseph F. Mooney, Vicar-General; the Very Rev. A. V. Higgins, Provincial of the Dominicans; the Rev. Father Monselli, of the Order of the Pious Missions, pastor of the Italian Church in Harlem; the Rev. P. F. McSweeney and the Rev. Father Drain, of St. Brigid's; the Rev. John G. McCormick, of St. Monica's; the Rev. Father Hartigan, of the Dominicans; the Rev. John Hughes, Paulist; the Rev. Father Flood, of St. John the Evangelist's; the Rev. P. Ennis, of the Franciscans, and Jeremiah Fitzpatrick, the President of the St. Vincent de Paul Society of this city.

Letters and telegrams were also received from the Revs. Cunnion, of St. Raphael's; Colton, of St. Stephen's, and Murphy, of old St. Patrick's, the Fathers of the French Church of St. John the Baptist and of the Mission of Our Lady of the Rosary at Castle Garden, and others, all expressing the heartiest approval of the objects of the meeting.

Vicar-General Mooney was the first speaker. He read from the decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in which Sunday liquor-selling is severely condemned, and then said:—

That is our platform, the platform laid down by the bishops of the church in this country and approved by the holy father himself. We take our stand on the broad grounds of public morality and good citizenship on this most burning and vital question. We care not what political promises or election pledges were made which it is now proposed to redeem; we protest against any scheme for the Sunday opening of the saloons. We want the Lord's day kept holy, and we want no interference with the laws designed to bring about this most laudable end. We demand this as Catholics, as Christians, and as citizens of this Republic.

The Vicar-General makes no bones about telling just why Roman Catholics are opposed to Sunday liquor-selling; it is because "we want the Lord's day kept holy." He is equally explicit as to the real purpose of Sunday laws. Notice the sentence: "We want the Lord's day kept holy, and we want no interference with laws designed to bring about this most laudable end." If the so-called Protestant advocates of Sunday laws were as candid we would hear less about "the civil Sabbath."

"Father" Higgins, Provincial of the Dominicans, declared:—

This Sunday opening means the effacement of the father from the family. It means the effacement of thoughts of God from the hearts of men on his own day. It means more drunkenness, more immorality. Therefore we are performing a duty to Christianity and to the sanctity of the home by this demonstration here to-night. We

protest against any legislation that would make Sunday anything else than a day of peace and church-going and rest. Therefore we denounce this most unwise, most immoral and most irreligious movement to open the saloons on the Lord's day.

After several other speeches of a like character, the following resolutions were adopted:—

Resolved, That as Catholics, we enter our earnest and emphatic protest against the proposed desecration of a day especially consecrated to religious devotion and observances, a day which we are commanded by the law of God to "keep holy," and that we would be unfaithful to our high and solemn sense of duty as Christian citizens of our free Republic if we failed at such a juncture to give public expression to our utter detestation and abhorrence of legislation that, instead of lessening, must inevitably increase the evils of the Sunday liquor traffic.

Resolved, That, entertaining the highest respect and reverence for the decision of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in reference to this particular matter, we earnestly hope, in the language of its decree, "that Sunday laws will not be relaxed, but more rigidly enforced," and that "those who are engaged in the traffic should abstain entirely from the sale of liquor on Sunday."

Resolved, That we solemnly protest in the interests of our holy religion and of public morality, in the name of afflicted humanity, for the true welfare of society and the maintenance of law and order, against the proposed violation and desecration of the Christian Sabbath for the benefit of any class and especially for the benefit of a trade that, while it is more exacting in its demands than any legitimate business, is more objectionable and obnoxious than any other on account of its gross abuses and great evils which attend even on its restricted and licensed prosecution.

Resolved, That we are in full and hearty accord with all bodies of our fellow-citizens who are engaged in the truly laudable and timely movement to abate the evils of the liquor traffic and who have publicly and indignantly, protested against the iniquitous, unreasonable and intolerable legislation demanded in the interests and for the exclusive promotion of this peculiarly absorbing and exacting business.

Resolved, That a printed copy of these resolutions, signed by the chairman and secretary of this meeting, be sent to each member of the Senate and Assembly of the Legislature of this State.

It is noticeable that the first resolution takes distinctively anti-Roman Catholic grounds upon the question of Sunday sacredness. The Roman Catholic doctrine is that the law of God does *not* require the keeping of Sunday, but of the seventh day, and that Sunday

observance rests entirely upon the authority of the church. A "Doctrinal Catechism," by Rev. Stephen Keenan, Imprimatur, John Cardinal McCloskey; Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay Street, New York, 1876, page 174, has this question and answer:—

Q. Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

A. Had she not such power she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have *substituted* the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority.

A like testimony is borne by "An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine," by Rev. Henry Tuberville; Imprimatur, the Right Rev. Benedict, Bishop of Boston; Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay Street, New York, 1833, page 58. This work says:—

Q. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

A. *By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday*, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping *Sunday* strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

69

Q. How prove you that?

A. Because *by keeping Sunday*, they *acknowledge* the *church's* power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin.

Cardinal Gibbons has also spoken plainly upon this question. In "The Faith of Our Fathers," page 111, he says:—

You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of the Saturday, a day we never sanctify.

Such authorities might be greatly multiplied, but the testimony quoted is sufficient. Rome is changing her tactics upon the Sunday question only to catch Protestants. And it is significant that this turn is taken especially by the Paulist Fathers to whom is specially committed the work of making proselytes of "Protestants."

Individual Roman Catholics are doubtless opposed to the liquor traffic on general principles. But Rome, as a church, is not opposed to the traffic, except on Sunday. A very large majority of liquor dealers are Catholics. Rome derives a great deal of support from liquor dealers. She dare not excommunicate the traffic and those engaged in it. The saloon may debauch and impoverish people, may beggar children and enslave wives, and murder husbands and fathers six

days in the week and Rome is silent; but when it touches Sunday "the church" speaks, demanding that it remain "a day of peace and church-going;" and declaring: "We want the Lord's day kept holy." Rome can be trusted to care for her own, and in this thing she is not alone; the so-called Protestant Church is gone after her.

"To Increase the Fine" *American Sentinel* 10, 9 , p. 69.

THE following petition is being circulated in Pennsylvania by the compulsory Sunday observance managers:—

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania:

Your petitioners, whose names are hereunto signed, do most respectfully and earnestly request your honorable bodies to so amend the Sunday law of 1794 as to make the penalty for the violation of the first section of said act for the first conviction \$25, for the second conviction \$50, and an increase of \$10 for each subsequent conviction. We earnestly protest against any modification or amendment of the said law, which will decreased said penalty or make it less effective to secure Sunday observance.

The writer attended the convention at which this petition was adopted, and the only reason why it did not ask for the penalty of imprisonment is because is was feared that it would be asking too much at one time. Imprisonment will come next and after that the whipping post.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 9 , p. 72.

THE manager of the Seventh-day Adventist publishing house in London, John R. Gibson, has been summoned to appear before the authorities to answer the charge of violating the factory law forbidding labor on Sunday. The employÈs in the publishing institution are Seventh-day Adventists, and rest on the Sabbath (Saturday). The prosecution of Mr. Gibson is nothing short of persecution.

THE *Catholic World* of July 18, 1870, in an article entitled, "The Catholics of the Nineteenth Century," published this:—

The supremacy asserted for the church in matters of education implies the additional and cognate function of the censorship of ideas and the right to examine and approve or disapprove all books, publications, writings and utterances intended for public instruction, enlightenment or entertainment, and the supervision of places of amusement. This is the principle upon which the church

has acted in handing over to the civil authorities for punishment criminals in the world of ideas.

Yes, this is the principle upon which the church has acted and acts to-day where she has the power. And we know of several "criminals in the world of ideas" that the church in the United States would be glad to hand over to the civil authorities for punishment.

THE *Detroit Evening News* argues thus regarding the question of taxation of church property which has been agitating the Michigan legislature:—

If the pecuniary burdens of the churches are increased by formal taxation, the community at large will have to foot the bill by sustaining double the number of strawberry festivals and oyster suppers it does now; and if this should fail, the voting ladies would have to take the lone oyster out of the soup to cut down expenses.

The *News* is right in concluding that church taxation would increase the number of shameful methods employed by the churches to support themselves in some other way than by self-denial, but every one would be left free to participate in these church-dishonoring methods or not, as he chose; but as the matter now stands all are indirectly compelled to support such churches, whether willingly or unwillingly.

THE Pennsylvania Sabbath Association's call for the convention of this antichristian and un-American society held in Altoona Feb. 14, 15, was signed by sixteen pastors, five of whom are Lutheran ministers of that city. The following is a part of the call:—

The conflict between the foes and friends of the Sabbath is fairly on and will admit of no compromise. The enemy is neither dead nor sleeping, and it is wisdom in the Christian people of the State to be on the alert and ready to guard against the loss of the legal protection of the Sabbath.

It would seem that the Lutheran Church is drifting with the rest back to papal methods,—back to the use of civil power to force obedience to the dogmas of the church.

JUST before going to press we received a letter from W. H. McKee, formerly associate editor of the SENTINEL, but now in Basel, Switzerland, informing us of the arrest of Mr. Henri Revilly, the book-keeper of the Seventh-day Adventist publishing house in that city, whom the authorities hold responsible for the Sunday work done by that institution in the absence of the manager, H. P. Holser, who, as the representative of the denomination's interests in Central Europe, is attending their international conference now in session at Battle Creek, Mich.

Although Mr. Reilly is in no sense the manager of the institution he is so held and threatened with three months' imprisonment. His trial was to occur February 16, and we await the result with interest. If he is imprisoned the work of the office will continue until all are arrested since each employ  of the institution is his own boss: the manager, Mr. Holser, having said to them on leaving for America, "The house is open to you every Sunday. You can come to work or you can rest."

The law under which the arrests were made is a factory law ostensibly in the interests of laboring people. But as the authorities know that each employ  rests on the seventh day and thereby meets the avowed intent of the law, the prosecution is simply persecution. For years the authorities have understood the facts in the case and have not interfered. The reason they now interfere can be learned by reading Mr. McKee's article on page 69 of this issue.

Our readers will remember that Mr. Holser was imprisoned for a term of twenty-one days in a Basel prison for permitting work to be done on Sunday in the publishing house. A sentence of forty days awaits him on his return. All this is occurring in the country of William Tell and the Reformation. This fact was brought to the attention of the people of Lucerne by a Seventh-day Adventist who was arrested for laboring on Sunday, in a pamphlet addressed to the citizens of his canton in which he said: "Fellow-citizens, you are at the present time raising a fund to erect a monument to William Tell. But while you are working to erect a stone monument to Tell, you have erected a living monument to Gesler."

POPE LEO XIII., in an encyclical letter dated Nov. 1, 1885, exhorted Catholics "to take an active part in all municipal affairs and elections, and to favor the principles of the church in all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate whenever possible in the administration of civil affairs," etc.

The Roman Catholics of New York City made haste to obey this command of the pope, and the city has been completely controlled by Roman Catholic politicians for the last ten years. In consequence there has developed a condition of unspeakable rottenness. Against this rottenness, which a priest of this city publicly declares was known to the church authorities, no voice was raised in protest. Now that it has been exposed and cannot be denied or evaded, the *Catholic*

Review of this city, in its issue of Feb. 17, has this to say of the results of the last ten years of Roman Catholic activity in the "municipal affairs and elections" of New York City:—

Has its [New York's] history in regard to the Catholics who have been appointed or elected to office been such as would be satisfactory to a requirement, that Catholics, as Catholics, should be fitly represented? Of course, there have been many brilliant exceptions, but, as a rule, have the Catholics of New York City reason to be proud of the career in public life of the men professedly Catholics who have, for instance, been elected for these many years past to represent the city in the State Assembly? Go over the list of them—a long list—during the last ten years. Look at the representation in Congress during the last twenty years, including an ex-prize fighter. Is it necessary, ten years after the decree of the Baltimore Council, that saloon-keepers shall dominate the "Catholic vote"? But they do it practically, and the man that denies this is either dishonest or ignorant. The saloon-keepers are a potency in the political organizations as they have been made up so far, and the mass of the "Catholic vote" has so far been following the dictates of one or the other political organization. Behind the saloon-keepers are the brewers, who hold chattel-mortgages from the saloon-keepers, and most of the brewers are now working together under some form of a "trust."

The above is the fruit of the pope's exhortation to Catholics to "make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life." It is the "more abundant fruit" which has resulted from the Roman Catholic Church enjoying "in addition to liberty" the "favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority." And yet the church proclaims herself the author, promoter, and preserver of civilization!

March 7, 1895

"Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots" *American Sentinel* 10, 10, pp. 73, 74.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL and Seventh-day Adventists believe and teach that the term "Babylon" of Rev. 17 and 18 applies to the Roman Catholic Church.

All Protestants believed this in the days of the Reformation. In fact, it has been the practically unanimous belief of the popular Protestant churches until within a very brief period.

But a change has been wrought in popular Protestantism, and instead of calling the Babylon of the Bible by her right name,

Protestants are now calling her the "Mother Church of Christendom," "a part of the mystical body of Christ," etc.

But why this change? Has Babylon become converted? Has the Lord healed her? No, this cannot be, for confession must precede healing, and Babylon stoutly avers that she has never been sick. No, Babylon teaches every abominable doctrine that she taught in the days of the Reformation. Every reason that existed in the sixteenth century for protesting against Roman Catholicism, for denominating her the Babylon of the apocalypse, exists to-day.

Why is it then that the system which the Reformation denounced as the great prophetic apostasy, is now by the descendants of the reformers terms "one branch of the Christian church"? We propose to answer this question in this article, but before we can do it, it is necessary to take a look at the papal church as described in the Scriptures.

In Rev. 17:2, 6, "Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots" is spoken of as one "with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication,"—one "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." And in Rev. 18:3, it is plainly stated that the reason for the fallen condition of this fallen church is that "the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her." This is the reason she is fallen. She has been intimate with the civil governments of earth. She has failed to heed the warning words, "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?" Jas. 4:4.

Not only has she done this, but she is now doing it, and the last of these adulterous proposals is addressed by Pope Leo XIII. to the American Government through the American bishops of the United States. And this encyclical is alone sufficient to brand the Roman Catholic Church as the fallen Babylon of the Bible. In it the pope says:—

The church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and laws of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected from violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance.

Wants More Than Liberty

Is not this all that a Christian church could ask? Isn't it more than the conquering church of the apostles had? Is it not the scriptural

relation which the Church and the State should sustain toward each other? It certainly is, for Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and he separated the Church from the State and asserted the independence of each by the words: "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Matt. 22:21. But this is not all that the Roman Catholic Church has had, and it is not all that she wants in the United States, for the pope immediately condemns this separation of Church and State in the following words:—

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*.

If it is not universally lawful for the Roman Catholic Church to be dissevered and *divorced* from "the kings [governments] of the earth," then it follows that it is considered lawful and expedient that the Roman Catholic Church be united and married to "the kings of the earth." What, therefore, the Word of God declares unlawful and spiritual "fornication," the Roman Catholic Church in 1895 declares lawful and expedient, thus virtually acknowledging herself the spiritual adulteress of prophecy.

But the pope does not stop here, but continues to still more plainly, if it were possible, proclaim his church to be the fallen church of Revelation. He says:—

She [the Roman Catholic Church] would bring forth more abundant fruit if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority.

Not the Fruits of the Spirit

That is, if the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, instead of being "dissevered and divorced," were united and married to the United States Government "she would bring forth more abundant fruits." The pope is correct; she *would* bring forth more abundant fruits. She always has brought forth more abundant fruits when committing "fornication with the kings of the earth." But they have not been the fruits which result from being united to Christ, for the fruits of the Spirit are not the fruits of a union of the Church with the kings of the earth, but the fruits of a union with Christ, who says:—

Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; *no more can ye, except ye abide in me.* I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth *much fruit*; for without me ye can do nothing.

And now since the only legitimate fruits which the Church can bear are the fruits of a union with Christ, it follows that the "more abundant fruits" which the "infallible" pope declares the Roman Catholic Church bears when united with the governments of earth, must be illegitimate fruits, or the fruits of spiritual "fornication." Thus plainly does Leo XIII., head of the Roman Catholic Church, confess that the church is the fallen Babylon of Revelation.

But, again, "by their fruits ye shall know them," says Jesus. What have been the fruits of the union of the Church with the governments of earth? "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Have these fruits followed the union of the Roman Catholic Church with the kings of the earth? Listen for an answer from the speaking blood of the martyrs. Ask the silent walls of the convent and dungeon. Ask the "wheel," the "stake," the "rack," the "iron maiden," and the "torture chair." Follow the pope's armies as they march against the Waldenses, the Huguenots, and Albigenses, and see "death and hell" follow in their wake. No, no, the fruits of the union of the Church with the

74

kings of the earth has not been "love," but hate; not "joy," but sorrow; not "peace," but war; not "long-suffering," but swift and merciless vengeance; not "gentleness," but satanic ferocity; not "goodness," but wickedness; not "faith," but infidelity; not "meekness," but arrogance; not "temperance," but drunkenness, made more "drunken with the blood of the saints."

Why They Do Not Protest

And now the question: Do not the popular Protestant churches know that these things are so? Then knowing them, why do they not join with the AMERICAN SENTINEL and Seventh-day Adventists in saying so. Why do they not with one voice denounce the encroachments of the papal church on the American Republic? Why have the few criticisms that they have ventured to offer been so cautiously written, so tame and colorless? Why did they not boldly denounce the pope's plain condemnation of the principle of

separation of Church and State? Why did they not deny and denounce the statement that the church in "addition to liberty" should enjoy the "favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority"? Ah, there is a good reason why they did not. They live in glass houses and are afraid to throw stones. In plain English, they want the very thing that the pope wants, and are, and have been working with might and main to secure it, and therefore to condemn the pope's position was to condemn their own; to condemn the pope was to condemn themselves.

Have not the popular Protestant churches united in demanding the "favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority" in support of the church dogma of Sunday sacredness? And have they not invited the Roman Catholic Church to aid them in securing this demand? Yes, they have, and the invitation was quickly accepted by "Babylon the great, the mother of harlots," for she knew that the aforetime daughters of the Reformation were compromising themselves in this demand, were violating the Protestant principle of complete separation of Church and State, and were taking the side of the papacy; and she knew that such a course would effectually close their mouths against similar demands of the "mother church." She knew that after they had compromised themselves, should they dare to utter a protest against her enjoying the "favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority," charging that such a condition was spiritual fornication with the Government, she could say, If I am the "mother of harlots" because I demand the "favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority" in order to bring forth "more abundant fruits," you are my daughters because you have demanded and obtained the same thing.

And, just as she anticipated and just as we expected, there are a few Protestants who themselves compromised in this matter, now have the hardihood to criticise their mother. And just as we expected she now replies to them in substance, "You are another."

How She Silences Them

The *Catholic Times*, of Philadelphia, thus replies to one of these critics, and the *Catholic Mirror* reprints the reply in its issue of Feb. 16:—

He [Pope Leo XIII.] maintains that the action of the church would be more efficacious, if, along with this liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority. Here he

passes from an actual condition to a theory and refers to an ideal condition. His reference is perfectly correct. *Are not the laws regarding Sunday observance a concession to Christian demands?*

The editor of the *Monitor*, a Roman Catholic paper of San Francisco, in his issue of Feb. 16, after quoting the pope's words, "But she would bring forth more abundant fruits if in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority," proceeds to silence the compromised Protestants who have criticised the "holy mother church," with the following retort:—

This truism is acted upon every day by those preachers and by those societies who are seeking for legislation for the better observance of the Sunday.

It is with these hard facts that the Roman Catholic Church is able to silence the puny protests from compromised Protestantism. No wonder the leading prelates of the Catholic Church helped the apostate Protestant churches to secure a Sunday closing law from Congress. They knew that by such means they would compromise Congress and close the mouths of these Protestants against papal encroachments. The game was successful and popular Protestantism has become *particeps criminis* in the ruin of the American principle of separation of Church and State, and cannot protest against the encroachments of Rome without confessing her own guilt. However, Seventh-day Adventists and the AMERICAN SENTINEL protested against the iniquity of the whole thing, and are now free to expose the encroachments of Rome, and they are doing it and will do it.

And now we say to the honest, conscientious Christians in the Roman Catholic Church, and there are many of them, and to the consistent Protestant Christians in the Romanized, compromised daughters of the Reformation, to both we say in the language of God's Word, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen." "For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her." "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." Rev. 18:2, 3, 4, 5.

"Persecution in London" *American Sentinel* 10, 10, p. 74.

THE *Pall Mall Gazette*, of February 14, contains the following account of the fining of Mr. John Gibson, of London, a Seventh-day

Adventist, for permitting work to be done on Sunday in the printing office of which he is manager:—

Tract Society's Sunday Labor. ON A MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

The International Tract Society, of 451 Holloway road, which carries on a letterpress printing business, was summoned at Clerkenwell police court for having employed two females and one male young person on Sunday, January 27. Mr. John Gibson, secretary of the society, appeared in answer to the summons, and from his statement of defense it appeared that the society, a Christian institution, was established for the purpose of bringing about the recognition of Saturday as the Sabbath, or seventh day, in accordance with the biblical law. They gave a half-holiday on Fridays, and closed their premises on Saturday; and contended that they were doing all the law required. This was a matter of conscience with them. Some forms were given them by the factory inspector to fill up, but they only provided for members of the Jewish faith, and they were not Jews. Mr. Bros said the society would have to obey the law, and to say this was a matter of conscience was no excuse. He imposed fines and costs, amounting to 78s. [\$19.00]. Mr. Gibson said he could not conscientiously pay the fine. Mr. Bros said the fine could be recovered by distress; but, no doubt, the directors of the society would see that the law was likely to be too strong for them.

Seventh-day Adventists have for many years, by pulpit and press, taught that the enforcement of Sunday observance, especially upon those who observe the Bible Sabbath (Saturday), would become universal. This teaching was based on the "sure word of prophecy." The State of Arkansas began this persecution, and has been followed by Tennessee, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts and Florida, in the United States; Canada, on the north; Germany, Switzerland, Norway, and England in Europe; and lastly, by the island continent, Australia. In none of these cases have the Seventh-day Adventists disturbed the public or private worship of anyone; in none of these have they violated the Golden Rule. It therefore follows that these prosecutions are nothing short of persecutions and a fulfillment of the scripture of Rev. 12:17, which reads: "The dragon was wroth with the woman [the Church], and went to make war with the remnant of her seed [the last Church, or the Church in the last days], which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

**"The Seventh-day Adventist General Conference" *American Sentinel*
10, 10 , pp. 74, 75.**

WE have in the past said much in these columns about the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in this and other countries, by means of Sunday laws; and it may not be amiss to give a short pen sketch of their thirty-first General Conference which was in session in Battle Creek, Mich., from February 14 to March 4. The meetings were held in their large tabernacle, which is heated by steam and lighted by electricity, and capable of seating 2,500 people.

The delegates to the conference numbered only about one hundred and twenty-five, but the main auditorium was comfortably filled at every meeting, and at the evening services the tabernacle, with its vestries and galleries, was literally packed.

In this conference were men from almost every State and Territory in the American Union; from Canada, from Germany, from England, from France, from Scandinavia, from Turkey, from South Africa, from South America, and from the islands of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. There were men who have suffered imprisonment for their faith, in Russia, in Switzerland, in Turkey, and in several of our American States (the details of which have been told in these columns from time to time).

Seventh-day Adventists are not an unorganized band of unpractical and visionary fanatics, but have as complete and perfect a representative church government as any denomination in the world; and though they number, all told, less than fifty thousand communicants, their work has encircled the globe. The sun never sets upon their educational and publishing institutions, nor upon their cotton tabernacles—tents—in which their summer evangelistic services are conducted. They have, by the living preacher, planted the standard of truth upon every continent, and their work extends from Finland on the north to the extremity of New Zealand on the south. They have publications in nearly a score of languages, and their colporters, Bible-readers, and ministers, have penetrated alike the busy mart, the wilds of Africa, the jungles of India, and the solitude of lonely Pitcairn. Where the voice of the living preacher has not been heard, the printed page has borne its silent testimony to the solemn truths which make the Adventists a separate and a peculiar people.

The Seventh-day Adventist General Conference is—like all their conferences—a representative body. It is composed of delegates from

the several States, provincial and national conferences, embracing the churches of North America, South America, Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and the islands of the sea.

Having had its rise in the United States, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination naturally has headquarters here, as also its largest

75

membership and the greatest number of its local conferences. The United States alone has thirty-two organized and self-supporting conferences, besides the Southern District—a General Conference mission field. Canada has two organized, self-supporting conferences and a General Conference mission field. The work in Great Britain is under the supervision of the British Mission, with headquarters at London. The other conferences and missions in Europe are: the Central European Conference, the Danish Conference, the Conference of Norway, the Conference of Sweden, the German Mission, and the Russian Mission. The other foreign conferences are the South African Conference, the Australasian Union Conference, the New Zealand Conference and the Polynesian Mission. Work directly under the direction of the Foreign Mission Board is also being carried on in India, China, and the newly-opened portions of Africa. A missionary ship is rapidly spreading among the numerous islands of Oceanica a knowledge of the "gospel of the kingdom."

Seventh-day Adventists have no creed but the Bible. They depend for unity not upon written creeds, not upon resolutions of synods or votes of conferences, but upon the Spirit of God which the Saviour promised to send to lead his people into all truth. Hence, while in their conferences they sometimes earnestly discuss doctrine, they never by vote decide questions of faith, and yet they are the most united people upon the face of the globe. Their conferences are models of order and system, being devoted to Bible study, generally in the form of lectures, with privilege of asking questions; to devotional and social services, and to the transaction of business.

Their local work is supported by tithes voluntarily paid by the members. (This is not made a test of fellowship.) Their foreign work is sustained by special donations, and freewill offerings made for the purpose of sending the gospel into "the regions beyond."

Seventh-day Adventists, as their name indicates, are observers of the seventh day of the week. This day they hold to be "the Sabbath" and "Lord's day" of the New Testament, as it is admittedly "the Sabbath" of the Old. With them the fourth commandment of the

Decalogue stands upon an equality with the other nine; all are to be kept, not outwardly merely, but from the heart; not by human effort, but by divine power received by faith in the Son of God, who, by a life of perfect righteousness, "condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."

Adventists do not, as is sometimes falsely charged, depend for salvation upon their observance of the Sabbath. They regard all good works not as means of grace, but as the fruit of grace, and teach that the true Sabbath-keeping is possible only to those who are in Christ, and that merely refraining from work and business on the seventh day of the week is not Sabbath-keeping. The law of God they hold to be spiritual and hence can be kept only by those who are spiritual.

As is also indicated by their name, Seventh-day Adventists are believers in the literal, visible, second coming of Christ. This event they regard as near; but they hold to no definite time, believing that God has not revealed even the year of the second advent, much less the day and hour. And yet, because Seventh-day Adventists teach the near coming of Christ, they are repeatedly, either ignorantly or maliciously, charged with the time-setting folly of other bodies of Adventists. Nothing however could be farther from the truth.

Seventh-day Adventists are evangelical; that is, Bible Christians, believing all things that are written in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Squaring their lives by the Word of God, they are a sober, industrious, law-abiding people. They are not found in our police or criminal courts, except as they are haled there for fidelity to the law of their God. But it may be asked, Why do not Adventists keep two days and thus avoid this persecution? The answer is that Adventists regard Sunday as a rival of the Sabbath of the Lord; and with them, to keep it would be to deny the Lord of the Sabbath. Even courts of justice have denied that refusing to keep Sunday is with Adventists a matter of conscience, and have branded their fidelity to their principles as mere obstinacy; but so did the Roman emperors and governors the refusal of the early Christians to offer incense to the Roman gods. The Christians were not forbidden, they argued, to worship their God; they were merely required also to honor the national gods. It is the same with the Adventists. It is said: They may keep the seventh day if they will, but they should also keep Sunday. But "no man can serve two masters." God has set forth the Sabbath as the badge of his authority; it is his ensign: "Moreover also I have

them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Ezek. 20:12. To give like recognition to a rival sign would be the same as for soldiers to pay equal honors to the flag of their rightful sovereign and to that of a rebel prince; for that is just what the Sunday is, the badge of antichrist, the sign of sun worship anciently and of the papacy in modern times, and of rebellion against God and his law from the fall until the present moment. It is the "wild solar holiday of all pagan times," and is to-day flaunted by Rome in the face of the world with the taunt that "by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin,"¹¹ 1 and "the observance of Sunday by Protestants is an homage [worship] they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Roman Catholic] church."¹² 2

Adventists are staunch friends of education, faithfully sustaining their schools where established and continually planting new ones. The educational secretary reported to the conference that there were three thousand students in their schools in this and other lands.

Believing that it is a Christian duty to present not only the mind but the body a living sacrifice to God, and that all our powers should be sanctified to his service, in obedience to the inspired injunction: "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God," they eschew the use of all intoxicating liquors, tobacco, etc., and adopt a healthful though liberal diet. In short, with Adventists, religion is not something to be put on like a dress coat on the Sabbath and then to be carefully laid away for the "six working days," but is a living power designed to sanctify the life every day, to make one a better neighbor, a better husband, a better wife, a better father, a better mother, a better child; and eventually and above all, a citizen of that better country "wherein dwelleth righteousness."

The success achieved by the Adventists since the holding of their first conference in 1849 is truly phenomenal [*sic.*], especially in view of the fact that they have almost at every step encountered bitter opposition and not infrequently open persecution. But with unswerving faith in God and in the justice of their cause they have moved steadily forward and have seen the work prosper in their hands.

Battle Creek, Mich.

"The Right Thing to Do" *American Sentinel* 10, 10 , p. 77.

THE *Echo*, of Darlington, Ind., publishes the following in its issue of February 15:—

The *Echo* has a large number of sample copies of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to whosoever wants one, which advocates some principles that every American citizen who is loyal to the free liberty and untrammelled personal rights of each individual and the law of equal rights of our country should be deeply interested in. Don't get prejudicial and think it is designed to work on your religious or political faith. If you are incapable of reasoning for yourself, you are in bad shape. You don't want your rights to think and worship your God according to the dictates of your own conscience to become under bondage, do you? Then read and put into acts the right of your suffrage, when it costs you nothing.

We have noted with please the many favorable comments on the work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL which have appeared recently in the columns of our exchanges, but to know that one of them has carefully preserved copies of the SENTINEL and now offers them to its subscribers with the above recommendation, is indeed cheering. The *Echo* declares in its motto that it is "No man's slave," and its attitude toward the SENTINEL would bear out its courageous declaration.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 10 , p. 80.

THE general Government is not alone in making appropriations for religious education and religious instruction. Among the items in an appropriation bill recently introduced into the Maine legislature, is, "For Priest's Salary, \$200." Another bill appropriates \$1,000 for the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and \$3,000 for the Sisters of Charity in Lewiston. The fact that State governments are also involved in this iniquity does not make it any better. It simply shows the extent of the evil and the urgent necessity for educating the people upon the correct principles of the separation of Church and State.

THE *Western Watchman*, a Roman Catholic paper of St. Louis, Mo., contained the following editorial in its issue of February 14:—

The Protestant papers are indignant at the pope for expressing a hope that the United States might one day become Catholic. They declare that in such event liberty would be no more. Tut-tut men. You are mad. If the United States were to become Catholic tomorrow it would take all the sensible Catholics in the land all they could do to prevent the converts from making the profession of any other than the Catholic faith a penal offense.

The *Watchman* is entirely correct in its conclusions, and the reason for the correctness of its deductions can be found in the Word of the Lord. When men who have known the truth, reject it and turn from light to darkness, the Saviour says to them: "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" Again, speaking of the tyrannical ecclesiastical system of his time, the prototype of the papacy, he said of its converts: "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves." Yes, an apostate Protestantism is more to be dreaded than the papacy itself.

THE Roman Catholic paper, the *Western Watchman*, thus defends the pope's shrewd method of addressing the American people under pretense of addressing the Roman Catholic bishops of America:—

Bishop Paret, of Maryland, is highly indignant because Leo XIII., in his late letter, addresses himself to the American people. He thinks he should confine his counsel to Catholics. The pope is the spiritual head of the Church; and the Church claims the spiritual allegiance of all those who are baptized.

So the pope claims the spiritual allegiance of even the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL and addressed his late encyclical to them. Well, we have received it, and have made several comments on it. The pope will find some of them on the first and second pages of this paper.

March 14, 1895

"Beaten at Its Own Game" *American Sentinel* 10, 11 , pp. 81, 82.

THE *Christian Statesman* is badly frightened at the aggressions of Romanism. But who is the *Christian Statesman*?

The *Christian Statesman* is, and has been for more than twenty years, the mouth-piece of the National Reform Association, an organization that has persistently denounced the American idea of separation of Church and State as "political atheism."

It is the mouth-piece of the organization that has demanded an amendment to the Constitution definitely declaring that this is a Christian nation, but leaving the question as to who are the Christians, to be settled by later enactments and decisions.

The *Christian Statesman* and this association were the agencies which organized and led the forces which browbeat Congress into legislating on the question of which day is the Sabbath.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL commenced its career by exposing the wickedness of the movement advocated by the *Christian Statesman*. The SENTINEL pointed out that the principles advocated by the *Statesman* were essentially papal, and that the papacy would build on the foundation which was being laid by the *Statesman* and its constantly augmenting forces.

But instead of listening to our warning, the *Statesman* made overtures to the Roman Catholics in the following words:—

Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them.

Papists were appealed to to help resist the progress of "political atheism" by securing from Congress a law recognizing Sunday as the Christian Sabbath. In the meantime the Supreme Court decided that "this is a Christian nation." Armed with this remarkable decision, these Romanizing Protestants redoubled their exertions. Roman Catholic prelates were appealed to for assistance. They responded and the conspiracy was successful.

A stock argument of these compromising Protestants in their demand for national legislation enforcing Sunday observance was to point to the decisions of courts that Christianity is a part of the common law, to State Sunday laws, to national and State Thanksgiving proclamations, and to the employment of chaplains by national and State governments.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL declared that all these things were violations of the spirit of the Constitution, and that, instead of demanding more legislation on the strength of these violations of the spirit of the Constitution, all these vestiges of the State-church polity of Europe should be abolished to harmonize with the Constitution. We declared that popular Protestantism in clinging to these vestiges of papal policy was nursing in its bosom the viper that would yet be used by the papacy to sting to death the principle of American liberty, and through America, the liberties of the world.

And now we see our predictions being literally fulfilled. We see Rome building on the platform so blindly laid and upheld by the *Christian Statesman* and its allies. Pope Leo XIII., the shrewdest political diplomat in the world, seeing that the time had come to strike a decisive blow at American liberty now so sorely wounded in the house of its friends, addressed an encyclical to the American Government and people, through the American bishops, condemning

the American idea of separation of Church and State. Here is a part of it:—

The church among 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*. . . . She [the Catholic Church] would bring forth more abundant fruits if, *in addition* to liberty, she enjoyed the *favor of the laws* and the *patronage of public authority*.

A few compromised Protestants startled by this bold bid for the patronage of American law and public authority which they themselves were earnestly laboring to obtain, ventured to criticise the pope's encyclical. But Rome expected this, and was ready for it. And what was her answer? She simply pointed to the platform which silly Protestants had themselves laid for her to build on. The following is the reply which, in substance, has appeared in nearly every Roman Catholic newspaper in the United States. Immediately upon the publication of the encyclical, the "Very Rev. A. F. Hewitt, D.D., Superior General of the Paulists," and editor of the *Catholic World*, wrote this reply and had it telegraphed to the leading papers of the country:—

Our greatest jurists have declared that this is a Christian country. The Sunday is recognized and its observance protected by law. Thanksgiving and fast days are proclaimed by authority. Chaplains are appointed in legislatures, in the army and navy. Colleges, under the control of ecclesiastics, and institutes of charity have been liberally aided, and among these have been some institutions under the direction of Catholic authorities. There is nothing in this policy which is un-American.

In this manner does Rome defend its claim to the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority. And all those who have worked and are working for Sunday laws with which to force universal obedience to their misinterpretation of the fourth commandment, and are pointing to governmental chaplains, Thanksgiving proclamations, and court decisions that this is a Christian nation, as arguments in support of their claims,—all such now stand stultified in the presence of Romish aggressions.

But our readers will be interested in reading the pitiable wail of the *Christian Statesman* as it sees the papacy building on its foundation. And let it be remembered while the following is perused, that it is from the same pen and the same paper that in 1884 wrote and published the before-quoted petition to Roman Catholics, asking that they "co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism;" which being interpreted, was a request for Roman Catholic aid in breaking down the principle of separation of Church and State embodied in what they termed "that infidel document,"—the United States Constitution. We quote from the *Christian Statesman*, of Feb. 23, 1895:—

Romanism, with keen appreciation of the vast issues at stake, and with far-reaching calculations as to the future, is employing every possible means to gain and hold the commanding and decisive position when the crisis which is sure to come in our national life, shall be upon us. She is pouring in her millions of devotees from other lands to wield the sovereign ballot here. She is commanding them by her highest authority to take an active interest in political affairs, and to sub-

82

ordinate all political conduct to the advancement of the Roman Catholic Church. She is determined to control the common school system of our country, or to break it up and substitute for it her own parochial schools in which her rapidly-multiplying youth shall be molded to her own liking, and prepared to do without question her own authoritative bidding. Not satisfied with holding as at present the balance of power as between the two great political parties, and receiving rich pay first from one and then from the other of these parties for her united vote that is sure to turn the tide of victory whichever way it goes, she aspires to positive and absolute direct control of our national life. And the ratio of the numerical increase of her youth will with absolute certainty bring this about, if her youth are not by the maintenance of our common schools molded into true and loyal American citizens. And this education of her own youth is what Rome is now with all her energies setting herself to accomplish.

In the final issue Romanism claims to decide all moral questions, and her "infallible" interpretation of moral law must be imposed upon the schools and upon the State itself. This is the Roman or papal principle: and its inexorable logic is the Inquisition for all who do not submit. This is the principle that now threatens the nations' right to interpret God's moral law for itself. The two systems are in their death-grapple these closing years of the nineteenth century. Our nation was born in the providence of God a Protestant nation, with the Bible as its ultimate law, and the nation itself the responsible interpreter of that law in its own proper sphere

of action. Shall it continue such a nation? Shall it retain the Bible to its schools, and train its youth,—and al its youth,—in whom the nation's future is bound up, to know God's Word and the duties of citizenship as taught in that Word? Shall our legislators and judges and executive officers and our people at large go to God's moral law or to the Roman Pontiff to know what are the rights and duties of the nation and of her citizens and subjects? This is the conflict on one side of the great moral and political battlefield on which the contending forces in our national life are already engaged. Do we know our danger? Are we on our guard? To be aware of the danger in time is half the battle won.

"The two systems" that "are in their death-grapple these closing years of the nineteenth century" are here presented as the infallibility of the pope and the infallibility of the "nation." The papal system places the infallibility in the pope. The *Christian Statesman* professedly places the infallibility in "our legislators and judges and executive officers and our people at large." Both systems demand an infallible interpretation of the moral law which shall be binding on all. But who shall interpret the moral law for these legislators and judges? Is each man to be left to his own private interpretation? *No, indeed.* The *Christian Statesman* and its allies will not permit this. One case will suffice to illustrate this truth. The "moral law" says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." The *Christian Statesman* "interprets" this moral law to mean "the first day is the Sabbath," and then hands this interpretation to legislators and judges with the demand that it be accepted and acted upon under penalty of political death. This the *Christian Statesman* and its allies have done and are doing, thus actually claiming for *themselves* the infallibility they professedly claim for the nation. The death struggle now going on in this nation is therefore between the "infallibility" of the pope and the infallibility of popish-Protestant preachers,—between the "beast and his image." The true child of God will refuse to bow to the dictates of either. He will "go to God's moral law" to ascertain his duty, and will refuse to worship, by his obedience to, either the Roman Pontiff or his American image. "And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and

ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12.

"Crossing the Abyss" *American Sentinel* 10, 11 , p. 82.

THE New York *Press*, in its issue of February 25, contained the following significant news item:—

OVATION TO A BISHOP

First Time a Catholic Clergyman Has Addressed the Y. M. C. A.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, Feb. 24.—Right Rev. John A. Watterson, bishop of the Columbus diocese, addressed a big meeting of the Y.M.C.A. to-day. As many persons as gained admission to the hall were turned away. This was the first time in its history that a Catholic clergyman had addressed a meeting under the auspices of the Y.M.C.A.

The bishop was introduced by General Secretary W. T. Perkins. He spoke for an hour and a half on "Christian Citizenship," the audience being held in rapt attention and frequently breaking into applause. When the bishop advanced to the platform the applause amounted to an ovation. He thanked the audience for its generous welcome. It showed him, he said, that it did not regard him as a bull in a china shop, and especially a papal bull in the beautiful china shop of the Y.M.C.A. The climax of his address was reached in the following passage:—

"While I am uncompromising in the matters of my faith, and inflexible in those lines of conduct which depend on the principle of faith, and while I would deserve the contempt and scorn of every right-minded man if I were recreant to my conscience in those things which I hold as truths, yet I know of no doctrine of the Catholic Church which prohibits or prevents me from working for the good of my fellowmen, no doctrine which interferes with my allegiance to the government and laws of my country. On the contrary, I know that the whole teaching and the whole spirit of my religion require me to be true to my country and its government, and to promote its honor by the faithful discharge of all the duties of American citizenship. All of you would know it, too, if you knew my religion as well as I do."

Nothing is more patent to the careful observer than that popular Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are bridging the gulf made by

the Reformation. Another fact just as evident is that this is being accomplished by compromises on the part of Protestants, while Rome is "inflexible" in holding the soul-destroying doctrines condemned by the Reformation, and in denouncing the American principle of separation of Church and State.

"Seventh-day Adventists and Separation of Church and State"
American Sentinel 10, 11 , p. 82.

IT is now well known that Seventh-day Adventists are strongly opposed to Sunday laws, but it is not generally known that this opposition to religious legislation is consistently adhered to in all its bearings. It is not generally known that this denomination is the first and only denomination in the United States that has officially declared in favor of the taxation of all church property.

March 5, 1893, the following resolutions were adopted by their General Conference held at Battle Creek, Mich.:—

WHEREAS, In view of the separation which we believe should exist between the Church and the State, it is inconsistent for the Church to receive from the State pecuniary gifts, favors, or exemptions, therefore,

Resolved, That we repudiate the doctrine that church or other ecclesiastical property should be exempt from taxation, and further,

Resolved, That we decidedly protest against any such exemption, and favor the repeal of such legislation as grants this exemption.

There are some who might charge insincerity on the ground that there is no danger that church property will ever be taxed and therefore it cost the denomination no sacrifice to thus express its loyalty to principle.

However, the denomination at its last General Conference, which closed March 4th, passed a resolution that leaves no ground to doubt its sincerity. Its missionaries reported from Mashonaland, in South Africa, that the South African Land Company, chartered by the British Government with powers similar to the famous British East India Company, offered to donate liberal tracts of land to representative missionaries for missionary purposes, and that a fine tract of land, numbering twelve thousand acres, was placed at their disposal. The matter was brought before the General Conference and disposed of with the following resolution which was passed unanimously, with the

understanding that funds would be supplied to the missionaries with which to purchase all needed land for a mission site:—

Resolved, That we ought not as a denomination either to seek or accept from any civil government, supreme, local, or otherwise, any gift, or grant either of land, money, or other thing of value.

It is evident from this that Seventh-day Adventists are sincere in their belief in the complete separation of Church and State.

"Struggling for Place" *American Sentinel* 10, 11 , p. 82.

THE *Wesleyan Christian Advocate* (Atlanta, Ga.), of January 30, contains the following editorial:—

Standing by His Colors

It seems that on State occasions Canada has places of honor for the dignitaries of the Catholic Church, but does not recognize Methodists, Presbyterians and others, though they represent a majority of the people there. Dr. Carman, the superintendent of Canada Methodism, declined to attend the funeral of Sir John Thompson, because of this discrimination. In explanation of his course, he says:—

"Personal feelings are not here to be considered for a moment. For myself I might well enough have accepted any place; but for the Methodist Church I must have the ground and rank to which the Methodist Church is entitled, and to which for herself and for others that church has asserted that claim. It is an affair of great political significance—of immense civil, social and ecclesiastical significance. It is an affair of human rights, of the resistance of ancient wrongs, of the assertion and maintenance of freedom and proper self-respect, of rejection of pompous and absurd pretensions, and of teaching other people their place and duty. *The men that will submit to tyranny are cowards*, and proclaim themselves base tyrants were the places changed. Possibly the time has come to set these wrong matters right, and a kind providence may have given us a good occasion."

This clerical struggle for "*place*" now raging in the United States and Canada among Protestants, brings to mind the history of the struggle of the papal bishop for *place* in the early centuries of Christianity.

We recommend Dr. Carman and all clergymen, both in Canada and the United States, to abandon their struggle for first "*place*" at the side of the *State* and hasten to press close to the side of the Lord

Jesus Christ. They can all have first place there, for he is "no respecter of persons."

"Looking Backward" *American Sentinel* 10, 11 , p. 82.

UNDER the title "Can Sunday Laws be Enforced," Rev. J. J. M'Carrell in the *Christian Statesman* of February 2, furnishes the following encouragement to modern "Blue Law" advocates:—

Two hundred years ago if anyone in Boston or New England in general had any doubt as to the possibility of enforcing such laws, he need only attempt to go out of town, or come into town, or walk out for an airing, or stand talking to his neighbor, on Sunday, or keep his shop open after sundown Saturday. He would be soundly and probably *sorely* convinced that such a thing is possible

The compulsory Sunday observance champion of to-day looks back upon the palmy days of the New England theocracy with longing heart and wishful eye.

"Conflicting Views" *American Sentinel* 10, 11 , p. 83.

THE following editorials are among the most recent contributions to the discussion of the question, are laws enforcing Sunday observance of the nature of the religious legislation of a State-church polity, or are they purely civil enactments for the protection of the *man* and not the *day*:—

THE "INDEPENDENT,"
FEBRUARY 21.

THE "CHRISTIAN STATESMAN,"
FEBRUARY 2.

We are rather severely taken to task by the *Sabbath Outlook*, a Seventhday Baptist publication, for an editorial concerning the prosecution and imprisonment in Maryland and Tennessee of seventhday keepers for violating Sunday laws. It says we undertake a "lame apology" for the wrongs done, and that, when we say that Sunday laws are not enforced by the courts because of the divine sanction or because of the religious aspects of the day, we are guilty of an "evasion of facts." Let us see, Dr. Spear, in his "Religion and the State," shows that the Christian Sabbath is not an institution of the Federal Government, and is wholly unmentioned in any of the State constitutions except that of Vermont; that it is treated in the laws as a day of cessation from labor, and not as a religious institution; and that the State courts have taken an entirely secular view of it. Thus the Supreme Court of New York held that it is a "civil and political institution," resting on the same foundations as the laws against gambling, lotteries, selling intoxicants on election days, etc.; that of Pennsylvania that it is only a "civil regulation;" that of South Carolina that Sunday is a "mere day of rest," with which religion has nothing more to do than with a statute which should make July 4th or January 8th a rest day; that of Alabama that Sunday legislation is simply an exercise of the police power, and "cannot be justified on the ground that such abstinence [from labor] is enjoined by the Christians religion;" and that of Ohio that the validity of such legislation is "neither strengthened nor weakened by the fact that the day of rest it enjoins is

It will be noticed that in the clear and strong convention address given in this issue, the author uses the common and officially accepted legal phrase "Sunday laws." This he does, evidently, in order to have the term throughout the address the same as that made use of in our courts. In the same way the author occasionally speaks of "a civil Sunday." We refer to this matter for the purpose of urging the most careful distinction in the use of the words "Sabbath" and "Sunday." The latter word is correctly used only in relation to the first day of the week or anything connected with that day when the idea of the Sabbath as an institution for rest and worship is entirely wanting. A Sunday newspaper is a paper published on the first day of the week in violation of the Sabbath. A Sunday-school is properly a school on the first day of the week without any closer relation to the rest and worship of the Sabbath than a Monday school might have. A Sabbath-school is one on the first day of the week for the promotion of what is in support of the rest and worship of the Sabbath. So a *law for the purpose of preventing Sabbath desecration if property a Sabbath law*. A Sunday law is one like that of Louisiana which simply places the first day of the week on a level with such legal holidays as the 4th of July and Christmas. It contains no implication of the sacredness of a day of rest and worship, or of the institution of the Sabbath. But in our States generally this institution of a rest day and a day for worship is most clearly kept in view in the laws concerning the first day of the week. The proper designation of these laws, therefore, is Sabbath laws,

The *Independent* is still clinging to the erroneous and illogical idea that Sunday laws are not religious legislation. It is driven to this defense because it is unwilling to adopt the State-church theory in which Sunday laws were born, and at the same time unwilling to abandon its defense of such laws. We have published the editorial from the *Christian Statesman* to show that there is a wide disagreement among Sunday-law advocates on the point of the nature of these laws. The *Christian Statesman*, the acknowledged leader in the crusade for the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws, boldly avers that such laws are religious laws, that the only consistent basis for such laws is the divine command of God, and all attempts to place these laws on a civil basis is itself "political atheism." Laying aside the question of facts, the opinion of the *Christian Statesman* is more important than that of the *Independent*, because the *Statesman* is the recognized champion of the Sunday-law movement in the United States, and devotes more space to the discussion of the question in a single issue than the *Independent* does in a month.

But as regards facts: The *Statesman* is certainly correct in its claims that Sunday laws are religious enactments. It traces Sunday laws through the State-church period of colonial days to the English State-church enactment of Charles II., and from there back to Constantine's famous law. No one can read the law of Charles II. in connection with the Sunday laws of the several States and deny that they are modified copies of it. These facts the *Independent* will not attempt to deny. So much for the origin.

Neither will the *Independent* deny that the demand for them comes from the Church. Rev. W. F. Crafts, in his book the "Sabbath for Man," says: "During nearly all our American history the churches have influenced the State to enact and improve Sabbath laws."

The *Independent* attempts to hide behind the decision of courts that Sunday laws are devil regulations. It is true that most of the courts have taken this view, but although this is *law* it does not follow that it is *fact*. The Supreme Court of the United States once decided that the negro "had no rights which the white man was bound to respect." The *Independent*, while admitting for the time being that this was law, would deny that it ever was a *fact*. Sunday laws are religious

in *origin, nature, and object*, and when courts can make sin righteousness they can make Sunday laws religious.

But the courts are not a unit in placing Sunday laws on a purely civil basis. The United States Circuit Court, in its decision of the famous King case, denominated as "disingenuous" the "argument of his [King's] adversary sects that it is the economic value of the day of rest and not its religious character which they would preserve by civil law."

Again, the Supreme Court of California, *ex parte Newman*, reviews the decision of certain courts that Sunday laws are mere civil regulations, in the following forcible language:—

These decisions are based upon the ground that the statutes requiring the observance of the Christian Sabbath established merely a civil rule, and make no discrimination or preference in favor of any religion. By an examination of these cases, it will be seen that the position taken rests in mere assertion, and that not a single argument is adduced to prove that a preference in favor of the Christian religion is not given by the law. In the case in 8 Barr, the court said: "It [the law] intermeddles not with the natural and indefeasible right of all men to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; it compels none to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent; it pretends not to control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and it establishes no preference for any religious establishment or mode of worship."

This is the substance of the arguments to show that these laws establish no preference. The last clause in the extract asserts the proposition broadly; but it is surely no legitimate conclusion from what precedes it, and must be taken as the plainest example of *petition principii*. That which precedes it establishes that the law does not destroy religious toleration, but that is all.

Now, does our constitution, when it forbids discrimination or preference in religion, mean merely to guarantee toleration? For that, in effect, is all which the cases cited seem to award, as the right of a citizen. In a community composed of persons of various religious denominations, having different days of worship, each considering his own as sacred from secular employment, all being equally considered and protected under the Constitution, a law is passed which in effect recognizes the sacred character of one of these days, by compelling all others to abstain from secular employment, which is precisely one

of the modes in which its observance is manifested and required by the creed of that sect to which it belongs as a Sabbath. Is not this a discrimination in favor of the one? Does it require more than an appeal to one's common sense to decide that this is a preference? And when the Jew or seventh-day Christian complains of this, is it any answer to say, Your conscience is not constrained, you are not compelled to worship or to perform religious rites on that day, nor forbidden to keep holy the day which you esteem as a Sabbath? We think not, however high the authority which decides otherwise.

The truth is, however much it may be disguised, that this one day of rest is a purely religious idea. Derived from the Sabbatical institutions of the ancient Hebrew, it has been adopted into all the creeds of succeeding religious sects throughout the civilized world; and whether it be the Friday of the Mohammedan, the Saturday of the Israelite, or the Sunday of the Christian, it is alike fixed in the affections of its followers beyond the power of eradication; and in most of the States of our confederacy, the aid of the law to enforce its observance has been given, under the *pretense* of a civil, municipal, or police regulation.

Once more, Chief Justice Rafin of the Supreme Court of North Carolina in the case of the State vs. Williams, thus honestly and candidly says:—

The truth is that it [Sunday labor] offends us, not so much because it disturbs us in practicing for ourselves the religious duties, or enjoying the salutary repose of recreation, of that day, as that it is, in itself, a breach of God's law, and a violation of the party's own religious duty.

The history of the "civil" claim for Sunday laws is thus briefly told in the history of other religious legislation by the Baptist historian, Robert Baird:—

The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death and banish "Antinomians" and "Anabaptists," not because of their religious tenets, but because of their violation of civil laws. This is the justification they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse! But just so it is; wherever there is such a union of Church and State, heresy and heretical practices are apt to become violations of the civil code, and are punished no longer as errors in religion, but infractions of the laws of the land. So the defenders of the Inquisition have always spoken and written in justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal.—*Religion in America, p. 94.*

It is true that a large majority of court decisions have embodied the "civil" view of Sunday laws, but these decisions have followed precedents long established and from which jurists have not dared to break away. These precedents were established under a terrible ecclesiastical pressure brought to bear upon the courts, which demanded the transference of a State-church measure from the church establishment of England to the disestablishment in America, and a "civil" reason for it. The United States Circuit Court decision, previously referred to, states the situation thus:—

The court, in cases like this, cannot ignore the existing customs and laws of the masses, nor their *prejudices* and *passions* even, to lift the individual out of the restraint surrounding him because of these customs and laws before the time has come when public opinion shall free all men in the measure desired.

Seventh-day Adventists bring no railing accusation against our courts. They charge no man with dishonest. The churches have demanded Sunday legislation of the legislators and sustaining decisions from judges. We are persuaded that there are judges who are as anxious to let the inoffensive seventh-day observers go free, as was Pilate to save the life of Jesus; but outside the court stands the Church as of old with threatening mien, pointing to the law and demanding their punishment under penalty of political death. "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." John 19:11.

"Rome Never Demanded More" *American Sentinel* 10, 11 , p. 84.

THE *Christian Statesman*, of February 16, publishes an address delivered by Dr. R. J. George, at a convention of compulsory Sunday-observance advocates, held recently at New Castle, Pa. The address, which, with others, the *Statesman* promises will soon appear in pamphlet form, is entitled, "The Duties of the States to the Church," and is treated under eight heads. The reader may be inclined to doubt that it is possible for a minister outside the pale of Rome to take such positions, but each of the eight positions were boldly taken and soberly defended and heartily indorsed by the convention and by the leaders in the movement for the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws. The following positions are startling indeed, but they are the logical outcome of the first step,—a Sunday law:—

1. It is the duty of the State to recognize the independent authority of the Church.
2. The State is to be subservient to the Church.
3. The State should profess the true Christian religion.
4. The State should require scriptural qualifications in her rulers.
5. The State should *restrain practices* that are injurious to religion.
6. The State should maintain a true standard of morals.
7. The State should protect the Church.
8. The State should support the Church by timely gifts.

And now we ask, if this is not a faithful description of the "beast," the papacy? And since it is not the "beast" that is here speaking but an apostate Romanizing Protestantism, it can be none other than the Apocalyptic "image to the beast."

The Roman Catholic Church, in the darkest of the darkness of the Dark Ages, never demanded more from the State and never employed more in exterminating heretics than is here demanded. And this is the dominant sentiment of the present crusade for the enforcement of the Sunday-Sabbath, the "mark" or badge of the "beast," on those who "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." (See Rev. 14:8-12.)

"Persecuting Colonel Ingersoll" *American Sentinel* 10, 11 , p. 84.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL does not believe the Bible, but on the contrary declares that he believes it his conscientious duty to lecture against it for the gate receipts minus expenses.

This he has a right to do. And this right should be held sacred and defended by all, including those who believe the Bible to be the Word of God.

However, this is not the view taken by certain ministers of Hoboken, N.J., who, led by one, Rev. H. T. Beatty, a Presbyterian, recently attempted to prevent Col. Ingersoll from delivering his lecture against the Bible in their city. There is on the statute books of the State the following law:—

If any person shall willfully blaspheme the holy name of God, by denying, cursing, or contumeliously reproaching his being or providence, or by contumeliously reproaching Jesus Christ or the Holy Ghost, or the Christian religion, or the holy Word of God (that is, the canonical scriptures contained in the books of the Old and New Testament), or by profane scoffing at or exposing them or any of them to contempt and ridicule, then every person so offending

shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$200 or imprisonment at hard labor, not exceeding twelve months, or both.

The ministers of Hoboken invoked the old law against Col. Ingersoll, and tried to have the authorities use it to prevent the lecture. But the Corporation Council announced that Mr. Ingersoll could not be prevented from delivering his address, but that should he violate the law, he would be promptly arrested. The agitation of the matter procured for the Colonel an immense audience, among which were the prosecuting preachers and their police. Col. Ingersoll, by ingenuity, succeeded in delivering his address in such a way as to technically escape the law and disappoint the preachers.

The SENTINEL, as our readers know, has not sympathy with Mr. Ingersoll's attacks on the Bible, but we do demand for him the freedom of speech. The God of the Bible is well able to defend himself, and since he chooses to permit Mr. Ingersoll to express himself freely about the Bible, the preachers had better follow His example. And besides, who is to define what is blasphemy? Col. Ingersoll ridiculed the idea of an eternal burning hell in which sinners writhe in indescribable agony throughout the countless ages of eternity. Doubtless this would be regarded as blasphemy under the law, but if denying this dogma of the Church is regarded as blasphemy, then we would be regarded as blasphemous also, for we deny it, and deny that the Bible teaches it.

The early Christians were regarded as blasphemous because they declared that the gods of the heathen were no gods.

The State has no infallible tribunal by which to determine what is blasphemy, and is therefore not competent to pass upon the question. The preachers may decide for themselves, but let them not call upon the civil law to enforce their decision. We close with the remark that certain preachers, by their so-called higher criticism, are doing more to destroy faith in the Bible than are the lectures of Col. Ingersoll.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 11 , p. 88.

THERE is trouble in the Presbyterian Church. The church is divided on certain questions, into what is called the "minority" and "majority" divisions. The *Evangelist* represents the minority and the *Presbyterian*, the majority. We publish on page 87 of this issue an editorial criticism from the *Evangelist* of the methods which the

Presbyterian employs to increase its circulation. Our comment is, "Babylon is fallen."

ALL should read the article in this issue entitled, "The Failure of the Pulpit." It is written by a Methodist and published in a leading Methodist Church paper, and is therefore the statement of one who knows whereof he speaks, and who speaks as a friend and not as an enemy of the Methodist Church. No one familiar with the sins of "the man of sin" and the manifest symptoms of those sins as delineated by prophecy and recorded in history, will fail to recognize in the facts stated in the article referred to, a perfect description of the papal apostasy.

ROMAN CATHOLIC and Protestant religious papers are just now engaged in a love feast. The occasion for this is the recent Roman Catholic demonstration in favor of Sunday closing, in which it was resolved to aid non-Catholics (Protestants) in preserving the sacredness of Sunday. The Protestant press was wonderfully pleased with this and published columns of editorial commendation and rejoicing. The Catholic papers copied these and renewed their loyalty to Sunday. These Roman Catholic editors must laugh in their sleeves at the way Protestants hug the papal Sabbath.

THE *Monitor* (Roman Catholic), in its issue of March 2, publishes a review of an article in the *Amador Record* advocating religious teaching in the public schools. The *Monitor's* review which embodies some good points well stated against that colorless thing "non-sectarian Christianity," contains the following reference to Seventh-day Adventists:—

If the public school goes into the business of teaching the ten commandments it will have to go into the business of explaining them. If they are all commandments, all are important and all must be inculcated. If so, how are we to get over the elementary question of the observance of the Sabbath? Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day, is one of those "plain, self-evident" truths of which the *Amador Record* speaks, yet who shall say which day of the week is to be observed as the day of rest? If the public school teachers decide that Sunday is the Lord's day the Jews will have a right to complain. And not only Jews but the Seventh-day Adventists can object to this interpretation. In fact to these latter the observance of the first day of the week as the Sabbath is a mark of antichrist and the proof of the great apostasy. They will protest that this is sectarian teaching, and so they are experienced bands at protesting, the *Amador Record* and the public school teachers might soon learn that their trials and tribulations had only begun.

We are pleased to note that the *Monitor* recognizes that Seventh-day Adventists are "experienced hands at protesting." We are glad that it recognizes that Protestantism is not yet dead. And right here we protest against the *Monitor's* quoting the Sabbath commandment from the *catechism* instead of from the Bible. If it had quoted from the Bible instead of the catechism it would have experienced no difficulty in determining which day is the Sabbath. The catechism which reads, "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day," is very indefinite and needs "explaining:" but the Bible which says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," is very definite and needs no "explaining." And this very assumption of power on the part of the Roman Catholic Church to substitute its law for the law of God constitutes the "work of antichrist and the *proof* of the great apostasy."

THE *Western Watchman* (Roman Catholic) speaks thus defiantly of the power of its church:—

The German Emperor applauded the statement made in the Reichstag the other day that the two practical dangers that now menaced the Fatherland were Socialism and Catholicism. If the church is an enemy then is she the greatest under the stars. Whatsoever she falls on shall be crushed to powder.

We surmise from the last sentence that the *Watchman* refers to "the stone which the builders rejected," which "is become the head of the corner." It is said of this stone, which is Christ (Eph. 2:20), "Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." Luke 20:18. If it is upon the authority of this text that the *Watchman* predicts the crushing of the German Empire by the Roman Catholic Church, it is terribly mistaken, for that stone is Christ. However, the fate of the Roman Catholic Church is symbolized by a stone. We refer to Rev. 18:21, which reads: "And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all."

"More Persecution in Tennessee" *American Sentinel* 10, 11 , p. 88.

ONE of our editors, who is in attendance at the trials of the Seventh-day Adventists at Dayton, Tenn., who were charged with maintaining a nuisance by laboring on Sunday, telegraphs that there were ten defendants found guilty on seventeen separate charges,

and fined two dollars and fifty cents and costs on each of the seventeen charges.

We have not yet learned the names of these ten victims of the Sunday-law crusade, but from previous correspondence we are able to state that one of them is Prof. G. W. Colcord, President of the Graysville Academy, a Seventh-day Adventist institution. Prof. Colcord is also an ordained minister of the denomination. It is quite likely that a large proportion of the seventeen convictions are against him, as he was charged with six offenses.

The telegram states that the judge suspended the fines, but that the costs must be paid by the convicted parties, or they will be committed to jail.

The telegram further states that three local lawyers volunteered to plead the cases gratis; also that the defendants have asked for a new trial and an arrest of judgment.

This is the largest number of Seventh-day Adventists convicted at one time, and does not bear out the prediction of some that these persecutions were only surface agitations on the on-flowing tide of liberty. Tennessee has been at this persecuting business a long time, and now, instead of showing signs of improving, is steadily growing more intolerant; and the example is being followed by other States at home and abroad. Verily, the Scripture is true which says, "And the dragon ["that old serpent called the Devil and Satan"] was wroth with the woman [the Church], and went to make war with the remnant [the last Church or the Church in the last days] of her seed, which keep the *commandments of God*, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. 12:17.

We will furnish our readers a full account of the trials in our next issue.

LATER:—Another telegram received just before going to press announces that the ten convicted parties, which include Eld. G. W. Colcord and his nephew, Prof. I. C. Colcord, have been refused a new trial and are now locked in the county jail at Dayton, Tenn., and, in consequence, the Graysville Academy is closed. And this is in America in the year *eighteen hundred and ninety-five!*

March 21, 1895

**"More Religious Persecution in Tennessee" *American Sentinel* 10,
12 , pp. 89, 90.**

**Seventh-day Adventist Academy at Graysville Closed by Religious
Intolerance**

IN 1892, Prof. G. W. Colcord, a Seventh-day Adventist minister, established an academy at Graysville, Rhea County, Tenn. He invested in this school all the money he had, amounting to several thousand dollars. Several of his brethren likewise invested money in the enterprise, not as a speculation nor with the expectation of any financial return, but for the purpose of building up a school that would afford young people in that part of the country an opportunity to acquire a good education and thus fit them for usefulness in the world.

Elder Colcord associated with him in this work, his wife and his nephew and wife, who gave their time to the work, receiving only a very limited remuneration. The school prospered, and when it closed a few days since, had an enrollment of over one hundred students.

A number of Adventist families from different parts of the State and from neighboring State, moved to Graysville in order that they might educate their children at this academy. Pleasant homes were established and the village soon wore an air of prosperity to which it had long been a stranger. Everything moved along pleasantly until the fall of 1894, when some persons, probably envious of the prosperity of the Adventists, invoke the Tennessee Sunday law against them and secured the indictment of fourteen members of the Graysville Church, including Elder G. W. Colcord, Prof. I. C. Colcord, his nephew, and M. C. Sturdevant, manager of the boys' dormitory. These indictments were found at the instigation of a man who had moved into the neighborhood and who had taken offense because one of the Adventists who kept a grocery had refused to sell him goods on credit. The attorney-general, be it said to his credit, used his influence to prevent this action, but without avail, and in due course the indictments were docketed for trial at the March term of court, which just closed at Dayton.

Three of the indicted Adventists were absent from the neighborhood and were not arrested. One asked to have his case continued until another term of court, and his request was granted. Nine appeared for trial. The cases were taken up March 5. The

defendants employed no counsel, each one making a brief statement to the court and jury, of which the following are samples:—

Wm. Burchard's Defense Before the Court and Jury

I would just like to say that I am indicted for violating the Sabbath. I plead not guilty. I have been keeping the seventh day for four and one half years. I have found out that the Bible says that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath. I obey the laws of the land, but when they conflict with the laws of God I obey the laws of God; and when they do not, I obey the laws of the State. The Bible 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, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: 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." The State says the first day of the week is the Sabbath. God created the heavens and the earth, and when other gods contravene, I obey the God of

22

heaven. I'll read Acts 5:29: "Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 4:19: "But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." I count this a case against me for my belief. I read in Rom. 10:17, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." I believe my Bible; my faith is that the seventh day is the Sabbath, so it is a case about my belief in the Bible. I was born and raised in Rhea County, Tennessee, and have never been in court before. The Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee has decided that it is the commitment of more than one act that constitutes a nuisance. They have only one offense against me.

Henry Burchard's Defense

I will just say to the gentlemen of the jury that I am here before you to-day for working on Sunday. I am keeping the seventh-day Sabbath; that is the reason I am brought before you. Had I not kept the Sabbath of the Lord, I would not be before you. There are other people that carry on the usual vocations of life on Sunday, but are not brought before you. I am brought before you because I keep the seventh day, not because I work on Sunday. The civil law says we shall not work on Sunday, and the law of God says we shall keep the seventh day, and work six. I owe my first allegiance to my God.

I will obey the laws of the land till they come in conflict with the law of my God, then I feel compelled to obey God rather than man. Forty years ago Seventh-day Adventists preached that this thing would come; people said it was not so. They said they would never see in America persecution for conscience' sake. The Adventists based their statements upon the Bible, and you see it is true. I have corrupted no one, I have disturbed no one. No one has said this. God says we shall keep the Sabbath day: "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, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: 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." And I believe what God says. I thank God that I do believe what he says, and that he gives me courage to obey him rather than man. Not that I wish to disobey the laws of the State, I wish to submit to the laws of my country until they come in conflict with the laws of my God. I submit my case to you, gentlemen of the jury.

These simple statements were listened to with intense interest, not only by the judge and jury, but by all in the court room; and they evidently made a deep impression upon all. The men who made these pleas on their own behalf were "unlearned and ignorant;" but the Lord had said, "When they bring you into the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take no thought how or what ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Ghost will teach you in the same day and hour what ye shall say." And again, "I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall be able to gainsay nor resist." No attempt whatever was made to answer these simple, but forcible pleas in behalf of liberty of conscience, though the defendants were all convicted. In passing judgment in the cases, his honor, Judge J. G. Parks, candidly admitted the force of their arguments, the injustice of the law, and the malice of the prosecution. His honor was evidently an unwilling party to what he regards as religious persecution. Only his sense of official duty led him to act the part which he did in these cases. The following is the final judgment of the court as written and furnished to us by Judge Parks himself:—

State vs. Wm. Burchard and Others

In these cases the defendants have been adjudged guilty, after a fair trial by a jury of good men, of violating that day which is

recognized by the law of our State as the Sabbath, and becomes my duty—painful though it be—to pronounce judgment upon the verdict.

While my private sympathies are with the defendant, and while I might go even further and say that I believe they have good grounds for their belief as to the Sabbath, yet this is a temporal, not a spiritual, court. We are not trying the question as to whether a particular belief be right or wrong. The only concern we have is to ascertain what the law is and whether it has been violated. As to the law, it is plain, and it is not only our sworn duty to enforce it, but it is also our duty to encourage respect for all law in general. As individuals, we may each have our own opinions as to the justice of a law, but as public officials, entrusted with its administration, our duty is unequivocal. A coördinate branch of the government is clothed by the people with the law-making power, and when the power is exercised within constitutional limits, the judiciary can do nothing but enforce the law thus enacted. The Supreme Court of this State, whose decisions must be taken as final by the lower courts, has passed upon the law in question and we cannot rightfully reverse the decision.

As an individual, I am moved to say, however, that there is nothing I regard with more concern or solicitude than an encroachment of legislative enactment upon the personal rights of the individual in matters of conscience. That there is a limit in these matters beyond which legislation cannot rightfully go, will be conceded by every man. Where is that limit? This is a question which even the enlightened civilization, it seems, cannot answer. Human laws are of necessity imperfect. One class of individuals will claim that their rights are encroached upon in this way; another, in that way, and so on. This arises from diversity and shades of opinion. These are questions which cannot be settled to suit everybody. In the cases at the bar there is a very large and intelligent part of the people who honestly and conscientiously believe that secular labor on Sunday is a desecration of the true Sabbath, and that this tends to corrupt public morals. That this belief is widely prevalent is fully evidenced by the several laws we have prohibiting various things as tending to desecrate the day. These laws would not exist but for public sentiment in their favor. And it must be conceded that the people who entertain this sentiment are as honest in their belief as are the people who believe in observing a different day. They honestly believe that public morality requires the observance of that day which has been recognized practically by all Christian denominations as the Sabbath, and this is the purpose of the legislation on this subject. As to the constitutionality of this legislation, grave doubts are entertained by many who adhere to Sunday as the Sabbath. While

every man is guaranteed the right to worship as his conscience dictates, and while no law respecting the establishment of religion can be passed, yet this has always been interpreted to mean that no particular creed or form of religion shall be prescribed, and the Church and State shall remain divorced. All our laws recognize Christianity in general as the basis of our civilization, and laws for its protection have always been regarded as in keeping, not only with the Constitution, but also with public policy. Sunday is, and for a long time has been, recognized by nearly all Christian denominations as the Sabbath, and it is for this reason, no doubt, that the law which protects that day has been acquiesced in as constitutional. It has not been regarded as a law which prescribes any particular belief, but as one which protects the unanimous belief of nearly all Christian denominations.

But here we have a very respectable element of Christian believers who are honest, inoffensive, law-abiding people in all matters not conflicting with their sense of duty, who believe they are under divine command to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. As a matter of abstract, individual right can they be required to observe another day also? Their position is not that of a person who claims that as a matter of personal liberty he has the right, if he chooses, to run an open saloon on Sunday, or to do any like act. That is not a matter of conscience—this is. They claim that it is not only their right, but their duty under divine command to observe the seventh day. Calling them "cranks" is no argument and has nothing to do with the question. If there were only one of them he would be entitled not only to his honest belief, but to the exercise of that belief, so long as in so doing he did not interfere with some natural right of his neighbors. A man cannot kill another and excuse himself on the ground that he believed he was carrying out God's will in so doing, because this would deprive his victim of a natural right, viz.; the enjoyment of life. Do the defendants in keeping the seventh day and working on the first, thereby interfere with any natural right of their neighbors? Or is it an artificial right created by human law? Has any power but the divine will the right to establish any one day as the Sabbath? If the day has been appointed by divine edict, but two or more persons honestly and conscientiously differ as to what day was appointed, can the dispute be settled by legislative enactment? And shall one be given rights which are denied the other? Does might make right, and have the majority the right to dictate in matters purely of conscience? These are grave questions upon which no opinion is now ventured. But in this country, which we proudly call free, and to which our fathers came to escape religious persecution and to establish a government which would wipe out every vestige of religious intolerance, we cannot be too careful to guard with jealous care the cherished rights of freedom of

opinion not only in matters affecting conscience, but in politics and in all sociological relations of life. I have serious doubts as to the justice of the law, but the remedy is not to be found in disobeying it, but in having it repealed. Fine defendants \$2.50 each, but suspend judgment.

This opinion does credit both to the head and to the heart of Judge Parks. As might be supposed, it made a profound impression upon those who heard it, and public sentiment in the town of Dayton is decidedly against the persecution of the Adventists. Some difficulty was experienced in securing juries because of the unwillingness of men to sit in these cases. All the papers in the town have spoken plainly and emphatically against the prosecution of such cases. But the officers of the law have under the laws of Tennessee no option in the matter. The fault is not with the officials of the court but in the law which makes it possible for irresponsible and unprincipled men to use it to oppress and harass those who differ from them in religious opinion and practice.

The costs in each of these cases amount to about twenty dollars, and this the defendants refuse to pay, choosing rather to suffer an unjust imprisonment than to pay an unjust fine. The State of Tennessee has taken them from their homes and from their work for no just cause and they simply submit to the powers that be, but refuse to become parties in any degree to the iniquitous proceeding by the payment of a fine. Of course the imprisonment of Elder Colcord and Professor Colcord resulted in the immediate closing of the Graysville Academy for an indefinite length of time and the students, some of whom were ready to graduate, are again scattered to their various homes. It is thus that religious intolerance, operating through an unjust and oppressive law, arrays itself in Tennessee against education, progress, and liberty of conscience.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 12 , p. 96.

WE give elsewhere in this paper under the head of "More Religious Persecution in Tennessee," some account of the closing of the Graysville Academy through the enforcement of the Tennessee Sunday law. We hope that no reader of the SENTINEL will omit this article, for the facts given are intensely interesting, and everybody ought to be familiar with them. Especial attention is called to the judgment in the cases as rendered by the Court.

THE work done by the Adventists at Graysville was not of a noisy or offensive character, nor was it done in a manner that ought to have been offensive to anybody. Seventh-day Adventists are quiet, peaceable people, and are willing to go more than half way for the sake of peace; but they are not willing to surrender their consciences to anybody, hence the persecution which they are called upon to suffer.

FOR the Adventists to obey the Sunday law of Tennessee which demands that they shall keep Sunday, would be to render homage to an institution which is opposed to the Sabbath of the Lord. The law of God requires the keeping holy the seventh day. Not only does it forbid work upon the seventh day, but it clearly establishes a distinction between that day and all other days of the week; and this distinction all must respect who would obey the divine law. To keep two days would, to the Adventist, be the same as for the loyal soldier to pay equal respect to the flag of his country and to the banner of a rebel prince in rebellion against his sovereign. The Sabbath is set forth in the Scriptures as a sign that God is the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and that he is the sanctifier of his people. The Sunday is set forth by the papacy as the badge or sign of its authority or power to change the law of God, and to command men under sin. To understandingly pay equal respect to these rival institutions is to prove disloyal to the God of heaven, and to put to an open shame Him who declared himself Lord of the Sabbath day. Seventh-day Adventists can go to prison, but they cannot deny their faith and their God.

THE names of the convicted Seventh-day Adventists now in jail at Dayton, Tenn., are: Eld. G. W. Colcord, Prof. I. C. Colcord, M. C. Sturdevant, William Burchard, Henry Burchard, Dwight Plumb, W. J. Kerr and E. S. Abbott. William Wolf was also convicted, but the costs were paid by his father who is not an Adventist, and he was consequently released.

CARDINAL GIBBONS' official organ, the *Catholic Mirror*, published in its issues of September 2nd, 9th, 16th and 23rd, 1893, editorials showing that there is no Bible authority for the Sunday Sabbath; that this institution rests wholly upon the authority of the traditions of the Catholic Church, and therefore the claims of Protestants "to any part therein" was declared "groundless, self-contradictory, and suicidal."

Seventh-day Adventists have always taught that the Sunday Sabbath institution is a papal institution and the mark of the papal

apostasy, and that this attempt change of the Sabbath is predicted in the Scriptures. Hence, when these articles appeared, Seventh-day Adventists published them with appropriate comments as a confession from papists themselves to the charges of the inspired prophets, and circulated more than half a million copies. They were also published in pamphlet form by the *Catholic Mirror*, and run through five editions.

Although the articles close with a defiant challenge to Sunday-keeping Protestants to reply, no society or denomination has attempted an official reply. However, what purports to be a reply has been issued by the "Advent Christian Publication Society," a First-day Adventist organization. It is written by a Protestant Episcopal minister. Why he did not get his own people to publish his reply, and why the Sunday-keeping Adventists did not get one of their own member to write this document, is not stated in the pamphlet. However, we publish in this issue a reply to the so-called reply. It is written by one who has been suspended from the ministry by the First-day Adventist Church, for his belief in the divine obligation to keep holy the "Sabbath day according to the commandment." It will pay you to read it.

PENNSYLVANIA is now the Sunday-law-convention storm center of the country. These conventions are manipulated by the *Christian Statesman*. In its issue of March 9, it publishes a set of resolutions passed at one of these conventions held at Altoona, Pa. One purpose of the conventions is to intimidate the Pennsylvania legislature into granting the *Statesman's* demand for an increase of the fine for violating the Sunday-Sabbath from four dollars to twenty-five dollars. The following is a part of the resolution demanding this increase:—

That we approve the plan adopted by the Williamsport convention of petitioning the State legislature to raise the fine for violating the Sabbath law from four dollars to twenty-five dollars; and while we are opposed to rigid enforcement of this law against those who conscientiously keep Saturday as the Sabbath, so long as they do not infringe on the rights of other citizens and of the State itself, we regard their position and methods as allying them with infidels and other opponents of the Sabbath, as hostile to the government of the State and to the government of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This resolution is a most intolerant pretense to toleration, and was forced from the convention by charges that the Sunday-law movement would result in the persecution of Seventh-day observers.

Passing by the charge that keeping and advocating the keeping of the same Sabbath which Jesus and his disciples kept, is "allying them [Seventh-day keepers] with infidels" and making them "hostile" "to the government of the Lord Jesus Christ,"—passing this self-contradictory charge, we come to the expressions "rights" "of the State itself" and "hostile to the government of the State."

What do these expressions mean? They are explained by an editorial answer in the same issue, to a question regarding the burning of Servetus by John Calvin. The editor defends that fiendish transaction by saying that the book regarding the Trinity written by Servetus, was "an injury to the State as well as the Church," and that "the sentence was pronounced and executed upon Servetus as an enemy to the stability, peace and welfare of the country."

Let all seventh-day observers understand that their faithfulness in observing the "Sabbath day according to the commandment," and their refusal to observe Sunday according to the commandment of the "man of sin," the "mystery of iniquity," the papacy, places them, in the minds of the Sunday-law crusaders of Pennsylvania, along with Michael Servetus, who was, in the minds of the priests of the established church of Pennsylvania, very properly burned over a slow fire, because he was "hostile to the government of the State."

March 28, 1895

"The Plans of the Papacy" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , pp. 97, 98.

AT the annual banquet of the Carroll Institute in Washington City, February 26, 1895, Archbishop Satolli, Rome's "apostolic delegate" to the United States, spoke "on behalf of Pope Leo XIII.," and in his speech he said that—

The opinion was certainly growing, that we were nearing a most critical point in history; and that, in this country, especially, great problems would soon demand positive solution. All the horrors of a social revolution were predicted by men as renowned for accurate and calm thinking, as Prof. Goldwin Smith and Prof. Von Holst. The apostolic delegate held, with a recent magazine writer, that the Catholic Church alone held the true solution of the terrible problem which lies at the threshold of the twentieth century; and that it belongs to the pope alone to pronounce a social *pax vobiscum*.—
New York Sun, Feb. 27, 1895.

The papacy "can see what is to be." She sees approaching, the time of commotion and upheaval and revolution which careful

thinkers also see; which cause statesmen to be uneasy, and which are making rulers to fear: and she proposes to take advantage of it all to exalt herself once more to the place of supremacy among the nations and over their peoples. This is her own definitely laid-out plan, and to know it, is important. She likewise knows that the United States is leading the world, and that this country will therefore necessarily have a leading influence in shaping the solution of "the terrible problem;" consequently, she proposes to control the United States, and through this solve the problem to her satisfaction. Therefore the word from Rome is that—

The United States of America, it can be said without exaggeration, are the chief thought of Leo XII. in the government of the Roman and universal Catholic Church. . . . A few days ago, on receiving an eminent American, Leo XII. said to him: "The United States are the future; we think on them incessantly." . . . This ever-ready sympathy has its base in the fundamental interests of the holy see; in a peculiar conception of the part to be played, and the position to be held, by the church and the papacy *in the times to come*. The interest is the necessity in which Rome finds she is, to direct her general course according to *the signs of the times* and the transformations on the agitated surface of the world. . . . What we do know is, that *a world is in its death-agony*, and that we are entering upon the night which must inevitably precede the dawn in this evolution. The church, in the eyes of the pope, has a mission to fill.—*Letter from Rome, in Catholic Standard, Philadelphia, Pa., Nov. 3, 1894.*

Has not the papacy had experience in just this course of things? Has not the papacy seen, practically, the world once in its death agony? The Roman Empire, in its greatest day, was practically the world as the world then was—all civilization was within its limits, and was under its control. She saw that mighty empire, "the sublimest fabric of human greatness ever built by man,"—she saw it go to pieces, and universal anarchy reigning amid the ruins.

Thus as the world then stood, and as it then was, she saw the world in its death agony. And out of that death agony of the world she exalted herself to the supremacy over kingdoms and peoples that she held in the Dark Ages, and by which she cursed the world so long.

She sees the same elements again permeating society and States, the same movements again agitating the nations, and she congratulates herself and exclaims: "Out of the death agony of the world before, I drew life and vigor to myself; upon the ruins of society once, I rose to supremacy over all—I will do it again. Thus it was

demonstrated to all the world in that day that I was superior to all earthly things; and so will I again and in this day demonstrate to all the world—large as it is—that 'I am, and none else besides me.' 'I shall be a lady for ever.' 'I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow.'"

This is her scheme, and this is her tone in view of the bright prospects on every hand that her scheme will succeed. And her scheme will certainly succeed. For not only is it true that the papacy is described as "A king of impudent face, and understanding deep schemes" (Dan. 8:23, Jewish Translation): that "It is impossible to deny that the polity of the church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom;" and that "The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection that, among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place" (*Macaulay's Essay, Von Ranke*); not only is all this true, which of itself would strongly presage the success of her openly announced scheme, but the "sure word of prophecy" has plain foretold that her scheme will succeed. For thus it stands written: "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him [the beast, the papacy], whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13:8. And "she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously," saying "in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." Rev. 18:7.

And just then, and "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine: and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her. And the kings of the earth, who have committed fornication and lived deliciously with her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning, standing afar off for the fear of her torment, saying, Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come." Verses 9, 10. All this shows as plainly as need be, that Rome's scheme, as mapped out and published by herself, is certain to succeed, *so far as the world and worldly power is concerned*; and that her certain triumph that far, *is to bring her certain ruin* for evermore. For it stands written: "A mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found *no more at all*." Verse 21.

Such is the course, the success, and the end, of this scheme pertaining to the papal "social *pax vobiscum*" for America and the world. And at this time, and in view of these things, there is heard "another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." Rev. 18:4, 5. "My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord." Jer. 51:45.

"Come out of her, my people," saith the Lord. Reader, are you completely out of Babylon? Is your name in the book of life

98

of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world? Have you thus a sure shelter from the terrible storm, and salvation from the utter ruin, that hasteth greatly? "For the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand;" "even the voice of the day of the Lord." "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him." "Behold, I come quickly: and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."

**"Religious Persecution at Graysville, Tennessee" *American Sentinel*
10, 13, p. 98.**

THE eight convicted Adventists have now been in the Rhea County jail at Dayton since the afternoon of the 8th inst. Owing to the kindness of Sheriff Darwin, they are not confined in cells but occupy two rooms in the front of the jail on the second floor. These rooms are not clean, but they are light and are not *offensively* dirty. Each room contains two fairly comfortable double beds. The Adventists also have the freedom of the building and the jail yard. One of their number is permitted to carry water for drinking from a spring some distance from the jail, so that they are not compelled to use the water from the contaminated well in the jail yard. Their food is not hygienic but might be worse. They are allowed to receive visitors at their pleasure, and so, as jail life goes, they have much for which to be thankful.

But while their imprisonment is not rigorous, it is imprisonment. They are deprived of their liberty. They suffer the indignity of being counted criminals, and enemies of the State. They are taken from their homes and families, and from their business which necessarily suffers during their absence. Three of the families are left almost penniless. One of the prisoners, who has had but little work for

months owing to the hard times, was compelled to leave his wife and seven children with good in the house for only a few days. Two other families, while not so large, are scarcely less needy. The husband and father is taken away, and so far as the State is concerned, the wife and children are left to beg or to starve—and for what offense?

The sole offense of the Adventists was exercising their God-given right to labor six days for their daily bread, after having kept the Sabbath according to the divine command. They interfered with no one. They harmed no one. They could in all good conscience say, in the language of the Apostle Paul: "We have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man." They are guilty only of practical dissent from the religion of their neighbors; and it is for this that they are imprisoned in the State of Tennessee, in the United States of America in the closing decade of the nineteenth century!

The closing of the Graysville Academy is a peculiarly sad feature of the persecution at this place. A more unselfish work is seldom undertaken than was the founding of this academy. As stated last week, Elder Colcord had put all his means into this school, not for the purpose of making money, but in order that he might do good to his fellow-men, that he might be enabled to fit the children of his brethren and of his neighbors for usefulness here and for happiness hereafter. But because he permitted the inmates of the Students' Home to work on Sunday, to wash their clothes and to saw wood, and to do such other work as is usually done on Saturday by Sunday-keepers while attending school, he is ruthlessly taken from his family, from his home, from his labor of love for the young and for the cause and the God he loves, and is shut up in prison as an enemy of society and of civil order!

Nor are the imprisoned men the only sufferers; as already related, helpless families are left without means of support, and the students of the academy are deprived of the opportunity to pursue their studies. Many of these students have come here from a considerable distance at great expense, that they might enjoy the benefits to be derived from this excellent school. Whole families have practiced economy and denied themselves, that the young people might come to Graysville; and now in close times and at a season of the year when money is usually hard to get, the students are compelled to send to their parents for money to pay their fare home. Then, if the school reopens, there will be the expense of returning again,

amounting in some cases to forty dollars for the round trip. It is thus that the State of Tennessee deals with Seventh-day Adventists boys and girls who are trying to get an education at Graysville Academy.

Public opinion is divided here. The majority and the best people deprecate the persecution. The *Dayton Leader*, the *Dayton Republican*, and the *Daily Times*,—all the papers published in Dayton,—denounce the prosecutions as religious persecution, and demand the repeal of the law. But evil men are plotting further persecution. They are spying upon the Adventists and demanding that additional indictments be found against them, and that they "be compelled either to cease their Saturday-keeping or leave the State." This is the very language in which some of their enemies put it. It is not the Sunday work that offends, but the Sabbath rest. Others work on Sunday and are not molested. The railroad trains thunder through the county and through the village and disturb no one; the furnaces of the Dayton Coal and Iron Company are operated on Sunday as on other days and nobody is offended.

The temper and tone of the press of the county is shown by the following from the *Daily Times* of Sunday, March 10:—

The Adventists in Prison

The *Times* man visited the jail yesterday and found the Adventists quartered in the front portion of the jail upstairs, and not in the disreputable rear. They are allowed perfect liberty to come and go about the building. They all appear cheerful under their misfortune and are bearing up well under their burden.

It seems to us that it is really too bad that these people have to suffer when others actually deserving punishment go untouched by the law.

The *Times* suggests some one circulate a petition setting forth the facts in the case, and praying their release, and forward the same to Gov. Peter Turney. We are certain that every person in Dayton would sign it.

This is simply a sample of the utterances which have appeared in all of the Dayton papers. But it matters not what the papers say nor even what the people say so long as the present Sunday law is upon the statute books of Tennessee. Any bigot may set the machinery of the law in operation and better men be his victims.

"Woman's National Sabbath Alliance" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , p. 98.

IN this city, February 7, "The Woman's National Sabbath Alliance" was organized. A part of the pledge of the alliance reads as follows:—

We . . . do hereby pledge ourselves to resist by precept and example whatever tends to undermine Sunday as a day of rest and worship: such as the Sunday secular newspapers, Sunday concerts, Sunday social entertainments, Sunday driving and traveling for personal gain or pleasure, and we further pledge ourselves to use our influence to create a right sentiment on all aspects of the Sunday question, especially in reference to traffic of every kind on that day.

When we read this pledge of the new organization, we remarked in the SENTINEL that while the ladies were in error as regards the Biblical day of rest, yet they were violating no principles of religious liberty in endeavoring "by precept and example" to influence people to their way of thinking and acting. But since one error logically leads to another, we made the following prediction: "We shall confidently expect to see, ere long, this so-called 'Sabbath Alliance' going the way of the American Sabbath Union in this matter; namely, appealing to the civil law."

We were correct in our prediction, for the very first document issued after the Alliance was organized was entitled, "Address to the Women of America," and contained among other things the following:—

We therefore call upon the women of our beloved and favored land—the land toward which the eyes of all nations turn,—to foster *by every influence in their power*: First, a higher appreciation of *civil laws*, wisely administered, *designed to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship*.

It is also announced in this same address that the headquarters of the Alliance is in the room of the president of the American Sabbath Union, and that its committee will "direct the affairs of the Alliance in co-operation with the American Sabbath Union."

More than this: upon investigation we learn that the Alliance was organized through the efforts of the president of the American Sabbath Union.

The second meeting of the Alliance was held March 11, on which occasion it was announced that "among those endorsing this movement are Mrs. Fuller, wife of Chief Justice Fuller, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Shiras, wife of Associate Justice Shiras," etc., etc. Thus it

would appear that this Alliance has secured the indorsement of the wives of two of our Supreme Court judges in their effort to "foster by every influence in their power a higher appreciation of civil laws wisely administered, designed to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship."

If this be true, there will be no one to act the part of Pilate's wife when these judges shall be called upon to act the part of Pilate in condemning as malefactors innocent Seventh-day Adventists who follow in the steps of their Master in observing the Sabbath of which he declared himself to be the Lord, and performing inoffensive labor on Sunday.

"Papal Confidence" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , p. 98.

THERE is an effort on foot to have the National Government establish a national university at Washington. The *Western Watchman* (Roman Catholic), of March 14, speaks thus of the project:—

A mighty effort is being made to induce the Government to establish a national university. The Government will never do it. The only national university Washington will ever know is the one recently founded in that city by Leo XIII.

It is thus confidently that papists speak of their power in national affairs. So confident are they of their capture of the American Republic that they already speak of their university as the "only national university."

"Right for Once" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , pp. 98, 99.

THE *Christian Statesman* has finally struck a note that chords with truth. We hasten to publish it:—

The London *Christian*, speaking of vagrancy in England, says that in Somerset it has increased within two years from 20,000 to 46,000 cases. The chief constable says he sees no signs of criminality; the

increase comes wholly from men out of work. "A large number," the chief constable adds, "are short-service soldiers, some belonging to the Army Reserve. These men draw their deferred pay in a lump on leaving the army, go on 'the spree' with it, and at once and forever enter the destitute class. A few years ago the *Daily News* showed how the short service term was making the paupers and crowding the southern counties with them." "And now," exclaims the

Christian, "ye secretaries of Boys' Brigades and ye ministers and officers of the same, when ye admit 16,539 boys taken with your guile! and only 2,102 with your Bible classes!! are you not whetting the boys' appetite for at least a short service term in an army somewhere?" We cordially indorse this protest. The Boys' Brigade movement is a singular admixture of the military and the religious spirit, and as such deserves the opposition which the friends of peace have been offering to it.

We hope our contemporary will hold to this truth,—that you can't make a boy a Christian by teaching him military tactics; and that this may lead to an understanding of kindred truths, one of which is that you can't make a man a Christian by law.

"Church or Jail" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , p. 99.

UNDER the heading "Church or Jail," a contemporary publishes the following unusual facts regarding the action of a Rockford (Ill.) judge:—

Police Magistrate Morrison has adopted a unique method of inflicting punishment on offenders. Two prisoners, one convicted of drunkenness and one of beating his wife, were sentenced Tuesday morning and the court suspended their sentences so long as they attend church regularly.

One is in doubt as to the object the judge had in view in this extraordinary proceeding. Does he regard church-going as a punishment, or as a means of reformation, or both? Such proceedings, however, are quite in harmony with the decisions of State and Federal judges that Christianity is a part of the common law, and that "this is a Christian nation." The judges evaded a very important question in not designating what church the culprits should attend. It is now in order to decide who are the Christians, and then judges can order convicts to attend the "legitimate and most holy" church.

"Is Massachusetts Hard of Hearing?" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , p. 99.

GOVERNOR GREENHALGE, of Massachusetts, recently addressed a compulsory Sunday observance meeting in Boston, and among other things, said:—

I came here, my friends, as an individual, and I may say, also, as an official of the commonwealth of Massachusetts. I am bound by my oath to support and to execute the laws of the commonwealth, and as one of those laws gives official sanction to

the Lord's day, I am pledged to see, as far as I can, that the day is kept holy. (Applause.)

Massachusetts, kneeling upon the desolate seashore, two and a half centuries ago, heard the thunder of this Sabbath law from Sinai, and wrote it into her statute book. There it is to-day, and, I prophesy, there it will remain forever. (Great applause.)

Here is no mincing matters; no attempt to hide the religious character of Sunday laws behind the "civil Sabbath" mask. The governor proposes to enforce the thunders of Sinai upon all the people. But who delegated the governor to interpret and enforce the divine will? Is he the vicegerent of the Almighty? Is he the Moses of this modern theocracy?

The governor says Massachusetts heard the thunder of this Sabbath law from Sinai and wrote it into her statute books. Massachusetts must be hard of hearing. What is in the statute books is not at all like the thunderings of Sinai. The Massachusetts statute requires the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, while the Sinaitic law says "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." However this is as near the truth as any self-constituted representative of God ever gets.

"Congress Has Ruined Sunday" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , p. 99.

THE makers and preservers of the "American Sabbath" are in trouble. In 1892 they forced from Congress the first legislation in the history of the nation touching Sunday sacredness. It was the fruits of a long and bitter fight. They had secured State recognition of the Sunday Sabbath, but to make the "American Sabbath" complete, it must be sanctioned by the national legislature. Congress yielded, and the "American Sabbath" was finished. When the final vote was taken, the "Christian lobbyists" in the gallery arose and amid great rejoicing, declared, "Now we've got it." Congress had made them a Sabbath, and they were happy.

But now Congress has spoiled the "American Sabbath;" utterly ruined it. It held business sessions all day Sunday, March 3, and thus desecrated what a preceding Congress had sanctified. Of course the Sunday-law people are angry. But what can they do? "Turn the rascals" out, of course, and vote in another Congress that will reestablish the sanctity of the "American Sabbath." The following is one of the resolutions passed with this end in view, by the eastern

Pennsylvania conference of the United Evangelical Church at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., March 7:—

Resolved, That we are deeply grieved by the godless action of our National Congress in having Sunday sessions and consider it an insult to this Christian nation, whose representatives they are, and hold that if any of the men who are guilty of the above offense should at any time seek the suffrage of their fellow-citizens for offices of public trust, every Christian should deem it his duty to oppose them by voice and ballot.

If all these Sunday-law people would exchange their man-made Sunday Sabbath for the "Sabbath of the Lord," a day sanctified by the Lord himself and which does not depend on human law for its holiness, they would not have to spend their time making a Congress to make and preserve the "American Sabbath."

"Christian Unity' a Sham" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , p. 99.

THE following letter regarding the so-called "Christian Unity" movement, of the Bay Cities, Mich., published in the *Bay City Times-Press*, of March 8, will be of interest to those who are watching the movement in these cities, which has for its object the union of Protestantism and Catholicism. The letter is written by Rev. C. H. Irving, a Baptist minister:—

Rev. H. J. Johnson, Secretary Bay City Ministerial Association—

My Dear Brother: Through you I wish you present my withdrawal from the Ministerial Association of the Bay Cities.

For my brother pastors I have the sincerest regard and have always enjoyed the Christian fellowship manifested at our gatherings. Since it has seemed wise, however, for the association to enter into a movement inappropriately called "Christian Unity," I deem it consistent with my convictions and honor as a Christian and a Baptist to have no further connection with the association.

While I would regret to question the motives of my brethren who have thrust this matter on the association, yet I do regard it as very unwise and disloyal.

As far as I am personally concerned, there can be no fellowship between Roman Catholic clergymen and myself. I certainly would not occupy the position I do for a moment if I did not believe that the Roman hierarchy was corrupt from root to branch.

If I did not believe that Catholicism was injurious to its followers and one of the greatest enemies to our nation, that its teaching is idolatrous and ruinous; that it practically ignores the plain teachings of God's Word, whatever its claims are to the contrary; that it is the determined enemy of free speech, free schools and soul liberty,—if I

did not firmly and with substantial reasons believe these things, then I would step down and out of the pulpit.

Personally I could not be loyal to my Catholic fellow-citizens, to my convictions as a Christian minister, to the Word of God as interpreted by the Holy Spirit, to the flag of my country, or to the trust committed to me by my God, if I did not preach the truth about the errors of Roman Catholicism, and do so fearlessly, fully, and in love.

It cannot be possible that the brethren are ignorant that the "Christian Unity" movement so-called, is a sham. If so, let them read "St. Mary's Parish Messenger," January, 1895, page 5. Speaking of how the Protestants rally to the support of their churches, it concludes by saying: "See what is done to keep up error and heresy; see how a false religion is supported." This article is signed by "Your Devoted Pastors." This is the second act in the "Christian Unity" movement, and I am confident that a discerning public will await with no small interest the third and final act in this farce.

Fraternally, C. H. IRVING.

One of "Your Devoted Pastors" here referred to is Jos. Schrembs, pastor of St. Mary's Catholic Church, and one of the priests connected with the "Christian Unity" movement. It would appear that while he was engaged in public love-feast demonstrations with Protestant ministers, he was telling his people that the religion of these ministers is "error and heresy," "a false religion," etc. While the "Christian Unity" movement put padlocks on the Protestant ministers' mouths, so that they dared not preach Bible truth regarding the papacy, the priest continued to tell what he believed to be the truth about Protestantism. No man can preach the gospel without offending the papacy. The Protestantism of to-day is on better terms with Roman Catholicism than formerly, but it is because it has compromised the truth. There can be no true love manifested in a movement which compromises the truth of the gospel. A true Protestant will tell the truth about Roman Catholicism in love, even though it cost his life, but he will not compromise with the "mystery of iniquity."

"Before Conscience Is Law" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , pp. 99, 100.

THE Baptist *Examiner*, of this city, is making a noble fight against religious intolerance. In its issue of January 31, it said: "There is a 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 act accordingly. Others mistake religious toleration for liberty." Referring to the persecution of seventh-day observers for laboring on Sunday, the *Examiner* further says, "In not a few States religious liberty is grossly, wickedly, infamously violated through abuse of what are called the Sunday laws." After narrating a few of the cases of persecution in the States of Arkansas, Tennessee, Maryland, Georgia and Pennsylvania, the editor continues:—

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 [Dr. Wayland] 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 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

100

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.

Later Dr. Wayland introduced a similar resolution in the Philadelphia Baptist Monday Conference, with the result that it passed that body. Against this noble stand of the *Examiner* and Dr. Wayland, a number of Baptist papers have protested, among them the *Nashville Baptist*, the *Alabama Baptist*, the *Canadian Baptist*, and *Messenger and Visitor* (St. John, B.C.). We wonder that any *Baptist* could defend or excuse these persecutions. Our readers who know the history of the struggle of Baptists for "soul liberty," and how sacredly they have held the rights of conscience, and how often they have refused to obey human law when that law conflicted with conscience, and have meekly taken the consequent flogging, imprisonment, banishment, and even death, will be interested to know how these Baptists defend what the *Examiner* calls a gross, wicked, infamous violation of religious liberty.

Here is a sample from the *Central Baptist* (St. Louis), which appeared in its issue of February 7. The heading of the article is, "Philadelphia Letter," and the writer is G. J. Burchett:—

"Religious Liberty.

This was the live topic which came before the conference on Monday. Dr. H. L. Wayland introduced the subject by the following resolution:—

"Resolved, That we request the Pennsylvania legislature to enact such a law as shall prevent the violation of religious liberty in the person of citizens who, having conscientiously observed Saturday as a day of rest and worship, engage on the first day of the week in quiet labor not interfering with the worship of their fellow-citizens."

On the fact of it, this resolution is very taking with Baptists. In connection with this we feel that we have a glorious record, and we can afford to grow eloquent on this topic. The world owes us a great debt for the battles we waged and the victories we gained. We were the advocates of this when we stood alone. We are not alone now: others have joined us; we have plenty of religious liberty, such an abundance that the dangers seem to be that one may do most as he wills if only he pleads the rights of conscience in religious matters. The world has heard of our liberty and has come to spy it out. True, they have brought along some uncomfortable weapons; and Mormondom has sprung up among us, and means to share our liberties.

The discussion of this topic brought out the fact that there are persons known as "Adventists" who defy the Sunday laws of many of our commonwealths and make special efforts to get themselves arrested and then cry, "religious persecution." Probably this is not confined to Adventists. It is plain to be seen that the question of religious liberty is not before us now as once it was: and the Lord is surely raising up some prophet who shall call upon us to remember that *before conscience is law*. And probably our next great conflict will arise out of this very question as to whether the law of the land shall be obeyed, or every one shall do as he pleaseth, "for there was no king in Israel."

As we read this we seem to hear not a descendant of Roger Williams or Elder Holmes, but the voice of Cotton Mather as he defends the persecution of Baptists. A favorite argument is to charge that the persecuted court persecution. This was the charge made by Mather against the Baptists. Oh, no, "the question of religious liberty is not before us now as once it was." It was quite different then. Then

we were persecuted: now we are the persecutors. While we are loth to say it, it is nevertheless the fact that the Baptists of the South are the leaders in this persecution of seventh-day observers. The infidel smiles in contempt at the acrobatic agility with which the persecuted Baptist turns into a persecuting Baptist, and as he turns from this Christ-dishonoring performance, he remarks: "I told you so; he howls vociferously about persecution, but give him the power and he will treat his dissenting brother to the same."

Yes, there has arisen a prophet in these days among Protestants, and he is having a strong following from Baptists, and his message is "that before conscience is law." But he is not from the Lord, for the Lord says through the Apostle Peter, when human law conflicts with conscience, "we ought to obey God rather than men." However, the Lord speaks of this prophet in Rev. 19:20, but he calls him a "false prophet." In the 13th chapter the same power is brought to view under the term, "Image of the beast," and he here preaches "that before conscience is law;" and those who refuse to accept this papal doctrine are threatened with death. And that which it is attempted to enforce is the "mark of the beast," or the mark of the papacy. And this is just what those backsliding Baptists are attempting to enforce on Seventh-day Adventists; they are attempting to enforce the papal Sabbath,—Sunday,—which has no foundation in the Scriptures, but which the papacy points to as the sign of mark of its power. Seventh-day Adventists, like Baptists of old, refuse to accept the false doctrine that "before conscience is law," and like them prefer to suffer persecution.

Not only do they refuse to accept this doctrine of the false prophet, but they are sounding the warning of God against this "false prophet" as found in Rev. 14:8-12.

To faithfully give this warning will cost everything, even life itself; but thank the Lord, there is victory at the end.

"And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." Rev. 19:19, 20.

"And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and

over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." Rev. 15:2, 3.

"America and the Vatican" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , p. 102.

SATOLLI is cautiously feeling his way toward the establishment of diplomatic relations between Uncle Sam and Leo XIII. He thinks that the constitutional principle separating Church and State is no barrier. He says:—

It is well to reflect that the holy father enjoys always, in fact and by international right, the prerogatives of sovereignty. In the second place, the separation between the Church and the State (sanctioned by the Constitution), excluded the action of one power over another in civil matters in regard to the Church, and in religious matters in respect to the State, but does not exclude official relations between the one power and the other, unless by separation is meant the inevitable hostility or open wrong of the civil power towards the Church and its ministry. It is also to the point to consider that many nations (although they have in their constitutions the said principle of separation between State and Church), maintain, nevertheless, amicable reports and relations with the holy see, and I can also add that although the holy see has no diplomatic reports with the empires of China and Japan, it has certainly found no official obstacle in their diversity of religion.

But the condition of the Catholic Church in the United States in whose Constitution was inserted the article of separation of the State from any religious sect, cannot escape our consideration, I might almost say a sense of surprise; if up to date no official relations exist between the Government and the holy see, it is because the great majority of the population is anti-Catholic. In the meantime the church here is attaining possibly greater developments and liberty than in other States.

There was a time when diplomatic relations with the Vatican would have been impossible, but since the Supreme Court has declared that "this is a Christian nation," it is logical that this "Christian nation," should, like such "Christian nations" as Spain and Portugal, establish diplomatic relations with the "sovereign pontiff."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 13 , p. 104.

THE *Dayton Republican* says it is rumored that more Seventh-day Adventists have been indicted by the grand jury of Rhea County, Tenn.

THE compulsory Sunday-observance crusade has become so universal that it is impossible to notice all the conventions held and the legislation perfected and proposed in its interests.

IN view of the fact that the Senate of Massachusetts has passed a bill prohibiting "sacred concerts" on Sunday, special attention is called to the editorial from the *Boston Traveller*, which appears in this used-page 101.

THE London branch of the International Tract Society, whose manager was recently fined \$19 for permitting work to be done at the society's office on Sunday, was notified on the 15th inst., that unless the fine was paid by the 21st inst., the property of the society would be levied on to collect it.

MORE information is furnished this week regarding the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists at Dayton, Tenn. Let no reader of the SENTINEL forget for a day that a number of honest men are imprisoned at Dayton, Tenn., for performing inoffensive labor on the first day of the week after they had "rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment."

THOMAS DIXON JR., has for six years held the position of pastor of the Twenty-third Street Baptist Church of this city. A few weeks ago he resigned, and has since established an independent church. In his letter of resignation he announced that he would establish a church "to proclaim this as the hour in which the gospel of Jesus must have its special fulfillment, if society be saved from anarchy. That the State is even now the outline of the kingdom of God, being the only organ through which the people can act as one man in the pursuit of righteousness. . . . That political action is a sacrament." We see no reason why Mr. Dixon should have to start a new church in order to proclaim this doctrine. The Presbyterian Church indorses Dr. Parkhurst who teaches this doctrine. The Christian Endeavor Society, as a body, has commenced to act on these ideas. The National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union teaches all this. The Baptist Church is fast accepting this doctrine, one evidence of which is its indorsement of the work of the "Civic Federation" movement; and another, the fact that it is

beginning to teach that "before conscience is law," thus putting the State, managed by the preachers, in the place of God. This is an old doctrine, as old as the papacy, and we know no reason why Mr. Dixon could not have connected himself with that organization. But against this, *the error of our time*, we quote the words, "My kingdom is not of this world."

THE following is from the opinion of Judge Parks, rendered at the trial of the Seventh-day Adventists who are now in jail at Dayton, Tenn., for doing common labor on Sunday:—

"Do the defendants in keeping the seventh day and working on the first, thereby interfere with any natural right of their neighbors? Or is it an artificial right created by human law? How any power but the divine will the right to establish any one day as the Sabbath? If the day has been appointed by divine edict, but two or more persons honestly and conscientiously differ as to what day was appointed, can the dispute be settled by legislative enactment? And shall one be given rights which are denied the other? Does might make right, and have the majority the right to dictate in matters purely of conscience?"

The American *people* must answer these questions, and upon a correct answer hangs the destiny of civil and religious liberty in America and the world.

BISHOP MCGOVERN, of Harrisburg, Pa., has given out an open letter addressed to the legislature of Pennsylvania, criticising the action of the House in passing a bill prohibiting the wearing of a distinctive religious garb by teachers in the public schools of that State. The bishop predicts the speedy triumph of his church over all her enemies in this country and refers to her triumphs in Europe in the following boastful manner:—

Bismarck, of the iron hand, in our time, but with a manly chivalry which recoiled from stripping the religious of their dress, yet drove them out of the schools, hospitals and asylums, and expelled them from their homes, kindred and native land, and in the floodtide of persecution, when cautioned against resorting to these extreme measures, in the self-confidence of a tyrant, he boasted that he would not go to Canosa. Yet he did go, and paid homage to the power he had defied, and returned, but not with the penitential spirit of Henry the Fourth, and was hurled from office and now molders in obscurity. The Emperor of Germany seats at his right hand Cardinal Ledochowski, whom Bismarck expelled from his see in Posen, and with royal munificence, presents him with a gold snuff-box, set with jewels, from which the cardinal, from time to time, gives a pinch of Roman snuff to wake up the sleepy ex-chancellor.

The religious in their garb are returning back to Germany and doing business at the old stand; a Catholic, for the first time in the dynasty of the Hohenzollerns, is chancellor, and poor Bismarck, as his last resort, has the privilege to make snoots at him in the dark. The irony of fate. We are all aware of the savage barbarities—priests hunted down like wolves, forfeiture, imprisonment, death, quartered and scored—which were meted out to Roman Catholics in England and Ireland for three hundred years; but to-day a Roman cardinal holds the place of honor on state occasions, next to the heir apparent to the throne.

How unlike the Master is this defiance, and how it argues the tyranny of the church when she finally conquers as she surely will.

AMS shown by our first article Rome thrives on the ruin of nations. She must therefore observe with pleased anticipation the growth of mobocracy in this country as manifested during the last few days. With murderous mobs defying the civil authorities of Louisiana and Colorado, and the civil authorities themselves in the person of the Indiana legislature reïnacting the scenes of the French Revolution, it would appear that the Republic is fast drifting toward ruin. Bishop McGovern, of Harrisburg, Pa., says, in the *Johnstown Tribune* of March 7: "The Catholic Church will govern the storm and gather the spoils which their violent impetuosity leaves behind."

THE evening edition of the *World* has invited short contributions treating on the question, "What Shall Our Sunday Be?" The following is one of the contributions which appeared under date of March 21:—

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH MADE SUNDAY

TO THE EDITOR: William R. Jacobs seriously tells the *Evening World's* many readers that in violating the Sunday laws you violate the law of God, by which he means the Bible and the ten commandments, and throughout his letter he calls Sunday the Sabbath. Now for that gentleman's benefit I would inform him that the Sabbath is the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, and was the day kept holy in the old law and by the apostles; it was later on changed by the Roman Catholic Church, and every Protestant who keeps Sunday thereby acknowledges that church to be the true church with the right to make religious laws for the entire Christian world. If Mr. Jacobs doubts me I refer him to the *Catholic Mirror's* challenge to the Protestant world to prove by the Bible or commandments that they were authorized to change the day of rest from Saturday to Sunday, and to the AMERICAN SENTINEL, a Protestant weekly, which has the same challenge in its columns every issue. If Protestants want to know

how to keep Sunday they should ask the Roman Catholic Church, as that body, having made the day, knows best how it should be kept.
P. M'G.

Paterson, N. J.

The writer of this letter is not known to the SENTINEL, but seems to be acquainted with the SENTINEL and with the fact that Sunday observance, as a so-called Christian practice, is solely of papal origin.

April 4, 1895

"The Papal Power and the Impending Political Crisis" *American Sentinel* 10, 14 , pp. 105, 106.

THE Roman Catholic Church declares that the world is on the eve of a great political crisis; and she is right.

The same church further declares that she is the only force in the world that can pronounce the "*pax vobiscum*," that can command peace in the coming storm. Is she right?

We propose to deal with this matter in a most practical way; first, by asking and answering the question, What is the record of the Roman Catholic Church as regards rioting and mob violence?

The church of Rome was born, both as regards doctrine and supremacy, in riot and bloodshed. The councils that established her creed were scenes of mob violence, second only to the French Revolution. ¹³¹

The supremacy of the church of Rome was acquired by the cruel, rapacious destruction of the Herulian, Vandal, and Ostrogoth kingdoms, by such papal champions as the savage Clovis. ¹⁴²

Her creed and supremacy have been perpetuated by violence and bloodshed. One of the many proofs of this statement is found in the murderous marches of Roman Catholic mobs against the Albigenses. We quote from Catholic authority: "Innocent [III.] proclaimed a crusade or holy war, with indulgences, against Albigensian heretics, and requested Philip II., the king of France, to put himself at its head. The king refused, but permitted any of his vassals to join it who chose. An army was collected composed largely of desperadoes, mercenary soldiers, and adventurers of every description, whose sole object was plunder. . . . The war opened in 1209, with the siege of BÉziers and the massacre of its inhabitants. . . . The war lasted many years and became political; in its progress great atrocities were committed. Languedoc was laid desolate and the provincial

civilization destroyed. Peace was made in 1227 and the tribunal of the Inquisition established soon after." ¹⁵³

Another historical event bearing on this matter is the massacre of St. Bartholomew. On this occasion, according to the Roman Catholic historian, Bossuet, twenty-five thousand Huguenots were butchered by Roman Catholic mobs. And the "infallible" pope, Gregory XIII., stamped the approval of the church upon the fiendish act, for "as soon as the news was received in Rome, the canons of St. Angelo were fired, a solemn *Te Deum* was sung, and the pope struck a medal bearing on the one side his own portrait, and on the other a picture rudely representing the massacre." ¹⁶⁴

With these facts and multitudes more that stain the pages of human history and are patent to all the world, the Roman Catholic Church which the Word of God calls the "mystery of lawlessness," ¹⁷⁵ has the brazen effrontery to proclaim herself the one and only available power that can control the lawless in the soon-coming social revolution.

There are those who will attempt to apologize for this lawlessness by saying that it was the result of the times, and that civilization has mollified the church, that the church of to-day, and especially in America, is vastly different from the church of the Middle Ages.

For the benefit of such we will narrow the discussion to the Catholic Church in the United States in 1895. Here and now the church is on her good behavior. Here she is by every means in her power attempting to pose as the author and conservator of both civil and religious liberty, and the only power that can save the country from social and political ruin in the approaching crisis.

But just at the time when she was so eloquently arguing for these pretensions, an event occurred at Savannah, Ga., demanding an explanation. This event was a determined attempt on the part of a Roman Catholic mob to kill an ex-priest by the name of Slattery, who was advertised to speak in that city against Catholicism, February 26. We know nothing of Mr. Slattery. The Catholic Church gives him a bad name, and says the riot was due to this fact; but this does not palliate the crime, nor is it an excuse, for the same mob violence has greeted Father Chiniquy both in this country and Canada, and no attempt has been made to brand him as an immoral man before he left the church.

The following abridged description of the riot is from the *Sun*, which Roman Catholics will not accuse of misrepresentation:—

SAVANNAH, Feb. 26.—For five hours to-night the city was in charge of a mob and on the verge of a religious riot. The entire white military force of the city, except the artillery, was on duty.

There are ten infantry companies in the militia and the Georgia Hussars, the latter being dismounted. The actions of a mob estimated at 4,000, the greater part being Catholics, caused their summons to duty. . . .

For three days it had been apparent that trouble was brewing, because the city was placarded with notices that ex-Priest Slattery and his wife, described as an ex-nun, would lecture here to-night on Catholicism.

Members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians at once took steps to prevent their appearance here. Petitions were circulated asking Mayor Myers to refuse to permit Slattery to appear. . . .

"I cannot stop this man from lecturing," said the mayor, who is a Hebrew, "but I can prevent disorder and I will do so. If the police have not sufficient force to do so, the military will be appealed to. Riot will not be tolerated." . . .

The lecturer had hardly begun before brick-bats and cobblestones began to rain in through the windows. The police had closed all the heavy inside shutters, and this saved the audience from injury, only two or three persons being injured by flying glass. . . .

Before nine o'clock the mob had grown to probably between 3,000 and 4,000 persons. Window after window in the Masonic Temple was smashed. Cries of "Kill him," "Down with Slattery," "Death to the renegade," were heard. Chief McDermott summoned the mayor. . . .

The mob hissed at the police and hooted at their orders to disperse. The military alarm, eleven taps on all fire bells in the city, was sent in. When it sounded the mob derided.

"Bring on your military," some of the leaders shouted. "They can't save Slattery." . . .

The military were deployed so as to drive the mob back and to form a hollow square about the hall. While a consultation between the commanding officers and the mayor was held. Capt. John R. Dillon, one

of the best-known Catholics of the city, tendered his service as a peacemaker.

He brought Vicar-General Cafferty, who is in charge of the diocese in the absence of Bishop Becker, to the scene of trouble. The vicar-general addressed part of the mob:—

"This man Slattery," said he, "can do your church no harm.

"You are bringing disgrace upon your religion by your conduct here to-night. It can meet but with condemnation. I plead with you

to disperse and go home. Don't render it necessary to shed blood here to-night."

A few of those whom he addressed shook the vicar-general by the hand and left, but the majority stood still. Major Maldrem and others urged the mob to disperse, but to no purpose.

Later, repeated attempts were made both to burn and blow up the Masonic Temple where the lecture was held, and all this by the people of the church that claims to be the author and preserver of both religious liberty and public order.

Ever since this lawless occurrence, the Roman Catholic press has labored to explain it, and it is these comments that we wish to notice briefly. All started out to write editorials condemning the outrage, which should accord with the claim of the church as the author and conservator of religious liberty and civil order, but, with one exception, they all, so far as we have read, close with a practical justification of the action of the mob.

The *Monitor* of San Francisco, closes its editorial comment of March 2, thus:—

The trouble is Catholics have been too tolerant and too good natured, and this lesson of Savannah will not be without beneficial results.

Again, under date of March 9, the editor of the *Monitor* replying to the editor of the Redlands (Cal.) *Citrograph*, Mr. Craig, who suggested to Catholics that they should appeal to the civil law for redress and not to violence; after asking Mr. Craig what he would do if some Catholic priest should talk about the Congregational Church as Mr. Slattery does about the Catholic Church, writes thus:—

Why, if you didn't go out and shoot the blackguard in his tracks, is there a man, woman or child in Redlands, Scipio Craig, that would not have the right to call you a coward and poltroon?

Other Catholic papers have advised that instead of appealing to violence it would be better to prevail upon the civil authorities to prohibit such lectures, and others still advise that persons be stationed at the door of the place of meeting to get the names of all who attend, and then they could be dealt with in an appropriate manner later.

As to the responsibility for the mob, the church has been compelled to take one of two positions; either that she did all she could to prevent the violence and failed, or that she connived at or directly incited the riot. It must be evident to all that either position would be damaging to the present plans of the church. If she did all

she could to prevent the riot, it is clearly demonstrated that she cannot control her *own mobs*, and her bid for the job of controlling all the mobs of all the world is made to appear in a most ridiculous light. If she connived at the creation of the mob or directly incited it, then she is the enemy of free speech and the author of mob violence as of old.

She has chosen the first horn of the dilemma, and an official statement has been promulgated by the National President of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Judge J. P. O'Connor, and published in the *Western Watchman* (St. Louis), of March 11, in which it is stated that efforts were put forth to prevent violence. And the *Catholic Review*, of March 9, says that Vicar-General Cafferty addressed the mob, urging them to disperse; but to no purpose, as seen by the *Sun's* account of the riot previously quoted.

The *Catholic Mirror* now comes forward to explain why Vicar-General Cafferty and the Hibernian Order could not control the Catholic mob. In its issue of March 9, the *Mirror* says:—

Protestants cannot understand the excitement among Catholics over lectures like those of Slattery. To the Protestant mind religion means holding a certain set of opinions, but the idea of getting excited about them when they are attacked, and especially of dying for them, is to them inconceivable. Of the Catholic attitude toward the faith they have not an idea. To Catholics, however, the faith is the dearest of all things, and not only is the true Catholic ready to give up his life for it, but at any attack upon it or upon the ministers of his religion, or the saintly women who devote themselves to a religious calling, the indignation is so great that with some, especially Catholics of the simpler sort [like the editor of the *Monitor*], a kind of frenzy ensues, and hence the blind and savage wrath exhibited by the mob at Savannah. Thus some allowance must be made for these good people, who, in hearing the church assailed, were aroused to the same pitch of fury that a loving son experiences when the honor of his mother is besmirched.

And this is the reason why the Roman Catholic Church cannot control her own mobs. But in saying that Catholics exhibit "a kind of frenzy," a "blind and savage wrath," a "fury" when the church is criticised, is to confess that "these good people," including the editor of the *Monitor*, are not Christians. For Peter says of Christ, that "when he was reviled, he reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously;" and in doing this he "suffered for us, leaving us an *example*, that ye should follow his steps." ¹⁸⁶ And Christ himself says:—

Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you. ¹⁹⁷

When Jesus told the truth about the corrupt church of his day, the record states that the Jews were "filled with madness;" ²⁰⁸ and the Lord explained this by saying to them, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth." ²¹⁹ Yes, neighbor *Mirror*, we do understand "the excitement among Catholics."

Thus we find that the Roman Catholic Church in America, in 1895, is true to her nature. That she is possessed of the same "frenzy" that was exhibited in the councils which created her creed; the same "blind and savage wrath" that characterized her conquering marches to universal supremacy; the same "fury" that perpetuated her power by massacring Waldenses, Albigenses, and Huguenots who told the truth about her.

And it is this "mystery of lawlessness," this "lawless one," that was born, reared, and perpetuated through violence, that now confesses that she is unable to control the "frenzy," "savage wrath," and "fury" of her own mobs,—it is *this church* that now declares that she is the only power that can control the mobs of the world, that is, that can pronounce the "*pax vobiscum*" over a world in anarchy.

And now we appeal to the rulers and people of America and the world to turn a deaf ear to the preposterous claims of the "mystery of lawlessness," for God himself being judge, she can neither speak peace to the tempest-tossed soul nor the storm-rent State. And to those who are honestly trusting in her or her daughters for salvation, God says in his infinite love: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." Rev. 18:4, 5.

"Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Matt. 11:28-30.

"The Sunday Law of Tennessee against Natural Right" *American Sentinel* 10, 14 , pp. 106, 107.

THE position of the courts in Tennessee in their relation to the Sunday law of that State, especially as affects observers of the seventh day, is certainly not a desirable one.

In pronouncing judgment upon the Seventh-day Adventists convicted in Rhea County in the recent term of court, Judge Parks said in effect, as published in these columns two weeks ago, that his sympathies were with the defendants, but that he was compelled by his official oath to enforce the law as he found it, and not as he might wish to have it.

In this connection his honor said: "If there were only one of them, he would be entitled not only to his belief, but to the exercise of that belief so long as in so doing he did not interfere with any natural right of his neighbor. A man cannot kill another and excuse himself by claiming that he believed he was carrying out God's will in so doing, because this would deprive his victim of a natural right, viz., the enjoyment of life. Do the defendants, in keeping the seventh day and working on the first, thereby interfere with any natural right of their neighbors, or is it an artificial right created by statute?"

This question admits of but one answer. The exclusive right claimed by Sunday-keepers is not a natural, but an artificial right, created by statute. It does not interfere with one man's right to rest on Sunday because another man does not so rest. The "annoyance" and the "nuisance" is simply mental; it is of the same kind that might be experienced by the Protestant in seeing the Catholic make the sign of the cross, using holy water, or going to mass or confession. The "annoyance" is of the same kind as that felt by the Baptist seeing the pedo-Baptist practicing sprinkling, or *vice versa*. This was virtually conceded by Judge Parks in his summing up of the cases, when he said: "Sunday is, and for a long time has been, recognized by all Christian denominations as the Sabbath, and it is for this reason, no doubt, that the laws which protect that day have always been acquiesced in as constitutional."

In his *dictum* in the King case, Judge Hammond admitted the same fact in the following language: "Sunday observance is so essentially a part of the same [the Christian] religion that it is impossible to rid our laws of it."

This is equivalent to saying that notwithstanding the constitutional guarantee contained in the Tennessee Bill of Rights, the State of Tennessee and its courts have sustained laws giving preference to one form of religious worship over another. The language of Article 1

of the Bill of Rights is: "That no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment or mode of worship." That the Tennessee Sunday law is in violation of this provision, so far at least as observers of the seventh day are concerned, seems clear, and yet the court of last resort has not so held. The reason for this seems to be that individuals have not been considered, but that only organizations have been taken into consideration. In other words, that an individual to have any conscience which the law is bound to respect, must

107

belong to some organization, and that before the law can show any preference for any form of worship, it must recognize some religious denomination and some denominational creed. This idea is certainly foreign to the spirit of American institutions, as it is also to the spirit of the gospel.

Another very pertinent question raised by Judge Parks is as follows: "Has any power but the divine will the right to establish any one day as Sabbath? If the day has been set apart by divine edict, but two or more persons honestly differ as to what day was appointed, can the dispute be settled by legislative enactment?"

His honor did not answer his own question in words, but it admits of but one answer. The question as to which day is the Sabbath is certainly a religious question, and clearly only the Divine Being has any right to say which day he himself appointed, and this he has said in no uncertain language; and it is because of obedience to this command that Seventh-day Adventists are to-day suffering imprisonment in Tennessee.

While perhaps not so designed, Judge Parks' remarks are a fearful arraignment of the Sunday law of the State of Tennessee. In his official capacity and under his oath of office, the judge felt that he could not do otherwise than enforce the law, or that which the Supreme Court has said is the law; but his honor has placed himself upon record, unmistakably, as opposed to such law; and in this he is not alone. There is a strong sentiment in the State against such law, and against religious persecution under color of the law. The question is, Will the lawmakers of the State of Tennessee vindicate the honor of the State by repealing this iniquitous statute, or will they maintain the law as it stands and thus make it possible for irresponsible parties

to oppress honest citizens and drive them from the State by enforcing such unjust law?

"Is Saturday the Seventh Day?" *American Sentinel* 10, 14 , p. 107.

THE *Progressive Farmer*, of Raleigh, Tenn., publishes in its issue of March 19, a very candid editorial entitled, "The Day of Rest." We extract from it the following paragraph:—

The time-keepers and almanac manufacturers doubtless think they have it down right. But it is possible that some smart Aleck has slipped a cog. Certainly we ought to observe the *seventh* day as we are commanded, and if our present Sunday is the *first* day of the week, we ought to get right.

The last sentence states the truth honestly and pointedly, and is deserving of attention. We will start our investigation with the crucifixion. The 56th verse of the 23rd chapter of Luke reads thus: "And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." The next verse, the first verse of the 24th chapter, says: "Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them."

From the above it is evident that the "Sabbath day according to the commandment," in the time of Christ, and as late as the writing of the book of Luke, was the seventh day, or the day *preceding* the first day of the week.

No one will claim that so long as Jerusalem and the Jewish nation were preserved there was any chance of losing the identity of the seventh day or Sabbath.

After the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in A.D. 70, the Jews were scattered to the four winds, and from that day to this, they have been found in every nation under heaven. And nowhere and at no time has there been during these nineteen centuries any disagreement as to which day is the Sabbath or seventh day, among all these millions of scattered Jews. The Jews in China, Russia, Italy, France, England, Australia, and America, all keep the same seventh day. Since the seventh day has been thus providentially and infallibly preserved, it cannot be possible that the first day has been lost. It is impossible to preserve the seventh day and lose the first day. Hence, since our Saturday is the seventh day of the week, "our present Sunday is the first day of the week," and every man, woman, and

child, who is observing the first day, ought, if they desire like the editor of the *Progressive Farmer*, to obey God, to cease keeping the first day and commence "to observe the seventh day as we are commanded."

Let us now view it from another side. Those who keep Sunday, say they do it in honor of the resurrection of Christ, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week. They claim that the practice of keeping the first day originated very early. They also acknowledge that Christian converts from the Jews continued to observe the seventh day, and all who know anything about the history of Christianity know that there was a conflict in the Church as to whether the first day or the seventh day should be observed. Constantine contributed to this controversy by issuing his famous edict in 321 A.D., commanding "that all judges, people of the cities, and artificers rest on the venerable day of the sun." Later the Council of Laodicea anathematized those who observed the seventh day. Could it be possible that the day of the week could be lost when there was a severe controversy as to which was the proper day to observe?

The impossibility of losing a day is made apparent by asking if anyone remembers an instance where a whole family lost the day of the week? There are frequent cases where an individual makes this mistake, but invariably other members of the family will set him right. But should a whole family lose their reckoning their neighbors would correct them. And if a whole neighborhood should lose the day of the week, the adjoining neighborhoods would convince them of the error. Should a whole State or Province err in their reckoning, other State and Provinces would right them. And should all the people of a nation go to sleep, and thereby lose a day, other nations would convince them of their mistake. And should all the people of all the nations of all the world lose the same day (how absurd!), then the God of the universe, who made the Sabbath for man, who blessed and sanctified it at creation's morn, and who recommended its observance in tones of thunder from Sinai's flaming top, while the earth trembled, and who wrote it with his own finger on tables of stone, who gave the life of his only begotten Son to save man from the penalty of its violation, and it from the burdensome traditions of men,—would he not arise in his majesty and announce anew the day of sacred rest?

Is it not a little strange that men are satisfied that Sunday is the first day of the week, the day on which Christ rose,—so satisfied that they will enact laws to preserve it from desecration, and put seventh-

day observers in prison for not observing it, and yet declare that they are not sure but we have lost a day, and therefore we are not sure that Saturday is the seventh day, and that Sunday is the first day?

Let every one who refuses to observe the seventh day as God commands for fear that time has been lost, stop and think what excuse he will give when summoned before the judgment bar of God. When asked why he did not observe the seventh day as commanded, it would devolve upon him to *prove* that the day was *lost*; and in order to prove that the day was lost, he would have to prove *how* it was lost, *where* it was lost, and *when* it was lost. And to prove how, where, and when the day was lost, would be to *find* the lost day, and when the lost day is thus found there is no lost day.

We sincerely hope that the editor of the *Progressive Farmer* and all who are like minded, will not be deceived by the illogical, impossible, unreasonable, and unscientific "lost time" idea.

"Would Not Observe Thursday or Friday" *American Sentinel* 10, 14 , pp. 107, 108.

AN interesting discussion of Sunday and Sunday laws is now in progress in the *Martin Mail*, of Martin, Tennessee. We publish this week a very valuable contribution to this discussion from the pen of Hon. William P. Tolley, an ex-senator of Tennessee.

One contributor, signing himself "Rex," asks a defender of the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists who signs himself "A Friend," the question, If the law enforced the observance of Thursday or Friday, would you obey it? to which "A Friend" answers thus:—

Mr. Tolley, in his article [The Sabbath], condemns our courts for the punishment of Mr. Capps and others for Sunday violation of law. I justified the courts and gave my reason, which was an open violation, both of the law of the land and the law of God, and supported my argument by reference to Rom. 13, which says, "Be subject to the laws that be," etc. "Rex" wants to know if the law said keep Thursday or Friday, would I obey? I answer, no; for that would violate the Word of God.

Every religious bigot that ever beat, banished or burned a brother in the name of Christianity has tried to defend his cruelty by appealing to the thirteenth chapter of Romans. And at the same time every one of them would deny the application of the text to himself as does "A Friend," in case *he* were the victim of a persecuting law.

None but a dishonest or superficial reader can fail to see that Paul exhorts men to obe-

108

dience to "the powers that be" only in temporal matters as between man and man. Verses 6-8 of this chapter plainly teach this. There is no mention of the first four commandments of the Decalogue, which enjoin obedience to God. To say that Paul taught that men should obey laws which conflict with the laws of God, not only contradicts his teaching in this chapter, but it is to say that he taught one thing and practiced another, for he often suffered as the result of violating laws enacted by the "powers that be," which conflicted with the laws of God.

But when "A Friend" says he would not obey a Tennessee law enforcing Thursday or Friday because such a law would violate the Word of God, he admits that the thirteenth chapter of Romans does not teach that a man should disobey God's law in order to obey man's law. In this he admits all that Seventh-day Adventists claim. Seventh-day Adventists declare that the law of Tennessee, which commands the observance of the first day while God commands the observance of the seventh day, is just as much in conflict with the law of God as would be the command of the State to observe the fifth or sixth day (Thursday or Friday) which "A Friend" says he would not obey. And no man can prove that it is not. Why can't "A Friend" and all his friends see it? "Consistency, thou art a jewel!"

"Everlasting Punishment" *American Sentinel* 10, 14 , p. 111.

WE stated in the SENTINEL of March 14 that we did not believe the church dogma of "an eternal burning hell in which sinners writhe in indescribable agony throughout the endless ages of eternity." With this statement in mind a correspondent asks us to explain Matt. 25:46, which reads as follows: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."

Our correspondent will notice that there is a difference between "everlasting punishment" and everlasting "agony," misery, or torment. When the wicked are finally destroyed, it will be everlasting punishment, but not everlasting "agony." Christ promises the righteous "life eternal." Should they afterwards die, they would not enjoy "life eternal." The fate of the wicked is "everlasting punishment" in opposition to "*life* eternal." *Death*, the final punishment of the wicked, will be everlasting. Should they be resurrected at the end of a

million years their punishment would not be everlasting; but if their death is everlasting, then their punishment is "everlasting punishment."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 14 , p. 112.

THREE of the Seventh-day Adventists imprisoned at Dayton, Tenn., on the 8th of March, have served their term of imprisonment and are now at liberty. Three more will be released on the 15th inst., while the other two, including Elder Colcord, will not be released until May.

ON another page we print a petition which is being circulated at Dayton, Tenn., by well-disposed persons of the city, for the release of the imprisoned Adventists. It is addressed to the County Court of Rhea County, a body composed of the justices of the peace of the county. Some of these are known to be in favor of releasing the prisoners, but it is reported that fifteen are in favor of working them in the chain-gang as was done with the Adventists of Henry County a few years ago.

THE *Western Watchman* (Roman Catholic), of March 7, speaks thus of Father Chiniquy:—

Chiniquy, the octogenarian reprobate of Canada, has written a letter to Archbishop Fabre, of Montreal, requesting him to let him alone and to order his priests to let him alone. We doubt if any priest has troubled himself about the surly old sinner; but if any have, we think his request very reasonable. Why can't these officious priests let these old braggart infidels alone? They bring the sacraments into contempt refusing them often to those who want them: and forcing them on those who won't have them. This mad running after impenitent cut-throats and blasphemers is very un. . .

There is enough savagery in this editorial to burn a hundred heretics. And yet they tell us the Roman Catholic Church has experienced a change of heart since her palmy days of the Dark Ages.

THE following extract from the opinion of Judge Parks, rendered at the trial of the Seventh-day Adventists who are now in jail at Dayton, Tenn., for doing common labor on Sunday, presents the injustice of compulsory Sunday observance so forcibly that we wish to keep it prominently before the public:—

"But here we have a very respectable element of Christian believers who are honest, inoffensive, law-abiding people in all matters not conflicting with their sense of duty, who believe they are

under divine command to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. As a matter of abstract, individual right can they be required to observe another day also? Their position is not that of a person who claims that as a matter of personal liberty he has the right, if he chooses, to run an open saloon on Sunday, or to do any like act. That is not a matter of conscience—this is. They claim that it is not only their right, but their duty under divine command to observe the seventh day. Calling them "cranks" is no argument and has nothing to do with the question. If there were only one of them he would be entitled not only to his honest belief, but to the exercise of that belief, so long as in so doing he did not interfere with some natural right of his neighbors. A man cannot kill another and excuse himself on the ground that he believed he was carrying out God's will in so doing, because this would deprive his victim of a natural right, viz.; the enjoyment of life.

"Do the defendants in keeping the seventh day and working on the first, thereby interfere with any natural right of their neighbors? Or is it an artificial right created by human law? Has any power but the divine will the right to establish any one day as the Sabbath? If the day has been appointed by divine edict, but two or more persons honestly and conscientiously differ as to what day was appointed, can the dispute be settled by legislative enactment? And shall one be given rights which are denied the other? Does might make right, and have the majority the right to dictate in matters purely of conscience?"

We are aware that the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that "this is a Christian nation" and cited Sunday laws as one of its sustaining proofs, but we appeal from the Supreme Court of the United States to the *people* of the United States, as did Abraham Lincoln when the Federal Court had decided that the negro "had no rights which the white man is bound to respect." Let the American *people* seriously ponder the vital questions raised by Judge Parks, and remember that upon their answer hangs the destiny of American liberty, and through the influence of America, the liberties of the world.

April 11, 1895

"In Jail for Conscience' Sake" *American Sentinel* 10, 15 , pp. 113, 114.

OUR forefathers sought to lay broad and deep the foundations of religious liberty in this favored land.

Having themselves felt the heavy hand of oppression, they the better understood the value of liberty, and sought by declarations of

rights and by constitutional guarantees to make it sure to all future generations.

The founders of this Government held that rights exist independently of government; that men are endowed with these rights by their Creator, and that they are inalienable.

In harmony with this fundamental principle of our Government, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, the First Amendment to the National Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The constitutions of most of the States of the Union contain similar guarantees of freedom of religious faith and practice: and of these guarantees none is more ample than that contained in Section 3, Article 1, of the Declaration of Rights of the State of Tennessee, which declares—

That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; that no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any minister against his consent; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment or mode of worship.

But notwithstanding this seemingly ample guarantee of religious liberty, persecution for conscience' sake is to-day rife in Tennessee. Three weeks ago we published in these columns a picture of the Seventh-day Adventist academy at Graysville, closed by religious bigotry and intolerance under color of the Sunday law of Tennessee. In this issue we present to our readers a picture of the jail at Dayton, Rhea County, where eight Seventh-day Adventists, including the principal of the closed academy and his first assistant, were imprisoned, March 8, for no other offence than doing ordinary secular work in a quiet and orderly manner, and permitting it to be done upon the school premises, on Sunday.

The indictments under which these men were convicted, were (varying only in names and dates) as follows:—

STATE OF TENNESSEE

Rhea County
Circuit Court, November Term, 1896

The Grand Jurors for the State aforesaid, being duly summoned, elected, impaneled, sworn, and charged to inquire for the body of the country aforesaid, upon their oath present: That Elder Colcord, heretofore to wit on the 30th day of September, 1894, in the county aforesaid, did unlawfully do, exercise and carry on the common avocations of life, the same not being acts of real necessity of charity, on Sunday, to the common nuisance, against the peace and dignity of the State. A . J .
FLETCHER.

Attorney-General.

The following is the warrant for the arrest of Elder Colcord, President of the academy

114

who is an ordained minister of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination:—

STATE OF TENNESSEE

To the Sheriff of Rhea County, Greeting

You are hereby commanded to take the body of Elder Colcord, if found in your country, and him safely keep, so that you have him before the judge of our Circuit Court for the County of Rhea, at the Courthouse in the town of Dayton, on the first Monday in March next, then and there to answer the State on an indictment for violating Sabbath. Herein fail not, and have you then and there this writ.

Witness: C. G. GILLESPIE.

Clerk of said Court at office in Dayton, first Monday in November, A.D., 1894.

C. G. GILLESPIE, *Clerk.*

The "nuisance" charged in the indictment is simply a legal fiction. It is purely mental, and not physical. The annoyance felt is of the same kind that might be felt by a Protestant seeing a Catholic making the sign of the cross, or going to mass or to confession; or that the pedo-Baptist might experience in seeing a Baptist minister immersing candidates for church membership, or that a Baptist might feel in seeing the pedo-Baptist sprinkling infants. It is simply the annoyance of intolerance.

None of the work complained of in these cases was of a nature to actually disturb anyone on account of the noise made by it. In connection with the academy closed by the persecution, was a boarding home under the direct charge of Elder Colcord and his wife.

Here such students as so desired were permitted to board. They paid a certain rate per week for their board and tuition, and assisted in the work of the house, which was shared alike by all in the family. Five days in the week were devoted to school work; one, the seventh day, was observed as the Sabbath-day "according to the commandment;" and Sunday was devoted to such work as is often done under like conditions in other families upon Saturday. The young men attending the school would saw and split wood, while the young women did the washing under the supervision of a matron. It was for permitting such work as this that Elder Colcord was indicted and imprisoned.

Only a single act of Sunday work was proved against Prof. I. C. Colcord, the first assistant, and that was carrying a few boards a short distance on Sunday. What the boards were for was not stated by the witness.

Three of the men were convicted for digging a well on Sunday; one cut some wood, another was seen "pulling fodder" [stripping the blades from cornstalks], while another was arranging some wire netting around a vegetable bed to keep the chickens from destroying it. It was for such heinous(?) offenses that the eight Seventh-day Adventists were imprisoned in a Tennessee jail, March 8, where five of them are to-day.

As our readers well known, Seventh-day Adventists observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, according to the fourth commandment: "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, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: 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." They believe that this commandment not only requires rest upon the seventh day, but that it likewise establishes a difference between the Sabbath and all other days of the week, and that it is a religious duty to respect that difference. Therefore it is with them a matter of conscience not to rest habitually upon two days of the week, because to do so would be to ignore the distinction which God has made between the Sabbath and "the six working days." (Ezek. 46:1). That this is a question of conscience with the Adventists, is admitted by his honor, Judge Parks, before whom the cases were tried, in the following language:—

Their position is not that of the person who claims that as a matter of personal liberty, he has the right if he chooses, to run an open saloon on Sunday, or do any like act. That is not a matter of conscience—that is.

In his defense before the court Elder Colcord said:—

It is a sad feature in human life that we are divided. The saddest divisions that occur are those arising from differences in religious opinion.

My convictions have undergone a change since I was first converted. Then, I believed it was right to keep Sunday—now I know that it is my duty to keep the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord. This thing is a part of my very being. You might just as well think to compel me to take the name of my God in vain as to imagine that I could for a moment consent to any compromise in this matter. The third commandment guards the sacredness of God's name; the fourth commandment guards his sacred day. Many in this house would not let judge or jury come between them and their God in the matter of the third commandment; no more can I in the matter of the fourth. I have no desire to set at naught the laws of my country, or to show disrespect to those who administer them. I honor earthly rulers, but I honor my God more. As I said, the fourth commandment defends God's holy day, and in obedience to that commandment I respect that day, and cannot show a like regard for another day.

This is a religious question. There is nothing in nature that gives rise to the Sabbath except the revolution of the earth upon its axis, but even then we know of the Sabbath only by revelation—only as it is revealed in the blessed Bible. This is therefore a Bible question, and I have a right to argue it from the Bible; and that Book tells me that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord my God, and commands me to keep it holy. This I cannot do unless I treat it differently from all other days; but this the State of Tennessee forbids me to do, and demands that I shall outwardly at least, pay the same respect to another day; but this I cannot do, for I must with the apostles "obey God rather than men." Now I am called to answer for my faith before an earthly tribunal: but I say to the court and jury that there is a time coming when there will be a change, and God, and not man, will be the Judge—and in that Court questions will be decided not by the statute books of Tennessee, but by the law of God.

Not only have I a natural, God-given right to worship my Creator according to the dictates of my own conscience, but I have a constitutional right that ought to be respected by the courts of this State. Section 3, Article 1, of the Declaration of Rights, says, "that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience." No jury, no judge, no court,

according to that law, has any right to come between me and my conscience in any matter whatever. I leave the case with you.

As stated in a previous issue of the SENTINEL, the pleas of all the Adventists were very similar in nature—all defending their right and asserting their duty to keep the Sabbath, and not to show like respect to another day. But in harmony with the decision of the Supreme Court of the State, his honor, Judge Parks, charged the jury that it was not a religious question, but simply a question of law. "What is the law? and has it been violated?" said his honor, "are the only questions before this court." The law, he declared, was that secular work should not be done on the first day of the week, "the Sabbath recognized by the law." Whether or not that law had been violated was a question of fact to be decided by the jury. Of course, as there was no denial on the part of the defendants, the jury had no option but to convict, and the judge had no legal option but to pronounce judgment in accordance with the law, as laid down in the statute books, and as defined by the Supreme Court of the State.

As previously stated in these columns, the judge imposed a fine of two dollars and a half in each case, and then immediately remitted the fine, expressing his regret that he could not also remit the costs, declaring that his sympathies were with the defendants, but that it was his duty to administer the law as he found it, and not as he might think that it ought to be. Elder Colcord and one other of the defendants were convicted on four indictments, two others upon two indictments each: the others upon one each. This makes their terms of imprisonment range from twenty to seventy-six days. One and all refused to pay the costs, because to do so would be to recognize the justice of their conviction and to encourage further prosecution under the same unjust law.

Adventists are not the enemies of law and order. They are as far removed from anarchists as it is possible for men to be. They are in all points not touching their conscientious convictions, a most law-abiding and exemplary people. Their enemies can find nothing against them, except that touching the law of their God. (Dan. 6:5). They are subject to civil rulers in civil things, not from fear, but for conscience' sake; but in all matters of religion they choose to "obey God rather than men." Nor is this an exhibition of religious fanaticism. The principle thus stated is known and recognized by the best and most enlightened thinkers everywhere. In his work on moral philosophy, President Fairchild, of Oberlin College, says:—

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

The Baptists and Quakers of New England acted upon the same principle. They disobeyed the laws which interfered with their religious liberty, and quietly submitted to the penalties imposed upon them; but did not resist the rulers, and the measure of religious liberty enjoyed in this country, to-day, is due largely to their fidelity to principle. Their disobedience of the unjust law, and quiet submission under unjust punishment, witnessed so loudly against injustice and oppression, that men were enabled to see the real principles involved, and were led to recognize them to some degree. When Elder Holmes, the Baptist minister of Massachusetts, was sentenced to pay a fine or be whipped, in 1651, he said:—

I would not give my body into your hands upon any other account, yet upon this I would not give a hundredth part of a wampum-peague to free it out of your hands, and I make as much conscience of unbuttoning one button of my coat as I do in paying the thirty pounds in reference thereunto.

On the same principle the Adventists refuse to pay a single penny. They have defrauded no man, they have corrupted no man, they have offended against no just law; they will not resist when they are put in prison; they will not seek freedom by flight; but they will not become parties to the wicked thing by voluntarily paying money as the price of their liberty; in other words, they will not purchase freedom by the payment of fines.

"The Vital Principle Involved" *American Sentinel* 10, 15 , pp. 115, 116.

THOSE who have read the forgoing article will understand something of the reasons why Adventists suffer imprisonment rather

than keep Sunday. But a few additional facts on this point will not be out of place.

We have already seen that Adventists regard it as a sacred duty to habitually treat Sunday as a secular day, because they understand that the fourth commandment establishes a difference between the Sabbath and the six other days of the week, and requires men to respect that difference. To ignore this distinction between the Sabbath and the other days of the week would be simply to defeat the object of the divine law, and to set up a counterfeit of the divine law, and to set up a counterfeit of the memorial which God has ordained to keep in view the fact that he is the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and the sanctifier of his people. ²²¹

As the Adventists view it, physical rest for man is not the primary object of the Sabbath; for it "was made for man" before the fall, and consequently before man stood in need of rest from wearing toil. Its object was clearly to keep in lively exercise man's loyalty to God as the Creator. The Fourth of July is designed to fan the flame of patriotism in the American breast, and is a finite illustration of the infinite wisdom and purpose of God in creating the Sabbath for man. Viewed from this standpoint, it is plain that the fourth commandment not only enjoins the keeping of the true Sabbath, but likewise forbids rivals and counterfeits.

Every law must show in some way the authority by which it was enacted, and this the Decalogue does only in the fourth commandment. In that precept it is declared that the giver of the law is the Creator of the heavens and the earth. It is this fact that gives the Sabbath its memorial character. The Sabbath commandment is in fact the seal of God's law, as it alone designates the Giver of the law, and states the basis of His authority to require obedience.

In like manner, the Sunday institution is the seal or mark of a rival power. It was anciently the badge of sun worship, the "wild solar holiday of all pagan times." ²³² It was dedicated to the worship of the sun and to the most abominable and revolting idolatries. In modern times it is set forth by the Roman Catholic Church as the badge of her authority, as will appear from the following quotations from standard Roman Catholic authorities:—

Question.—Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

Answer.—Had she not such power she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for

the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority. ²⁴³

Question.—How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

Answer.—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

Question.—How prove you that?

Answer.—Because by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin.

²⁵⁴

Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage [worship] they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Roman Catholic] church. ²⁶⁵

Believing that papacy to be antichrist, and holding the Sunday Sabbath to be the badge of its power, it is evident that with Adventists the observance of Sunday would be equivalent to rendering homage to antichrist,—hence their steadfast refusal to obey Sunday laws, and their willingness to suffer imprisonment, the chain-gang, and even death itself rather than so much as appear to regard Sunday other than a common working day. It is not, as many seem to regard it, simply a matter of a choice of days for physical rest, but is with the Adventists a vital question directly affecting their salvation. These facts show most conclusively that Sunday laws do interfere at least with the religious rights of Adventists by requiring of them a service which they cannot conscientiously render. This is in addition to the hardship of being deprived of one-sixth of the time divinely allotted to them for their work.

But let not the reader of this image for a moment that Seventh-day Adventists render themselves unnecessarily obnoxious to their neighbors by making an unnecessary display of their disregard for Sunday. It is a settled principle with Adventists to do unto others as they would be done by. For this reason they avoid doing on Sunday anything that would be likely to be a real disturbance in the community in which they live; and this they do, whether there is a Sunday law or not, out of regard for their neighbors. They go even farther than required by the Golden Rule, for they do not expect that a like regard will be paid to them, or to their feelings upon the Sabbath. They recognize the fact that they are a minority, and they are willing to suffer any inconvenience or loss to which they may be subjected to for this reason, provided it is not a sacrifice of principle.

Seventh-day Adventists are a sober, industrious, peace-loving people. They are not found in our courts of justice except as they are haled there for violation of the Sunday laws. Their enemies themselves being witnesses, they are in all other respects model citizens; but upon this point they are unyielding. They will not deny their faith nor prove untrue to their principles and to their God.

It is a significant fact that while hundreds, yes thousands, of people all over the land are working on Sunday, many of them habitually, very few of them comparatively are prosecuted; while Seventh-day Adventists are singled out and made the victims of unjust and unequal laws. In Rhea County, Tennessee, hundreds of men are employed on Sunday in various lines of work, but only the Adventists are prosecuted. One man, not an Adventist, was indicted last November, but when his case was called to trial at the recent term of court, the prosecuting witness refused to prosecute the case, and it was promptly thrown out of court, but every Adventist was

116

diligently prosecuted, and promptly convicted. The same condition of affairs prevails elsewhere, and the explanation of the latter is that it is not the Sunday work of the Adventists that offends their neighbors, but their Sabbath rest. As was stated by a resident of Graysville, not long since, the object of the persecution is "to make them quit their Saturday keeping;" and as a resident of Western Tennessee expressed it some years since, "We are not going to have them teaching our children that Sunday is not the Sabbath and that Saturday is."

"The Story Briefly Told" *American Sentinel* 10, 15 , p. 116.

Fines, Imprisonment, the Chain-gang and Death Follow Faithfulness to the Law Of God.

IT is evident that the liberty-loving people of this country are not aware of the extent to which the principles of religious liberty are being violated in the United States, in the persecution of seventh day observers.

Not long since, the facts became known to the Baptist *Examiner*, of this city, and it was led to remark in its issue of February 7, in connection with a brief summary of the cases, that "in not a few of our States religious liberty is grossly, wickedly, and infamously violated."

We are certain that were the facts regarding these cases generally known, there would be thousands whose sense of justice and right would revolt at the injustice now practiced upon an inoffensive, conscientious people, whose only fault, their enemies themselves being judges, is that they observe the seventh day and work the "six working days" according to the commandment of God.

These persecutions began in Georgia in 1878, with the imprisonment of a Seventh-day Adventist by the name of Samuel Mitchell, for the offense of plowing his field on Sunday. Mr. Mitchell's age and feeble health were not able to resist his thirty days' imprisonment in a damp and loathsome cell. He contracted disease from which he died after a lingering illness.

Arkansas followed Georgia in 1884, and perpetrated some shameful crimes against religious liberty and humanity. In most cases the offense was doing common farm labor on Sunday. In some cases the only horse or the only cow was seized by the State to satisfy the fine and costs. In one case a father and son were imprisoned and made to sleep on the bare floor with only a Bible for a pillow. In 1887 the Arkansas Bar Association espoused the cause of liberty and recommended the enactment of a clause in the Sunday statute exempting seventh-day observers. Senator R. H. Crockett, grandson of Davy Crockett, championed the measure in the legislature, and it passed the Senate with but two dissenting votes, both cast by preachers, but in the face of a strong opposition lobby representing the churches of the State. However, notwithstanding the exemption, a member of this church was recently fined for doing farm labor on Sunday, and the case is now pending on appeal.

Tennessee began persecuting Adventists in 1885, and has continued with slight interruptions until now. Respected citizens, born and reared in the State, against whose character there could be found no stain, men whose hairs were whitened and whose forms were bent with the care and toil of sixty winters, were taken from their farms hidden amid the groves of Tennessee, fined, imprisoned and driven in the chain-gang with criminals, and made to work as common felons on the streets of their county seat. It was from this State that the King case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, but terminated by the sudden death of the defendant. Justice-loving citizens of the States, like ex-Senator William P. Tolley, and ex-Governor Porter now United States Minister to Chili, have entered noble protests against these persecutions, but with no

permanent result. The attitude of the popular churches was strikingly illustrated when the King case was before the Supreme Court of the State, and the Attorney-General was prevented by disinclination to prosecute, or from some other cause, from attending court. When this was learned, the Ministers' Association of Memphis called a meeting, and as a result, hired an attorney to appear and prosecute the humble farmer. The white-cap notice and the shot-gun mob have been utilized to intimidate these inoffensive people.

Maryland was the next State to fall in line with the backward march. The first case, that of Mr. Judefind, was tried in 1892, and the accused committed to jail for thirty days for husking corn in the shock on Sunday. The complaining witness was Mr. Rowe, pastor of the M. E. Church of Rock Hall. Since the imprisonment of Mr. Judefind, five of his brethren have been imprisoned in most cases for longer terms, while others have been prosecuted but released on technical blunders in the lower court proceedings. In one case an aged father was spied upon, arrested and prosecuted by his own son, the constable, and, astonishing to relate, imprisoned for setting out tomato plants in his own garden on Sunday.

To illustrate the character and spirit of these imprisoned men, we print below a letter written from jail to Mr. Moon, President of the International Religious Liberty Association, by one of the "criminals":—

Centerville Jail, Centerville, Md., Nov. 28, 1893.

ELDER ALLEN MOON—*Dear Brother:* It is with pleasure I received your kind and most welcome letter. I thank God he is filling our hearts unutterably full of glory and of God. And we know that if our earthly house be dissolved we have a building of God not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. We will not murmur nor complain beneath His chastening rod, but in the hour of grief or pain will lean upon our God. And God has promised to withhold nothing from them that walk uprightly, and he knows our every need better than we do. And how precious are these truths when received in the heart with thanksgiving unto Him who is the author of our faith, and will be the finisher. I know, dear brother, you are suffering with me, for we are knit together in bonds of love. Now, brother, I thank God he let his children have a test of faith and thank and praise his holy name, we do not think strange of the fiery trials which are to try us as though some strange thing had happened unto us, but rejoice inasmuch as we are partakers of Christ's sufferings. 1 Peter 4:12, 13. O, you know, dear brother, just how it is. It is because Christ is working in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure: that is the problem solved.

Now, Brother Moon, I shall close my letter to you as it is about my bed time, and I have been reading and visiting all day, and I feel tired. Do not think the hours go slowly. Why, time is rapidly flying and I want to improve the few precious hours in cheering those that may be cast down. I am daily drinking of salvation's well, and I want every one to come to the fountain. Write soon again. I love to hear and read words from you. I am in no way discouraged, but I am happy in the Lord. I have a precious wife and eleven children, and I have given them all to the Lord. Though shut up in prison from them by the hand of the dragon, I can rejoice still. Pray for me. Write soon.

Your brother in Christ,
I. BAKER.

The last State to join the crusade against the Adventists is Massachusetts. Mr. Gibson, of Everett, Mass., was recently fined fifty dollars and costs, on complaint of the mayor, for selling a half pound of candy to the mayor's spy sent to get evidence against him. His case has been appealed and is still pending.

There have been, in the States named, fifty-three Seventh-day Adventists, convicted of violating the Sunday laws. Thirty of these have suffered imprisonment. The universal testimony of their persecutors is that they are good neighbors, and aside from Sunday work, they are law-abiding citizens.

Seventh-day Adventists have never been prosecuted for an actual disturbance of any person's Sunday rest. Of the hundreds of witnesses against them in the fifty-three cases, only *two* have sworn that they were disturbed by the work. One swore that though he did not see the work done, he was disturbed by the mere *knowledge* that it was being done. The other disturbed witness swore that he was "shocked" on seeing the Seventh-day Adventist hoeing in his field, while acknowledging under oath that at the same time he was so "shocked" with the seventh-day observer's Sunday hoeing, he, with his hired hand, was driving home a cow which they had gone to a neighbor to procure.

The whole situation is thus briefly summed up in a candid statement by Chief Justice Rafin, of North Carolina, in the case of the State vs. Williams:—

"The truth is that it [Sunday labor] offends us, not so much because it disturbs us in practicing for ourselves the religious duties, or enjoying the salutary repose or recreation of that day, as that it is

itself a breach of God's law, and a violation of the party's own religious duty."

"Persecution Long Expected" *American Sentinel* 10, 15 , pp. 116, 117.

THE denomination, five of whose members are now in prison in Tennessee, has long expected to meet these persecutions. This expectation was based upon the "sure word of prophecy." From the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Revelation and many other scriptures, they understood that there would come a time in the history of the United States when the leaders of the people would practically repudiate the great principle of religious liberty, and, papacy like, persecute those who dissented from certain law-enforced church dogmas, especially the doctrine of Sunday sacredness. These positions were taken and published to the world more than forty years ago.

At that time the principles of religious liberty were highly prized, and these predictions were ridiculed as the merest vagaries. However the church continued to teach them, and to declare that as the churches became more worldly and thereby divorced themselves from

118

the power of God, they would lose sight of the great principle of religious liberty and would seek the aid of civil law to force a recognition of the church by enforcing the observance of Sunday. It was thought that this was impossible because of the high importance which Americans attached to the principles of religious freedom. To this it was answered that the people, as they became farther removed from the scenes of the struggle for liberty, would lose its spirit in the effort for material gain. It was also declared that the churches, when transformed from poor, weak, struggling minorities, into rich, powerful, controlling majorities, they would forget the days of their affliction and the principles of liberty of conscience for which they strove, and would themselves turn persecutors.

There are a few who still contend for the principles of religious freedom for which their fathers fought. And these now bear testimony to the indifference to, or the repudiation of, the principles at one time so universally entertained.

The *Examiner*, before quoted, thus expresses its wonder and astonishment at this change of sentiment: "It is amazing how good people fail to understand what are the principles in this matter." And

again: "We wonder that the very stones do not cry out against such wicked travesties of justice: that Christian men do not lift up their voices in protest against this wicked perversion of religion, this insult to the name of Christ. And in particular, why do not Baptists whose fathers stood against the world for soul liberty, make themselves heard when these relics of medieval bigotry and persecuting intolerance are found in our free country?"

Surely a change has come over the people, and it is now impossible to stir them to a realization of the situation, and the sufferers do not hope for deliverance this side of the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven to reap the harvest of the earth. Rev. 14:14-16.

In the meantime Seventh-day Adventists bring no railing accusation against their persecutors. Their attitude toward all concerned is thus expressed in one of their publications:—

"Against those responsible for our persecution we bring no railing accusation. Against the honorable judges of the courts before whom our cases have been or may be tried, we speak no evil word. against prosecuting attorneys and prosecuting witnesses we harbor no resentment. Against grand jurors who have found indictments, and trial-jurors who have returned the verdict, "guilty," we speak no word of condemnation; and for those professed Christians who have instigated these persecutions by making complaint against us, and who in most cases, have been ashamed to allow their names to be known, we have only thoughts of pity. To these we say that by our labor on Sunday, we have not infringed the natural or constitutional right, civil or religious, of any man. 'We have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man.' 2 Cor. 7:2. And to all concerned we say with terrible earnestness, Count well the cost before taking upon yourselves the awful responsibility of attempting to force upon us, by pains and penalties, the sign of allegiance to Rome and the mark of her power. Beware, 'lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.'" Acts 5:39.

"Conscience and the State" *American Sentinel* 10, 15 , p. 118.

IT is clear that government cannot become the judge of men's consciences; and that the plea of conscientious conviction cannot be accepted as a final and sufficient defense in all cases of violation of law. What rule, then, can be adopted which will preserve the authority of the State and yet not trench upon the rights of conscience?

The question thus raised is well answered by a clause in the constitution of the State of Maryland: "No person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless under color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace or safety of the State. . . . or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights." In this the line is drawn just where it should be, namely, *at the equal rights of others*. Under this provision the courts are not called upon to judge any man's conscience, but only to judge whether or not his conscience leads him to infringe the equal rights of his fellowmen. That a man's conscience is just what he says it is, no man has either right or occasion to deny. A man's statement of his conscience is an end of controversy; but it does not follow that one has a right to do whatever his conscience tells him is right for him to do. There is a difference between conscience and the *rights* of conscience. No man, however conscientious, has any right to infringe the equal right of another; and at this point civil government has a right to take cognizance, not of any man's conscience, but of the relation of the act to the rights of others.

The principle briefly stated is this: No man should be either required or forbidden to do any act contrary to conscience, however erroneous that conscience may be, *unless the doing or forbidding to do that act trenches on the equal rights of others*. This rule would (1) abrogate all civil laws requiring the observance of Sunday or of any other day; and (2) it would leave the courts free, not to judge men's conscience, but to protect all men against wrong in the name of conscience. But this is only saying in other words that which we have said many times before, namely, that civil governments are instituted not to create or to "grant" *rights*, but to guarantee the free and untrammelled exercise of equal, natural, God-given, inalienable rights, and that of these the highest and most sacred is perfect freedom in matters of religious belief and practice.

"They Plead Their Own Cases" *American Sentinel* 10, 15 , pp. 118, 119.

AT the beginning of the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists for Sunday labor, prominent attorneys were employed to plead their cases; among them the Hon. Don. M. Dickinson, of Detroit, Mich., and thousands of dollars were thus spent with the hope of securing

favorable decisions, but to no avail. James T. Ringgold, of the Baltimore bar, one of the ablest lawyers of Maryland, on learning of the injustice being done to seventh-day observers, volunteered his services, and made a noble fight for liberty in his State, but the decisions were against him. One case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, but was dropped from the calendar owing to the sudden death of the defendant. Since then, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that "this is a Christian nation," citing the Sunday laws of the several States as sustaining proof. Consequently, Seventh-day Adventists entertain no hope of relief from the Federal Court.

The failure of human counsel has led them to rely more implicitly upon divine assistance, and they now appear in their own defense, relying wholly upon the promise of the Lord: "When they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." Luke 12:11, 12.

The following are brief quotations from the

119

defenses of these people, who, in most cases, are farmers in possession of a limited education:—

I have a few words that I would like to say. This is something new to me. I was born and reared in Queen Anne's County, and I was never before the court until to-day. I have always endeavored to be a law-abiding citizen. But I am here on a matter between my Lord and myself. I would like to say to the court that I am a Seventh-day Adventist. I study my Bible, and my convictions are that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord my God.

I was raised in the Sunday-school, and I was taught the ten commandments. I was taught that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and then was taught to observe the first day in its stead. In my study of the Bible I cannot find where God, the Lord Jesus, or the apostles, ever changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day. I am conscientious in the matter, and choose to stand for God and the right. I leave the case with the court.—*Robert R. Whaley, before the Circuit Court of Queen Anne's County, Md.*

I would like to say to the jury, that, as has been stated, I am a Seventh-day Adventist. I observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath. I read my Bible, and my convictions on the Bible are that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath, which comes on Saturday. I observe that day the best I know how. Then I claim the God-given right to six days of labor. I have a wife and four children,

and it takes my labor six days to make a living. I go about my work quietly, do not make any unnecessary noise, but do my work as quietly as possible. It has been proved by the testimony of Mr. Fitch and Mr. Cox, who live around me, that they were not disturbed. Here I am before the court to answer for this right that I claim as a Christian. I am a law-abiding citizen, believing that we should obey the laws of the State; but whenever they conflict with my religious convictions and the Bible, I stand and choose to serve the law of my God rather than the laws of the State. I do not desire to cast any reflections upon the States, nor the officers and authorities executing the law. I leave the case with you.—*W. S. Lowry, before the Circuit Court of Henry County, Tenn.*

I do not deny working on the first day of the week, but I do deny working on the Lord's day, because the first day of the week is not the Lord's day. The commandment of God says, "Six days shalt thou labor. . . but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," and we must keep it. If any one can point to a single scripture, showing that Sunday is the Lord's day and should be kept, I will confess being in error. I have lived in this county all my life excepting eighteen months, and was never before charged with wrong.

There has been offered \$2,000 for the production of a scripture which shows that Sunday should be observed and Cardinal Gibbons has said there was no authority in the Bible for keeping Sunday; and some of you, gentlemen [to the jury], probably know of this. The Lord has said, "We ought to obey God rather than men," and he also said, "Ye cannot serve two masters."

I do not work on Sunday to defy the laws, but because I must obey God when his law conflicts with man's laws.—*W. G. Curlett, before the Circuit Court of Queen Anne's County, Md.*

Your honor, the summons which brought me into this court accuses the defendant of keeping open shop on the Lord's day, to which charge I plead not guilty [drawing a New Testament from his pocket]; and I desire to define the Lord's day by the declarations of Him who is the Lord of the Lord's day as they are recorded in the Lord's book. . . .

I wish to refer you to Mark 2:27, 28, which reads: "And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Again, speaking of the Lord Jesus, the declaration is made in the second and third verses of the first chapter of the Gospel of John, that "The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." The first declaration, your honor, asserts that the Sabbath was *made*; and the second scripture declares that the Lord Jesus, who was in the beginning with the Father, made all things that were made in the beginning; hence, the Lord made the Sabbath day, and

is therefore, rightfully Lord of the Sabbath day or Lord's day. He is who labored six days and rested the seventh day: "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Now, having shown that the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath day, I call your attention to Luke 23:56, to show which day of the seven is the Sabbath or Lord's day. The text reads as follows: "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now (next verse, chap. 24, verse 1) upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." The text first quoted states that the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath. This text states that "the Sabbath day according to the commandment" is the day which precedes the first day of the week. The Son of man is therefore Lord of the day which precedes the first day of the week, and that day is the Sabbath or seventh day of the week. Therefore the only day which the Son of man declares himself the Lord of, is the seventh day of the week, or the day preceding the first day of the week, is the Lord's day. . . .

Your honor, I claim the divine right of dissent, and therefore deny the right of the pope of Rome, the czar of Russia, the president of the United States, or the mayor of the city of Everett, to prescribe for me my religious duty. All I ask, as a free-born American citizen, and as a man, is the free exercise of my civil and religious right to worship God according to the dictates of my own conscience. I deny the right of the magistrate to compel me to observe the first day of the week, and thereby deprive me of one-sixth of my time in which to earn my living.

I have observed the Sabbath since 1878, previous to which time I kept Sunday. I require no civil law to enable me to keep the seventh day, and every one around me exercises his right to keep Sunday and labor on Saturday; and no man disturbs me in keeping Saturday. I disturb no man on Sunday or on any other day, and no man thus accuses me. All I ask is the free exercise of my right to worship Him who said, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath," and the right to labor six days, according to the dictates of my own conscience, so long as I do not actually disturb my neighbors.

Your honor, I have not interfered with any natural or constitutional right of my neighbors, and I am not guilty of keeping open shop on the Lord's day. And I trust you will so decide.—*W. T. Gibson, before the First District Court of Eastern Middlesex, Middlesex County, Mass.*

Now, gentlemen of the jury, look me in the face, and tell me that I am guilty of any crime! You know, gentlemen, we are not criminals. Are we dangerous men to run at large who need to be restrained and deprived of our liberty? Look me in the eyes and tell me. Is there a single one of you that believes any man's person or property is endangered by our going at large?—Not one of you. Nor does any other man. No witness has come here and testified to anything of the kind. If our going at large is dangerous to anything, it is to somebody's religious sentiment, and if that be deemed a sufficient reason for restraining us, then it shows on the face of it that this whole thing is religious persecution.—*Eld. W. S. McCutchen, before the Circuit Court of Hall County, Ga.*

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 15 , p. 120.

THE mission of this number of the SENTINEL is to call attention to the injustice perpetrated against a harmless people in Tennessee, and to announce the principles for which they suffer. It is not to create sympathy for them. They do not need it. If their faith is not worth suffering for it is not worth professing. The object is to bring before all the people the vital principles of truth and religious liberty involved in these persecutions, that they may be saved from participating in the cruel work. "Offenses will come, but woe unto him through whom they come."

HE who fails to protest against the persecution of his neighbor, thereby virtually forfeits the right to protest when he is himself persecuted.

THE Sunday law of Tennessee is supposed to be for the purpose of protecting the public morals, and yet one of the questions asked several of the jurors in "the Adventist cases," was, "Have you any conscientious scruples against trying such a case, and, if so, can you lay them aside and decide according to the law and the evidence?" What kind of morality must it be that can be fostered by laws, to administer which courts and jurors must needs lay aside their conscientious convictions? And what guarantee of even common honesty remains when conscience is laid aside, violated, trampled in the dust?

THE Seventh-day Adventist academy at Graysville, Tenn., stands a mute witness to the intolerance of certain Sunday-keepers of that State. It will not be opened again during the present school year, and with thirty or more new indictments against the teachers, patrons and students of the institution, it is clear that when it opens it must be with

a new corps of instructors, and largely with new students. However it will open with the fall term.

A letter received after going to press states that the sheriff at the time of writing was serving warrants on sixteen members of the Graysville Seventh-day Adventist church, who are charged with Sunday work. We will give the names next week. The letter also states that the petition for the release of those now imprisoned was rejected by a vote of 13 to 11.

A BILL was introduced into the Tennessee Legislature on the 2nd inst., the purpose of which is to make all personal property liable for fines and costs, including the State and county tax, in misdemeanor cases. Should this bill become a law it will enable the enemies of the Adventists to absolutely strip them of personal property under the Sunday law of that State.

April 18, 1895

"They Have Become Aggressive" *American Sentinel* 10, 16 , p. 121.

A MOST significant sign of the times in connection with the constantly augmenting Sunday law crusade is the active, aggressive action taken of late by Roman Catholic prelates for the legal enforcement of Sunday observance. When the compulsory Sunday observance movement began several years ago, Roman Catholics fought shy of it, but now all this is changed, and they not only openly favor the movement, but are beginning to assume the leadership.

On the evening of April 7, two thousand Roman Catholics of this city were addressed by the "Paulist Fathers" Doyle and Elliott on the subject, "The Preservation of the American Sabbath." Among other significant things, the latter said: The law given on Sinai was a law, and please God, there will be a Sunday law as long as our Government lasts."

And now comes the announcement in the *Northwestern Chronicle*, a Roman Catholic paper of St. Paul, Minn., of the organization of a Roman Catholic association, called the "Sunday Law Observance League." Priest John Gmeiner, chairman of its press committee, has issued an address "To the W.C.T.U. and all Friends of the American Sabbath," which is signed by "Mrs. A. V. Nicholas, State Superintendent of Sabbath Observance."

This address, which has been sent to the leading papers of Minnesota for publication, begins with a quotation from Crafts' "Sabbath for Man," and continues in a strain not distinguishable from an American Sabbath Union document. It concludes with the following appeal:—

All W.C.T.U.'s and Y.'s, churches, pastors, young people's societies, temperance organizations, Law and Order leagues, and individuals are called upon to help maintain our Sabbath as a day of the Lord for the people, without regard to race, sex, or condition, for a day of rest and worship. To this end let us make Sabbath observance week in Minnesota marked by sermons, public meetings, Sunday-school exercises, distribution of literature, and prayer for the better enforcement of law against all infringement of the right of Sabbath observance and particularly against that arch-enemy of God and man, the saloon.

Priest Gmeiner accompanies the address, as published in the *Northwestern Chronicle*, of April 5, with a statement of the Protestant organizations that have already indorsed the new Roman Catholic movement. He says: "It has been heartily indorsed and approved by the Methodist Episcopal ministers' meeting at St. Paul, March 25, and by the Baptist Ministerial Conference held about the same time in the same city."

The priest next quotes the indorsement of a leading Presbyterian minister of St. Paul, and closes with a request to "all ministers of St. Paul and throughout the State," "to lay the question of Sunday observance before the members of their congregations at the earliest convenient occasion, so that a decided move in the right direction may be made at once throughout the State." A mass meeting is announced at St. Paul for the 15th inst., at which the editor of the *Northwestern Chronicle* will preside.

Now, all this is most significant. It shows that Roman Catholics are forging to the front in the universal Sunday-law stampede. For years the W.C.T.U., the National Reform Association, and the American Sabbath Union have appealed with indifferent success to Roman Catholics for assistance in the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws; but now Roman Catholics have assumed the leadership and call upon these same societies to co-operate with them in enforcing the observance of Sunday which they claim has no Bible support, and is therefore a sign of the power of the Roman Catholic Church to ordain feasts and holy days, the observance of which by Protestants

they declare "is an homage they pay in spite of themselves to the authority of the [Roman Catholic] Church."

The people who publish the AMERICAN SENTINEL have long expected that Roman Catholics and Romanizing Protestants would unite to enforce the Sunday, the mark of papal apostasy upon all. This expectation was based on the "sure word of prophecy," and was published to the world before there was a sign of such a union, and when such an unnatural union was scouted at as impossible. It has come and it behooves the people who knew it would come, and the thousands who knew of this prediction and who have been watching to see whether it would be fulfilled, to be up and doing while the day lasts, "for soon the night cometh when no man can work;" when the opportunity will be forever past of proclaiming to the world the message: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God." Rev. 14:9, 10.

"Sin from a Roman Catholic Standpoint" *American Sentinel* 10, 16 , pp. 121, 122.

THE Roman Catholic claims the "power to command feasts and holy days," and to "command them *under sin*." That is, the church claims the power to ordain holy days and the manner of their observance, and the power to pronounce any disobedience of these commands to be sin, which, if not repented of, results in the eternal ruin of the disobedient one. With this assumption of the church in view, a few observations regarding the law of the church regulating Lent, just past, may be interesting and profitable.

The following are the commands of the church regulating the fast of Lent, as promulgated by Cardinal Gibbons:—

1. All the faithful who have completed their twenty-first year, unless exempt by dispensation or some other legitimate cause, are bound to observe the fast of Lent.

2. They are to make one meal only a day, except on Sundays.

3. A small refreshment, commonly called collation, is permitted in the evening.

5. The following persons are exempt from the obligation of fasting: Persons under twenty-one years of age, the sick, nursing women, those who are obliged to do hard labor, and those who, through weakness, cannot fast, without great prejudice to their health.

6. The faithful are reminded that, besides the obligation of fasting imposed by the church, this holy season of Lent should be, in an especial manner, a time of earnest prayer, of sorrow for sin, of seclusion from the world and its amusements, and of generous almsgiving.

Let it be remembered that to disobey these commands of the cardinal is sin. The reader, unacquainted with the rules of the church, will think that these commands are very severe. However, the pope has granted an "indult," that is, an indulgence to the Roman Catholics of the United States, by which they can violate the above commands, without sin, where others in less favored countries, should they disobey them, would be counted sinners. Here is the indulgence:—

122

II

By virtue of an indult to the United States, dated August 2, 1887, the following special dispensations are granted:—

1. The use of flesh must be permitted at all meals on Sundays, and once a day on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, with the exception of the second and last Saturdays of Lent. But flesh meat and fat are not to be used at the same meal during Lent, except on Sundays.

2. The use of butter, cheese, milk and eggs is also permitted every day in Lent.

3. It is allowed to take in the morning some warm liquid, as tea, coffee, or thin chocolate, made with water, and with this liquid a mouthful of bread.

4. Those for whom the hour of noon may be an inconvenient time for dinner, may invert the order and take their collation in the morning, and their dinner in the evening.

5. The use of hog's lard, or dripping, instead of butter, is authorized in preparing permitted food.

6. Persons exempt from the obligations of fasting are free to take meat more than once on those days when its use is granted by dispensation.

III

The Paschal time extends from the first Sunday of Lent till Trinity Sunday, during which time all persons who have attained the proper age are bound to recite worthily the holy communion. The holy season of Lent is a very proper time also for children to make their first confession, which they ought to do generally about the age of seven years. Parents should see to this.

By order of his eminence the cardinal, W. A. REARDON, *Chancellor*.
Baltimore, Feb. 15, 1895.

It will be noticed that while it is a sin to eat *flesh* on certain days, it is not sin to eat *fish*. It will be interesting to note further what is included under the term "fish."

The *American Ecclesiastical Review*, a Roman Catholic monthly, "published for the clergy," with the authority of superiors ("*cum approbationes superoum*"), in its April issue, publishes the following question and answer:—

Qs. Does the privilege, which exists in the Southern States, of eating seal-duck on days of abstinence, extend to all parts of the country?

Resp. . . . Wherever this species of sea-fowl is commonly reckoned in the same category of food as turtles, lobster, frogs, oyster, etc., which though they cannot be called fish, are nevertheless held to be lenten food, there the practice of serving seal-duck is licit. Some regard as included in this category even the meat of beavers, otters, coots, and other semi-marine animals which live almost exclusively in the water and obtain their food there.

From this we learn that, according to the church of Rome, it is a sin to eat *flesh* on certain days, but it is not a sin to eat fish, seal-duck, turtles, lobsters, frogs, oysters, beavers, otters and coots. In other words, the church damns a man who eats beef or mutton, and commends him when he eats turtles, lobsters, frogs, oysters, beavers, otters and coots.

"Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4), but the Roman Catholic Church has thought to change that law which the Lord, by the Psalmist, calls "perfect," and by Paul calls "spiritual," "holy," "just," and "good," and has erected another standard of righteousness, a part of which declares that it is a sin to eat beef and mutton on certain days in certain countries, but righteousness to eat turtles, lobsters, frogs, oysters, beavers, otters and coots.

Oh that Roman Catholics would turn from the burdensome traditions of men to the law of God; from the "vicar of Christ" and "the virgin," to Him who said, "Come unto me."

**"The Educational Work of the Adventists" *American Sentinel* 10, 16 ,
pp. 122, 123.**

THE closing of the Adventist academy in Rhea County, Tenn., by the persecution at that place, naturally suggests some question as to the extent and nature of the educational work conducted by this people.

The education facilities of the denomination are summarized by Prof. W. W. Prescott, their educational secretary, in his recent report to the General Conference, as follows:—

Battle Creek College, at Battle Creek, Mich.; Union College, at College View, Neb.; Healdsburg College, at Healdsburg, Cal.; Walla Walla College, at College Place, Wash.; and Claremont College, at Claremont, South Africa. There are four academies, or schools, doing work of academic grade, in this country; at South Lancaster, Mass.; Mt. Vernon, Ohio; Keene, Texas; and Graysville, Tenn.; and one abroad [Frederikshavn, Denmark]. There are also the West Virginia Preparatory School, the Australasian Bible School, a school in Mexico in connection with the Medical Mission; schools for native children upon Pitcairn Island, upon Raiatea of the Society groups, in the South Pacific Ocean, upon Bonacca of the Bay Islands in the Caribbean Sea, about fifteen church schools in this country and abroad, two General Conference Bible schools, and quite a number of local colporters' and conference schools not regularly organized.

At the time of the making of this report, February 17, there were enrolled in the regular schools, not including the local colporters' and conference schools not regularly organized, over three thousand pupils. The total number of instructors and helpers engaged in school work was at the same time one hundred and seventy, approximately. This does not include Bible schools, schools for the education of colporters, or local church schools.

Thus it will be seen that for a denomination numbering only about fifty thousand communicants, the Seventh-day Adventists are doing a large amount of educational work.

Battle Creek College, Battle Creek, Mich., has an enrollment of six hundred and twenty-eight; Union College, Lincoln, Neb., has an enrollment of four hundred and thirty-six; and Graysville Academy, the school closed by the imprisonment of the principal and his first assistant, is credited with an enrollment of one hundred and five. The number of teachers in the Graysville Academy was nine; at Union College, thirty-seven; and Battle Creek College, thirty-four. A larger number at Union College is due to the fact that there are German and Scandinavian departments.

The educational work done by the Adventists is by no means superficial. In fact, they aim at thoroughness in all their work.

Education is essential to any people who espouse unpopular doctrines. They must be able to defend their positions, and to defend them intelligently, and this they cannot do without education. Of course, their educational work differs somewhat from that of other denominations, for it has reference more to religious training than perhaps that given by any other denomination. Bible truth is taught in all their schools, and almost everyone takes the "Book of books" as one of his studies. However, the sciences are not neglected, and students leaving some of their institutions and entering various colleges in the country, have passed very satisfactory examinations; in fact, some of the Adventist schools have been highly complimented on the quality of their work by those who have learned of them by coming in contact with students who have entered other and higher institutions of learning.

The Adventists are a practical people, and as far as possible, give a practical education. Most of the students in their colleges and academies have some definite purpose in view, and are studying to fit themselves for some particular sphere of usefulness. Being reared in Christian families, and having Christian aspirations themselves, their students, as a rule, work from a conscientious standpoint, and not simply to be able to pass certain examinations and receive a diploma at the end of their course. They realize that they are fitting themselves for active work in the cause of God, and that their time and even themselves are not their own. Hence a different spirit pervades these institutions from that found in many schools.

The medical missionary work is receiving a good deal of attention from this people. They have at Battle Creek the largest and best equipped medical and surgical sanitarium in

123

the world, and here are educated nurses who receive a thorough training and preparation for active work. Those desiring to take a medical course are encouraged to go to Ann Arbor and enter the regular course there; and many of them subsequently take a post-graduate course at Bellevue, New York. A number of these have already gone to foreign fields and others are preparing to go ere long.

Tennessee and other States may persecute this people, and attempt to drive them from their borders, but they cannot stay the onflowing tide of their work. They are not fanatical, but they are enthusiastic, and have the courage of their convictions. They are willing to suffer reproach, loss of property, loss of liberty, or even loss

of life, for the sake of the truth which they profess. No people make their religion a part of their daily lives more than do the Adventists, and prison bars have no terrors for them when they have the consciousness that they are doing God's service.

As related in these columns four weeks ago the academy at Graysville is closed, owing to persecution; but it will not be permitted to remain so. It is the purpose of the denomination to re-open it at the usual time for the beginning of the fall term.

"The Declaration of Rights of Tennessee Vs. the Tennessee Sunday Law" *American Sentinel* 10, 16 , pp. 124, 125.

THE preceding memorial to the Tennessee legislature deserves more than passing notice. It is a remarkable fact in itself that there should be occasion for such a memorial in the closing decade of the nineteenth century. The facts set forth are startling, the arguments used are convincing, and the principle stated is sound.

That the Sunday laws are religious in their origin and purpose there can be no doubt. This has so often been admitted even by the defenders of the Sunday laws that it is idle to question it. In deciding the King case in Western Tennessee, August 1, 1891, Judge Hammond, of the United States District Court, said: "Sunday observance is so essentially a part of that [the Christian] religion that we cannot rid our laws of it." And again, in the same opinion, his honor said:—

Freedom of religious belief is guaranteed by the Constitution; not in the sense argued here, that King, as a Seventh-day Adventist, or some other as a Jew, or yet another as a Seventh-day Baptist, might set at defiance the prejudices, if you please, of other sects having control of legislation in the matter of Sunday observances, but only in the sense that he should not himself be disturbed in the practices of his creed; which is quite a different thing from saying that in the course of his daily labor, disconnected with his religion, just as much as other people's labor is disconnected with religion, labor not being an acknowledged principle or tenet of religion by him, nor generally or anywhere, he might disregard laws made in aid, if you choose to say so, of the religion of other sects.

His honor erred in stating that Mr. King's daily labor was disconnected from his religion; because Mr. King belonged to a class of religionists who believe that whether they eat or drink, or whatsoever they do, they should do all to the glory of God, and that

the fourth commandment not only requires Sabbath rest, but forbids a like treatment of any other day.

The vital point, however, in this quotation from Judge Hammond's opinion, is his recognition of *the fact that Sunday is a religious institution, and that it has a place in our laws for religious reasons.* His honor, Judge Parks, admitted the same truth in his opinion in the recent cases in Rhea County, Tenn. He said:—

Sunday is, and for a long time has been, recognized by nearly all Christian denominations as the Sabbath, *and it is for this reason, no doubt,* that the law which protects that day has been acquiesced in as constitutional.

Such authorities might be greatly multiplied, but it is unnecessary. The reasons given are not in keeping with American principles of government. "There is not a shadow of right in the general Government," says James Madison, "to intermeddle with religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation."²⁷ 1 This language is just as true of the government of Tennessee, whose Declaration of Rights declares "That no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience." It has certainly the purpose of the framers of the constitution of Tennessee to guarantee absolute freedom of conscience; and the language of the Declaration of Rights is even plainer and more comprehensive than is that of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

If it be objected that a man cannot be permitted to do everything that his conscience may lead him to do, it is sufficient to reply in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "Our legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power, that their true office is to declare and enforce our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us."²⁸ 2

The State need not ask what any man's conscience is, but simply guard the rights of the individual. It is no concern of the State what the individual does so long as in so doing he does not infringe the rights of his fellow-man. Judge Parks stated this principle thus clearly in his opinion already referred to: "A man cannot kill another and excuse himself on the ground that he believed he was carrying out God's will in so doing, because this would deprive his victim of a natural right, viz.: the enjoyment of life. Do the defendants, in keeping the seventh day and working on the

first, thereby interfere with any natural right of their neighbors? or is it an artificial right created by human law?" There can be but one answer given to the judge's question, viz.: It is an artificial right. Private work on Sunday by one man does not interfere with the right of another man not to work. So that the only reason for enforced Sunday observance, by the individual, is a religious reason, as Judge Parks and Judge Hammond, in common with many other jurists, admit.

But it was clearly the purpose of the framers of the Declaration of Rights of Tennessee to forever prohibit the legalization of any religious institution or the enforcement of any religious practice. "Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for violation of what government denominated the law of God."²⁹ 3 It was doubtless to prevent similar evils that the framers of the Declaration of Rights of Tennessee wisely prohibited the legislature from intermeddling with questions affecting the conscience.

But the memorial presented to the legislature by the Adventists of Rhea County goes farther than to merely assert *their* rights of conscience in this matter. It takes the ground that Sunday laws interfere with the rights of conscience of every man. The constitution of Tennessee was evidently not designed to guarantee toleration merely, but to establish religious liberty. It was evidently the purpose of the framers of that instrument to afford equal protection to *all* citizens of the State, whether Jews, Christians, or agnostics. "The protection of the constitution extends to every individuals or to none. It is the individual that is intended to be protected. The principle is the same whether the many or the few are concerned. The constitution did not mean to inquire how many or how few would profess or not profess this or that particular religion. If there be but a single individual in the State who professes a particular faith, he is as much within the protection of the constitution as if he agreed with the great majority of his fellow-citizens. . . . Under the constitution of this State the legislature cannot pass any act, the legitimate effect of which is *forcibly* to establish any merely religious truth, or to enforce any merely religious observances. The legislature has no power over such a subject. When, therefore, the citizen is sought to be compelled by the legislature to do any affirmative religious act, or to refrain from doing anything, because it violates simply a religious principle or observance, the act is unconstitutional."³⁰4

This language, though used concerning the constitution of California, is just as appropriate to the constitution of Tennessee. The Declaration of Rights of the latter State seeks to provide for absolute religious equality: but the Sunday law of the State clearly does give preference to a religious institution, giving it the patronage of public authority. It gives those religious denominations that observe Sunday a decided advantage over all others, and imposes a heavy burden upon observers of another day. Thus it infringes the rights alike, of the seventh-day Christian, of the Jew, and of the man who professes no religion. Nor does it stop here, for, as is clearly set forth in the memorial, it interferes with the right of every man, for it leaves no man free to change his opinion and practice in regard to Sunday work. The memorial ought to receive candid consideration at the hands of the legislature and of the people of Tennessee.

"They Defend the Persecution" *American Sentinel* 10, 16 , p. 125.

THE *Examiner and National Baptist*, of this city, has entered courageous, consistent and persistent protest against the persecution of seventh-day observers. However, it is no more than would be expected from the denomination of Roger Williams. This surprise is, that there can be found a Baptist paper that justifies these persecutions. Yet the writer has before him *six* Baptist papers, four from this country and two from Canada, that attempt to defend these violations of the principle of religious liberty. Some of our readers would doubtless be interested to read some of them. The following from the *Texas Baptist Standard*, of March 28, is a representative of these defenses, both as to the spirit manifested and arguments(?) adduced:—

The *Standard* has received a copy of the county paper of Rhea County, Tenn., in which there is a lengthy account of the trial and imprisonment of a number of Seventh-day Adventists, who were indicted and convicted for violating the Tennessee Sunday law. Some of our Baptist exchanges have wasted considerable breath in trying to work up sympathy for this kind of lawlessness, but as yet the *Standard* has not been able to enter into their views of the case. It may be a matter of conscience for a Seventh-day Adventist to keep Saturday, but it is certainly not a matter of conscience for him to become a lawbreaker. Our opinion is that these Adventists knowingly premeditate the breaking of the Sunday law in order to be arrested and put in jail, so that they may be able to raise the cry of persecution. It used to be a matter of conscience with an

orthodox Mormon to have anywhere from two to two dozen wives, but the National Government seems to have taken the view that a man's conscience in such a case had gone wrong, and that the man who carries such a conscience around with him, is a good deal more at home in jail or in the penitentiary than anywhere else. It might be a matter of conscience with some men to whip their wives. And there are a great many men who never suffer a twinge of conscience on account of any violation of the moral code. It is a matter of conscience with the saloon keeper to sell whiskey on Sunday, because there are a great many toppers who drink more on Sunday than any other day. From these obvious facts, it would follow that lawlessness should not be tolerated simply because it happens to be done under the guise of religion or on the plea of liberty of conscience. As the *Standard* sees, it is just as much harm for Seventh-day Adventists to violate the laws governing the Christian Sabbath as it is for the saloon-keeper. To take the position that the Seventh-day Adventists have the right to secularize the Lord's day, and turn it into a day of work, is to concede all that they claim on the Sabbath question. If they feel in conscience bound to work on Sunday they need not flaunt it in the faces of Christians who believe in keeping the Lord's day holy unto him.

In reply to all this we submit the following from the *Examiner and National Baptist*:—

"We did not expect any Baptist would defend the prosecution of otherwise inoffensive Christians for labor on the first day of the week that disturbs nobody else. . . . It would have been easy, by the use of similar arguments, for those who persecuted Baptists in the past, to have justified their conduct and policy."

"Amen!" *American Sentinel* 10, 16 , p. 125.

THE *Evangel and Sabbath Outlook*, of March 21, encourages the persecuted Seventh-day Adventists of Rhea County, Tenn., with the following words:—

We say to these Sabbath-keepers, let the officers have your bodies for prison cells and chains, but sell neither truth nor loyalty to God's Sabbath.

To this the *Cottage Pulpit*, of Nashville, Tenn., responds thus:—

Amen! to that sentiment, brother of the *Evangel*. And may it spread over this State and Union and find a lodgment and take root and grow and bear fruit in the hearts of true patriots everywhere, until the dark spirit of religious bigotry and blindness shall be driven from the field it has invaded under cover of these old "Blue Law" statutes in the codes of this and other States.

If the legislature of Tennessee in session at the Capitol would do its duty, it would not adjourn until it has wiped off the stain of this Rhea County disgrace from the escutcheon of our good commonwealth. If the members of the two houses of this legislature would do an act of lasting benefit to the State and honor to themselves, individually and collectively, they have only to apply the knife to the religious persecuting section in our revised code, and hurl it out!

To the utterances of both the *Sabbath Outlook* and the *Cottage Pulpit*, the SENTINEL says Amen!

"Our Tennessee Letter" *American Sentinel* 10, 16 , p. 127.

MATTERS at Graysville are running along about as usual. It is a quiet neighborhood and withal an agricultural community, and most people are quite busy with their spring work. The non-resident students who are attending the academy have all left for their homes. There is still some discussion about the imprisonment of the Adventists, and as to the people opinion is somewhat divided about the propriety of prosecuting under the Sunday law. The better class of citizens, the reading and thinking people, are pretty generally agreed that this is religious persecution, and that it is a shame that inoffensive citizens should be arrested and imprisoned for no other offense than doing upon Sunday, work which would be held to be entirely commendable on any other day. The Adventists themselves are pursuing the even tenor of their way as though nothing had happened.

The sheriff came to-day with warrants to arrest the following members of the Graysville Seventh-day Adventist:—

L. S. Abbott,	2 cases (now in jail).	
H. C. Leach,	"	
Lewis Abbott,	"	
N. E. England,	1 case.	
Byrd Terry,	"	
Dwight Plumb,	"	(now in jail).
W. J. Kerr,	"	(was in jail).
Monroe Morgan,	"	
E. R. Gillett,	"	
Columbus Moyers,	"	
Wallace Ridgway,	"	
J. M. Hall,	"	

made on looking over the vote on the tally sheet. Chairman *pro tem*, Benson, who took the ayes and noes down as cast, was in the clerk's office when the discovery was made, and verified this by going carefully over each justice's name and how he had voted. Mr. Benson said it was an error of his head and not the heart; that he had called McPherson to help count the vote and they had both made it 12 to 11. It is not known how Chairman Crawford would have voted on a tie vote.

The vote as cast was—

For releasing—A. M. Broyles, Keylon, Smith, Fugate, A. P. Hayes, Eli Hayes, Hicks, Mowry, Morgan, Merritt, Clouse, Baldwin—12.

Against releasing—Waterhouse, Wyrick, Trentham, Gillespie, D. E. Broyles, Benson, King, Dodd, Lillard, Monday, Torbett, McPherson—12.

Not voting—Knight, Romines, Green.

Absent—Henry.

A significant incident happened, a few days since, on one of the streets of Graysville when two Adventists met. One was a deacon of the church, and, stopping, he said to the other: "Wright Raines (the man who prosecuted them) and his family are suffering for the necessaries of life. What ought we to do in this case?" The other responded: "What does the Bible say?" Simultaneously the words from the Saviour fell from the lips of both: "If thine enemy hunger, feed him: if he thirst, give him drink." The one who first raised the question said: "Yes, that's right; but if we give him anything he'll perhaps think that we are trying to buy his favor." But the other said: "How can that be, since the trials are over, and Mr. Raines is not the prosecutor in the cases to be tried in the next term of court?" It was therefore agreed that the Scripture injunction should be followed.

The Adventists bring their religion into their daily lives to a great extent. Prayer and praise is to be daily heard in every Adventists family, and in their meetings there is a marked spirit of devotion. They are Bible Christians, and true Protestants, for the Bible is their only rule of faith and practice, and a "thus saith the Lord" is with them the end of controversy. An officer of the court said to the writer only a few days ago: "These Adventists are the best example of Rhea County, and the county would be better off if we had a thousand of them." And yet several of them are confined in the Rhea County jail, and others are under indictment and will doubtless be imprisoned next July. But they do not repine, and will not swerve from what they regard to be their duty to God.

But this is not saying that it is easy for these people to suffer persecution. They are human and have the feelings to which human flesh is heir. Their hearts are just as tender and their affections as warm, as the hearts and affections of other people, and when the father and husband is taken away and locked up in jail, it is a cruel blow to the wife and children; but there is no repining on the part of those who are left at home. The women are not heard, as was Job's wife, begging their husbands to curse God and die; but, on the contrary, they encourage their husbands to faithfulness, and say: "We are ready to go too when our time comes." It is possible to go too when our time comes." It is possible to imprison whole families, or even entire communities, of such people, *but it is not possible to turn them from their allegiance to God and to his law.* They can go to prison—or to death if need be—but *they cannot deny their faith.*

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 16 , p. 128.

THE Associated Press announced on the 11th inst. that Governor Turney had pardoned the five Seventh-day Adventists imprisoned at Dayton, Tenn., March 8. All honor to Governor Turney. The governor would now do credit to himself should he send a message to the Tennessee Legislature now in session recommending the repeal of the Sunday law under which they were imprisoned. The pardons were granted on the recommendation of the trial-judge, Judge J. G. Parks, who shares with the governor the honors of the noble act.

UNDER the circumstances, it is safe to say that this action of the officials of Tennessee is without a parallel in our history. Here were five men duly convicted of the violation of the law of the State and committed to prison upon refusal to pay the costs duly assessed: not only so, but they had respectfully but firmly declared in court that they could not obey the law, and yet they were pardoned by the governor upon the recommendation of the trial-judge. This can only be regarded as a confession that the law is unjust and that it ought to be repealed.

THE legislature of Massachusetts has enacted a most rigid Sunday law. It declares that no entertainment shall be given on Sunday at which an admission fee is charged, and makes any person attending such prohibited entertainment liable to a fine of five dollars. Another portion of the law reads thus:—

Whoever, on the Lord's day, keeps open his shop, warehouse or workhouse, or does any manual labor, business or work, except

works of necessity and charity, or takes part in any sport game, or play, except a sacred concert, shall be punished by a fine of \$50 for each offense, and the owner of any hall in which said law is violated is liable to a fine of \$500.

It will be noticed that the church theater is exempted,—“any sport, game, or play, *except* a sacred concert.”

FOR some time the Polish Roman Catholic Church, of Omaha, Neb., has been the scene of disgraceful fights between factions in the church. The latest developments are the burning of the church and the arrest of a priest as the probable incendiary. It is alleged that the church was saturated in the second story with kerosene. By a court decision the priest's faction would have been compelled to vacate the church in two days, and the evidence, it is said, clearly proves that the priest and his faction decided to burn the church rather than abandon it to the other faction. And yet the Roman Catholic Church declares that she is the only power that can control the mobs of the world.

THE latest news from the prosecuted Seventh-day Adventists of London is that the authorities have seized their goods to the value of \$90, which they will sell to collect fine and costs, amounting to \$30.

The following brief statement accompanying the above facts, as issued by the persecuted Adventists, will explain their attitude toward the prosecution:—

It is not from stubbornness or any disrespect to the authorities that the fines have not been paid. If they had been imposed for any ordinary infraction of the law, they would have been paid on once. But the fourth commandment forbids us to recognize Sunday as in any way whatever different from the succeeding five days of the week. To do so would be sin. Consequently, to pay a fine for violation of a human enactment that bids us recognize Sunday as a day of rest, would be to put ourselves on the side of that human law, in opposition to the commandments of God. If property is forcibly taken to satisfy fines, those who take it are alone responsible; but we cannot by any act whatever become partakers in the sin of the government in setting itself above the authority of the Creator.

IN 1892 the Supreme Court of the United States declared that “this is a Christian nation,” and cited as one proof the “Sabbath laws” of the various States. The leaders of the Sunday-law crusade immediately seized upon this decision as furnishing the highest possible authority for Sunday legislation. Armed with this decision the Sunday-law leaders besieged Congress to enact a law closing the

World's Fair on Sunday, not so much for the purpose of shutting the Fair on Sunday as for the purpose of committing Congress to the creation of a precedent for Federal legislation favorable to Sunday sacredness. They succeeded, and Sunday sacredness was declared established.

But startling to relate, the Congress of the United States desecrated in 1895 what it had hallowed in 1892. It continued in session the great part of Sunday, March 3, and engaged in work just as secular as that done by the imprisoned Adventists in Rhea County, Tenn. But still more startling to the apostle of compulsory Sunday observance comes the information that the United States Supreme Court, the creator of this "Christian nation," held a session on Sunday, April 7, and performed work just as secular as was ever performed by an Adventist anywhere. Thus it would appear that the creators of the "Christian nation" and the "Christian Sabbath" have destroyed what they created. This fatal fact is becoming apparent to the Sunday-law advocates, and they have already declared their intention of turning the desecrators out and putting in their places men who will recreate what their predecessors destroyed. Now all this trouble could be avoided by accepting the Sabbath blessed and sanctified by the "Lord of the Sabbath," and which does not depend for its perpetuity on legislative or judicial action.

IN harmony with what appears to be concerted action on the part of the papacy in the United States to push the enforcement of Sunday laws, the *Catholic Review*, of March 31, publishes a defense of compulsory Sunday observance, in which occurs the following:—

In every one of the original States, including, of course, New York, the common law of England in force at the time of the separation was declared to be reŕnacted, with some exceptions bearing upon political sovereignty, land tenure, and the like, necessary to effectuate the separation and its new conditions. But the common law of England presupposed the Christian religion and that remained to the State of New York and is still in force.

With this for a basis the article concludes that "the courts will be bound to uphold Sunday as a day of worship and of rest from unnecessary labor." This is the same position which has always been taken by those professed Protestants who were so anxious to secure the power of the State in support of their dogma of Sunday sacredness. Rome has a number of dogmas which she will yet build on this same foundation with the same reasoning to the consternation of these unwise Protestants.

April 25, 1895

"The Duty to Obey Civil Rulers" *American Sentinel* 10, 17 , pp. 129-131.

THAT it is a Christian duty to obey civil government no believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures can deny. In the thirteenth chapter of Romans it is expressly commanded: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." And again we are admonished to "be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake;" so that the Christian is to obey civil rulers not from fear of punishment, but as doing service unto the Lord.

But we find it recorded in the Scriptures that in some cases the servants of God refused obedience to civil rulers, and that God vindicated them in so doing. In the third chapter of Daniel we have the record of the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-neg to bow down to the golden image which the king had set up. We have also the record that they were miraculously delivered from the furnace without even so much as the smell of fire upon them. In the sixth chapter of Daniel it is recorded that Daniel himself refused obedience to a decree of the king, properly signed and promulgated; for which disobedience he was cast into the den of lions, from which he was miraculously delivered by the direct interposition of God.

Coming to the New Testament scriptures, we find an account of the arrest of Peter and John for preaching the gospel. They were commanded by the rulers "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." Then the rulers further threatened them, and let them go; but they continued preaching, and were shortly arrested again; and the magistrates said unto them: "Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us. Then

Peter and the other apostles answered and said, WE OUGHT TO OBEY GOD RATHER THAN MEN."

Here is a seeming contradiction in the Scriptures. First, we have the positive injunction to obey the powers that be. The Word declares that they are ordained of God. Then we have the record of several instances where inspired men refused obedience to the powers that be and were miraculously protected in so doing. What is the solution of the apparent difficulty?

Here Is the Answer

The answer to this question is found in the words of the Saviour, recorded in Matt. 22:21: "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Civil government is indeed ordained of God: but for what purpose? This we may learn by referring again to the thirteenth chapter of Romans, where we read these words concerning the civil magistrate:—

For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

It will be observed that in this scripture the same distinction is made between duties which we owe to God, and duties which we owe to men, that is made by our Saviour in the words: "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." The subject under discussion is civil duties. No reference whatever is made to our duty to God, and the commandments referred to, viz." "Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false

witness, Thou shalt not covet," all have to do with our relations to our fellow-men. The same thing is shown in the seventh and eighth verses: "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." And again in the tenth verse we are told that "love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." So the subject under discussion is our civil relations to our fellow-men.

The Lord Has Not Abdicated

God has, for wise reasons, given civil power into the hands of men, but he has not committed moral government to any human authority. This he could not do without abdicating the throne of the universe: because if men were permitted to govern one another in matters of conscience, if God had ordained civil government for this purpose, there could be no certain moral standard: because it would be man's duty to obey the civil law, whatever that might be. Thus, in a Roman Catholic country it would be sin not to adore pictures and images, while in a Protestant country it would be a sin to do so.

On the other hand, if God had not committed civil authority to men, and given them power to enforce their own natural rights as between one another, one of two things would have been inevitable: either punishment of evil doing would have been so long deferred as to afford no protection to those in need of it, or else it would have been so swift and certain as to have terrorized man, and destroyed in a measure his free moral agency.

That the line is drawn in the Scriptures just where we have indicated, viz., between our duty to God and our duty to man, is evident from the language of Daniel to the king, as recorded in Daniel 6:22. After his deliverance from the lion's den, Daniel said to the king: "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me: forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; *and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt.*"

Daniel did not say that he had not disobeyed the king, but he did say he had done no hurt—that is, he had done no wrong to the king

nor to any other man. His disobedience was in a matter which was solely between himself and God. It was no concern of the king's, therefore the king had no right to require obedience at his hand in

that matter. This was precisely the position of the apostles when commanded not to preach in the name of Jesus. They said: "*We ought to obey God rather than men.*" The Saviour had commissioned them to preach, and the civil authorities had no right to forbid them to preach, and when they did so forbid them, the apostles had the God-given right to refuse obedience; yea, more, it was their bounden duty to refuse obedience. To have done otherwise would have been to prove disloyal to the God of heaven.

The Principle Is Universally Admitted

This principle has been admitted by men in all ages, and thousands have laid down their lives rather than prove untrue to it. Blackstone states a similar principle thus: "This law of nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this." This is said not of moral law, but of natural law; but if true of natural law, how much more is it true of moral law? But we have already seen that one man cannot decide for another what are his duties toward God, nor can one man properly require another to discharge his duty toward God. Our Saviour himself, as we have seen, laid down the principle that we are to "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." We are not to render to Cesar the things that are God's, nor are we to render them to God through Cesar; but we are to render them to God, and to God alone are we responsible.

In his report communicated to the United States House of Representatives, March 4, 1830, on the petitions requesting a discontinuance of Sunday mails, Hon. Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, set forth the principle that man is absolutely independent of any human authority in matters of conscience, in the following language: "The framers of the Constitution recognized the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation and his rights of conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our own bosoms. It is this consciousness, which, in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs in tortures and flames. They felt that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man

could exercise no authority over their consciences. *It is an inborn principle which nothing can eradicate.*"

The same principle is laid down by President Fairchild in his work on Moral Philosophy. In fact, it has been recognized by Christian men in every country and in all times. The martyrs whom we honor to-day, whose memories we revere, laid down their lives rather than prove disloyal to conscience and to God. In the language of Hon. Richard M. Johnson, "Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God." This fact alone should be conclusive upon the question under discussion. Human law is imperfect, the administrators of human law are necessarily imperfect, and both human law and its enforcement constantly vary. If conscience were to be guided by human law, there could be, as before stated, no certain standard of right and wrong. That which would be morally wrong in one State might be morally right in an adjoining State, and that which was sin to-day might be virtue to-morrow. But every man knows that he is directly responsible alone to God in things pertaining to God; and that while he is also responsible to God for wrongs done to his neighbor, he is properly amendable in a sense to his fellow-men for such acts. Every man regards any interference with *his* conscience as tyranny; then why should any man wish to control or interfere with the equal rights of another in matters of conscience?

The Plea of Conscience and Natural Rights.

But it may be objected that every man cannot be permitted to do that which his conscience tells him may properly be done. This is very true. For instance, Guiteau, the assassin of President Garfield, claimed that in shooting the president, he was doing God's service. His plea, as to his belief, may or may not have been true. There was no possible way of demonstrating its truth or falsity; neither was there any necessity for inquiring into that question. It is a fundamental principle that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights: that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." President Garfield had the same right to life that Guiteau had, and Guiteau had no right to deprive President Garfield of life. Neither has any man the right, under the plea of conscience, to deprive his fellow-man of any natural

right; or to trample upon, or interfere in any way with, any equal right of his fellowman; nor does he do so in exercising his own inalienable, God-given right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. For instance, the Catholic does not trench upon any natural right of his Protestant neighbor by going to mass or confession, by making the sign of the cross, or by abstaining from meat on Friday. His Protestant neighbor may regard him as foolish and superstitious, and may feel a certain sense of annoyance due to his knowledge that the Catholic believes and practices as he does, but this does not prevent the Protestant from freely holding and practicing tenets of *his* religion.

It is equally true, in the matter of Sabbath observance, that one man's failure to observe a Sabbath does not prevent another man from either resting or working upon that day. If one person chooses to work, and he does that work in a civil and orderly manner, it can in no way interfere with the right of another man to rest, neither can it interfere with his right to worship. We very properly have laws protecting peaceable assemblies upon all days, and we have special laws protecting religious assemblies from disturbance. These laws are available upon any day of the week, and may be enforced at any time by those who feel that their rights are interfered with. Why, then, should we have laws requiring all men to rest upon Sunday, because some men wish to worship upon that day? There can be but one reason, and that is the "reason" of religious bigotry and intolerance.

One Man's Worship Not Dependent on Another's Rest.

There can be no reason why one man should rest simply because another wishes to worship. If this were a natural right, it would be the natural right of every man. Therefore it would also be the duty of the government to prohibit labor on the sixth and seventh days, as well as upon the first, because rights belong to the minority as much as to the majority. Indeed, government is for the purpose of preserving the rights of the minority as against the majority; but there is no such natural right. And that there ought to be no such artificial or statutory right must be evident to every candid, thinking man. The framers of the National Constitution provided that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and several of the State Constitutions are even more explicit in their guarantees of religious liberty. The Declaration

of Rights of the State of Tennessee declares "that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship."

The Declaration of Rights of the State of California provides that "the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be guaranteed in this State."

The Declaration of Rights of the State of Maine provides that "all men have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and no one shall be hurt, molested, or restrained in his person, liberty, or estate, in worshiping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, nor for his religious professions or sentiments, provided he does not disturb the public peace, nor obstruct others in their religious worship."

A Failure to Apply the Principle.

The Declaration last quoted is a distinct recognition of the line of demarcation between civil and religious duties. The line is properly drawn; and absolute right of conscience is guaranteed in everything not trenching upon the equal rights of others. It is true that this principle has not been adhered to strictly in any State; no more has the constitutional guarantee that there should be no distinction made and no preference given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship. It was evidently the purpose of the framers of the constitutions of the various States to absolutely prohibit a preference by law for any religion. The American idea is not that of toleration merely, but of absolute natural right and equality in religious matters. But in almost every State we find laws requiring cessation of secular affairs on Sunday; thus giving a decided preference and advantage to those sects which regard Sunday as the Sabbath. That such laws do discriminate between sects, and that they do give preference to one sect over another, is thus clearly shown by Chief Justice Terry, of California, in an opinion delivered in 1858. His honor said:—

In a community composed of persons of various religious denominations, having different days of worship, each considering his own as sacred from secular employment, all being equally considered and protected under the Constitution, a law is passed which in effect recognizes the sacred character of one of these

days, by compelling all others to abstain from secular employment, which is precisely one of the modes in which its observance is manifested, and required by the creed of that sect to which it belongs as a Sabbath. Is not this a discrimination in favor of the one? Does it require more than an appeal to one's common sense to decide that this is a preference? And when the Jew or seventh-day Christian complains of this, is it any answer to say, Your conscience is not constrained, you are not compelled to worship or to perform religious rites on that day, nor forbidden to keep holy the day which you esteem as a Sabbath? We think not, however high the authority which decides otherwise.

It is true that this view has not usually prevailed in courts of last resort; but courts are not infallible, and it is certain that in sustaining Sunday laws they have violated the fundamental principle of liberty of conscience.

131

The Civil Plea Examined.

It is claimed by some, however, that Sunday is merely a civil regulation. But how can that be civil which rests upon a religious reason? How can that be a civil regulation which would not exist were not the institution which it enforces religious? Even granting that nature demands that man shall rest one day in seven (which is not admitted, however), what is there in nature to teach that all men *must* rest at one and the same time? Why must a particular day be singled out and all men be required to rest upon it? Why do we not find in some States or in some communities a law requiring all men to rest habitually upon one day each week instead of laws requiring all men to rest upon Sunday? and why is it that where we do find permission granted for those to work upon Sunday who rest upon another day, they are required to rest "conscientiously and religiously"? The evidence is overwhelming that Sunday laws are religious in their origin, in their purpose, and in their enforcement.

The tendency among men is not to work too much. It is true that some people are overworked, but it is from force of circumstances rather than from inclination; and it is safe to say that more physical injury accrues to men from night work and from irregular hours than from failure to rest one day in seven. As a matter of fact, comparatively few men do labor continuously and arduously seven days in each week; so that the civil argument is not sustained either by reason or by facts; and no man will deny that were it not for the

religious regard for the day, were it not for the fact that a large majority of the people believed that some sacredness attached to the day, nobody would be required by law to observe it; though it might possibly be held as a legal holiday in order that those who desire leisure upon that day might have it. This is true at the present time in California, but in no other State does the Sunday law rest upon that basis.

We have no compulsory holidays. The Fourth of July, Christmas and Thanksgiving Day are legal holidays, but nobody is required to observe them; nobody is punished for working upon them; nobody is forbidden to do upon those days any secular work, or to follow any secular employment. The fact is that compulsory Sunday observance is a relic of the union of Church and State. It is an inheritance from colonial days when religion was enforced by law, and when men were compelled to attend and support houses of worship. Such statutes have properly no place in our system of government. They are contrary to the spirit of our free institutions, and show that we have not yet reached the plan of absolute religious right, but that we simply tolerate dissenters. "The Constitution," says Hon. Richard M. Johnson, "regards the conscience of the Jew as sacred as that of the Christian." But in practice neither the United States nor any State except California has shown itself equal to a practical application of this principle.

"Not Biblical" *American Sentinel* 10, 17 , p. 131.

A CORRESPONDENT sends as the *Western Recorder* (St. Louis), a Baptist paper, published by the Baptist Book Concern, containing an article entitled, "Christian vs. Jewish Sabbath," which he asks us to notice. Space will not permit of an extended notice, neither in such a notice needed. The author sums up his argument in three paragraphs which we quote with our comments inserted within brackets:—

"Condensed reasons for observing the Christian Sabbath." [The Bible nowhere calls the first day of the week the Christian Sabbath.]

"1. It was the most appropriate day which a ransomed people could observe: [The most appropriate day for a ransomed people to observe is the day commanded of God]: being that on which the Saviour was raised from the dead and the Spirit inaugurated his

reign." [The Bible does not *record* that the Spirit inaugurated his reign on the first day of the week.]

"2. We have precedent, in a way [Yes, *in a way*, in the same way which Roman Catholics have precedents for purgatory, prayers for the dead, Mariolatry, invocation of saints, infallibility, etc.], to show that it was custom, for Gentile churches, under apostolic sanction, to meet for public religious worship and for celebrating the supper on the first day of the week: and there could be no higher authority emanating from inspired men." [There is but one instance recorded in the New Testament where a public meeting was held on the first day of the week, and that was a night meeting beginning Saturday night and continuing until Sunday morning, after which the rest of the first day was consumed in traveling.]

"3. We have the sanction of the Holy Spirit for the observance of the first day, in that the Spirit inspired Luke and Paul to record the fact, without censure, that the Gentile Christians did observe the first day instead of the Jewish Sabbath. [Neither Luke, Paul nor any other New Testament writer records any such change.] This ought, one would think, to be sufficient to justify [to] even the most scrupulous that the Christian Sabbath [meaning Sunday] is the day God designed should be observed by his people during the present dispensation." [It ought not to be sufficient because it is not biblical.]

"Answer to a Correspondent" *American Sentinel* 10, 17 , pp. 131, 132.

THE following letter represents the views of the average Sunday-law advocate, stated with an unusual frankness and apparent sincerity. The author deserves a candid Christian answer, which we will endeavor to give here for the benefit of others who may be likeminded. To save space in replying we have numbered the principal points and will notice them under corresponding figures. We must of necessity be brief, and ask therefore that our brevity be not taken for harshness, for we entertain the kindest regard for our correspondent:—

EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.—*Dear Sir:* Some one has been so kind as to send to my address two or three copies of the SENTINEL. I have read them with care, and I like the stand the SENTINEL takes against the encroachment of the Church on this American continent. And I believe it is high time for the American nation to take cognizance of the facts there stated; and I feel sorry to hear of my fellow Christians being in jail. But I am led to inquire,

Who is to blame for the incarceration? is it not the law-breakers! (1) I would ask the SENTINEL what opinion *Rome* must form (2) to see a paper so thoroughly American in its name and sentiment, encouraging violation of its own *laws* in reference to the holy Sabbath of America (3)—the observance of which has been the safeguard of our nation, the hope of our future. (4)

A good deal of Scripture has been quoted to show that the persecuted (Sabbatarian) brethren are right and the American nation wrong. Then if they are right, why do they complain! (5) Read Matt. 5:10, 11. "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. *Blessed are ye*, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you *falsely, for my sake.*" But is this falsely! (6) Our American Sabbath is the law of *our nation*, and should be respected by every citizen. Our American laws do not say to the Seventh-day Baptist, You shall not keep your day of rest, not at all; so your religious liberty is not interfered with whatever. (7) But then the nation has made a law that the Sabbath day (the day you call the first day; (8) shall be the day of rest of Sabbath in *America*; and these incarcerated ones have risen up in rebellion against the law (9) even when the nation has not tried to interfere with their way of thinking. (10)

Perhaps this may be the cause of the complaint, instead of rejoicing, simply because it is not "falsely" for their sake.

But are there not other words and examples of one Lord Jesus, that it would be well for the seventh-day brethren to observe? First, the meek example of Jesus, Matt. 27:52: "And when he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing." (11) Or would it not be better to do as he commanded his disciples to do, Matt. 23:2: "All therefore whatsoever they bade you observe, *that observe and do.*" (12) Or would it not be wise for them, when a righteous nation has adopted a law, to observe, (13) and they imagine (14) they should observe another day, and the nation says; "Well, my friends, you may keep your day, we don't object, but you must keep ours." (15) I say, would it not be wisdom to flee into another country if one can be found where the day they think right may be the national law? (16) But I am in favor of keeping the law in regard to *the Sabbath*. I see no conflict between the *law* and the *Bible*. I am also in favor of compelling all on this continent to conform to our national laws, Jew and Gentile, bond and free. Let us keep our Sabbath day holy *and* the laws of our land sacred, and not violate our righteous laws and get the penalty and then complain of persecution. The officers are justified in doing their duty. Let us as a nation arise and let the world know that we are in favor of our holy Sabbath day and the law of our land.

I remain yours in favor of the American Sabbath,

MOSES HARVEY.

Bar 89, Plains P. O., Pa.

1. The "law-breakers" are no more to blame for this incarceration than were the three Hebrews who were cast into the fiery furnace. Both violated laws which conflicted with their duty to God. The Hebrews violated a law which sought to compel them to outwardly worship a golden image. The Tennessee Seventh-day Adventists violated a law which sought to compel them to outwardly worship (Obedience is the highest form of worship, 1 Sam. 15:22) the government which demanded obedience to its Sunday-Sabbath and in addition, to worship the papacy which originated the Sunday-Sabbath in opposition to the "Sabbath of the Lord." God blessed the Hebrews in their violation of the law of Nebuchadnezzar, and he is blessing the persecuted seventh-day observers of Tennessee. The Lord delivered the Hebrews from the fiery furnace, and through the instrumentality of Judge J. G. Parks and Governor Turney. He has delivered the Adventists from the Dayton jail.

2. We care not what opinion "Rome" or any other organization or individual may form regarding our attitude to the government, so long as we are faithful to God and just to our fellow-men. However, Rome would despise us if we submitted our consciences to the keeping of the civil power.

3. The SENTINEL begs to be relieved of all responsibility for "our laws in reference to the Holy Sabbath of America." These laws are not our laws. We acknowledge allegiance to but one Sabbath law and that law commands the observance of the holy "Sabbath of the Lord," a day which precedes the "holy Sabbath of America."

4. God pity our nation if its hope for the future depends on the observance of an institution of the Roman Catholic Church.

132

5. They do not complain. On the contrary, the walls of their prisons who with prayer to God for their persecutors. The SENTINEL has repeatedly said that the publication of these persecutions was not to create sympathy for the persecuted, but to save the people from ignorantly fighting against God. Our position is summed up in these words of the "Lord of the Sabbath": "Offenses will come: but woe unto him, through whom they."

6. Is it falsely? We are prosecuted for violating the Sabbath by laboring on the first day of the week. Are we guilty? Is the first day of the week the Sabbath? Let the Lord answer: "Six days shalt thou

labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20:9, 10. "When the Sabbath was past. . . very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." Mark 14:1, 2. And *now*, is the Sabbath the first day of the week, or the day before the first day of the week? The seventh-day observers in Tennessee believe the Bible and keep the Sabbath, the seventh day, and labor on the "six working days" (Eze. 46:1), because of which they are accused of breaking the Lord's Sabbath. Come now. Brother Harvey, wish the Bible open before you, we ask in all candor, are they accused truthfully or falsely?

7. The law requiring the three Hebrews to worship the golden image did not forbid them to worship the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: but only that they worship the image also. It is true that the Sunday law does not forbid seventh-day keepers to worship the Lord of the Sabbath by worshiping him on the seventh day, but only asks that all men worship the government also by obeying the law enforcing the observance of the "holy Sabbath of America." "Ye cannot serve to masters," says the Lord, and so the Seventh-day Adventist cannot worship God and a government in conflict with God.

8. We call it the first day because God calls *it* the first day. Matt. 28:1; Mark 14:1; Luke 23:56 and 24:1.

9. Their "rebellion" is of the same character as that of Daniel, the three Hebrews, Peter and John, Paul and Silas, and the Christian martyrs of succeeding centuries.

10. The government *has* interfered with their way of thinking. Their way of thinking is that they ought not to treat one of God's "six working days" as they treat his holy rest day, but the law says they must treat the "holy Sabbath of America" with the same outward reverence with which they treat the "holy" "Sabbath of the Lord."

11. It is true that Jesus at his trial remained silent *amid* the false accusations of his enemies, but it is also true that he told his followers, "When they bring you into the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." Luke 12:11, 12. The persecuted Seventh-day Adventists follow this instruction, and in fulfillment of his promise the Lord is giving them on such occasions "a mouth and wisdom!" which all their adversaries are not able "to gainsay nor resist." Luke 21:15.

12. This was said of "the Scribes and Pharisees who sit in Moses' seat." But neither Moses Harvey nor yet "this American nation" can prove what they are entitled to sit in Moses' seat. God has brought to an end the theocracy of Israel, and all attempts to revive it "until he come, whose right it is," is a usurpation of the prerogative of God and is anti-Christian.

13. A righteous nation will not enact a law which attempts to compel men to violate God's standard of righteousness. Ps. 110:172.

14. They do not "imagine" that they should observe another day; they *know* that they ought, for the Lord plainly commands them to observe another day.

15. The law of King Nebuchadnezzar did not say we must not worship your God, but only said you must worship ours. If our correspondent is correct, the Baptists, should they get the power in some States, would have the right to immerse all the people who had not been immersed, and when Methodists and others objected they could quietly reply: "We don't object to your being sprinkled, but you must be immersed also, for that is our baptism."

16. Our correspondent suggests that Seventh-day Adventists flee to some country where they would not be persecuted. But to what country can they flee? Brother Harvey is in favor of driving us out of the "land of the free" because we will not submit the keeping of our consciences to him and other likeminded men; but he knows there is no other earthly country to which we can flee. The oppressed of all other countries have in the past been flowing to this; therefore an order to leave this country is simply a command to "get off the earth."

But now that Brother Harvey advises us to move to another country, we will inform him that we are preparing to go. We have known for a long time that the spirit of persecution would become so bitter in this country that those who refused to "worship the beast (the papacy) and his image (the "land of the free" transformed by a union of Church and State into a persecuting power like the papacy) and receive his mark" (the Sunday-Sabbath) by obeying the Sunday laws—would have to move to "a better country that is, an heavenly." Heb. 11:9-16. These persecutions indicate that that time is not far distant, and we are getting ready to go and trying to get Brother Harvey and as many others as we can to get ready too. Those who are ready to meet the Lord when he comes for us as he has promised (John 14:3) are described as "they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 17 , p. 136.

THE earnest, consistent Protestant could not but notice the silence maintained by the press of the country toward the pope's recent bold, unequivocal condemnation of the American principle of separation of Church and State. The following, printed in the *Catholic World* for April, in an article by Walter Elliott, a priest of the "Paulist Fathers," entitled the "Musings of a Missionary," will present what papists regard as the reason for this silence:—

The press dare not openly attack the Church, and in large part has no desire to do so, and it is quite accessible to the publication of articles on the Catholic side.

The press of the country is a powerful factor for good or ill, and if it is true that the Roman Catholic Church has silenced its protest against Catholic encroachments, the final and complete triumph of the papacy in this country will be comparatively easy.

THE *Catholic Mirror*, of April 6, attempts another apology for the violence attempted by Catholics against ex-priest Slattery. The apology is a covert encouragement to violence as the reader will see. The *Mirror* says:—

Slattery came very near precipitating a riot in Memphis similar to that of which he was the cause in Savannah. How can the people be blamed for showing indignation against this man? It is not the doctrines of the Catholic Church that he attacks, but the character of the priests and nuns. Catholics know how pure and devoted their religious are, and the feeding of anger, when they are libelled by a wretch like Slattery become uncontrollable.

The *Mirror* asks "how can the people be blamed" for trying to kill ex-priest Slattery, and acknowledges that under the circumstances the "rage" of Catholics is "uncontrollable." If this were the apology of natural, unconverted men who made no profession of Christianity, who did not pretend to follow the example of Him "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again," we would not think very strange of it; but even then we would not expect to hear these sentiments uttered by a good citizen who always favors redressing his grievances by the orderly, legal methods provided by law rather than by the anarchistic methods of mob violence. Since Rome returns railing for railing how can she claim to be Christian? and since she admits that her children are "uncontrollable" when their religious teachers are spoken against, how can she lay claim to being the only force that can control the mobs of all the world in the approaching social upheaval! Let her

control the "uncontrollable" within herself before posing as the only power that can control the anarchy outside the church.

TWO Baptist papers have taken their stand with the *Examiner* in defense of the religious liberty principle violated in the imprisonment of seventh-day observers in Tennessee. These two papers are the *Watchman* (Boston) and the *Indiana Baptist* (Indianapolis). The first named speaks thus:—

It looks as if the Seventh-day Adventists would be driven out of Tennessee. Although judges and lawyers condemn the statutes under which several of their people were arraigned, convictions have followed. A number of them, refusing to pay the cost of their prosecution, have been committed to prison. The facts of the case, it is truly alleged, go to illustrate the truth of the words of Thomas Jefferson, that, where a bad law is on the statute books, "a single bigot may set the machinery of the law in motion, and better men be his victims."

The *Indiana Baptist* quotes the above and follows it with this paragraph:—

We have little respect for the "arguments" by which the seventh-day advocates so persistently urge their peculiar views, but we do heartily sympathize with them in the persecution to which they are subjected by bigots. Roger Williams should be on earth again to teach even some Baptists that "the civil magistrate has no authority to punish breaches of the first table of the Decalogue." We are yet far from the recognition of the right of every man to perfect religious liberty.

What Baptist paper will be the next to take the side of Roger Williams? We are keeping a roll of honor and will promptly record the first consistent utterances of those papers heretofore silent or the published repentance of those who have spoken for the persecutors.

"Prosecuted for 'Breaking Saturday'" *American Sentinel* 10, 17 , p. 136.

IN a previous issue the SENTINEL announced that J. W. Huddlestone, a Seventh-day Adventist of Fort Smith, Ark., had been convicted and fined for laboring on Sunday, notwithstanding the Sunday law of the State expressly exempts from its penalties any "person who, from religious belief, keeps any other day than the first day of the week, usually called the Christian Sabbath."

As was also announced an appeal was taken from the decision of the justice, and this appeal is developing some points of peculiar

interest. It seems that the prosecuting attorney has despaired of being able to convict in the face of the exemption clause unless he can prove that Mr. Huddleston has *not, from religious belief, kept the seventh day*; and this he declares he is able to do. He says he has witnesses who will swear that Mr. Huddleston has broken his own Sabbath.

As Seventh-day Adventists are known for the strictness with which they observe the Sabbath, the reader will wonder how the prosecuting attorney will sustain the charge. He will undertake to do it thus: Seventh-day observers not only follow the Bible in regard to the *day* of the Sabbath, but they also follow the scripture direction regarding the time of *commencing* and *closing* the Sabbath. The Bible directs that, "from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbaths" (Lev. 23:32); and then defines the evening to be at the setting of the sun (Mark 1:32); but the law of Arkansas defines the day as beginning and ending at midnight. Therefore when Mr. Huddleston labored or made purchases after the setting of the sun on Saturday night after the Sabbath or seventh day of the Bible was past, he was still laboring and making purchases on the *seventh day of the law of Arkansas*, and thereby failing to keep "any other *day* as the Sabbath," in the strict legal sense.

To the fair-minded such petty persecution seems impossible, but as history abundantly shows there is no lengths to which the self-appointed avenger of what he may term a breach of God's law, will not go to accomplish his purpose.

The trial is set for April 28, and the prosecuting attorney promises to crowd the case on the lines here indicated. The spirit with which this will be done can be learned from a remark made by the prosecuting attorney to Mr. Huddleston, at their last interview, to the effect that Seventh-day Adventists were "a set of d—d fools, who ought not to be allowed a place on the earth, but ought every one to be in hell."

Meanwhile let Seventh-day Adventists manifest the spirit of the Master, "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again." Let them pray for their persecutors, for who knows but they are as honest as Paul who said: "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." Acts 26:9.

"Bless them which persecute you; bless, and curse not." Rom. 12:14.

May 2, 1895

**"A Problem for the Tennessee Legislature" *American Sentinel* 10, 18 ,
p. 137.**

THE action of the Governor of Tennessee in pardoning the imprisoned Adventists presents to the legislators of that State a problem worthy of their careful attention.

This pardon was granted unconditionally upon recommendation of the trial-judge, not only without any promise upon the part of the convicts that they would obey the law in the future, but in the face of explicit statements from them that they could not obey the law.

Nor was this all: several of the pardoned men were already under bonds to stand trial upon new indictments for violations of the same law under which they were imprisoned. Under these circumstances the pardon can be viewed in no other light than an arraignment of the law as unjust: and the question arises, What will the Legislature of Tennessee, now in session, do about it?

The American principle of government is, "that all men are created equal: that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. . . . That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men." Will the Legislature of Tennessee see to it that the Seventh-day Adventists of that State are permitted to exercise the rights to which both judge and governor have in effect officially declared that they are entitled; if not under the laws of the State, certainly under that higher law to which all just governments are amenable, namely, the law of inalienable rights?

The State of Tennessee may, in the pride of her authority, refuse the plea of Justice and continue the persecution; but might does not make right. "What other nations call religious toleration we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade these rights, but justice still confirms them."³¹ 1 It has been admitted by members of the Legislature of Tennessee that the Sunday law does infringe natural rights; that it does trench upon the religious liberty of the individual; but it is claimed that there is a "practical difficulty" in the way of repeal. But what is the "practical difficulty"! It is simply the intolerance of the people, the indifference of the law-makers and the

groundless assumption that religion cannot survive without special protection by the State.

But such a "practical difficulty" is entirely aside from the constitution of Tennessee. That instrument recognizes no religion and makes no provision for the fostering of any religious cult or creed; it recognizes no other power than that of persuasion for enforcing religious observances. Let the Sunday keepers of Tennessee recommend their religion by deeds of benevolence, by lives of virtue and by deeds of piety, and they will accomplish vastly more for Christianity than could possibly be accomplished by the use of the entire police power of the State. In the language of another: "Let them combine their efforts to instruct the ignorant, to relieve the widow and the orphans, to promulgate to the world the gospel of their Saviour, recommending its precepts by their habitual example: government will find its legitimate object in protecting them. It cannot oppose them, and they will not need its aid. *Their moral influence will then do infinitely more to advance the true interests of religion, than any measure which they may call on Congress to enact.* The petitioners [for the discontinuance of Sunday mails] do not complain of any infringement upon their own rights. They enjoy all that Christians ought to ask at the hands of any government—protection from all molestation in the exercise of their religious sentiments." ³²²

The rights asserted by the Tennessee Adventists are the natural, inherent, inalienable rights with which every man is endowed by his Creator. They may be trampled upon by the State, they may be denied by the Legislative, the Judicial, and the Executive branches of the Government of the State of Tennessee or of all the States or of the United States, but they do not thereby cease to be rights, and they will one day be recognized as such; possibly never at the bar of any earthly tribunal, but in the words of Elder Colcord before the Circuit Court of Rhea County: "There is a time coming when there will be a change, and God and not man will be the Judge—and in that court questions will be decided, not by the statute books of Tennessee, but by the law of God."

"One Day in Seven But No Day in Particular" *American Sentinel* 10, 18 , pp. 137, 138.

THE following question and answer appeared in the *Christian Statesman* of March 30:—

Q. 32.—A.F.B., Evergreen, Ala. "If you can refer us to anything in the Bible for Sunday, as strong as the Sabbath commandment is for Saturday, I would be pleased to see it. 'The seventh day (Saturday) is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.' Why not keep it? It is a perpetual sign between God and his people. If you do not keep it you have no perpetual sign between you and your God."

Ans.—The fourth commandment is "strong" for neither Saturday nor Sunday. It is strong for "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The institution for rest and worship of one day in seven or the seventh day is that for which the fourth commandment has its place in the Decalogue. A mere day cannot be a sign between God and his people. The institution of the Sabbath, a day religiously kept and honored as a day of rest and worship, is such a sign. And this is to be a perpetual sign. The obligation to keep the Sabbath is a perpetual obligation of immutable moral law. This immutable moral law does not change with the variations of solar days north or south of the equator, or east and west of any given meridian, or during the journeyings of the sun from tropic to tropic or the journeyings of humanity from arctic to Antarctic seas or in either easterly or westerly direction round the world. The law of the Sabbath as embodied in the fourth commandment and in man's nature is immutable law for man because it is universally and perpetually the same for all men in every part of the world.

Such juggling with Scripture is pitiful, and it illustrates to what lengths men will go to defend a cherished dogma.

With a hope of converting even the editor of the *Christian Statesman* from the error of his way, we will show the inconsistency of this attempted answer; and to do this we will begin with the scripture record of the origin of the Sabbath, as found in Gen. 2:1-3:—

Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.

138

Now we ask in all candor, does this scripture teach that God rested on a particular day, or does it teach that he rested on an "institution" which is one day in seven but no day in particular?

The scripture says, "God blessed *the seventh day* and sanctified *it*; because that in *it* he had rested," etc. Does this scripture teach that God sanctified and blessed a particular day or that he sanctified and blessed one day in seven but no day in particular?

The above illustrates the absurdity of the *Statesman's* answer. But the *Statesman*, while making use of this jugglery against the seventh-day Sabbath, does not dare apply it to first-day observance. The *Statesman* speaks of the first day as a sanctified, holy day. But where did it get its holiness? The only biblical account of the hallowing of a Sabbath day, the *Statesman* insists does not apply to any particular day. For what reason, then, does the *Statesman* apply it to the first day of the week? Did an all-wise God not know which day to hallow and therefore hallowed no day in particular, and then left it for finite men like the editor of the *Statesman* to decide which day of the seven was the proper day upon which to place this holiness?

And did God, after handing to man his holiness to be placed on a particular day which he was not able to decide upon himself,—did he then commission men like the editor of the *Christian Statesman* to enforce this man-hallowed day on all other men under penalty of sin against God, and consequent final ruin: and in case a man should refuse to accept men like the editor of the *Christian Statesman* as vicegerent of God on earth, has God authorized them to use the heavy hand of civil law to compel him to honor the man-hallowed day?

We doubt not that at this point the *Statesman* will attempt to parry this fatal logic by asserting that although the holiness of the Sabbath institution is not necessarily associated with any particular day of the seven, and can therefore be shifted from one day to the other, nevertheless God himself, the Lord Jesus, or his inspired apostles must do the shifting and not man. However, this diplomatic dodge will avail nothing unless it can be shown from the Scriptures that they *did* so shift the holiness once placed on the seventh day, to the first day. But this no mortal man can do.

The *Christian Statesman* calls the first day of the week "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" but while it is recorded that "the *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," it is nowhere stated in the Scriptures that the Sabbath of the Lord has been transferred from the seventh day to the first day. The *Statesman* will contend that the Lord's blessing and sanctification was temporarily attached to the seventh day of the week, but is now attached to the first day of the week; but no man can find a scripture record of the transfer of this blessing and sanctification to the first day of the week.

The *Christian Statesman* applies the term "Sabbath" to the first day of the week; but cannot find when the Lord of the disciples ever applied that term to any other than the seventh day.

The *Christian Statesman* asserts that although it was once sin to perform secular labor on the seventh day of the week, such labor can now be performed on that day without sin; but while teaching and practicing this, it is unable to produce a single scripture in support of its teaching and practice.

The *Christian Statesman* contends that at one time it was lawful to do secular work on the first day of the week, but that now it is a sin against God to perform such work on that day; and yet the *Statesman* cannot possibly find a single scripture to sustain this position. And what is more, it was this very lack of scriptural support for first day observance that led to the invention of the "one day in seven but no day in particular" theory. This theory was invented with a view to utilizing the fourth commandment in support of first-day observance. But centuries passed before the latter part of the sixteenth century did the Church seriously attempt to place the sacred robe of the fourth commandment on the pagan Sunday.

The utter absence of scriptural support for first-day holiness must drive every "one day in seven but no day in particular" advocate to the conclusion that all the sanctification and all the holiness placed on the first day of the week were placed there by man. For according to this position God did not intend to bless any particular day but only an institution which may be shifted from one day to another; but since neither God, the Lord Jesus, nor his inspired apostles ever shifted it from the seventh day on which it was first placed, to the first day, the holiness and sanctification claimed for Sunday are purely of human manufacture.

The *Statesman* hints at the close of its answer that the definite seventh day cannot be observed because of a difference of longitude and latitude. In all sincerity we ask, did not the Lord who created the world and who rested from his creative work on the seventh day, and then blessed and sanctified it "because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made;"—did not the Creator know the shape of the world which he had created? Or did he command the observance of the seventh day under the impression that it could be observed, and then several centuries later learn from the editor of the *Christian Statesman* and others that the world was so shaped that it was impossible to observe a particular day, and therefore the best

that could be done under the circumstances would be to observe "one day in seven but no day in particular," which must be understood to be the first day of the week and no other, always and everywhere, the world over, under penalty of fines and imprisonment in this life, and in the life to come everlasting torture in the flames of hell?

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 18 , p. 144.

LET it not be forgotten that while Seventh-day Adventists are being prosecuted in Tennessee for Sunday work, iron furnaces, coke ovens, railroad trains and newspaper offices run as usual and are not interfered with. In Dayton, where eight Seventh-day Adventists were recently imprisoned, a large iron furnace is operated every Sunday, a Sunday paper is published, livery stables do business, trains are run, and nobody is disturbed, nobody is indicted; but an Adventist, three miles away in the hills, pulls fodder, and he is arrested and imprisoned for committing a nuisance!

IN our issue of March 14, we had occasion to denounce the persecution of Robert G. Ingersoll by certain clergymen of Hoboken, N. Y., who revived an old statute against blasphemy, and attempted thereby to prevent Mr. Ingersoll from delivering his lecture against the Bible. In this article we carelessly attributed a mercenary motive to Mr. Ingersoll. This was unjust, both to Mr. Ingersoll and the SENTINEL. The SENTINEL has no power, no occasion and no right to sit in judgment on the motives of any man. The SENTINEL is Christian, and Christ said: "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."

MORE than forty years ago the people who publish the AMERICAN SENTINEL published to the world a prediction based on Scripture, that the time would come in the not distant future when the Sabbath question would be prominently before the country,—that it would be discussed in pulpit and press, and in legislative halls, and that the fruits of all this would be the enactment and enforcement of seventh-day observers. Much of this is now being fulfilled and more soon will be. *Die Rundschau*, a Lutheran paper, of wide circulation and influence, published in Chicago, introduces an editorial criticising the Sunday-law movement, with the following true statement of the present universal agitation of the question:—

In most States of the Union the Sunday question is once more a burning one. Not only the subject of discussion in the pulpit, in

religious conventions, in the religious periodicals of the sects, in tracts and pamphlets, but also on the floors and in the committee chambers of legislatures. Almost everywhere there is a powerful movement afoot to effect the establishment or recognition of rigid Sunday laws. Thus there are, for example, before the New York Legislature alone, no less than six bills giving attention to this matter. General recognition of Sunday as a day of rest is sought, and the State is to effect the same by means of legislation and by forcing all to obey such legislation.

Such facts are indeed significant.

REV. DR. SNYDER, of St. Louis, has this to say in the *Globe-Democrat*, of the seventh part of time theory which attempts to clothe the first day of the week with the authority of the fourth commandment:—

Rev. Mr. Kirtley preached recently on the fourth commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," and said: "The Sabbath institution that we have is the same institution given in Eden commanded through Moses, approved by Christ and observed by Christians." It is a perpetual wonder to me that intelligent and well-informed people, like Mr. Kirtley, will continue to repeat that statement, year after year, and generation after generation. It is strikingly and singularly inaccurate. The Sabbath day of the old biblical dispensation is the seventh day of the week. Any Israelite would have been amazed to hear the suggestion that any man could observe the Sabbath on any other day. There is not a word or a hint in the Bible that observance of the Sabbath meant the observance of one seventh of the time! It is stated in the Bible that the miracle of the falling manna testified to the sacredness of the specific twenty-four hours between sunset on Friday till sunset on Saturday. To attempt to transfer all the sanctions of the Sabbath from the seventh day of the week to the first day is a monstrous perversion of the Scripture.

There is not an advocate of the one day in seven theory but would ridicule such jugglery if he were the seventh son in his father's family to whom for good reasons had been willed a larger portion of the father's estate, and it was attempted to deprive him of the property on the ground that one son of the seven was all the will called for, and that it made no difference with which son the counting commenced.

A TENNESSEE paper, in the defense of the prosecution of the Adventists under the Sunday law of that State, says: "We had just as well uphold the Mormons in their polygamous belief, as to sanction and support these Adventists in their belief relative to the proper day to keep holy."

This is a confusion that the trouble is with the belief of the Adventists in relation to the day to be kept holy, and not with their practice of working on Sunday. It explains likewise why it is that others who work on Sunday are not prosecuted: it is because Sunday work by those who do not observe another day is not a protest against the substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath; while working on Sunday after having rested upon the seventh day is an emphatic protest against Sunday sacredness. It is the Sabbath rest coupled with the Sunday work that offends, and not the Sunday work itself.

The reference in the quotation to Mormonism and Mormon polygamy is only for the purpose of exciting prejudice. Those who are troubled upon this question ought to send three cents to this office for "Religious Liberty and the Mormon Question," a twenty-page tract, showing the difference between Sunday laws and laws prohibiting polygamy.

PREIST ELLIOTT, of the "Paulist Fathers," who has been lecturing to non-Catholics in Michigan and Ohio, closes a summing up of the results of his efforts with the following in the *Catholic World* for April:—

In the many non-Catholic missions which we have given, nearly all of them in public halls, we have learned many strange things, but the strangest of all is the ripeness of the harvest. The fruit is so ripe that it is falling from the trees and is being carried away by every passer by. Even the religious perplexities among our countrymen, their very divisions and sub-divisions spring from their eagerness for the truth. They want to be holy with the holiness of Christ, and that makes them enter and then makes them leave one and now another denomination. They are a religious people who are accessible to Catholic argument—would that all bishops, all provincials of communities, all priests and nuns, would write this fact on their hearts! Let it be posted up at every recruiting station of our Lord's peaceful army that the American people can be drawn to listen to this church. Let it be announced in the seminaries, let it be placarded in the novitiates and colleges and scholasticates the world over: Behold, THE GREAT REPUBLIC: IT IS A WHITE FOR THE HARVEST.

Priest Elliott manifests a commendable zeal, which, if exercised on the side of truth, would be a power for good. It is becoming more and more apparent that the American Republic is looked upon by the pope and the papacy as the ripest and most important harvest field of the world. And the great scheme of the papacy is to capture the bell sheep of liberty's flock and thus make easy the scheme to corral all

within the fold of the Vatican. It is a stupendous scheme and is succeeding.

May 9, 1895

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 10, 19 , pp. 145, 146.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL sincerely loves all Roman Catholics, from the pope on his throne to the peddler under his pack.

WE trust that our love for them is so great that if called upon to do so we would be willing to die that we might do them good.

THE reason for making these statements at this time is to correct a wrong impression which may have been made upon the minds of Roman Catholics, and for which wrong impression we may be partially to blame.

WE have said much and will say more about the papacy, its history, its doctrines, and its aims, both as regards America and the world; and this is written that Roman Catholics may know the motives from which we speak and the object at which we aim.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is moved to speak against the character and aims of the papacy, with the hope of saving Roman Catholics themselves from their own false system, and to save others from being deceived into believing that the system constitutes the true Church of Christ. This we shall endeavor to do in the spirit of Christian love, and wherein we shall fail in doing this we shall misrepresent and dishonor the cause we seek to serve.

WE cannot hope to have the friendship of all those who are in bondage to the errors of Rome, because were we to tell the truth even with the tongue, and amid the sympathetic tears of the world's Redeemer, it would not save us, as it did not save him, from the charge of being an enemy. Paul, when contending for the gospel of faith against the bondage of works,—the same gospel for which we stand, and the same bondage against which we speak,—was led to cry out in the travel of his souls, "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?"

TWO dangers lie in the path of him who would faithfully tell the truth. First, there is the danger of being unnecessarily severe, as Martin Luther was at times: and on the other hand, through an over desire to please, the danger of compromising the truth as did Philip Melancthon at the Diet of Augsburg. Luther, in his advocacy of truth,

was sometimes harsh, but invincible, while Malancthon was usually mild but sometimes vacillating. We shall take neither for our model, but instead, the perfect Reformer, the "Lion of the tribe of Judah," "the Prince of Peace."

WITH Jesus as our model we will speak the truth in love, but we *will* speak the truth. It is false charity that is silencing the Protestant Churches to Roman Catholic errors and aggressions. True Christian love will lead its possessor to die for the good of one in error, but will never consent to a compromise with error. It led the Apostle Peter to say to the Jews, in one breath: "Ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of life;" and in the next, "Brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it." It inspired the martyr Stephen to say to the Jews, "Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers?" And then when his hearers were stoning out his faithful life, this same infinite love led him to pray "with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge."

THE SENTINEL has no desire and no occasion to question the sincerity of Roman Catholics in their beliefs, or their desire to attain to supreme power in America and the world for the good of America and the world. We do not even question the sincerity of the popes, princes, and prelates who violated safe conducts and tortured and burned "heretics" for the good of their souls and the good of society. On the contrary, we believe they were sincere; for the inhuman cruelties they practiced can only be explained on the ground that their perpetrators were actuated by a mistaken sense of duty to God that led them to stifle the promptings of even natural affection; and that this view is correct is proven by the words of Christ who said, "The time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service."

BUT to admit that Roman Catholics are sincere in their erroneous doctrines and conscientious in their cruelties to dissenters, does not mitigate the errors nor lessen the crimes of Catholicism, nor yet the duty to faithfully oppose them. However, it does admonish us to eliminate from our utterances all human hate and harshness, all unsanctified elements of the natural heart, all ridicule,—everything but what is absolutely necessary to vindicate the truth, and to speak even this in love.

WE are aware that Roman Catholics in the United States profess to be satisfied with the American principle of separation of Church and State. But should we admit this, the fact still remains that the papacy in the United States is an integral part of the papacy as a whole, and were Roman Catholics to become liberalized by American institutions, the controlling spirit of the church, which never changes, would eventually rebuke and destroy such liberality. A striking instance of this is before us. For years Cardinal Gibbons has published in "Faith of Our Fathers" (1893, p. 283), an indorsement of the American idea of separation of Church and State, and a plain disavowal of any desire for State patronage; but now comes Pope Leo's encyclical to America and condemns the American principle and the cardinal's indorsement of it. We print the two in parallel columns:—

I do not wish to see the day when it would be very erroneous to draw the church will invoke or receive any conclusion that . . . it would be government aid to build our churches, or universally lawful or expedient for the to pay the salary of our clergy; for the church and State to be, as in America, government may then begin to dictate to separate and divorced. . . . She [the us what doctrines we ought to preach. church] would bring forth more abundant And in proportion as *State patronage* fruit if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed would increase, the sympathy and aid of the favor of the laws and the *patronage* the faithful would diminish. of the *public authority*.

It is for reasons like the foregoing that we cannot cease to regard the papacy as the great

146

enemy of religious liberty. At the same time we doubt not that there are those connected with the system who are in favor of religious freedom. Indeed, we are persuaded that there are those in the Roman Catholic Church who are sincere, self-sacrificing Christians, not *because* of their system, but *notwithstanding* it. However, it would be unfaithfulness to them and treason to the cause of Christ should we silence our warnings for fear of giving offense.

HAVING said this we now promise Roman Catholics and Romanizing Protestants, that, the Lord being our helper, we will more earnestly and more faithfully than ever oppose *with the truth* the soul-destroying errors of the papacy, and unveil its plottings for the supremacy of America, and through America, the supremacy of the world. We shall point to the satanic cruelties of which the church has never repented, and call Roman Catholics away from the professed

vicars of Christ who instigated or approved these cruelties, to Christ himself who rebuked this spirit in his apostles, and who said, "The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them;" and we call upon all would battle for truth and religious liberty to united with us in maintaining, in this age of compromise and concession, the true principles of Protestantism for the good of the honest and truth-loving in both Catholicism and compromising Protestantism.

**"Mormon Polygamy and Religious Liberty" *American Sentinel* 10, 19 ,
p. 146.**

THE only paper in Rhea County, Tenn., that attempts to justify the prosecution of the Graysville Adventists under the iniquitous Sunday law of that State, published an article recently, in which an effort was made to show a parallel between private Sunday work and the practice of polygamy.

This is not the first time that this view has been taken of this matter. In several cases even judges upon the bench have assumed that Sunday legislation and laws forbidding plural marriages rested upon the same foundation and were of the same character; but that this is a serious mistake must be apparent to any one who will lay aside prejudice and give the subject careful thought.

The basis of Sunday legislation is the supposed sacred character of the day, and the case would not be different were the day really the divinely-appointed Sabbath. The basis of laws regulating marriage is the rights of the contracting parties and of their prospective offspring.

To permit plural marriages in any part of the nation would be to invalidate to a certain extent every marriage contract in every State. No woman would be legally secure in the possession of a whole husband, for any man by going into that State or Territory in which polygamy was permitted could take one or more additional wives, and the woman who had married him in good faith would have no redress. Thus it is seen that the State must prohibit polygamy in every case, or else fail of the very object for which governments are instituted among men, namely, the preservation of natural rights.

Again, marriage imposes upon those who enter it, certain obligations, and they must not be permitted to escape those responsibilities, for if they do, the burdens which they should bear will fall upon others.

To protect the community from the imposition of this burden, the State rightly insists that marriage shall not be transient, but permanent.

But none of these things is true of a failure to keep a Sabbath. One man's neglect or refusal to keep the Sabbath does not deprive another of that privilege: neither does it burden the State. This is practically admitted by even the most zealous advocates of what they are pleased to term a "civil Sunday law." In answering the question, "Should there not be a law to protect the Jew in the observance of his Sabbath?" Rev. W. F. Crafts well says, "It is not sufficiently emphasized that the Jew is left absolutely free to observe the seventh day. He can close his shop: he can refuse to work." This is true: but it is no more true of the Jew and the seventh day than it is of the Sunday-keeper and the first day.

It must therefore be apparent that there exists no sufficient civil reason for Sunday laws, and that Sunday is therefore not, properly speaking, a civil institution, but a religious institution recognized by civil law and enforced by civil power. But this is contrary to the entire spirit of American institutions and in flagrant conflict with the fundamental law of the nation and of the several States.

"How They Change the Sabbath from the Seventh to the First Day"
***American Sentinel* 10, 19 , p. 146.**

THE following, from the *Christian Instructor and United Presbyterian Witness*, of April 11, attempts to justify the observance of the first day of the week as the Sabbath, thus:—

Is it so that the Bible requires the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath still? It is admitted that that was the day appointed by God at first, that it was observed until the time of Christ, that it is observed still by orthodox Jews. There is no need of discussion on these points: for no one, we presume, denies them. But the question is, whether God requires men all around the world to keep precisely the same twenty-four hours that the Jews always kept as Sabbath, and requires it to the end of time. The Apostle Paul, in Colossians, second chapter, as we have noted elsewhere in this paper, speaking of Jewish institutions, teaches that Christ nailed Jewish law to his cross, and the ordinances thereof were taken away. Therefore he says: "Let no man judge you . . . in respect to Sabbath days." Whether they be Catholics, Jews or Adventists, don't let them trouble you about these. But Christ did not nail the moral law to his cross and take it away, but he established it as the

rule of life; so the moral duty of keeping holy one day in seven is an "everlasting covenant;" it is an "everlasting sign." To keep the same identical twenty-four hours, however, all around the world is an impossibility. The same twenty-four hours is not, and never was, holy time all around the world. So it is not the exact time but the seventh part of the time in regular order of days that God required of man to observe as the Sabbath.

The following is a restatement of the foregoing, with some legitimate and even necessary deductions therefrom:—

1. Christ nailed the seventh-day Sabbath to the cross.
2. Christ reestablished the keeping of one day in seven as an "everlasting covenant," an "everlasting sign."
3. It is impossible to keep the same seventh day all around the world, but we admit that the Jews have always done this and are still doing it.
4. God does not require all men to keep the same seventh day, but the same seventh part of time, which is dependent entirely on the day with which the counting begins.
5. But since this logic is all right for the purpose for which it was invented, that is, to get rid of the "seventh-day Sabbath," it is disastrous if used for any other purpose, for it leaves every one to choose his own day which leads to utter confusion: therefore all men ought to keep the same seventh part of time.
6. And that seventh part of time must fall on the first day of the week and not on the seventh day, since to permit it to fall on the seventh day would be to defeat our object to get rid of the "seventh-day Sabbath."
7. Since some men refuse to accept the seventh part of time which we have decided to make holy time, and choose to decide for themselves which seventh they will observe, it is absolutely necessary for all nations the world over to enact laws to compel all men to observe the same seventh part of time which we observe, notwithstanding we said it was impossible to keep the same day all around the world.
8. We only quoted a part of one scripture to prove that the seventh-day Sabbath is abolished; and the reason why we quoted only a part was because the other part explains that the sabbath days of which Paul says, "Let no man therefore judge you," "are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." If we had quoted this some might think that the sabbaths referred to are the Sabbaths of the ceremonial law (Lev. 23), which pointed to Christ and ceased at

his coming, and not to the seventh-day Sabbath of the fourth commandment which points to creation.

.9. Then again, the part of the text we used must not be used against our first-day Sabbath, but only against the seventh-day Sabbath, for if used against us it would be difficult to explain why we could judge others who do not want to keep our seventh part of time, and would embarrass us in enacting and enforcing laws compelling all men to keep our first-day Sabbath.

"The Catholic Moral Standard" *American Sentinel* 10, 19 , pp. 146, 147.

IN giving his reasons, in the *Converted Catholic*, for January, for becoming a Protestant, Rev. Jas. A. O'Connor says:—

Butler's Catechism [*sic.*] told me in those days of my youth that "a grievous offense or transgression against the law of God" is called a "mortal sin," because "it kills the soul and brings everlasting death and damnation on the soul;" while venial sin does not kill, but only "hurts the soul by disposing to mortal sin." Furthermore I was taught by this Catechism that the gravity of an evil action was intensified by being perpetrated on Sunday. The question was: "Is the sin the greater for being committed on Sunday?" and the answer was: "Most certainly."

That this is still the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church was illustrated by Rev. Henry A. Braun, D.D., Rector of St. Agnes' Roman Catholic Church on East Forty-third Street, this city, when in company with another converted priest I called on him for tickets for the service in his church, the feast of St. Agnes, in February, 1893, when Bishop McQuaid preached and Archbishop Corrigan, Bishop McDonnell of Brooklyn, and a score of priests were present. Father Braun received us as intelligent gentlemen who called on him for press tickets that would give us good seats, and he detained us for half an hour while eulogizing the parochial school system. We listened with apparent interest, and when he had concluded he illustrated the necessity of parochial school teaching as distinguished from the public schools by saying that a Catholic boy who had done wrong or was guilty of sin would realize the gravity of the offense more keenly if told by his teacher that the day in which the transgression occurred was, for example, Good Friday, the day on which our Lord died, or the Lord's day, Sunday. That, said he, would be an appeal to the boy's faith that would restrain him from future transgressions. "Don't you think so?" he said to me.

Very quickly and forcibly I replied, "Not at all. That is one of the reasons why the American people will never consent to allow public

money to be given to your schools. You teach a false and unchristian system of morality. A sin is a sin whether committed on Friday, Sunday, Monday, or any other day of the week."

Father Braun's face grew scarlet, but he tried to recover his ground by the question: "Don't you think

147

the sin is greater by being committed on a holy day—for example, is it not a greater sin to get drunk on Sunday than on any other day of the week?"

His manner was embarrassed and I replied good-humoredly, "It depends on the kind of a drunk. If it is a case of intoxication it is as bad as Sunday as on any other day of the week, no more or less; a drunk is a drunk whenever it occurs, and the drunkard's sin is as great on Wednesday as on Sunday. That is another instance of the immoral teaching of your church. Your standard of morality is totally different from that of the American people, and they will never indorse such doctrine by giving support to your schools."

Mr. O'Connor is quite right in regard to the quality of an act. Sin is sin on whatever day it is committed. But we are not so sure that he is right about the views of the American people. In fact, everything goes to show that the "American" view is substantially the Catholic view. Indeed, almost every American State prohibits on Sunday some things which are not prohibited to Catholics by the church except for such hours of the day as are devoted to public worship, and then only that the people may be the more free to attend Sunday services. This shows that even in the "American" conception the time of the commission of an act changes the quality of the act.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 19 , p. 152.

THE confiscation bill has been defeated in the Tennessee Legislature. Had this bill passed it would have enabled the enemies of Seventh-day Adventists to have absolutely stripped them of their property. Its defeat shows that the law-makers of that State are not without some humane impulses.

THE *World*, of the 30th ult., had this item of news:—

PARK RIDGE, N.J., April 20.—Henry Lauschall and his fifteen-year-old son Paul, who live at the Hotel Lavelle, No. 104 Wooster Street, New York, were arrested at Woodcliff yesterday morning by Constable S. J. Van Wagonen, on the charge of fishing on Sunday in the Pacekack Brook. The constable ordered them to stop fishing under threat of arrest. They gave no attention to the order, and were taken before Justice W. B. Smith, of Park Ridge. They pleaded guilty to the charge, and were fine \$20 each. Landlord

Louis Layette of New York, paid the fines, and says that he will carry the case to the higher courts.

This is simply another illustration of the tyranny of Sunday laws. What possible reason could there be for forbidding fishing on Sunday more than on other days except the supposed sacred character of the day? and what business has the State to meddle with any such question?

A CATHOLIC paper has this significant item relative to "Father" Elliott's propoganda for the "conversion" of Protestants:—

The missions to non-Catholic Americans that Father Elliott has been preaching in Michigan and Ohio, are making an impression not only on the audiences he seeks, but also on those of the faith. The young men readers of the *Catholic Columbian* having been asked in what way could \$50,000 be best expended for the public good, one of them answers: "I would give the \$50,000 to the Paulist Fathers for the extension of their missions to non-Catholics." A happy choice, truly, for that sum could not be spent on a better cause!

It is certain that the Catholics of this country are manifesting a wonderful activity in the work of proselyting from the ranks of other churches. They discern the drift in their direction and are simply out with their grab-hooks to secure that which is floating their way.

THE fact that every year adds immensely to the volume of civil and criminal law thought to be necessary to regulate the conduct of the people, should admonish us that we live in an age when self-government is rapidly becoming a lost art.

True freedom consists not in liberty to follow one's own inclinations in all things, but in a practical recognition by both government and people of the principles of eternal justice. Freedom does not mean license, for that only is liberty which recognizes and respects the rights of others equally with our own.

There is a sound basis for the words of Cowper:—

He is a freeman, whom the truth makes free,
And all are slaves beside. There's not a chain,
That hellish foes, confederate for his harm,
With as much ease as Samson his green withes.

This is not saying that men may not deny to their fellows the free exercise of their God-given rights,—the history of the world too clearly proves that,—but it is saying that while despotic power may invade human rights, "Justice still confirms them." In the words of Elder Colcord before a Tennessee court: "There is a time coming when there will be a change, and God and not man will be the Judge—and

in that court questions will be decided not by the statute books of Tennessee, but by the law of God."

Rights may be trampled upon now, but there is a time coming when wrongs shall be righted and the truth vindicated, when "the prisoner and serf shall go free," when "truth crushed to earth shall rise again." It is better in the long run to be right than to be popular.

AN Old Testament exemplification of Christ's words, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's," is found in the record of the experience of the three Hebrew worthies who were cast into the "fiery furnace." They disobeyed the king's command to "fall down and worship the golden image" because it required them to render to Nebuchadnezzar and his golden image that which was due alone to God; but they obeyed the king's command to "come forth, and come hither," because it was their duty to render obedience to the king in matters not conflicting with their duty to God; and the Lord, who approved their disobedience by miraculously preserving them alive, brought the miracle to a close at the command of the king, that the faithful men might obey the consistent command.

May 16, 1895

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 10, 20 , pp. 153, 154.

ONE of the most far-reaching and destruction errors of the day is the exaltation of the State to a place it was never designed to occupy, and which in the very nature of things it cannot occupy without destroying at once liberty in both civil and religious things, and putting man in the place of God.

THE pagan conception of the State is summed up in the motto: "The voice of the people is the voice of God." The proper conception of the State is tersely expressed in the Declaration of Independence: "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 to secure these rights governments are instituted among men*, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

HERE the individual and not the State is given the first place; and government, instead of being lord and master, is the servant of the people, created by them and deriving its just powers from them. God,

the Creator, and not the State, is declared to be the author of rights. And not only is he in this declared to be superior to the State, but he is likewise set forth as superior to the people; hence it is impossible that the voice of the people should be "the voice of God." The people make the State, and it derives all its just powers from the people; but even they, the people, the makers of the State, do not make rights, and cannot destroy them. They may by despotic power invade these rights, but they still exist, for they are God-given and are co-existent with their Author, for they subsist in his very nature.

TO deny the existence of inalienable, God-given rights, rights that are above and beyond the power of human government to take away, is to deny the sovereignty of God himself and to make him subordinate to the State; for it is to put the State in the place of God, or rather to make the State of God, which is, in fact, the pagan conception of the State; hence the pagan motto previously quoted, or in other words, the assumption that the people in their aggregate capacity are divine, that by sufficiently multiplying the finite, infinity is the result, that by massing humanity, divinity is created.

THE doctrine of inalienable rights was not new, as some seem to suppose, when the Declaration of Independence was written. Eleven years before Jefferson wrote that immortal document, Blackstone had published to the world this statement of the same principle:—

Those rights which God and nature have established, and are therefore called natural rights, such as life and liberty, need not the aid of human law to be more effectually invested in every man than they are; neither do they receive any additional strength when declared by the municipal laws to be inviolable.

IT was perhaps only liberty pertaining to civil things, to the mere temporalities of life, that Blackstone had in mind when he wrote these words; but be that as it may, a greater than Blackstone had, centuries before, enunciated the doctrine of inalienable rights as pertaining to man's relations to his Creator; for this doctrine is set forth as certainly in the words: "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's," as in the Declaration of Independence itself.

BUT even before the time of our Saviour this principle had been discovered and boldly announced in the court of the most powerful monarch of ancient times. The three captive Hebrews were conscious of rights superior to human law when they boldly declared to Nebuchadnezzar: "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set

up." This was a declaration of independence long antedating the one written by Jefferson, and was as truly an avowal of the existence of natural, God-given rights as was the document signed by our forefathers in Philadelphia, on the Fourth of July, 1776. The words of Daniel to the king when he had deliberately disobeyed him in the matter of offering prayer, are likewise an assertion of the same divine right. He had disobeyed the king, and yet he said boldly: "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me: forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; *and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt.*"

THAT the doctrine of inalienable rights must be true is evident from the fact that in no other way could God retain the throne of moral dominion. Man must have, so far as his fellow-men are concerned, perfect liberty in things pertaining to God, or else God could not govern by a perfect law. Had God committed the administration of his law to men, it must necessarily have been imperfect since the administrators of law must also interpret the law which they administer; and the law is, for the time being, whatever its authorized interpreter says it is. Hence, had god committed to men moral government there could in the very nature of the case, have been no certain moral standard.

GOD has committed to man the maintenance of his own rights in civil things; and it is for this purpose that civil government is ordained. Hence civil government should be used for no other purpose than the conservation of civil rights. It was Jefferson who said of the duties of legislators: "Their true office is to declare and enforce our natural right and duties and to take none of them from us. No man," he continues, "has a natural right to commit aggressions on the equal rights of another; and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him; every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of society; and this is all that the laws should enforce upon him."

BUT some may query, Why spend time proving in this enlightened age, in the closing decade of the nineteenth century, a truth which was recognized as *self*-evident more than a century ago? Simply because it is neither as clearly seen nor as universally recognized to-day as it was in 1776. A different theory of civil government obtains largely to-day. Instead of being regarded as the creature and servant of the people, the State is clothed with "that divinity" which was once supposed to "hedge about a king;" government, instead of being

merely the conservator of natural rights, is said to have "unlimited and undivided power

154

over every individual within its jurisdiction, over every institution that its subjects may establish within its territory, and over every commodity that exists within its territory." ³³ 1 In short, the State, like the king, "can do no wrong."

SUCH a theory is utterly destructive of both civil and religious liberty. It destroys *all* individual liberty and makes every man a slave. Yea more, it puts the State in the place of God and makes every man who accepts it a veritable pagan; and that whether he realizes it or not, for no man can accept this theory of government and say with the apostles: "We ought to obey God rather than men." For this reason the AMERICAN SENTINEL protests against the doctrine as un-American and unchristian.

"Protestants Petition Satolli" *American Sentinel* 10, 20 , p. 154.

A FEW weeks since, "Father" Phelan, editor of the *Western Watchman*, published some shamefully untrue things about Christian Endeavor conventions. These false charges, however, could not harm Christian Endeavorers; but since they were made, Christian Endeavorers have themselves said and done things that are harming them.

The proper thing for them to have done is thus stated by Christ:—

Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you. Matt. 5:11, 12.

But instead of following the counsel of Christ and being "exceeding glad," the Christian Endeavorers became "exceeding made," and one of their spokesmen is reported as saying, in an address entitled, "Father Phelan's base attack upon the young people of America":—

Judas Iscariot was a gentleman compared with this shameless priest. I wouldn't be surprised if Mr. Iscariot would decline to recognize him below.

Father confessor! God pity the poor girl that should ever be so silly as to whisper her secrets in such a swine's ears.

Retraction is no remedy. Swift and adequate punishment alone will reach the case, and if it does not soon follow, the whole Romish Church authorities will be held responsible.

But the Christian Endeavorers did not stop with rendering railing for railing, cursing for cursing, but have, astonishing to relate, petitioned Mgr. Satolli to curse "Father" Phelan also. The following is a copy of this remarkable document:—

To His Reverence, Mgr. Satolli, Roman Catholic University, Washington, D. C.:—

We, the undersigned Christian Endeavorers of Asbury Park, N. J., respectfully call your attention to the wicked, false, and slanderous statements published by Father Phelan, one of your priests in St. Louis. This base and inexcusable assault is made upon more than three millions of pious, earnest, godly, and irreproachable young Christians in America. It is unparalleled in its baseness and enormity, and should consign its author in everlasting infamy and contempt. We therefore ask that the creature from which it emanated be degraded, unfrocked, and deposed from the high position which he has so recklessly disgrace. We are encouraged to make this petition from the many protestations which you, as well as the Holy See which you ably represent, have recently fully and earnestly made, with full confidence that you will give it immediate and careful consideration.

We had not read five lines of this document before we predicted that this tacit acknowledgment of Satolli, as a representative of the "Holy See" to which not only Roman Catholics may appeal, but to which Protestants also may petition for redress of grievances, would be pointed to by Roman Catholics as a recognition of papal authority. In this prediction we were right.

The first to call attention to it was "Father" Phelan himself, who says:—

The preachers some time ago were shouting to Mgr. Satolli from the Atlantic to the Pacific to get out of the country; and to stand upon the order of his going, but go at once. Now they are on their knees to him to stay just long enough to cut our head off!—*The Western Watchman, May 7.*

The *Northwestern Chronicle*, of May 3, Archbishop Ireland's official organ, regards the matter in much the same light. It says, after condemning "Father" Phelan's utterances:—

Another thing is also observable in connection with the affair, and that is that the attacked parties themselves are glad to appeal to Archbishop Satolli for redress, which will unquestionably be given if it is in his power. So an apostolic delegate, even if he is an "eyetalian," is not so bad a thing after all.

It was this appealing for redress of grievances that laid the foundation of the papacy which banished religious freedom from the

earth. The disputing bishops appealed to the Bishop of Rome to decide their disputes. Later the Bishop of Rome claimed the prerogative to decide such questions, and later still pointed to the appeals to him as an acknowledgment of his authority. Rome always encourages such appeals and then never forgets them when made. An illustration of this is seen in the controversy between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Church. Every petition from the bishops of England to the Bishop of Rome is now used to show that the Church in England once recognized the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and that her failure to do so now is an evidence of apostasy.

Protestants, if you are not prepared to accept popery from A to Z, then don't petition the papal delegate.

"Arrogant Contrariness" *American Sentinel* 10, 20 , p. 154.

THE *Hartville* (Mo.) *Press*, of April 25, contained this heartless editorial reference to the recent imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists at Dayton, Tenn:—

Eight Seventh-day Adventists are imprisoned at Dayton, Tenn., for laboring on Sunday. This is right. When people become so they won't be governed by the laws of their State they ought to migrate or at least be punished for their arrant contrariness.

Fidelity to principles has always been regarded by the persecutor as "arrant contrariness." Especially was this true of the early persecution of the Christians by the pagans. Pliny, the pagan governor of the Province of Bithynia, writes thus to the Emperor Trajan regarding the former's attitude toward the Christians:—

I have taken this course about those who have been brought before me as Christians. I asked them whether they were Christians or not. If they confessed that they were Christians, I asked them again, and a third time, intermixing threatenings with the questions. If they persevered in their confessions, I ordered them to be executed; for I did not doubt but, let their confessions be of any sort whatever, this *positiveness and inflexible obstinacy deserted to be punished.*

If the editor of the *Hartville Press* were called upon to obey a law in conflict with his conscience, we have that respect for him to believe that he would refuse to violate his conscience even in the face of the charge of "*arrant contrariness.*"

**"The 'Examiner,' the [N. Y.] 'Christians Advocate,' and the Sabbath"
American Sentinel 10, 20 , p. 156.**

THE Baptist Church discards infant baptism because it is not commanded by the Word of God, yet it observes the first day of the week as the Sabbath. This inconsistency is constantly getting Baptists into trouble. When the church demands a scriptural command for infant baptism from some church which adheres to the unscriptural practice, they are sure to be met with the challenge for a scriptural command for Sunday observance. Here is an instance taken from the New York *Christian Advocate* (Methodist) of April 25:—

The following is from the *Examiner*:—

"The late Thomas Cooper, of England, an eminent popular lecturer, who in mature life became a Christian and a Baptist, once explained the way in which he was led to adopt Baptist views. In conversation with a Christian woman, a Baptist, he said: 'I have generally found that, whatever practices or beliefs there may be among the various Christian bodies, they have usually some text which, rightly or wrongly, is quoted to justify them; but I have never heard of any text which authorizes the old Romish custom of the christening of church bells.' 'Really,' replied his friend, 'that is a very simple matter. The christening of bells is authorized by the very next verse to the one which commands the christening of babies!'— a remark which set Thomas Cooper thinking, with the result above indicated."

The *Christian Advocate* quotes the foregoing and follows it with this comment:—

Why this was published we can hardly imagine. Is there any person who supposes that all the practices or beliefs of Christians can be sustained by some positive text? Our Baptist friends would find great difficulty in finding a positive text in support of some of their beliefs. Without doubt there is no text commanding the christening of babies. Nor is there any commanding the substitution of the Lord's day for the Sabbath.

The church dogma of Sunday sacredness is becoming a universal cudgel with which to smite him who would appeal to Scripture as the only authority for doctrine and practice. When a Protestant church appeals to Scripture against the unscriptural doctrines and practices of the papacy, the papist seizes the Sunday cudgel and cracks his Protestant disputant over the head with it, and forthwith he is silent. Then when a Protestant of one church, as in the foregoing instance, attempts to appeal to Bible truth against unbiblical traditions, the

defender of tradition instantly seizes the Sunday cudgel and pounds his Protestant brother into silence.

The fact is, the Sunday institution stands as the ensign of tradition and ritualism, while the Sabbath stands for the Bible and Jesus Christ.

**"The Bible Day and the Meeting at Troas" *American Sentinel* 10, 20 ,
p. 159.**

A READER asks this question: "What reason have you for saying that the meeting of Acts 20:6 was held on Saturday night and that a part of Sunday was spent in traveling?"

The Bible day, unlike the modern day, begins at the setting of the sun. That this is true is shown by several texts of Scripture. In the first chapter of Genesis we find repeatedly the expression, "The evening and the morning were the first day," "The evening and the morning were the second day," etc. This alone would of course not be conclusive, though it is suggestive. But in Lev. 23:32 we find the express command: "From even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath." That the "even" here referred to was marked by the setting of the sun is evident from Mark 1:32: "And at even, *when the sun did set*, they brought unto him all that were diseased," etc. The connection shows that the setting of the sun marked the close of the Sabbath, which, according to the commandment, was and is, the seventh day.

The texts cited establish clearly the fact that the Bible day commences with the even, that is, at the setting of the sun. The meeting at Troas was on the first day of the week. It was likewise an evening meeting, for "there were many lights in the upper chamber."

But, according to the Bible, the evening of the first day of the week is not what we call Sunday evening, but what corresponds to our Saturday evening. This conclusion is unavoidable. It follows therefore that "a part of Sunday was spent, by Paul and his company, in traveling," for the record is, that after healing the young man who fell from the window, Paul "talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed." While of Luke and his companions we read: "We went before to ship, and sailed unto Assos, there intending to take in Paul; for so had he appointed, minding himself to go afoot."

The only reasonable conclusion to be arrived at from a careful reading of the whole account of the visit to Troas, is that arriving at Troas early on Sunday, Paul and his company spent an entire week

there. At the close of the Sabbath, Luke and his companions sailed for Assos, but Paul tarried over night, held a farewell meeting with the church at Troas, and then went on foot to Assos, where he met his companions who had made the much longer journey by water. The twentieth chapter of Acts affords not even a hint of Sunday sacredness, but rather the contrary.

The view here presented is not peculiar to observers of the seventh day, but is identical with that presented by Conybeare and Howson, in their "Life and Epistle of the Apostle Paul," so far as the time of the Troas meeting and the Bible day are concerned.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 20 , p. 160.

THE *Republican*, of Dayton, Tenn., says that a bill was introduced into the legislature of that State on the 27th ult., "to amend section 2289 of the Code so as to provide that persons observing Saturday as the Sabbath shall not be liable to penalty for working on Sunday." Such a bill would of course relieve the persecuted Adventists for the time being, were it to become a law; but it would not settle the principle at stake. Section 2289 of the Code of Tennessee ought to be repealed, as should every similar law in every State in the Union and of every country in the world. The whole principle of Sunday legislation is wrong.

THAT we are living in an age of moral degeneracy was strikingly illustrated recently in the city of Brooklyn.

The bookkeeper of a wealthy club was found to be a defaulter to a large amount, and was criminally prosecuted.

A petition, signed by a large number of respectable persons, was presented to the trial-judge, praying for leniency for the embezzler. Among the reasons urged for clemency was this:—

He was surrounded by many temptations; he was actuated by a desire, so common in our modern life, to live on a scale equal to that of the gentlemen with whom he associated daily, and to raise and educate his children as did his neighbors.

The *Christian Advocate*, of this city, refers to the facts stated as "an illustration of the widespread decline of principle," and says: "More sympathy is now shown for thieves and defaulters than admiration for simple, old-fashioned honesty."

The *Advocate's* remarks is quite true, but is not that paper partly responsible for the moral degeneracy which substitutes custom for the moral law and places a higher value upon the applause of men

than the favor of God? For instance, in the matter of Sunday-keeping, very many religious papers and ministers of the gospel acknowledge that they have no better authority for the observance of the first day of the week than custom. They would keep the day commanded by God, but by so doing they would lose caste and influence. Are not the cases, if not parallel, at least akin? The defaulter breaks the eighth commandment that he may appear well, while the others break the fourth commandment that they may stand well, be popular and avoid the self-denial incident to being out of joint with the practices of society at large. Is not the principle the same?

"Georgia at It Again" *American Sentinel* 10, 20 , p. 160.

A SPECIAL telegram announces that J. Q. Allison, a Seventh-day Adventist of Douglas County, Ga., has been arrested for working on Sunday. He is to be tried this week. Mr. Allison, if convicted, will, according to the Georgia statute, "be punished by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars, imprisonment not to exceed six months, *to work in the chain-gang on the public works, or on such other works as the county authorities may employ the chain-gang, not to exceed twelve months, and any one or more of these punishments may be ordered in the discretion of the judge.*"

In case a fine is imposed, Section 4582 of the Georgia Code makes the following provisions for its disposal:—

All moneys arising from fines imposed for offenses, the *gist of which consists in their being committed on the Sabbath day*, shall be paid to the ordinary of the county, to be by him distributed for the *purpose of establishing and promoting Sabbath-schools in the county.*

In case the convicted party refuses to pay fines, or in case he is sentenced to the chain-gang. Section 4814 provides:—

In all cases where persons are convicted of misdemeanor, and sentenced to work in the chain-gang on the public works, or public roads, or when such persons are confined in jail for non-payment of fines imposed for such misdemeanor, the ordinary of the county, and where there is a board of commissioners of roads and revenues of the counties, then said board of commissioners, and in those counties where there is a county judge, then the county judge, where such conviction was had, or where such convicts may be confined, may place such convicts, in the county or elsewhere, to work upon such public works of the county, in chain-gangs, or otherwise, or hire out such convicts, upon such terms and

restrictions as may subserve the ends of justice, and place such convicts under such guards as may be necessary for their safe keeping.

In case of "insurrection" (which would doubtless include a refusal to work in the chain-gang on the Sabbath), Section 4821 provides:—

Whenever any convict or convicts now confined, or hereafter to be confined, in the penitentiary of this State, or member or members of the chain-gang now confined, or hereafter to be confined in the penitentiary of this State, or wherever else employed as such, shall be guilty of insurrection or attempt at insurrection, such convict or convicts, or member or members of the chain-gang, shall, upon trial and conviction in the Supreme Court of the county in which the crime is committed, be deemed guilty of a capital offense, and punished with death, or such other punishment as the judge in his discretion may indict.

Thus it appears that Mr. Allison is facing as a possibility, first, a thousand-dollar fine; second, six months' imprisonment; third, the chain-gang; fourth, all three combined; fifth, he faces the possibility of being sold to the highest bidder, to some contractor, and in either case whether in the chain-gang of the State or the private contractor, should he refuse to work on the Sabbath, as he surely would, he "may be punished with death"!

The State of Georgia is not in Russia; it is in the southeastern part of the United States, and professed Protestant churches are behind this barbarous Sunday law.

May 23, 1895

"The Pope's Letter to the English People" *American Sentinel* 10, 21 , pp. 161, 162.

POPE LEO XIII. has written a letter to "the English people who seek the kingdom of Christ in the unity of the faith." All professed Christians seek the unity of the faith, and therefore the pope addresses all the professed Christians of England.

This is not the first time the papacy has attempted to persuade the English people to return to the "unity of the [Roman Catholic] faith." A notable attempt was made just three hundred and seven years ago this month.

In May, 1588, the papacy sent one hundred and fifty messengers to England to argue with the English people and persuade them to return to the Roman Catholic faith. Twelve of these messengers were

named after the twelve apostles, and others were named after the "saints."

While these messengers were apostolic in name, and were commissioned by the professed vicar of Christ, Pope Sixtus V., they were not apostolic men armed only with the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," but instead they were huge battle ships, armed and equipped with 2,088 galley slaves, 8,000 sailors, 20,000 soldiers, 2,650 cannon, 123,790 rounds of shot, and 517,500 pounds of powder. ³⁴¹

Beside being equipped with these ordinary death-dealing arguments of war, these papal messengers, which history calls the "Spanish Armada," and which Roman Catholics were pleased to call the "Invincible Armada," were equipped with still other papal arguments which were to be used to restore the unity of the faith in special cases, wherein the ordinary war arguments failed. These special arguments were the torture instruments ³⁵² of the "Holy Office of the Inquisition;" and to insure the effective application of these arguments, Don Martin Allacon, Administrator and Vicar-General of the "Holy Office," accompanied these satanic instruments of cruelty.

However, this Armada argument was but one in a series of papal measures intended to persuade the English people to return to their allegiance to the pope. Before sending the Armada, and with a view to weakening the loyalty of the English people to the queen of England as a preparation for it, the pope hurled a bull of excommunication against the queen, from which the following is extracted:—

We do, out of the fullness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being a heretic, and a favorer of heretics, and her adherents in the matter aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever. . . . And we do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her or her monitions, mandates, and laws; and those that shall do the contrary, we do strike with the like sentence of anathema. ³⁶³

This excommunication was followed by papal attempts to assassinate the queen, and then came the pope-blessed "Invincible Armada," which was heroically fought and finally defeated and driven off by the much inferior navy of England. Our illustration shows one of

the stratagems used by the English to save themselves from the choice of a terrible death or unity with Rome. On the night of August 7, the English loaded eight ships with combustible material, smeared their masts with tar, sailed them near the Spanish fleet and then set them on fire, with the hoped-for result that the Spaniards took flight and sailed away, after which the English ships and a terrible storm completed their defeat and almost complete destruction.

This is a brief description of the failure of an old papal method of securing the unity of the faith. But why does not Pope Leo XIII. now use the methods of his "infallible" predecessor, Pope Sixtus V.? Why don't he send an Armada instead of an "Apostolic Letter"? It cannot be because the papacy has discarded

162

these antichristian methods, for this is impossible, since Pope Leo X. "infallibly" condemned Luther's proposition that "to burn heretics is contrary to the will of the Holy Ghost," thus "infallibly" sanctioning the practice of burning heretics. Again, Pope Pius IX., the immediate predecessor of the present pope, as late as 1851, "infallibly" condemned the proposition, "The church has not the power of availing herself of force or any direct or indirect temporal power."

No; the papacy has not disavowed and cannot disavow the methods used in the Middle Ages to secure the "unity of the faith," without destroying the doctrine of "infallibility" which is has "infallibly" proclaimed.

Why is it then that Leo XIII. now speaks to the English people with "the deep tones of sympathetic feeling" ³⁷⁴ instead of with the deep-toned roar of Spanish cannon?

Since it cannot be because of a change in the papacy it must be because of a change in circumstances. Here lies the truth. When the Spanish Armada attempted the destruction of Protestantism in England, the papacy controlled the greater part of western Europe. Spain was a great naval power, while England was much inferior in naval resources, with only about four million people. To-day the papacy is shown of its temporal power, Spain though still Roman Catholic has lost its naval prestige, while England is the strongest naval power in the world.

That Rome would do the same now as she did in the sixteenth century is also made evident by present papal practices in Catholic countries. In Roman Catholic South America Protestant missionaries are persecuted. And when the Methodist ministers of Chicago

petitioned Satolli a few months ago to petition the pope to secure religious liberty for Protestant missionaries in that country, Satolli coolly replied by sending them a copy of the pope's letter calling the governments and people of the world back into the Roman Catholic Church, thus in reality saying, "You can have religious freedom in Catholic South America only by joining the Catholic Church."

Again, Protestant missionaries have been mobbed and driven from the Caroline Islands by Roman Catholics; and only a few weeks ago, Roman Catholic Spain peremptorily denied the request of the Government of the United States that American missionaries be allowed to return to the Caroline Islands.

And almost simultaneously with the pope's letter to England, he sent one to Hungary commending the organization of a distinct Roman Catholic political party with the object of securing the repeal of liberal measures recently passed in that country, placing all religious denominations on an equal footing before the law. But the pope, acting in that country in accordance with his recent encyclical to America, demands "in addition to liberty, the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority."

For these and other reasons that might be cited, the English people ought not to be deceived by this letter which the New York *Sun's* Rome correspondent, himself a Roman Catholic says is written "with *delicate tact*, in the most *flattering tone*," and "drawn at long sight" with "infinite ecclesiastical ambition." It is the papal policy to use force when in power, and flattery when seeking power; and it is astonishing that so many Protestants are so credulous and short sighted as not to see in the flattery and the "deep-toned sympathy" of the pope, a deep-laid plot "drawn at long sight," to regain the supremacy of the world.

And it is only a false charity that would silence the cry of warning because the plottings of the pope for the world' supremacy are carried on with "delicate tact" instead of defiant temerity; with the "flattering tone," instead of the "Invincible Armada."

May God save the Protestants of England and the world from being deceived by this siren song and flattering tone of the pope into compromising with Rome. And may the same God save Roman Catholics themselves from the tyranny which will follow the triumph of their own system. To this end we labor and pray.

**"Civil Law and the Rights of Conscience" *American Sentinel* 10, 21 ,
pp. 162, 163.**

THE following letter from the editor of the *American Monthly Microscopical Journal* will be read with interest by all. Mr. Smiley's position is unique; he insists upon obedience to laws which he confesses are unjust. But his candid tone leaves no doubt of his entire sincerity; hence his views are entitled to respectful consideration:—

Washington, D. C. , May 6, 1895.

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: I have read carefully your issue of April 11, upon the Sunday question and freedom of conscience. Your people ought not to overlook, as they do, that human laws are to be obeyed *whether right or wrong by the people who choose to live under them*. Society is dependent for its maintenance on the execution of the will of the majority as expressed in laws. When those laws come into serious conflict with the views of certain citizens, as in the case of the Seventh-day Adventists and others, the liberty of conscience cannot rightfully be set up as a justification for breaking the laws. Your only resort is to submit under protest or go away from a society which tolerates such oppressive laws and establish or find one that is not so. Take the Mormon doctrine of polygamy as parallel. Many Mormons hold as conscientiously to plural marriages as you do to Saturday rest. But their religious views, however conscientious, cannot be set up as a defense for violating law (just or unjust is not the question at all). For my own part I consider all Sabbath laws (Saturday or Sunday) as infringements of personal liberty and would gladly vote to abolish all such laws; but while they exist they must be respected. To defy them is anarchy. *Elder Colcord is an anarchist* to the extent of defying one human law, and he can have no word to utter against the thief who says and does steal conscientiously. Many now believe that property laws are contrary to God's laws and could as conscientiously defy them as did the Adventists defy the Sunday law. I would join them in seeking to undo wicked laws of which we have hundreds, but so long as these infamous laws stand, Elder Colcord and the rest do wrong in violating them. He will not say that two wrongs make one right. If our nation is so foolish as to adhere to wicked laws, and it doubtless will to many of them, you and I owe it to humanity to go away, as did our forefathers, to a new land and establish an asylum for the oppressed of all peoples. America once was. To-day it is not. It is more cruel than France in its religious oppressions and is going to be worse than it is now after a few years. I hope you will submit these views to the calm and careful consideration of your readers,

and cease to put your people forward as justified in violating (bad) laws.

Yours truly,

CHAMS. W. SMILEY, *Editor*.

Mr. Smiley's first proposition is more in keeping with the theory of law and government that prevailed in Rome under the Cesars than with the principles of the Declaration of Independence. According to Mommsen "the whole duty of man, with the humblest and greatest of Romans, was to keep his house in order, *and be the obedient servant of the State*." But the American theory of government makes the State the servant of the people, created by them for the conservation of their rights. The Declaration of Independence sets forth as a self-evident truth the proposition that all men are by their Creator endowed "with certain *unalienable rights*," and that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, *deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed*." Now was this conception of government and of human rights original with the framers of the Declaration of Independence. As quoted in this paper last week, Blackstone had, eleven years previous to the signing of the Declaration, published to the world a very similar statement of the same principle, in these words:—

Those rights which God and nature have established, and are therefore called natural rights, such as life and liberty, need not the aid of human laws to be more effectually invested in every man than they are; neither do they receive any additional strength when declared by the municipal laws to be inviolable.

An inalienable right cannot be destroyed or alienated by any law. It may be invaded by despotic power, its exercise may be denied, but it is none the less a right; and this has been recognized as preëminently true of rights of conscience.

January 19, 1829, the Senate of the United States adopted a report by the committee on post offices and post roads, in which this truth is set forth in the following stirring words:—

What other nations call religious toleration we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them.

About a year later, March 5, 1830, the National House of Representatives concurred in a similar report from the House Committee on post offices and post roads, in which occurs this passage:—

The framers of the Constitution recognized the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation, and his rights of conscience inalienable. *Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our own bosoms.* It is this consciousness which in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs, in tortures and in flames. They felt that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man could exercise no authority over their consciences. *It is an inborn principle which nothing can eradicate.* The bigot, in the pride of his authority, may lose sight of it; but strip him of his power, prescribe a faith to him which his conscience rejects, threaten him in turn with the dungeon and the fagot, and the spirit which God has implanted in him rises up in rebellion and defies you.

Observe that the Constitution did not create this right, but merely recognized it; therefore it exists wherever man exists, whether recognized or not by anybody. Constitutional law may deny it, statutory law may override it, as it does in Tennessee, but it is none the less a right, and he who through fear of consequences fails to assert this right and to exercise it, is disloyal alike to true manhood and to God who claims his highest allegiance.

Thomas Jefferson, than whom no man ever better understood the principles of free government, said:—

The religion of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated in their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men. It is unalienable, also, because what is here is right towards men is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society. Before any man can be considered as a member of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the universe.

But even were the rights in question merely constitutional rights instead of being as they are, both constitutional and natural rights, any invasion of them would still be a nullity, and the individual might still violate any law made in contravention of them without becoming thereby an anarchist. Hon. James Brice, M. P., from Aberdeen, author of "The

Holy Roman Empire," says of acts of Congress, in his recent work, "The American Commonwealth":—

Their validity depends on their being within the scope of the law-making power conferred by the superior authority [the Constitution] and as they have passed outside that scope they are invalid. . . . They ought not to be obeyed or in any way regarded by the meanest citizens, because they are not law.

This being true of acts invading merely constitutional rights in civil things,—substantial rights to be sure, but not trenching upon the domain of conscience,—how much more is it rue of inalienable, God-given rights of conscience!

Nor is it alone by statesmen and publicists that this principle has been seen and enunciated. President Fairchild, of Oberlin College, says:—

It is too obvious to need discussion, that the law of God, the great principle of benevolence, is supreme, and that, "we ought to obey God rather than men," in any case of conflict between human law and the divine. . . . It is often urged that the right of private judgment, as now maintained, in reference to obedience to the laws of the land, will subvert government, and introduce confusion and anarchy. . . . The danger, however, is greatly over-estimated. *Government is never the gainer in the execution of a law that is manifestly unjust. . . . Conscientious men are not the enemies, but the friends, of any government but a tyranny. They are its strength, and not its weakness.* Daniel, in Babylon, praying, contrary to the law, was the true friend and supporter of the government; while those who, in their pretended zeal for the law and the constitution, would strike down the good man, were its real enemies. *It is only when government transcends its sphere, that it comes in conflict with the consciences of men.*

But it is objected that the example is corrupting, that a bad man will violate a good law, because the good man refuses to obey a wicked law. The cases are just as unlike as right and wrong, and any attempt to justify the one by the other, is gross dishonesty. Unquestionably, the principle can be abused by the wicked, and so can any truth whatever, but *the principle of unquestioning obedience to human law is false*, and needs no perversion to make it mischievous. Practically, the cases are few, in well-established governments, where the law encroaches upon the rights of conscience; but *if the principle be surrendered, the cases will multiply. . . .* The most grievous of all imperfections in government, is the failure to secure the just and good result. *Injustice and oppression are not made tolerable by being in strict accordance with the law.* nothing is surer, in the end, than the reaction of such wrong, to break down the most perfectly constituted government.—*Fairchild's Moral Philosophy, pp. 178-186.*

The Adventists of Tennessee, as well as of other States, act upon this principle. They refuse to obey Sunday laws, not from reckless disregard of civil authority, but from conscientious conviction of sacred duty. No matter how utterly at variance with their ideas of justice a law might be if it did not invade the realm of conscience, if to obey it did not involve disobedience of the law of God, no Adventist would disobey. They would submit even, as did the Saviour, to the imposition of an unjust tax (Matt. 17:24-27); but they, like "Peter and the other apostles" (Acts 5:29), feel that they must "obey God rather than men."

It is very true that government cannot permit men to do whatever they may claim is done by them conscientiously. As our correspondent says, some men are conscientiously opposed to laws guarding property rights, and some are conscientious in the matter of plural marriages. But there is a touchstone to which all such questions can be brought and by which they can be infallibly settled; it is the rule given by Christ himself: "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesars; and unto God the things that are God's."

This draws the line between our duties to God and our duties to our fellow-men, and that is just where all just government must draw it. Whatever trenches upon the equal right of another may be forbidden, and everything else is outside the domain of human legislation. Said Abraham Lincoln: "I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, *so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights.*"—*Political Debates, page 83.*

Lincoln's words are in exact accord with these words from Thomas Jefferson:—

Our legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power, that their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties and to take none of them from us. No man has a natural right to commit aggressions on the equal rights of another; and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him; every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of the society; and this is all the laws should enforce upon him.—*American State Papers Bearing on Religious Legislation, p. 69.*

Jefferson's rule, which is first of all the divine rule, and secondly the American rule, would exclude all laws requiring the observance of real or supposed holy days; but it would not exclude from the domain of proper civil jurisdiction laws prohibiting polygamy; because the

marriage relation necessarily involves the rights not only of the contracting parties but of their offspring and of society. It would be impossible to permit polygamy anywhere in the United States without thereby jeopardizing the rights of every woman in every State in the Union, and in every country in the world; for with plural marriages legalized anywhere, any man who wished to do so might go to that place and there marry other wives without regard to the rights of his first wife who had married him with no thought of any such thing. This is but one point of the many at which polygamy trenches upon civil rights that civil government is in duty bound to safeguard, and to vindicate when infringed.

We take our stand on this question with the Fathers of the Republic and declare with Alexander Hamilton that "justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. . . . In a society, under the form of which the stronger faction can readily unite and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature, where the weaker individual is not secure against the violence of the stronger."—*Federalist LI*.

Professor Colcord is not an anarchist, nor is any man an anarchist simply because he enters a practical protest against tyranny. President Fairchild well says: "Conscientious men are not the enemies but the friends of any government but a tyranny. They are its strength, and not its weakness. Daniel, in Babylon, praying contrary to the law, was the friend and supporter of the government; while those who in their pretended zeal for the law and the constitution, would strike down the good man, were its real enemies." And so today Elder Colcord and his brethren are the real friends of law and order in Tennessee, while those who would prostitute the law to the base ends of bigotry and intolerance are the enemies of all just law, the betrayers of soul liberty.

"Who dares not follow Truth where'er
Her footsteps lead,
But says, 'Oh, guide not there nor there,
I have not strength to follow where
My feet would bleed;
But show me worn ways, trodden fair
By feet more brave'—
Who fears to stand in Truth's broad glare,
What others dared not will not dare,
Is but a slave."

"Harrison's Pen and Cleveland's Hook" *American Sentinel* 10, 21 , p. 163.

ON Sunday, May 11, President Cleveland, with two cabinet officers, went fishing near Leesburg, Va. They fished from 7 o'clock in the morning to 6 o'clock in the evening, catching among them seventy trout, of which number twenty-eight were caught by the President.

This completes the ruin of the "American Sabbath" which the Sunday-law crusaders persuaded the national Government to make in 1892.

On Feb. 29, 1892, the United States Supreme Court decided that "this is a Christian nation," citing Sunday laws as one proof.

On July 19, 1892, the Congress of the United States followed the lead of the Supreme Court and passed a Sunday bill.

On August 5, this bill was signed by President Harrison and became a law. The pen with which it was signed was begged from the President and carefully treasured in the archives of the American Sabbath Union; and we were told in great glee that the sacredness of the "American Sabbath" was permanently assured. But what man can sanctify, he can desecrate, and so—

On March 3, 1895, the same being Sunday, Congress "desecrated," by spending the day in legislative session, what its predecessors had sanctified.

On April 7, the same being Sunday, the United States Supreme Court "desecrated" the Sunday of this "Christian nation" by sitting in executive session and attending to business ever performed by a Seventh-day Adventist on that day. And finally—

On May 11, the same being Sunday, Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, spent the day catching trout, and "desecrated" with his hook what his predecessor had sanctified with his pen; and thus completed the ruin of the Government-made "American Sabbath."

Against all this the Sunday-law crusaders are entering a vigorous protest, and threaten to "turn the rascals out." Although the State-sanctified Sabbath is ruined, the "Sabbath of the Lord" still stands.

"The 'Monitor' Criticises the Cardinal's Latin" *American Sentinel* 10, 21 , pp. 163, 164.

SOME time ago, the Catholic *Monitor* accused the AMERICAN SENTINAL of "steady and unlimited abuse of the pope of Rome." To this we replied that "the only mention that we have had occasion to make of the pope has been in connection with his scheme to unite the Roman Catholic Church with the power of the United States Government, to do with this nation now as 'the church' has done done with other nations in the past, and so to bring Europe and all humanity once more under the power of the papacy; and in doing this we have only stated the facts as given from the pope through Catholic channels." But that "these plain facts, however, plainly stated, set the papacy in such a wicked light before the country that it is easy enough for Catholic papers to see in it only 'steady and unlimited abuse of the pope of Rome.'"

We further said that "the only other occasion that we have had, or used, to discuss the pope was when, last year, he addressed 'the Princes and Peoples of the Universe,' and gravely informed us that 'WE [that is himself] hold the regency of God on earth.'"

In our use of the address, "The Princes and Peoples of the Universe," the *Monitor* thinks it has found evidence of great obtuse-

164

ness, if not both ignorance and heresy. It accordingly reins us up, in its own vigorous style, as follows:—

This refers to one of the pope's encyclicals. Now let us tell the *American Sentinel* that there is no encyclical addressed to the princes and peoples of the universe. There is one addressed *Principibus Populisque Universis*, but any school boy who has got as far as *hic haec hoc* would be able to tell it that this does not mean the princes and peoples of the universe. If the *American Sentinel* is not able to interpret the title to a modern document written in so simple a language as Latin, how can we expect it to interpret prophecies which have been written in every corrupt dialect from the vulgar Chaldee of Daniel to the Hellenistic Greek of St. John?

It may be that our knowledge of Latin is so defective as not to be able in all things to bear the *Monitor's* superior criticism. It may be, indeed, that we have not "got as far as *hic haec hoc*;" and it may be, therefore, that we are, indeed, "not able to interpret the title to a modern document written in so simple a language as Latin." But whatever may be our knowledge or lack of knowledge of "so simple a language as Latin," we were not quite so simple as to suppose that our own translation of a Latin passage from the pope would be accepted by Catholics as correct,—especially when such translation

was used as the text for a criticism of the vital claim of the pope which is but the claim of the papacy.

In this matter, therefore, we did not attempt any translation of our own; but thought to use one obtained from such an authority in Latin that even Catholics themselves would not question its correctness. And thinking that Cardinal Gibbons was probably well enough acquainted with "so simple a language as Latin" to translate the encyclical, we thought that a translation certified by him could safely be used. Accordingly we waited until a standard Catholic paper had printed the authorized translation from the Cardinal himself. The *Northwestern Chronicle* was the first such paper in which we found the authorized translation, and this is the one we used. In the issue of that paper dated July 20, 1894,—page 5,—the Cardinal's authorized translation of the encyclical is printed in full with introduction by the editor, and note by the Cardinal. This introduction, note, and the opening words of the encyclical are as follows:—

We present below an exact English translation of the Latin text of the encyclical recently bound by his holiness, Pope Leo XIII. obtained through the courtesy of Cardinal Gibbons. It is accompanied by the following note thereon from the cardinal,—

"It is not easy to do justice to all points of this very beautiful, suggestive and far-reaching apostolic message of the holy father without reading and re-reading it, as all may do with profit and delight.

"The admiration inspired by the broad and noble Christianity which marks this supreme appeal of the venerable pontiff to unity, charity and Christian peace cannot but be mingled with amazement if we recall the advanced age of its august author and consider the clearness of style, the simplicity and force by which the message is distinguished.

"But it is the lofty thought so admirably expressed by Leo XIII. in this encyclical that will most arrest the attention of the princes and peoples to whom it is addressed. Looking back upon the eventful past of his pontificate as from a height, the holy father seems to embrace all races and all nations in his charity. His appeal to the Greek Catholics and the Protestants may meet with no immediate response, but it will hardly fall upon deaf ears.

"Most significant, and to us Americans of peculiar interest, is the holy father's definition of the lines which should mark the respective spheres of the civil authorities of Christian States. In this and in mutual tolerance lies the best hope that the world will some day see the promise realized: '*Fiet unus ovile of unus pastor.*'

J. CARD. GIBBONS."

The encyclical reads as follows:–

"APOSTOLIC LETTER

To the princes and peoples of the universe:

Leo XIII., pope.

Greeting and peace in the Lord."

These are the identical words that we copied, and which we used, when we said that the pope "last year addressed 'the Princes and Peoples of the Universe' and gravely informed us all that 'WE [that is himself] hold the regency of God on earth.'" The translation is the official one and authorized by Cardinal Gibbons himself; and the Latin address is translated, "To the Princes and Peoples of the Universe."

Now as this is not the AMERICAN SENTINEL'S translation at all, but the Cardinal's, or at least that of the Cardinal's official translator and authorized by the Cardinal, let us read the *Monitor's* broadside over again with the application not to the AMERICAN SENTINEL where it does not apply at all, but to Cardinal Gibbons where it really applies. So read it runs thus:–

Now let us tell Cardinal Gibbons that there is no encyclical addressed to the princes and peoples of the universe. There is one addressed *Principibus Populisque Universis*, but by school boy who has got as far as *hic haec hoc* would be able to tell him that this does not mean the princes and peoples of the universe. If Cardinal Gibbons is not able to interpret the title to a modern document written in so simple a language as Latin, etc., etc.

That is the true reading of the passage from the *Monitor*. But is it true that Cardinal Gibbons is not able to interpret the title of a modern document written in so simple a language as Latin? Is it true that Cardinal Gibbons has not got as far as *hic haec hoc*? And is it therefore true that there is no encyclical addressed to the princes and peoples of the universe? These questions and their answers lie between the editor of the *Monitor* and the Cardinal Gibbons.

"Sunday Laws Interfere with Sabbath Keeping" *American Sentinel* 10, 21 , p. 166.

IT is claimed by the supporters of Sunday laws that they do not interfere with the right of Adventists and other Sabbath-keepers to observe the seventh day, but that they (the Sabbatarians) are left entirely free to "keep their Sabbath." That this claim is false has been

frequently demonstrated. About three years ago an Adventist in Kent County, Md., was summoned to attend court as a witness on the Sabbath. He refused to attend, and was arrested on a bench warrant and taken into court. He thereupon stated to the judge that he could not conscientiously testify on that day, as it was the Sabbath according to the fourth commandment. His honor informed him that the law of Maryland recognized but one day as the Sabbath, and that day was Sunday, and that he must testify or go to jail. He again refused to testify and was sent to jail.

A similar case occurred last November in Anne Arundel County., Md., when two Seventh-day Adventists were fined for contempt of court in refusing to attend as witnesses on the Sabbath. If our courts were to begin to sit on Sunday, would not every Sunday-keeper feel at once that his religious liberty was infringed? Certainty, for it would make every man who has any religious regard for Sunday liable to be required by the State either to violate his conscience or to subject himself to punishment for contempt of court.

Again, the law of Georgia forbids work on Sunday. The Seventh-day Adventist works and is arrested and taken into court. The judge says to him: "You are at perfect liberty to observe the seventh day if you wish, but you must keep Sunday also. For your refusal to do this I sentence you to twelve months in the chain-gang." The chain-gang works on the seventh day, and so far as the law of the State of Georgia is concerned, the Seventh-day Adventist can be required to work on that day, and in case of persistent refusal may be punished with death.

What, then, has become of the "perfect liberty" of the Sabbatarian to keep the seventh day? It has vanished into thin air: in fact, it never existed in any State having a Sunday law, except in the imaginations of Sunday-keepers.

"The Pope Favors Sunday Law Societies" *American Sentinel* 10, 21 , pp. 166, 167.

IN our issue of April 18, we noted the aggressive attitude lately assumed by Roman Catholics in the matter of enacting and enforcing Sunday laws. So sudden and general was this new attitude manifested through Roman Catholic press and pulpit, that it was evident that the movement was the result of concerted action emanating from an authoritative source.

There is evidence that this concerted action has its source in the Vatican. The following letter is taken from the *Catholic Review* of May 11, addressed by the pope to the president of the Sunday Rest Association of France, which has for its object the enactment and enforcement of more rigid Sunday laws:—

Beloved Son, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

Very grateful to us have been your letters, especially that which gives us information dear to us concerning the association for the observance of the Sunday's repose. It is true that France abounds in pious works usefully founded by the generous activity of her sons, but it pleases us to point out that over which you preside among those which are especially distinguished for the nobility and holiness of their aims.

This your association tends directly to cause to be rendered to God, as is just, a due homage by the cessation of work as he himself rigorously ordered even from the beginning of the old law. Hence we commend your work, and all the more readily do we look upon it with love, since contempt for the holiday of the Lord, is, day by day, the cause of new and great evils both for men and nations.

As to you, beloved son, and to our companions, who are so well inspired, we think it just to give you our exhortations. We wish that what so far you have been doing spontaneously, and upon your own initiative, you will continue to do in the future in compliance without invitation.

May God look with complacency upon your organ-

167

ization and the manifold works done by you for this cause, and may you find a pledge of Divine favors in the apostolic blessing which we impart to you, beloved son, and to all those who, with you, devote themselves to so salutary an enterprise.

Given at Saint Peter's, etc.

LEO XIII., POPE.

NOW that the papacy has officially arrayed itself with popular Protestantism in the crusade for compulsory Sunday observance, what earthly power will be able to withstand this powerful confederation? How literally are the scriptural predictions, made forty years ago by Seventh-day Adventists, now being fulfilled. Reader "how long halt ye between two opinions?"

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 21 , p. 168.

THE bill introduced into the Tennessee legislature by Mr. Hooper, to exempt from the penalties of the Sunday law, observers of the

seventh day, was recommended for passage by the Judiciary Committee of the House by a vote of nine to four. Of course this bill is not what it should be; the Sunday law of Tennessee ought to be absolutely repealed; but it is gratifying to know that probably a majority of the members of the Tennessee legislature recognize the fact that the law is unjust. The educational campaign along religious liberty lines ought to be continued in that State.

JUST as we go to press news comes from Georgia of the release of J. Q. Allison, a Seventh-day Adventist, who, as we announced last week, was arrested for plowing his field on Sunday. Mr. Allison was tried May 15 and found guilty. However, the judge assessed only the costs, \$22, with the alternative, in case of default of payment, of twelve months in the chain-gang.

When it was seen that Mr. Allison would not pay the fine, his Sunday-keeping neighbors besieged him with entreaties to pay it and not disgrace his family by going to the chain-gang. Mr. Allison thanked his friends for their interest in him, but explained that there was a principle involved which he could not afford to compromise.

When it was seen that Mr. Allison would not surrender, the sheriff started with him and other prisoners to Atlanta to sell him to the chain-gang contractors. However, when the train reached Austell, Mr. Allison's home, the sheriff ordered him to get off and go home, but not to work on Sunday again, under the threat of the full penalty of the law. It was afterwards learned that the costs had been paid by unknown parties. We will give a detailed account of the trial in our next.

THE *Converted Catholic* for June, will contain an article exposing "Falsehoods Regarding Father Lambert, the Converted Redemptorist Priest," who is now one of three Methodist ministers in charge of Coke Church, Kingston, Jamaica, W.I. It seems that no sooner was this ex-priest out of the country than Roman Catholic papers from Maine to Texas began to publish a statement that he had become insane and was an inmate of an asylum; adding that it was doubtless aberration of mind that led him to separate from the Catholic Church. The article referred to is a complete refutation of the story, which could have no other purpose than to destroy the influence of Mr. Lambert's renunciation of Romanism.

THE *Western Watchman* (Roman Catholic), in its issue of May 9, copies from the *London Standard* what purports to be a quotation from the last will and testament of Pope Leo XIII. which he has sent to cardinals and heads of orders. The quotation reads thus:—

Even if the temporal power has not been attained, the papacy has arrived at a situation enabling it, when the opportune moment shall come, to dictate conditions, and the same calm, prudent line of action will conduce further to that end, if followed unaltered.

This "calm, prudent line of action" of the present pope, is deceiving many Protestants into the belief that the papacy has become converted, but at the "opportune moment," they will be undeceived; but it will then be too late to retrieve the fatal mistake.

THE Sunday movement in France is being urged forward, not on religious grounds as in this country; oh, no! but on the so-called "civil" basis. The Sunday-Rest Association, organized four years ago, now has a membership of several thousand. Its aim is stated to be "to secure the reënactment of the law which prescribes the cessation of all work on the seventh day of the week."

The only law "which prescribes the cessation of all work on the seventh day of the week" is the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, hence the aim of the association must be to secure the reënactment of the fourth commandment by the French Chamber of Deputies!

Of course, this view of the matter is a direct contradiction of the claim that the movement is being urged forward on "civil" grounds, but then in such things it does not do to be too particular; in the matter of enforced Sunday-rest, "civil" grounds means a civil law enforcing a measure of religious observance. It does not mean that the thing is done for civil reasons, that is, to protect material civil rights, or indeed civil rights at all, but only in response to a religious sentiment which demands practical recognition at the hands of the State.

THE *Independent*, of May 16, contains the following:—

We are very sorry to say that a bill has been introduced into the Florida legislature, in accordance with the recommendation of Supt. W. M. Sheats, making it a punishable offense for any school, public or private, in the State to allow white and colored students to be educated together, and also forbidding any white people to teach in the colored schools. And this shameful bill has been passed by the Lower House; and we do not know any reason why it is not likely to be carried through the Senate, and signed by the governor. We would expect something better if Dr. J. L. M. Curry were not abroad, so that his restraining influence will not be available. He has more than once prevented such injudicious legislation. There will be a chance for

some minor martyrdom, if this law passes; for we cannot imagine that Christian people will be willing to obey it.

The *Independent* here recognizes the necessity of disobeying a law that interferes with Christian duty. Although we believe that the *Independent* is willing to recognize the right of the Seventh-day Adventist to disobey a Sunday law, yet there are many religious papers that will commend the violation of the proposed Florida law and at the same time apply the epithet "anarchist" to the conscientious seventh-day observer who disobeys a Sunday law.

THE spirit of the whole Sunday-law movement is well exemplified by the *Christian Statesman*, which has just published a "black-list" of the members of the Legislature of Pennsylvania who voted for the repeal of the special law making the fine for violation of the Sunday law \$25 in Allegheny County instead of \$4, as it is in the rest of the State. This list ought, however, to be regarded as a roll of honor, for such in reality it is; but under the leadership of the *Statesman* and papers of that ilk, the "Christian" people of Pennsylvania will doubtless be able to defeat for reflection some of the men who had enough regard for correct principle to vote for the repeal of that hateful piece of special legislation,—legislation which could not be enacted under the present constitution of that State. But whatever may be the result to the men who favored repeal of the law, when legislators who vote for the cause of liberty are black-listed and called "enemies of the Sabbath," and counted enemies of the State, what may seventh-day observers expect, who not only support the principles for which those men voted, but who live them out, even to open violation of the wicked law for which the *Statesman* is as zealous? How long will it be ere the *Statesman*, that recently attempted to justify the burning of Servetus, will demand the infliction of the severest penalties upon all who refuse to regard the counterfeit Sabbath?

May 30, 1895

**"The Georgia Courts and the Sunday Law" *American Sentinel* 10, 22 ,
pp. 169, 170.**

AN interesting question, though by no means a new one, has been raised by the case of J. Q. Allison, at Douglasville, Ga., an account of which is given elsewhere in this paper.

Mr. Allison produced a Bible in court and proposed to show from it his authority for holding that the seventh day is the Sabbath. But he was stopped by the judge, who told him: "That won't do in this court." "We allow every man his own religious opinions, but this is simply a civil law."

Mr. Allison then read from Section 6, Article 1, of the constitution of Georgia, which is as follows:—

Perfect freedom of religious sentiment shall be, and the same is hereby secured, and no inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property, or prohibited from holding any public office or trust, on account of his religious opinion; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the people.

Mr. Allison was interrupted by the court before he had finished reading this section, and was informed that the only question before the court was, whether he had worked on the first day of the week or not, at the time charged in the indictment. And in this connection the judge said:—

I would not interfere with you in any way in the enjoyment of your religion; this is simply a law of the State, and we are bound thereby. The State could say that you should keep Wednesday or Thursday or every other Thursday, that it would be a crime to work on every other Wednesday or every other Thursday, and we would be bound to obey that law.

This statement by the judge would be true if the law were indeed a merely civil regulation *based upon civil reasons*; but according to decisions of the Supreme Court of Georgia, his statement is not true. The Supreme Court of that State has sustained Sunday laws upon distinctively religious grounds. And the reasons given could not by any possibility apply to Wednesday or Thursday or to every other Wednesday or Thursday. Moreover, the judge cannot find in American law anywhere an *enforced* civil holiday. The prohibition of secular labor and business on Sunday has absolutely no other basis except the supposed sacred character of the day. No other reason could possibly exist for forbidding a man to plow in his own field on Sunday; and Judge Janes can ascertain for himself that this is the ground upon which the Supreme Court of Georgia has sustained the Sunday law.

In 1852 Judge Lumpkin, of Georgia, said: "All agree that to the well-being of society stated intervals of rest are absolutely necessary. We should not tempt mankind, therefore, to yield obedience to

municipal arrangements which overlook and disregard *the moral law of the great Jehovah, who, from the smoking top of Mount Sinai, proclaimed to all the world, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; in it thou shalt not do any work.'*" ³⁸¹

This is a direct acknowledgment of the religious character of Sunday, and likewise of the laws which sustain it, and the same could never be true of Wednesday or Thursday, for nobody claims that the fourth commandment has any reference to those days. Again, as recently as 1871, Judge Lochrane said that in presuming the law of Kansas to be the same as that of his own State (Georgia) in this regard, because the contrary view would suppose the people of Kansas to have *annulled the Decalogue* and to have permitted by law the disregard of *Christian obligation*; and not only to have forgotten, but violated the injunction, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy; in it thou shalt do no manner of work." ³⁹²

170

Again, in the same year (1871) it was held by the same court ⁴⁰³ that the power to enact a Sunday law was collected from the general powers delegated to maintain good order, but added: "The power is a very high prerogative, and is supported by the principle involved in the preservation of *morals and the duties of citizens upon the Lord's day.*" In 49 Ga., 436, *Bass vs. Irvin*, it is said that "the code denominates it [the first day of the week] the Lord's day, and as *the Lord's day*, all courts and magistrates are to consider it."

It is quite evident from these authorities that while the Sunday law of Georgia is a "civil" law in the sense that it has a place upon the statute books of the State and is enforced by the civil courts, it is not more civil than would be any other law requiring the observance of any other religious institution. The terms "Lord's day," and "Sabbath" occur no less than eight times in the several sections of the Georgia code referring to Sunday, while in Section 4582 it is provided that "all moneys arising from fines for offenses, *the gist of which consists in their being committed on the Sabbath day*, shall be paid to the ordinary of the county, to be by him distributed *for the purpose of establishing and promoting Sabbath-schools in the county.*" This language is conclusive as to the character and intent of the law; it has no other purpose than to honor Sunday as a religious institution.

It will be observed that under this Sunday law there are certain offenses, "*the gist of which consists in their being committed on the Sabbath day.*" The gist of these offenses is not that they invade the

rights of other people, or even that they injure the person himself who commits them, nor that they are licentious nor that they disturb the public peace, but that they are violations of "the Sabbath." And yet the courts of the State refuse to allow one accused of Sabbath-breaking to show from the Bible which day is the Sabbath, telling him that "that [the Bible] won't do in this court;" "we allow every man his own religious opinions, but this is simply a civil law." And so, and in exactly the same sense, would be a law requiring all parents to have their children sprinkled, as was once the case in Massachusetts, and that too, *for the protection of morals*.

Religious persecution has always been defended on exactly the same grounds. Robert Baird, the church historian, says:—

Religious persecution has always been defended on exactly the same grounds. Robert Baird, the church historian, says:—

The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death and banished "Antinomians" and "Anabaptists," not because of their religious tenets, but because of their violation of civil laws. This is the justification they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse! But just so it is: wherever there is such a union of Church and State, heresy and heretical practices are apt to become violations of the civil code, and are punished no longer as errors in religion, but infractions of the laws of the land. So the defenders of the Inquisition have always spoken and written in justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal.—"*Religion in America*," p. 94.

It is in precisely this way that Cardinal Gibbons defends the Inquisition. He says:—

The Spanish Inquisition was erected by King Ferdinand, less from motives of religious zeal than from human policy. . . . It must be remembered that in those days, heresy, especially if outspoken, was regarded not only as an offense against religion, but also as a crime against the State, and was punished accordingly.—"*Faith of Our Fathers*," pp. 292, 293.

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

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

This is only putting into slightly different phrase the papal "argument" in justification of the Inquisition. It is neither better nor worse in the one case than in the other. In the days of the Inquisition the Roman Catholic faith was regarded as the bulwark of social order, and therefore to be protected by civil law; now, the Sunday institution is declared by professed Protestants to be essential to good government, and so to be jealously guarded by the State. In these Sunday-law prosecutions, history is simply repeating itself.

Jerome, the subject of our illustration, was not burned at the stake by the Roman Catholic Church any more than are Seventh-day Adventists in Georgia and Tennessee imprisoned and sent to the chain-gang by the so-called Protestant churches whose influence created and sustains the Sunday laws. The Roman Catholic Church simply declared Jerome a heretic, and as such he was regarded as an enemy of the State; and our illustration shows him being led to the stake, not by ecclesiastics, not by officers of the church, but by the civil authorities—officers of the State—just as Adventists are to-day imprisoned and driven in chain-gangs by authority of the State, but none the less in obedience to the behest of professed Protestants. The religious sentiment of the community was then crystallized into civil law precisely as it is to-day and that not for the protection of civil rights, but for the enforcement of religious dogma.

It was not pretended in this Allison case that anybody was interfered with in the least degree. There was no disturbance, no infringing upon the rights of others. The gist of Mr. Allison's offense was that he worked on Sunday, the day which the State of Georgia has declared is the "Sabbath," "the Lord's day," and which it has decreed must be kept "holy." There is absolutely no civil element in it except the fact that the day is entrenched in the civil law. A law requiring everybody to be baptized and to join a church would be civil in just the same sense as is this law requiring the observance of Sunday in the State of Georgia; and such a law would be no more in conflict with the constitution of that State than is the Sunday law.

The assertion that Mr. Allison or anybody else is left perfectly free in religious matters under a Sunday law is false. How free would the Sunday-keepers of Georgia consider themselves if they were taxed one-sixth of their time for the benefit of Mr. Allison's religion?

Moreover, the fact that Mr. Allison is in the minority does not alter the case one iota. Judge Parks, of Tennessee, has well said: "*If there were only one of them he would be entitled not only to his honest*

belief, but to the exercise of that belief, so long as in so doing he did not interfere with some natural right of his neighbors."

This is the touchstone to which all such laws and all such questions ought to be brought, namely, the equal rights of others. Does one man, by working on Sunday, thereby infringe the equal rights of another man to rest or to worship? If not—and he certainly does not—any law forbidding such work is simply an expression of intolerance and despotism, none the less intolerable, because instead of being the intolerance and despotism of one it is the intolerance and despotism of the majority.

"Trial of J. Q. Allison" *American Sentinel* 10, 22 , pp. 170, 171.

THIS trial, referred to in these columns last week, took place in the Superior Court at Douglasville, Ga., May 15, before Hon. C. G. Janes, Presiding Judge. W. T. Roberts, Solicitor General, appeared for the State. Mr. Allison conducted his own case. Two witnesses were sworn for the State, both of whom testified that they lived near Mr. Allison, and that they had seen him plowing in his field on Sunday, the 21st day of April, as charged in the indictment.

Mr. Allison did not deny doing the work, but offered to show that it was not of a nature to disturb anybody, and that in fact nobody was disturbed thereby. Both the witnesses testified on direct examination that they would not have seen Mr. Allison at work had they not gone to the place where he was, on purpose to see him.

Mr. Allison attempt to cross-examine the second witness, as follows:—

Q. How near is your place to mine? where does your land come up to it; your field?

A. I suppose it is a hundred yards, or something like that.

Q. You worked there on the seventh day?

A. Yes, sir, I worked on Saturday.

Mr. Allison. I want to prove whether I disturbed him, or whether I had complained about his disturbing me.

The Court. Never mind about that; that has nothing to do with this case. The only question in the world is whether you worked on the first day of the week; that is the only question in the case; I mean, worked in your ordinary employment.

The solicitor general then asked the witness two questions to establish the fact that Mr. Allison was working at his usual employment; after which the judge asked Mr. Allison if he had any

statement to make. From this point onward we copy verbatim from the notes of the official stenographer:—

The Court. What statement do you want to make?

Mr. Allison. I want to show where I get the authority that the seventh day is the Sabbath. (The defendant had produced his Bible, as if to read.)

The Court. That won't do in this court.

Mr. Allison. I am not allowed to give the reasons?

The Court. No sir; we allow every man his own religious opinions, but this is simply a civil law.

Mr. Allison. Will you allow me to read a piece from the constitution of Georgia?

The Court. If it applies to this case—any law of the State—if you want to read it.

Mr. Allison. (Reading from the code.) "Freedom of Conscience.—All men have the natural and inalienable right to worship God each according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no human authority should in any case control or interfere with such right of conscience. Religious Opinions.—No inhabitant of this State shall be molested in person or property—"

The Court. If you want to make any statement about the facts of this case, you can do so;—you have no lawyer to represent you:—if you do not want to, you need not do so, as to whether you did this work on this day.

Mr. Allison. I work on the first day of the week, and rest the seventh day. I keep it. I do nothing but feed my mules and water them, and some such things. We don't even do our cooking on the seventh day; we try to keep that holy. God has said we shall work six days, and rest the seventh. I rest the seventh, according to the commandment. I know that is the right day to keep, and I try to keep it.

The Court. You want to make any statement as to whether you did this work as charged against you?

Mr. Allison. Yes, sir, I do; I said I worked on the first day of the week; I do that.

The Court. I mean in this case, whether you did the work that the State has charged you with, and as sworn to by the witnesses?

Mr. Allison. Yes, I don't deny that; I don't deny working on the first day of the week, but I deny working on the Sabbath, that is, the Lord's day.

The Court. You don't deny doing the work that the witnesses swore to?

Mr. Allison. No, sir.

The Court. You mean to swear that you did do it?

Mr. Allison. Yes, sir; I did the work.

The Court. That these witnesses said you did?

Mr. Allison. Yes, sir; but I claim that I have a right, under the Constitution and under the laws of God, that I have a right to work or not work and keep the day that he wants me to keep; that is the way I do. I claim I could not work on the seventh day, and then go right on and keep the first day of the week without displeasing God.

The Court. There is nothing in that. I have as much respect for your religion as anybody in any church in the country, or good men in the country. I would not interfere with you in any way in the enjoyment of your religion; this is simply a law of the State, and we are bound thereby. The State could say that you should keep Wednesday or Thursday, that it would be a crime to work on every other Wednesday or every other Thursday, and you would be bound to obey that law. I have a perfect respect for every man's religion, and I think every man has a right to his religion, whether he is a Mohammedan, or Jew, or Christian, or a Buddhist, and whether he believes in the seventh day, or the first day, or any other day.

Mr. Allison. Don't you think I would be worshiping some other god, if I was to obey the law in this matter believing as I do? Why God would not protect me, I would be worshiping another god.

The Court. Probably I would not be competent to argue this question with you, when you come to the Bible. This is an act of the State, and if you live in the State of Georgia, you must obey its laws.

Mr. Allison. Don't you remember where you read about Daniel? They made a law special for Daniel, and they cast him into the lions' den, and he broke the law, and God protected him in it.

The Court. I believe I have heard something about that, but the day of miracles is past. I am here simply to enforce the laws, and no matter what a man's religious opinions are, if the laws of the State are that he shall not work on a certain day, and he continues to work on that day, I am bound to enforce the law; I am simply bound to do that; that is my duty; that is my oath. I state to you that you are guilty, according to your own statement, of the violation of the law, and you cannot live in the State of Georgia and do that. The trouble is this, that is you are allowed to do this—I understand you are a good man, your neighbors say you are, there is nothing in the world against you—but if you are allowed to do this, bad men would claim the same privilege, and desecrate what the great majority of people consider the Sabbath; but outside of any reason for it, that is the law.

As appears from the record, the verdict of guilty was entered without the jury leaving their seats. The court then took a recess until afternoon; and, upon reassembling, the judge proceeded to pass sentence upon Mr. Allison, prefacing it with the advice that if the defendant's religion prevented him from obeying the Sunday laws of

Georgia, he would better move out of the State and go where he would be allowed to live out his religion. He said if Mr. Allison persisted in working on Sunday, and came up before him again, he would put him where it would be a long time before he could get out of the State. Then, repeating what he said about Mr. Allison's being a good man and a good citizen, and there being nothing in the world against him, he said: "I will let you off easy this time with the costs, \$22.05, or in default thereof, twelve full months in the chain-gang."

For some discussion of the principles involved in this case, see article on first page of this paper.

"The Boys' Brigade" *American Sentinel* 10, 22 , p. 171.

ONE of the founders of the "Boys' Brigade" movement, describing the origin of the movement in a recent number of the *Independent*, says:—

All healthy boys have a love of soldiering born in them.

This intended defense of the military spirit that is permeating the churches, is the strongest condemnation of it. It is very true that boys are born with a love for war, but it is also true that these boys must be "born again" before they can enter the kingdom of heaven. John 3:3. And to the Church was committed the teaching of this vital truth: but instead of condemning the fruits of the natural heart, among which are "emulation, wrath, strife," the concomitants of war, and teaching that all these belong to the natural heart, to escape which all must be born again, the Church is fostering the natural heart and stamping it with the approval of the Christian Church. The excuse is made that this natural desire of the carnal heart is taken advantage of to get the ear of the boy to teach him that he must be born again. But to do this is to "do evil that good may come," a proposition condemned by the Scriptures. Rom. 3:8. With the one hand the Church is building what with the other it professes to destroy. "Ye cannot serve two masters."

"Found at Last and Last Found in Tennessee" *American Sentinel* 10, 22 , pp. 171, 172.

SOME divine authority for Sunday observance has been a want of many centuries, and many have been the efforts to supply it. Scripture has been wrested, history has been forged and tomes have been written, but all to no purpose; the fact still remained that Sunday was, as Neander says, "always only a human ordinance;"⁴¹¹ but now

the lack has been supplied(?) and that in the very place where most needed, namely, in Tennessee, as is witnessed by the following from the *Memphis Weekly Commercial* ⁴²²:—

MILAN, Tenn., May 18.—Mr. J. A. Warner, of this city, has in his possession a wonderful letter, which is probably one of the oldest specimens in existence. It has been in the Warner family 173 years. It is written on material resembling parchment, and yellow with the age of two centuries. The copy and letter are presented as follows:—

COPY OF A LETTER

"Written by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and found eighteen miles from Iconium twenty-five years after our blessed Saviour's crucifixion and transmitted from the holy city by a converted Jew, and faithfully translated from the original Hebrew copy now in possession of Lady Cubasa.

"This letter was found under a stone, both round and large, at the foot of the cross eighteen miles from Iconium near a village called Mesopotamia [*sic.*]. Upon this stone was written and engrave: 'Blessed be he that shall turn me over.' All that saw it prayed to God earnestly and desired that he would make known unto them the meaning of this writing, that they might not in vain turn it over. In the meantime a little child of about six or seven years of age turned it over to the admiration of all present, and under the stone was written the command of Jesus Christ in a letter published by the angel Gabriel ninety-eight years after the death of our Blessed Saviour and carried by a person belonging to Lady Cubass, and made public in the city of Iconium."

THE LETTER

"Glory to God on high and on earth good will to all men, whosoever worketh on the Sabbath day shall be cursed. I command you to go to church and to keep the Lord's day holy without doing any manner of work. You shall not idle or mis-spend your time in decking yourselves in superfluous and costly apparel and vain dressing, for I have ordained a day to be kept holy that your sins may be forgiven: you shall not break My commandments, but observe and keep them written with My own hand. You shall not only go to church yourself, but your man servant and your maid servant, to observe My word and learn My commandments. You shall finish your labor every Saturday

at six o'clock in the afternoon, from that time the preparation of the Sabbath begins.

"I advise you to fast five days in the year, beginning with Good Friday, and so continue the four first days following, in remembrance of the five bloody wounds received for mankind.

"You shall diligently and peacefully labor in your respective vocation wherein it has pleased Almighty God to place you.

"You shall love one another with brotherly love and cause them that are not baptized to come to church and receive the holy sacrament, and be made members thereof; and in so doing I will give many blessings, and comfort you in great temptation, and surely he that doeth to the contrary shall be cursed and unprofitable. I will also send hardships of heart upon them, but especially upon impenitent sinners and hardened unbelievers.

"He that giveth not to the poor shall be unprofitable.

Remember to keep the Sabbath day, for the seventh day I have kept to Myself, and he that hath a copy of this letter and keepeth it without publishing it to others, shall not prosper, and he that publish it to others shall be blessed of Me, and if their sins be in numbers as the stars in the firmament and believe in this they shall be pardoned, and if they believe not in this writing and keep not My commandments I will send My plague upon them and their children and their cattle, and whosoever shall have a copy of this letter and keep it in the house nothing shall do them any damage, neither pestilence, lightning or thunder shall hurt them, and if a woman be with child and in labor and she firmly puts her trust in Me, she shall be delivered of her birth; you shall hear no more of Me, but of the blessed spirit, until the day of judgment."

"JESU HOMINUM SALVTOR"

Memphis Weekly Commercial.

This is not the first time that documents of this king have been discovered(?) in remarkable ways: and that they have a common origin is evident from their marked similarity: and yet they are not free from contradictions, which circumstance however is never taken seriously by the slave of tradition.

As related by J. N. Andrews, in is "History of the Sabbath," pp. 287-390, there visited England in the year 1200 A.D., one Eustace, the abbot of Flaye in Normandy, and the burden of his preaching

seems to have been Sunday observance. "At London also, and many other places throughout England," remarks Hoveden, ⁴³³ "he effected by his preaching that from that time forward people did not dare to hold market of things exposed for sale on the Lord's day" [Sunday].

The abbot met much opposition, however, even from the clergy, and some were so inconsiderate as to demand of the zealous preacher that he cite some divine authority for the observance upon which he so strenuously insisted. The result was that he for a time abandoned the field and "returned," says Hoveden, "to Normandy, unto his place whence he came."

But the Sunday-breakers were to enjoy only a short respite. The following year, as the same author relates, ⁴⁴⁴ the abbot returned with the authority demanded in the shape of the following document:—

THE HOLY COMMANDMENT AS TO THE LORD'S DAY

Which came from heaven to Jerusalem, and was found upon the altar of Saint Simeon, in Golgotha, where Christ was crucified for the sins of the world. The Lord sent down this epistle, which was found upon the altar of Saint Simeon, and after looking upon which, three days and three nights, some men fell upon the earth, imploring mercy of God. And after the third hour, the patriarch arose, and Acharias, the archbishop, and they opened the scroll, and received the holy epistle from God. And when they had taken the same, they found this writing therein:—

"I am the Lord, who commanded you to observe the holy day of the Lord, and ye have not kept it, and have not repented of your sins, as I have said in my gospel, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' Whereas, I caused to be preached unto you repentance and amendment of life, you did not believe me, I have sent against you the pagans, who have shed your blood on the earth; and yet you have not believed; and, because you did not keep the Lord's day holy, for a few days you suffered hunger, but soon I gave you fullness, and after that you did still worse again. Once more, it is my will, that no one, from the ninth hour on Saturday until sunrise on Monday, shall do any work except that which is good.

172

"And if any person shall do so, he shall with penance make amends for the same. And if you do not pay obedience to this command, verily, I say unto you, and I swear unto you, by my seat and by my throne, and by the cherubim who watch my holy seat, that I will give you my commands by no other epistle, but I will open the heavens, and for rain I will rain upon you stones, and wood, and

hot water, in the night, that no one may take precautions against the same, and that so I may destroy all wicked men.

"This do I say unto you; for the Lord's holy day, you shall die the death, and for the other festivals of my saints which you have not kept: I will send unto you beasts that have the heads of lions, the hair of women, the tails of camels, and they shall be so ravenous that they shall devour your flesh, and you shall long to flee away to the tombs of the dead, and to hide yourselves for fear of the beasts; and I will take away the light of the sun from before your eyes, and will send darkness upon you, that not seeing, you may slay one another, and that I may remove from you my face, and may not show mercy upon you. For I will burn the bodies and the hearts of you, and of all of those who do not keep as the holy day of the Lord.

"Hear ye my voice, that so ye may not perish in the land, for the holy day of the Lord. Depart from evil, and show repentance for your sins. For, if you do not do so, even as Sodom and Gomorrah shall you perish. Now, know ye, that you are saved by the prayers of my most holy mother, Mary, and of my most holy angels, who pray for you daily. I have given unto you wheat and wine in abundance, and for the same ye have not obeyed me. For the widows and orphans cry unto you daily, and unto them you show no mercy. The pagans show mercy, but you show none at all. The trees which bear fruit, I will cause to be dried up for your sins; the rivers and the fountains shall not give water.

"I gave unto you a law in Mount Sinai, which you have not kept. I gave you a law with mine own hands, which you have not observed. For you I was born into the world, and my festive day ye knew not. Being wicked men, ye have not kept the Lord's day of my resurrection. By my right hand I swear unto you, that if you do not observe the Lord's day, and the festivals of my saints, I will send unto you the pagan nations, that they may slay you. And still do you attend to the business of others, and take no consideration of this? For this will I send against you still worse beasts, who shall devour the breasts of your women. I will curse those who on the Lord's day have wrought evil.

"Those who act unjustly towards their brethren, will I curse. Those who judge unrighteously the poor and the orphans upon the earth, will I curse. For me you forsake, and you follow the prince of this world. Give heed to my voice, and you shall have the blessing of mercy. But you cease not from your bad works, nor from the works of the devil. Because you are guilty of perjuries and adulteries, therefore the nations shall surround you, and shall, like beasts, devour you."

The promulgation of this document greatly stimulated Sunday observances in England as indeed its modern prototype may possibly do in Tennessee.

It will be noted that there is some conflict between the two documents as to the proper time to begin the observance of Sunday. The Sunday commandment, which now turns up in Tennessee, commands those to whom it is directed that "You shall finish your labors every Saturday at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, from that time the preparation of the Sabbath begins." The document brought to England by the ablest names the "ninth hour [three o'clock] on Saturday" as the hour at which all work must cease, and many remarkable things are related as happening to those who disregarded this injunction. Hoveden relates some of these stories as follows:—

One Saturday, a certain carpenter of Beverly, who, after the ninth hour of the day was, contrary to the wholesome advice of his wife, making a wooden wedge, fell to the earth, being struck with paralysis. A woman also, a weaver, who, after the ninth hour, on Saturday, in her anxiety to finish a part of the web, persisted in so doing fell to the ground, struck with paralysis, and lost her voice. At Rafferton also, a vill belonging to Master Roger Arundel, a man made for himself a loaf and baked it under the ashes, after the ninth hour on Saturday, and ate thereof, and put part of it by till the morning, but when he broke it on the Lord's day blood started forth therefrom; and he who saw it bore witness, and his testimony is true.

At Wakefield, also, one Saturday, while a miller was, after the ninth hour, attending to grinding his corn, there suddenly came forth, instead of flour, such a torrent of blood, that the vessel placed beneath was nearly filled with blood, and the mill wheel stood immovable, in spite of the strong rush of the water; and those who beheld it wondered thereat, saying, "Spare us, O Lord, spare thy people!"

Also, in Lincolnshire a woman had prepared some dough, and taking it to the oven after the ninth hour on Saturday, she placed it in the oven, which was then at a very great heat; but when she took it out, she found it raw, on which she again put it into the oven, which was very hot; and, both on the next day, and on Monday, when she supposed that she should find the loaves baked, she found raw dough.

In the same county also, when a certain woman had prepared her dough, intending to carry it to the oven, her husband said to her, "It is Saturday, and it is now past the ninth hour, put it one side till Monday;" on which the woman, obeying her husband, did as he commanded; and so, having covered over the dough with a linen

cloth, on coming the next day to look at the dough, to see whether it had not, in rising, through the yeast that was in it, gone over the sides of the vessel, she found there the loaves ready made by the divine will, and well baked, without any fire of the material of this world. This was a change wrought by the right hand of Him on high.

"The historian [Hoveden] laments that these miracles were lost upon the people, and that they feared the king more than they feared God, and so 'like a dog to his vomit, returned to the holding of markets on the Lord's day.'"

It is by such subterfuges as this Tennessee discovery and its legitimate predecessor invented by the Abbot Eustace, that the Sunday institution, now hoary with age, was first foisted upon the Christian Church; and it is by means little less dishonest that it is now maintained as a sacred day.

"The Lord's Interpretation of the Second Commandment vs. the Roman Catholic Interpretation" *American Sentinel* 10, 22 , p. 173.

THE *Monitor* finds great fault with the AMERICAN SENTINEL for having in its lead-piece a picture of the Bartholdi statute of liberty enlightening the world. It declares that this is a violation of the second commandment: and that therefore we are inconsistent in insisting on the observance of the Sabbath while breaking the second commandment. Here is the argument of the *Monitor*:

On its title page it [the AMERICAN SENTINEL] has a picture of a graven image made to represent the goddess of liberty. This graven image is set up in New York harbor contrary to the laws which the Almighty gave to Moses, and which are as binding as the law concerning the Sabbath day. "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor the likeness of any form that be in heaven above, or that be in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments."

Surely this commandment is as clear as the commandment concerning the Sabbath. It is an open and explicit prohibition against the making of images, and against honoring them in any way. There are no exceptions. All images are *tabu*. How then can the *American Sentinel* continue to violate this commandment by retaining Bartholdi's statute in its lead piece, especially as it is crying woe and dissolution against Christendom for breaking the ordinance concerning the Sabbath day!

After the extreme of the *Monitor's* emphatic division as to who may have "got as far as *hic haec hoc*" in "so simple a language as the Latin," it may not be positively irreverent for us to suggest that its exposition of the second commandment is not correct. "All images" are *not* "tabu," and never were. For immediately after the giving of this commandment by the Lord, the Lord himself gave the following directions with regard to the building of the sanctuary:—

"Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering: of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering. . . . And let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them. According to all that I show them, *after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof*, even so shall ye make it. . . . And *thou shalt make two cherubim of gold*, of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the two end of the mercy seat. . . . And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim." "And thou shalt make a vail of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen of cunning work: with *cherubim shall it be made.*" Ex. 25:2-22; 26:33.

After all this had been done, again there is this record:—

And the Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole. . . . And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole. Num. 21:8, 9.

And when the temple took the place of the tabernacle, it also was built according to the plan and pattern given to David by the Spirit of God, and which was written out by the hand of the Lord upon David for the guidance of Solomon in the building of the temple. 1 Chron. 18:11, 12, 29. And of this it is written:—

Now these are the things wherein Solomon was instructed for the building of the house of God. . . . He overlaid also the house, the beams, the posts, and the walls thereof, and the doors thereof, with gold; and graved cherubims on the walls. . . . And in the most holy house he made two cherubims of image work, and overlaid them with gold. . . . And he made the veil of blue, and purple, and crimson, and fine linen, and wrought cherubims thereon. 2 Chron. 3:5-14.

This is the evidence enough to show that the sweeping interpretation of the second commandment given by the *Monitor* is directly contradictory to the plain word of the Lord. And all this time, too, the Lord was "crying woe and desolation against Israelites for breaking the ordinance concerning the Sabbath day." But the *Monitor*

says to the Lord in that case, as certainly as to us: "There are no exceptions. All images are *tabu*." How then could the Lord continue to violate this commandment by retaining images of cherubim in and all about the most holy place of his worship, especially as he was "crying woe and desolation against Jerusalem for breaking the ordinance concerning the Sabbath day"?

But was the Lord right? or is the *Monitor* right? Which? Is the Lord's interpretation of the commandment correct? or is the *Monitor's* interpretation correct?

It is true that the second commandment does forbid the making of all manner of images or likenesses of things to be *bowed down to*, to be *feared*, to be *reverenced*, or to be in any way *served*. This is true of images made at the direction of the Lord as well as images made altogether in the imagination of men. This is shown by the fact that when Israel showed reverence to that brazen serpent and burned incense to it, it was broken to pieces before them and called, as it was, *only* "a piece of brass." 2 Kings 18:4. And when Israel came to attach virtue to the temple and to trust in it, the Lord brought up the Chaldeans who stripped the temple of its gold, left the temple in ruins, carried the people captive, and made the land desolate. Jer. 7:4-15.

Among images or likenesses so used there are indeed "no exceptions." All images of all sorts so used, or in any such way regarded, are indeed "*tabu*." All such use of images and likenesses of any persons or things is idolatry. And such is precisely the use which is made of images and likenesses by Catholics everywhere.

We make no charge of inconsistency, however, against Catholics in their *bowing down* to graven images, likenesses, etc., for they both bow down to images and put away the Sabbath day. They disregard both the second and the fourth commandments. There is no room there for any charge of inconsistency. The thing is sheer, straight idolatry and abandonment of the God of heaven and earth.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 22 , p. 176.

THE first two articles in this paper treat of the case of J. Q. Allison, convicted on the 15th inst. in the Superior Court of Douglas County, Ga., of "violating the Sabbath." These articles are interesting and will repay a careful perusal. The judge's testimony as to the irreproachable character of the defendant is worthy of note, as is also the simple but earnest manner in which Mr. Allison gave the reasons

for his refusal to obey the Sunday law of Georgia. The cause of the Bible Sabbath lost nothing in this trial. The humble farmer with truth on his side is more than a match for a whole State; and even though he had gone into the chain-gang he would have gone a victor.

THREE Seventh-day Adventists in Bienne, Switzerland, have just been imprisoned for refusing to send their children to school on the Sabbath. When Elder Holser was imprisoned for keeping the Seventh-day Adventist Basel publishing house open on Sunday, it was said that the law did not interfere with his right to keep the Sabbath if he wanted to, but only forbade him to operate a factory on Sunday; but how about the law requiring observers of the seventh day to send their children to school on the Sabbath? Does that law "leave Seventh-day Adventists perfectly free to keep Saturday if they choose to do so"?

"KOREA," says the *Independent*, "is not yet a Christian country, even if the Ministers of Justice and the Interior are Christians: and it is surprising to learn from *The Korean Repository*, published at Seoul, that since the appointment of the new ministry, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, the government offices are closed from Saturday afternoon till Monday morning." But we fail to see anything strange about this fact. Sunday was originally a heathen festival, and why should it not be still honored by heathen nations? It is a prediction of Holy Writ that all the world shall worship the beast, the papacy, and this will be done by exalting the Sunday, adopted by the papacy from paganism, and made the badge of papal authority.

AN exchange announces that a bill has been introduced in the Illinois Senate aimed at Schweinfurth, the so-called prophet, of Rockford, Illinois. It provides that whoever assumes or pretends to be a deity or to possess the attributes of a deity, or pretends to be a son of God, or Jesus Christ, or claims to be the incarnation of the Holy Ghost, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for from one to two years.

This measure exhibits a lamentable ignorance of the principles of religious liberty, and the sentiment behind the bill is more dangerous than the pretender, Schweinfurth. Let Illinois keep a level head and proceed against her bogus Christ in a statesman-like manner. It is none of the State's business whether Schweinfurth claims to be the incarnation of Christ, the Holy Ghost, Confucius, Mohammed, or Beelzebub. It is only when his claims lead him to violate the rights of his fellow-creatures that the law can properly interfere, and then only

with his *acts* and not his *claims*. Illinois already has ample law to cover the case. If the element behind the proposed law had lived in the time of our Saviour, it would doubtless have joined in the cry, "Crucify him."

THE National Reformers would have us suppose that the political doctrine that governments derive "their just power from the consent of the governed," had its origin in the infidelity of the eighteenth century. But more than two hundred and fifty years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and more than two hundred years before the utter rottenness of the Papal Church in France had filled that country with the infidelity which we are told gave rise to the doctrine that the people are the source of civil authority, Luther, Linck, Melancthon, Bugenhagen, and Amsdorff, "the fathers of the Reformation," announced the same doctrine. In a letter to the Elector Frederick, they said: "No prince can undertake a war without the consent of the people, from whose hands he has received his authority." This was good Protestantism and good Christianity then, and it is just as good Protestantism and just as good Christianity now.

June 6, 1895

"Why, What Evil Hath He Done?" *American Sentinel* 10, 23 , pp. 177, 178.

"WE have a law, and by that law he ought to die," has always been regarded by bigots, whose creeds were crystallized into civil law, as an all-sufficient reason for demanding the death of the dissenter.

The question, "Why, what evil hath he done?" is answered with the cold, cruel statement from the law-favored priests, "We have a law, and by that law he ought to die."

The answer of Justice, "I find no fault in him," only enrages the accusers to answer the more vehemently, "*We have a law, and by that law he ought to die.*" "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cesar's friend."

Men of all creeds now look back upon the scene, which is the subject of our illustration, and condemn the demand of the Jewish leaders for the life of a faultless man. They condemn the time-serving Pilate for yielding to their haughty threats. Yet while this is true there are many of these who, while cursing those who crucified Christ

under the guise of loyalty to law, are to-day repeating in principle the same sin against God and man.

On May 15, J. Q. Allison, a Seventh-day Adventist, of Georgia, was sentenced by the Circuit Court of Douglas County, Ga., to pay costs amounting to \$22,05, or in default of payment, to serve twelve months in the chain-gang.

What was is crime? Let the report of the court stenographer answer: "State vs. J. Q. Allison. Misdemeanor—*Sabbath-breaking*."

The specific act here designated as "Sabbath-breaking" is thus described by one of the State's witnesses:—

Question. About how much did he appear to plow that [Sunday] morning?

Answer. I suppose nothing hardly but a small garden spot, not more than that.

Q. That was about a quarter from the big road?

A. It was a little over a quarter from the nearest big road from there.

Q. Was it in sight?

A. No, sir; a man could not see him from where I was at, unless he went to him.

It was for this Sunday-Sabbath-breaking, for this invasion(?) of the natural rights of mankind that Mr. Allison was sentenced, in default of the payment of costs, to twelve months in the chain-gang.

And now, to ascertain officially what Mr. Allison was *not* sentenced to twelve months in the chain-gang for, we quote again from the official report of the trial; this time from Mr. Allison's cross-examination of one of the State's witnesses:—

Mr. Allison. Have you [Mr. Strickland] worked near my house on the seventh day? . . . Haven't you worked close to my house on the seventh day?

Ans. Yes, sir.

Q. Have I ever found any fault with you about that?

A. If you have, I have not heard of it; you have never bothered me.

Q. I have never complained of your disturbing me?

A. No, sir; you never have at all; I say that.

Q. You know of my ever disturbing your or anyone else?

A. No, sir.

The Court. You are not on trial for disturbing anybody else.

Here we have it announced from the bench

that Mr. Allison was not sentenced to the chain-gang for injuring his neighbors; no, not even for disturbing them.

Since he had not injured any one, either in reputation, person, or property, what had he done so heinous as to take him from his family and business and consign him as a felon to twelve months' chain-gang labor with the vilest of malefactors? "Why, what evil hath he done?"

In reply to this grave question, let the words of the presiding judge be submitted as they appear in the official record of the trial:—

The Court. . . . The trouble is this, that if you are allowed to do this—I understand *you are a good man* your neighbors say you are, *there is nothing in the world against you*—but if you are allowed to do this, bad men would claim the same privilege, and *desecrate* what the great majority of people consider the Sabbath, but outside of any *reason* for it, *that is the law*.

In this single sentence we have combined the admission of innocence, the secret reason for condemnation, and the retreat behind the law, which characterized the trial and condemnation of the Son of God.

The secret reason given by the rulers for desiring the death of Christ, was: "If we let this man thus alone, all men will believe on him; and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation." John 11:48. Thus it is seen that the secret reason for his death was that they could not sustain their creed against the teaching and example of his life. So in this case it is admitted in an unguarded moment that Mr. Allison's irreproachable life will teach other men the truth that the State-enforced Sabbath is not the Sabbath of the Bible, contrary to the belief of "the great majority of the people." But immediately perceiving that this "reason" betrayed the ecclesiastical nature of the law and its administration, the court hastens to take shelter behind the law, thus: "Outside of any reason for it, *that is the law*." "We have a law, and by that law he ought to die."

Let those who condemn the rulers of Israel for demanding the life of an innocent man, because "we have a law," explain why they can to-day condemn an innocent man to the chain-gang because they are the "great majority" and "have a law" which makes it possible.

A strange feature of all these cases is that the accusers, and in some instances, State officials, look upon the conscience of a Seventh-day Adventist as a kind of weather vane to be shifted to accord with every human ordinance. Do they think that faithfulness to

conscience has perished from the earth, that God has abdicated the throne in favor of human law?

It is passing strange that they do not shrink from the awful responsibility of attempting to crush a dissenting minority. Do they not dread to add to that torrent of fears, that ocean of anguish, represented in the Apocalyptic vision as pouring into the ear of Omnipotence, with the eloquent voice of woe, that imploring question, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" Rev. 6:10.

Should Seventh-day Adventists weary of courts, fines, confiscation of goods, imprisonments and chain-gangs,—should they yield to the demand that they treat the Sunday-Sabbath, which they for sufficient reasons regard as the mark or badge of papal apostasy, with the same outward regard which they pay to the Sabbath of the Lord, the sign of the true God; will the representatives of these persecuting States appear in judgment with the statement that since they declared Sunday to be that Sabbath of the Lord and compelled the Seventh-day Adventists to observe it, therefore they demand in the name of the commonwealth that the condemned be pronounced guiltless?

At that great and final judgment there will be no foreign minister to unfurl his country's flag over the violator of heaven's law, and demand and enforce protection in the name of his government. States may secure for their citizens safe conducts through a country with which they have diplomatic relations, but not through the country of the "King of kings." Yet, in the face of all this, man, mortal man, whose life is as a vapor that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away; this puny man that must himself stand at the bar of God and answer for his own acts, this same man will presume to interpret the Word of God and force his fellow-mortals to accept of his interpretation, or suffer in prisons and chain-gangs. Could anything be more presumptuous?

Ye rulers of States and of nations,
Who trace with a fallible pen
"Infallible" creed born statutes
To fetter the conscience of men;
Whose laws conflict with Jehovah's.
And brand on the brow or the hand
A counterfeit seal of that statute
Proclaimed from the mountain top grand;
If we sever our sign of allegiance

bicycle or tricycle or to publicly promenade in the streets, avenues, or public highways of said city while dressed or arrayed in costumes commonly known as bloomers, knickerbockers, baseball attire, or trousers."

The reasons given in the preamble for the passage of the ordinance, are:—

WHEREAMS, this craze [for wearing bloomers] has assumed such proportions that it menaces the public morals of this good city; and

WHEREAMS it is *unhealthy*, un-American, and unlady-like to appear in such costumes.

We are not so much concerned about this so-called bloomer "craze" as we are with the craze among would-be statesmen to make of the State a kind of foster mother, whose business it is to feed, clothe and catechize its citizens. There was a time in the history of England when the government prescribed certain apparel for its citizens on the ground of protecting their health, but we supposed we had outlived such paternalism. But it seems that in this matter we were mistaken, for one branch of the Minnesota Legislature actually passed a bill compelling men to act patriotically on Memorial Day. But a law forbidding women to wear bloomers on sanitary grounds, and a law enforcing patriotism are less unreasonable than is a law compelling all citizens to act piously on Sunday. The first two are unreasonable and un-American, the last is not only unreasonable and un-American, but positively unchristian.

"What Is Rome's System?" *American Sentinel* 10, 23 , pp. 178, 179.

THE *Monitor* took upon itself the task of defining in what the ritual of the sect to which the AMERICAN SENTINEL belongs, was "summed up." We replied, showing that we have no ritual at all, and also showing the distinction between Christianity and ritualism, which is simply the difference between Christianity and Catholicism. In this we said that "the whole Roman Catholic system is only one of forms, of ceremony, of ritual. In that system all such things are used as means—as 'means of grace'—with the hope of *thereby* obtaining Christ. Rome's is a system of salvation—justification—by works."

Upon this the *Monitor* says:—

To which we reply that the SENTINEL knows nothing—absolutely nothing about Rome's system.

How does the *Monitor* know this? How is it that the *Monitor* knew so much about the "ritual" of the SENTINEL as to be able to sum it up in a single sentence? How is it that the *Monitor* knows anything at all about the SENTINEL or its "ritual"? Perhaps the *Monitor* will say that it has read and studied the subject. Very good. But is it a fact already decided by the *Monitor* that the editors of the SENTINEL cannot—absolutely cannot read or study at all? If the *Monitor* admits that the editors of the SENTINEL can read and study, then in that it certainly admits that our means of knowing about Rome's system is precisely as good as is that of the editor of the *Monitor* to know about the "ritual" or anything else pertaining to the SENTINEL.

This is remarked, however, merely in passing. The material point of the *Monitor's* reply is as to whether in the Catholic system, forms and ceremonies—ritual—are "means of grace." This the *Monitor* vigorously denies in these words:—

We do not look upon forms or ceremonies or ritual as means of grace. There is only one source of grace and that is Jesus Christ. There is only one giver of grace and that is Jesus Christ. . . . Now, as Christ is the dispenser of grace, can't he dispense it as he wills and how he wills? If he will have it flow through certain channels, who is Alonzo T. Jones that he will say nay to Omnipotence? If Christ's virtue went out through the hem of his garment, what is to prevent it from going out through the waters of baptism? And if Catholics believe that the employment of baptism is the way appointed by the Lord for the conferring of regeneration—the way by which—not the water, not the form, but—Christ himself confers regeneration, what right has the AMERICAN SENTINEL to accuse us of barren ritualism?

This would-be denial is a full confession of all that the SENTINEL charged. We never

said nor intended to say that in the Catholic system any forms or ceremonies were looked upon as *sources* of grace, nor as *givers* of grace. What we said is, that these things are looked upon and "used as *means*—'means of grace'—with the hope of *thereby* obtaining Christ." That is what we said; and what we meant in that expression is precisely what the *Monitor* says that Catholics believe, *namely*: that these forms are channels through which they hope to obtain the grace of Christ. We used the word "means" in no other sense than "channel." And the clause which said that these forms are "used as means—'means of grace'—with the hope of *thereby* obtaining Christ,"

would express our thought exactly if it said that these forms are *used as channels through which the grace of Christ is expected to be obtained.*

In that article we said in so many words that "the form of baptism, the form of the eucharist, etc., are employed in the Catholic system as 'means of grace.'" In the attempt to deny this the *Monitor* says that the grace of Christ "flows through certain channels," and that "Catholics believe that the employment of baptism *is the way* appointed by the Lord for the conferring of regeneration—*the way by which* Christ himself confers regeneration."

Now, if there be anybody who, after reading our statement and the *Monitor's* denial, cannot see that the *Monitor* says just what we said—who cannot see that the SENTINEL'S word, "means," and the *Monitor's* words, "is the way," "the way by which," and "channels," say the same thing,—then let such an one read these definitions:—

"MEANS: That through which, or by the help of which, and end is attained; something tending to an object desired; intermediate agency or measure."

"CHANNEL: That through which anything passes; *means of passing, conveying, or transmitting.*"

Thus it is as clear as anything needs to be that the *Monitor's* would-be denial is nothing else than a confession of all that we charged upon the Catholic system as to ritualism.

In closing we cannot do better than to write again what we first said—February 14, 1895—on this subject, and write it now in the *Monitor's* own words on the subject. As so written it runs thus: He who has Christ has the very life and substance of all the forms of service and of worship which he has appointed. Then these cease to be mere ceremonies or rites, and become the expression of the living presence and power of Christ himself in the life of the believer. This is the end of ritualism, of ceremonialism; the end of a *form* of godliness without the power; the end of any employment of the form of baptism, or the form of the eucharist, etc., as "means of grace," as "channels through which grace flows," as "the way in which Christ confers regeneration" or any other grace, as these are employed in the Catholic system.

"The law came by Moses, but the *reality* and the grace came by Jesus Christ." John 1:17 (Syriac). Now, the whole Roman Catholic system is only one of forms, of ceremony, of ritual. In that system all such things as baptism, the eucharist, etc., are used as means with the hope of thereby obtaining Christ; that is, as "means of grace,"

"channels through which," "the way by which," the grace of Christ is conferred and obtained: whereas with us any such things are used altogether as *the expression of the grace*, the presence and the power of Christ, *which we already have, by faith*. Rome's is a system of salvation—justification—by *works*; while ours is the divine truth of salvation—justification—by *faith*.

That is what we said February 14, 1895, to the *Monitor* on this point, *only with the Monitor's* would-be denial inserted. And thereby it is made as plain as A B C that by the *Monitor's* own words Rome's system is exactly what we said it is.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 23 , p. 184.

IT is not the custom of the SENTINEL to credit its original matter, but since the first-page article closes with an original poem whose authorship may be desired by some of our readers, we will state that it was written by our acting assistance editor, Mr. A. F. Ballenger.

J. F. ROTHROCK, a Seventh-day Adventist of West Salem, Ill., was arrested May 20 and convicted of keeping his store open on Sunday. He was prosecuted under a city ordinance, there being no State-law forbidding open stores on Sunday. So great an interest was manifested in the case that the court adjourned to the opera house where Mr. Rothrock spoke in his own defense. We have not learned what further action was taken in the case, but presume it was appealed.

A SPECIAL telegram to the AMERICAN SENTINEL from Amory, Miss., under date of June 2, says:—

Nash fined one dollar and costs. Immediately paid by the people.

This means that "the people" are better than the law of the State. Mr. Nash is a Seventh-day Adventist colporter. He follows his business five days in the week, rests on "the Sabbath day according according to the commandment," and on the first day of the week does around his home such work as needs to be done. He was arrested for hoeing in his garden on Sunday, and *was tried upon the Sabbath*. We do not know, but presume he was informed by the judge that the law in no wise interfered with his right to keep "his" Sabbath, but that he must keep Sunday also. But how would Sunday-keepers like a law that not only required them to observe a day for which they have no religious regard, but under which they were liable to be dragged into court on the day which they regard as sacred to rest and

worship? Like the Baptist martyrs of New England, Mr. Nash refused to pay a single penny for exercising his God-given rights. Hence the payment of the fine and costs by "the people" who were not willing to see an honest man imprisoned for exercising his inalienable right of conscience.

AMONG the very few religious papers which have spoken out plainly in condemnation of religious persecution, the *Examiner and National Baptist*, of this city, stands forth preeminent. On another page we print an article from its editorial columns which ought to be read by everybody, and especially by those Baptists who either never knew or who have forgotten what their brethren of past generations suffered in defense of soul-liberty.

So far as our acquaintance with Sabbath-keepers qualifies us to speak,—and we have known thousands of them scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Lakes to the Gulf,—observers of the seventh day are, as a rule, considerate not only of the rights but also of the feelings of their Sunday-keeping neighbors. We know that no law is necessary to compel them to respect any right of their fellow-men in the matter of weekly rest and worship. Nor can we think that even the measure of Sunday restriction, which the *Examiner* would favor, is at all necessary.

The thousands of Sabbath-keepers to which we have referred, and besides this many other thousands, many of them in our large cities, who find no difficulty in observing the seventh day, while all the world around them is upon pleasure and money-making bent, prove that those who wish to do so can rest and worship while others are engaged in secular pursuits.

We have ample laws for the protection of both individuals and assemblies upon all days without special laws for Sunday. But if Sunday laws were restricted to the sphere indicated by the *Examiner* they would be much less objectionable than they now are. But we do not regard even that as necessary or even proper. Nevertheless, we say, all honor to our Baptist contemporary for its fearless championship of the freedom for which Baptists of past generations suffered fines, imprisonment, whipping, banishment, and *death*. Evidently, God is yet testifying of the gift of Roger Williams, and by his faith "he being dead yet speaketh."

"Maryland Again Persecuting" *American Sentinel* 10, 23 , p. 184.

ROBERT R. WHALEY, a Seventh-day Adventist, of Church Hill, Maryland, is now serving a thirty days' sentence in the county jail at Centerville, for working in his garden on Sunday. Mr. Whaley is a carpenter, and for some time previous to his arrest, was engaged in building a house in the country at such a distance from his house in the country at such a distance from his home that he did not return until Friday evening of each week. And since he was not permitted to labor on the house on Sunday he devoted that day to caring for his garden.

This his Methodist neighbors would not allow, but entered complaint against him; and on his return home, Friday, May 24, he was served with a warrant, and his trial before the magistrate was set for the evening of May 25. Mr. Whaley was convicted, and in default of payment of fine and costs, was sentenced to thirty days in the county jail and was locked in a cell, Monday May 27.

Mr. Whaley considered it useless to appeal to the higher court since a case had been appealed to the Supreme Court of the State, and he himself had appealed to the Circuit Court on a former occasion, all to no avail.

It will be remembered that Mr. Whaley spent thirty days in the same jail last fall, for a similar offense. At that time the sheriff was very kind: but as in the biblical account there arose a king in Egypt who knew not Joseph, so now there has arisen in Queen Anne's County a sheriff who is unacquainted with Mr. Whaley, and consequently Mr. Whaley is at present locked in a cell as a common criminal. However, it is to be hoped that his faithful, consistent life will touch the heart of his new jailer.

Mr. Whaley is forty-three years old and has a wife and seven children. They were formerly Methodists, and it is at the hands of their former church associates that they now suffer. It is difficult to understand how men who take the name of Christ and profess to obey the Golden Rule can thus cruelly take a husband and father from his hand-working wife and prattling children, and from his only means of procuring them bread and shelter, and lock him behind bars. It is gratifying to know that Mr. Whaley's wife is in perfect sympathy with her persecuted husband and would work her finger nails off in an attempt to care for her little ones rather than have her husband yield the vital principle at stake.

The International Religious Liberty Association, with headquarters at 271 West Main St., Battle Creek, Mich., will undertake to care for

Mr. Whaley's family while he is in jail. This association is supported by its members who pay an annual due of one dollar, and from donations contributed by those interested in the struggle for religious freedom against these modern relics of medieval days. But since the association has a score or more of these cases in Tennessee, Georgia, Mississippi and Illinois on its hands, with the prospect of others, it will be necessary for the friends of liberty of conscience to manifest their interest in a material way. We feel like remarking, in the language of the German Lutheran editor, quoted on page 180: "For God's sake let us not be inactive, but let us make preparations for the battle. The most precious liberty of our country is at stake."

In this connection we call attention to our first-page article. The principles therein discussed will apply with equal force to this Maryland case.

June 13, 1895

"An Atlanta Paper Defends the Georgia Inquisition" *American Sentinel* 10, 24 , p. 187.

THE *Atlanta Constitution*, of May 25, has an article in defense of the persecution of J. Q. Allison, by means of the Georgia Sunday law.

The *Constitution* attempts to make the following points, which we have numbered for easy reference in replying:—

(1.) In the Christian world the first day of the week is now observed as the Sabbath, and the seventh day is only an ordinary working day. Are the millions of Christians who observe the first day to have their devotions interrupted by a very few persons, perhaps not more than a score or so in a State, who claim that they have the right to do any kind of work and make as much noise as they please on that day?

(2.) We think not. The minority should follow the example of the pious Jews who observe both days, the seventh and the first, thus keeping their Sabbath and respecting the one observed by the majority.

(3.) Allison was not persecuted on account of his religious belief. He was punished because he violated a penal law of the State. Under the police powers of every commonwealth there are much severer statutes in relation to very small matters. Even under the municipal ordinances great hardships result when a man exercises natural and God-given rights in some cases where the law restrains him in the interests of the public.

(4.) The Douglasville man should have observed his own Sabbath, and then he should have respected the Sabbath of his neighbors who are in accord with the overwhelming majority of the State and the nation and all Christian lands. For the sake of peace and order we cannot allow a few to bring anarchy into our system simply because they claim to be acting according to their religious convictions. Once give way to this plea, and we would then have no right to prohibit polygamy among the Mormons. In a republic the majority rule, and it would be a dangerous thing to admit the right of the minority to defy the laws under pretense of living up to their religion. If the Douglasville man wants to smash the Georgia Sabbath let him pay the penalty or go elsewhere.

(1.) The fact that those who keep Sunday are overwhelming in the majority does not touch the question at all. Mr. Allison was not sentenced to the chain-gang "for disturbing anybody." This is the statement of Judge Janes himself. The charge was "Sabbath-breaking," and the State's witnesses testified that they *were not disturbed*. Nobody's devotions were interrupted; nor do observers of the seventh day claim the right to interrupt the devotions of anybody upon any day. Moreover, there are ample laws upon the statute books of Georgia, and of every other State, for the protection of religious worship upon any day.

Special laws to prevent the interruption of devotion on Sunday are not needed. The idea that private work, such as Mr. Allison was doing, could by any possibility interrupt anybody's devotions is absurd and reveals the deliberate dishonesty of such a plea.

(2.) And pray, why should the minority respect the *day* "observed by the majority"? There can be only one reason, namely, its supposed sacred character. And the expression, "respecting the one [*i.e.*, the Sabbath] observed by the majority," is a confession that the purpose of the law is to guard the *day* and not the rights of the people.

But what right has the State of Georgia to require any man to show any respect whatever to any religious institution? No more right than has Spain and other Roman Catholic countries to require all men to remove their hats in the street while a religious procession is passing.

The constitution of Georgia says:—

Perfect freedom of religious sentiment shall be, and the same is hereby secured, and no inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property or prohibited from holding any public office or trust, on account of his religious opinion.

It may be objected that this guarantees only freedom to believe, but not to practice. But that is to charge the framers of it with trifling and dishonesty. The principle which should govern in all such cases is thus stated by Hon. James G. Parks, a native of Georgia, and judge of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit of Tennessee. Speaking of dissenters from the prevailing creed, Judge Parks said:—

It there were only one of them he would be entitled not only to his honest belief, *but to the exercise of that belief, so long as in so doing he did not interfere with some natural right of his neighbors.*

This was said of Tennessee, but it is just as true of Georgia; and that it is just what the constitution of Georgia means is evident from the limiting words of the same section previously quoted: "But the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the people."

Here, again, the line is drawn just where Judge Parks draws it, namely, *at the rights of the people*. It may be urged that the phrase, "acts of licentiousness" has nothing necessarily to do with the rights of others; but even were that granted, the defenders of the Georgia Sunday statute would have gained nothing, for by no possibility could it be made to appear that plowing in one's own field on Sunday was an act of licentiousness in any proper sense of the word; *for only the sacred character of the day could make it such*, and with such matters the State of Georgia has of right nothing to do.

Again, what right, either natural or constitutional, has the majority, however great, to require any man to yield up one-seventh of his time as a tribute to their religion? It is a principle of law that even the State has no power to take private property for public use without adequate compensation. But what compensation does the State of Georgia give to J. Q. Allison, or to any other man, for the one day which it demands each week as a tribute to Sunday sacredness? None whatever.

(3.) It is not true that Mr. Allison "was persecuted because he violated a penal *law* of the State." He did violate a *statute* of the State, but not a *law*; for an unconstitutional statute is not law: and as we have seen, the constitution of Georgia gives the legislature no power to require of anybody anything contrary to conscience. Aside from "acts of licentiousness," and in all matters not trenching upon the equal rights of others, conscience is supreme according to the fundamental law of Georgia, and all so-called laws violative of this

principle are null and void, and the enforcement of them is only anarchy and tyranny; for "in a society, under the forms of which the stronger faction can readily united and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature, when the weaker individual is not secure against the violence of the stronger." ⁴⁵¹

It is a fundamental principles of American government that *natural rights are inalienable*, and yet the *Atlanta Constitution* solemnly publishes to the world the statement that "under the municipal ordinances great hardships result when a man exercises natural and God-given rights in some cases where the law restrains him in the interests of the public."

Are we living in America in the closing decade of the nineteenth century, or are we still in the Dark Ages? Have Washington, Jefferson and Madison lived in vain? They certainly have if such principles as those advocated by the *Atlanta Constitution* are to prevail.

Thomas Jefferson said: "Our legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their powers; that their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, *and to take none of them from us.*" ⁴⁶² And again: "*The idea is quite unfounded that on entering into society we give up any natural right.*" ⁴⁷³

The government that restrains any man from the exercise of his natural rights, either for the supposed good of society or upon any other pretext whatever, is a despotism, no matter by what name it may be called.

(4.) Little remains to be said on this paragraph. Only an intolerant bigot can read it and find himself in harmony with it. The cry of "anarchy" raised in it will certainly fail to alarm any considerate and liberal-minded man. The anarchy most to be dreaded is the anarchy of despotic government, in which, under the forms of law, natural rights are denied and men sentenced to the chain-gang for exercising the soul-liberty given them by God and guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

The cry of Mormonism and polygamy is a favorite one with the bigot who would justify himself in forcing his religion upon his neighbor; but the candid and thoughtful will not be deceived by it. Marriage is a civil relation and involves duties and responsibilities which those who enter into it must not be permitted to shirk. For this reason and to preserve inviolable the contract rights of the parties and the rights of their offspring, the State properly regulates marriage and prohibits polygamy. With polygamy legalized anywhere in the

United States no woman would have any legal guarantee of the inviolability of her marital right, for any man who so desired might, by merely changing his residence, take other wives, and his first wife would have no redress.

In no sense can the prohibition of plural marriages be shown to be parallel with the prohibition of Sunday labor, which in no wise interferes with the rest or devotion of others. The use of the Mormon argument shows plainly one of two things, either the absence of thought or the presence of intellectual dishonesty.

"Methodists and Pope Leo XIII" *American Sentinel* 10, 24 , p. 188.

THE Methodist ministers of Chicago are making the papal prelates of this country no little trouble. They are demanding that the papal church practice what it preaches; that Methodists in Roman Catholic South America be permitted to enjoy that religious liberty which Roman Catholics enjoy in the United States and which American Catholics profess to indorse so warmly, and which they claim is the religious liberty they would ensure to Protestants in America were they to become the controlling majority. However, the Methodist ministers of Chicago are so unreasonable as to ask that the Roman Catholic Church show her faith by her works, or in other words, secure to Protestants in the Roman Catholic countries of South America the same liberty enjoyed by Roman Catholics in the United States and thereby give the world a practical object lesson of the principles so enthusiastically professed in theory. Of course, this is a perplexing problem, since the religious-liberty principles advocated by Roman Catholics in the United States are intended only for home consumption and not for export to Spain or South America.

Since the Methodist ministers are persistent in their demand for religious liberty in South America, and are liable to create quite a stir by their repeated prodding of pope and prelates, it may be profitable to give a history of the case up to date.

On April 2, 1894, the Methodist ministers' meeting of Chicago, a body which includes the Methodist ministers of Chicago and adjacent cities, and which holds a regular weekly session, sent the following preamble and resolution to Archbishop Ireland with a request that they be by him forwarded to Monsignor Satolli:—

WHEREAS, It has been made evident to us that our Protestant brethren in the republics of Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia labor under oppressive disabilities that effect not only their faith and

the public worship of God according to the dictates of their conscience, but also their civil and inalienable right to be married without being compelled to forswear their religious convictions,

Resolved, That as representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Chicago, we forward the following request to Archbishop Ireland, asking him to pass it on to Monsignor Satolli, in order that he may, in the most effective manner, bring it to the notice of the head of the Roman Catholic Church.

In view of the repeated and warm approval by the clergy and laymen of the Roman Catholic Church in this country of religious freedom as existing by law in these United States, we respectfully and earnestly request that the proper authorities of that church use their good offices, under the direction of Pope Leo XIII., to secure for the Protestants of Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia for the same liberty of conscience that is enjoyed by Roman Catholic citizens of this country.

N. H. AXTELL, *President*.

J. T. LADD, *Secretary*.

Chicago Methodist Preachers' Meeting.

JOHN G. FOSTER,

JOHN LEE,

M. M. PARKHURST, *Committee*.

After waiting some time, two members of the committee wrote Archbishop Ireland, inclosing stamped envelope for reply, asking after the fate of the first communication; but again no answer was received. On June 22, a member of the committee wrote direct to Monsignor Satolli, asking him the following questions:—

1. Has Archbishop Ireland invited your attention to the action of the Chicago Methodist Ministers' meeting of April 2, 1894?
2. Will you, in the most effective manner, bring this request, a copy of which I inclose, to the notice of Pope Leo XIII.?
3. If so, when?

Receiving no reply to this, a registered letter, dated July 15, and signed by all members of the committee, was sent to Monsignor Satolli, asking the apostolic delegate if he would "have the goodness to give a direct answer to the questions found in his first letter." The following is Monsignor Satolli's reply:—

Washington, July 31, 1894.

MR. JOHN LEE, M.A., B.C.,

Dear Sir:—Your letter of June 22 and document dated July 12, came duly to hand. The inclosed copy of encyclical letter from our holy father is, I think, the most fitting reply I can make.

Yours very sincerely in Christ,
FRANCIS ARCHB. SATOLLI, *Deleg. Apostol.*

As we have before stated in commenting on this reply, it said in substance, "If your brethren in South America want to enjoy religious liberty, let them become Roman Catholics."

Not satisfied with this reply, the matter was again brought before the ministers' meeting on September 3, and it was decided to send the documents and correspondence in the case to the various Protestant bodies of the country for action.

Failing to reach Rome through Ireland and Satolli, the committee next sent a registered communication direct to the pope. Not hearing from him in due time, another registered communication was sent, and not hearing from him this time and learning that Cardinal Gibbons was going to Rome, the persistent Methodist ministers forwarded to him a communication to be carried to Leo XIII., and thus matters stand at this writing.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL is not in favor of Protestants' petitioning the pope or any of his prelates for anything, not even religious liberty in South America. However, we presume that our Methodist friends would insist that it was a shrewd diplomatic protest rather than a petition, for the purpose of compelling the Roman Catholic Church to permit religious liberty in Catholic South America, or stand before the world as the advocates of religious freedom when in the minority and as persecutors when in the majority.

Methodists in general look upon this move to make the pope show his hand as not only just and reasonable, but quite diplomatic. If this is true what would Methodists think and say if Seventh-day Adventists in Maryland, Tennessee and other States should write a similar letter to the heads of the Methodist Church in America protesting against being fined and imprisoned at the hands of Methodists who attempt to compel them to recognize their State-enforced Sunday dogma? The facts in the case are that the first Seventh-day Adventist who was imprisoned in Maryland for laboring on Sunday (husking corn) was imprisoned on complaint of a Methodist minister; and the Seventh-day Adventist now in jail at Centerville, Md., for hoeing in his garden on Sunday, was placed there on complaint of his Methodist neighbors: while the *Catholic Mirror*, of Baltimore, about two years since, published a strong denunciation of these Maryland persecutions and demanded the repeal of the law under which they are carried on.

One of the complaints which Protestants sometimes make against Roman Catholics is, that the latter attempt to compel them to remove their hats or in some other way recognize a procession bearing the consecrated bread. This our Methodist friends condemn as a violation of religious liberty; but it is no more a violation religious liberty than is the attempt to compel the Seventh-day Adventist to bow to the Methodist idea of Sunday sacredness. There is absolutely no difference between an attempt on the part of Roman Catholics to compel a recognition of a portion of bread which they consider holy, and an attempt on the part of Methodists to compel seventh-day observers to recognize a portion of time which Methodists consider holy. And now, we ask in all sincerity, would not an Adventist letter addressed to the Methodist Church in America, demanding religious freedom from Methodists in Maryland and elsewhere in the United States, on the ground that Methodists claim to be in favor of religious liberty, be just as pertinent as a Methodist letter addressed to the pope demanding religious liberty in South America in the United States claim to be in favor of religious freedom? If not, why not?

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 24 , p. 192.

MARTIN LUTHER, though dead, yet speaketh. The German Lutheran paper, *Die Rundschau*, of Chicago, is watching the signs of the times and interpreting their meaning with a keenness of perception that is truly refreshing. After narrating in its issue of May 22 the humiliating course of certain Christian Endeavors in petitioning Satolli to degrade "Father" Phelan as a punishment for his grossly false charges against the morality of the members of the society, the wide-awake Lutheran editor comments thus:—

"In fine, we have this yet to say: no one is more powerfully into the hands of popery than is the false Protestantism of our day. There be few to-day that do clearly perceive this and are preparing for the consequences. And, as detrimental as are the consequences to our land, they cannot and will not fail to transpire, if the eyes of the 'Protestants' of America are not opened in time, and if they do not, *above all*, rid themselves of the pope and all popery."

A PETITION "to the authorities" is being circulated in Rhea County, Tenn., praying that the Sunday law shall be more strictly observed than heretofore. The Graysville Adventists know what that means and

are preparing for whatever may come at the July term of the Circuit Court.

The regular time for the third quarterly meeting of the year in all the Adventist churches is the first Sabbath in July, which, this year, comes on the 6th. But as eleven of the male members of the church, including the elder, are likely to be in prison at that time, the meeting will be held one week earlier, namely, June 29. The story is thus told in a private letter written by one of the indicted Adventists to a minister of the denomination, whom he urges to be present at the meeting referred to:—

We have changed our quarterly meeting so as to come one week earlier this time. As the usual time of holding the meeting comes the same week that the Circuit Court for this county is in session, and as it is more than probable that a large number of the male members of the church will be in jail, we have concluded to make this change. . . . Has there ever before been a quarterly meeting among us changed for such a reason? . . . We are living in a wonderful time. May the dear Lord help us.

The brethren are all well, and good courage is full in the hearts of all. Our meetings are better and better as week succeeds week. Don't forget us at the throne of grace.

The writer of the letter from which this extract is made, is a man of intelligence and refinement. He was an officer in the Union Army during the Rebellion, was subsequently a member of years been an official member of the Seventh-day Adventist church at Graysville. He is one of the most gentle, inoffensive and exemplary Christian men to be found anywhere, loved and respected by all who know him; but the first week in July is almost certain to see him a convicted inmate of the Rhea County Jail. Such is the practical working of the Tennessee Sunday statute.

June 20, 1895

"The Sabbath and the Sufficiency of Scripture" *American Sentinel* 10, 25 , pp. 193, 194.

DOES the Bible contain all things necessary to salvation?

The consistent Protestant says, yes; the consistent Roman Catholic says, no.

It is around this point that the battle between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism has always been waged, and always will be waged, until the end of time.

When the papacy yields on this point, it yields all. It cannot exist as a system a moment after it surrenders this point. On the other hand, when Protestantism compromises itself on this point, it has compromised its very existence, and must perish.

It therefore follows that when Protestantism harbors an unscriptural doctrine it harbors a deadly foe. It gives aid and comfort to its life-long enemy, and commits treason against the cause it professes to serve.

Protestantism is harboring such an enemy in the Sunday-Sabbath, and Roman Catholics are using this fact to silence the voice of Protestantism. The Romanizing High-Church party in the Protestant Episcopal Church use it to silence the voice of their protesting brethren; Methodists use it to silence the Baptists' plea for scriptural baptism. In fact, the greatest foe to a faithful return to scriptural doctrine and practice, is found in the Sunday-Sabbath.

To illustrate: Every Roman Catholic work which discusses the doctrine of the church, attempts to prove that the Bible does not contain all that is necessary to salvation. And every such work appeals to the Sunday-Sabbath, which all the popular Protestant churches observe, as proof of its claim.

Here are a few of the many examples:—

Now the Scriptures alone do not contain all the truths which a Christian is bound to believe, nor do they explicitly enjoin all the duties which he is obliged to practice. Not to mention other examples, is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday, and to abstain on that day from unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most prominent of our sacred duties? But you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify. . . . We must *therefore conclude* that the Scriptures alone cannot be a sufficient guide and rule of faith. . . . because they do not contain all the truths necessary for salvation. ⁴⁸¹

The Protestants have no scripture for the measure of their day of rest,—that they abolish the observance of Saturday without warrant of Scripture,—that they substitute Sunday in its place without scriptural authority,—consequently, that for all this, they have only traditional authority. Yet Protestants would look upon a man who would do profane work after five o'clock on Sunday, or keep the Saturday and profane the first day, as a victim of perdition. *Hence we must conclude*, that the Scripture, which does not teach

these things clearly, does not contain all necessary truths, and consequently, cannot be the only rule of faith. ⁴⁹²

The keeping holy of Sunday is a thing absolutely necessary to salvation; and yet this is nowhere put down in the Bible; on the contrary, the Bible says: "*Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy*" (Ex. 20:8), which is *Saturday*, and not Sunday; *therefore the Bible does not contain all things necessary to salvation, and consequently, cannot be a sufficient rule of faith.* ⁵⁰³

Not only is the Sunday-Sabbath used by Roman Catholics against the general by Roman Catholics against the general position of Protestantism on the sufficiency of Scripture, but it is used to justify every unscriptural doctrine and practice of their church. Every time a Sunday-keeping Protestant declares a certain Roman Catholic doctrine to be unscriptural, the Catholic kills the force of the protest by replying that Sunday-keeping is without scriptural warrant also. In fact, Roman Catholic children are taught in parochial schools to use this argument against the Protestant who protests against the multitude of fast days enjoined by that church. Here is an illustration from "A Doctrinal Catechism," page 181:—

Q. In what manner can we show a Protestant that he speaks unreasonably against fasts and abstinences?

A. Asks him why he keeps Sunday, and not Saturday, as his day of rest, since he is unwilling either to fast or abstain. If he replies that the Scripture orders him to keep Sunday, but says nothing as to fasting or abstinence, tell him the Scripture speaks of Saturday or Sabbath, but gives no command anywhere regarding Sunday or the first day of the week. If then he neglects Saturday as a day of rest and holiness, and substitutes Sunday in its place, and this merely because such was the usage of the ancient church, should he not, if he wishes to act consistently, observe fasting and abstinence, because the ancient church so ordained?

And now we instance an illustration of how effectively this argument is used. The *New York Observer*, of January 24, 1895, assailed the Roman Catholic mass, as follows:—

There is not, in all the Word of God, a passage that can be quoted in favor of an early and fasting communion.

To this the *Catholic Union and Times*, of Buffalo, promptly replied:—

Neither is there a single text of scripture to authorize you to change the Lord's day from the seventh to the first day of the week.

This shot from the Roman Catholic editor effectually silenced the *Observer*; not a word has been ventured in reply.

Not only do Roman Catholics use the Sunday-Sabbath tradition to silence Sunday-keeping Protestants, but Sunday-keeping Protestants

use it against each other. Recently, the *Examiner National Baptist and Christian Inquirer* published the statement that the Roman custom of christening bells "is authorized by the very next verse to the one which commands the christening of babies."

To this the New York *Christian Advocate* (Methodist), in its issue of April 25, quickly responded thus:—

Our Baptist friends would find great difficulty in finding a positive text in support of some of their beliefs. Without doubt there is no text commanding the christening of babies; now is there any commanding the substitution of the Lord's day for the Sabbath.

As the short from the *Catholic Union and Times* silenced the *Observer*, so this shot from the *Advocate* silenced the *Examiner*. And thus it is seen how the Sunday-Sabbath dogma stands for tradition as against the sufficiency of Scripture, and is a shield in the hands of Roman Catholics to parry the scriptural blow of the Sunday-keeping Protestant; and in the hands of one Sunday-keeping Protestant his more scriptural Protestant neighbor. In short, the greatest barrier to-day to a return to primitive Bible truth is the inconsistent Protestant practice of hallowing

194

the unhallowed Sunday institution and of the decorating the God-hallowed Sabbath-day.

There are those who charge Seventh-day Adventists with exaggerating a non-essential, in faithfully observing the "Sabbath day according to the commandment." But it is not a non-essential; it is a vital question. Upon it turns, as we have seen, the question of whether the Word of God contains the truth necessary to salvation or whether it does not; whether the claim of the Roman Catholic Church that tradition is essential to salvation is true or not; whether we will take the Bible, with the Saviour of the Bible, and his salvation which saves to the uttermost, or the tradition of the papacy with its traditional saviour which cannot save without the intervention of Mary, the saints, and the priests, and "millions of years" in the purifying flames of purgatory?

This is what Seventh-day Adventists are standing for; this is what they are suffering in prisons for; and this is what, God helping them, they are willing to die to maintain.

"Clerical Juggling" *American Sentinel* 10, 25 , p. 194.

A LARGE majority of those who observe the first day of the week instead of the seventh day, attempt to use the fourth commandment to justify their practice. However, this use of the fourth commandment is a modern invention. Fifteen hundred years of Christian history and ecclesiastical controversy passed before any church became so reckless as to attempt to steal the livery of the fourth commandment with which to clothe the Sunday-Sabbath.

To show how the commandment is wrested in the attempt to furnish scriptural authority for the unscriptural dogma of Sunday-sacredness, we will quote the commandment, with the juggling necessary to make it applicable:—

"Remember the Sabbath day [formerly the seventh, but now the first day] to keep it holy. Six days [which formerly excluded the seventh, but now includes it] shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the first day [formerly the seventh day] is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; 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" one day in seven, but no day in particular, and hallowed one day in seven, but no day in particular; and then authorized the clergy from the sixteenth century and onward to determine which day of the seven is holy, and to force that decision on all other men with the aid of the civil authority.

Although this rendering of the commandment is ridiculous, it is the rendering absolutely necessary to cover the position taken by ninety-nine out of every one hundred Sunday-keeping Protestants. Is it any wonder that thinking men should become disgusted with this jugglery with words and retort in the language of the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* editorial, of April 23, thus: "Once for all this clerical juggling with words should cease: Sunday is not the Sabbath, and every preacher knows it is not"?

Every Protestant who wrests the scripture in this manner vitiates the divine Word and silences his voice against papal perversions of scripture. If the Sunday-keeping Protestant can do violence to the fourth commandment as illustrated above, then the Roman Catholic can wrest the following precious text, thus:—

"If we confess our sin [to the priest], he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" [in the flames of purgatory].

The Sunday-keeping Protestant protests against this rendering of the text, but his protest is nullified by the fact that he is guilty of doing equal violence to another text to justify his practice. Thus it is seen that the Sabbath controversy involves the integrity of the Scriptures, and with it the simplicity and purity of the gospel of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. And in contending for the integrity of the Sabbath command, Seventh-day Adventists are contending for the integrity of scriptures which contain the good news of salvation through faith in Christ, instead of through faith in priests, popes and purgatory.

"Clashing Voices" *American Sentinel* 10, 25 , p. 194.

A COPY of the *Evangel and Sabbath Outlook*, containing an account of the conviction

June 27, 1895

"The Model Sabbath-keeper" *American Sentinel* 10, 26 , pp. 201-203.

ROBERT R. WHALEY, a Seventh-day Adventist, is now in jail at Centerville, Md.

He was placed there on complaint of a Methodist neighbor.

The complaint of the Methodist was that his seventh-day neighbor set out plants in his garden on Sunday.

If Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, should come to Maryland, would he enter the pew of this Methodist as he worships on Sunday, while his seventh-day, Christian neighbor, on his complaint, is locked in a cell,—would he enter that pew and say to the Methodist, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant"? Would he?

Or would he go to the prisoner in his cell and say, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life;" and then visit Mr. Whaley's home and speak words of comfort to the weary wife, and bless the prisoner's little children?

Twelve honest, upright citizens of Rhea County, Tenn., are to be tried at Dayton, the county seat, July 1, on the charge of "violating the Sabbath." These twelve men are Seventh-day Adventists, and their offense is that after resting the "Sabbath day according to the commandment," they (without disturbing either the public or private worship of their neighbors) followed their usual vocations on Sunday.

On Which Side Would He Be Found?

If Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, should come to the court-room, at Dayton, next Monday, would he side with the professed Christians who are persecuting their seventh-day, Christian neighbors, or would he espouse the cause of the twelve men charged with "violating the Sabbath"? Would he be found at the prosecutor's table aiding the first-day observers to convict their seventh-day neighbors, or would he be found in the prisoners' dock, saying, "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for there is the kingdom of heaven."?

These questions can be answered with positive certainty by referring to the record of the attitude of Christ toward the Sabbath and toward self-constituted guardians of other men's Sabbath-keeping, when he visited our world about nineteen hundred years ago. He is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." And what he did then he would do now.

What did he do then? To better understand the conflict between Christ and the Pharisees of his day over the Sabbath question, it is necessary to briefly note the history of Sabbath-keeping among the Jews. The Lord, through the prophet Jeremiah, made the following promise to Israel:—

And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the Sabbath day, but hallow the Sabbath day, to do no work therein; then shall there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they, and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem: and this city shall remain for ever. Jer. 17:24, 25.

On the other hand, should the people div-

202

obey, they were threatened with the following judgments:—

But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched. Verse 27.

The Result of Disobedience.

They refused to obey, and the threatened judgments overtook them, as recorded in 2 Chron. 36:18-21: "They burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof." And this was done "to fulfill the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah."

Those of the people who survived the siege were taken to Babylon, where they remained for seventy years; after which their descendants were permitted to return and rebuild Jerusalem.

Remembering that their city and temple had been destroyed, and their fathers taken into captivity because of a failure to hallow the Sabbath, one of the first resolutions they made after returning, was as follows:—

They clave to their brethren, their nobles, and entered into a curse, and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our Lord, and his judgments and his statutes; . . . and if the people of the land bring ware or any victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, that we would not buy it of them on the Sabbath. Neh. 10:29-31.

But a few years later the people disregarded their oath and again violated the Sabbath in the most flagrant manner, as recorded in Nah. 13:15, 16:—

In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine presses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day: and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem.

Nehemiah's Warning.

Remembering that both their city and nation had been destroyed because of Sabbath-breaking, Nehemiah warns the people thus:—

Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath. Verses 17, 18.

From the days of Nehemiah to the coming of Christ, this threatened destruction of the Jewish nation was kept before the people by the priests, as a reason for the strict observance of the Sabbath. An almost endless number of hair-splitting rules for the observance of the Sabbath was enacted until the true Sabbath, and true Sabbath observance was lost sight of and a counterfeit, man-made sabbath, hedged about with traditional exactions, took its place.

The Sabbath of the Lord and the sabbath of the Jews were just as different and just as conflicting as were the Lord of the Sabbath and the Jewish leaders. Although these two Sabbaths occupied the same twenty-four hours, they could have been no more unlike *in character* if the sabbath of the Jews had been observed on Sunday.

True Sabbath observance is the hallowing of the hallowed day. The seventh day is the Sabbath, whether men recognize it or not. It is impossible to hallow the Sabbath on any other day than the one hallowed by the Lord. But it is possible to observe man's erroneous ideas of Sabbath-keeping on the seventh day as did the Jews, without hallowing the Sabbath of the Lord. True Sabbath-keeping is a hallowing of the God-hallowed day in the God-appointed way.

The Sabbath of the Lord "was made *for* man," not against him; it was a merciful institution. The sabbath of the Pharisees was unmerciful in that it enslaved men. It included in its prohibited work the rubbing out in the hands of a little grain with which to satisfy hunger. Mark 2:22-28. It prohibited the healing of the most pain-racked sufferer. Proof that healing the sick was included among the "*work*" prohibited by the sabbath of the Pharisees is found in Luke 13:11-14:—

False Sabbath-Keeping.

And, behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself. And when Jesus saw her, he called her to him, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And he laid his hands on her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, *because that Jesus had healed on the Sabbath day*, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and *not on the Sabbath day*.

Thus it is seen that when Christ came to Israel he found a traditional, priest-made Sabbath, and he found the Jewish rulers watching sharply for violators of it, lest its violation should result in again bringing upon them the judgments of God, whereby they would lose their place and nation and be again taken into captivity.

What should the Lord of the Sabbath do? Should he rescue the Sabbath from beneath the traditional sabbath of the Pharisees, or should he leave it buried forever beneath that tyrannical institution? To rescue it he must violate the laws enacted to enforce the man-made sabbath, and consequently, rest under the charge of being a Sabbath-breaker, and of making the people Sabbath-breakers, and thereby inviting the judgments of God upon the nation. This he *must* do, and suffer all the consequences: for it was prophesied of him that "He will magnify the law, and make it honorable" (Isa. 42:21): and no part of the law was more dishonored by traditional enactments than was the Sabbath.

What He Did.

What the Lord of the Sabbath did under these circumstances he would do to-day, and what he did his followers ought to do to-day. It is recorded in Mark 3, that—

He entered again into the synagogue: and there was a man there which had a withered hand. And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the Sabbath day; that they might accuse him.

Here we have the Lord face to face with the issue. To refuse to heal the afflicted man would be to surrender the true Sabbath to the claims of the false sabbath. To heal the withered hand would be to subject himself to the charge of Sabbath-breaking, and endanger his life.

And he saith unto the man which had the withered hand, Stand forth. And he saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace. And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other.

This tells what the Lord of the Sabbath did; and the next verse tells what the defenders of the sabbath of tradition did:—

And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, *how they might destroy him.*

Repeated Attempts To Kill Him.

The *first* account given by Mark of an attempt to "destroy" the Saviour is the one just quoted.

The *first* recorded attempt to "destroy him," as given by Matthew, is on this same occasion, and for the same offense,—violating the traditional sabbath by healing contrary to law, and keeping the true Sabbath by healing the afflicted, and doing good on that day.

The *first* attempt to kill him, as recorded in Luke, is at this same time and for the same reason,—healing the withered hand on the Sabbath day.

The *first* attempt to "slay him," recorded by John, was occasioned by his violating the traditional sabbath of the Pharisees. It is found in the fifth chapter of John, and reads thus:—

And a certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years. When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case, he saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole? The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool: but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me. Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked: and on the same day was the Sabbath. . . . *And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the Sabbath day. Verses 5-9, 16.*

The *first* sending of officers to arrest him to put him to death was occasioned by another healing on the Sabbath, another honoring of the true Sabbath, and a disregarding of the false, traditional, unmerciful sabbath of the Pharisees; and is recorded in the seventh chapter of John, as follows:—

Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me? . . . If a man on the Sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath day? . . . Then they sought to take him: but no man laid hands on him, because his hour was not yet come. And many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do

more miracles than these which this man hath done? The Pharisees heard that the people murmured such things concerning him; *and the Pharisees and the chief priests sent officers to take him.* Verses 19, 23, 30-32.

Again, in the ninth chapter it is recorded that when Jesus healed the blind man on the Sabbath day, the Jewish leaders declared in their rage, "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." Verse 16.

His Faithfulness.

Thus over and over again the Jewish leaders attempt to kill the Lord of the Sabbath because he violated their sabbath regulations and did honor to the true Sabbath. But notwithstanding he knew that they were watching him, and that every time he violated their sabbath laws he was endangering his life; still he persisted in doing that which was lawful on the Sabbath of the Lord, and that which was not lawful according to the sabbath laws of the Pharisees.

From these repeated attempts to kill the model Sabbath-keeper as a Sabbath-breaker, it is plain that when they *do* kill him, whatever may be the professed reasons, an important reason, if not the chief one will be that he violated what *they* declared was true Sabbath-keeping; but which, in fact, was Sabbath-breaking,—a sabbath observance which they themselves had originated, and upon the keeping of which they rested the existence of their city and nation.

In the eleventh chapter of John, it is recorded that the Pharisees called council and opened it thus:—

What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on

203

him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.

It is very true, as the Lord had said, and as Nehemiah had reiterated, their place and nation *did* depend on the observance of the Sabbath; but they were now making it depend upon the observing of their false ideas of Sabbath-keeping. The council closed with these words from the lips of the high priest, Caiaphas:—

It is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.

The Real and the False Reason.

Thus the Sabbath-breakers deliberately decided to kill the model Sabbath-keeper in order to save the nation from the judgments of God. And they killed him (but not openly) on the charge of Sabbath-breaking. To have charged him publicly with Sabbath-breaking would have necessitated a public acknowledgement that he had *healed* on the Sabbath day, and this would have necessitated a public confession that he had *power to work miracles*, a fact which they were most desirous of concealing. Hence, they accused him before Pilate of being a *civil* offender,—“We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cesar, saying that he himself is Christ a king.”

This basely untrue and cruelly dishonest, civil charge availed, and the model Sabbath-keeper was murdered, by the Sabbath-breakers ostensibly as a civil offender; but in truth, as a religious offender.

The model Sabbath-keeper submitted to be nailed to the cross, and to perish as a malefactor, but he persistently and faithfully *refused* to submit to the laws enforcing a false Sabbath, and thereby rescued the Sabbath of the Lord from beneath the traditions of men.

The Parallels.

Christ observed the Sabbath of the fourth commandment; so do Seventh-day Adventists.

There is absolutely no scriptural authority for the traditional sabbath observance of the persecutors of Christ; neither is there any scriptural authority for the Sunday-sabbath of the persecutors of Seventh-day Adventists.

The Sabbath observance of the Pharisees was man-made, and yet the salvation of the individual and the nation was made dependent upon it; it was therefore the sign of their salvation, and that a salvation by *human works*. The Sunday-sabbath of to-day is a man-made institution, and yet the salvation of the individual and the nation is made dependent upon its observance; it is therefore the sign of salvation by human works.

Christ broke the laws enforcing the observance of a sabbath made *by* man, in order that he might faithfully keep the Sabbath made *for* man; so do Seventh-day Adventists.

Christ could not submit to the laws enacted to do honor to a rival sabbath without dishonoring the true Sabbath; neither can Seventh-day Adventists.

Christ, because of his faithfulness to the Sabbath, was called a Sabbath-breaker and accused of "perverting the nation." For their faithfulness to the same Sabbath, Seventh-day Adventists are called Sabbath-breakers, and accused of "corrupting public morals."

Christ was crucified to save the nation from the judgments of God; Seventh-day Adventists are persecuted for the same reason.

Christ was persecuted before a *civil* court, ostensibly as a *civil* offender, when in truth his offense lay in his *religion*. Seventh-day Adventists are persecuted before the courts ostensibly as *civil* offenders, when in reality their offense lies in their *religious* beliefs and practices.

Christ was faithful in his Sabbath-keeping, even unto death; so have Seventh-day Adventists been, and the Lord of the Sabbath being their helper, so will they be.

Again we ask, If Christ should come to Maryland or Tennessee, would he espouse the cause of the persecuting Sunday-keepers *or* the cause of the persecuted Sabbath-keepers?

"Certainly" *American Sentinel* 10, 26 , p. 204.

"MORE than two hundred and fifty years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and more than two hundred years before the utter rottenness of the Papal Church in France which we are told gave rise to the doctrine that the people are the source of civil authority, Luther, Lanck, Melancthon, Bugenhagen and Amsdorff, 'the fathers of the Reformation,' announced the same doctrine. In a letter to the Elector Frederick, they said: 'No prince can undertake a war without the consent of the people, from whose hands he has received his authority.' This was good Protestantism and good Christianity then, and it is just as good Protestantism and just as good Christianity now."—*American Sentinel*.

Will the *Sentinel* be manly enough to add that more than eight hundred years before Luther was heard of, a pope name Zachary wrote to the French: "The prince is responsible to the people whose favor he enjoys. Whatever he has—power, honor, riches, glory, dignity—he has received from the people, and he ought to restore

them to the people from whom he has received them. *The people make the king: THEY CAN ALSO UNMAKE HIM.*"—*The Monitor*.

Now the AMERICAN SENTINEL has been "manly" enough to publish the above, will the *Monitor* be manly enough to tell its readers that the AMERICAN SENTINEL copied the expression, "Peoples and Princes of the Universe" from the pope's encyclical as it appeared in the *Northwestern Chronicle* (July 20, 1894, page 5), a standard Roman Catholic paper, and that therefore its charge that "the AMERICAN SENTINEL is not able to interpret the title to a modern document, written in so simple a language as Latin," and that "any school boy who has got as far as *hic haec hoc* would be able to tell it [the SENTINEL] that this [*Pincipibus Populisque Universis*] does not mean the princes and peoples of the universe," applies to Cardinal Gibbons who sent the encyclical to the *Northwestern Chronicle*, or in case he sent a Latin copy, then to the editor of the *Northwestern Chronicle*, "Rev. John Conway." Will the *Monitor* be manly enough to tell its readers that this charge of gross ignorance, instead of applying [*sic.*] to the AMERICAN SENTINEL applies to the editor of the *Northwestern Chronicle*, a priest of the "Church of the *Latin* rite"?

While we are compelled to differ with the *Monitor* on religious questions, we desire to regard the editor of that paper as being manly and honest.

"Was It a 'Slip'?" *American Sentinel* 10, 26 , p. 204.

THE *Truth Seeker*, of the 15th inst., thus takes us to task for a supposed "bad slip," which however was not a slip at all:—

The AMERICAN SENTINEL made a bad blip in its issue of May 30. During the trial of J. Q. Allison of Douglasville Ga., for the violation of the Sunday law, the judge said, answering the plea of the defense that the Sunday statute interfered with the religious liberty of the citizen:—

"I would not interfere with you in any way in the enjoyment of your religion; this is simply a law of the State, and we are bound thereby. The State could say that you should keep Wednesday or Thursday or every other Thursday, that it would be a crime to work on every other Wednesday or every other Thursday, and we would be bound to obey the law."

To this the editor of the Adventist paper replies: "This statement by the judge would be true if the law were indeed a merely civil regulation based upon *civil customs*."

The italics are his. He then goes on to show conclusively that the Sabbath law is not based on merely civil reasons and thus effectually disposes of the judge's defense of the persecution. But we are not here concerned with this aspect of the matter; what we would call attention to is the astounding admission of the SENTINEL that the State has a right to make honest labor a crime on any day *for any reason*. This is unconditional surrender.

The SENTINEL has made no such surrender. Our freethought critic has overlooked the *if* in what we said. The SENTINEL has many times proved that there is, and can be, no *civil reason* for enforced weekly rest. This was the thought we had in mind when we italicized the phrase "*based upon civil reasons*." It would have been better, we confess, to have said plainly in the very next sentence that there could be no such reason; but we did say in the same paragraph: "The prohibition of secular labor and business on Sunday has absolutely no other basis except the supposed sacred character of the day. *No other reason could possibly exist* for forbidding a man to plow in his own field on Sunday."

It follows that there can be no civil reason for prohibiting honest labor upon any day, for if there could that reason could apply to Sunday as well as to any other day. The fact that after years of diligent search no such reason has been found proves that it does not exist. The SENTINEL has made no surrender either unconditional or otherwise, for the SENTINEL supposes no un-supposable case. The position of the SENTINEL is and always has been that a weekly day of rest can exist only on a religious basis and for religious reasons, that therefore the State could, of right, have nothing whatever to do with the question; and that all so-called civil reasons are mere figments invented for the purpose of evading constitutional guarantees of freedom of conscience.

However, we are glad that the *Truth Seeker* is so clear-sighted as to detect even this supposed heresy, and we hope our contemporary will continue to seek the truth and point out the errors connected with this subject, even to the extent of correcting a supposed error in the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

July 4, 1895

"The Immorality of Sunday Laws vs. the 'Immorality' of Sunday Work"
***American Sentinel* 10, 26 , p. 210.**

THE charge against the Seventh-day Adventists on trial this week at Dayton, Tenn., for Sunday work, is that they are guilty of nuisance, because Sunday work is "immoral and of pernicious effect." But is Sunday work immoral?

The word immoral is defined by the best dictionaries, as follow:—

Not moral; inconsistent with rectitude, purity, or good morals; contrary to conscience or the divine law; wicked; unjust; dishonest; vicious; licentious, as, an immoral man; an immoral deed.—*Webster's International Dictionary.*

Not moral; wanting in principle of or morality; unprincipled; dishonest; depraved.—*Encyclopedic Dictionary.*

Not moral; not conforming to or consistent with moral law; unprincipled; dissolute; vicious; licentious.—*Century Dictionary.*

It is evident from these definitions that the moral or immoral character of an act rests upon a more substantial basis than the mere whim or even the delicate judgment of men; it is inherent in the act itself. An immoral act must be violative either of one's duty to God or to his fellow-men. Nothing can be made either moral or immoral by human law. For instance, marriage, which is a proper, natural and perfectly moral relation, would not become immoral even if prohibited by civil statute; nor would prostitution become moral even if legalized in every country in the world. *The divine law alone, whether revealed in nature or by inspiration of God, gives moral character to human actions.*

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men," and that for this purpose and within this sphere "the powers that be are ordained of God," and ought to be obeyed. *Outside this sphere all pretended civil authority is usurpation and is itself immoral.*

Sunday Work Not An Offense Against God.

That Sunday work is not an offense against God is evident from the fact that *it is forbidden by no divine law* revealed either in nature or by inspiration. The divine law of the Sabbath declares: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work." To violate this law is to be guilty of immorality: but the Tennessee Adventists do not violate this law. It is admitted on all hands that they obey this divine Sabbath law. They must therefore be

acquitted of immorality from the standpoint of duty toward God. The Divine Being does not require Sunday rest. But even if this were not true; if Sunday were the divinely-appointed Sabbath, and everybody admitted the fact, secular government would have no right to enforce its observance.

Sunday Work Does Not Interfere With The Natural Rights Of Others

It is argued by some, however, that the prohibition of Sunday labor in Tennessee does not rest upon the religious ideas, but upon a purely civil basis; and that the immorality of Sunday work lies not in the idea that it offends God, but in the fact that it is a violation of civil law. But such forget, or never knew, that "no man has a natural right to commit aggressions on the equal rights of another; and this is all from which the laws ought to restrain him;" and that "every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of the society; *and this is all the laws should enforce on him.*"

It is not pretended that private Sunday work by one man or by one family interferes with any natural right of another man or family, or that it prevents others from resting upon that day. No such charge is made against the Tennessee Adventists. Indeed, the universal testimony even of their enemies is that *they have not disturbed others* by their Sunday work: and the courts of the State have held that "it is not necessary to show that anybody was disturbed." In Georgia it was expressly stated by Judge Janes, in the Allison case: "You are not on trial for disturbing anybody." It follows as certainly as effect follows cause, that Sunday work is not immoral from the standpoint of natural human rights: and again and finally, the Adventists must be acquitted of the charge of doing that which is "immoral and of pernicious effect."

Sunday Workers Not Immoral.

If Sunday work were "immoral and of pernicious effect," as is charged by the courts of Tennessee, its evil effects ought certainly to be most clearly seen upon those who engage in it habitually; but instead of being noted for immorality, the Seventh-day Adventists are everywhere acknowledged to be most exemplary people, honest and of good report. Even their enemies being the witnesses there is no fault to be found with them except concerning their Sunday work: in all else they are admittedly the best of citizens.

The Immorality of Sunday Statutes.

But what shall we say of the morality of Sunday laws, so-called? They, as we have seen, contravene the divine law of the Sabbath. They command rest when the law of God enjoins activity; and they, indirectly at least, enjoin work when the law of God commands rest. The inevitable effect of such "laws" must be to destroy respect for the law of God, and to exalt the creature to the place which belongs of right to the Creator.

When the States forbids honest labor on Sunday it forces men into idleness. When God enjoins rest from labor, it is that the time may be employed in spiritual worship. God requires man to cease from his labor on the Sabbath, but he gives to man a spiritual nature, by means of which the cessation from labor is profitably employed. On the other hand the State compels idleness, but does not and cannot give to the idler that spiritual nature which enables him to properly employ the enforced idleness; and therefore, as Satan finds some mischief for idle hands to do, the State, in enforcing idleness on Sunday instead of promoting morality, is in reality fostering immorality. It is generally admitted that more crimes are committed on Sunday than on any other day of the week.

Again, Sunday statutes are immoral, because they demand for the State that which belongs to God. A weekly day of rest is the badge of God's authority, a sign of loyalty to him as the Creator and of faith in his power to save. By its Sunday laws, so-called, the State robs God of the honor due him, destroys reverence for his law, and stifles the conscientious convictions of many who might otherwise be won to the service of the true God and to the keeping of his divinely-ordained Sabbath.

Again, when the State exempts certain occupations, such as barbering, railroading, steamboating, and certain trafficking such as selling drugs, meats, and groceries during certain hours,—by these exemptions the State undertakes to amend the law of God and to decide for the individual what necessary or charitable labor is permitted on the Sabbath and what is not. In other words, the State presumes to act as conscience for the individual and to decide questions which belong to the domain of individual conscience.

From the reasons thus briefly given it must be clearly seen that Sunday legislation and not Sunday work "is immoral and of pernicious effect."

"The 'Canadian Baptist' and Sunday Laws" *American Sentinel* 10, 27 , pp. 210, 211.

A CORRESPONDENT has sent us editorial clippings from the *Canadian Baptist*, Toronto, relative to the question of compulsory Sunday observance. He underlines some of the inconsistencies in the editorials, and then writes at the bottom of the matter the words, "probe tenderly." The advice is good; and, at no time is it more needed than when examining a Baptist's attempt to justify enforced Sunday observance. After all that Baptists have suffered for their refusal to obey State-enforced church dogmas, and while proclaiming to the world that one reason for their existence is to teach the world the great principle of "soul-liberty" and separation of Church and State, to find them now defending the prosecution of seventh-day observers for refusing to bow to the laws enforcing the traditional church dogma of Sunday sacredness, it requires the exercise of more than human charity to prevent one from probing deep and energetically. But remembering our own mistakes, and how patient the Lord has been with us, and how slow we have been, and still are, to see and faithfully obey the unfolding light of truth, we are admonished to "probe tenderly."

The *Canadian Baptist* is led to notice the question of Sunday laws, by learning of the conviction of Seventh-day Adventists, J. Q. Allison and R. T. Nash, of Georgia and Mississippi, for doing farm labor on Sunday, and of the resolution passed by the American Baptist Publication Society, at its recent annual meeting at Saratoga, condemning these persecutions.

After criticising the severity of the Georgia Sunday laws, the *Canadian Baptist* says:—

But, on the other hand, what are the State authorities, entrusted with the enforcement of the laws, to do with men who openly and, possibly, ostentatiously, persist in working on Sunday in the open fields, when their fellow-citizens are not permitted to do so? Is it clear that such persons have any claim on our sympathies when the laws of the land are put in force against them? It may press hardily, and no doubt does so, on many, to lose the second day from the week. But, is it not the duty of a good citizen to obey the laws of

his country? He may, of course, meanwhile do all in his power to obtain a modification or repeal of the law which he believes to be unjust.

To show that this is the language of the persecutor, we will put it, slightly altered, into

211

the mouth of Cotton Mather, and direct it against Baptists.

It is true that the laws requiring Baptists to have their children baptized, are severe, but what are the civil authorities, entrusted with the enforcement of the laws, to do with men who openly persist in refusing to have their children baptized, when their fellow-citizens are not permitted to disobey? Is it clear that such persons have any claim on our sympathies when the laws of the colony are put in force against them? Is it not the duty of good citizens to obey the laws of their country? They may, of course, secure the modification of the law (however they should not be allowed to succeed in this), but in the meantime it is their duty to obey the law and have their children sprinkled.

At this point an attempt will be made to show that the cases are not parallel, because the statute enforcing the traditional church dogma of infant baptism is a religious act in conflict with conscience, while the acts enforcing the observance of the traditional church dogma of Sunday sacredness are not religious statutes. But this no man can do.

The *Canadian Baptist* will not deny any of the following statements:—

1. Sunday statutes originated in a union of Church and State.
2. They were originated for the purpose of enforcing the religious observance of the day.
3. No attempt was made to defend them on civil grounds until the great principle of separation of Church and State was applied to governments.
4. And even now the greater portion of those who advocate Sunday statutes do it on the religious basis.
5. The very wording of the statutes even to-day betray their origin, nature and object.

These facts are so patent that we believe that the *Canadian Baptist* will not have the hardihood to deny any of them; and yet, while admitting all this, it attempts to prove that though Sunday laws were born and reared in a union of Church and State, and still wear

their ecclesiastical dress, and are vitalized and utilized by ecclesiastics, that nevertheless they are purely civil enactments.

The Baptist historian, Robert Baird, has this to say on the *civil* excuse for ecclesiastical statutes:—

The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death and banished "Antinomians" and "Anabaptists," not because of their religious tenets, but because of their violation of civil laws. This is the justification they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse! But just so it is; wherever there is such a union of Church and State, heresy and heretical practices are apt to become violations of the civil code, and are punished no longer as errors in religion, but infractions of the laws of the land. So the defenders of the Inquisition have always spoken and written in justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal.—"*Religion in America*," p. 94.

The *Canadian Baptist* urges seventh-day observers to obey the Sunday act, even though they must lose one sixth of their time thereby. If it were merely a matter of loss of time, this advice would be good from a financial standpoint, since the fines and imprisonments are far more expensive than the loss of one day each week. But their attitude toward the act does not turn on the financial problem. Once for all we want to impress the *Canadian Baptist* with the thought that Seventh-day Adventists cannot conscientiously obey Sunday "laws." They regard the Sunday-sabbath as the sign of papal apostasy from the Word of God, and Sunday "laws" as attempts to compel them to bow to this mark of the papal beast.

The *Canadian Baptist* may deny that they are conscientious in the matter, and that the enforcement of the "laws" is religious persecution. Russia denies that it is persecuting Jews and Stundists, and argues that its "laws" are for the good of society; but that does not change the facts. The Massachusetts authorities denied that they persecuted Baptists and denied their claim of conscience, and contended that the laws were wholesome and necessary for the common weal; but this did not change the fact that Baptists were conscientious, that they were persecuted, and that the acts under which they suffered were persecuting measures. Oh! for another John Bunyan, or Roger Williams!

It is gratifying to know that the *Canadian Baptist* still regards the Sunday-law problem as a "vexed and difficult question." This indicates that the struggle between Baptist principles of separation of

Church and States and the old error of Church and State union have not yet been definitely settled in its mind in favor of persecution.

"The Pedigree" *American Sentinel* 10, 27 , p. 216.

AND Satan begat paganism.

And Satan and paganism begat sun-worship.

And Satan and sun-worship begat the "venerable day of the sun."

And Satan and the "venerable day of the sun" begat the "Christian Sunday."

And Satan and the "Christian Sunday" and the paganizing bishops begat Sunday laws.

And Satan and the "Christian Sunday" and the paganizing bishops begat Sunday laws.

And Satan, the Sunday laws and the bishops begat the union of Church and State, papal Rome.

And Satan and papal union of Church and State begat the English union of Church and State.

And Satan and the English union of Church and State begat the Sunday laws of Charles Second.

And Satan, the English union of Church and State, and the Sunday law of Charles Second begat the colonial union of Church and State and the colonial Sunday laws.

And Satan, the colonial union of Church and State and colonial Sunday laws begat State union of Church and State and State Sunday laws.

And Satan, State Sunday laws and religious bigots begat the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, Maryland, Georgia and other States.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 27 , p. 216.

WE understand that the superintendent of the House of Refuge in St. Louis has forbidden Catholic priests to perform their rites in that institution, although he admits the ministers of Protestant denominations. The superintendent attempts to justify his action on the ground that the Catholic mass is "idolatry? But on what authority does this public official pronounce this rite idolatry? Has the State of Missouri legally defined idolatry? If not, what business has this city official to permit the performance of certain religious rites as orthodox and prohibit others as idolatrous? Roman Catholic officials in Spain

and South America have as much right to pronounce the worship of Protestants idolatry and prohibit it, as has a Protestant official in the United States to pronounce the Roman Catholic mass "idolatry," and exclude its priests from public institutions.

It is such inconsistencies as these that hurt the cause of religious liberty and show that much of the agitation against papal domination is based on passion and prejudice, and not on principle. Our religious liberties are as much in danger from these "Protestants" as from the most aggressive Roman Catholics.

July 11, 1895

"Adventists in Jail in Tennessee" *American Sentinel* 10, 28 , pp. 217, 218.

The Bill of Rights Again Violated and Religious Liberty Outraged.

ARTICLE 1, Section 3, of the constitution of the State of Tennessee declares: "That no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship." But notwithstanding this explicit guarantee of religious liberty, EIGHT Seventh-day Adventists are again incarcerated in the jail at Dayton, Tenn., for no other offense than not keeping the sabbath established by the statutes and decisions of the State of Tennessee.

Besides the eight Seventh-day Adventists, one young man, not an Adventist, is imprisoned for the same offense, namely, working on Sunday. This young man, though of age, is unmarried and is the sole support of his widowed mother and his mother's sister. He is a miner and worked in the mines near Graysville. This he did on the days the mines were operated and on Sunday he cut wood for his mother. This was in January and February of this year. This was his only offense; he injured no one, and disturbed no one. Why then was he prosecuted?—The answer is not far to seek: his widowed mother is an Adventist and she is persecuted in the person of her son. The young man's name is Allen Cathy.

One other man, not an Adventist, was under indictment, but was justly acquitted on the ground that the work done was a work of necessity. He was absent from home on Saturday, being detained by a storm. His family was without fuel and he borrowed some wood

from a neighbor and hauled it on Sunday. That he was prosecuted for this can be accounted for only in one of two ways: either the witnesses did it for the fees, or else it was because he sometimes attended the Adventist church and it was done to warn him against becoming an Adventist. The latter seems the more probable as out of the large number of men that work on Sunday in Rhea County, only the Adventists, the one by kindred, the other by some degree of sympathy, were prosecuted. This man's name is George Dodson.

The names of the imprisoned Adventists, with the amounts of their fines, will be found at the close of the judge's decision which follows this article.

The imprisoned men were each found guilty on one indictment with the exception of the widow's son, Allen Cathy; he was convicted on two indictments.

There were two indictments against H. C. Leach, but for want of evidence he was acquitted on the second indictment.

There were also three indictments against N. B. England, two against E. S. Abbott, one against E. R. Gillett, one against Walter Ridgeway, and one against Oscar England. There were two verdicts of acquittal in N. B. England's case, and one mistrial.

It was agreed between Mr. Abbott and the attorney general that one verdict should settle both his cases; but the jury failed to reach a verdict; these cases therefore went over to the next term of court.

The witnesses against E. R. Gillett could not be found and his case was continued against his earnest protest. He is a rather feeble old man of sixty four years and pleaded that his case might either be tried or else the indictment dismissed. But his plea was denied.

Mr. Ridgeway's case was also postponed because of the absence of witnesses, against his earnest protest.

The only defense made in most cases was that the defendants kept the seventh day and believed that they had the God-given right to work six days. They maintained that the civil law had a right to take cognizance only of acts which infringed the equal rights of others; and that as the keeping of a Sabbath had reference solely to God and the recognition of his claims upon them, to enforce its observance was clearly outside the sphere of human government. The defendants insisted that under the Bill of Rights of the State they could not be legally required to observe any day, and that they had a constitutional right not only to keep the seventh day but to work on the first day of

the week, so long as in so doing they did not trench upon the equal rights of their neighbors.

Judge Parks' view of the law and his duty under it has not changed in the least. He publicly declared that his sympathies were with the Adventists, and he believes that the law ought to permit them to do quiet work on Sunday; but declared that it is not his province to make law but to enforce it as it has been made by others. He referred to what he said last March in regard to the law and declared that he did not regret in any particular the action he had taken at that time in suspending the fines and subsequently recommending the pardon of the convicted men. But, as what he said will appear elsewhere in this paper, it is not necessary to repeat it here.

The attitude of Attorney General Fletcher was not materially different from what it was last March. He simply proceeded upon the theory that it was his duty to prosecute the cases; and manifested no feeling whatever toward the defendants.

Some change, however, was noticeable in the attitude of the juries. As previously stated, there were several acquittals, and a number of mistrials, which would have scarcely been possible four months ago. It is evident that the agitation of the subject in Rhea County has resulted in quite a change in sentiment. There are good reasons to believe that there will be no more cases of this kind for some time to come, except the cases which have been postponed which will necessarily come up at a future term of court.

Of course there are not wanting evil-disposed persons who would continue the persecutions either from motives of religious intolerance, or for the purpose of securing witness fees; but a better sentiment seems to be prevailing, and it is confidently predicted that no indictments will be found by the present grand jury.

A noticeable event of the trials was a speech by ex-Congressman Snodgrass in which he declared his belief that the statute was unconstitutional, the opinion of the Supreme Court, notwithstanding. He expressed great sympathy for the Adventists, but advised them strongly that they ought to submit under the circumstances, and obey the law until it could be repealed, as he was very confident it would be by the next legislature. He said that he would remind the Adventists of that scriptural

injunction which says, "Be subject unto the higher powers," for "the power that be are ordained of God." The ex-congressman seems to

have forgotten, or never to have understood that God has ordained no human power to rule over conscience. Nor did it occur to him that to adopt his view of the scripture in question would be to make conscience entirely a creature of civil law, and would justify the condemnation and execution of every martyr from Stephen to the present time. For, with but few exceptions, all these have died as violators of the civil law. Had nobody ever disobeyed laws that were in conflict with conscience, the Reformation could never have taken place. Luther would never have left the Catholic Church; Wesley would never have preached contrary to the Established Church; and John Bunyan would never have insisted on preaching the gospel contrary to the orders of the civil magistrate.

The early Baptists and Quakers of New England and the Baptists of Virginia suffered fines, imprisonments, whippings, banishment and death for violation of the civil law. And the degree of religious liberty which we enjoy to-day is due to the fact that they dared to disobey unjust laws; and that they continued to disobey such laws until the things that they suffered brought their fellow-men to recognize the fact that there was such a thing as the rights of conscience. It is a matter of surprise that intelligent men are found to-day who will endeavor to maintain the position that it is a Christian duty to surrender conscience to civil laws.

If every man who sees the injustice, yea, the abominable iniquity of such statutes as the so-called Sunday law of Tennessee, would act upon his honest conviction and treat the statute as void in practice, as it is in fact, it would speedily be wiped from the statute books. But as long as men recognize the binding force of such statutes and obey them, so long they will continue to be used as instruments of oppression and injustice. We have not the slightest doubt of the integrity of Judge Parks and we have nothing but the kindest feeling toward him, and only respect for him. But we cannot agree that under the American system of government any man is under obligations to do a moral wrong. And it certainly is morally wrong to imprison honest men for honest work which disturbs no one. The fact that it is the State instead of an individual that does the wrong does not make it any less a wrong. A despotism of the many over the few is not less intolerable than the despotism of one over many. It is as iniquitous for the majority to violate and trample upon the fundamental law of the State as is done in these Adventist prosecutions, as it would be for a single individual to defy and to override a just law. The judge

says that it is the duty of the court to sustain and enforce the law, and yet the very judgment he passed against the Adventists was in flagrant violation of the Bill of Rights quoted in the outset of this article, as his honor well knows, and as ex-Congressman Snodgrass admitted in open court when speaking for the attorney general. Can it be possible that in an American State, under the American system of government, it is the duty of an officer to override what his conscience tells him is the just rights of his fellowmen? We don't believe that it is.

"An Unbaptistic Baptist" *American Sentinel* 10, 28 , p. 219.

THE *Canadian Baptist*, in its issue of June 13, attempts to explain and justify Sunday statutes and the punishment of seventh-day observers under them, thus:—

Let us suppose, by way of illustration, that in a given community the question of Sunday laws is just being settled for the first time. Having decided that a statutory rest-day is essential to the general weal, the first question for the statesman is, evidently, "What day of the week shall be set apart as the day of rest?" He looks over the field and finds that a large proportion of the citizens, say three-fourths of the whole, are already accustomed to observe Sunday as a weekly sabbath, sacred to rest and worship; to assemble in the most peaceable and orderly manner on this day for religious purposes, etc. How long will the real statesman hesitate as to what day shall be chosen as the weekly rest-day for the whole community?

In order to aid our Baptist friend to see the real nature of this "illustration," we will put it, slightly altered, into the mouth of a Russian defender of his established church, and the enforcement of the laws against Stundists:—

Let us suppose, by way of illustration, that in a given country the question of church establishment is just being settled for the first time. Having decided that an established religion is essential to the general weal, the first question for the statesman is, evidently, "Which one of the several religions shall be legally established and enforced upon all?" He looks over the field and finds that a large proportion of the citizens, say three-fourths of the whole, are already accustomed to worship according to the rites of the Greek Church. How long will the real statesman hesitate as to what religion shall be chosen for the whole country?

It may be objected that a law compelling all to remain idle on a certain day because a majority of the people are supposed to regard that day holy, is not parallel with the policy in Russia of compelling Jews, Stundists and other dissenters to conform to the religion of the majority. But there is absolutely no difference save in degree. The seventh-day observer who is imprisoned or put in the chain-gang in America for refusing to remain idle on the holy day of his neighbor, is as truly persecuted as is the Stundist who is exiled to Siberia for dissenting from the law-enforced creed of his Russian neighbor.

There is one point in the attempt of the *Canadian Baptist* to justify Sunday laws that deserves attention. It presumes that Sunday laws are first found necessary on purely civil grounds, and afterwards the day is selected which the majority regard as holy. But the *Canadian Baptist* has gotten the cart before the horst. There never was a Sunday act secured on that basis. All Sunday statutes originated in an attempt to protect the supposed religious character of the day, and *afterwards* when the doctrine of separation of Church and State prevailed; then and not till then was the *civil* excuse invented.

The statutes enforcing Sunday observance in all English-speaking countries are direct, legitimate descendants of the Sunday act of Charles II. This no historian or member of the legal fraternity will dispute. And now, to show that the act did not originate in the civil idea, but in the idea of enforced religious observance, we quote the statute here:—

For the better observation and *keeping holy* the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, be it enacted by the king's most excellent majesty, and by and with the advice and consent of the lords, *spiritual* and temporal, and of the commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that all the laws enacted and in force concerning the observation of the day, and *repairing to the church thereon*, be carefully put in execution; and that all and every person and persons whatsoever shall upon every *Lord's day apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately*; and that no tradesman, artificer, workman, laborer, or other person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any *worldly* labor or business or work of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's day, or any part thereof (works of necessity and charity only excepted), and that every person being of the age of fourteen years or upwards offending in the premises shall, for every such offense, forfeit the sum of five shillings; and that no person or persons whatsoever shall publicly cry, show forth, or expose for

sale any wares, merchandise, fruit, herbs, goods, or chattels whatsoever, upon the Lord's day, or any part thereof, upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit the same goods so cried or showed forth or exposed for sale.⁵¹ 1

Nearly all the Sunday statutes to-day wear ear-marks, which indicate their religious origin, nature and object. They contain such theological expressions as "violating the sabbath," "breach of the sabbath," "desecrate," "worldly employment," "Lord's day," "Christian sabbath," etc., etc. But if all these distinctively religious expressions were eliminated this would not change their nature. A rose would smell just as sweet if called by some other name, and a law enforcing all men to be idle while some pray would be just as tyrannical if expressed in secular terms and called civil.

It is one of those strangely inconsistent things that follows the transformation of a weak, minority church into a powerful majority that makes this article a necessity. Think of it! A Baptist journal defending the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists for refusing to obey Sunday laws when Roger Williams was banished from an American colony, because among other things, he "declared the opinion that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the sabbath."⁵² 2

"Afraid of the Simple Bible" *American Sentinel* 10, 28 , p. 221.

THE *Christian Statesman* is publishing a series of editorials intended to show how the several Protestant churches may and ought to unite or rather federate into one "united church." The creed of this "united church," which is also to be the United States church, is to be "the acceptance of the divine law and of the headship of Christ." But has the *Christian Statesman* suddenly become orthodox, and is it going to advocate the "commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," the biblical creed of the remnant Church? Not by any means, for it hastens to add:—

It is not wise to attempt to make the Bible itself, uninterpreted and in its simple letter the sole fundamental creed of the church. As seen in a former article the inspired and infallible Word of God is to be acknowledged as supreme, authoritative law. The final appeal must be to that in all moral questions in both Church and State. But the State and Church must for themselves determine what the teachings of this divine Word are by the best interpretation which each in its own sphere of duty can reach.

In this case, as is usual with State-Church systems, the *Statesman* is afraid of the Bible. Though professing to desire that it shall be the

basis of union, it hastens to explain that it does not mean to state that the commandment, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord" is to be obeyed as it reads, but as interpreted by the majority in Church and State,—that is that "the first day is the sabbath of the Lord." And since the creed of the Church is the creed of the State, the dissenter from this "interpretation" is to be handed over to the State for punishment as of old. All this which the *Statesman* proposes to do is now being done in a degree. Doubtless if the program planned by the *Statesman* shall materialize it will result in an increase of the amount of heresy hunting and correcting of heretics.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 28 , p. 224.

WE are devoting much of our space these days to the cause of the persecuted Adventists, but we have no apology to offer. The principles at stake in these persecutions involve the cherished rights of every man, Protestant and Catholic, believer and unbeliever. If the Adventists can be imprisoned for a failure to obey one dogma of the ruling creed, then may the Methodist or the Catholic or the unbeliever be compelled to obey some other dogma when the ever-changing majority happens to be against him and is faith. The wise and courageous will understand this and act accordingly, but the thoughtless or time-serving will see nothing but a few "foolish Adventists" and remain silent, or with "thumbs turned down" demand that the fatal blow be struck the defenseless minority.

No one can read Judge Parks' decision in this issue without being impressed with his unconstitutional, tyrannical, judicial legislation that he thinks it his duty to enforce.

ONE of the gratifying features of the Tennessee persecutions is that the entire local press of Dayton, the scene of the trials and imprisonment of the Adventists, is outspoken in their defense. Read the scathing words of the *Dayton Leader* on page 220.

EIGHT honest citizens of Tennessee spent their Fourth of July in Rhea County Jail for failing to remain idle on Sunday while the people of the established religion worshiped. And yet while these men were suffering for violating a dogma of the State established creed, the Fourth of July orator of Tennessee delivered himself of flowery periods in praise of "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

O "MAJESTY of the law," how many wrongs have been committed in thy name!

THINK of it! One of those convicted Tennessee Adventists is still at large!! How did the criminal break jail, did you ask? He didn't break jail. The kind-hearted judge told him to go home and cut his oats and then return to jail! Although this condemned man is at large there is not a Sunday-keeper in Rhea County that would lock his granary or his money-drawer against him.

THE two witnesses against J. Q. Allison, the Georgia Seventh-day Adventist, who was sentenced in default of the payment of costs to twelve months in the chain-gang for plowing in his field, desire that the readers of the SENTINEL and the general public shall know that they were unwilling witnesses against Mr. Allison. Good! We are glad that they were unwilling witnesses, and glad that they want the public to know it; and consequently, we are glad to make it known. And our columns are open to a confession from the man who inaugurated the persecution, but who is ashamed to allow his name to be known.

"FATHER" ENRIGHT, a Roman Catholic priest, delivered an address recently, before a large audience in Kansas City. The *Kansas City World*, of June 24, reports the priest as saying:—

What right have those who are not Catholics, who merely believe in the Bible, to keep Sunday holy? The Bible says that the seventh day shall be a day of rest, and Sunday is not the seventh day, but the first. Sunday is the holy day of the Catholic Church, and every time it recurs, the entire civilized world renounces the teaching of the Bible and obeys the mandates of the Catholic Church alone.

The priest is mistaken on one point. The whole civilized world does not obey the mandates of his church. There are a few who refuse to worship the beast or receive his mark (Rev. 14:9), and eight of them are now in prison at Dayton, Tenn., for their refusal.

THE *Lester* (Iowa) *Record*, in its issue of June 14, published an account of the imprisonment at Centerville, Md., of Robert R. Whaley, the Seventh-day Adventist, who set out plants in his garden on Sunday. The *Record* follows the story of the imprisonment with a request that funds for the care of Mr. Whaley's family be sent to A. O. Tait, Battle Creek, Mich., who is secretary of the International Religious Liberty Association, the organization which has undertaken to provide for the families of those who are thus unjustly imprisoned. The *Record* will have the thanks of these persecuted people as well as all lovers of justice and right.

ONE of the prisoners now in jail at Dayton, Tenn., said in his defense:—

"We find that Jesus Christ was a carpenter working six days in the week; therefore, Jesus did many hard days' work on the first day of the week, and he is our pattern."

Another said to judge and jury that they were not trying the defendant merely, but the defendant's Lord who had commanded him to do that for which he was on trial.

Another in closing his address to the jury said: "I would rather have the frown of the whole world and face prison bars or chain-gangs, or whatever may be before me, than have the frown of God. I will say further, that I believe in my heart that if it is the wish of my God for me to meet these things, all the good men in Rhea County cannot keep me out of them, and if not, all the bad men in the county cannot put me there. I leave myself in your hands and before God as you expect to meet me in the Judgment, I trust you will decide these things."

July 18, 1895

"Christ or Diana" *American Sentinel* 10, 29 , pp. 225, 226.

"STEADFAST she looks to heaven, and breathes the Sacred Name, unmoved by lover's plea, or sword, or rack, or flame. O holy hope in God! O fearless faith divine! undimmed by death, or time, or tears; immortal and sublime!

"Edwin Long was not only won for himself merited fame as an artist, but more, he has in this picture given to the world a double object lesson on the cruelty of religious persecution and the triumphs of Christian fortitude, without an equal.

"Christ or Diana' is a masterly representation of the conflict between Christianity and paganism. Studying the inspired face of the martyr and the countenance of her anxious lover,—who, realizing the cruel death that awaits a refusal, urges her to be 'subject to the powers that be,'—one forgets the present, and absorbed in the scene, involuntarily asks, 'Will she compromise'? To cast upon the flame a few grains of the incense would be to recognize the worship of the goddess Diana and reject Christ. What a contest! It is the Roman world against conscience. A religion hoary with age and resplendent with earthly glory, is determined to crush the new and simple faith of the despised Nazarene.

"Silence seals the assembly. Again, the gray-haired priest repeats the conditions: 'Let her cast the incense; one grain and she

is free'—as if loth to sacrifice so sweet a life. The musicians wait with more than usual interest. Every face is solemn. But as the needle seeks the pole, so the eyes of the maiden turn heavenward, and she is steadfast. Her doom is sealed; Christianity triumphs; Rome is baffled. The emperor proclaims liberty of conscience, and the battle is won; but won for that age only, for history has many times repeated the scene. When men cease to suffer for principle, either sin or righteousness will have perished from the earth."

The painter and the sculptor vie with each other in the effort to do honor to that faithfulness to principle so beautifully portrayed by our illustration. But reader, this faithful martyr was not a martyr in the eyes of the ruling Church and State of her time. She was but the despised follower of the despised Nazarene. Her steadfastness was termed stubbornness, and she died not as a martyr, but as a malefactor, a destroyer of religion and social order, an enemy to the peace and dignity of the State.

Thus it has always been. Faithfulness to conscience has been denounced as stubbornness by the contemporary historian. Decade after decade has passed before the "hated heretic" is viewed in the true light of a martyr to conscience.

Tennessee Against Conscience.

Eight men are not in jail at Dayton, Tenn., for refusing to cast the single grain of incense on the altar of what they believe to be a false worship. ⁵³¹ Sunday, by many good people, is held to be the sabbath. They have a right so to think, and to conform their lives accordingly. But many who hold this belief demand more than this. They demand that their neighbors shall be made to at least act as if they too believed that Sunday is the sabbath. To this end they appeal to the government to enact statutes which shall force their dissenting neighbors to recognize that Sunday is the sabbath.

Some of these dissenters, like the eight men now in jail, not only believe that Saturday, the seventh day, is the only Sabbath of the Bible, but they believe that the Sunday-sabbath is an institution of the papacy, the "mark of the beast," the observance of which by one who is cognizant of this fact is to invite upon him the "unmingled wrath of God." With them life and death are at stake. That they are terribly in earnest no one can doubt. The kind-hearted judge, in passing sentence upon them, declared: "It must be patent, even to the most

casual observer, that they are good citizens, who are *thoroughly conscientious* in the course they have taken."

And so now, instead of having pagan Rome against conscience, as presented in our illustration, we have the "Christian" commonwealth of Tennessee against conscience.

The Possibilities Involved.

If both Tennessee and the persecuted men continue firm, what is to prevent the infliction of the death penalty as a final punishment? The logic of the case demands it. In similar cases last March the judge fined the same offenders one dollar and costs, but immediately remitted the fine and expressed a regret that he could not remit the costs. But at this the second offense, he increased the fine more than seven-fold as a punishment for continuing in a course which he admitted was dictated by "thoroughly conscientious" motives,—a course, too, which injured no other human being. Being "thoroughly conscientious" in the course they have taken they would meet the contempt of the judge and all men if they should now violate their consciences for fear of fines and imprisonment. If they continue to be "thoroughly conscientious," they will certainly soon come before the judge for a third offense, and, following the course pursued in the second case he will multiply the penalty in accordance with the gravity of continued violation, and so on from one degree of punishment to another until life imprisonment or capital punishment is reached. All this is involved in the first attempt of the State to coerce the conscience, and two steps toward this final and fatal result have been taken in Rhea County, Tenn. The great historian, Gibbon, thus forcibly states the principle which is being so vividly exemplified in that State:—

It is incumbent on the authors of persecution previously to reflect whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. They excite the flame which they strive to extinguish; and it soon becomes necessary to chastise the contumacy, as well as the crime of the offender. The fine, which he is unable or unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severity of the law; and his contempt for lighter penalties suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment.

Loyalty to Principle, Secular and Sacred.

Faithfulness to principle in secular matters is applauded by men of the world. The men of the Revolution who refused to pay the "three pence a pound" tax on tea are accounted heroes to-day. And when Ambassador Pinckney resolutely answered a foreign power, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute," our nation applauded the patriotic utterance and prepared to sacrifice a million human lives to defend the principle at stake. How much more important is it that Christian men should remain true to a principle which involves loyalty to their Creator and Redeemer, and upon which turns their weal or woe for both time and eternity! Ought not their watchword to be, Thousands of loyal hearts for the defense of truth and right, but not one cowardly compromise with error and oppression?

"Christ and Sabbath Laws" *American Sentinel* 10, 29 , p. 226.

WHEN Christ came to earth more than eighteen hundred years ago, there were statutes enforcing false sabbath keeping, and he deliberately violated them. Healing the sick on the Sabbath day was regarded by the Pharisees as "work" and therefore a breach of the sabbath (Luke 13:10-16, and John 5:5-18); and many of the people were afraid of these false-sabbath statutes and would suffer their racking pains until the going down of the sun, after which they would crowd about the Lord of the Sabbath for his healing touch. Mark 1:21, 32, 33.

But Jesus was not afraid to violate these wicked statutes even though he knew that an effort would be made to kill him if he did. Mark 3:1-6. He violated statutes which enforced false sabbath keeping in order to teach the people to hallow the true Sabbath which had been hidden by these traditional enactments. Jesus Christ is the great model Sabbath keeper. His followers are to-day commanded to "follow his steps." This is what Seventh-day Adventists are doing. They violate statutes which enforce a false sabbath. They do it in order to teach the world that Sunday is not the Sabbath and that the seventh day is. The Seventh-day Adventists now in jail at Dayton, Tenn., are there for doing that which their Lord did. "The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you." John 15:20.

**"Roger Williams Banished Because He Opposed Sunday Laws"
American Sentinel 10, 29 , p. 227.**

THE following paragraphs from the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," article "Roger Williams," show that seventh-day observers are in good company in suffering because of their opposition to compulsory Sunday observance:—

He [Williams] went to Salem, where, in April [1631] the church asked him to become their teacher. But, as we learn from Winthrop, "at a court held at Boston (upon information to the governor that they of Salem had called Mr. Williams to the office of teacher), a letter was written from the court to Mr. Endicott to this effect; that whereas Mr. Williams had refused to join with the congregation at Boston, because they would not make a public declaration of their repentance for having communion with the churches of England while they lived there; and besides *had declared his opinion that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the sabbath* nor any other offense, as it was [which was] a breach of the first table [first four commandments of the Decalogue]; therefore they marveled they would choose him without advising with the councils and withal desiring that they would forbear to proceed till they had conferred about it." The conference was, that, in the summer or early autumn, Williams withdrew to Plymouth. . . .

Williams returned to Salem in the latter half of the year 1633, some of the Plymouth people having become so attached to him that they removed thither also. He became assistant to the pastor, and on the death of the latter, in 1634, was himself made pastor of the church. During his whole ministry there, he held the very highest place in the love and honor of the people of Salem.

But certain of his opinions brought upon him the displeasure of the authorities of the colony. He was repeatedly cited to appear before the General Court; and in October, 1635, it was "ordered that the said Mr. Williams shall depart out of this jurisdiction within six weeks now next ensuing." Permission was afterwards given him to remain at Salem until spring, but as it was soon reported, that, at gatherings in his own house, he had continued to utter the objectionable teachings, an officer was sent to Salem in January, 1636, to apprehend him, in order to put him on board ship, and send him back to England. On the officer's arrival at Salem, it was found that Williams had departed three days before, whither could not be learned.

The most noted of the proscribed opinions of Williams was the doctrine that the civil magistrate should not inflict punishment for purely religious error. It has been urged that it was not simply for his doctrine of religious liberty, but for other opinions also, that Williams was banished. This, however, will not exculpate the General Court; for we find them enacting a law, that "If any person or person within the jurisdiction . . . shall deny . . . their [the magistrates'] lawful right

or authority . . . to punish the outward breaches of the first table . . . every such person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment." In other words, though it be admitted that Williams was banished for other utterances, together with the proclamation of the doctrine of religious freedom, the court deemed it proper to decree banishment for that teaching alone. Certain others of Williams' opinions were condemned, *e. g.* those regarding the royal patent, the administration of certain oaths, etc.; and it is declared by some that these doctrines threatened the civil peace and thus rendered him justly liable to exile. But in Rhode Island, where the teachings of Williams and of all others were freely permitted, life and property and civil order were as secure as in Massachusetts. In other words, the Rhode Island experiment showed that Williams' teachings were not dangerous to civil order, and that therefore his banishment from Massachusetts was unnecessary, and consequently unjust.

There is a striking parallel between the banishment of Roger Williams and the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists to-day. Williams denied the right of the civil magistrate to punish men for breaking a sabbath; so do Seventh-day Adventists. The persecutors of Williams declared that his opposition to Sunday statutes would destroy civil order; the persecutors of Seventh-day Adventists assert the same. Williams continued his opposition to Sunday statutes in the face of an enactment forbidding it; so do Seventh-day Adventists. For his opposition Williams was banished; for their opposition Seventh-day Adventists are not in jail at Dayton, Tenn.

Our secular histories are full of praise for Roger Williams, because of his opposition to Church and State union of his day, and Baptist historians and Baptists generally are proud, and justly so, of his noble stand against religious legislation. But if he was right in opposing Sunday statutes then, and in suffering banishment rather than cease his opposition to them, why ought not all Baptists and all admirers of Williams to rally to the defense of Seventh-day Adventists who are to-day, and in America, suffering imprisonment for the same offense? Why is it that certain Baptist papers praise the conduct of Roger Williams and denounce his persecutors, while denouncing the same conduct in Seventh-day Adventists, and indorsing their arrest and imprisonment? Consistency, thou art a jewel!

The *Indiana Baptist* states the situation forcibly when it says:—

Roger Williams should be on earth again to teach some Baptists that "the civil magistrate has no authority to punish breaches of the first table of the Decalogue." We are yet far from the recognition of the right of every man to perfect religious liberty.

Yes, a second Roger Williams is sorely needed; and we have hopes that we are to have such a man in the person of H. L. Wayland, of the *Examiner National Baptist and Christian Inquirer*, who is now doing noble, courageous work in that direction.

In the words of the *Examiner and National Baptist*: "We wonder that the very stones do not cry out against such travesties of justice, that Christian men do not lift their voices in protest against such wicked perversion of religion, this insult to the name of Christ. And, in particular, why do not Papists, whose fathers stood against the world for soul-liberty, make themselves heard when these relics of medieval bigotry and persecuting intolerance are found in our free country?"

We appeal to all Baptists and all lovers of justice and right. Look upon the scene of Roger Williams bidding good-by to home and loved ones before fleeing into the wilderness from the hand of persecution! Look at that scene and remember that it has been repeated scores of times in the last few years in the States of Tennessee, Maryland, and Georgia! The eight imprisoned men at Dayton, Tenn.,—imprisoned for their faithfulness to the same principle for which Roger Williams was banished—are men with human hearts, men who love their homes and families and are in turn loved by wife and children; and likely there were moistened eyes when the parting came, and the little ones clung to father's side. Oh, when will men cease to martyr the true heroes of their day while engaged in building the monuments of those martyred by their fathers! Thank God, there are men to-day who with a weeping wife pressing their hand and the little ones clinging to their garments, will, with resolute face, look heavenward and pledge freedom and fortune, honor and life, to the maintenance of truth and religious liberty! Thank God that faithfulness to truth and conscience has not perished from the earth!

"Baptists and Sunday Statutes" *American Sentinel* 10, 29 , pp. 227, 228.

THE following from a standard publication of the Baptist Church states clearly the position which that church has held from the days of Roger Williams, against a union of Church and State in general, and compulsory Sunday observance in particular:—

The duty of the civil magistrate in regard to the observance of the Lord's day.

Christ said (John 18:36): "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I

should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." Here Christ refuses to employ physical force. His kingdom is not of this world: and civil laws and

228

the force of the magistrate are not the means to promote its advancement. It is a kingdom of truth and love, because each man is a free moral agent under the government of God, he is accountable to God. This personal accountability to God carries with it the right of every man to decide for himself his religious belief and his worship. With these the State has no right to interfere. These rights of conscience are inalienable. For the protection of these, with other inalienable rights, States are organized, civil laws enforced, and magistrates elected. So far as religion is concerned, the sphere of the State is described in one word—PROTECTION. . . .

However much we may deprecate the demoralizing tendencies of Sunday theaters and concerts, games and excursions, and the sale of candies and fruits and newspapers on the Lord's day, still we ask for legal restraint upon such things only in so far as they may *directly interfere with public religious worship*. As Christians, we ask of the State only protection in the exercise of our rights of conscience; and we will depend alone upon the truth of God and the Spirit of God to secure the triumph of Christianity. With an open field and a fair fight, Christianity is more than a match for the world, because "the foolishness of God is wiser than men." 1 Cor. 1:25. The almightiness of the Eternal God is in the cross. Hence Christ said: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."—"The Lord's Day," pp. 29-31, by D. Read, LL.D.; American Baptist Publication Society, 1420 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.

If the Baptist papers of the South would join with the Baptist *Examiner*, of New York and Philadelphia, in maintaining these principles, and in instructing their constituency therein, the persecutions of seventh-day observers in the South would be greatly diminished.

"Presbyterians, Attention!" *American Sentinel* 10, 29 , p. 228.

Dr. Barnes On Enforced Sunday Idleness

THE celebrated Presbyterian theologian, Dr. Albert Barnes, speaks thus of compulsory Sunday idleness. Let Presbyterians and all other thinking men read and ponder:—

If we can have a sabbath, sacred in its stillness and its associations; maintained by a healthful, popular sentiment, *rather than by human laws*; revered as a day of holy rest, and as a type of

heaven; a day when men shall delight to come together to worship God, and not a day of pastime, Christianity is safe in this land, and our country is safe. If not, the sabbath, and religion, and liberty will die together. . . . If the sabbath is not regarded as holy time, it will be regarded as pastime; if not a day sacred to devotion, it will be a day of recreation, of pleasure, of licentiousness.

Since this is to be so, the question is, what is to be the effect if the day ceases to be a day of religious observance? What will be the effect of releasing a population of several millions one-seventh part of the time from any settled business of life? What will be the result if they are brought under no religious instruction? What will be the effect on morals; on religion; on sober habits of industry; on virtue, happiness, and patriotism? Can we safely close our places of business and annihilate all the restraints that bind us during the six days? Can we turn out a vast population of the young with nothing to do, and abide the consequences of such a universal exposure to vice? Can we safely dismiss our young men, all over the land, with sentiments unsettled and with habits of virtue unformed, and throw them one day in seven upon the world with nothing to do? Can we safely release our sons and our apprentices and our clerks from our employ, and send them forth under the influence of unchecked, youthful passions? Can we safely open, as we do, fountains of poison at every corner of the street, and in every village and hamlet, and invite the young to drink there with impunity? Can there be a season of universal relaxation, occurring fifty-two times in a year, when all restraints are withdrawn, and when the power of temptation shall be plied with all that art and skill can do to lead the hosts in the way to ruin, and to drag them down to hell?

One would suppose that the experiment which has already been made in cities of our land, would be sufficient to remove all doubt from every reasonable mind on this subject. We are making the experiment on a large scale every sabbath. Extensively in our large cities and their vicinities, this is a day of dissipation, of riot, of licentiousness, and of blasphemy. It is probable that more is done to unsettle the habits of virtue, and soberness, and industry; to propagate infidelity, and to lay the foundation for future repentance or ignominy; to retard the progress of the temperance reformation, and to prepare candidates for the penitentiary and the gallows on this day than on all the other days of the week. So it always is where institutions designed for good are abused. They become as powerful in evil as they were intended to be for good. The sabbath is an institution of tremendous power for good or evil. If for good, as it is designed, and as it easily may be, it is laid at the foundation of all our peace, our intelligence, our morals, our religion. If for evil, it strikes at all these; nor is there any possible power in laws or in

education that can, during the six days, counteract the evils of a sabbath given to licentiousness and sin. ⁵⁴1

It may be answered that a great many voluntarily choose thus to spend Sunday. This is true, but it is also true that the Church and State, if they have not united to *compel* idleness on that day, are not responsible for the dissipation occasioned by that idleness, but, on the other hand, if the Church and the State have compelled them to be idle when they preferred to engage in honest toil, they become responsible for the crime that idleness produces.

The Sabbath of the Lord is a spiritual ⁵⁵2 rest, not merely a day of cessation from work. When God enjoins rest from labor, it is that the time may be employed in spiritual worship. God requires man to cease from his labor on the Sabbath, but he gives to man a spiritual nature, by means of which the cessation from labor is profitably employed. On the other hand the State compels idleness, but does not and cannot give to the idler that spiritual nature which enables him to properly employ the enforced idleness; and therefore, as Satan finds some mischief for idle hands to do, the State, in enforcing idleness on Sunday instead of promoting morality, is in reality fostering immorality as Dr. Barnes here teaches.

"Methodists Oppose Persecution" *American Sentinel* 10, 29 , p. 228.

A SAD feature of the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists for inoffensive Sunday labor is that their prosecutors in many cases are members of the Methodist Church, whose founders themselves suffered much from members of State-enforced creeds.

To show that the persecution of seventh-day observers by Methodists is contrary to the published, standard theology of that church, we quote from that celebrated Methodist work, "Binney's Theological Compend," a work officially recommended as a part of every Methodist ministers' course of reading. The quotation is as follows:—

It is the duty of the civil power to protect Christians against disturbance in their Sabbath worship. But the power is intruding into the divine prerogative when it assumes the right to compel the subject to worship God, or to refrain from those pursuits that do not disturb others. The keeping of the Sabbath is eminently a moral duty, and hence it must be a voluntary service rendered under the pressure of moral suasion only. ⁵⁶1

This is the position which the SENTINEL has always maintained, and it is the position taken by Seventh-day Adventists in their opposition to Sunday laws; and had it been followed by Methodists, much of this modern persecution for conscience' sake would never have occurred.

"They Are Partial in the 'Law'" *American Sentinel* 10, 29 , p. 230.

A SIGNIFICANT fact in connection with the so-called enforcement of the Tennessee Sunday "law" is that, with but few exceptions, *only observers of the seventh day are prosecuted*. At the recent term of the Circuit Court in Rhea County, two men were tried for Sunday work who were not Adventists: but the exceptions—if indeed these cases were exceptions—only prove the rule. One of the two referred to is a young man, the only support of his widowed mother who is an Adventist. The other, though not an Adventist, attended their meetings occasionally and was supposed to be favorable to the doctrines of the Adventists. The prosecution was probably a gentle hint to him that it would be the part of worldly wisdom at least for him to let Adventism alone.

Probably a score of railroad trains, both freight and passenger, thunder through both Graysville and Dayton every Sunday, "jarring the earth," as one gentleman in Dayton expressed it, and waking the echoes among the hills; but nobody is disturbed thereby. Sunday railroad trains are not a nuisance in Tennessee.

The great furnaces of the Dayton Coal and Iron Company are operated every Sunday, employing hundreds of men. The chimneys belch forth their clouds of smoke that can be seen for miles, a black flag, as it were, flaunted in the face of the Tennessee Sunday "law;" but nobody is disturbed; the officers who oaths bind(?) them to prosecute the Adventists, take no heed. They are blind to this patent violation of the "law." The switch engine used to draw away the huge caldrons of melted, seething slag from the furnaces, operates every Sunday, frequently sounding its shrill whistle as though openly defying the so-called law and its minions: but nobody is disturbed; nobody is prosecuted.

But it may be said that all this is "necessary" work. This is not true however. It is no more necessary than is any work done for profit. All work is necessary in order that men may live and grow rich; but the work referred to is not necessary in a legal sense. Moreover, much

work is done at the furnace on Sunday that could be done just as well on some other day. The writer saw men repairing a furnace, laying brick, etc., on Sunday; but nobody was disturbed, and nobody was prosecuted. Such work in Tennessee is not a nuisance unless done by Adventists.

Livery stables do business in Dayton on Sunday, and nobody is disturbed; nobody is prosecuted. Drugstores are kept open and sell anything called for, whether necessary or not; but no notice is taken of this violation of the "law" by the men who insist that it is their "sworn duty to enforce the law."

Fruit growers pick, pack, and ship fruit on Sunday and are not indicted. The man probably most prominent in the prosecution of the Adventists at the recent term of court in Rhea County, a member of the grand jury that found the indictments and himself the prosecuting witness in at least one case, employed a large force of pickers every Sunday during the strawberry season, paying extra wages upon that day in order to induce people to work for him. But nobody appeared to prosecute him. His work was not a nuisance. But an Adventist saws wood on Sunday, and that is a nuisance. Another sets fence posts and that is so corrupting to public morals that nothing but a penalty of from \$30 to \$37.50, fine and costs, or ninety days in the county jail can atone for the offense. So tender is the public conscience when Sunday work is done by Adventists that one man is now in Rhea County jail for the heinous offense of taking a wheelbarrow from a wagon on Sunday and setting it over a fence into the yard of the owner, another Adventists. This was absolutely the only offense proved against this man, and for this he must remain in jail about seventy-five days!

As in the cases of four months ago, it was shown that the work done by the Adventists was not of a character to annoy anybody except as they were annoyed by the mere knowledge that the work was done on the day that they have been taught to regard as the Sabbath. In no case did it appear that there was any noise to distract the minds of the people from pious meditation or to attract public attention. There was no screech of steam whistles, no "jarring of the earth" by the rush of ponderous wheels, no clouds of smoke to attract attention for miles, no sound of escaping steam to annoy the passerby, no soda fountain or cigar stand to attract loafers and induce the spending of money, no attractive livery rigs to tempt the pleasure seeker, no fancy wages offered to induce men who believed

they ought to keep Sunday, to work on that day; nothing but quiet, orderly, private work. Yet notwithstanding this fact the "law" holds it to be a nuisance, and the courts declare that they must enforce the "law," and so the Adventists are in jail while the railroad men, the iron men, the livery-stable men and Sunday fruit pickers are all at liberty. And this is the policy which, according to Judge Parks, is to "compel respect for all law"! But we believe that down in his inmost soul the judge knows that such an administration of so-called law is only a travesty on justice and tends to bring all law into contempt. We believe that such a solemn mockery of justice is exceedingly distasteful to both Judge Parks and Attorney-General Fletcher. We are sure that they have no sympathy with such work and that they act their part in it only from a sense of "duty;" but we fear that such a plea will not avail them in the great and final Judgment. The martyrs of the past all suffered under the forms of civil law; but were their prosecutors and judges not responsible? Yea, verily, and they must meet the dark record before that tribunal in which every man "shall give account of himself to God."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 29 , p. 232.

SOME of our readers may wonder how it is that seventh-day observers in Tennessee can be punished so severely when the only statute forbidding Sunday labor provides for a fine of but three dollars, recoverable before a justice of the peace. The explanation lies in the fact that the Supreme Court of the State has decided that a repetition of Sunday work constitutes a "nuisance," and is indictable. And to carry this judicial legislation further, Judge Parks has decided that "a single act of work done under such circumstances as to amount to a nuisance, is indictable and punishable as such." The term "such circumstances" is explained by the judge in the next sentence to mean "in such a public manner as to be open to the observation of the public."

And now let the hundreds of thousands of men and women throughout this broad land, who read this number of the SENTINEL, remember that a man is in jail, or in the chain-gang, at Dayton, Tenn., for a term of seventy-five days, for the single act of lifting a wheelbarrow from a wagon over a fence into the yard of his brother Adventist on Sunday.

PROTESTANTS are being persecuted by means of State enactments in several Roman Catholic countries of South America. They have demanded of the pope that these persecuting acts be repealed. The papal Secretary of State answers in substance that these statutes are "civil" enactments, not religious. We are sorry for these persecuted Protestants, and we denounce this "civil" excuse as a mere dodge. However, we expect good will come from it. Many Protestants in America try to dodge the fact that Seventh-day Adventists are persecuted by asserting that Sunday statutes under which they suffer, are "purely civil," not religious.

Now the papacy is trying to make these Protestants swallow some of their own medicine. We say to them, Don't you swallow it. Spit it out. That's what Seventh-day Adventists are doing with the abominable stuff.

EIGHT honest, conscientious Seventh-day Adventists of Rhea County, Tenn., have been condemned to serve terms of from seventy-five to ninety days in the county jail at Dayton, Tenn., for the offense of doing common labor on Sunday—labor which disturbed no other person's private or public devotion. It has also been decided to work these honest men in the chain-gang, and by the time this reaches our readers this will doubtless be accomplished. For an account of the trial and condemnation of these men, see page 229.

July 25, 1895

"Papal Strategy" *American Sentinel* 10, 30 , pp. 233, 234.

THE *Western Catholic News* (Chicago), in a recent issue, condemned the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee; but with a view to convincing seventh-day observers that they were in error in observing the seventh day instead of the first day, the *News* attempted to quote Scripture in support of Sunday observance.

Under date of June 20, the SENTINEL called the attention of the *News* to a number of standard Catholic authorities which positively declared that there was no scriptural authority for Sunday observance. The *News* acknowledges the authorities quoted, but makes this astonishing explanation of the difficulty in its issue of June 29:—

Yes, we cheerfully publish all the proofs adduced by the SENTINEL, and we recognize them as good for the purpose used in every instance. Military strategy in war times suggested the

policy of the Federal army temporarily occupying stockades and fortifications erected by the enemy—as long as they were useful as a means of destroying said enemy, but to be demolished later. So it is with the authors from which the SENTINEL quotes.

What an admission! The *News* here deliberately acknowledges that it is the policy of Roman Catholic authors to solemnly advocate a position which they believe to be false and which they expect later to oppose. The *News* admits that the papacy is treacherous, that it will deliberately deceive, and that the positions taken in its official publications in some cases are directly opposed to the real position of that church, and that these positions are taken for the purpose of deceiving and destroying the enemy (non-Catholics). No Protestant, no Orangeman, no A. P. A. has ever brought against the Roman Catholic Church a more damaging charge.

But we want our readers to sense the gravity of the situation. That they may the better do this we republish some of the authorities brought to the attention of the *News*, and which it declares are pious papal lies, means which justify an end. Here is one from the *Catholic Mirror*, of Sept. 9, 1893. The quotation occurs in a series of four editorials, which appeared in that paper, Sept. 2, 9, 16 and 23, 1893, and afterwards published in pamphlet form by the Mirror Publishing Company. This pamphlet has passed through five editions and is still advertised by the *Mirror*. Here is the quotation:—

Thus, it is impossible to find in the New Testament the slightest interference by the Saviour, or his apostles, with the original Sabbath, but, on the contrary, an entire acquiescence in the original arrangement; nay, a *plenary indorsement* by him, whilst living; and an unvaried, active participation *in the keeping of that day and no other by the apostles*, for thirty years after his death, as the Acts of the Apostles has abundantly testified to us.

Hence the conclusion is inevitable; viz., that of those who follow the Bible as their guide, the Israelites and Seventh-day Adventists have the exclusive weight of evidence on their side, whilst the biblical Protestant has not a word in self-defense for his substitution of Sunday for Saturday.

Now let it be known that the *Western Catholic News* charges the *Catholic Mirror* with soberly, deliberately and persistently publishing this scriptural deduction while secretly believing it to be false. Bear in mind that the SENTINEL does not charge the cardinal's organ with thus wickedly lying regarding a sacred subject; let it be kept constantly in mind that the terrible charge is made by the *Western Catholic News*.

Here is another quotation to which we called the attention of the *News*:—

Q. Is the observance of Sunday, as the day of rest, a matter clearly laid down in Scripture?

A. It certainly is not; and yet all Protestants consider the observance of this particular day as essentially necessary to salvation. To say, we observe the Sunday because Christ rose from the dead on that day, is to say we act without warrant of Scripture; and we might as well say that we should rest on Thursday because Christ ascended to heaven on that day, and rested in reality from the work of redemption.—"*A Doctrinal Catechism*," by Rev. Stephen Keenan, p. 352.

Again, we call the reader's attention to the fact that the *News* says the writer of this, Rev. Stephen Keenan, was lying when he wrote it, and that Cardinal McCloskey, the imprimatur, knew when he licensed the publication of this book, that he was licensing the publication of what he believed to be a lie written for the purpose of deceiving non-Catholics; and further, when P. J. Kennedy's Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, New York, published the work, the managers knew they were publishing an exegesis of Scripture that was absolutely false. This be it remembered, is the charge made by the *News*, not by the SENTINEL.

The following quotation from page 111 of Cardinal Gibbons' work, "Faith of Our Fathers," was one of the quotations before the editor of the *News*, when he made that startling charge of Jesuitical deception, quoted at the beginning of this article:—

But you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.

The *Western Catholic News* says that the Bible does authorize the sanctification of Sunday and the secularization of the Sabbath, and that Cardinal Gibbons believes the same; and that he has only published this falsehood for the purpose of deceiving, and that at the strategic moment he will destroy this theological ambushade and build up again the position which he is now, by means of this Jesuitical deception, laboring to destroy. Once more we repeat that we do not ourselves bring this grave charge against the cardinal; we have believed that he and the other authorities referred to were sincere in these statements. We quoted them, however, not as proofs of fact, but as confessions offered after the facts had been otherwise indisputably proven.

The prophet Daniel predicted the rise of a power that would "crush the saints of the Most High" (Douay Version), and "think to change times and the *law*." (R.V.) Dan. 7:25.

History, both ecclesiastical and secular, witness to the fact that an attempted change in the Sabbath command of "the law," was made in the third century by that church which later became known as the Roman Catholic Church. If every Catholic authority in the world denied that the papacy had attempted to change the Sabbath contrary to Scripture, instead of acknowledging it, this would not change the fact. The SENTINEL simply quotes these Roman Catholic utterances as the confession of one already proven guilty.

But to return to the main question: When a Roman Catholic editor deliberately and un-

234

blushingly declares that it is the settled policy of the Roman Catholic Church, in waging war on non-Catholics, to teach one thing publicly while privately holding the opposite view, how can he or his church expect the American people to believe the church when it asserts that it is in favor of religious freedom, and if it should ever get control in the United States it would not use its position to oppress non-Catholics? The Catholic Church in the United States is just now loudly proclaiming its loyalty to the American principle of religious freedom. It is declaring that prejudice against it is wholly unjustifiable, in view of its repeated assertion that it is in accord with the American idea of separation of Church and State. But many of us who have studied the history of the papacy were convinced that it was a part of the papal policy to deceive its opponent with pleasant face and fair promises until the opportune moment came to strike the fatal blow.

The editor of the *Western Catholic News*, who ought to know, voluntarily declares that this is the policy of the papacy. And, besides, the *Western Watchman*, of St. Louis, another Roman Catholic paper, in its issue of July 11, has decided that the moment has arrived to "uncover" ⁵⁷ 1 on the question of religious freedom and to announce that if the Roman Catholic Church ever obtains power in the United States that it will compel all Protestants and non-Catholics to remove their hats when a Roman Catholic procession passes on the streets. However, we are persuaded that these two Catholic journals "uncovered" a little too soon. But be that as it may, from this on, if the *Western Catholic News* is not promptly repudiated by the Roman Catholic Church, no Roman Catholic will have the right to charge

non-Catholics with misrepresenting the Catholic Church by charging it with duplicity—with deliberately lying for the purpose of deceiving and destroying an enemy.

Now let the reader turn and read the editorial, previously referred to, from the *Western Watchman*, page 235, and learn from that Catholic organ the kind of religious liberty Protestants will enjoy when the papacy gets control in this country.

"A 'Nuisance' in Tennessee" *American Sentinel* 10, 30 , p. 234.

SECTION 2289 of the Code of Tennessee forbids the carrying on of the common avocations of life on Sunday, works of real necessity and charity only excepted, under penalty of \$3, to be recovered by "one-half to the person who will sue for the same" before a justice of the peace. Nothing is said in the statute about public or private work. All work is forbidden "except work of necessity or charity."

This was all the Sunday law that Tennessee had until a few years since, a Seventh-day Adventist in Henry County, Tenn., was indicted for nuisance; it being contended that whereas a single act of Sunday work was punishable only under the statute, a repetition of such offense became a nuisance and was indictable. This view of the matter was sustained by the Supreme Court, notwithstanding the fact that that same tribunal had previously held that barbering on Sunday was not indictable, and that to so hold would be "a far-fetched and strained interpretation of the law," and of the word "nuisance."

In the several cases tried in Western Tennessee under this decision (for we cannot say that they were under the statute), the idea that it required a repetition of an offense to constitute a nuisance, was consistently kept in view. As stated in these columns, June 13, Judge Swiggart held in Henry County, January, 1893, that "it is not an indictable offense for a man to perform one act on Sunday against the statute." And in a particular case in which the proof was that the defendant had worked in his garden on one Sunday, and that he had "piled chunks" in his clearing on another Sunday, Judge Swiggart charged that if the proof showed only two acts of Sunday work, it would not be sufficient to establish such a succession of acts as to constitute a nuisance.

But as previously stated in these columns, Judge Parks, of the 17th Tennessee Circuit, takes a very different view of the "law," as made by the Supreme Court, and holds that a single act of public

work is indictable and punishable as a nuisance. At the recent term in Rhea County, he charged as follows:—

GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY: The defendant is charged in the indictment with carrying on the common avocations of life on Sunday, the same not being acts of necessity or charity. To this charge a plea of not guilty has been entered, and this makes the issue which you are impaneled and sworn to try.

It is a violation of the laws of the State for any person to carry on any of the common avocations of life on Sunday by doing secular work of any kind, works of real necessity or charity excepted. The gist of the offense consists in doing work of such character or in such manner as amounts to a public nuisance. A nuisance is defined by law to be that which works hurt, inconvenience or damage to the public, or that is injurious to public morals.

To constitute the offense charged in this indictment it is not necessary for the State to show that any person was actually disturbed by the work. It is sufficient if it be shown that the acts which the law holds as illegal and forbidden were done in such a public manner as to be open to the observation of the public. The law regards the carrying on of common work on Sunday as having a tendency to corrupt public morals, and regards the example as pernicious and contrary to good order, the well-being of society, and public policy—provided such work is not of real necessity or charity and done in a public way; that is, where it is open to the observation of the public.

Ordinarily, a single act of any kind, which, if repeated and continued would amount to a nuisance (such as profanity, etc.), is not indictable. This rule applies to cases of the kind now on trial. If a person does a single act of work, which is not continued to that extent, or which is not done under such circumstances as to amount to a nuisance as already defined, he would not be guilty. But the Supreme Court has held that in profanity cases (for instance) a single oath, either by its terms, or the circumstances under which it is uttered, may amount to a nuisance. Precisely the same rule applies to a case of the kind now on trial. A single act of work, done under such circumstances as to amount to a nuisance, is indictable and punishable as such. A man may do such work as he sees fit in private and the law will take no cognizance of it as a nuisance. But when he does the common work of life on Sunday (acts of necessity or charity excepted), and does it in such a public manner as to be open to the observation of the public, the law regards it as prejudicial to public morals and indictable as a nuisance, whether it be a single act or whether it be repeated and continued from Sunday to Sunday. A different rule would allow a person to work all day on Sunday under such circumstances as

would amount to a most flagrant desecration of the day and escape punishment on the ground that it was only a single act, etc.

It will be noticed that in this charge the judge attempts to refute the claim that a single act is not indictable as a nuisance. He affirms that it is, and says:—

A different rule would allow a person to work all day on Sunday under such circumstances as would amount to a most flagrant desecration of the day and escape punishment on the ground that it was only a single act.

In this the judge utterly ignores the existence of any statute on the subject, or of a statutory penalty. True, a person might work all day on Sunday and escape indictment on the ground that it was only a single act, but he could not escape the fine provided by the statute, if anybody was willing to sue for the same. His honor thus assumes that the safeguards thrown around Sunday by the legislature are utterly inadequate and that the courts must protect it by the imposition of very materially heavier penalties. This is remarkable enough in any event, but it is the more so when we remember that Judge Parks has, in several ways, given very decided evidence of sympathy with those who are persecuted under this very remarkable so-called Sunday law.

Little effort was made in the recent cases in Rhea County to prove more than one act of work on Sunday, and several of the accused were convicted for a single act and for very trivial acts; acts which taken alone, that is apart from the well-known practice of the defendants to keep another day and to work on Sunday, could scarcely have been held to amount to a "flagrant desecration of the day." It seems clear that both judge and jury were influenced in this matter by the religious views of the defendants, that is, that they allowed the fact of the religious views of the Adventists to operate against them, and this notwithstanding the fact that the judge several times warned the jury against this. But it only shows how impossible it is to eliminate religious prejudices from the administration of a statute which owes its very existence to religious dogma and to the tendency of the majority to coerce the minority in matters of conscience.

If Judge Parks' view is to prevail, and if it be the correct one, as a legal proposition, then the decision of the Supreme Court has entirely superseded the statute enacted by the legislature. If a more flagrant violation of constitutional law can be found anywhere in the history of any American State, we would be glad to be referred to it. For, unless Judge Parks greatly errs in his interpretation of the decision of the Supreme Court, that eminent tribunal has usurped the function of the

legislative branch of the government, and has both repealed and enacted law.

But we do not want any reader to get the idea that we regard the Sunday statute of Tennessee as made by the legislature of the State as any better in principle than that made by the decisions of the Supreme Court. The principle is precisely the same so far as the right of the State to regulate sabbath observance goes. All such legislation in Tennessee is unconstitutional, whether enacted by the legislature or by the Supreme Court; and we believe that legal minds in that State are fast coming to see it in that light.

"The Church and Citizenship" *American Sentinel* 10, 30 , pp. 234, 235.

THE Church is an association of Christians. The work of the Church is not to make men good citizens, but to spread the light of the gospel, by which men are made Christians. A Christian is necessarily a good citizen, but good citizenship is not the aim of the gospel. If it were, it would fall infinitely short of accomplishing what it does to-day. A Christian must be a good citizen; but a good citizen may be no Christian at all.

The foundation of Christianity is faith,—"the faith of Jesus." The foundation of citizenship is respect for the rights of others. Christianity deals with the thoughts and intents of the heart; citizenship deals only with the outward deportment. The majesty of the law may secure in an individual an outward regard for the rights of others, but it cannot make right the thoughts and intents of the heart.

He whose outward deportment does not correspond with the desires and intents of his heart is a hypocrite. The law can change a man's deportment, but not the man himself.

235

When it essays to change character, it succeeds, if at all, only in making men hypocrites.

To bring the force of the government to bear upon the consciences of men is therefore the worst possible way to attempt to make good citizens; for good citizens are not identical with hypocrites. The man who yields to force and regards not the dictates of his own conscience, will not be likely to regard the consciences of others. No reform in character, therefore, can come through the ballot box; but only a change in the administration of government. The reform that is to make men better must be wrought by the grace of God. The one

uplifting and transforming power that can be brought to bear upon men in this world is the power of the gospel.

It is the work of the Church to "preach the gospel to every creature." Mark 16:15. This includes ministering to the physical as well as to the spiritual wants of mankind. See James 1:27; Matt. 25:31-46. And when the Church is doing this, her legitimate, God-appointed work, she is doing all that it is possible for her to do toward making men good citizens.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 30 , p. 240.

NATIONAL REFORMERS and many other professed Protestants are laboring to amend the National Constitution so that it shall expressly recognize Jesus Christ as the Sovereign of this nation. To all such we recommend the careful reading of the editorial from the *Western Watchman*, on page 235.

Be it remembered that these National Reformers have petitioned Roman Catholics to aid them in overthrowing the "atheistical" Constitution of the United States, and in building one that should recognize Jesus Christ as the Sovereign Ruler of the United States. When the Roman Catholics have gotten the same control in this country that they now have in South America, these National Reformers will have no one to blame but themselves if the Roman Catholics attempt to compel them to bow down to a bread-god sovereign as they are now doing with Protestants in Ecuador.

NOT long since, a Methodist minister and editor in Brazil was persecuted by Roman Catholics because he failed to bow to the "host" which was being carried in procession on the streets. The AMERICAN SENTINEL joins with Methodists in condemning this persecution. Seventh-day Adventists are persecuted in Tennessee, Maryland, and other States, in some cases by Methodists, because they refuse to bow to laws enacted to compel the recognition of Sunday as the sabbath. The Roman Catholic believes that the consecrated bread is the real Christ. Methodists believe it is a false Christ. Methodists believe that Sunday is the real Sabbath. Seventh-day Adventists believe it is a false sabbath. There is absolutely no difference between an attempt on the part of Roman Catholics to compel Methodists to act as if they regarded a portion of bread as holy, and an attempt on the part of Methodists to compel Seventh-day Adventists to act as if they regarded a certain portion of time as holy.

Seventh-day Adventists condemn the former as persecution. Will the Methodists condemn the latter as persecution?

SOME one, signing himself "M.," has contributed an article to the *Dickson* (Tenn.) *Enterprise*, in which he attempts to break the force of biblical precedents for violating bad law, cited by the Adventists. He says:—

Ah, well, say they, if the civil conflicts with the divine, then it is our Christian duty to obey God rather than man. We admit this proposition to be true in the abstract, and here lies the danger of deceiving the simple-minded. It is a "catchy" phrase. But who is to construe the law? Who says our Sunday statutes conflict with God's law? Whose opinion shall prevail, those of a handful of fanatics, or the combined intelligence and morality of the Christian world?

What an argument! Do majorities infallibly decide what is and what is not in conflict with God's law? If so, all the martyrs were fanatics who should have gracefully submitted to the majority, rather than court persecution by acting contrary to the "combined intelligence" of the ruling majority. Our readers will be the more surprised when we inform them that this man is master in chancery and a *Presbyterian*. Sufferings of Presbyterian martyrs! Think of a Presbyterian, whose ancestors,—only a "handful," so bravely and persistently violated the statutes enacted and enforced by the "combined intelligence and morality of the Christian world"—the papacy, pleading majorities! If majorities are to decide questions of conscience, then Romanism was right in persecuting Presbyterians in days gone by, and is right now in persecuting Protestants in Roman Catholic countries.

And now that the reader may refresh himself with a courageous, consistent, Christian utterance on these Tennessee persecutions, let him turn and read the letter from a Baptist minister on page 235.

August 1, 1895

"In the Chain-Gang Under the Flag" *American Sentinel* 10, 31 , p. 241.

IT was the evening of the third of July, that the eight Seventh-day Adventists, now in the chain-gang in Rhea County, Tenn., went to prison.

Court had adjourned until the following Monday, and the judge, before whom they had been tried, the attorney-general, who prosecuted them, and the jurors, who found them guilty, had all gone home to spend the Fourth—with their friends.

But not so with the convicted Adventists. Their wives and children, a number of whom had been in court to hear the judge's sentence, had bidden them a sorrowful good-by, and had gone to their now lonely homes. Most of their friends who had been with them through the trial had also gone home and left them—prisoners.

It was then the sheriff said, "Come on," beckoning them to fall into line for the march to the jail, which was to be their prison until the temporary workhouse should be ready for the occupancy of—the chain-gang.

A few moments sufficed to reach the prison, and then came the registration of their names with a detailed description of each man, so that should they escape they might be easily identified. But the eight Adventists had no thought of escape. They would not resist wrong and oppression even to the extent of seeking freedom in flight.

As the sheriff registered their names, some, earnest of the patriotic demonstrations of the morrow—"the glorious Fourth"—attracted their attention and reminded them that it was the even of the National Independence Day; and one of them said, with a smile and yet sadly, and with just a touch of irony in his tone: "Sheriff, won't you please erect a liberty pole to-morrow where we can see it?"

Oh, what a train of thought is started by that question! What! a liberty pole and a flag for convicts? What could "Old Glory," the "Star Spangled Banner," the emblem of Freedom, the flag of both the State and the Nation, mean to men who had violated the "law" of the land, who had braved the power which wears the flag? What comfort could chain-gang convicts, "law" breakers, possibly derive from looking upon the banner unfurled by the power that enslaves them—that power that brands them as enemies of the State, and drives them to the stone pile with the vilest criminals, that locks them in loathsome cells or works them ten hours per day under a broiling sun, for no other offense than worshiping God according to the dictates of their own consciences? In short, What is the flag of the Union to Seventh-day Adventists to-day?

Ah! thrilling memories cluster around that flag; for while Seventh-day Adventists have no taste for war or carnage, while they as followers of the Prince of Peace are opposed to war, even as are the Quakers, they remember that it was in the providence of God that this land became an asylum for the oppressed of other lands; and they love the old flag because under its folds their forefathers found that liberty to worship, which was denied them in the Old World, and

which is to-day denied Adventists in "free America;" not because of the flag nor of that for which it stands, but in flagrant violation of the principles represented by every fiber of that noble banner; principles for which patriots died in 1776, and for which in this year of our Lord, 1895, men toil in the chain-gang in Tennessee. And in the language of the poet these men can to-day look upon that flag and say—

"Thou art Freedom's child, Old Glory,
Born of Freedom's high desire." ⁵⁸¹

The flag had its birth in the days of Washington, and Jefferson, and Madison, and Patrick Henry; in the days when men knew the value of liberty because they had known what it was to be denied freedom of conscience; in the days when humble Quakers, patient Mennonists, noble Baptists, and warmhearted Methodists and staunch Presbyterians alike claimed as an inalienable and God-given right, freedom to worship their Creator according to the dictates of conscience, and challenged the right of any man to dictate to them in matters of religion, or in any manner to come between them and their God.

Those stars and stripes stand for the immortal Declaration of Independence and for that noble charter of liberty, the Constitution of

242

the United States; not as perverted by the Supreme Court decision of February 29, 1892, but as it stood when our fathers had written into it: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And just as men deprived of water, love to think of "parting streams and crystal fountains," of roiling rivers and wars-swept lakes, so Christian patriots, men who, living in all good conscience, render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's, love to look upon the banner of civil liberty, even though that which it represents has been denied them; yes, even though their hearts bleed for the wrongs which they suffer, and for the violence done to that freedom once cherished, but now lightly esteemed by so many who know not its worth; for they know that religious rights are as lasting as the rock-ribbed hills or snow-capped mountains, yea, that they are as eternal as the Everlasting King who gave them; that such rights "are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens however small;" and that though despotic power may invade those rights, "justice still confirms them." And they with the poet can say:—

Knaves have stolen thee, Old Glory,
For their Babylonians lovers,
From their festal walls and towers
Droops the flag that then was ours;
O'er their crimes thy beauty trails,
And the old-time answer fails
When from chain-gangs, courts and jails
Men appeal to thee, Old Glory. ⁵⁹²

The flag is not a god, but in the providence of God it stands as the high water-mark of human liberty. But alas! as the sacred name of Christ has been made the cloak of most unchristian acts, so this providential symbol of liberty has been made the covering for most revolting crimes against the most sacred rights of men. And as Madame Roland, on her way to the guillotine, bowed before the clay statue of Liberty erected in the Place de la Revolution, exclaimed: "Liberty! Liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name;" as Seventh-day Adventists can to-day raise the stars and stripes with these words: "O banner of liberty, what crimes are committed under thy ample folds! what wrongs are done in thy name! what injustice and oppression is practiced by those who are sworn to maintain the principles by which thou wast begotten!"

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves;" and we have fallen upon evil times, when men know not what true liberty means. Some in the mad pursuit of wealth, others in the fierce struggle for existence, have forgotten that he who fails to protest against the persecution of his neighbor, thereby virtually forfeits the right to protest when he is himself persecuted. Channing has well said: "The spirit of liberty is not merely, as multitudes imagine, a jealousy of our own particular rights, but a respect for the rights of others, and an unwillingness that any man, whether high or low, should be wronged."

It was the purpose of the founders of this Government to erect, if possible, impassable barriers against religious bigotry and intolerance. As remarked by the compiler of "American State Papers Bearing on Religious Legislation":—

Both Jefferson and Madison were opposed to the States having anything whatever to do with regulating religious observances of any kind; and the liberal spirit supported them. But as this spirit is supplanted by self-interests, the intolerance of State Courthouses again manifests itself in reviving the old religious laws, and prosecuting Sabbatarians for Sunday labor, etc. Jefferson, foreseeing this, designed to have all religious laws swept from the statute books,

not willing to have them remain as a dead-letter, which might, at any time be revived by the partisan zealot. In his "Notes on Virginia," query, xvii, Jefferson says:—

"Besides, *the spirit of the time may alter, will alter*. Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. A single zealot may commence persecution, and better ones be his victims. It can never be too often repeated, that the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis, is while our rulers are honest, and ourselves united. From the conclusion of this war we shall be going down hill. It will not then be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and *their rights disregarded*. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. *The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall . . . or expire in a . . .*"

In the light of current events, Jefferson's words seem almost prophetic. The spirit of the times have altered; our rules have, many of them, become corrupt; and the question has been repeatedly asked of petitioners for justice, "How many are there of you? Have you political influence?" Our people have become careless, and in scores of cases a few bigots have commenced persecution and better men have been their victims. But neither the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, nor the banner which represents them in any nor in all of these. The fault lies at the door of fallen human nature, and the remedy is the power of God; for such things will be until He comes, whose right all dominion is, for his alone is a righteous rule. And the divine promise is: "At that time shall thy people be delivered; every one that shall be found written in the book."

"Inconvenient Citizens' Versus Unjust Laws" *American Sentinel* 10, 31 , pp. 242, 243.

AMONG the papers that have defended persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in the South, is the *Atlanta Constitution*; but evidently the *Constitution* would like to be fair, if it only knew how. In its issue of July 18th, occurs the following:—

The Seventh-day Adventists

Speaking of the efforts to get the Supreme Court to come to the relief of the Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee and Georgia, who have been sent to the chain-gang for doing secular work on Sunday, the *Chicago Tribune* says:—

"The question of religion appears to be one of those which the framers of the Constitution deemed it best to leave entirely to the States. At the time when the Constitution was adopted Connecticut had an established church—the Congregational one—and in all the States the Sunday observance laws were infinitely more rigid than they are now. In many of them Sunday travel was forbidden, Sunday amusements of the mildest character were not tolerated, and the man who thought it wrong to work Saturday was told no one would force him to work on that day, but that if worked on that day which the majority of the people looked on as holy, he would suffer for it.

"It rather seems, therefore, as if those who complain of the religious laws of the States in which they live, will have to look to the State for redress and not to the National Government, which does not seem to have any more to do with the Sunday question than with the marriage and divorce question."

This is a fair statement of the situation. But it is said that the Tennessee authorities will soon have another question to decide. The Adventists say that no punishment and no human power can force them to work on Saturday, their Sabbath. If they gain this point, the chain-gang will get only five days' work in the week out of them.

Upon the whole, these scrupulous religionists are very inconvenient citizens to have in a community. When at liberty they want to disregard our Sunday, but in the chain-gang they will claim two rest days in the week; Saturday, as a matter of conscience, and Sunday, as a matter of law.

The cases will make trouble. It is impossible to deal with it justly and at the same time satisfactorily.

The statement quoted from the *Chicago Tribune* is doubtless "fair" in the sense, that the writer of it had no intention to misrepresent the case, or to do injustice to the persecuted Adventists. It is, moreover, probably true that the United States Supreme Court would take that view of the matter; but this does not necessarily follow from the facts stated by the *Tribune*. It is true, that as originally adopted, the National Constitution left the matter of religion entirely with the States; but it is far from an unreasonable proposition that the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution have very materially changed all this. The First Amendment provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, *or prohibiting*

the free exercise thereof." The Fourteenth Amendment provides that "no State shall make or enforce any law that shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

Certainly, under the First Amendment, freedom from all legal and statutory interference in matters of religion, is one of the privileges of every citizen of the United States; and as such it is guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. This being true, we ask, how in the name of law and justice can any State abridge this privilege of citizens of the United States?

But the most serious and inexcusable state- [*sic.*] made by the *Constitution* is that, Adventists when at liberty, "want to disregard our Sunday; but in the chain-gang they will claim two rest days in the week: Saturday, as a matter of conscience, and Sunday, as a matter of law."

It is very certain that no Adventist will work in the chain-gang, or anywhere else, on the Sabbath. All the tortures of the Inquisition would be powerless to compel a true Seventh-day Adventist to thus violate his conscience, either by breaking the fourth commandment or any other commandment of the Decalogue.

But it is not true that any Adventist would likewise claim the privilege of "Sunday as a matter of law." Adventists, it is true, hold themselves under no obligation to work in the chain-gang, though thus far they have done so, when so commanded by the officers having them in charge. But they would as soon work on Sunday in the chain-gang as to work there upon any other day; and they would doubtless do so, were any State to be so inconsistent as to imprison them for doing private work on Sunday, and then require them to do public work in the chain-gang upon that day.

The *Constitution* says: "The cases will make trouble. It is impossible to deal with it [them] justly, and at the same time satisfactorily."

Yes; these cases will make trouble so long as the various States insist on putting men in prison and working them in the chain-gang for exercising a constitutional, natural, God-given right; because, whether or not, it is a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to work on Sunday, there is not a single State constitution but contains an even more explicit guarantee of religious liberty than does the National Constitution; and in every State this guarantee of religious liberty is violated under the operations of the so-called Sunday laws.

But why should these cases make trouble? The Sunday "law" of Georgia is violated every week in a thousand ways, and yet no trouble is made about it. The *Atlanta Constitution* issues a Sunday edition in flagrant violation of the statute of that State, but we

243

have not heard of any trouble over it. The railroads in Georgia ran their locomotives and trains recklessly through the so-called law, fifty-two Sundays every year, and there is no trouble about it. The writer recently saw posted in the Union Depot at Atlanta, the announcement of a regular Sunday excursion, with tickets on sale every Sunday at that depot; and the same number of the *Constitution*, from which we have quoted, publishes a schedule of Sunday trains from the city of Atlanta, the capital of Georgia, a State that sends men to the chain-gang for ordinary farm labor on that day.

Why should railroad trains and Sunday papers make no trouble, and yet men be arrested for doing ordinary private work on Sunday? There is but one answer: It is because the so-called law, which is yet law, because violative of the constitution, is made the engine of persecution and oppression against those who observe another day, and are in truth persecuted, not for Sunday work, but for Sabbath rest.

The trouble which the *Constitution* fears can be avoided in one of three ways: either let the legislatures of the various States repeat their iniquitous Sunday statutes; or let the various Supreme Courts declare them unconstitutional, as they most certainly are; or let the citizens of the several States, each man for himself, practice the Golden Rule and cease to invoke against their neighbors these antiquated, unjust, unconstitutional, and tyrannical statutes.

Seventh-day Adventists will make no trouble if they are left in the quiet enjoyment of their God-given rights; but God helping them, they will never cease to protest against wrong and injustice, and never content to yield their consciences into the keeping of the individual, nor of the several States, nor of the United States.

"What Does the 'Sabbath Recorder' Mean?" *American Sentinel* 10, 31 , p. 243.

THE *Sabbath Recorder* is a Seventh-day Baptist paper, published at Plainfield, N. Y., in which State, observers of the seventh day are permitted by statute to labor on Sunday. The *Recorder* is therefore at a good safe distance from feeling in its own person or in the persons

of its employÈs the pains of religious persecution. Nor is this all; so far as we know, a score of years have intervened since any Seventh-day Baptist has been prosecuted under a Sunday statute in any State. If there have been more recent cases we have not been informed of them.

This immunity is due very largely, we think, to the fact that members of that denomination are found almost exclusively in States which, like New Jersey, have exemption clauses in favor of those who observe as a sabbath, a day other than Sunday. This still further removes the *Recorder* from the persecution which it does not feel even in the persons of Seventh-day Baptists. But the *Recorder* should understand that he who fails to protest when others are persecuted, thereby forfeits the right to protest when he himself is persecuted.

But does not the *Recorder* protest against the persecution of Seventh-day Adventist? Yes, in a half-hearted way which leaves the reader to doubt if after all the Adventists are suffering more than their just deserts at the hands of their outraged neighbors. For example, in its issue of July 25, the *Recorder* says of the enforcement of Sunday statutes against Seventh-day Adventists:—

In some cases resentment is provoked and advantage taken of the possibilities of legal trial and punishment, because those who observe the seventh day are provokingly defiant of law and the practice of the majority. We confess to very grave misgivings concerning the wisdom and spirit that principle seen to court such notoriety, if any such instances exist.

That is the *Recorder's* statement in all its cold-blooded cruelty and injustice. The perhaps intended to be saving clause, "it any such instances exist," is nullified before it is written by the positive statement, "Resentment is provoked and advantage is taken," etc., "because those who observe the seventh day are provokingly defiant," etc. The *Recorder* has made the point-blank statement quoted. Will it prove it? If not, will it retract it?

In marked contrast with the reproach which the *Recorder* takes up against its neighbors, the persecuted Seventh-day Adventists, is the testimony of Judge Parks, in his letter to Governor Turney, recommending the pardon of the Adventists imprisoned at Dayton, Tenn., last spring. The letter is as follows:—

Isabella, Tenn., April 8, 1896.
To the Governor, Nashville.

At the March term of the Circuit Court of Rhea County, several Seventh-day Adventists were convicted and sent to jail for violating the Sunday laws. They are among the very best people of that county, and I can cheerfully recommend that these remaining in jail be pardoned—this for several reasons, chief of which is that there was no aggravation shown in a single case. It is true that they did some work on Sunday, but it was done in a quiet way, and without any studied effort on their part to attract public attention. In fact the proof rather tended to show that they tried to do their work in such a way as not to attract public attention.

They have been in jail nearly a month, and I think the punishment they have undergone amply sufficient.

Very respectfully, JUD. G. PARKS,
Judge 17th Circuit.

These are the facts as proven in open court by the State's witnesses themselves; and what is true of these cases is equally true of the scores of cases tried in the various States since the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists commenced in Arkansas ten years ago. Adventists are Bible Christians and hold the Golden Rule in equal respect with the fourth commandment. But they ask no man to violate his conscience or to prove disloyal to his God to please them; neither will they yield their consciences to the keeping either of their neighbors or of the State. These facts ought to be known to the *Recorder*; certainly that paper has had ample opportunity to know them, and its unkind thrust at Seventh-day Adventists looks like a violation of the ninth commandment.

But we are persuaded that the *Recorder* does not represent any considerable number of Seventh-day Baptists is voiced not by the *Sabbath Recorder* but by the *Sabbath Outlook*, which, in noble contrast with the course of the *Recorder*, has not hesitated to give to persecuted Adventists full and hearty Christian sympathy; and instead of stabbing them in the back, has ministered to them words of Christian cheer and courage. And so, to the *Recorder*, we say, Go to the *Outlook*, learn its ways and be wise.

We sincerely hope that it will turn out that the *Recorder* spoke hastily in this instance, and that this uncharitable utterance does not represent the deliberate judgment of even its author. If, after the *Recorder* has investigated the matter and ascertained the facts, it, like a brotherly Christian, corrects its erroneous statement, we will gladly make a note of the correction.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 10, 31 , p. 247.

AN interesting question has been raised in Rhea County, Tenn., in the case of Allen Cathy, the young man convicted of cutting wood for his mother on Sunday. Mr. Cathy is a man of about twenty-two years of age. His mother is an Adventist, but he is not, and hitherto he has not been a Sabbath-keeper. But Sabbath, July 20, he refused to work and was placed in chains and restricted to a diet of bread and water. We do not know his reason for refusing to work; but it is probable that the injustice which he has suffered has opened his eyes to the real issues involved in the Sabbath question, and that he has honestly resolved to keep the Sabbath of the Lord. His imprisonment in the first place, was an outrage against human rights scarcely second to the wrong done to the Adventists, and if the event shall prove that his refusal to work on the 20th ult., was on conscientious and constitutional grounds, the wrong will be that much greater. Tennessee is treading upon dangerous ground. It has already reached a point where, to keep within the limits prescribed by the constitution, it must know just what Allen Cathy's conscience is; just whether the seventh day of the week is set apart by his religion as a day of rest; and man has never yet devised any effectual way of ascertaining such facts—of wringing from men the secrets of their souls, except by the rack and thumbscrew. Will Tennessee adopt such methods? or will it arbitrarily decide what young Cathy's religion is, or ought to be, and so continue to ride roughshod over his rights in a more modern but not less cruel way.

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 10, 31 , p. 247.

A CONTEMPORARY thinks we deal too tenderly with Judge Parks; and asserts that he "is the most blameworthy actor in the persecutions at Graysville." We cannot agree with this proposition. That Judge Parks errs both as to his view of the so-called law, and as to his duty to enforce it, we believe. But not one can converse with Judge Parks, as the writer of this note has done, and not be impressed with his entire candor. That the judge has in him the stuff of which martyrs are made, we do not know; but we are not prepared to attribute to him any unworthy motive. We believe that he ought to be governed by the higher law, the constitution of the State, which provides "that no human authority can in any case whatever, control

or interfere with the rights of conscience," and that he ought to refuse to entertain prosecutions under the so-called Sunday law of Tennessee and thus support the constitution as he is sworn to do. Our contemporary holds that he ought to "resign his position, and do it in such a way that his protest against legalized iniquity will ring from end to end of Tennessee." If there were not other way, our contemporary would be right. Persecution is morally wrong and nothing can excuse a man for wrong doing. But Judge Parks himself, holds a still different view, namely, that he ought to retain his position, enforce the "law" mildly but firmly for the time being, and use his influence for its modification. In our judgment he greatly errs; but it is, we are persuaded, an error of the head and not of the heart. If Judge Parks were upon the Supreme Bench instead of the Circuit Bench, we are persuaded that Tennessee would not long persecute honest men for honest work upon any day.

August 15, 1895

"The Enforcement of 'Law'" *American Sentinel* 10, 32 , pp. 249-252.

"WE have a law, and by our law he ought to die," ⁶⁰1 has been the justification of injustice and persecution in all ages.

It was civil "law" that cast the three Hebrews into the fiery furnace; ⁶¹2 that consigned Daniel to the lions' den; ⁶²3 that put to death the apostles; that gave to the wild beasts the early Christians; that clothed with authority the Inquisition; that burned Huss and Jerome and tortured and put to death millions of martyrs in the Dark Ages that whipped, banished, and hanged Quakers and Baptists in New England and Virginia, and that is to-day imprisoning honest men in Maryland and driving Christians in the chain-gang in Tennessee.

Except in isolated cases of mob violence, no martyr ever suffered except under the color and forms of civil "law;" and yet men are slow to learn the lesson that mercy is above statute, that justice is above "law;" that any act which contravenes the laws of nature, that attempts to alienate inalienable, God-given rights, is not law and ought to be treated as void in practice as it is in fact.

"By the light of burning heretics Christ's bleeding feet I track,
Toiling up new Calvaries ever with the cross that turns not back."

⁶³4

The measure of religious liberty which we enjoy in this favored land to-day, is due, under God, to the fact that God-fearing men

violated so-called civil laws, and continued to violate them, and to suffer the penalty, until by their sufferings they brought their fellowmen to the recognition of the fact that there

250

is a limit to civil authority; that human law is not supreme; that God has not abdicated the throne of moral dominion; that what other nations call religious toleration is in reality religious rights, of which "government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small;" that though "despotic power may invade those rights, Justice still confirms them." ⁶⁴⁵

"They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin."

Backward look across the ages and the beacon-moments see,"

That, like peaks of some sunk continent, just through Oblivion's sea;

Not an ear in court or market for the low forebodeing cry.

Of those Crises, God's stern winnowers, from whose feet earth's chaff must fly;

Never shows the choice momentous till the judgment hath passed by."

The press of the country has spoken out nobly in denunciation of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee and elsewhere. But there are a few ignoble exceptions. The *Commercial-Appeal*, of Memphis, ridicules and slanders the persecuted men, and then says:—

The laws against the violation of our day of rest are unrepealed, and no matter whether just or unjust, wise or unwise. . . . they should be enforced. ⁶⁵⁶

This sentiment is worthy of an Inquisitor of the "Holy Office," and had the editor of that paper lived in the days of the Inquisition, he would, if consistent, have said: "The laws against the violation of our religion are unrepealed, and whether just or unjust, wise or unwise, they should be enforced." Yea, he would have stood by and seen the cruel, red-hot pinchers sear and tear the flesh of the tortured victim; or, perchance, he would have himself heated the instruments of torture or brutally bared the breast of the shrinking maiden or of the devoted mother to the gaze of the rabble and to the bloody work of the scarcely more cruel iron.

The *Evening Sentinel*, of Knoxville, Tenn., also says, "Enforce the law," though it does not manifest the bitterness shown by the *Commercial-Appeal*. In its issue of July 22, the *Sentinel* publishes a

number of interviews with ministers at Knoxville, from which we make the following extracts:—

The [Evening] *Sentinel* man interviewed Rev. Dr. Moore, pastor of the Church Street Church, on the question, putting three questions to him, which he answered, as follows:

"Are you in favor of the strict enforcement of the laws in Tennessee against sabbath desecration?"

"As every other good citizen ought to be, I am in favor of the strict enforcement of all laws till they are repealed. If they are good laws let them be enforced, if they are bad, let them be repealed."

"What do you think of the recent imprisonment of the Seventh-day Adventists in Rhea County for working on Sunday?"

"I think Seventh-day Adventists, as well as any other people, should be punished according to law, for violations of law."

And so Dr. Moore, had he lived in the days of the Inquisition, would have gazed unmoved upon the *auto-da-fé*, and as the flames encircled their victims he would have said, if consistent: "As every other good citizen ought to be, I am in favor of the strict enforcement of the laws till they are repealed. I think these Protestants, as well as any other people, should be punished according to law, for violations of law."

To the *Evening Sentinel's* question Rev. Thomas C. Warner, D.D., replied:—

Laws are enacted with reference to the punishment of the evil-doer, and for the protection of society in all its rights and interests. The question of righteousness should never decide whether an existing law is to be enforced or not. Is it the law of the land? That question settled in the affirmative, then let the law be enforced. If the law is unjust, if it works hardship to innocent persons, still let it be executed so long as it remains upon the statute books. The surest way to secure the modification or repeal of an unjust law is to illustrate its prejudice by enforcing it. Whatever may be my private opinion touching the Sunday laws of Tennessee, I am in favor of their impartial execution. Whether they interfere with a man's religious views or his business practices, so long as they are of record for the regulation of public conduct and private practice, let them be rigidly applied.

It almost passes belief that these words could fall from the lips of a professed representative of the Man of Calvary, the Prince of Peace. Had this minister lived in the days of the Inquisition, when in every country in Europe and in every civilized country in the world it was against the "law" to disbelieve the dogmas of Rome; he must, if in

France or Spain, or the Netherlands, have stood by the burning pile, or by the gallows tree, and said:—

"The question of righteousness should never decide whether an existing law is to be enforced or not. Is it the law of the land? That question settled in the affirmative, then let the law be enforced. If the law is unjust, if it works hardship to innocent persons, still let it be executed so long as it remains upon the statute books."

In view of such utterances, is it any wonder that the prophet of God, in describing the very times in which we live, said: "Judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, *and equity cannot enter*"? ⁶⁶⁷

It is true that thus far the administration of the Sunday laws of the various States has been very mild compared with the acts of the Inquisition to which reference has been made. But this does not alter the fact that these men have been taken from their homes for no offense against their fellowmen; they have been unjustly deprived of their liberty and been branded as criminals and worked as convicts for a purely religious offense, for acts done in accordance with the dictates of conscience and not trenching upon the rights of others. Thus the authorities have undertaken, by persecution, to coerce men in matters of religion; and "it is incumbent on the authors of persecution," says Gibbon, "previously to reflect, whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. . . . The fine which he [the persecuted] is unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severity of the law, and his contempt suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment." ⁶⁷⁸

This is well illustrated in the cases of the Tennessee Adventists. Men can never fall into the hands of more merciful officers than those into whose hands the Rhea County Adventists have fallen. Four months ago Judge Parks imposed a fine of only \$2.50 in each case, and remitted even that. He also recommended the pardon of the convicted men. At the recent term of court he fined those previously convicted three times as much as he had previously done; and in one instance where the defendant had been twice convicted previously, once before a justice of the peace, and once in the Circuit Court, Judge Parks imposed a fine of \$12.50, five times the amount of the fine imposed four months before. Thus the State of Tennessee, as represented in this thing by its courts, has entered upon a course that must end in the infliction of the death penalty; for it is not a

supposable case that these men will violate their consciences even to save their lives; and certainly the temper

251

of Tennessee's law-makers must change very materially before the State will recede from the position it has taken.

Expressions of sympathy and kindly regard are no new thing in cases of persecution for conscience' sake. The ecclesiastical courts of the Dark Ages frequently expressed abundant sympathy for their victims and bespoke mercy for them at the hands of the civil authorities to whom they committed them to be dealt with "ACCORDING TO LAW;" mercy which they well knew their victims would not receive; for the condemned men were then, as the Tennessee Adventists are now, self-confessed "law" breakers, and it was a maxim then as it is now: "The law must be enforced." The result then was imprisonment, confiscation, torture and death by the rope, the ax, the fagot.

The ultimate end cannot be different now. True, the extreme penalty may not be so speedily reached as in the Middle Ages, but it is none the less inevitable. The death penalty is not only in the first attempt to coerce men in matters of conscience, but it is in the assumption of the right to coerce them; and the easy stages by which it is to be reached in Tennessee only make it the more certain. Had heavy penalties been imposed upon the Rhea County Adventists for the first offense, public sympathy would have been aroused in their behalf, and the so-called law might have been swept from the statute books; but the sympathy of the judge, the kindness of the sheriff and his deputies, the pardon by the governor, all serve to create a feeling that having been treated with such marked consideration, the Adventists ought to be willing to compromise, to surrender their consciences; and the fact that they will not compromise in the least, that they remain loyal to God and to conscience, is taken by many as an evidence on contumacy, and their further punishment is regarded as well-merited.

We have little hopes of influencing the State of Tennessee in this matter, or of even lightening the persecution of the Adventists there. Forewarned by the Word of God, we have long looked for such things in this country, and we expect them to increase rather than diminish. The return to the maxims and methods of the Dark Ages has begun, and the goal is certain. We expect to save from the ruinous course upon which they have entered neither the State of Tennessee nor yet

the United States, which has, in many ways approved the wicked principle which Tennessee has adopted; but we do expect to save honest-hearted individuals from participation in the wrong.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or
blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light."

"Hast thou chosen, O my people, on whose party thou shalt
stand,
Ere the Doom from its worn sandals shakes the dust against our
land? ⁶⁸⁹

God has ordained civil government, but he has not thereby abdicated the throne of moral dominion. Every man must give account of himself to God. As Lowell has oddly but forcibly expressed it:—

If you take a sword and dror it, and go stick a feller thru,
Gov'ment aint to answer for it; God'll send the bill to you.

It is no less a moral wrong to rob a man of his natural rights than to rob him of his money or other property; and it is no less a moral wrong to do it under the forms of law than it would be to do it without law.

Government cannot make right wrong nor wrong right, and the man who does a moral wrong in obedience to what he may understand to be law, or in obedience to that which is in fact human "law," will in the end find that he is not thereby freed from responsibility to God. Judge Parks, Attorney-General Fletcher, the grand and petit jurors, and the sheriff and his deputies, must each answer to God for the wrongs done the Adventists, and that at a bar where the plea of supreme court decisions and official oaths will not avail. The law of God will be the rule of that Judgment. As Elder Colcord so impressively said last March: "There is a time coming when there will be a change, and God, and not man, will be the Judge—and in that court questions will be decided not by the statute books of Tennessee, but by the law of God." And in that Judgment the authorities of Tennessee will be on trial, not as belonging to a system in which their identity is lost, merged into that moral nonentity, the

252

State, but as individuals, each responsible for himself to God, and each to give account for himself of the deeds done in the body.

"Careless seems the great Avenger, history's pages but record
One death grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems and the Word;
Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch Above his own."
6910

**"Fundamental Principle of Government ⁷⁰¹" *American Sentinel* 10,
32 , pp. 252, 253.**

THE fundamental principle of American jurisprudence is that stated in the Declaration of Independence: that government is instituted to secure the rights of man. These rights are simply artificial divisions of the law of nature. ⁷¹² Now that which is to be secured—man's rights—precedes that which secures them—civil government. They are also superior to the provisions of government. Blackstone says, "The law of nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original." ⁷²³

In the universal recognition (whether acknowledge or not) of this principle—that there is a superior standard of justice—lies the force of charges that certain legislative acts are unjust. For injustice is nonconformity to the law of justice—which is the natural law. If the legislature were omnipotent, if there were no superior law, if it could make right wrong and wrong right, then any law it might make could not be said to be unjust. Its own acts would be the standard of justice. Right would then be conformity to human law, and wrong, violation of human law. The absurdity of such a position is evident—the claim would be preposterous; as long as the maxim, *Humanum est errare*, is true, there must be some invariable standard by which all human acts, public as well as private, are to be judged. This standard is variously termed the law of justice, the law of nature, natural rights, etc., and has reference to those abstract principles of justice and right imprinted more or less clearly on the sense of every man.

It is this law that receives formal recognition in our declarations of rights—declarations simply of certain parts of this superior law;—not that these rights are any more sacred when thus "declared" than they were before, but they are thus rendered more susceptible of

enforcement. That they are simply a part of this higher law, and are so recognized, is proved by the provision so generally inserted in declarations of rights, that "the enumeration herein of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people"—a direct acknowledgment that these rights inhere in the people, and that such declaration is simply an express acknowledgment of the most important principles of this law. Theoretically, it adds no force whatever to the rights. Such declaration is not dissimilar to the frequent instances where the State Constitutions reenact certain provisions of the National Constitution. Such reenactment does not make the provision any more binding; nor would a provision to the contrary annul the superior law. The State Constitution, in so far as it contravened the provisions of the National Constitution, would simply be void. Blackstone states this principle in his commentaries: "Those rights, then, which God and nature have established, and are therefore called natural rights, such as are life and liberty, need not the aid of human laws to be more effectually invested in every man to be more effectually invested in every man than they are; neither do they receive any additional strength when declared by the municipal laws to be inviolable. On the contrary, no human legislature has the power to abridge or destroy them."

It is true that when recognized in our constitutions, our rights are more easily enforced, and hence this recognition was insisted on by Jefferson and other early American statesmen. But because this recognition may not exist, one's rights cannot therefore be legitimately trampled upon. Even if the Constitution did not prohibit the taking of private property for public use without just compensation, the legislature could not therefore legitimately do it. Nor can the legislature rightfully take the property of A and give it to B. There is no court in the land that would enforce such a decree. It would violate this superior law, and therefore be absolutely void. Hence, as government is instituted to secure the natural rights of man, and as our constitutions, in their declarations of rights, recognize this law and limit the powers of government accordingly, any law which deprives an individual of his rights is unconstitutional.

In accordance with this principle, Jefferson declared: "Our legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power, that their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us. . . . The idea is quite unfounded that on entering into society we give up any natural

right." This doctrine is coeval with courts of justice, and was unequivocally asserted and re-asserted centuries ago by England's most eminent chief justices. Said the distinguished Lord Hobart: "Even an act of Parliament, made against natural equity, as to make a man judge in his own case, is void in itself; for *jura naturae sunt immutabilia*, and they are *leges legum*."

Thus this American principle is simply that which has been declared again and again by the greatest jurists which have ever adorned the English bench. In "Elements of Right and of the Law" (Section 520), Mr. Smith says: "It is a well-established principle of the American law, that an act of Congress in excess of the constitutional powers of the Federal Government is absolutely void; and so far as the direct infringement of private rights is concerned, this principle is in fact enforced by the courts; but in questions merely political, there is in general no practical means of restraining the execution of the law. Nevertheless such a law is void, and not only affords no legal justification to any one seeking to enforce it, but every subordinate officer, and indeed every private individual, has the right to disobey it, and will be vindicated in doing so by the courts."

The individual retains his natural rights, and government is limited accordingly. And as every individual equally has the natural right to worship whom he pleases and on what day he pleases (as long as he interferes not with this same liberty in others), or to refrain from worshiping altogether, any human law interfering with this right, is, under our constitutions, void; it matters not whether it be a Sunday law, a law to compel him to attend church, or a law requiring any other religious observance, if it interferes with the right of a single individual, it is unconstitutional and absolutely void.

It is true that our judiciary have not always had a clear conception of this principle, and numerous decisions are flatly contradictory. But this is because in some cases precedents have been followed, not principles. Law, by some, has been regarded as a bundle of previous decisions, rather than as a science founded, like other sciences, on the immutable law of nature. The erroneousness of such a view must be obvious to all who have given it reflection. "The law of England," Lord Mansfield observed, "would be an absurd science were it founded upon precedent only." And Lord Coke repeatedly declared that the law "is the perfection of reason." "Reason," said he, "is the life of the law; nay, the common law itself is nothing else but reason."

In the onward march of civilization and in the advancement of science in general, progress has also been made in our system of jurisprudence;—not that principles have changed, for the law of nature is both unchangeable and immutable, but in this advancement clearer views of the principles of justice been obtained. Progress is especially seen in connection with religious legislation and religious decisions. In America the dogma that Christianity is a part of the common law has been repudiated. Sunday laws have been declared to be unconstitutional. Religious proclamations, too, were so held by Jefferson and Madison; and the latter also states that public chaplaincies are an illegitimate departure from American principles. And as our judges and legislators incline more to justice and reason and less to the precedents dictated by bigotry, our Government will become still more liberal, and our Sunday laws, and all other religious laws, will go the way that similar laws have gone before them. In order to fulfill the objects of government, every man must be insured "the fullest liberty to exercise his faculties compatible with the exercise of like liberty by every other man." This is the principle asserted in the Declaration of Independence, when it says, "All men are created equal;" and the repeated departures from it in our religious laws which discriminate against the sabbatarian⁷³ 4 and infidel are a standing reproach to our Government, and a constant travesty on justice.

"The Intolerant 'Blade'" *American Sentinel* 10, 32 , p. 253.

IN its issue of July 11, the *Toledo Blade* closes an editorial comment on the conviction of the Tennessee Adventists, for doing common labor on Sunday, with the following:—

There is no constraint upon the Adventists to devote the day to religious duties, or to hold it sacred. The law does not compel them to observe the Christian Sunday any more than it does the Jewish Sabbath. It merely declares that no one shall perform labor on Sunday; and there is no good reason why the Adventists should not obey that law. Their claim that it is a matter of conscience not to obey it, is absurd.

We are tempted to deal sharply with this utterance, but instead, will make the following brief comments:—

1. The commonwealth of Ohio recognizes that a statute compelling seventh-day observers to rest on Sunday, is tyrannical, and consequently exempts from its penalties "those who conscientiously

observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath." True, this is but toleration, but it is better than the oppression of Tennessee. Therefore, when the *Blade* asks that seventh-day "observers abstain from their usual avocations on Sunday, through respect for the Sunday laws," it asks a sacrifice that its own State regards as an injustice.

.2. The Sunday statute of Tennessee does bring constraint to bear on the Adventists to compel them to observe Sunday in the same manner enforced by the creeds of the Sunday-observing Protestant churches. All that the creeds require is cessation from labor. They do not attempt to invade the mind to ascertain whether it employs the Sunday in holy contemplation. Outward rest is all the creeds enforce, and this outward rest is just what the Sunday statute of Tennessee attempts to enforce. And just as the three Hebrew worthies refused to bow down to Nebuchadnezzar's image and *appear* to worship, so Seventh-day Adventists refuse to bow down to the pago-papal Sunday and *appear* to observe the statute-intrenched dogma of Sunday sacredness.

.3. Seventh-day Adventists know that Sunday observance is not commanded in Scripture. They know that Sabbath observance is commanded. They know that Sunday observance is a church ordinance only, and it put forth as the sign of an opposing system,—the mark of that system which declares that "the church has power to ordain feasts and holy days and to command them under sin." Seventh-day Adventists hold to a system of doctrine diametrically opposed to this system, and while thus believing they conscientiously refuse to wear the badge of the opposing system.

.4. Sunday statutes attempt to abridge the inalienable right to teach what one believes. "Action speaks louder than words." The Sunday observer works on Saturday, and by that work proclaims to all beholders that he does not believe that the seventh day is the Sabbath. Likewise, the seventh-day observer labors on the first day of the week, and thereby proclaims to the beholder that he does not believe that Sunday is the Sabbath. In Tennessee, the Sunday-keeper says, "No, you don't," and hastens to invoke the law to prohibit seventh-day observers from exercising a right which he loudly demands for himself.

If there is no conscience involved in being compelled to wear the badge of a false theological system,—if there is no conscience involved in the matter of teaching one's faith, then it is absurd for

seventh-day observers to assert that they cannot conscientiously obey the Sunday statute. But it is a matter of conscience for Seventh-day Adventists to rest on Saturday and work on Sunday. Nevertheless they do not thereby disturb either the public or private devotion of their neighbors. Only two of the hundreds of witnesses which have testified against them in the scores of cases that have been brought against them in the last few years have testified that they were disturbed. One of these was engaged at the same time in driving a cow home which he had gone to a neighbor, on Sunday, to procure. The other claimed to be disturbed, though he testified under oath, that he neither saw nor heard the Sunday work of his Sabbath-keeping neighbor, but was mentally disturbed by the *mere knowledge* that the work was being done. No; Seventh-day Adventists believe in practising the Golden Rule, and if their persecutors would act upon this Christian precept, all this persecution would cease.

"Missionaries Disregard Civil 'Law'" *American Sentinel* 10, 32 , p. 253.

SOME weeks since, we referred in these columns to the passage of a statute in Florida, prohibiting the co-education of the races. Referring to this "law," the *Independent*, of July 18, says, that "it affects not only teachers, but patrons of such schools—that is, parents may be imprisoned from three to six months in the county jail." The *Independent* further says: "The American Missionary Association will receive and teach pupils, white or black, who apply for instruction at Orange Park; and there will be teachers to run the risk of imprisonment. Scholars will be fitted to teach Florida schools, white or black."

We are glad the American Missionary Association has determined to disregard this so-called law. It is clearly violative of the constitution of Florida, because it is an infringement of religious liberty, and undertakes to interfere with missionary operations in that State. The gospel commission is,—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Missionaries, everywhere, find it necessary, not only to preach the gospel in the common acceptance of the term, but to establish schools wherein a Christian education may be given. This the American Missionary Association has done at Orange Park, Florida; and it is this which the statute referred to proposes to prohibit.

When American missionaries go to foreign lands and there establish schools for the instruction of the natives, and these schools are interfered with by the authorities, our Government protests against such interference, as an invasion of natural right and of the law of civilized nations. Here, an American State is proposing to do precisely the same thing. By this statute, Florida tells the American Missionary Association how it shall not preach the gospel in Florida; that it shall not educate colored pupils in a school conducted by white people. This attempt is as great an outrage upon religious liberty, and the excuses made for it, are as disingenuous as the Sunday laws of the various States, and the so-called reasons for maintaining them. Both are alike in open violation of natural, God-given rights, and both should be alike disregarded; and we are glad that, as the *Independent* says, "there will be teachers ready to run the risk of imprisonment," for violation of this Florida statute.

We honor the *Independent* for the stand which it has taken in this matter; and we honor the American Missionary Association for its determination to disregard this iniquitous measure, just as missionary associations have always disregarded similar so-called laws, designed to hinder their work in heathen lands; and just as Christians always have and always must everywhere disregard human enactments which trench upon the sacred rights of conscience.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 32 , p. 256.

THE New York *Recorder*, of August 12, in an illustrated article of considerable length, adds its testimony to what the press of the country have so generally spoken in condemnation of the persecution of the Adventists in Tennessee.

ONE of the eight Seventh-day Adventists in the chain-gang in Rhea County, Tenn., has been released by the county court, because on account of poor health he was unable to work. Our illustration on another page shows some of the Adventists at work on the approach to the county bridge, near Spring City.

"ENFORCING the 'law'" against Adventists by imprisoning them or driving them in the chain-gang differs from "enforcing the 'law'" against the heretics of the Middle Ages by means of red-hot pinchers, the gallows and the fagot, only in degree. Exactly the same principle is involved in both.

SUNDAY enforcement seems to be in the very air, and from every quarter comes intelligence concerning efforts to rigidly enforce Sunday statutes. There is scarcely a State in which the question is not being agitated, and both city ordinances and State "laws" are being invoked to compel the observance of Sunday.

SEVERAL Seventh-day Adventists have been arrested recently in Chicago under circumstances which indicate very clearly that the motive is very largely religious bigotry and intolerance. The Adventists have several churches in Chicago, and if the persecution becomes general throughout the city, we may look for interesting developments there.

MR. FAUST, a Seventh-day Adventist shoemaker of Baltimore, whose arrest some time since, we noticed in these columns, was again arrested for working on Sunday, July 21st. The policeman who had previously arrested him, had been watching him, and going into his house the back way, found him at work. The circumstances of the case all indicate clearly that it is a case of religious persecution pure and simple. Mr. Faust's work is not of a nature to disturb people, except as they are annoyed by knowing that he is at work. He is a poor man and badly crippled up by rheumatism, and this persecution works a great hardship upon both him and his family.

OUR second illustration, "Enforcing the 'law' in Tennessee," shows Seventh-day Adventists working in the chain-gang for no offense against their fellowmen, but for practical dissent from a religious dogma which has been entrenched in the statutes of Tennessee. That their punishment is not death does not change the principle. The "laws" which in other ages and in other lands tortured, hanged, or burned heretics differed only in degree from the "laws" which to-day imprison Adventists. Read our illustrated article on this subject.

THERE is a conflict of authority between Oregon and Washington, concerning Sunday fishing on the Columbia River. The laws of Oregon prohibit fishing on Sunday: while the laws of Washington permit fishing on that day. Under the plea of concurrent jurisdiction over the river, the Oregon authorities have undertaken to compel Washington fishermen to cease fishing on Sunday. What the result will be we are not able to say at this writing. The effort of the Oregon authorities shows, however, the disposition which seems inherent in Sunday enforcement.

THE *Jewish Messenger* professes "much sympathy for the eight Seventh-day Baptists [Adventists] of Rhea County, Tenn., who were

imprisoned for working on Sunday," but says it is idle for their friends to talk of religious persecution: that it is the first duty of citizens of all religions to obey the laws of the State, etc. Persecuted Christians have never lacked for sympathy of this kind. Pontius Pilate felt much sympathy for Christ, but nevertheless delivered him to be crucified, as the *Messenger* would deliver his followers now to the penalties of the law. Pilate's sympathy benefited neither himself nor any one else. It is as worthless in this day as it was in his.

THE manager of the *Present Truth* publishing office, London, Eng., in a recent interview with the officials having charge of the inspection factories, was given the alternative of complying with the demands of the Sunday law until an act of Parliament could be passed exempting the Adventists as the Jews are now exempted in that country, which exemption they must secure by their own petition, or of suffering the penalty of the law, which would henceforth be rigorously applied. Of course no Christian will seek temporal ease at the expense of sacrificing principle, hence the prospect is that the property of the office there will be seized to satisfy fines imposed for Sunday labor.

THE authorities of Rhea County, Tenn., have decided not to require the Adventists now in the chain-gang in that county to serve an additional length of time because they will not work on the Sabbath. This conclusion was reached just a few days subsequent to the publication of our last-page note of the 1st inst., in which we showed clearly that any such attempt would be a flagrant violation of the plain letter and spirit of the constitution of the State, which provides that "no person shall, in time of peace, be required to perform any service for the public on any day set apart by his religion as a day of rest." The Rhea County authorities are to be congratulated that they have decided not to thus further outrage justice.

AMONG the few papers that have approved of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, is the *Central Methodist*, of Cattlesburg, Kentucky, which, in its issue of July 20, said: "The Tennessee Adventists, who persist in performing manual labor on the sabbath, to the annoyance of their neighbors, have again been fined and sent to jail, as they should have been."

The animus of this note is paper is apparent, in view of the fact that none of the work complained of was done to the annoyance of anybody, and no witness testified that he was disturbed by the work done; the only annoyance felt was of the same character as that felt

by the *Central Methodist*, namely, the annoyance which is always begotten by bigotry and intolerance in the bosoms of those who are not willing that others should enjoy equal rights with themselves.

TO appreciate justly the nature of the times in which we live, we must look not at the men, but at the principles, which the times are bringing to the front. By these principles, the lives of other men touch our own. The fast-spreading principle of the union of Church and State brings our life in touch with that of each of the persecuted Christians now imprisoned for keeping the fourth commandment. We are not in the position of idle spectators of a play. There is something for each of us to consider and decide, and something to be done. There is a stand to be taken for or against divine truth. When Paul was brought before Felix, it was not, as it seemed, that the apostle might have a chance of regaining his liberty, but that Felix might be told of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come. The martyrs were persecuted in order that, by their sufferings, they might sow the seeds of truth. And God's hand is shaping now the unfolding of events, to present his truth to all people, that they may choose whether they will be loyal to him or not. While a few men are suffering for their faith, the voice of truth is sounding in the ears of millions, among whom are we, calling us and them to stand now on the side of righteousness, and against the flood of evil that is rising to engulf the world. God is speaking to us, and the thing of most importance for us is to hear and heed.

August 22, 1895

"Sunday Enforcement in New York" *American Sentinel* 10, 33 , pp. 257, 258.

IF anything had been lacking to illustrate fully the absurdity of Sunday legislation, it would be supplied by current events in this city.

New York has a very voluminous Sunday law, comprising, all told, about 2,200 words, and the possibilities bound up in it are immense. The most recent addition to the Sunday Code of the State, is a section prohibiting barbering on Sunday, except in New York and Saratoga, and also in these cities after one o'clock, P.M., on that day.

Some of the decisions under the Sunday statute of the State are specially worthy of note in this connection.

In 1811, Judge Kent said that "the statute has, for over a century, recognized the *sanctity* and the *obligation* [of Sunday], and punished its violators." While in the case of *Campbell vs. International Society* (4 Box., New York, 298), we are told that the statute "explicitly recognizes the first day of the week as *holy time*, and thus it has brought us back to the full and large and absolute rule of interdiction which we find provided in the earliest *laws of Christian States*, and which the construction of the statute of Charles II. has tended somewhat to narrow and impair." Again, in 12, New York, 455, the question is asked, "Is it not obvious that by reason of keeping a store open for business, a temptation is presented to those who have no regard for Sunday as *holy time* to violate the law?" Again, Judge Allen, of New York, held in 1861 that "the law of the State conforms to the *law of God* as that law is recognized by a great majority of the people."

These authorities might be multiplied, but they are sufficient to show the purpose and intent of the Sunday statutes of New York. That they rest upon a distinctively religious basis, is beyond question; but that they utterly fail in this purpose is plainly shown by the manner of their application, as well as by the statutes themselves. The sale of intoxicating liquors is prohibited in general, but is none the less carried on extensively by clubs for the use of members. Thus the law in effect permits the rich man to do on Sunday what it prohibits to the poor man. That this is any great deprivation to the poor man we do not believe, because we think that all are better off without intoxicating drinks; but we very much doubt the wisdom of giving free rein to the liquor traffic six days in the week and of limiting it to wealthy clubs upon Sunday. The only reasons for prohibition that the State ought to consider apply equally to every day; and that they are given weight only in behalf of one day, shows that the restriction is for the purpose of honoring Sunday rather than restricting the liquor traffic.

Shooting, hunting, trapping, and fishing, are prohibited on Sunday, and this section has been so rigidly construed as to extend even to the taking of fish in private ponds. Such a regulation can have only one object, namely the exaltation of the day because of its religious character.

Another section prohibits all labor on Sunday "except works of necessity or charity;" and "works of necessity and charity" are defined as including "whatever is needful during the day for the good order,

health, or comfort of the community." It is also provided that "it shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for servile labor upon the first day of the week, that the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week *as holy time*." This latter exemption serves to emphasize the religious character of the statute. All "public sports, exercises, pastimes or shows upon the first day of the week," are prohibited, but it has been held that "three men playing ball upon Sunday on private grounds" does not constitute a breach of the peace; and only a few months since Judge Gaynor, of Brooklyn, discharged a number of young men, arrested for playing ball on Sunday on a common in the city of Brooklyn, saying that it was no violation of the law.

Section 266 reads:—

All trades, manufacturers, agricultural or mechanical employments upon the first day of the week are prohibited, except when the same are works of necessity they may be performed on that day in their usual and orderly manner, so as not to interfere with the repose and religious liberty of the community.

But the next section provides for the sale of articles of food at any time before 10 o'clock in the morning, and prepared tobacco, fruit, confectionery, newspapers, drugs, medicines, and surgical appliances at any other time of the day.

We have no fault to find with the sale of tobacco, fruit, and confectionery, newspapers, etc., on Sunday more than on other days; but viewed from the standpoint of various decisions that the purpose of the statute is to preserve the *sanctity* of the day, we can but wonder what kind of *sanctity* it is that can be preserved by a statute which prohibits all agricultural and mechanical employments, and at the same time permits the sale of tobacco, confectionery, etc.

Another feature which emphasizes the religious character of the Sunday statute of New York, is the prohibition of all parades and processions on Sunday, except funeral processions for the actual burial of the dead, and "*processions to and from a place of worship in connection with a religious service there celebrated*."

Another section prohibits theatricals, operas, etc. Doubtless it is this provision which has given rise to the so-called "sacred" concerts, wherein the livery of heaven is made to do service for the devil.

Some of the decisions under the New York Sunday statute are peculiar; for instance, "a contract for the hire of a horse to be used on Sunday for pleasure cannot be enforced;" but "an agreement to make an ascension in a balloon on Sunday from a public garden, is within

the statute." Tobacco, fruit, etc., may be freely sold at any hour of the day, but it is a crime to sell a glass of soda-water, or a paper of pins.

According to this statute, which it has been judicially declared, "is in harmony with the religions of the country and the religious sentiment of the public," it is wrong to do barbering on Sunday in any place within the limits of New York State, except in the cities of New York and Saratoga, and even here it is right only until one o'clock in the afternoon. According to this "law" it is wrong for an

258

expressman or drayman to receive or convey or deliver goods on Sunday, but quite right for the railroad companies or steamboats to do the same thing. It is quite right for a man to stand upon the street selling cigars, but wrong for another man, or for anybody else, to sell a pair of shoe-strings either on the street or in a store.

But enough has been given to illustrate not only the absurdity but the immorality of the so-called Sunday laws. Their purpose is declared to be to "protect the sanctity of the sabbath;" but their effect is the very opposite or would be were there any sanctity attached to the day which they are intended to safeguard. Their effect is to turn away the minds of the people from the law of God and center it upon the "law" of the State. They in effect say that the law of God is defective: that its prohibitions are too broad and sweeping, and that it must be changed in order to meet the conditions of modern society. And instead of leaving it to the individual conscience, a thousand absurd and inconsistent prohibitions are adopted, arbitrarily prohibiting one thing and permitting something else, which is neither more necessary nor more moral; hence the conscience is seared as with a hot iron. The individual, instead of asking, "What does the law of God say?" inquires only, What does the law of the State say? and the conscience is eased in committing sin if the act done is within the statute. Thus men are taught to look not to the law of God as a moral standard, but to the "law" of the State; the result is that their morals are no more perfect than is the "law" by which they are regulated.

There has recently been an effort made in this city to enforce the Sunday statutes. This has been carried so far that some dealers have even been afraid to sell soda-water. Only a few weeks ago general notice was served throughout the city that all business must close. The manager of this office was notified to close up, which, however, he refused to do, and has not as yet been molested; but the end is not yet. Bigotry and fanaticism have not yet exhausted themselves,

and the Sunday-law crusade has not run its course. Mayor Strong spent a recent Sunday at Asbury Park, N.J., and while there expressed his determination to enforce the "law," and made special mention of the Sunday statute, which he said would be rigidly enforced; hence interesting developments may be expected in New York City ere long. However, these things only serve to illustrate the absurdity and immorality of Sunday legislation.

"Without Excuse" *American Sentinel* 10, 33 , p. 258.

THE *Tribune*, of Knoxville, Tenn., is published daily, *including Sunday*; yet, in its issue of August 7, it says:—

These thirty thousand Adventists want the statutory laws which meet the approval of some twenty millions of Christians in this country changed to suit their views, or amended as to give them the privilege of disregarding Sunday while denying the privilege to all who do not believe as they do. The law compels nobody to observe Sunday religiously. It makes it a legal day of rest, and enables the moral and religious element to devote the day to worship or religious observance undisturbed.

We suppose that even the *Tribune* cannot be held responsible for what it does not know, as it would be unfair to so hopelessly load down even a newspaper; but there is no reason why it should not have known that Adventists do not ask "the privilege of disregarding Sunday while denying the privilege to all who no [*sic.*] not believe as they do."

In a memorial presented to the legislature of Tennessee last April, the Adventists plainly said: "We do not ask simply for a clause exempting *us* from the penalties of the law, but for the repeal of the law; because to ask simply an exemption would be to admit the right of the State to legislate upon such questions, and consent that the legislature might properly require of others that which we are not willing it should exact from us."

This thing was not done in a corner, and the *Tribune* ought to have known the facts before trying to state them.

The *Tribune* continues:—

The law provides the largest religious freedom consistent with common sense and good government; it cannot undertake to adjust itself to exactly suit the views of the Adventists whose peculiar ideas lead them into deliberate violation of the law.

Then why does not the *Tribune* obey the "law"? If the "law" is so good and so just, what possible excuse can the publishers of a

newspaper have for violating it, as is done in the *Tribune* office fifty-two weeks every year? Or are we to understand that it is all right to violate the Sunday "law" for gain, but wrong to violate it for conscience' sake?

But the *Tribune* says that "the Adventist is not compelled to labor on Sunday; he is not compelled to observe it in a religious manner; it does not force him to observe Saturday as a religious day; he can devote any day in the week he chooses to religious observance or worship, and so can anybody else. Sunday is the accepted sabbath of this country, and the law protects it as a day of rest."

Again, the *Tribune* is discussing questions about which it knows nothing. The Adventist is compelled by the law of the Sabbath to labor on Sunday, for only by habitually treating it as a common day can he obey the fourth commandment. But in view of the utterances quoted, what possible excuse can the *Tribune* have for violating the Sunday statute of the State of Tennessee?

"The Man-made Sabbath" *American Sentinel* 10, 33 , pp. 258, 259.

THE weakness and imperfection of human handiwork are often apparent enough in mundane things, but in the man-made sabbath they attain to such surpassing proportions as to eclipse all else. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, the Sabbath being a thing that is divine?

The man-made sabbath is the Sunday. This institution must be upheld by force, or it will fall to the ground. But force does not commend itself in such a thing to the upright person. Force is for the wicked, not for the good.

It cannot be upheld without force, and it cannot be enforced without working hardship to innocent people. But a sabbath that works hardship upon people, works exactly contrary to the divine purpose of the Sabbath, which is to do people good and not to injure them. Human wisdom and discretion must direct the enforcement of the human sabbath, and these qualities, finite in themselves and often coupled with and controlled by a blind zeal, make it inevitable that the enforcement of the man-made sabbath should often be attended by injustice. Along with the poisonous liquor which should not be drunk on any day, the Sunday law is quite liable in many instances to shut away from poor people some of the necessities of life. Cases illustrating this have been evolved from the effort now in

progress to enforce the Sunday law in this city. And still greater is the hardship which it brings upon those who, in obedience to God's command, observe the seventh day,—subjecting them to persecution and imprisonment, to say nothing of the financial loss which would result to them from Sunday idleness.

Contrast with this man-made sabbath, the divine institution, "the Sabbath of the Lord," that was made by Him who is infinite, who created man and sustains and ministers to him in all the needs of his human nature, even numbering the hairs of his head. At the close of creation, God rested on the seventh day and blessed that day, that it might be a blessing to mankind. He made it a day of delight to all who observe it, without a single exception. Upon this point he says, "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." Isa. 58:13, 14. Here is delight in its highest and most elevating form, and this delight God pledges to every observer of his holy day. There is no hardship in the Sabbath of the Lord, but only blessing; for it brings each individual into communion with Him who is infinite in goodness, in wisdom and in power.

God's Sabbath was made for man. Mark 2:27. This the Saviour said when he rebuked the Pharisees who found fault with his disciples because they plucked and ate the grain as they were passing through the fields on the Sabbath day. The Pharisees had made a sabbath which was against man, by perverting the divine institution to an agreement with their own human ideas, and loading it with man-made restrictions, by which a person would be compelled to go hungry on the Sabbath if the least work, such, for example, as that done by the disciples, were involved in the preparation of his food. To keep the Sabbath as they had made it by their traditions, was an intolerable burden, a mere exhibition of a person's powers of endurance. Parallel with this "Jewish Sabbath," and partaking of the same nature, was the Puritan Sunday, with its austere regulations for the deportment of old and young. This was against men, both in the day which it required to be observed, and in the manner of its observance. God has blessed only the seventh day, and only that day

can bring the Sabbath blessing to mankind. Man cannot bless a day or make it holy or cause it to be a blessing and a delight to those who observe it. This can be done only by the power of God.

But while the seventh day has been made a day of special blessing and delight by the act of God, and while he has both the power and the wisdom that enable him to deal impartially with every person, he does not force men and invites them to receive it as a blessing from him, but leaves all free to choose whether they will do so or not. It is left for the man-made sabbath to be thrust upon people by force. Having neither the power nor the wisdom nor the Word of God to give it force, its dependence is only human precepts, human example and enactments. And as human precept and example are found insufficient to give it respect and stability among men, the highest power of man is invoked in its support, which is the power of law. But human law cannot change the heart, or touch the hidden springs of love and free will which must be called into action in true Sabbath keeping, as set forth in the Word of God.

This completes the picture of human folly which is being exhibited before the world by the misguided people who are working to force Sunday keeping upon their fellowmen by law. Sabbath making and Sabbath enforcing are things altogether beyond the finite wisdom

259

and power of man. Meanwhile the Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day, blessed and sanctified by Him and perfectly adapted to our human needs,—remains for all mankind, a a [*sic.*] day of blessing and delight to all who choose its observance, and a sign of their vital connection with the one true God, the Creator of heaven and earth.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 33 , p. 264.

FURTHER particulars concerning the prosecutions in London, Eng., for Sunday labor, inform us that the Adventist publishing house on Holloway Road has been fined about \$100 (including costs) for successive violations of the Sunday (factory) law, and the defendants were informed that in case the fines are not satisfied there will be an imprisonment of fourteen days for each offense.

The ostensible aim of this factory law is to protect woman and minors from being overworked; but in this prosecution there is no charge of overwork or of hardship to the employÉs, all of whom rest on the seventh day of the week. The prosecution rests solely on the fact that work was done on the first day of the week. Instead of being

a protection to these employÈs, the law, as it is applied, actually works hardship to them, since it would deprive them of one-sixth of their wages. The manager of the office is prosecuted under a law designed to protect employÈs, because the law is not allowed to work exactly contrary to its purpose! Was ever a law made to exhibit such absurdity of injustice?

The trouble is, it is a Sunday law. Doubtless its originators thought it a very benign and useful piece of legislation, as indeed it seems upon its face. But there was a dead fly in the ointment, and now it comes to light. And that is true of every legal measure which has within it the Sunday institution. Sunday laws will never operate as they are intended; for they are contrary to the eternal law of right.

THE *Christian Statesman* complains that the nation has never witnessed such a carnival of Sunday "desecration" as "we are having this present summer." A large share of the blame the *Statesman* lays at the door of camp-meeting managers, and says:—

Church members do not feel their responsibility for the preservation of the sabbath as they should. Consistent loyalty to the Lord of the Sabbath requires separation from their sin. But it is clear that nothing short of statute law, properly enforced, will meet the necessities of the case as set forth above.

What a confession! Church members must be compelled by statute to manifest a "loyalty" for the Lord of the Sabbath which they do not feel! But is it any wonder, since the leaders of religious thought defiantly trample upon the real Sabbath, the Lord's day of the Scriptures, heap contempt upon it, and attempt to compel the observance of a counterfeit without divine warrant? Is it any wonder, we say, that even members of Sunday-keeping churches do not respect the day?

APROPOS of the note from J. W. Scoles, relative to the conviction of five Adventists in Illinois, is the suggestion that it seems to make a deal of difference whose ox is gored. In those States where the statutes make no exception in favor of observers of another day, the courts seem to act their part very reluctantly, and only because it is their "duty" under the "law." But in States having such exceptions the courts seem determined to find some way of evading the plain provisions of the statute so that the hated Adventists may be convicted right or wrong. It is simply the beginning of the end.

August 29, 1895

"Rome and the Bible" *American Sentinel* 10, 34 , pp. 265, 266.

IT is a boast of the Roman Catholic Church that "Rome never changes;" and yet few people realize how true it is that the Roman Catholic Church of to-day is the same in spirit, in purpose, and in policy as was the Roman Catholic Church in the sixteenth century.

September 5, 1893, Mgr. Satolli, speaking for the pope of Rome, bid the people of the United States to "go forward, in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth—the Bible—and in the other, the Constitution of the United States." But let no one be deceived by this apparent change of front by the papacy. Rome's attitude toward the Bible is just what it has always been, namely, one of hostility to the Word of God uninterpreted by "the church."

Prior to the Reformation, the Bible was an unknown book, so far as the common people were concerned; but few even of the priests had ever seen the Book, and fewer still had ever read the sacred Volume, Luther never saw a Bible until he was twenty years of age; and until that time imagined that "those fragments of the gospels and epistles that the church had selected to be read to the people during public worship every Sunday throughout the year," composed the whole Word of God. ⁷⁴¹

It may be said that this was the fault of the times and not of the church; that all books were rare and expensive. But that Rome could have given the Scriptures to the people in the living languages of Europe, is proved by the fact that the Reformers did it in a single generation, in the face of the most bitter opposition by the papal church.

The fault was not with the times but with an apostate church, which not only kept the Word of God locked in dead languages, but forbade the reading of it under heavy penalties. Our illustration shows with what trepidation the people read the Scriptures in those days. It was against the law to read the Bible, and they watched as they read, as a housebreaker watches lest detection overtake him; and startled at the slightest noise, even as the hunted deer starts at the snapping of a twig or the rustle of a fallen leaf.

But the Reformation unsealed the previous Volume. "Tyndall and Luther," says Dr. Wylie, "the one from his retreat at Vildorfe in the Low Countries, and the other from amid the deep shades of the

Thuringian forest, sent forth the Bible to the nations in the vernacular tongues of England and Germany."

The thirst thus awakened for the Scriptures, Rome did not think it wise to openly oppose. Civil penalties could no longer be invoked to punish those who read the Word of God. But papal policy was equal to the emergency. The Council of Trent enacted ten rules regarding the reading of prohibited books; and in the fourth rule the council prohibits anyone from reading the Bible without a license from his bishop or inquisitor—that license to be founded upon the certificate from his confessor, that he "is in no danger of receiving injury from so doing." The council further said: "If anyone shall dare to keep in his possession that book [the Bible], without such a license, he shall not receive absolution until he has given it up to his ordinary." ⁷⁵²

Such was the attitude of Rome toward the Bible at the era of the Reformation, and

266

such it is to-day. "No farther back than 1816," says Wylie, "Pope Pius VII., in his bull, denounced the Bible Society, and expressed himself as 'shocked' by the circulation of the Scriptures, which he characterizes as a 'most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined;' 'a pestilence,' which it behoves him 'to remedy and abolish;' 'a defilement of the faith, eminently dangerous to souls.' He congratulates the primate, to whom his letter is addressed, on the zeal he had shown 'to detect and overthrow the impious machinations of these innovators;' and represents it as an episcopal duty to expose 'the wickedness of this nefarious scheme,' and openly to publish 'that the Bible printed by heretics is to to [*sic.*] be numbered among other prohibited books, conformably to the rules of the index; for it is evident from experience, that the holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit.' ⁷⁶³ Thus, in the solemn judgment of the Church of Rome, expressed through her chief organ, the Bible has done more evil than good, and is beyond comparison the worst book in the world." ⁷⁷⁴

In America, Satolli, the papal delegate, tells the people to "go forward bearing in one hand the book of Christian truth—the Bible;" but in Roman Catholic countries the Word of God is still a forbidden book; and as we shall see, the Bible, as the supreme authority in matters of faith, is still forbidden by Rome even in this country.

Some years ago, while Rome was yet under the rule of the pope, and English clergyman found it impossible to purchase in the city of Rome a single copy of the Scriptures of portable size in the language of the people; and when he inquired of each bookseller the reason of his not having so important a volume, the answer in every instance was "*E prohibite*," or "*Non ? permissio*;"⁷⁸⁵ that is, the volume was prohibited, or not permitted to be sold. It is a matter of general knowledge that at the present time Protestant colporters in the Roman Catholic countries of South America, are not permitted to circulate freely copies of the Scriptures. They are hampered and hindered in a hundred ways, and are often arrested and thrown into prison upon the slightest pretext, evidently to prevent them from putting the Bible into the hands of the people.

But does not Rome permit the reading of the Bible by her people in the United States? Yes; but of the Catholic version only, and that is never printed without notes. The Roman Catholic Church claims to be the only authorized interpreter of the Scriptures, and she suffers her people to receive the Scriptures only as she interprets them; and when Rome says, "Go forward, bearing in one hand the book of Christian truth—the Bible,"—she means the Roman Catholic bible, and that interpreted by the church; for Rome has repeatedly refused to authorize the circulation among Catholics of the Douay version of the Scriptures, without note or comment.

The creed of Pope Pius IV., which every Catholic is taught to recite, and to which every priest is required to subscribe, thus defines the sense in which Rome admits even her own version of the Scriptures:—

I do also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother, the church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the *unanimous consent of the fathers*.

To the same intent, the present pope, Leo XIII., says:—

The professors [teachers] of Holy Scripture, therefore, amongst other recommendations, must be well acquainted with the whole circle of theology and deeply read in commentaries of the holy fathers and doctors and other interpreters of mark.

Thus Rome interposes insurmountable barriers between the people and the Bible, even while professing to freely give them the sacred Volume, bidding them go forward, bearing it in the right hand.

"The Protestant Bible," says Rome, "is only a false skin, in which infidelity and revolution wrap themselves." ⁷⁹6 But Rome no longer fears the Bible in the United States as she once feared it, because the Bible is no longer regarded by the great mass of the people of this country as it was once regarded. The higher criticism and the thousand and one evasions of the plain Word of God, which have been adopted by so-called Protestants to support unbiblical doctrines, have so discredited the bible and so instilled into the minds of the people the papal idea that the Bible must be interpreted, that Rome now feels safe in bidding the people thus educated to go forward, bearing in one hand the emasculated and discredited Bible, and in the other the perverted Constitution of the United States.

The very foundation principle of true Protestantism was thus set forth in the protest of the princes at Spires, April 12, 1529:—

"There is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God." "The Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine." "Each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts." "This Holy Book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness; we are resolved, with the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only Word, such as is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine and of all life, and can never fall or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell whilst all the human vacuities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God."

It is before the Bible regarded in this light that Rome trembles. But Protestants are no longer taught to reverence the Word of God as did the German princes; they are no longer taught that a plain "Thus saith the Lord" is the end of controversy. They are, on the contrary, taught to accept what men have said *about* the Bible rather than the Bible; and as this is distinctively Roman Catholic doctrine, Rome can well afford now to appear as the champion of the Scriptures, for she well knows that, under the influence to which we have referred, the Bible has lost its power with the people; and she no longer fears it.

"Rome never changes," but times changes; and the changed attitude of Rome toward the Bible is not a change in principle but in policy. The same hostility to the Word of God exists as formerly; but as Protestants are no longer taught to look upon the Bible as of supreme authority, but regard it as something that must be interpreted, Rome no longer opposes the Bible but sets herself forth

as the interpreter, expounder, and defender of that sacred Book. There is, in fact, an unconscious conspiracy between Rome and apostate Protestantism, and Rome's so-called change of front is due to this conspiracy.

"Keeping the Fourth Commandment" *American Sentinel* 10, 34 , pp. 266, 267.

THE commandments of God are given men to be kept every day in the week, and to this rule the fourth commandment is no exception.

That commandment says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." The Sabbath day is holy, for God made it so; and we are commanded to keep it holy. How are we to do this?

God made the Sabbath day holy by resting from his work upon it, blessing and sanctifying it. Gen. 2:2, 3. This separated the Sabbath day from the other days of the week.

267

They are working days; it is the sacred rest day. Eze. 46:1.

This distinction we are commanded to preserve. In the words of Deut. 5:12, we are to "keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it." To sanctify means to make separate, or distinct, from surrounding things. This definition is based upon Scripture.

When the Lord was about to come down in his majesty upon Mount Sinai and proclaim his law in the presence of the assembly of Israel, he gave directions to Moses concerning the mount, telling him, "Thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it; whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death." And afterwards Moses, alluding to the same, said, "The people cannot come up to Mount Sinai, for Thou chargedst us, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it." Ex. 19:12, 23.

Another illustration is furnished in the narrative of God's meeting with Moses at the burning bush. As Moses turned to behold the bush, God said to him, "Draw not nigh hither; put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." Ex. 3:5.

Mount Sinai, while it was the abode of God, was sanctified,—set apart from the country about it, by the bounds placed around it, through which the people were not permitted to pass. The ground about the burning bush was likewise set apart from other ground, being made holy by the presence of God. By being thus separated or set apart, it was sanctified.

To sanctify the Sabbath, therefore, we must keep it separate, or distinct, from other days. It has been made so by the act of God, and this distinction we must preserve. Hence, while we are to regard the Sabbath as a sacred rest day, we must also regard the other days as working days. And this precludes us from regarding Sunday as a rest day.

Therefore it is utterly impossible to keep the Sabbath holy—to sanctify it—while making a weekly rest day of Sunday. To make Sunday a rest day, is to break in upon the distinction which pertains to the Sabbath. To keep the Sabbath commandment, we must regard the first six days as working days, as well as rest upon the seventh.

Let no one then assert that the law of the State commanding the observance of Sunday is not of a nature to interfere with the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath. It is directly contrary to the fourth precept of God's law, and forces upon every observer of that precept whom it reaches, the question whether he shall render obedience to God or to man?

"Righteousness by Statute" *American Sentinel* 10, 34 , p. 267.

THE *World*, of the 16th inst., thus contrasts New York's policy with that pursued in Chicago:—

If there is anything which the city of New York can do in the way of aiding the mayor of Chicago to make government easier and better in the western city, it ought to do it. We owe him a debt of gratitude for having expressed in just thirteen short words a doctrine that is at the present time of vital importance to New York.

Mayor Swift says: "Out in Chicago we don't think men can be made righteous by statute." The opinion of New York is identical with that of Chicago. The difference between the two places is that in Chicago the authorities, recognizing the impossibility of making men "righteous by statute," do not attempt the impossible, whereas in New York a young police commissioner, clothed with the novelty of power, acts on the theory that he can make men righteous by statute, although he would probably admit as a matter of fact that such an achievement was impossible even for a police commissioner.

But Chicago is not consistent in the stand it has taken, as is witnessed by the fact that while it cannot make men "righteous by statute," to the extent of closing saloons on Sunday, the authorities of that city propose to make Seventh-day Adventists "righteous" by

compelling them to cease work on that day. There is a vast deal of hypocrisy in both New York and Chicago.

"Progress of National Reform" *American Sentinel* 10, 34 , p. 269.

THE *Christian Statesman*, of August 10, published an article upon the progress of National Reform, in which it recounts with evident satisfaction, the conquests made by the National Reform movement since its inauguration in 1863.

"A little over thirty years ago," says the *Statesman*, "a few National Reformers went about our country lecturing on the kingship of Christ. They were met with a very cool reception." "But," continues the *Statesman*, "the workers never lost heart; they continued holding their local meetings and national conventions and sending out their literature."

The publication of the *Christian Statesman* was commenced in 1867. At that time the entire daily press of the country was opposed to the movement; and "the religious weeklies with rare exception," says the *Statesman*, "were also hostile, or at the best utterly indifferent. It was not simply the idea of a constitutional acknowledgment of Christ as King that was regarded as so impracticable or absurd, but the idea of the kingship itself. The thought seemed to prevail on every hand, even among the members of the evangelical churches, that the truth of Christ's kingly office was a theological doctrine with which civil government and nations had nothing to do."

"But," exclaims the *Statesman*, "what a marvelous change is witnessed to-day! The 'Good Citizenship' movement of the Christian Endeavor Society is only one of many indications as to the moral revolution that has taken place. Papers are springing into existence to advocate the truth that Jesus Christ is the Saviour and Governor of the nation. The *Christian Statesman*, once so lonely, now has plenty of company in the maintenance of this truth. And the National Reform Association is now not the only organization for the dissemination of the principles of Christian civil government. Other societies are being organized throughout our land with such avowed aims as the following, which we quote from document No. 11 of the series issued by the National Christian Citizenship League: 'It already has auxiliaries in various States and Territories, and exists for the following purposes: 1. To reveal Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the

State and nation as well as of the individual. 2. To make Christian principles operative in public affairs. 3. To unite the followers of Christ in consistent, harmonious, and aggressive action for these purposes."

This is, as the *Statesman* very properly says, taking up the very same work that the National Reform Association has been engaging in for over thirty years; and what that movement is, the *Statesman* then proceeds to define: It is to incorporate the fundamental principles of Christian civil government into our nation's fundamental law. In short, National Reform means a man-made theocracy. It means men ruling in the place of God; it means an image to the papacy, for the papacy is the man of sin, sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. And National Reform, whether called by that name or whether dubbed "Christian Citizenship," is practically the same thing; it is a new papacy, an image of the power that has its seat upon the seven hills.

It is all very well enough to talk about making the law of God the fundamental rule of national life; but who is to define the law of God? As Richard M. Johnson so tersely expressed in [*sic.*] in 1829: "Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God."

Persecution is inseparable from the assumption to rule in the place of God. It was for this reason, that our forefathers sought to establish in this country a purely secular government.

This principle was recognized by the Presbytery of Hanover in Virginia; when, in 1776, it addressed the Virginia House of Assembly a memorial in which occurred these words:—

It is at least impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility, *which would lead us back to the church of Rome.*

Whoever assumes to decide a religious question for anybody else, assumes the prerogative of infallibility as truly as does the pope of Rome, and thus leads all who follow him, back to the church of Rome; and this the government must do if it shall undertake to make the law of God the fundamental law of the land. It must decide what the law of God is, and having decided what it is, it must decide what it means, as was done in the World's Fair Sunday legislation when Congress decided that the fourth commandment now requires the observance of Sunday. National Reform means that such questions

shall not only be discussed and decided in the halls of Congress, but in our courts of justice; and it is to such a *regime* as this that not only the *Christian Statesman* and the National Reform Association, but all the auxiliaries to which the *Statesman* has referred, are pledged. And it is such a *regime* as this that the SENTINEL has opposed and will ever continue to oppose.

"Wants to Set Himself Right" *American Sentinel* 10, 34 , p. 272.

REFERRING to our illustrated number of August 15, a Knoxville, Tenn., pastor, writes us as follows:—

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL:

Gentlemen: Having given a partial quotation of an interview which I accorded a reporter for the SENTINEL, a daily paper of this city, on the subject of the punishment of the Tennessee Adventists for violation of the Sunday laws of the State of Tennessee, I ask that you do me the justice of publishing the closing paragraph of that same interview, as follows:—

"As to so-called Sunday laws, I believe they could, and certainly should be so framed as to duly respect the conscience of the subject. It is to be regretted that a body of religionists who conscientiously regard some other day of the week than Sunday as sanctified to holy purposes cannot, under the existing laws of our commonwealth, have their conscience respected. I believe, however, they would themselves prefer the enforcement of the law as it exists, to having its provisions disregarded at the expense of correct public notions touching the supremacy of the law. Perhaps in this I credit them with a patriotism their lips would discision. However, I think not."

I have no doubt you will give the foregoing a place in your paper, together with so much of this letter as may be needful. That you will be as careful to send marked copies of the paper in which it shall appear, to various sources in this city, as you were to furnish the same sources with your issue of the 15th inst. can not be questioned.

Very truly yours,

THOS. C. WARNER.

Knoxville, Tenn., August 31st, 1895.

We cheerfully comply with Mr. Warner's request, though we do not see that it alters the case materially. We quoted only a portion of the interview because we had not space for all of it, and because his opinion of what a Sunday law ought to be could not affect his deliberate judgment that—

The question of righteousness should never decide whether an existing law is to be enforced or not. Is it the law of the land? That question settled in the affirmative, then let the law be enforced. If the law is unjust, if it works hardship to innocent persons, still let it be executed so long as it remains upon the statute books.

We said before, and we say again, that this being Mr. Warner's deliberate convictions, he must have said the same thing in the glare of the fires that consumed the martyrs in France or Spain, or at the foot of the gallows tree whereon the Protestants of Holland were executed; for it was all only the enforcement of civil law. We are glad that Mr. Warner's better self revolts at the *logic* of the words which his lips uttered. The country can well dispense with the "loyalty" which says: "If a law is unjust, if it works hardship to innocent persons, still let it be enforced so long as it remains upon the books."

Mr. Warner has not exactly retracted this unguarded utterance, but we are glad to believe that he spoke without realizing that he thereby justified all the crimes which have been committed in the name of law in this wicked world; and their name is legion.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 34 , p. 272.

MRS. J. C. BATEHAM, Superintendent of the Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, has an article in the *Christian Statesman*, of August 3, in which she protests mildly against the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, and says:—

A clause providing exemption for those who conscientiously observe Saturday instead of Sunday, and are careful not to disturb the rest of others, should always be inserted even if those provisions may occasionally be abused. . . . Courtesy and the Golden Rule require that even at partial expense of uniformity the consciences of the minority should be protected.

This statement does credit to Mrs. Bateham's heart. It is perhaps all that could be expected of one in her position. It does seem that almost everyone ought to be able to see that all Sunday legislation is improper, and that all Sunday-law enforcement savors of religious persecution. Mrs. Bateham can see this in the case of the enforcement of the so-called law against Adventists in Tennessee. She says, "It savors of religious persecution, which, looked at on the lowest plain, is thoroughly impolitic since making martyrs for conscience always increases the following, and nothing more prejudices the onlooker than appearance of lack of fair play."

This is indeed looking at the matter from the "lowest plain." But we do not attribute this motive to the lady in question; we believe that it is her innate sense of justice that leads her to protest against persecution. Having seen and admitted so much, may she be enabled to see more.

THE *Sabbath Recorder* thinks our strictures of August 1, unjust, and complains that we quoted only a part of what it said. We can only say that we had no intention to be unfair; nor do we think that we did our contemporary any injustice, though our criticism was probably unnecessarily caustic. This latter we regret. We still think, however, that one unacquainted with the facts in the case, could get no other impression from the *Recorder's* vote than that some at least of the persecuted Seventh-day Adventists had been unnecessarily offensive to their neighbors, and had thus needlessly brought trouble upon themselves. This we deny in *toto*, and base our denial not upon the unsupported assertion of the Adventists themselves, but upon the sworn testimony of the State's witnesses in the several cases. We are sure that in not a single one of the scores of cases tried during the past ten years in several different States, has there been any evidence of aggravation. The annoyance charged has all been of the kind that is begotten of bigotry and intolerance, and is born of an unwillingness on the part of the persecutors to award to others equal rights with themselves.

"More Tennessee Injustice" *American Sentinel* 10, 34 , p. 272.

AUGUST 19, the authorities of Rhea County, Tenn., notified the Seventh-day Adventists whom they have been driving in the chain-gang for nearly two months, that they will be required to make up the time which they have "lost" by keeping the Sabbath. Thus these men are being punished directly for obeying the fourth commandment.

The constitution of Tennessee provides that "no man shall in time of peace be required to perform any service to the public on any day set apart by his religion as a day of rest;" but this constitutional guarantee is being deliberately violated by the authorities of Rhea County, who are punishing men for not working on a day set apart by their religion as a day of rest.

"Wants to Set Himself Right" *American Sentinel* 10, 34 , p. 272.

REFERRING to our illustrated number of August 15, a Knoxville, Tenn., pastor, writes us as follows:—

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL:

Gentlemen: Having given a partial quotation of an interview which I accorded a reporter for the SENTINEL, a daily paper of this city, on the subject of the punishment of the Tennessee Adventists for violation of the Sunday laws of the State of Tennessee, I ask that you do me the justice of publishing the closing paragraph of that same interview, as follows:—

"As to so-called Sunday laws, I believe they could, and certainly should be so framed as to duly respect the conscience of the subject. It is to be regretted that a body of religionists who conscientiously regard some other day of the week than Sunday as sanctified to holy purposes cannot, under the existing laws of our commonwealth, have their conscience respected. I believe, however, they would themselves prefer the enforcement of the law as it exists, to having its provisions disregarded at the expense of correct public notions touching the supremacy of the law. Perhaps in this I credit them with a patriotism their lips would discision. However, I think not."

I have no doubt you will give the foregoing a place in your paper, together with so much of this letter as may be needful. That you will be as careful to send marked copies of the paper in which it shall appear, to various sources in this city, as you were to furnish the same sources with your issue of the 15th inst. can not be questioned.

Very truly yours,

THOS. C. WARNER.

Knoxville, Tenn., August 31st, 1895.

We cheerfully comply with Mr. Warner's request, though we do not see that it alters the case materially. We quoted only a portion of the interview because we had not space for all of it, and because his opinion of what a Sunday law ought to be could not affect his deliberate judgment that—

The question of righteousness should never decide whether an existing law is to be enforced or not. Is it the law of the land? That question settled in the affirmative, then let the law be enforced. If the law is unjust, if it works hardship to innocent persons, still let it be executed so long as it remains upon the statute books.

We said before, and we say again, that this being Mr. Warner's deliberate convictions, he must have said the same thing in the glare of the fires that consumed the martyrs in France or Spain, or at the foot of the gallows tree whereon the Protestants of Holland were executed; for it was all only the enforcement of civil law. We are glad

that Mr. Warner's better self revolts at the *logic* of the words which his lips uttered. The country can well dispense with the "loyalty" which says: "If a law is unjust, if it works hardship to innocent persons, still let it be enforced so long as it remains upon the books."

Mr. Warner has not exactly retracted this unguarded utterance, but we are glad to believe that he spoke without realizing that he thereby justified all the crimes which have been committed in the name of law in this wicked world; and their name is legion.

September 5, 1895

"Some Probabilities of the Southern Chain-gang System" *American Sentinel* 10, 35 , pp. 273-275.

LAMST May a Seventh-day Adventist of Austell, Ga., was sentenced to twelve months in the chain-gang for private work done on his own farm on Sunday. ⁸⁰¹

And now, as appears from the letter printed on page 275, like sentences of ninety days each, are hanging over W. A. McCutchen, a Seventh-day Adventist minister, and E. C. Keck, a Seventh-day Adventist teacher.

Nor is this all. The Austell Adventist is again threatened with arrest, as are also others of the same faith in Georgia. These facts, together with recent revelations of horrible cruelties practiced upon helpless convicts by the chain-gang authorities suggest the awful possibilities, yea, even probabilities, of the Southern chain-gang system.

As yet no man, so far as we know, has actually served in the Georgia chain-gang because of his religious opinions and practices, but men have so served in both Henry and Rhea counties, Tennessee: and at the date of this writing, seven Seventh-day Adventists are so serving in the latter-named county: and, like Mr. Allison, these men are threatened with further persecution in case they refuse to violate conscience and surrender their God-given and constitutional rights.

These convicted Adventists have been as humanely treated as it is possible to treat men who, for no offense against their fellow-men, are taken from their homes and families, and required to subsist upon prison fare, and to work ten hours per day under a southern sun, for daring to obey a command of God. But such a denial of sacred rights is itself barbarous cruelty.

In both Henry and Rhea counties, Tennessee, the chain-gang had fallen into disuse because it was found to be unprofitable, and it was revived specially for the punishment of Seventh-day Adventists. This is indicative of the temper of the Tennessee authorities.

The constitution of Tennessee provides that "No person shall in time of peace be required to perform any service to the public on any day set apart by his religion as a day of rest." Shielded by this wise and humane provision of the fundamental law of that State, no effort has been made in Tennessee to *compel* Seventh-day Adventists to labor upon the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord.⁸¹ 2 But the constitution of Georgia contains no such provision, and in view of the revelations of horrible cruelty already referred to, it is easy for the imagination to picture the treatment in store for the conscientious Christian who, being sentenced to the Georgia chain-gang for loyalty to the Sabbath, refuses to labor upon that day.

Some of the abuses of the Georgia chain-gang system have just been brought into public notice by a suit which has been entered by an ex-convict against the penitentiary lessees for damages, for injuries inflicted upon him by the barbarities to which he was subjected while serving in the chain-gang.

This man, Harvey Merritt, a negro, was, when he entered the chain-gang, strong and healthy. He was pardoned recently by the governor, only a shadow of his former self, being a complete physical wreck. Shortly after being placed in the chain-gang, Merritt was taken down with rheumatism and was unable to work. His legs and hips were so swollen that he could not walk; and yet he was refused medical assistance, and was subjected to the most inhuman treatment. We

274

quote his own words as they appeared in the New York *Herald*, of August 18:—

Dr. McCown, who was in charge, said I wasn't sick at all, and would not treat me. But all the five weeks, each morning they dragged me out to the works [a brickyard], which were about a half a mile out, and let me lie there all day. Then they dragged me back at night. They dragged me head first on my breast, and wore the skin all off of my belly and breast.

"For the first ten or fifteen days this man was not whipped. Then one of the lessees," says the *Herald's* correspondent, "visited the camp and ordered the whipping boss to give him a hundred lashes a

day for three months, or, until he would work. In vain did the poor convict explain that he was sick."

The next day the doctor and the lessee came to where Merritt was lying, in front of the building.

"Get up and walk," ordered the lessee.

The negro complained that he could not.

Then Captain James, who was whipping boss, took a heavy pole and beat the negro with it. "I was lying down," he says, "James hit me on the back of the head and shoulders. He was beating me when the doctor told him to stop, saying that anybody could see that I was sick."

Subsequently, this man was given seventy-five lashes. When cold weather came on he was refused shoes or sufficient clothing, and both his feet were badly frozen.

This man has employed as his attorney Col. E. N. Broyles, one of the best lawyers in Georgia, a man notably conservative, and one who does not figure in sensational cases. Colonel Broyles hesitated for some time to take this case because the statements made by the negro seemed to be incredible. He began an investigation, however, and was soon fully satisfied that the man was telling the truth.

The case of Merritt is an extreme one, but by no means isolated. Last winter there were numerous cases reported from Georgia, in which convicts suffered severely from insufficient clothing: some were compelled to work almost naked in icy water until their feet were frozen, and they were permanently crippled. Some lost portions of their feet, and in one or two cases, legs had to be amputated.

Such are the abuses to which, under the Sunday law of Georgia, God-fearing men, good citizens,⁸² 3 good neighbors, kind husbands and fathers, are liable to be subjected at any time; for while the abuses cited have occurred in connection with the penitentiary system, it is stated by the *Herald* that—

If the abuses in the penitentiary proper are bad, the abuses in the collateral branch, known as the county chain-gangs, are infinitely worse.

The men who are sentenced by the courts to short terms for misdemeanors—the men who, in the eyes of the courts, are not guilty of crimes [felonies]—fare worse than do the convicts in the penitentiary proper.

One of the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL visited Georgia recently for the express purpose of learning for himself the truth about the chain-gang system, and seeing for himself convicts actually at

work in chain-gangs. He saw, in the city of Atlanta, working in the Exposition Grounds and on streets adjacent thereto, several hundred convicts, each man wearing a chain: and watching each gang was a guard, with a Winchester rifle or a double-barreled shot-gun, ready to shoot down any man or boy who might attempt to escape.

Many of these men worked in an aimless, hopeless sort of way as though all the spirit was crushed out of them. Some wore double sharp tones, which indicated that they would brook no disobedience; and altogether the scene was one never to be forgotten.

Each country is allowed to work its misdemeanor convicts in chain gangs, and they are put to work on the roads or streets. It is not an unfamiliar sight to see men and boys wearing heavy shackles, working upon the roads, or upon the streets of cities; and, as in the case of the chain-gangs already described, each squad has its guard armed with a Winchester rifle or a double-barreled shot gun and a six shooter. The State has no reform school, and the writer saw boys of twelve or fourteen years of age wearing striped suits and working with other convicts in the chain-gang in Atlanta. Some of these boys looked like anything but hardened criminals, and were probably more sinned against than sinning. The younger ones did not wear chains while at work. Not long since, one of these boys was beaten to death by an inhuman overseer. A correspondent of the *New York Herald*, speaking, August 18, of the youthful convicts working in county chain-gangs, says:—

A Dodge County boy who was convicted of a misdemeanor, was sent to a chain-gang in Laurens County. He was needed in Dodge to testify in another case, and he came back there practically a physical wreck. It was shown that he had been so badly beaten that he could scarcely walk. There were great welts all over him. The evidences of cruelty were so marked that the county authorities at once presented the facts to the governor, and the boy was pardoned.

Another instance of cruelty in a county chain-gang, is thus reported by the same writer:—

William Griffin, a white convict, was interviewed by the *Yaldosta Times*, and told the story of how, on Christmas Eve, he saw one of the convicts flogged so badly that he died that night. This was in one of the private chain-gangs, which are operated in some of the smaller counties. The county itself has not enough convicts to warrant running a chain-gang of its own. Some enterprising individual succeeds in leasing these convicts and those from other small counties near by, and there he operates it, the absolute

monarch, without any restraint whatever. Instances have been cited where these men have held convicts beyond the time for which they were sentenced.

Griffin thus tells of the rations served in some of the county chain-gangs:—

For breakfast, half a pone of corn bread and a

275

small slice of meat; the same amount of bread and a slightly larger slice of meat for dinner; half a pone of bread and a little syrup for supper. Sometimes a small amount of greens at dinner, not half as much as a man would want to eat.

The term "meat" means here the side of hogs, almost all fat and heavily salted. The complaint is universal among the men that they do not have enough to eat.

As might be expected, the accommodations for sleeping are no better than the rations. At night the convicts are kept in ill-smelling, vermin-infested stockades. There is one such in Atlanta. The convicts are packed together like sardines in a box. A central chain runs through the building, and to this all the convicts are fastened by the leg-chains which they are required to wear constantly. Many stories are told of shameful neglect of these chained men. In fact, horrors equaling the stories of the sufferings of Russian exiles to Siberia are of every-day occurrence in the chain-gangs and stockades of Georgia.

These details are revolting even when we know that the men who suffer these things are justly deprived of their liberty and required to render services to the public; but revolting as are such scenes, they pale before the scenes which are almost certain to be witnessed ere long in the State of Georgia, when honest, God-fearing men shall be driven in the chain-gangs of that State and most barbarously treated for refusal to work upon the divinely-appointed Sabbath of the Lord.

Such injustice in milder form has been witnessed already in other States. But Georgia presents an unusually promising field for revolting outrages against religious liberty, from the fact that the laws of that State provide that one guilty of violating the Sunday law, may be "punished by a fine not to exceed \$1,000, imprisonment not to exceed six months, to work in the chain-gang upon the public works, or on such other works as the county authorities may employ the chain-gang, not to exceed twelve months; and any one or more of these punishments may be ordered, at the discretion of the judge."

Persistent refusal to work in the chain-gang would be counted insurrection, and might be punished with death; and would certainly be punished very severely by the grasping contractors. It is fearful to contemplate the probabilities growing out of the Georgia Sunday law; for Seventh-day Adventists convicted under that law would certainly refuse to work on the Sabbath; and judging by the treatment accorded to other prisoners, they could expect no mercy from their inhuman overseers. And yet we are living in the closing decade of the nineteenth century, in "free America," a so-called Christian land.

The question has been asked, "What if Christ should come to London, or Chicago, or to Congress?" But is it not equally pertinent to ask, What if he should come to Tennessee or Georgia, and there find in prisons, stockades, and chain-gangs, Christian men condemned for loyalty to the "Sabbath of the Lord"? Would he not say:—

I have come, and the world shall be shaken
Like a reed, at the touch of my rod.
And the kingdoms of time shall awaken
To the voice and the summons of God:
No more through the din of the ages
Shall warnings and chidings divine,
From the lips of my prophets and sages,
Be trampled like pearls before swine.
I turn from your altars and arches,
And the mocking of steeples and domes,
To join in the long, weary marches
Of the ones ye have robbed of their homes;
I share in the sorrows and crosses,
Of the naked, the hungry and cold,
And dearer to me are their losses
Than your gains and your idols of gold.
I will wither the might of the spoiler,
I will laugh at your dungeons and locks.
The tyrant shall yield to the toiler,
And your judges eat grass like the ox.
For the prayers of the poor have ascended
To be written in lightnings on high,
And the walls of your captives have blended
With the bolts that must leap from the sky. ⁸³⁴

"Because sentence against an evil work is not executed *speedily*, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." But deliverance is none the less certain. The justice of God slumbereth not.

"True Protestantism" *American Sentinel* 10, 36 , p. 275.

TRUE Protestantism is that Protestantism which most truly and forcibly protests against the evil principles represented in the religion of the papacy.

Those evil principles are older than the papal system, and true Protestantism is older than the Reformation.

The most effective protest against error is a statement of the truth: and as actions speak plainer than words, the most effective presentation of divine truth is found in the Christian life.

This is true Protestantism, and it is as old as the creation of man. Its effectiveness has been shown in all ages, by the persecution it has brought upon its exemplifiers in the world. It is shown now by the persecution directed against Christian violators of the Sunday law, by those who adhere to the papal doctrine that Sunday is the Sabbath, and that civil power should enforce religious dogmas, while other violators around them are not molested.

This Protestantism is not a mere negation, dependent on other doctrines for its existence. It is the living, positive, eternal truth of God. It was first, and the errors of Romanism and of all false religions came afterwards. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made," and by the same word truth has stood in all ages, stands now, and will stand eternally. The Reformers found that word, and receiving it in faith, they at once became Protestants. It is thus that true Protestants are made to-day.

"Is It Singular?" *American Sentinel* 10, 36 , p. 276.

BISHOP A. G. HAYGOOD, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, said in commenting upon the prosecution of Adventists in Tennessee: "Singularly these violators of civil law—claiming conscience for keeping Saturday—seem to have no conscience about breaking the law of the State their citizenship binds them to support.

Is it singular that a Christian, acting in the fear of God, refuses to do wrong, even though a law of the land commands it? Is it not a singular kind of a conscience which would dictate kind of a conscience which would dictate a blind obedience to every human enactment which might assume the form of law, even though as bad as the fugitive slave law, or some law of heathen lands? Would a Christian be thus bound by his conscience in China? Or were the

early Christians so bound under the laws of pagan Rome? If so, their martyrdom was due to their own folly.

Christians have always disregarded human laws when they were clearly contrary to the law of God. The Christian's conscience can not be separated from that law, for that is the eternal rule of right. That would be a singular kind of conscience which would make human law its guide, taking no account of the law of God. That is not the kind possessed by the Adventists.

"In the Chain-Gang Under the Flag" *American Sentinel* 10, 35 , pp. 277, 278.

[Reprinted by request from the SENTINEL of August 1.

IT was the evening of the third of July, that the eight Seventh-day Adventists, now in the chain-gang in Rhea County, Tenn., went to prison.

Court had adjourned until the following Monday, and the judge, before whom they had been tried, the attorney-general, who prosecuted them, and the jurors, who found them guilty, had all gone home to spend the Fourth—with their friends.

But not so with the convicted Adventists. Their wives and children, a number of whom had been in court to hear the judge's sentence, had bidden them a sorrowful good-by, and had gone to their now lonely homes. Most of their friends who had been with them through the trial had also gone home and left them—prisoners.

It was then the sheriff said, "Come on," beckoning them to fall into line for the march to the jail, which was to be their prison until the temporary workhouse should be ready for the occupancy of—the chain-gang.

A few moments sufficed to reach the prison, and then came the registration of their names with a detailed description of each man, so that should they escape they might be easily identified. But the eight Adventists had no thought of escape. They would not resist wrong and oppression even to the extent of seeking freedom in flight.

As the sheriff registered their names, some, earnest of the patriotic demonstrations of the morrow—"the glorious Fourth"—attracted their attention and reminded them that it was the even of the National Independence Day; and one of them said, with a smile and yet sadly,

and with just a touch of irony in his tone: "Sheriff, won't you please erect a liberty pole to-morrow where we can see it?"

Oh, what a train of thought is started by that question! What! a liberty pole and a flag for convicts? What could "Old Glory," the "Star Spangled Banner," the emblem of Freedom, the flag of both the State and the Nation, mean to men who had violated the "law" of the land, who had braved the power which wears the flag? What comfort could chain-gang convicts, "law" breakers, possibly derive from looking upon the banner unfurled by the power that enslaves them—that power that brands them as enemies of the State, and drives them to the stone pile with the vilest criminals, that locks them in loathsome cells or works them ten hours per day under a broiling sun, for no other offense than worshiping God according to the dictates of their own consciences? In short, What is the flag of the Union to Seventh-day Adventists to-day?

Ah! thrilling memories cluster around that flag; for while Seventh-day Adventists have no taste for war or carnage, while they as followers of the Prince of Peace are opposed to war, even as are the Quakers, they remember that it was in the providence of God that this land became an asylum for the oppressed of other lands; and they love the old flag because under its folds their forefathers found that liberty to worship, which was denied them in the Old World, and which is to-day denied Adventists in "free America;" not because of the flag nor of that for which it stands, but in flagrant violation of the principles represented by every fiber of that noble banner; principles for which patriots died in 1776, and for which in this year of our Lord, 1895, men toil in the chain-gang in Tennessee. And in the language of the poet these men can to-day look upon that flag and say—

"Thou art Freedom's child, Old Glory,
Born of Freedom's high desire."⁸⁴¹

The flag had its birth in the days of Washington, and Jefferson, and Madison, and Patrick Henry; in the days when men knew the value of liberty because they had known what it was to be denied freedom of conscience; in the days when humble Quakers, patient Mennonists, noble Baptists, and warmhearted Methodists and staunch Presbyterians alike claimed as an inalienable and God-given right, freedom to worship their Creator according to the dictates of conscience, and challenged the right of any man to dictate to them in matters of religion, or in any manner to come between them and their God.

Those stars and stripes stand for the immortal Declaration of Independence and for that noble charter of liberty, the Constitution of the United States; not as perverted by the Supreme Court decision of February 29, 1892, but as it stood when our fathers had written into it: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And just as men deprived of water, love to think of "parting streams and crystal fountains," of roiling rivers and wars-swept lakes, so Christian patriots, men who, living in all good conscience, render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's, love to look upon the banner of civil liberty, even though that which it represents has been denied them; yes, even though their hearts bleed for the wrongs which they suffer, and for the violence done to that freedom once cherished, but now lightly esteemed by so many who know not its worth; for they know that religious rights are as lasting as the rock-ribbed hills or snow-capped mountains, yea, that they are as eternal as the Everlasting King who gave them; that such rights "are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens however small;" and that though despotic power may invade those rights, "justice still confirms them." And they with the poet can say:—

Knave have stolen thee, Old Glory,
For their Babylonians lovers,
From their festal walls and towers
Droops the flag that then was ours;
O'er their crimes thy beauty trails,
And the old-time answer fails
When from chain-gangs, courts and jails
Men appeal to thee, Old Glory. ⁸⁵²

The flag is not a god, but in the providence of God it stands as the high water-mark of human liberty. But alas! as the sacred name of Christ has been made the cloak of most unchristian acts, so this providential symbol of liberty has been made the covering for most revolting crimes against the most sacred rights of men. And as Madame Roland, on her way to the guillotine, bowed before the clay statue of Liberty erected in the Place de la Revolution, exclaimed: "Liberty! Liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name;" as Seventh-day Adventists can to-day raise the stars and stripes with these words: "O banner of liberty, what crimes are committed under thy ample folds! what wrongs are done in thy name! what injustice

and oppression is practiced by those who are sworn to maintain the principles by which thou wast begotten!"

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves;" and we have fallen upon evil times, when men know not what true liberty means. Some in the mad pursuit of wealth, others in the fierce struggle for existence, have forgotten that he who fails to protest against the persecution of his neighbor, thereby virtually forfeits the right to protest when he is himself persecuted. Channing has well said: "The spirit of liberty is not merely, as multitudes imagine, a jealousy of our own particular rights, but a respect for the rights of others, and an unwillingness that any man, whether high or low, should be wronged."

It was the purpose of the founders of this Government to erect, if possible, impassable barriers against religious bigotry and intolerance. As remarked by the compiler of "American State Papers Bearing on Religious Legislation":—

Both Jefferson and Madison were opposed to the States having *anything whatever* to do with regulating religious observances of any kind; and the liberal spirit supported them. But as this spirit is supplanted by self-interests, the intolerance of State Courthouses again manifests itself in reviving the old religious laws, and prosecuting Sabbatarians for Sunday labor, etc. Jefferson, foreseeing this, designed to have all religious laws swept from the statute books, not willing to have them remain as a dead-letter, which might, at any time be revived by the partisan zealot. In his "Notes on Virginia," query, xvii, Jefferson says:—

"Besides, *the spirit of the time may alter, will alter*. Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. A single zealot may commence persecution, and better ones be his victims. It can never be too often repeated, that the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis, is while our rulers are honest, and

278

ourselves united. From the conclusion of this war we shall be going down hill. It will not then be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and *their rights disregarded*. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. *The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion.*"

In the light of current events, Jefferson's words seem almost prophetic. The spirit of the times have altered; our rules have, many

of them, become corrupt; and the question has been repeatedly asked of petitioners for justice, "How many are there of you? Have you political influence?" Our people have become careless, and in scores of cases a few bigots have commenced persecution and better men have been their victims. But neither the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, nor the banner which represents them in any nor in all of these. The fault lies at the door of fallen human nature, and the remedy is the power of God; for such things will be until He comes, whose right all dominion is, for his alone is a righteous rule. And the divine promise is: "At that time shall thy people be delivered; every one that shall be found written in the book."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 35 , p. 280.

JOHN MATHEWS, a Seventh-day Adventist, of Selton, Ont., was on August 28 put in jail at Chatham, Ont., for doing ordinary labor on Sunday. His "crime" was cutting hay on Sunday, July 7, and building a fence on Sunday, August 4. He was given the alternative by the judge of paying \$20.65 (fine and costs), or of spending thirty days in a prison cell. As he would not be a party to the iniquitous proceeding by any voluntary act, he refused to pay the fine, and is now in jail. And thus, to borrow the language of Gibbon, the world is fast becoming "a safe and dreary prison" for all such as honor God by keeping his Sabbath, and refuse to honor the rival institution, Sunday.

THE *Knoxville* (Tenn.) *Tribune* remarks that "Sunday laws are taking a new grip on themselves all over the country." This is true not only of this country but of all the world; with this exception, that said "laws" are taking a grip on Seventh-day Adventists rather than on themselves. If they gripped all violators alike, their purpose would be less evident and the *Tribune* would not be issued on Sunday as at present.

But an unjust statute is not made better by being universally applied, and we are glad that while Adventists toil in the chain-gang for private Sunday work the *Tribune* is unmolested. Every man has a natural, God-given right to work on Sunday whether he keeps another day or not, and he has that right even though he gives his voice in favor of denying the same right to his fellow-men.

AMS stated in these columns last week, the authorities of Rhea County, Tenn., not content with depriving honest, Christian men of

their God-given rights and driving them in the chain-gang for nearly two months, have decided to require them to serve an additional length of time because they would not work upon the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day.

Inasmuch as Sabbath-keepers alone have been singled out for prosecution, while others who have worked much more openly and in a way better calculated to disturb the general quiet of the day, than have Adventists, have not been prosecuted, it is patent to all that Adventists have been imprisoned and driven in chain-gangs, not for Sunday work, but for Sabbath rest. But plain as that is, it is even plainer that this additional penalty is a penalty imposed upon them directly for Sabbath rest. They are thus made to pay directly for the privilege of keeping the Sabbath; and this under a constitution which declares that "no human authority can in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience."

A Sunday-keeper must have his day protected by law, but the Sabbath-keeper must pay for the privilege of keeping the Sabbath of the Lord by a hard day's work for every Sabbath that he keeps while in prison; and by spending in idleness, if he obeys the "law," one day for every Sabbath he keeps while not in prison.

Certainly the State of Tennessee has reached a point where even the most obtuse can see that its prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists, is persecution, pure and simple.

THE *Kentucky Baptist Standard* (Waco, Texas), of August 15, has a very ill-natured note upon the imprisonment of Adventists in Tennessee, in which it sharply rebukes the *Indiana Baptist* and the *Journal and Messenger* for the sympathy they have given to the persecuted Adventists. The *Kentucky Baptist Standard* says:—

The Adventists are entirely familiar with the laws of the land on the Sunday question, and they get in jail for the very purpose of eliciting the sympathy of the public. We do not blubber over them at all. If they want to keep out of jail let them obey the law like other decent people, and they will be certain not to get into trouble. We think the authorities in Tennessee did exactly right in enforcing the law, and believe the Sunday laws we have are good laws, and that they ought to be kept on our statute books and rigidly enforce.

This is a strange utterance for a Baptist paper, and shows that intolerance has gained a foothold in that communion as well as in other churches whose past history does not justify us in expecting so much of them.

The statement is false, that Adventists "get in jail for the very purpose of eliciting the sympathy of the public." Adventists have done everything they reasonable could do to keep out of jail, except to surrender their consciences. We think the *Kentucky Baptist Standard* would do well to read up a little on the life of Roger Williams and the early history of the Baptist Church. Scores of Baptists have died in past ages for violating civil laws with which they were entirely familiar.

REV. EDWARD THOMPAMSON, LL.D., manager of the Sunday League of America, is conducting a Sunday campaign in this State. He spoke at Syracuse on a recent Sunday, the burden of his discourse being to show that this is a "Christian" nation. Of course, the "clinching" argument was Justice Brewer's decision in the Trinity Church case. "Dr. Thompson announced," says the *Syracuse Post*, "that he expected to hold a series of meetings in the city in about six months' time to agitate the Sunday question. Meanwhile the league, membership blanks for which were passed throughout the congregation, would busy themselves in the distribution of literature, which should set the people of Syracuse to reading, thinking and studying on the subject."

A few thousand copies of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, judiciously distributed in Syracuse, would do very much toward giving proper direction to the thoughts of the people on this subject. Who will do it?

THE *Iowa State Press*, published at Iowa City, comments as follows upon the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee:—

This sect is quite correct in contending that the Sunday of Christian observance, and the Sabbath kept under the old law, are not the same. The first Christians changed the day to be observed as they changed divers other matters, and the new holy day first obtained civil recognition under Constantine. He allowed them to hold services openly, and protected them from heathen intolerance. We of course know nothing of the gravity of the offense, but if it was only working on Sunday, without doing it so as to annoy people who worshiped on that day, we think the laws of Tennessee should be amended, so as to give the most perfect liberty to all, to keep every day as one of rest, if they can afford it, or not keep any day if so that pleased them better, always providing that the liberty to do as they please, did not extend to preventing anyone else from doing as they pleased.

We do not believe State interference in matters of belief, has ever been of any benefit, and we know it has invariably lessened respect for religion. The Adventists in Tennessee may have made

themselves offensive, not by their pious observance of the old Sabbath, but by a determination to keep it in such a way as to annoy others, to whom they knew it objectionable. Like where Macaulay says the Puritans abolished bear baiting, not because they pitied the bears, but because they knew it angered the Carders who loved the cruel sport.

We can assure our Iowa contemporary for the Tennessee Adventists have not intentionally disturbed anybody; indeed, we might go further than that, and say that *There has been no real disturbance to anybody*. Adventists are considerate, not only of the rights but of the prejudices of their neighbors. They are are [*sic.*] not only a liberty-loving people, and so go just as far as they conscientiously can in respecting the wishes of their neighbors. None of the work complained of in Tennessee was of a character or done in a place to be any real annoyance to anybody. The most noisy work done was putting clapboards on a house. Such work might be a real annoyance in a village, but this house stands in the woods at a distance from any other building; and the noise occasioned by the work, if heard at all by others would certainly not be loud enough to occasion any real annoyance, except annoyance such as a Protestant might feel in seeing a Catholic making the sign of the cross or sprinkling himself with holy water. Of course, this is very annoying to some people, but no person has any right to be annoyed at such things. Adventists have not made themselves offensive in any proper sense of that term; they have wronged no man; they have defrauded no man; they have trampled upon the civil rights of no man.

September 12, 1895

"History Repeating Itself" *American Sentinel* 10, 36 , pp. 281, 282.

HISTORY is repeating itself to-day in the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists.

It is denied by some that the Adventists are persecuted. But persecution has never been called by that name by those who engaged in it—it has always been "ONLY ENFORCING THE LAW."

Nor has there, as a general thing, been any attempt to justify persecution avowedly in the interests of religion. In every age and in every country religious intolerance has been defended, to a greater or less extent, on the ground of public policy.

Dissenters have ever been accused as enemies of the State, subverters of social order, disturbers of the public peace, and violators of the civil law, just as Seventh-day Adventists are to-day stigmatized as anarchists and indicted for acts "against the peace and dignity of the State."

Ahab's wicked accusation, contained in the question to Elijah, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?"⁸⁶ 1 has been repeated in various forms in every country and in every age, from that time until the present. It was not as a religious dissenter, that Elijah was persecuted, but as a disturber of the peace of the kingdom.

When Daniel was accused to the king, because he prayed three times a day with his windows open toward Jerusalem, contrary to the royal decree, the accusation was couched in these words: "Daniel, who is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed."⁸⁷ 2 And the argument which prevailed with the king, was: "Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, That no decree nor statute which the king establisheth, may be changed."⁸⁸ 3 Daniel's disobedience was held to be utterly subversive of civil order, and so worthy of death.

The Son of God was also accused as "one that perverteth the people;"⁸⁹ 4 and the prevailing argument with Pilate for his condemnation was, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Cesar."⁹⁰ 5 Religious bigotry simply invoked against Christ the penalties of the civil law. He suffered, not as an enemy of religion, but as an enemy of the State. The accusation written over him as he hung upon the cross, was, "The King of the Jews."⁹¹ 6

As with their Master, so with the disciples; they also were accused as disturbers of the public peace, as subverters of civil order. At Thessalonica the cry was, "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Cesar."⁹² 7

And at Ephesus the silversmiths raised a tumult because their craft was endangered (Acts 19:27) by the preaching of the apostles. Nor was the danger imaginary; so close was the relation between the prevailing faith and the social and commercial customs of the country, that it was easy to find what appeared to them to be a substantial secular basis for the legal prohibition of the preaching of Christ.

"There is no new thing under the sun;"⁹³ 8 and so we find Cardinal Gibbons endeavoring to discover civil reasons for the Inquisition, He

says: "The Spanish Inquisition was erected by King Ferdinand, less from motives of religious zeal, than from human policy. It was established, not so much with the view of preserving the Catholic faith, as of perpetuating the integrity of the kingdom. . . . It was, therefore, rather a royal and political, than an ecclesiastical institution." ⁹⁴⁹

282

Coming down a little nearer to our own time, we find one of the historians of New England, attempting to justify the banishment of Roger Williams, upon the ground that he was a disturber of the peace. He says:—

In all strictness and honesty he persecuted them—not they him; just as the modern "Come outer," who persistently intrudes upon some private company, making himself, upon pretense of conscience, a nuisance there; is—if sane—the persecutor, rather than the man who forcibly assists as well as courteously requires, his desired departure. ⁹⁵¹⁰

According to Bancroft, the pretext was that Williams was a foe to their civil institutions. He says:—

Roger Williams, the apostle of "soul-liberty," weakened civil independence by impairing its unity; and he was expelled, even though Massachusetts bore good testimony to his spotless virtue. ⁹⁶¹¹

Another of the historians of Massachusetts makes an argument similar to that of Dr. Baxter's. Of the Quakers and their persecutors, he says:—

It is to be as frankly and positively affirmed that their Quaker tormentors were the aggressive party; that they wantonly initiated the strife, and with a dogged pertinacity persisted in outrages which drove the authorities almost to frenzy. ⁹⁷¹²

It might appear as if good manners, and generosity and magnanimity of spirit, would have kept the Quakers away. Certainly, by every rule of right and reason, they ought to have kept away. They had no rights or business here. . . . Most clearly they courted persecution, suffering, and death; and, as the magistrates affirmed, "they rushed upon the sword." Those magistrates never intended them harm. . . . except as they believed that all their successive measures and sharper penalties were positively necessary to secure their jurisdiction from the wildest lawlessness and absolute anarchy. ⁹⁸¹³

Mr. Brooks Adams examines these accusations at length, and shows conclusively from the most authentic records, that the Baptists

and Quakers were not as a class guilty of any civil offense, properly so-called. He says:—

The early Quakers were enthusiasts, and therefore occasionally spoke and acted extravagantly; they also adopted some offensive customs, the most objectionable of which was wearing the hat. ⁹⁹14

Mr. Adams shows very clearly that the "annoyance" and "disturbance" attributed to Quakers was due simply to the intolerant feelings of their persecutors.

These inoffensive people were driven from their homes; were cruelly whipped; were banished from the colony; were hung like murders; and yet the testimony of the historian is, that while they "adopted some offensive customs," "the most objectionable" was "wearing the hat," that is, refusing to uncover in the presence of so-called superiors.

That which made "the wearing of the hat" so offensive in the Quaker, was his reason for doing it. "The Quaker scorned to take off his hat to any of them [rulers or nobles]; he held himself the peer of the proudest peer in Christendom. . . . Thus the doctrine of George Fox was not only a plebeian form of philosophy, but a prophecy of political changes. . . . Everywhere in Europe, therefore, the Quakers were exposed to persecution. Their seriousness was called melancholy fanaticism; their boldness, self-will; their frugality, covetousness; their freedom, infidelity; their conscience, rebellion." ¹⁰⁰15 "They were," says Bancroft, "hated by the church [the English establishment] and the Presbyterians, by the peers and the king. The codes of that day describe them as "an abominable sect;" "their principles as inconsistent with any kind of government." Thus it was the Quaker's principles, and not his hat, that gave offense, and it was for his principles that he was imprisoned in England and banished from Massachusetts. ¹⁰¹16

Though banishment was considered one of the milder forms of punishment, it was, when we come to consider the circumstances, barbarously cruel. To the east lay nearly three thousand miles of ocean, and beyond it the persecution from which they had fled; to the west, the trackless wilderness, inhabited by wild beasts and savage men. Banishment meant only too often death, by cold or hunger, or by the hands of savages.

Among the Quakers, banished from Massachusetts, was a family by the name of Southwick. October 19, 1658, the Southwicks were ordered to depart from the colony before the spring elections, namely,

to depart in a New England winter; but having no way of going, except on foot, their cattle having been previously seized and sold to pay fines, and they left well-nigh penniless, they remained in the colony, and the following May, says Mr. Adams, "found them once more in the felon's dock." When arraigned, they asked what wrong they had done. The judges answered that they were rebellious for not going as they had been commanded. "The old man and woman piteously pleaded 'that they had no otherwhere to go,' nor had they done anything to deserve banishment or death, though ?100 (all they had in the world) had been taken from them for meeting together."
10217

But their plea was of no avail. "The father, mother, and son, were banished under pain of death." "But their misery was well-nigh done; they perished within a few days of each other, tortured to death by flogging and starvation."

Whole columns might be written descriptive of the cruel injustice perpetrated upon inoffensive Baptists and Quakers in New England. The record of fines, imprisonment, whipping, and banishment, and hanging, is a long one; but we spare our readers.

These details are revolting, and the reader wonders that such things could have taken place. But why regard with horror the dark records of injustice in past centuries, when in our own day similar scenes are enacted. Already fines have been imposed; imprisonment has been endured; innocent men have been driven in chain-gangs; banishment has been indirectly attempted; and whipping and death must soon follow. In scores of cases, it has been heartlessly said of Adventists—"If they do not want to conform to our customs, let them leave the country." But where shall they go? The New England Baptists and Quakers had the trackless wilderness to which to flee. Roger Williams first found an asylum with the Indians, and subsequently settled in Rhode Island, founding a colony there. But where shall the persecuted Sabbath-keeper go? Were he to flee from the persecutions of civilized, "Christian" men, where are the savages with whom he might find refuge? where the wilderness in which he could plant a colony and make for himself a home?

Moreover, many of these people, if they were to go out at all, would have to go as our illustration shows the Quakers of New England going, stripped of all earthly possessions except the clothes on their backs. Injustice and oppression are robbing them of their goods, and when finally they are driven out, they will go penniless.

And yet this is neither China, nor Russia, nor Turkey; it is "free America;" neither are we living in the seventeenth century, but in the closing decade of the nineteenth, surrounded with all the influences of "Christian civilization," warned by the history of the Dark Ages, and taught by the experience of a century of civil and religious liberty. But our boasted civilization, like Rome, is crumbling under its own magnificence; the light of liberty is going out, extinguished by human selfishness.

Is there, then, no hope? Yea, verily: God lives, and when his people, weaned from earth by the things that they suffer, cry day and night for deliverance, "he will avenge them speedily."¹⁰³ 18 "Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your years: for the coming of the Lord draweth night." James 5:7, 8.

"Worse than Tennessee" *American Sentinel* 10, 36 , pp. 282, 283.

FROM clippings that have been sent us from the daily papers of Chatham, Ont., where Mr. John Matthews, a Seventh-day Adventist, is in jail for having regarded Sunday as a working day, in obedience to the fourth commandment, it seems likely that "Protestant" Ontario will soon make a record of persecution for conscience' sake, which will surpass any that has yet been made in Tennessee. A reporter of the Chatham *Daily Planet* publishes an interview which he had with the prisoner and with some of the officials concerned in the case, of which the following is a part:—

The prisoner takes the thing coolly enough. He thinks he's a martyr—says such fellows as he have to endure persecution and all that sort of thing. "I suppose I'll have to spend most of my days in jail, now," said the man to me. "Oh, I don't know about that," I answered. "The next time you'll probably get Central Prison, instead of jail; and I tell you what, my Christian friend, a month of the Central will sicken you."

"Will you put him at hard labor?" was asked the governor. "If there is any work to be done he'll have to take his turn with the rest," replied Mr. Mercer.

"Suppose he won't work on Saturday?"

"Well, he'll get into trouble, that's all. If he were at the Central and refused to work, they'd give him the cat."

In no other case that has yet arisen has it been announced, as it is here, that the imprisoned Adventist would be compelled to work on the Sabbath. In Tennessee and elsewhere in the United States, they have been allowed to observe the day set apart by the fourth commandment by refraining from work, in harmony with the dictates of their consciences. But in this case, should there be opportunity for its realization, the plainly-implied purpose is to compel the prisoner, if possible, to violate his conscience and work on the day set apart by his religion as sacred, by an application of the lash! This is the kind of religious freedom which is to-day allowed a good and upright citizen of the highly-civilized province of Ontario.

In addition to this, if the published report be true, Governor Mercer has taken upon himself to decide that the pastor of the church to which the prisoner belongs, Mr. A. O. Burrill, is not an ordained minister of the gospel: that is, that the ordination conferred upon Pastor Burrill, in accordance with the usage of the denomination to which he belongs, is not genuine ordination! Hence, the report says, the governor is in doubt as to how far Pastor Burrill should be indulged in the

283

privilege granted to ordained ministers, of visiting people in prison.

And all this occurs in a section of country where religious intolerance cannot be charged to political animosity, race prejudice, or any of those causes which some Northern journals, in commenting upon the persecutions in the South, have alleged as the underlying reasons therefore. The one cause of it all is the spirit of religious intolerance which is fast taking possession of people in all sections of the country, and not only here, but in the most civilized lands elsewhere.

"Roger Williams and Sunday Statutes" *American Sentinel* 10, 36 , p. 283.

JULY 18, Mr. A. F. Ballenger, of this city, addressed a letter to Mr. Sydney S. Rider, editor of *Book Notes*, Providence, R. I., and secretary of the Rhode Island Historical Society, making the following inquiry:—

Can you direct me to some work which will inform me as to how early Sunday laws were enacted in Rhode Island? It is very evident that Roger Williams denied the right of the civil magistrate to "punish a breach of the Sabbath," and it therefore becomes an

interesting question as to how early such laws were enacted in his colony.

In *Book Notes*, for July 27, Mr. Rider responded at some length, stating that the first Sunday law in Rhode Island bears date of Sept. 2, 1673—ten years before the death of Mr. Williams. This statute simply prohibited gambling and drunkenness upon the first day of the week. In 1679 it was extended somewhat, being amended so as to impose a fine "upon such evil-minded men as did" "require their own servants to labor upon the first day of the week, and hired the servants of other men for the same purpose."

In 1719, forty-six years after the death of Roger Williams, this law was again amended to read—"No person within this colony shall do, or exercise any labor or business or work of their ordinary calling, nor use any game, sport, play, or recreation on the first day of the week, under penalty," etc.

Mr. Rider says the fact that Mr. Williams held that "the magistrate ought not to punish the breach of the first table, otherwise than in such case as did disturb the civil peace," did "not mean that Williams denied the power of the civil magistrate to punish a breach of the Sabbath." We think that Mr. Rider errs in this. Henry S. Burrage, D. D., introduces this matter incidentally in his "History of the Baptists in New England." ¹⁰⁴1 Speaking of Roger Williams, he says:—

The church in Salem then called him, as the successor of Mr. Higginson, who, on account of feeble health, was compelled to retire from active service. The Salem Church was the oldest church in the colony, having been organized August 6, 1629, "on principles of perfect and entire independence of every other ecclesiastical body." The civil authorities in Boston protested against this action of the church in Salem: "That whereas Mr. Williams had refused to join with the congregation at Boston, because they would not make a public declaration of their repentance for having communion with the churches of England, while they lived there; and besides, *had declared his opinion that the magistrate might not punish the breach of the Sabbath, nor any other offense that was a breach of the first table*: therefore, they marveled they would choose him without advising with the council; and withal desiring that they would forbear to proceed till they had conferred about it." ¹⁰⁵ 2 Pages 14-15.

This makes it positively certain that this was at least understood to be Roger Williams' position upon this question at that time, and it ought to set the matter quite fully at rest.

The "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," article, "Roger Williams [*sic.*]," says:—

Mr. Williams had refused to join with the congregation at Boston, because they would not make a public declaration of their repentance for having communion with the churches of England while they lived there; and besides *had declared his opinion that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the Sabbath* nor any other offense, as it was [which was considered] a breach of the first table [first four commandments] of the Decalogue.

It was for this opinion that Mr. Williams was banished from Massachusetts, as will appear from the following further quotation from the "Schaff-Herzog," as follows:—

The most noted of the proscribed opinions of Williams was the doctrine that the civil magistrate should not inflict punishment for purely religious error. It has been urged that it was not simply for his doctrine of religious liberty, but for other opinions also, that Williams was banished. This, however, will not exculpate the General Court; for we find them enacting a law, that "If any person or persons within the jurisdiction . . . shall deny . . . their [the magistrates'] lawful right or authority . . . to punish the outward breaches of the first table . . . every such person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment." In other words, though it be admitted that Williams was banished for other utterances, together with the proclamation of the doctrine of religious freedom, *the court deemed it proper to decree banishment for that teaching alone.*

The "American Cyclopedia," article, "Roger Williams," speaking of the proposed settlement of Mr. Williams as assistant pastor to the congregation at Salem, says:—

A remonstrance from the General Court against his settlement was immediately transmitted to Salem, in which it was complained that he had refused "to join with the congregation at Boston, because they would not make a public declaration of their repentance for having communion with the churches of England, while they lived there;" and besides this, "*had declared his opinion that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the Sabbath, nor any other offense, as it was [perhaps considered as] a breach of the first table.*"

These authorities seem to leave no question as to the attitude of Roger Williams toward laws designed for the protection of the *day*; and this view is not materially affected by the fact that a law was enacted in Rhode Island, prohibiting drunkenness and gambling, and the employment of servants upon Sunday. For it was not until forty-six years after the death of Mr. Williams that ordinary labor on Sunday was prohibited, so that it is certain that Roger Williams was not in

favor of such Sunday laws as are upon the statute books of most countries to-day.

"Securing the Sabbath" *American Sentinel* 10, 36 , pp. 283, 284.

THE Scriptures tell us that "the Sabbath was made for man" (Mark 2:27); that it was made by the Lord when he had finished the work of creation (Gen. 2:2, 3), and that it was given by him to man to be a sign between him and those who would honor him by its observance. Eze. 20:12, 20.

The observance of the Sabbath is commanded by the law of God, which speaks to all the world. When God spoke his law from Mount Sinai, his voice shook the world (Heb. 12:26); and we read of that law that "what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." The law must therefore be of universal application.

It is the will of God that all men should keep his Sabbath. Not to keep it would be a transgression of his law, and a sin; for "sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. And as surely as God is Sovereign of the universe, it is never necessary that any man should do a thing that is contrary to His will. It is never a necessity that any should die. It is certain, therefore, that it is possible for every person to keep the Sabbath. Everyone can secure its rest and its blessings every week, in the year if he wills to do so.

Whether other men keep the Sabbath or not, makes no difference with his own privilege and responsibility in the matter. God made the Sabbath for every person, individually, and it is for each one to accept and observe it, without reference to the course of others. No person can excuse his own wrong-doing by pleading the wrong-doing of his neighbors.

No human law, therefore, can have any place in securing to any person the privilege of keeping the Sabbath. No human law can enforce an obligation that is due to God. Divine obligations were not left to be enforced in that way. God has not forbidden sin under penalty of eternal death, and yet left men to secure righteousness by so weak and uncertain a thing as human law.

God has secured righteousness in Sabbath-keeping and in every other requirement of his law, by something infinitely stronger and better than any human enactment, and that is, the power of his own

word. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." Ps. 33:6. By that power which created man in the beginning, he is created anew in Christ, or made righteous. And of this creative power the Sabbath is the weekly reminder.

But it may be said, Ought there not to be a Sabbath law for the benefit of weak-kneed persons who would like to keep the Sabbath, but fear it might go hard with them if they should try it? Ought not places of business to be closed on the Sabbath in order the men may keep it without risking the loss of money or of position? So it may seem to some people; but there is no real support for Sabbath laws in considerations of this kind. No moral strength can be derived through a human law. The person who would like to do right but does not do so for fear of the consequences, is in need of a different aid than any that can be supplied him by human enactments. What he needs is faith, and faith is not a thing of human manufacture; it is the gift of God. And the history of God's people in all ages shows that faith is able to sustain a person in following his convictions of right, not only without the support of any human law, but in the face of adverse laws and of popular sentiment and custom. (See Heb. 11.)

He who has God's support in his course of life, cannot reasonably ask for any other support. He whose god cannot support him in right doing so as to crown the same with success, would better set aside his god at once. That is not the true God,—the Lord of the Sabbath. And if God will care for a person while he is doing wrong—disregarding the divine command—he will certainly do as much for that person when he turns from his wrong-doing and walks in the pathway of obedience.

Let no one imagine, then, that some human legislation is necessary in order that people may be able to do right. The greatest obstacle to right-doing is the opposition of the devil, working through the natural evil tendencies of every individual heart. And this, with all lesser obstacles, is overcome by the power of the grace of God.

Then if any person wants to keep the Sabbath, let him to so, without clamoring for legislation to clear his pathway of real or imaginary obstacles. God has legislated upon Sabbath observance in his own law, and there is no question but that he has covered the subject fully. His word, which is his

law, covers every duty of man which can pertain to things religious, and leaves no room for human legislation in the matter; and when men do legislate in such a case, their work cannot be other than superfluous and mischievous.

This is the trouble with legislation touching the divine institution of the Sabbath. God has marked out the duty and the privilege of all men with regard to a weekly day of rest, and there is nothing that need be added to his words. They indicate the best and wisest course for every man that it is possible to take. The Sabbath was made for man. It is exactly adapted to his nature and his wants. That men should rest on the seventh day, making the other six days of the week working days, as God's law directs, is just what is suited to their highest welfare. And that is every man's duty before God.

It is not surprising, therefore, that human legislation upon the Sabbath institution, or which touches any of those obligations covered by the Sabbath, fails, as it does, to work satisfactorily. It can never succeed in accomplishing the end sought, for no human project can successfully invade the realm of the purpose and wisdom of God.

"The Catholics See It" *American Sentinel* 10, 36 , p. 284.

PROTESTANTISM stands silent before Rome. The former must either disavow what has been done in her name, or surrender to Rome the fortress of consistency, without which successful warfare cannot be waged.

When Protestantism—as represented by the vast majority who disavow allegiance to Rome—would lift her voice against Romish tradition and in favor of the Bible only as the rule of faith, Rome has but to ask, Why, then, do you keep Sunday? And there being no Scripture in support of it, they can give Rome no reasonable reply.

And now Rome asks another question. Certain prominent Protestants in America have been complaining because their brethren in the faith in Ecuador and some other Catholic countries of South America were oppressed on account of their religion. They made this complaint to the highest Roman Catholic official here, and through him to the pope, asking that the latter exercise his sovereign authority to secure for those Protestants religious freedom. Of course, the pope—if the petition ever came before him—easily found a way to disclaim any responsibility in the matter, and the credulous Protestants who expected him to raise his voice against the long-

standing policy and practice of the papacy, in every country where she has ruled, obtained no definite reply. But this was not the end of it. The *Pilot* (Boston), the leading Catholic journal of New England, in its issue of August 10, takes up the subject and speaks as follows:—

The *Pilot* is most assuredly in favor of religious freedom everywhere. . . . It is against intolerance in every form and every country; and if Mr. Lee [chairman of the committee that petitioned the pope] and his co-workers will extend their crusade so as to cover religious proscription in every latitude and longitude, they will find no more zealous supporter than the *Pilot*. But what about a country called the United States of America, where Jews and Seventh-day Baptists are punished by fine and imprisonment at hard labor, even in the chain-gang, if they do not keep holy a day which their Bible and their religion tells them is not to be so honored? We have not much admiration for the second of these classes; for, in truth they are the narrowest of all the narrow bigots we know; but that does not affect their right to religious liberty; and the beauty of their case is that it is not necessary to ask an American cardinal to ask an Italian cardinal to ask the pope of Rome to ask the president of a foreign republic to rectify the wrong. All that Mr. Lee and his brethren have to do is to ask the Congress of our own United States to enforce that clause of the Constitution which forbids any discrimination against religious liberty.

What will Protestants of the United States say to this? Will they disavow and condemn the evil thing and use their influence to have it stopped? If so, what means the ever-increasing agitation in Protestant circles everywhere for the passing and enforcing of Sunday laws? But if they do not, they will be their silence justify the papacy in every step of her long, dark career of oppression for conscience' sake.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 36 , p. 288.

THE Seventh-day Adventists, recently in the chain-gang in Rhea County, Tenn., have been released. They were not required by the authorities to work upon the Sabbath, but were required to work an additional number of days for the "privilege" of resting upon the Sabbath as required by the divine commandment. The officials were magnanimous(?) and did not exact the full pound of flesh; they "gave" them from one to three days each, because, as they said, the Adventists had been good hands, and had given them no trouble.

But the release of these men in no wise affects the question at issue; the fact remains that they were unjustly deprived of their liberty,

and that the State of Tennessee still claims the right to impose upon them the observance of the so-called sabbath under penalty of further imprisonment.

THE law of God is spiritual. The Saviour, in his sermon on the mount, showed that the sixth and seventh commandments could be broken even by an evil desire. And the Sabbath commandment, like the others, requires more than a conformity in outward acts. It requires that we should not seek our own pleasure on the Sabbath day, or speak our own words, but should make it a day of spiritual delight. See Isa. 58:13, 14. And no one can do this without being spiritually-minded. Hence it is utterly impossible for any human sabbath law to help any person to keep the Sabbath; and all the legislation that might be passed on earth, though enforced as strictly as ever human law was enforced, could not save the nation from being a nation of Sabbath-breakers in the eye of God.

THE *World*, of August 26, had the two following items of news, which serve to illustrate the wickedness of the statute which makes an act, otherwise commendable, a crime, simply because it is done on Sunday:—

Of the Sunday-law arrests the most interesting was that of Thomas Doughlin, of No. 1763 Third Avenue. He was selling ice, and a policeman saw him sell five cents' worth to a girl from a tenement-house. There used to be an order that the selling of ice was a work of necessity, but City Magistrate Simms, of the Harlem Police Court, held him for trial.

Another case was that of Cassel Goldman, clerk, in No. 17 Canal Street. He sold a policeman three cents' worth of writing paper. The place is a cigar shop as well as a stationer's, and the policeman, whose memorable name is Grimshaw, came in and said: "I want to write a letter. Won't you accommodate me with a piece of paper?" City Magistrate Denel held Goldman for trial.

It is difficult to properly characterize these arrests. It is astonishing that officers would make arrests under such circumstances, and still more astonishing that a police magistrate would hold a man for trial, arrested for selling ice. Bad as the Sunday law of New York is, it permits works of necessity and charity, and defines necessity as being "whatever is necessary for the health, comfort, or well-being of the people." It is evident, however, that nothing is to be permitted to stand in the way of a rigid enforcement of the Sunday law.

The other case, while not having in it the same elements of barbarous cruelty, as in the circumstances attending the arrest of the ice-man, presents a sad commentary on the morals which are

fostered by Sunday legislation. The sale of manufactured tobacco is legal in New York State on Sunday, therefore it was not a violation of the law for the clerk to sell cigars on that day, and it was doubtless for that purpose that the shop was open. The policeman who made the arrest, did not find the clerk selling other articles, nor did he induce him to violate the law simply by proposing to buy stationery from him, but professing that he wanted to write a letter, asks simply as an accommodation that he might be supplied with the necessary material; and for doing this favor the clerk was arrested. The first impulse is to blame the officer and to feel that society is unsafe in the guardianship of such men; but the fault is primarily with the "law" which makes an act otherwise commendable a crime because it is done upon Sunday. Sunday laws, instead of promoting morality, foster immorality.

THE plea that the imprisonment of men under the Sunday statutes of the various States is not religious persecution because "Sunday laws are civil enactments," can be honestly made only by those ignorant of history. With the exception of isolated cases of individual and mob violence, no martyr ever suffered except for violation of civil law. Of the Puritan régime in Massachusetts, Bancroft says: "Since a particular form of worship had become a part of the civil establishment, irreligion was a civil offense." ¹⁰⁶¹

Very much of the intolerance of the Puritans was "justified" on civil grounds. Of the banishment of certain offenders from the territory of Massachusetts, Bancroft says:—

The government feared, or pretended to fear, a disturbance of the public peace. . . . The triumph of the clergy being complete, the civil magistrates proceeded to pass sentence on the most resolute offenders. Wheelwright, Anne Hutchinson and Aspinwall were exiled from the territory of Massachusetts.

Religious intolerance has always masqueraded as the conservator of civil order.

September 19, 1895

"The Fountain of Lawlessness" *American Sentinel* 10, 37 , pp. 289, 290.

IN his second epistle to the church of Thessalonica, the Apostle Paul, speaking of the coming of the day of God, wrote:—

Let no man beguile you in any wise; for it will not be, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God. . . . And now ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work; only there is one that restraineth now, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his coming. 2 Thess. 2:3-8. (R.V.)

These words of inspiration have a most important bearing upon an understanding of the nature of the times at which the world has now arrived.

It is a time of prevailing lawlessness. Revolution and riot, insurrection and anarchy, lynchings and mob violence in every form, are setting law and order at defiance throughout the world. At the same time we see rapidly developing in this country a party that claims to stand for the principle of obedience to law; the members of which are zealously working to instill this principle into the public mind in favor of certain laws, and who are ready to denounce all such as do not favor those certain laws, stigmatizing them as lawless persons, if not as anarchists and traitors.

In view of these facts it is of the highest interest and importance to investigate the career of this "lawless one" of which the prophecy speaks, that we may know how far his teaching and example may have contributed to the lawlessness of the present day.

This "mystery of lawlessness" was already working in Paul's day, but was to be more clearly revealed as the "man of sin" who "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God." There is a power which exists in our world to-day, the history of which is an accurate fulfillment of these words. It is the papacy.

Is it any wonder that this power is spoken of as the "mystery of lawlessness" and "the lawless one," in view of the fact that it has actually dared to set at naught the law of the most high God? and even more than this, has claimed the power and the right to make changes in that law, and has set its own precepts and laws in the place of those spoken by Jehovah!

That the papacy has done this, is clear from her own testimony. True, she does not claim to have acted in opposition to the will of God; but her claim of divine sanction for her daring work only throws a more lurid light about the facts. Papal teaching upon this point, as published in her catechisms, is as follows:—

Q. Say the third commandment.

A. Remember that thou keep holy the sabbath day.

Q. What is commanded by the third commandment?

A. To spend the Sunday in prayer and other religious duties. ¹⁰⁷¹

This language is in bold contrast with that of God's law, as spoken by him upon Mount Sinai; for the third commandment of that law is: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." The second commandment, which forbids the worship of images, is dropped—stricken out—in this papal presentation of the divine law, thus leaving the third commandment to take the place of the second, and the fourth the place of the third. Moreover the Sabbath commandment enjoins, not the observance of Sunday, but of the seventh day. We quote further:—

Q. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

A. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday. ¹⁰⁸²

Q. Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

A. Had she not such power she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day,—a change for which there is no Scriptural authority. ¹⁰⁹³

And the Protestants (in name) of to-day are following the example of the papacy in defying the law of God; teaching that the first day, instead of the seventh, is the Sabbath which men are divinely commanded to observe.

Not only do they teach this, but they have incorporated this doctrine into their civil law, so that the observance of "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is commanded upon men under civil pains and penalties.

With but one exception, all the States of the Union have such laws in their statute books; and these laws are the ones, in particular, whose enforcement is now being loudly demanded in the name of respect for law!

If there is anything in the world that deserves the name of anarchy, it is defiance of the law of Jehovah. Satan was the first one who set up his will in opposition to that of the Creator. The papacy, actuated by the same spirit of self, has done likewise, and during the long centuries of her supremacy, her false doctrine so permeated the world that the nations are drunken with it. Rev. 14:8; 17:4; 18:3. And now, under the influence of this wine of false doctrine, the Protestant nations—and most noticeably our own—are imitating "the lawless one" in her heaven-daring course.

All that is against the law of God is lawlessness, even though it may have the form and appearance of law. It is in accordance with and by the aid of those principles of natural right and justice which the Creator has implanted in men's hearts, that all human laws are supposed to be framed; and when statutes are enacted contrary to those principles, they can have no binding obligation. On this point, Blackstone, the great law commentator, says:—

This law of nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this: and such of

290

them as are valid derive all their force, mediately or immediately, from this original.

A Sunday law is contrary both to that law which God spoke from Mount Sinai and to the law of natural rights; to the former, in that it puts Sunday in the place of God's Sabbath—the seventh day—and to the latter, in that it invades every man's natural right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. It is impossible, therefore, that Sunday laws should operate in the interests of peace and order, and of respect for true, or natural, law, which is unchangeable and eternal, and is synonymous with right. Alexander Hamilton said: "In a society under the form of which the stronger faction can readily united and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature, where the weaker individual is not secure against the violence of the stronger."—*Federalist II*.

Who, then, are the lawless ones to-day, and who are really working in the interests of respect for and obedience to law? Can those who adhere to the law of God,—both that which he spoke with his own voice, and that natural law of right which is stamped more or less clearly upon every mind, and from which all human law must

derive its force,—can such be properly viewed as other than law-abiding people, even though that adherence should lead them contrary to some of the statutes of men?

Is it not perfectly clear that the real promoters of lawlessness and anarchy are those who, wittingly or unwittingly, follow the example of "the lawless one" in setting aside the precept of Him whose throne is in the heavens, and whose kingdom ruleth over all?

When that law is set aside, confusion and anarchy are the inevitable result. The very heavens, with their shining spheres which declare the glory of God, are governed by divine law. Let that law be withdrawn, and celestial anarchy would show itself in confusion and the wreck of worlds. All nature testifies that "the law of the Lord is perfect." And we are resolved that our testimony shall agree with hers, by letting the divine law control our lives, as it controls her.

All the confusion, the lawlessness, the strife and anarchy which darken the face of the earth to-day, are the results of disregard of the perfect, divine law. He who teaches that the ten commandments have been abolished, or that any of those precepts have been changed, or in any other way weakens their hold upon men's consciences, is working to keep open the evil fountain that is sending forth its flood of lawlessness upon the earth.

"Dr. Sunderland on Persecution" *American Sentinel* 10, 37 , pp. 290, 291.

REV. DR. SUNDERLAND, of Washington, D.C., has taken occasion to review the AMERICAN SENTINEL, of July 18, in a three-column article in the *Boston Daily Standard*, of September 3.

The first thing the doctor notices is the "Roll of Honor," a list of about 120 papers that have condemned [*sic.*] the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists. Of the attitude of these papers, he says:—

It is comparatively easy in this country to denounce the action of the civil authorities in pursuance of existing law as the perpetration of crime upon inoffensive men and women, who yet stand the open, confessed violators of existing civil law, and yet claim that they are inoffensive people, whose conscience will not permit them to obey the law, because the law is man-made, and not God-made, in their opinion. Thus they turn upon the law and its faithful administration by those who are lawfully charged with its execution, and claim to be "oppressed" by this "un-American, unjust, bigoted and intolerant proceeding." They claim to be more holy than the law itself; that, indeed, the law is in direct contravention of God's law, and that in

deference to God's law they are perfectly justified in trampling on the State law, which they claim should be at once abolished.

This shows that the doctor's sympathies are entirely with the persecution and not with its victims. He speaks of turning "upon the law and its faithful administration by those who are lawfully charged with its execution," etc.; but the same number of the SENTINEL that published the "Roll of Honor," published an article, "Partial in the Law," showing that those "faithful" administrators of "law" conveniently closed their eyes to all violation except by Seventh-day Adventists. This fact alone brands the so-called enforcement of the Tennessee Sunday "law" as religious persecution.

But that Dr. Sunderland has no appreciation whatever of the real question involved is evident from this statement:—

The whole structure of this argument rests upon one small pivot, the calendar of the Sabbath. It turns simply on the question whether the Jewish or the Christian calendar is in vogue. They cling to the Jewish calendar, and ninety-nine one-hundredths of all Christendom accept the Christian calendar.

The whole question turns upon nothing of this kind. The question is a very simple one: Shall the minority have the right to believe and practice as they please in matters of faith, so long as they do not interfere with the equal rights of others?

It is utterly absurd to contend the private work, such as is carried on by the Adventists, in any way interferes with the right of the majority to keep Sunday, or that it interferes in any way with the due observance of that day by anybody who wishes to keep it. The very most that can be claimed is that it is offensive to the moral sensibilities of those who regard Sunday as a sacred day. But has civil government any right to undertake to "protect" the majority from such a shock to their moral sensibilities? To do so would be to return at once to the maxims and methods of the Dark Ages.

Moreover, the circumstances show that the moral shock is not due to the fact that the Adventists work on Sunday, but that their Sunday work, *coupled with their Sabbath rest*, is a protest against Sunday sacredness. No effort is made to prosecute others who work on Sunday; railroad trains, iron furnaces, coke ovens, livery stables, are operated on Sunday, and no effort is made to interfere with them. Daily papers are published in Tennessee, and in the cities street-cars run; and yet all these things are against the law equally as much as is the work done by Adventists. As stated in the number of the SENTINEL, which Dr. Sunderland reviews, a member of the grand

jury, that found the indictments against the Adventists, and was very prominent in their prosecution, works himself and employs others to work for him on Sunday in the fruit season, simply to shield himself from loss; and again, we say, the question is not as to the calendar, but as to whether Seventh-day Adventists shall enjoy equal rights with other people.

The doctor's talk about "Jewish calendar" and the "Christian calendar" is all about nonsense. Both Jews and Christians have the same week, and have had from time immemorial. The contention that man's first day was God's seventh day, is utterly without foundation. There is not a scintilla of evidence to support it. It is true that man was created on the sixth day, and that his first full day was the seventh day of creation week; but that it was his first day is absurd, for the man was not only created upon the preceding day (the sixth), but the woman was also created upon that day and given to man, so that the sixth day was not only Adam's first day, but it was his wedding day.

But this whole matter of man's first day being God's seventh day, is too silly to discuss seriously. We are not dependent for our knowledge of the Sabbath upon man's count of the weeks. It was a matter of direct revelation to the children of Israel. When they came out of Egypt and were led into the wilderness, God removed all possibility of doubt as to the identical day to be kept, by withholding manna upon that day every week for forty years. There was no possibility of a mistake there; God makes no mistakes.

Then again, at the time of the crucifixion we have the Sabbath unerringly pointed out by the statement concerning the holy water, that "they returned and prepared spices and ointments, *and rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment.*"

Within less than a generation from that time the Jews were scattered to every nation under heaven; and yet history records the disagreement arising either among the Jews, or between Jews and Gentiles, as to the correct numbering of the days of the week. This agreement is utterly destructive of the claim that any change of calendar could change the reckoning of the weeks; and it is equally true to the contention that nobody can tell which is the seventh day of the week.

The doctor's contention that the first day of the week is called the sabbath in the orig-

inal of Matt. 28:1, etc., is not worthy of serious consideration. No reputable critic has ever taken any such position, nor is there any probability that any such will take that position, for it is utterly untenable.

Toward the close of this long review the doctrine returns to his defense of intolerance in the matter of enforcing Sunday laws, but he does not use a single argument that was not used by the Puritans three hundred years ago to justify their intolerance toward Baptists and Quakers in Massachusetts. The only question and the one which will not down is: Shall observers of the seventh day enjoy equal rights with others, or will the majority continue to override by despotic power the rights of the minority? Adventists are not asking for toleration merely, they are demanding rights. The majority have the physical power to deny these rights and to punish men for exercising them; but no physical power and no amount of sophistry can *destroy* God-given rights.

But the doctor denies that God has ever given any man a right to do wrong. That is true so far as man's obligation to God is concerned. No man has a right from the divine standpoint to do wrong; "for God will bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." But so far as his fellow-men are concerned, God has given every man the right to do just as he pleases in moral things. To take any other position would be to justify the Inquisition.

The doctor's closing "argument" amounts to no more than calling those who observe the seventh day, "cranks;" but that settles nothing. Those who have chosen to obey God rather than men have always been accounted cranks, and have always been cried down as the perverters of the truth and the disturbers of social order. But "nothing is settled until it is settled right," and the doctor and all others may rest assured that this question of the rights of conscience cannot be settled in the way which he proposes. It must be settled right.

"Conscience above Statute" *American Sentinel* 10, 37 , p. 291.

SEPTEMBER 8, Dr. Talmage preached from the words recorded in Dan. 6:10: "His windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem." The doctor fully justified the prophet's disobedience of civil law, in these words:—

The scoundrelly princes of Persia, urged on by political jealousy against Daniel, have succeeded in getting a law passed that

whosoever prays to God shall be put under the paws and teeth of the lions, who are lashing themselves in rage and hunger up and down the stone cage, or putting their lower jaws on the ground, bellowing till the earth trembles. But the leonine threat did not hinder the devotions of Daniel, the C?ur de Lion of the ages. His enemies might as well have a law that the sun should not draw water, or that the south wind should not sweep across a garden of magnolias, or that God should be abolished. They could not scarce his companions with the red-hot furnaces, and they cannot now scare him with the lions. As soon as Daniel hears of this enactment he leaves his office of secretary of state, with its upholstery of crimson and gold, and comes down the white marble steps and goes to his own house. He opens his window and puts the shutters back and pulls the curtain aside so that he can look toward the sacred city of Jerusalem, and then prays.

I suppose the people in the street gathered under and before his window and said: "Just see that man defying the law! He ought to be arrested." And the constabulary of the city rush to the police headquarters and report that Daniel is on his knees at the wide open window. "You are my prisoner," says the officer of the law, dropping a heavy hand on the shoulders of the kneeling Daniel. As the constables open the door of the cavern to thrust in their prisoner they see the glaring eyes of the monsters. But Daniel becomes the first lion tamer, and they lick his hand and fawn at his feet, and that night he sleeps with the shaggy mane of a wild beast for his pillow, while the king that night, sleepless in the palace, has on him the paw and teeth of a lion he cannot tame—the lion of a remorseful conscience.

These are wholesome words, not because they are uttered by Dr. Talmage, but because they are true; and because so many hold to the utterly mischievous doctrine that the civil law must be obeyed *whether right or wrong*.

Daniel was right and his persecutors were wrong; and so is every statute-intrenched tyrant wrong. "I recollect well," says Rev. J. E. Scott, in the *September Arena*, "when the preaching of human freedom was stigmatized as revolutionary and anarchistic, and fraught with peril to the nation. To the defender of slavery the doctrine that all men are born equal was rankest anarchy. From the standpoint of human freedom the defender of slavery was the anarchist."

But that day has passed away, and now nobody in the United States defends human slavery, and the nation honors the men it once despised, and covers with flowers the graves of the men the multitudes once mobbed.

"Then to side with Truth is noble when we share her Wretched
crust,
Ere her cause bring fame and profit, and 'tis prosperous to be just;
Then it is the brave man chooses, while the coward stands aside,
doubting in his abject spirit, till his Lord is crucified,
And the multitude make virtue of the faith they Had denied."

"God's Sabbath vs. Man's Sabbath" *American Sentinel* 10, 37 , p. 291.

ALL we ask in regard to Sunday laws, is that man's law for Sunday-keeping shall be no more restrictive than God's law for Sunday-keeping.

We are frequently told by those who believe in keeping Sunday, and in laws to make people keep it, that the law of God does not command the keeping of a definite day of the week, but only of one day in seven. But these same men say it is necessary that a definite day—Sunday—shall be enforced by human law. Evidently, from their standpoint, God was not so wise as they are, or he would have been more definite.

That God was definite in his Sabbath command, is demonstrated beyond question by the fact that he "blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." God had finished his rest when he blessed the Sabbath day. Gen. 2:3. But God does not bless a thing that is past and gone; his blessing is for the present and the future. He blessed the Sabbath and hallowed it for the benefit of mankind, so that every week, from Adam's day to ours, there has dawned one day upon the world which was blessed and hallowed. And he who says that this day was not and is not a specified, definite day, might as well claim that God blessed and hallowed the entire week.

There is no rest in being compelled to rest, or recreation in being forced to do something you do not want to do. There is no benefit, physical or intellectual, to be derived from compulsory idleness. The healthy, human system,—thanks to the wisdom of the Creator,—does not take naturally to idleness. And when it is forced to be idle against its will, as in very many cases it is by a Sunday law, it will wear itself out more by chafing and fretting under the restraint than by any ordinary labor it might have performed during the day.

That must be a very restful sabbath to the sinner in which he is compelled to try to act like a saint!

There was recently on exhibition at the Royal Aquarian in London, an old clock, made by a pious Scotchman a century and a half ago,

and so constructed that it would keep Sunday; that is, it would stop short at 12 o'clock Saturday night and refuse to tick against until midnight of Sunday. It is just such ideas as this that naturally grow out of a man-made sabbath, as the ancient laws for Sunday-keeping well show. How fortunate it is for our race that the real Sabbath was made by God, and that he, not man, has adapted it to mankind. Otherwise we might expect the universe to come to a dead stop at Saturday midnight—the stars and sun stop shining, the grass and trees stop growing, the earth stop moving, the birds stop singing, in brief, everything stop short for a period of twenty-four hours, save the tolling church bells and the voice of the preacher delivering a sermon on eternal torment or predestination. But we may breathe freely over the actual situation; for it is God who made the Sabbath, and his Sabbath is not against man, but "for" him. Mark. 2:27.

"Look on This Picture, Then on This" *American Sentinel* 10, 37 , pp. 291, 292.

FOR orderly private work Seventh-day Adventists are fined, imprisoned, and driven in chain-gangs in Tennessee, because their example is said to be immoral and of pernicious effect. But iron furnaces, livery stables, railroad trains, and in short, almost anything not run by Adventists, except saloons, is permitted to do business on Sunday, while the State orders out and drills its militia on that day, as is witnessed by the following notice published in a Spring City paper, while eight Seventh-day Adventists were "doing time" there for "violating the sabbath":—

COMPANY, ATTENTION!

HEADQUARTERS OF COMPANY "G.," 2ND BATALLION,
N. G. S. T

Spring City, Tenn., August 5, 1895.

Orders No. 25.

All the members of this Company are hereby commanded to report at the Company Armory promptly at 2 o'clock on Sunday evening, August 18, 1895, for the purpose of starting on the march for the encampment at Crossville, Tenn., on the morning of the 19th. Each man will provide himself with one blanket, or heavy quilt; and at least two changes of underclothing, including one white shirt and white standing collars and cuffs. Each man will also see that he

has a pair of *clean* white gloves in the pocket of his blouse. No excuses from this duty will be granted, except for the best of reasons.

All who fail to obey this order will be arrested promptly, and punished as the State Regulations direct.

By order of W. P. MCDONALD,
Captain Commanding. J. H. HILTON, First Sergeant.

The captain of this company is the editor of the *Spring City Herald*, a paper which has insisted upon the enforcement of the law; and yet by this order he violates the fundamental law of the State which provides that "no person shall in time of peace be required to perform any service to the public on any day set apart by his religion as a day of rest."

To require a Sunday-keeper to drill on Sunday, as was done in Spring City, Tenn., August 18, is certainly a violation of this provision of the constitution of the State of Tennessee. But it is nevertheless a common practice in that State.

Sunday, June 30, just on the eve of the session of the court at which the Rhea County Adventists were convicted for Sunday work, one for lifting a wheelbarrow over a fence, the

292

writer of this note saw State Militia marching in the streets of Dayton, almost with the shadow of the courthouse in which the Adventists were sentenced three days later.

Such are some of the inconsistencies of the Tennessee Sunday "law" and its enforcement.

"Unworthy of Baptists" *American Sentinel* 10, 37 , p. 294.

WE have been surprised at the number of Baptist papers that have attempted to justify the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists for private Sunday work. Several of these papers have manifested a spirit very far from Christian; and some have taken positions which are utterly [*sic.*] inconsistent with the past history of Baptists.

The *Baptist Reaper*, of Martin, Tenn., in its issue of August 29, publishes the following:—

In regard to the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists for violating Sunday laws, and consequent charge of religious persecution, a correspondent of the *East Tennessee Baptist* makes a good point, as follows:

"Every citizen is to have perfect liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. The Seventh-day Adventists

claim that their consciences compel them to worship God on Saturday. No one has sought to prevent their doing so. Hence they are not persecuted."

As some one else has well remarked, all this cry of persecution is simply a little scheme for advertising Adventism. The attempt of this modern sect to produce martyrs is a miserable failure, and its plea is a fraud.

The correspondent of the *East Tennessee Baptist* is evidently not informed in regard to the views of Seventh-day Adventists. Seventh-day Adventists hold that Sunday is a rival institution to the true Sabbath; and that to observe it would be to violate the fourth commandment, which establishes a distinction between the Sabbath and all other days, and requires that all men shall respect that distinction. For the Adventists to keep Sunday also would be the same as it would have been for the three Hebrews to have appeared to worship the image which the King of Babylon had set up. It is a very short-sighted view to take of the matter to assert that Adventists are left perfectly free to keep the Sabbath, when they are forbidden to work on Sunday. Would Baptists feel that they were left perfectly free to practice immersion, if they were required to submit to sprinkling also? Would they not complain, and justly too, that their religious liberty was interfered with, their rights trampled upon? But Sunday is just as much a counterfeit of the Sabbath as sprinkling is a counterfeit of baptism; and Sunday is just as much opposed to the Sabbath as sprinkling is to true baptism.

The editor of the *Reaper* is evidently not well informed on Baptist history. He should read again the history of Massachusetts and of Virginia, and especially the life of Roger Williams, who was banished from Massachusetts for entertaining the opinion "*that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the sabbath, nor any other offense that was a breach of the first table.*"

We are glad, however, that there are yet some true Baptists.

"This little scheme for advertising Adventism," might be entirely frustrated if Sunday-keepers would only permit the Adventists to exercise equal rights with themselves. Our contemporary should remember the ninth commandment.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 37 , p. 296.

DOWN in Richmond, Va., if report be true, the Sunday law "reformers" have had the courage to take a step towards consistency

in the enforcement of Sunday "laws," and have secured a municipal order stopping the street railway service on that day. It is altogether probable, however, that such consistency would, in most of our large cities, be fatal to an increase of the Sunday congregation, which is the real object sought in the crusade for compulsory Sunday rest.

THE Sunday translation of the New Testament which is issued by the American Bible Society, has taken a decided step in advance of the English and other versions, from the standpoint of belief in divine honor for Sunday. It makes the translation of the first clause of Rev. 1:10, read: "I was in the spirit on Sunday," instead of the common rendering, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." Thus, by the authority and word of man, Sunday has at last obtained Scriptural recognition. This proof for Sunday will do to add to that furnished by Congress in 1892, when it voted that Sunday was the Sabbath.

ELDER H. P. HOLSER, Superintendent of the Seventh-day Adventist missions in Europe, writes to the *Review and Herald*, the official paper of the denomination, that the police of Basel, Switzerland, are very diligent in keeping watch of the Seventh-day Adventist publishing house in that city, to discover if work is being done on Sunday; but that they persistently close their eyes to other work going on in the immediate vicinity. For instance, on one Sunday they professed not to see a gang of workmen on the opposite side of the street from the publishing house, hammering and sawing, building a grand stand for a race to take place the same day. This shows very clearly that in Switzerland, as in the United States, Adventists are not persecuted for Sunday work, but for Sabbath rest.

THE article, "Zealous in Details," on page 292, deserves more than passing notice. It is calm, dispassionate, and logical. Its manly, Christian tone is in sharp and striking contrast with the intolerant bigotry of the paragraphs which the writer quotes in the outset of his article. Probably without realizing it, the *Advance* admits the religious character of the Sunday statute of Tennessee in the words, "They [the Adventists] are taken sharply to task by the church and civil authorities." It is the same old story over again, the Church using the power of the State to enforce her dogmas.

The charge that the Dayton (Graysville) Adventists "were planning for notoriety," is unreasonable. The Graysville Adventists had every reason to desire to be permitted to quietly attend to their own affairs. They selected the village of Graysville for the establishment of a school largely because it was a quiet place, where they supposed

they would be unmolested; and now to charge them with courting persecution is the height of folly as well as the depth of wickedness. A little more attention to "details" in the matter of obeying the ninth commandment would be an excellent thing for those who are so ready to speak against the Adventists.

EITHER religious liberty is a natural right of all men, or it is not the right of any man, for, "all men are created equal."

Religious liberty being the natural right of every man, it can have only natural limitations.

The only natural limitation to natural right is the equal rights of others. "Every man," says Macaulay, "has a right to all that may conduce to his pleasure, if he does not inflict pain upon anyone else. This is one of the broadest maxims of human nature, and I cannot therefore see how its supporters can be fairly called upon to defend it—the burden of proof lies, not on the advocates of freedom, but on the advocates of restraint."

The principle is that every man has a right, as far as his fellow-men are concerned, to do as he wills, provided that will does not lead him to trample upon the equal rights of his fellows. This principle has been seen and recognized by the defenders of religious liberty everywhere. The constitution of Maryland provides that—

No person ought by any law to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless under color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace or safety of the State, . . . or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights.

It will be noticed that in this the line is drawn at the rights of others. Up to that point no man has any right to question the right of his fellow-man to do as he wills.

This principle, while admitted theoretically in Maryland, as elsewhere, has in almost every State of the American Union, been violated in practice. In practice men are not permitted to do even in obedience to conscience everything which does not trench upon the equal rights of their fellow-men. For instance, in Maryland and other States, men are not permitted to exercise their natural right to labor when they choose, but are forbidden to do secular labor or business upon the first day of the week; and this whether it in any way interferes with the equal rights of others or not.

It is not sufficient to answer that by such work they cause mental pain to their fellow-men, because others by Sabbath work cause pain to those who observe that day; and rights being equal and to be

equally protected, if to be preserved from mental pain were a natural right, then there should also be a law forbidding work upon the seventh day. But nobody would contend for anything of that kind for a moment. Government cannot undertake to protect the feelings of the people. Government can protect only the reputation, the person and the goods of those who are under its jurisdiction. It cannot undertake to shield from the annoyance of their own bigotry and intolerance, those who imagine that others should do as they do, and believe as they believe.

September 26, 1895

"Religious Toleration in Maryland" *American Sentinel* 10, 38 , pp. 297, 298.

THERE are two facts that conspire to make the history of religious toleration in Maryland of surpassing interest to the student of American history. One is that the lord proprietary was a Roman Catholic; the other is that Maryland, it is claimed, was the first of the original thirteen colonies to establish religious toleration by statute.¹¹⁰¹

Confronted by the history of centuries of intolerance in other countries, Roman Catholics turn with satisfaction to the history of Maryland, and point to it with pride, as an evidence of the tolerant character of "the church."

After exhausting the very meager materials found in the Old World with which to support the papal claim that "the church" is tolerant, Cardinal Gibbons says:—

Turning to our own country, it is with no small degree of satisfaction that I point to the State of Maryland as the cradle of civil and religious liberty, and the "land of the sanctuary." Of the thirteen original American colonies, Maryland was the only one that was settled by Catholics. She was also the only one that spread aloft over her fair lands the banner of liberty of conscience, and that invited the oppressed of other colonies to seek an asylum beneath its shadow.¹¹¹²

There are, at least, two fatal errors in this paragraph: first, *Maryland was not settled exclusively, nor even principally, by Roman Catholics*; and second, *religious liberty was never established in that colony, either by Catholics or by Protestants*. The act of April 21, 1649, was an act of toleration merely, providing that "no person within

this province, *professing to believe in Jesus Christ*, shall be in any ways troubled, molested, or discountenanced, for his or her religion, or in the free exercise thereof." ¹¹²³

The same act provided that "whatsoever person shall . . . deny the Holy Trinity, or any of the persons thereof, shall be punished with death." And that "whatsoever person or persons shall from henceforth use or utter any reproachful words or speeches *concerning the blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of our Saviour, or the holy apostles or evangelists, or any of them*, shall in such case for the first offense forfeit to the lord proprietary the sum of five pounds sterling or the value thereof. . . . And every such offender or offenders for every second offense shall forfeit ten pounds sterling or the value thereof. . . . And every person or persons before mentioned offending herein the third time, shall for such third offense forfeit all his lands and goods, and be forever banished and expelled out of this province." ¹¹³⁴

It will be readily conceded that this was very far short of religious liberty; it was simply toleration *for believers in the Christian religion*. It is true it was far in advance of any other colony at that time except Rhode Island, ¹¹⁴⁵ but it was not religious liberty. In practice it did not secure even toleration to *all* believers in Jesus Christ. "The Quakers were persecuted in Maryland as badly as in Virginia and Massachusetts." For example: "In 1658, Joseph Coale and Thomas Thurston, preachers belonging to that body, were treated with great severity by the authorities and compelled to flee the country." ¹¹⁵⁶

But let us consider briefly the question as to whom the credit belongs for a measure of religious toleration in Maryland.

As before stated, Maryland was not settled by Roman Catholics but very largely by Protestants. The charter was issued on the twentieth day of June, 1632, to Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore. The following November, Leonard Calvert, brother of the proprietary, sailed from the Isle of Wight with two hundred colonists to effect a settlement in Maryland.

The vessels, the *Ark* and the *Dove*, sailed by way of Fortune Island, Barbados, and St. Christopher's, and did not reach Maryland until March, 1634. After cruising about in

298

the Chesapeake Bay and the Potomac River, they dropped anchor in St. Mary's River.

Leonard Calvert gained the good-will of the natives who were preparing to abandon that particular locality, and purchased from them for some cloth and a few axes, their right to the soil. Bancroft says:—

Upon the 27th [of March, 1634], the emigrants, *of whom at least three parts of four were Protestants*, took quiet possession of the land which the governor first bought. ¹¹⁶⁷

It is probable that the relative proportion of Catholics and Protestants in Maryland remained about the same, and though the government was in the hands of the lord proprietary, who was a Catholic, it would have been quite impossible for him, even had he desired to do so, to have denied toleration to so large a majority of his subjects. Bancroft says:—

In the mixed population of Maryland, where the administration was in the hands of Catholics, and *the great majority of the people were Protestants*, there was no unanimity of sentiment out of which a domestic constitution could have harmoniously risen. ¹¹⁷⁸

This was about the time of the conflict in England between the Parliament and Charles I., and Lord Baltimore, about affairs of the colony. Claybourne was still claiming Kent Island, and the Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Puritans, who formed a large proportion of Lord Baltimore's subjects, were restless under the authority of a Catholic, and were desirous of establishing Protestantism, so-called, as the religion of the colony.

In 1645, a petition was presented to the House of Lords, asking that the government of Maryland might be settled in the hands of Protestants. For some reason this petition was not acted upon, and "the politic Lord Baltimore," says Bancroft, "had ample time to prepare his own remedies. To appease the Parliament, he removed Greene [the Roman Catholic Governor], and in August, 1648, appointed in his place Wm. Stone, a Protestant of the Church of England." ¹¹⁸⁹ A very significant fact in this connection is that Lord Baltimore required Governor Stone to take and subscribe the following oath:—

I do further swear I will not by myself, nor any other person, directly trouble, molest, or discountenance any person whatsoever in the said province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ; and, in particular, no Roman Catholic, for or in respect of his or her religion, nor his or her free exercise thereof within said province, so as they be not unfaithful to his said lordship, or molest or conspire against the civil government established under him. ¹¹⁹¹⁰

This shows very clearly that instead of being in a position to dictate to others in matters of faith, had he been so disposed, Lord Baltimore was apprehensive lest religious toleration might be denied to his co-religionists; as, indeed, there was a manifest disposition in the colony to do, and as the charter would have warranted, for at that time popery was outlawed in England.

It was in April of the following year that the act, already referred to, establishing religious toleration, was passed. Bancroft says: "To quiet and unite the colony, all the offenses of the late rebellion were effaced by a general amnesty; and, at the instance of the Catholic proprietary, the Protestant governor, Stone, and his council of six, composed equally of Catholics and Protestants, and the representatives of the people of Maryland, *of whom [only] five were Catholics*, at a general session of the assembly held in April, 1649, placed upon their statute books" ¹²⁰11 this act of toleration.

It is not our purpose to deny that Lord Baltimore himself was a liberal-minded man; and it is very probable that he entertained charitable feelings toward Protestants. But even had this not been the case, his environment and the circumstances under which he received and held his charter were such that he could not well have taken any other course than that which he did take in securing for his subjects religious toleration. England was at that time Protestant, so-called, and the charter granted Lord Baltimore by Charles I., established in effect the Anglican Church as the church of Maryland. It gave the lord proprietary authority to found "churches and chapels, and places of worship in convenient and suitable places within the premises; and of *causing the same to be dedicated and consecrated, according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England.*" ¹²¹12

Speaking of this phase of the charter, Bancroft says: "Christianity, as professed by the Church of England, was established [by the charter]; but the patronage and advowsons of churches were vested in the proprietary; and, as there was not an English statute on religion in which America was specially named, silence left room for the settlement of religious affairs by the colony." ¹²²13 But it would have been in flagrant violation of the charter to have established Roman Catholicism, for an express provision of that instrument was that all acts concerning religious establishments were to be "according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England."

It will be seen at once that it was quite out of the question for Lord Baltimore to establish the Catholic religion in Maryland; ¹²³14 he did

the only thing that was possible for him to do under the circumstances to secure even toleration for those of his own faith: he established religious toleration for all who professed faith in Christ; and the fact that representative Catholics appeal to the history of Maryland, in proof of the tolerant spirit of Catholicism, demonstrates the paucity of such evidence.

But even if all that is claimed for Maryland were true, it would by no means establish the claim that is made in behalf of Rome. Cardinal Gibbons himself states the principle which dominates Rome everywhere. He says:—

Many Protestants seem to be very much disturbed by some such argument as this: Catholics are very ready now to proclaim freedom of conscience, because they are in the minority. When they once succeed in getting the upper hand in numbers and power, they will destroy this freedom, because their faith teaches them to tolerate no doctrine other than the Catholic. It is, then, a matter of absolute necessity for us that they should never be allowed to get this advantage.

Now, in all this, there is a great mistake, which comes from not knowing the Catholic doctrine in its fullness. I shall not lay it down myself, lest it seem to have been gotten up for the occasion. I shall quote the great theologian Becanus, who taught the doctrine of the schools of Catholic theology at the time when the struggle was hottest between Catholicity and Protestantism. He says that religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it. . . . This is true Catholic teaching on this point, according to Becanus and all Catholic theologians. ¹²⁴ 15

This is indeed, as the cardinal states, "the true Catholic teaching upon this point," and it ought to be universally recognized as such by Protestants. When Rome grants toleration she does not do it as a matter of principle, *but as a matter of policy*; and as a matter of policy, partial religious toleration was established in Maryland.

"The 'Christian Statesman's' Unchristian Intolerance" *American Sentinel* 10, 38 , pp. 298, 299.

THE *Christian Statesman*, as might be expected, is out with a defense of the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists. It has been moved to this by the stinging criticisms of intolerance made by such papers as the *New York Tribune* and the *Christian Intelligencer*.

The *Statesman* asserts that "not a single individual in any State of the Union has been prosecuted for keeping the seventh day as the Sabbath." We would like the *Statesman* to reconcile this assertion with the fact that in the neighborhoods where Adventists have

299

been prosecuted, only Adventists have been interfered with. We have repeatedly published this statement and given the facts, stating what kinds of work were done, and just where done; and so far from being denied, these facts have been recognized by others, and have been published to the world by others; not from what we have said, but from their own personal knowledge. The *Republican*, of Dayton, Tenn., has published such facts. Ex-Senator Slaughter, of Tennessee, has published to the world in the *Nashville American*, over his own signature, the statement that "steamboats, railroads, street-car lines, hotels, livery-stables, hackmen, and other money-making concerns can continue their various vocations without the least fear of molestation by officers of the law, whilst another class of true and good citizens must be persecuted for doing what others are promiscuously allowed to do."

The *Statesman* also asserts that "no man's conscience requires him to work on Sunday." It would be difficult to make a more erroneous statement. The *Statesman* ought to know, for it has had opportunity to know, the position of Seventh-day Adventists upon this question. Seventh-day Adventists regard the Sunday institution as a rival of the true Sabbath; it is the badge or mark of pagan and papal apostasy, and rebellion against the Creator of the heavens and the earth. For this reason they cannot pay even outward regard to it. They look upon the demand that they shall keep Sunday as exactly parallel to the decree of King Nebuchadnezzar requiring the three Hebrews, Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, to bow down with the multitude before the great image set up in the plain of Dura.

It is argued, however, that "the Adventists are left to observe the seventh day," and that "they are not required to keep Sunday religiously." Neither were the three Hebrews forbidden to worship the true God; nor were they required to pay more than outward and formal respect to the great image. They might have bowed before the image at the sound of the music and then prayed to the God of heaven; but to all beholders they would have appeared to worship the image, God vindicated them in their refusal to even seem to countenance idolatry.

It is true that Adventists are not forbidden to rest upon the seventh day, neither are they required to perform upon the first day any act which is of itself religious; but rest is itself a religious act *in such a case*, just as bowing before the image, under the circumstances, would have been a religious act on the part of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. Actions speak louder than words, and by working upon the seventh day, and resting upon Sunday, the Sunday-keeper testifies more loudly than he could by words that the seventh day is not the Sabbath, and that Sunday is the sabbath. In like manner by resting upon the seventh day and working upon the first day, the Sabbatarian testifies that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and that the first day is not. This the *Christian Statesman* would prohibit by statute, thus curtailing the liberty of the Sabbath-keeper to teach by his example that which he believes is the truth; so that not only do Sunday "laws" require of the Sabbatarian a service which he cannot conscientiously render, but they forbid him to render a service, in the way of testifying to the truth, which he feels in conscience bound to render.

It does not follow from this that the Sabbatarian should be unnecessarily offensive in his Sunday work; but he should treat the day as a secular day, doing quietly and in an orderly manner his accustomed work, just as Daniel, being accustomed to pray three times a day with his window open toward Jerusalem, continued that practice when he knew that the writing had been signed forbidding any man to ask any petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of the king only. His act was not uncivil, nor was it anything that could possibly be styled a disturbance of the peace before the king's decree was issued; neither was it anything that ought to have disturbed anyone after the decree was issued; and yet as a matter of fact, it did very seriously disturb Daniel's enemies; not because it was uncivil or because it injured them in any way, but because their intolerant feelings could not brook such violation of the king's decree, when in conflict with their ideas of propriety. And it is for the same reason that Sunday work by Sabbatarians so powerfully disturbs Sunday-keepers; it is because it is obnoxious to their intolerant feelings. They cannot brook it because they feel that it is improper, and because fortified by the knowledge that there is a statute against it, they cultivate that feeling until it becomes a passion with them.

"Scriptural Precedent for It" *American Sentinel* 10, 38 , p. 299.

THE *Outlook* gives an account of a communion service in Japan at which neither bread nor wine were used; sponge cake taking the place of the bread, and tea being substituted for wine; but those who partook felt that "they obeyed the command of our Lord." The *Outlook* remarks:—

This is parallel to the question which might arise in an arctic region. For ourselves, we have no doubt that Jesus baptized by immersion, but that would be manifestly impossible in a frigid zone. Do not these facts indicate that the virtue is not in the thing used, or in the form in which a rite is administered, but in the fact that it brings to mind the person and teaching of the Saviour himself? We think few would presume to say that the cake and tea were not as holy and acceptable as the bread and the wine, and a no larger would require baptism by immersion in the frigid zone. Not on the rite, but on the truth symbolized, the Master would have the emphasis placed.

The *Examiner* (Baptist) takes exception to this view of the case, and shows very conclusively that there is nothing to prevent immersion even in the coldest countries inhabited by man. It also goes further and shows that both bread and wine are easily obtainable in Japan, and that hence there was no occasion for substituting sponge cake and tea, as was done in the instance referred to by the *Outlook*.

But is there any greater impropriety in substituting sponge cake and tea for bread and wine in the celebration of the Lord's supper, or in substituting sprinkling for immersion in baptism, than there is in substituting the first day of the week for the seventh in the matter of Sabbath observance? The fact is that the practice of substituting something that the Lord has not commanded for that which he was commanded, is altogether wrong. However, the practice is very ancient, and is regarded by some as even venerable.

The first one so far as we know to offer a substitute, was Cain, who, instead of bringing a lamb as an offering, as required by the Lord, substituted the fruits of the ground. Another case of substitution is recorded in the 10th chapter of Leviticus, where we read that "Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not."

Thus it is seen that there is precedent even in the Scriptures for offering to the Lord something that he has not commanded instead of

that which he has commanded. These cases are not likely to be appealed to, however, in support of the practice, as it is very evident that such substitution was not pleasing to the Lord then; and there is no reason to believe that it is any more pleasing to him now.

"Are Methodists Consistent?" *American Sentinel* 10, 38 , pp. 299, 300.

THE Methodist missionaries, expelled from the Caroline Islands some years ago by the Spanish authorities, are demanding, through the State Department at Washington, the privilege of returning to the Islands. It is stated that the Secretary of State will shortly demand that the missionaries be permitted to return. Whether this will be granted or not remains to be seen; but if they are not permitted to return, it is stated definitely that Secretary Olney will take "most vigorous measures to bring about obedience."

Our sympathies in this matter are wholly with the Methodist missionaries. There ought to be no part of the world where any man who conducts himself civilly, could not go and teach whatever religious views he might wish to teach, in a quiet and civil manner, to as many as would listen to him, without molestation; neither ought there to be any portion of the world in which every man could not practice freely in accordance with his faith, as long as in so doing he did not interfere with the equal rights of his fellow-men.

But we fail to see how Methodists can consistently demand that they shall be permitted to teach and to practice contrary to the law of the Caroline Islands. We believe that the Methodists in this country advocate the idea that Seventh-day Adventists "should obey the civil law until it is repealed, whether right or wrong;" and that they should not array themselves against the "laws" which require the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath. This being their position here, what right have they to demand that they shall be

300

permitted to teach and practice contrary to the statute-intrenched religion of the Caroline Islands?

The fact is, forever, that neither Methodists nor any other denomination obey the civil statutes which are contrary to their religious faith and practice. Methodists are right in insisting upon their right to return to the Caroline Islands, but they are wrong in insisting that Adventists ought to obey Sunday laws until they are repealed. The enforcement of Sunday laws in this country is exactly the same in principle as the enforcement of the laws of the Caroline Islands

against the teaching and practice of the Methodists. It is just as legitimate and just as much the province of government to require Methodists to take off their hats to the host (a piece of bread), as it is borne through the streets, as it is to require all men to render homage to the Sunday institution by refraining from work upon that day.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 10, 38 , p. 303.

AN illustration is not an argument. But this fact is overlooked by certain ones who are trying to demonstrate the necessity for Sunday-rest laws by a diagram showing the human system in a continuous physical and mental decline through the week from Monday morning to Saturday night, and recovering its lost force at a single bond by keeping Sunday. The thing works so nicely by diagram that it seems quite unnecessary to cite actual experience, past or present, for further proof. But what about the traditional "blue Monday" with which the housewife is so commonly afflicted? It is quite a common impression, also, that more business is transacted on Saturday than any other day of the week, which does not quite harmonize with the supposed state of things as represented by the little diagram. We would suggest that if the diagram be changed so as to represent a downward plunge of the physical and mental faculties on Sunday, with a gradual rise throughout the week, it would accord much more nearly with the facts.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 38 , p. 304.

AND now it is in Montana that the dragon of religious persecution rears one of his hydra heads. August 3, in Butte, a Hebrew was arrested for selling goods without a license, and being too poor to pay his fine, was put into the chain-gang to work it out. Refusing to work on the Sabbath (Saturday), he was put into a dungeon, into which water was pumped so that he could not sit down. Two Seventh-day Adventists called on the mayor to learn the reasons for such treatment, and were told that it did not matter whether a man kept the seventh day or not, if he was in the chain-gang and refused to work on Saturday, he would have to take the consequences. This only shows very clearly that religious intolerance in this country is not sectional, and will be just as bad in those parts supposed to be possessed of a liberal spirit, as in any others.

ACCORDING to recent advices, Turkish atrocities still continue in Armenia. The purpose of this modern persecution is thus stated by a correspondent of the *New York World*:—

Ask yourselves if the Christian world is to sit idly by and witness this crusade of persecution which will not end until 2,000,000 Armenian Christians have been wiped out—wiped out because they will not abandon Christianity and worship in the Moslem mosques of the Turks.

It is impossible to describe the outrages committed by the Kurds and Turkish soldiers. To robbery, arson, torture and murder in the most fiendish forms is added still more revolting crimes against girls and women. Not one is safe, and but few have escaped insult and violence at the hands of Turkish hirelings.

The Armenian persecution is due to the same spirit of bigotry and intolerance that in the Dark Ages manifested itself in the horrors of the Inquisition and the Albigensean and Waldensean crusades; and it is the same spirit that is to-day manifesting itself in the persecution of Sabbatarians by means of Sunday statutes. The Armenians are slaughtered because they will not "worship in the Moslem mosques of the Turks." The seventh-day Christians of the world are fined, imprisoned, and driven in chain-gangs because they will not honor the false sabbath of their "Protestant" neighbors. The difference between persecuting to the death and persecuting to the chain-gang, is in degree only; the principle is the same.

October 3, 1895

"Some Principles Stated" *American Sentinel* 10, 39 , pp. 305, 306.

GOD is the Creator, and therefore the rightful sovereign of this world.

Whatever he commands is to be performed by his loyal subjects, no matter if all earthly powers should combine to prevent it; and that which he forbids will not be done by them, no matter how many of earth's mighty ones require it. The divine rule is: "Obey God rather than men."

When the Lord Jesus Christ was about to leave this earth, he gave to his church a commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" and from that day to this, his faithful ministers have been going and preaching.

When this commission was given, it was against human "law" to introduce any new religion into the Roman empire; and all the then known world was subject to Rome, so that in all the world it was against the "law" to preach the gospel. But Christ said "Go;" and they "went everywhere preaching the word."

Almost everywhere the disciples of Christ met opposition from earthly powers in executing this divine commission. They were persecuted in Jerusalem, were imprisoned and whipped, and some of them "were slain with the sword," but still the survivors continued to preach the gospel according to the divine command.

The opposition which the disciples met in their work did not surprise them, for the Master had told them that such would be the case. He said: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." And gospel messengers found that it was even so. Wherever they went the wrath of Satan was stirred up against them; and it was only too often manifested through civil rulers. But this did not cause them to cease preaching the gospel. When the magistrates commanded the apostles "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus," "Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

The experience of the apostles has been repeated in almost every country and in every generation from the beginning of their ministry until the present time. Everywhere the gospel has been introduced in the face of opposition from the civil authorities; but Christians have never stopped to question their duty in the premises.

The history of modern Christian missions is quite as replete with illustrations of this truth as is the history of the more early preaching of the gospel. With but few exceptions, heathen rulers have opposed the introduction of the gospel among their subjects; but without avail. Faithful men and women, counting "not their lives dear unto them," have penetrated the jungles of India, the deserts of Africa, and the solitudes of the isles of the ocean, carrying with them the gospel, which they have faithfully proclaimed, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear, and whether rulers gave their consent to its proclamation or not.

So universally has the right of the Christian missionary to obey the gospel commission been seen and admitted, that we find the governments of the principal "Christian nations" of the world insisting

that Christian missionaries shall be permitted to deliver their message to as many as will listen to it. Were it not for this, Christian missions, as they are maintained to-day, would be an impossibility in many lands: Turkey, China, and some of the islands of the sea, would still be without the gospel had the civil "law" been allowed to prevail rather than that higher law—the command of God, the gospel commission.

Even to-day we find various Protestant bodies insisting upon the right to go into Roman Catholic countries, and there not only to teach but to practice contrary to the "laws" of those lands; and when they are arrested and imprisoned under the forms of "law," they call it religious persecution, as is witnessed by the following letter published in the *London Times*, of Oct. 23, 1891:—

Religious Persecution in Portugal.

The Evangelical Alliance has often experienced your kind consideration and ready help in making publicly known cases of intolerant action and oppression against Protestant Christians in foreign countries. We are therefore encouraged to solicit again the favor of your publishing in your columns an extract from a letter from Oporto, dated the 6th inst., reporting how a Protestant named Francisco Bichao, an inhabitant of Aveiro, has been thrown into prison under a sentence of twelve months' imprisonment and a fine of ?2 or in default of payment a further term of three months' imprisonment. The offenses charged against him, before the civil court, was for *refusing to take off his cap to a cross carried at a funeral*. He appealed against the cruel sentence, and the letter above referred to now reports as follows:—

"The appeal to the Superior Court at Oporto was successful, inasmuch as the sentence was annulled on a technical point—viz., that it had not been clearly proved that he had wilfully treated the State Church with disrespect. His enemies, who were powerful, then carried the case to the Supreme Court at Lisbon, and here the original sentence was confirmed, on the ground that it was sufficiently proved that he committed the act wittingly. As the constitution grants liberty of conscience, provided that the State religion is respected, it is easy to see how a point can be stretched even to a year's imprisonment for not removing a cap to a passing cross (not a crucifix) carried at a funeral. The sentence hung fire for a time, but when the abortive attempt to establish a republic failed at Oporto on the 31st of January last, the government was enabled

to use extraordinary restrictions of private liberties, as well as to gag the Liberal press. This was the opportunity, and Bichao was arrested on the 28th of February, and placed in Aveiro prison. He wrote to me on the 24th advising me of the fact, and adding, 'But I am happy; blessed be the name of the Lord.'

"We hoped that the usual Easter list of pardons might have included his name, but were disappointed in this, and there he lies, to the shame of popery, for it *was a purely clerical persecution*, and to the disgrace of Portugal, which poses as a Liberal nation, and in many respects is truly Liberal. But the Concordat with Rome still gives the priests great power when they choose to use it against the freedom of the gospel."

Your faithfully,

J. FIELD, General, K. C. B.,

A. J. ARNOLD, *Secretaries.*

Evangelical Alliance, 7 Adam-street, Strand.

London, W. E., Oct. 13, 1891.

This missionary, it will be observed, was imprisoned for not removing his cap to a cross at a funeral. He doubtless regarded such an act as idolatry and so refused to uncover his head in the presence of the passing cross; and Protestants everywhere say that he did right.

More recently, Methodist missionaries in various South American countries have been

306

imprisoned for circulating among the people, copies of the sacred Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. Roman Catholicism is established by statute in those countries, and the Bible is, except by the permission of the priests in special cases, a prohibited book. To circulate it among the people is a violation of the "law," and yet the Protestant world applauds the disobedience of these missionaries and styles their prosecution, religious persecution, as it certainly is.

The *Converted Catholic*, for September, edited by "Father" O'Connor, a Presbyterian minister of this city, contains a long article entitled, "The Methodist Victory over Roman Intolerance," giving a history of the petition sent to the pope by the Methodist ministers of Chicago, asking the Roman Catholic Church to use its influence in securing for Protestants in the countries of South America and elsewhere the same liberty that is enjoyed by Roman Catholics in the United States.

It is made very clear in this article, and in the comments upon the action of the Methodist ministers, quoted from other papers, that

while the laws under which Methodist colporters are imprisoned in South America for selling and giving away Bibles, are civil statutes, they are, nevertheless, begotten by religious bigotry and born of religious intolerance. The *Chicago Tribune*, in its issue of July 31, said:—

The contention of the cardinal secretary of the holy see, to the effect that the condition of things in the South American States is dependent upon the civil laws will be shown to be a technicality, since in the States named the civil laws are inspired by the Roman Catholic Church.

Commenting upon the same subject, the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, of July 3, says:—

It is well understood that laws there in force are shaped to please the dominant church. Rome can secure in South America and other papal States, whatever laws it pleases.

And to the same intent, the *Cumberland Presbyterian*, of Nashville, in its issue of July 11, says:—

It is true, also, if intolerance and persecution continue in South America it will be because the Roman Church wills it. Rome, through its bishops and priests, really shapes the laws and the policy of the government in all these papal States.

In view of the principles herein stated, and the admission of these principles by representative Protestant papers, we would venture to again suggest that the imprisonment of Methodist missionaries in Roman Catholic countries for violating "civil laws," which require them to uncover their heads in the presence of the host or the passing cross, and which forbid them to obey the gospel commission by putting in the hands of the people the Scriptures in their own language, differ not one iota in principle from the laws which in this so-called Protestant country require the observance of Sunday. In Portugal and some other Roman Catholic countries, everybody is required to show respect for the established religion by taking off his hat when a religious procession passes along the street. In this country everybody is required to show respect for a statute-intrenched dogma of the prevailing religion by abstaining from work upon Sunday, and by obeying a "law" which forbids men to testify to what they believe to be truth that they are under obligation to give to mankind, by obeying the fourth commandment. We would ask our Methodist and Presbyterian and Christian friends of other churches, how they can consistently call the arrest and imprisonment of Protestant missionaries in Roman Catholic countries, religious

persecution, and at the same time insist that the imprisonment and driving of Adventists in chain-gangs is only enforcing "civil law."

It is just as true in this country that the "laws" which imprison Adventists and drive them in chain-gangs, are inspired and maintained by the Protestant churches, as it is that the laws which imprison Methodist and other Protestant missionaries in South America, Portugal and Spain, are inspired by the Roman Catholic Church of those countries. Hence if any obligation rests upon the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church to use their influence in favor of the repeal of the "laws" which imprison Protestant missionaries in Roman Catholic countries, the Protestant churches in this country are under just the same obligation to give their influence to the repeal of the "laws" which make persecution for conscience' sake possible here.

"Religion in the Constitution" *American Sentinel* 10, 39 , p. 306.

THE *Mail and Express*, in commenting upon the political situation in New York says:—

The sabbath, as an American institution, is imbedded in Federal and State constitutions and laws. Our national Constitution has only two references to religion, one which specifically says that Sunday is not to be counted as a legislative day, and the other which declares that "no religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Mr. Warner Miller, the author of the Sunday plank in the Republican platform of this State, also says, as reported in the *New York World*, that "the Constitution clearly recognizes the sabbath," since "on that day no measure may become a law, no business be legally transacted, and no one elected to office may take oath on that day."

But this, as the *World* points out, is not a recognition of Sunday as the "Christian sabbath," but as a legal holiday merely. There are other legal holidays beside Sunday—the first day of January, the thirteenth day of May, the fourth of July, the first Monday in September, the last Thursday in November, and the twenty-fifth day of December—on all of which cessation from business has legal sanction.

In its effort to find "the sabbath as an American institution," in the Constitution, the *Mail and Express* overlooks that plainest of all references to religion in the Constitution, which reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or

prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Perhaps there was a reason for passing this by, for this is certainly very far from being a recognition of the "American sabbath."

Of course, if the sabbath is "an American institution," it might be expected to have recognition and sanction in American laws, even that supreme law, the Constitution. But a sabbath which is an American institution cannot be God's sabbath, which he commands to be kept holy, for that was instituted by him at creation. Neither can it be the Sunday sabbath, for that is observed in all civilized countries, and was instituted in remote ages of antiquity. The simple truth is, that the Sabbath and American institutions are things wholly separate and distinct from each other.

Our forefathers who framed the Constitution evidently did not regard the Sabbath as American in its origin; and it is certainly not strange that under their wise direction neither it nor any other religious institution found recognition in that embodiment of our fundamental law.

"The Sunday Law in New York" *American Sentinel* 10, 39 , pp. 306, 307.

WE made brief mention in these columns last week of the action of the Republican party in adopting this as one plank of its platform: "We favor the maintenance of the Sunday law in the interests of labor and morality." We pointed out at the time that this meant nothing so far as the suppression of the liquor traffic was concerned; for the expression, "the Sunday law," can mean nothing else than the whole body of law upon that subject. It cannot and does not mean simply a law forbidding the sale of liquor on Sunday, for as we showed a week ago, it just as much pledges the party adopting it to the enforcement of the statute forbidding the sale of ice on Sunday, as it does to the enforcement of the statute which forbids the sale of liquor upon that day.

We feel no interest, however, in this as a political question. We are interested in it only so far as it shows the temper of the people in regard to the making, sustaining, and enforcing of laws for the observance of Sunday.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL is and always has been opposed to the traffic in intoxicating beverages. We believe that it is an enemy to civilized society; that it increases the burden of taxation; that it makes

widows, orphans, paupers, and criminals; that it endangers life and property, and that the evils resulting from it are not limited to those who actually drank intoxicating liquors. In short, we do not believe that "whiskey hurts only those who drink it."

Being opposed to the traffic in intoxicating liquors as a whole, and believing that it is evil and only evil continually, we are, of course, opposed to any law which, by prohibiting it one day in the week, by implication legalizes it and makes it respectable upon the other six days of the week.

The Methodist General Conference of 1888, adopted this: "We are unalterably opposed to the enactment of laws that propose by license-taxing or otherwise to regulate the drink traffic." Doubtless the thought underlying this resolution was that by government license, the liquor traffic becomes a protected monopoly and a political power; and that by withholding license the monopoly would be destroyed, the political power of the traffic be broken, and that general prohibition would follow.

We are likewise "opposed to the enactment of laws that propose by license-taxing *or otherwise* to regulate the drink traffic;" and for this reason if there were no other we oppose all laws prohibiting liquor-selling only on Sunday. And if the Methodists meant what they said in 1888, they must likewise oppose all laws which prohibit the selling of liquor *upon Sunday only*. Certainly the expression, "or otherwise," is broad enough to cover such regulation of the drink traffic; so that we stand upon this question shoulder to shoulder with the great Methodist Church, so far as it stands true to the action of the General Conference of 1888.

But as we have before remarked, Sunday laws are not designed as temperance measures, but to guard from "desecration" a day held by many people to be sacred to the service of God. A few years since, the *California Prohibitionist*, published in San Francisco, said that if saloons would close on Sunday, it was about all that could be asked of them: and as we said last week, Sunday liquor-selling is not regarded by Sunday-law advocates generally, as any worse than other forms of Sunday "desecration." For instance, the *Christian Statesman* recently remarked: "Sabbath laws need enforcement against the excursion as well

as against the saloon;" and the Baptist *Examiner* said, in its issue of September 19: "Do the liquor dealers and their friends fully

understand what they are doing in their efforts to keep saloon doors open on the Lord's day? Do they not see that they are forcing the issue—a clean sabbath or entire prohibition?" This is, as we said last week, saying to the liquor traffic just as plainly as words can express it, Co-operate with us in Sunday observance and your traffic is safe six days in the week; resist our efforts for general Sunday observance, and we will see to it that your traffic is prohibited every day.

The *Voice*, the great prohibition organ of this city, has in its issue of September 20, two articles, touching the Sunday-law plank, adopted by the Republican Convention at Saratoga. The *Voice* shows quite conclusively by quotations from prominent Republicans in this city, that the resolution referred to means little or nothing in respect to Sunday-liquor selling. As reported in the *Tribune*, of September 19, Mr. Warner Miller, the author of the resolution, said of it: "I do not see how any one can assert that the Republican party is a prohibition party from the resolution which I introduced."

This shows very clearly that Mr. Miller did not mean that the resolution should be understood as pledging the Republican party to oppose the liquor traffic. *The resolution is simply in the interests of general Sunday observance.*

As we said before, we have not the slightest interest in this as a political question. We do not care which party is successful in New York State this fall. There are good men in all parties, and we doubt not that for the year to come, either party would give the State a fairly decent administration; but we do want the people to understand the issue before them in regard to Sunday and its enforcement by civil statute. We want our readers to know that Sunday enforcement has become a political question.¹²⁵ 1 It has become a question upon which political parties feel bound to express themselves in their platforms; and the politicians, for the sake of gaining votes, are willing to pledge themselves to enact, maintain and enforce such laws, and this regardless of the inherent right of every man to be left perfectly free in matters of religion. We believe that the present agitation in this State for the closing of saloons on Sunday, will not result in curtailing the liquor traffic in the slightest degree, that just as much liquor will be sold and drunk as formerly; that just as many men will be drunken as formerly; and that just as many innocent persons will suffer as the result of the liquor traffic as formerly. But religious bigotry and intolerance will be increased; high-sounding professions will be made. Sunday will be honored in the eyes of the people; and this is

the great object which the master-mind that is back of all this Sunday agitation has in view.

"Blue Laws" *American Sentinel* 10, 39 , p. 307.

A WELL-KNOWN Washington pastor, Dr. B. Sunderland, has taken us severely to task for using the term "Blue Laws." He says:—

You ought never to be guilty of citing as a part of the "Blue Laws" of the colonies the part about a man's kissing his wife on Sunday, etc., because no such thing ever existed in fact; they were a compilation of a notorious Tory made out of whole cloth, to cast ridicule and contempt on the colonists; and as intelligent men you should know this and not resort to such a species of falsehood and misrepresentation to bolster up your case.

We are well aware that no such code of laws ever actually existed as that sometimes printed as the "Blue Laws of Connecticut." But we are also well aware that "laws" did exist in the New England colonies, notably in Massachusetts and Connecticut, under which the ministers and magistrates assumed authority to punish nearly all the acts said to have been forbidden by the "Blue Laws."

For instance, there was no "law" which said in so many words that a man should not kiss his wife on Sunday; but for all that, as related by Alice Morse Earle, on page 247 of "The Sabbath in Puritan New England." "Captian Kemble of Boston was in 1655 set for two hours in the public stocks for his 'lewd and unseemly behavior,' which consisted in his kissing his wife 'publicquely' on the sabbath day, upon the doorstep of his house, when he had just returned from a voyage and absence of three years."

Their fact is that the authorities of those days assumed to regulate nearly all the private affairs of life, and the term "Blue laws" has come to be applied by common consent and usage to all such improper and meddlesome legislation; and by using the phrase, one no more indorses all that the "Reverend" Samuel Peters, "a notorious Tory," wrote about the "laws" of Connecticut, than does one using the phrase "Siren song" indorse the mythological story of the three sea nymphs said to frequent an island near the coast of Italy, and lure mariners to destruction by their sweet songs. The term "Siren" has come to mean "something which is insidious or deceptive," just as the phrase "Blue Laws" means improper and meddlesome statutes which invade unnecessarily the private life of the citizen. It is in this sense

that the AMERICAN SENTINEL has used the term, and in this sense we shall continue to use it.

"New York Democrats and the Sunday 'Law'" *American Sentinel* 10, 39 , pp. 307, 308.

WE have considered elsewhere in this issue the attitude of the Republican party of New York towards the Sunday statute, as expressed at their late convention, in the words, "We favor the maintenance of the Sunday law in the interests of labor and morality."

It might naturally have been expected that the Democratic party, having always posed as the political representative and exponent of the principle of personal liberty, would take issue squarely with the former party, and stand in favor of that liberty which every Sunday "law" must necessarily invade. This, however, it has not done.

The difference between the two leading political parties of the State upon this point is not a difference in principle, but only in degree.

The one party favors the maintenance of the Sunday statute in the strict sense in which its enforcement has been recently conducted in this city, and which is demanded by the ecclesiastics who aim at securing a rigid observance of the day. The other party also favors a Sunday "law," but wants one that will secure "a proper observation" of the day, an "orderly Sunday," and that shall have the support of public opinion.

Such importance has the question of Sunday observance now attained in the Empire State, that neither of the two leading political parties dares to pass it over in silence. Neither dares to go before the people without having avowed itself to be in favor of legal Sunday observance. The only difference between them is in regard to the nature of the observance to be thus secured. The Republican party believes that it will receive popular support in standing for a strict form of Sunday observance, and the Democratic party believes that the seal of popular approval will be given to an attitude favoring a less rigid Sunday observance, such as would allow the obtaining of beer and other alcoholic drinks on that

308

day, and in its general aspect would be opposed to a "blue law" Sunday, but which, nevertheless, would admit of such restrictions as might be enacted without popular disapproval.

As stated elsewhere, we take no special interest in the outcome of this political contest. We stand opposed to all Sunday laws, because they all, whether strict or "liberal," invade the realm of conscience. They all, whether avowedly or not, demand a religious observance of the day, since they all demand cessation from work, which is a leading feature of that Sabbath observance which is commanded by God.

The Sunday "law" is now the leading issue between the two leading political parties of the leading State in the Union; and that issue, as we have seen, concerns only the degree of Sunday observance to be embodied in the "law." If the Republican party proves successful, as it has in recent elections, the result will doubtless be attributed to its strong Sunday attitude, and that attitude, having been thus apparently approved by the popular will, will be considered the proper one for the party in all contests, both State and National.

And thus the way is wide open for the Sunday issue to move rapidly forward to a position of supreme interest and importance in the nation. That it will do this there is not a shadow of doubt. And the presentation of that true personal liberty which is the Creator's gift to every man, cannot be left to any political party. That work must be done by those who know that perfect liberty that comes from God, through an acquaintance with the gospel of Jesus Christ.

October 10, 1895

**"God's Warning Against Yielding to Sunday Laws" *American Sentinel*
10, 40 , pp. 313, 314.**

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL has from the first opposed all movements in this country and elsewhere the success of which, through religious legislation, meant a union of Church and State.

It has opposed such movements because they were contrary to natural right and justice, contrary to the free exercise of conscience, and against the interests of both the State and the Church.

But there is another reason, and one of immeasurable weight and significance, wherefore the SENTINEL raises its voice against them; and that one is based upon those interests and that relation of the individual which are paramount to all others, namely, his eternal interests and his relation to his Creator.

That reason is stated in the plainest and most emphatic language by God himself. Let it be remembered that these movements for securing religious legislation relate almost wholly to a divine institution—the Sabbath—and that they exalt and aim to thrust upon the world by force a day which has been made a rival to the Sabbath God has appointed, and which he commands all men to keep. Therefore it is not strange that God should have spoken explicitly upon this subject, and should have uttered a most solemn warning against yielding allegiance in this matter of Sabbath observance to the power which has exalted itself against him.

That warning is given in these words: *"If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb. And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name."* Rev. 14:9-11.

Let all the world hear, and tremble at these words of the most high God!

The very essence of worship is obedience. The verse following those we have quoted reads: "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." The saints—those who worship God—are those who keep his commandments. Whoever does not keep God's commandments, worships not him, but another and opposing power.

The Saviour, in his condemnation of Phariseeism, said, "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. 15:9.

The "beast" and his "image" to which this warning message of Revelation 14 relates, are mentioned in the preceding chapter; and there are recorded some of the characteristics which identify them, and an outline of the work which they are to do. Verses 1-10 of this chapter are descriptive of "the beast." The remainder of the chapter speaks of "another beast," in nature like the first, though lamblike in appearance, which says "to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to the beast," and causes them—as many as will yield to its power—to receive the "mark" of the beast in their right hand or in their forehead.

It scarcely need be said that this language cannot have reference to literal beasts. No literal beast could talk to people and compel them to do work, as is here described. They are symbols which prophetic scripture employs in speaking of earthly governments.

Among the characteristics of the "beast" are "seven heads and ten horns," the body of a leopard, the feet of a bear, and the mouth of a lion. Verses 1, 2. A lion, a bear, and a leopard, are symbols used in the prophecy of Daniel to represent three successive universal empires,—Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Grecia. Dan. 7:9-6, 17, 23. After them arose Rome, greatest and most powerful of all, which ruled over their territory and incorporated what was theirs into itself. Hence it would not be inappropriately symbolized by a beast having some of the features of these animals.

Daniel lived at the time of the empire of Babylon; and the fourth kingdom which arose after his time was the kingdom of Rome. And even to-day there is a kingdom of Rome—a spiritual empire which arose upon the ruins of the civil empire, and still continues to wield despotic sway over untold millions of subjects.

This "beast" had seven heads and ten horns, and upon its horns were ten crowns. When the civil empire of Rome was broken up, it became divided into ten kingdoms (see Dan. 2:4-44), and this divided state continues to-day, notwithstanding the efforts of several great military leaders to weld them again into one empire. But, meanwhile, the spiritual empire of Rome grew and extended over all these nations; and though materially checked by the Reformation, continues a mighty and growing empire to-day.

One of the seven heads of "the beast" was "wounded unto death;" but "the deadly wound was healed; and all the world wondered after the beast."

The head governs the body. The heads of "the beast" governed the empire—Rome; not, of course, at the same time, but successively, from its rise down to the present day. Since the kings, the consuls, the triumvirates, the dictators, the emperors, etc., of Rome passed away, the papal head has ruled the empire, though given a deadly wound in modern times by the loss of temporal power. In the palmy days of the papacy she wielded not only spiritual but civil power, forcing kings and emperors to do her bidding; but at last, when the Reformation had checked her influence, the sword of civil power was turned against her. In 1798, a French army entered Rome, took the pope prisoner, and carried him into exile. For a time the papacy

seemed to have received her death blow. But, as the prophecy says, "the deadly wound was healed." A new pope was soon appointed, and with marvelous vitality she rallied in a measure from the shock, and continued on her course.

And the truth is only too plain that in recent times the power of Rome has been fast increasing, her hold strengthening in nearly every civilized land—notably, alas, in our own—upon the agencies through which civil authority is exercised. How long will it be ere she is able once more to control those agencies for her own ends?

And to-day all the world looks upon her

314

with wonder and growing admiration, and no nation counts itself able to make war with her. Germany, the strongest nation of Europe, with the great Bismarck as its leader, has found itself unable to contend against her.

The "beast" received his power, and his seat, and great authority, from "the dragon." The latter is identified in chapter 12 as "that old serpent, called the devil and Satan." Verse 9. He it was who sought to devour the man child—Christ—as soon as it was born. The visible agent in this attempt was Herod, who, as the Roman governor of Judea, represented the empire under which he ruled, and back of the pagan empire, wielding its power for his own purposes, was Satan, "the prince of this world," the real enemy with whom Christ contended.

Papal Rome was given the seat of pagan Rome—the "eternal city"—to which power and prestige still adhered; which power and prestige, as the papacy developed, rose to a height which far surpassed that exercised by her pagan predecessor.

There was given unto "the beast" "a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies." "Great" indeed, are the claims put forth by Rome: and her spiritual pretensions, such as the "infallibility" of her head, the power to forgive sins, to grant indulgences, to bind the conscience, etc., are blasphemies of the truest sort.

"It was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them." Here also papal Rome stands without a rival among earthly powers, as witness the long ages of her relentless warfare upon those whom she counted heretics.

It is the "mark" of this "beast" which is sought to be enforced upon all by "another beast" arising "out of the earth." And the papacy has a

mark, a sign of her authority. She affirms that she has this, and her own words tell us what it is. Looking in her doctrinal books, we find:—

Q. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

A. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of. ¹²⁶¹

The commands of Rome as regards her feasts and "holy days" are put forth as of binding obligation upon the consciences of men. And the mark of her asserted authority in this respect is "the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday"!

In another work we find:—

Q. Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

A. Had she not such power she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day,—a change for which there is no Scriptural authority. ¹²⁷²

The Sabbath, God's own sign of authority, the uplifted badge of the uplifted badge of papal power!—not the true Sabbath, of course, but one of papal manufacture. And there is a method in this madness, a wisdom which is that of a mastermind. For if the papal claim of power to change the Sabbath day to Sunday be the truth, there is no reason why she should not receive the homage and worship of all men,—yes, even of the host of heaven; and he who admits the claim cannot consistently refuse the worship.

This is evident from the nature of the Sabbath institution. It is the divine memorial of creation, the "sign" of Him who has creative power. The possession of creative power distinguishes the true God from all other gods. Ps. 33:6-9; 96:5; Ex. 20:11. The Sabbath is thus the sign of the true God, and by keeping it men show that the true God has their allegiance. This he has himself declared, in these words addressed to his chosen people:—

"Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." Ex. 31:13. This statement of the purpose of the Sabbath is repeated in Eze. 20:12, 20.

And therefore, had the papacy such power as she claims, and of which her change of the Sabbath is her own sign, she would stand superior to God himself, since the actual change by one power of the

laws or ordinances of another power, is evidence of the superiority of the former over the latter.

The seventh-day Sabbath is the appointed sign, or mark, of the power and authority of the Creator. The first-day sabbath is the acknowledged sign of papal power and authority, her change of the Sabbath being by her own testimony, entirely without scriptural warrant.

This false sign is the "mark" of "the beast," against which is uttered the fearful warning of Rev. 14:9-11.

And now, with the light of truth before them concerning God's Sabbath, as it is being everywhere proclaimed by Seventh-day Adventists and others, men are being forced to choose between the Sabbath of God and that of the papacy, by laws which command the observance of the first day of the week.

By those laws, when rigidly enforced, the papal sabbath,—the mark of Rome's asserted authority and power over the conscience,—will be forced upon all who yield obedience to them; and all such will, by this obedience, acknowledge allegiance to the papacy, and become worshipers of "the beast," and receivers of his "mark."

When the present Sunday laws of this country, and other more oppressive ones that will be made, shall be enforced, there will be in this land a fully-developed and living "image" of the papacy, even of what she was in former days—a Church-and-State power making use of the civil arm to enforce religious dogmas under the penalties of "the law."

This is the dark goal to which this country, spite of its Constitution and Declaration of Independence, its wise and noble forefathers, and the principles of liberty and justice bequeathed to it, is now hastening. The prophet on Patmos' isle beheld in his vision "another beast, coming up out of the earth," having "two horns like a lamb," yet speaking "as a dragon." "Time's noblest offspring"—and his last—appeared in the field of prophetic vision to close up the drama of human history; there to do a work which belied its lamblike appearance,—even to continue the oppression and persecution of God's people to the bitter end. He saw it exercising "all the power of the first beast before him."

And how long will it be before we also see in dread reality this same thing? Only so long as will be necessary to set up and put in motion the machinery of religio-political design, now being

manufactured on every hand, for the enforcement of Sunday observance and other ordinances of "the church."

This nation, of lamblike aspect, the refuge for the oppressed of other lands, the chosen standing ground of "liberty enlightening the world,"—which came up not out of the agitated sea of human strife and commotion, amid the overturning of kingdoms, but "out of the earth" like a growing plant, by the settlement of a new country, is sounding a dragon voice in the ears of those who would honor God by keeping his Sabbath, and preparing to force upon them and upon all, so far as oppressive laws can do it, the "mark" of the "beast"—the papal sabbath.

It is yet to do "great wonders" and deceive "them that dwell on the earth by the means of those "miracles" which it will have power to do, for the accomplishment of its oppressive purposes. The decree is to be made that no man may buy or sell "save he that has the mark;" and finally, that as many as will not worship the image of the beast "should be killed." Rev. 13:13-17. In what has already been done, is contained the pledge of what is yet to be.

Such is the national prospect; what is our prospect individually? What will be our attitude when the crisis comes? The "law," with its penalty, is a powerful argument, not convincing the conscience, it is true, but sufficing to change the course of many. The question is, Will that argument prevail with you? Will you receive the "mark" in your forehead, or yield outward allegiance by withholding your right hand from labor on the man-made sabbath, as God commands to be done on his holy day? or will the voice of the dragon be drowned in your ears by the solemn and portentous warning of Heaven,—"If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation"?

"An Exemption which Does Not Exempt" *American Sentinel* 10, 40 , p. 315.

THE following is from the Boston *Herald*, of September 30:—

Salem street [the Jewish street of Boston], as a commercial mart, was absolutely dead yesterday. All the stores, except those permitted by law to be opened, such as common victuallers' places and drug stores, were closed, and the usual Sunday activity was veiled by drawn curtains and locked doors.

This change was brought about by the order of Captain Cain, promulgated by his officers in that district, that none of the places of business which were opened for any part of Saturday should be opened on the Lord's day.

It was expected that there would be objection to the order, and there is, but it was not manifested in any aggressive form. The stores were closed for the time being, but it is the intention of the storekeepers to call the matter to the attention of the courts, and a series of caucuses, of which this subject was the principal theme, were held yesterday on Salem street, between Cross and Prince streets, by a throng of people, which almost completely blocked the ancient thoroughfare.

No definite plan of action has as yet been formulated, but this much can be stated: The shopkeepers, as a rule, are opposed to the order, and will fight it. Whether they will rebel as a body or select some individual to make a test case remains to be decided, but the chances are in favor of this latter plan of action. In the meantime, they will probably ask that the order be not enforced until the final decision of the court is received, so that their business may not be injured during the year or so necessary to a finding.

The Jewish shopkeepers claim they have the right, under the statutes, to continue their business as in the past. The law on the case is found in the last sentence of Section 2, chapter 434, of the Acts of 1895, and is as follows:—

"Whoever conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and actually refrains from secular business and labor on that day, shall not be liable to the penalties of this section for performing secular business and labor on the Lord's day, if he disturbs no other person."

For several weeks past there have been complaints and convictions under this statute, the courts holding that the seventh day of the week, in the intention of the law, was from midnight to midnight on Saturday.

The defense of those of the Jewish faith who are interfered with on account of this law is that their Sabbath is celebrated from sundown on Friday to sundown on Saturday, and they claim that if they do open their places of business at six o'clock on Saturday evening they are still entitled to the privilege, both under the Constitution and the statute, to open on Sunday. They claim that the law was intended to apply to them particularly, and to give them certain privileges. They further claim that the law ought to be liberally interpreted, to cover the period of their Sabbath, instead of being applied strictly to the seventh day of the week.

For all these reasons they hold that the merchant or laborer who ceases his labor at six o'clock Friday evening, and abstains from it until that same hour on Saturday evening, is entitled to the privilege

of opening his store or resuming his labor on Sunday. This rule is followed by the strict orthodox Jews, but some are not so scrupulous, and, instead of closing at six on Friday evening, do not close until Saturday morning, and then claim the privilege of opening again on Saturday evening, without waiving the right to keep open on Sunday.

The police make no distinction, however. If a man opens his shop for any part of Saturday, regardless of whether or not he had closed Friday evening, he is held to be violating the law, and will be prosecuted.

It is on this point that the light will be based, and the legal contest promises to be an interesting one, and rich in quotations from both Testaments and other authorities as to the nature of the Sabbath and of the Lord's day.

Behold in this another illustration of the inconsistency of Sunday laws. They exempt from their penalties those who observe the seventh day, because they observe that day "conscientiously." Because they conscientiously believe that the seventh day is the true Sabbath, and observe it as such, they are allowed to work on Sunday. But now it is determined by the authorities of one of America's leading cities, that the conscience of the seventh day observer must conform to the secular definition of a day, viz., that it is a period of twenty-four hours, beginning and ending at midnight. Why allow him any freedom of conscience at all, if it is proper to coerce his conscience in this respect?

Why exempt him from enforced Sunday rest because of his conscience, and again compel him to rest in spite of it? Why respect his conscience on one point of Sabbath observance and override it on another point? Could anything be more inconsistent? Are his rights of conscience any more sacred and worthy of respect at one time than at another?

Observers of the seventh day conscientiously begin and end the day at sunset. We say conscientiously, because that which directs their consciences in the matter of Sabbath observance, is the Word of God, and the same authority instructs them concerning the beginning of the day. The Scripture says, "the evening and the morning were the first day," etc. (Gen. 1:5), and again, we have the explicit statement, "From even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbaths." Lev. 23:32.

It will be interesting to note whether this action of the Boston authorities will be made to furnish a precedent for the civil authorities elsewhere in applying the "exemption" clause of Sunday statutes.

"George Washington's Admonition" *American Sentinel* 10, 40 , pp. 315, 316.

THE *Mail and Express*, of Oct. 3, attempts to make capital for the Sunday-law cause out of the public reverence for the memory of George Washington. To this end it quotes the following words of his, which it styles his "celebrated admonition to the people of the United States":—

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with public and private felicity. It is substantially true that virtue and morality are the necessary springs of popular government. Who that in a sincere friend of free government can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric.

Then it makes this astonishing comment:—

The corollary to these propositions of George Washington we find in the Republican State platform of 1895: "We favor the maintenance of the Sunday law in the interests of labor and morality."

That religion and morality ought to be respected and cherished by every man, of whatever position or calling, is certainly true; but it is no corollary to this proposition that Sunday laws should be made and enforced upon any person. The one is contradictory to the other; for he who cherishes the Christian religion will respect the conscience of every man, and be entirely opposed to any invasion of conscience by a religious law. If every American citizen in a position of public trust both respected and practiced the principles of Christianity, there would be no Sunday law or other measure of religious legislation enacted in this country, or left upon the statute books of any State. The individual who advocates a law to compel people to pay deference to any religious dogma, shows by that very thing that he has no regard for the teachings of Christ.

Washington's real attitude with respect to religious legislation, appears from other utterances of his which the *Mail and Express* finds no occasion to mention. One of these utterances is the following:—

Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen, is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

And as concerns the propriety of any connection between this Government and Christianity, the view of Washington is clearly shown in the treaty made under his administration with Tripoli, in 1797, which declares that "the Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion."

It is not justification of this adopted Republican principle, to claim that Sunday laws are not religious and do not interfere with the rights of conscience. Every Sunday law demands Sunday rest, and a weekly rest day being a religious institution, since it was established by God as a means of man's worship of him, the weekly rest is a religious act, and as such must affect the conscience of every Sabbath observer.

The Creator has sole right in the universe to the tribute of a weekly rest; and any such tribute paid to another power, as to the State, not only infringes upon that right, but by that very infringement borrows from it a religious character.

Quite in keeping with this misrepresentation of Washington, the *Mail and Express* proceeds to say of the Republican Sunday resolution that, "it harmonizes not only with our whole history as a nation, but also with

316

the spirit and genius of our Constitution,"—that Constitution which prohibits any religious test or qualification for public office, and declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"!

Truly it is a *blind* zeal which urges on the leaders in this Sunday-law crusade.

"The Sabbath Indestructible" *American Sentinel* 10, 40 , p. 316.

IF men would remember that the Sabbath is not a man-made institution, and that it does not partake of the nature and characteristics of that which is man-made, they would see that there is no occasion for concern over the danger that the Sabbath will be destroyed or lost; for no such danger exists.

The Sabbath was made by God, and is indestructible and unchangeable. It was not made by man's keeping of it, but by the act

of God in resting upon the seventh day, and blessing and sanctifying it. Before man ever kept it, the Sabbath existed as fully and as actually as it does to-day.

God, not man, made the Sabbath holy; and no man can make it holy now. No man can impart holiness to anything. God alone can do this, and it is only by this act of God that any man can become holy. The most that man can do is to keep holy that which God has made so.

We are commanded to keep the Sabbath holy; in other words, to keep it as God has made it. He has separated it from the other days of the week, by making it the rest day, the other six being working days. It is our part to see that in our own lives, this arrangement is preserved.

The danger is not that the Sabbath will be lost, but that men will be lost by failing to do as God has commanded. And as men cannot do as God commands, save as they become identified with Christ, so that He lives in them, as once before he did in the flesh, the perfect life, the need which is indicated by the prevailing worldliness and lawlessness, is for more earnest work in leading souls to Christ, and not for more stringent laws to "preserve" the institution of the Sabbath.

"'Grossly Insulted' and 'Outraged'" *American Sentinel* 10, 40 , p. 316.

THE *Pleasant Hill* (Mo.) *Gazette*, September 6, tells how the citizens of that place were recently "grossly insulted" by certain published utterances regarding a movement which had been started there for a stricter observance of Sunday. The *Pleasant Hill Local* was the offending party. That paper characterized the movement as narrow-minded, puritanical, and hypocritical, making, however, no mention of any person or church.

Whereupon the *Gazette*, as the champion of religion and morality, replied, "The question of Sunday closing here has received a fresh impetus from a scandalous article that appeared in the columns of the moss-covered raglet across the way," etc.; and the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on the following Sunday, passed this resolution:—

Inasmuch as every Christian and law-abiding citizen of our town has been grossly insulted by Mr. Race, who so flagrantly outraged all decency by his article in the last issue of his paper, and believing

our laws most wholesome and necessary for the public good, therefore,

Resolved, That we denounce said article as iniquitous and anarchistical.

We mention the incident as furnishing a sample of the temper and spirit of those zealous for Sunday laws. It is plainly not the spirit and temper of the meek Man of Nazareth.

The mere denouncing of the Sunday-law movement is regarded by Sunday observers as grossly insulting, flagrantly outrageous, and anarchistical. What, then, would be their feelings if this offending editor possessed the power, and used it, to put them in prison and in the chain-gang for refusing obedience to a law compelling them to rest on the seventh day of the week?

"Note" *American Sentinel* 10, 40 , p. 319.

THE *Catholic Review*, of this city, is a champion of rigid Sunday observances. Speaking of those who favor a "liberal" Sunday, it says:—

It is full time, however, that these imported "Liberals," whether actuated by the interests of the brewers and saloon-keepers, or by the wish to undermine the Christian character of our institutions, should try to understand the fundamental fact that this is a Christian land. The next fact growing out of this is that Sunday as the Lord's day, and not a secular holiday, is fundamental to our laws, forms an inherent part of the unwritten constitution, and therefore cannot be "liberalized," by any mere statute of the legislature.

If this be a Christian land, then it must be, in the opinion of the *Catholic Review*, a Catholic Christian land, since the papal church does not recognize Protestantism as being of a Christian character. This is a claim which the Catholic Church has already advanced, and which it will not be slow to establish, by every device in its power. There is in this "Christian nation" doctrine a pent-up flood of religious animosity and strife; for let the idea once become settled in all minds that this is a "Christian land," in a governmental sense, and it will become at once imperative to determine who are the Christians. And while each separate denomination can settle the question satisfactorily among themselves, there will be unending difficulty in settling it satisfactorily for all. Old controversies will be revived and new ones will be added; and those who finally establish themselves as the "Christians" to whom this land belongs, will have to do so by intrigue and force rather than by the testimony of Christian lives.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 40 , p. 320.

WE print on page 317 an article entitled, "That Resolution at Saratoga." It is from Dr. E. T. Hiscox, the well-known Baptist minister and writer, author of the "Baptist Manual."

We believe that Dr. Hiscox's statement as to the practice of Seventh-day Baptists in the matter of Sunday work is correct, and the same is equally true of Seventh-day Adventists. Every consistent Seventh-day Adventist must obey the Golden Rule, therefore no Seventh-day Adventist can render himself unnecessarily obnoxious to anybody upon any day. The consistent Sabbatarian cannot observe Sunday any more than Daniel could obey the decree of the king forbidding any man to ask any petition of any god or man for thirty days; but every Seventh-day Adventist can do to others as he would have them do to him; and as a class, this is what Seventh-day Adventists try to do.

A QUEER scene was witnessed last week in a Brooklyn court when a Sabbatarian was summoned to court to defend his right to retain the guardianship of his own children. The basis of the action was that in observing the seventh day he was hindered from earning as much as he might otherwise do, and that therefore he was not a proper person to have the custody of his own children.

It was charged that he had actually resigned a lucrative position in the New York Post Office because of his conscientious regard for the seventh day, and his unwillingness to work upon that day. This was held to be evidence that he was a monomaniac upon that subject. The attorney, who was prosecuting the case, got the man to actually "confess" that he felt that he ought to obey his conscience; that he ought to do what he believed was right regardless of consequences. It is true that the man is now earning \$15 a week, but that is only about half what he received in the post office, and it seemed to be quite beyond the comprehension of anybody connected with the case that any sane man would think of surrendering a position that was paying nearly \$30 a week for one in which he could earn only half that sum, merely that he might obey a commandment of God.

It may not be out of place to mention in this connection some comments made by an Ohio paper upon the persecution of Sabbatarians in Tennessee. This paper, *The Institute Bell*, deplors the intolerance and bigotry of those who are prime movers in this

persecution, but at the same time makes an "argument," which shows conclusively that the editor has no proper conception of what it is to have a genuine conscientious conviction. The fact is that there is too much made of convenience and not enough of conscience. Custom and expediency are set above conscience, and while everybody grants as a theory that people ought to do right, very few realize that a man who violates his conscience for any reason whatever, sins both against God and his own soul, thus separating himself from God and losing his own self-respect and weakening his own moral character.

THE following item is from the *Sun* of the 1st inst.:—

The Joint Arbitration Committee of the bakers' unions reported yesterday that at a meeting in 263 Bowery, the unions reported that they were dissatisfied with the way President Roosevelt of the Police Board is enforcing the Sunday laws. There is a law, they said, by which bakeries and bakery stores must be closed at a certain hour on Sunday forenoon. A committee was appointed to see him regarding the enforcement of this law. The unions says that if Mr. Roosevelt is sincere in his professions he will have to look after the bakeries as well as the saloons.

We remarked last week that a demand for "liberal Sunday laws" were in a position to consistently demand anything in that direction. Most of them have, no doubt, at some time or other, given their influence in favor of making or enforcing so-called laws to compel other people to cease doing something on Sunday, that they might properly engage in were it not for the "law," thus restricting the liberties of those who are engaged in certain lines of business, and therefore forfeiting their right to protest when the so-called Sunday "laws" infringe their rights.

Doubtless many of the bakers who are demanding that the bake-shops close at a certain hour on Sunday forenoon, would like to adjourn to the saloon or beer garden, which they would of course, wish to have open; but it will be very difficult for them to persuade the majority of the people that a place ought to be open for the sale of intoxicating liquors if shops for the sale of bread are closed; so that really such a demand is a demand that they be permitted to do as they please on Sunday, but that other persons be restricted in their liberties.

There is nothing in the world to prevent a baker from closing his shop at any hour, and there is no reason in the world why another

should close at the same hour if he does not wish to. It is simply selfishness that demands it.

October 17, 1895

"The Mission of the Church" *American Sentinel* 10, 41 , pp. 321, 322.

WE print elsewhere in this paper an article entitled, "Preacher and Plutocrat; or, the Corruption of the Church through Wealth," by Rev. Walter Allen Evans, which is deserving of more than passing notice.

Many will doubtless seek to turn aside the force of Mr. Evans' criticisms, warnings, and exhortations, by the cry of pessimism, and by pointing to our boasted civilization, the progress of the age in the arts and sciences, to the material prosperity of the world, and to the intelligence of its people; but none of these answer to the various serious questions raised by Mr. Evans.

Human nature is optimistic.

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast,
Man never is, but always to be blest."

To this characteristic of the race rather than to any scriptural warrant, is due the general belief in the final triumph of the gospel by the conversion of the world.

The true mission of the Church is little understood even by her ministers. Popular theology inculcates belief in a temporal millennium wherein all the world is to be converted to the Lord Jesus Christ, and all nations to own him as King; but the Scriptures teach a very different doctrine.

When the Saviour was about to leave this world, he commissioned his disciples, saying, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" ¹²⁸1 giving them also the divine assurance, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." ¹²⁹2

But he gave them no promise that the time would ever come when all the world would receive the message which they were to give. On the contrary, he told them that as he had been persecuted so they would be persecuted. ¹³⁰3 And that "as the days of Noe were, so shall the coming of the Son of man be." ¹³¹4

The days of Noah were days of moral darkness and degeneracy, yea, even days of gross wickedness ¹³²5 and forgetfulness of God; days when faith was well-nigh extinct in the earth; and that this is what the Lord wished to be understood as teaching would be the condition of the world in the closing years of its history, is evident

from his language on another occasion, when he asked this question: "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" ¹³³⁶

The gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." ¹³⁴⁷ But the Scriptures nowhere teach that the time is ever coming when all the world, or even the majority of the world, will believe. When asked by one, "Lord, are there few to be saved?" ¹³⁵⁸ He said unto them, "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." ¹³⁶⁹

Again, speaking of the end of the world, we find the Lord saying to his disciples: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world *for a witness* unto all nations; and then shall the end come." ¹³⁷¹⁰ There is nothing, however, in all this that indicates that the purpose of the gospel is to convert the world.

In perfect accord with the texts already quoted, are the words of inspiration found in the Acts and in the Epistles. In the first general council of the Christian Church, James declared that Simeon had set forth "how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, *to take out of them a people* for his name." ¹³⁸¹¹ While we find Peter declaring "that there shall come in the last days scoffers walking after their own lusts;" ¹³⁹¹² and the Apostle Paul, writing to Timothy, says: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away." ¹⁴⁰¹³ And again, in giving a solemn charge to his son in the gospel, he says: "I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the quick and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom: preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching. For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but, having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts; and will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables." ¹⁴¹¹⁴

In the light of well-known and recognized facts, must we not conclude that the time foretold by inspiration has come? For,

according to the testimony of ministers themselves, men are heaping to themselves teachers after their own lusts, and are turning away their ears from the truth, and are being turned unto fables. ¹⁴² 15 Instead of being upon the verge of temporal millennium, wherein all men are to yield to the claims of the gospel and gladly acknowledge Christ as sovereign, is it not evident that the world is ripening for the harvest, so graphically described by the pen of inspiration: "And another angel came out of the temple which is in heaven, he also having a sharp sickle. And another angel came out from the altar, which had power over fire; and cried with a loud cry to him that had the

322

sharp sickle, saying, Thrust in thy sharp sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth; for her grapes are fully ripe. And the angel thrust in his sickle into the earth, and gathered the vine of the earth, and cast it into the great winepress of the wrath of God."? ¹⁴³16

"What Is Christian Endeavor?" *American Sentinel* 10, 41 , p. 322.

THE word "Christian" means, pertaining to Christ,—partaking of the nature and spirit of Christ.

"Christian" endeavor, therefore,—that which is such in fact,—must be such endeavor as bears the stamp of Christ's character and life. All Christian work is but the work of Christ himself, performed through human instruments.

But we see in this country very much that is called Christian endeavor, the like of which we search in vain to discover in the purposes and life of Christ. An example of this is furnished by the Christian Endeavor convention which closed its session in Brooklyn, October 9. This appears from the following resolutions, with the passing of which the convention concluded its work:—

1. That we favor the execution of law, and call upon the executive officers in our towns and cities to honor their oaths of office and earn their salaries by executing law.

2. We protest against any modification of laws in the interest of the liquor traffic providing for the opening of saloons on Sunday.

We protest against the inauguration by statute of any system of "local option" that does not cover the whole State.

We call for such revision of the excise laws as will do away with the screens in saloon windows, and will permit policemen the right of entrance to saloons at all hours of the day or night.

3. We favor the divorce of city government from partisan politics.

4. We believe in the observance of Sunday as a day of rest from labor, service for humanity, and worship of God.

5. We congratulate the governor and legislature of Texas on their defense of decency in forbidding prize fighting.

6. We wish to express our sympathy with Armenia in her sufferings and with Cuba in her struggles.

7. We urge more interest in and work among mission fields, home and foreign.

8. We pledge ourselves to purity in private life, loyalty to American institutions, and service to Jesus Christ.

The commission given by Christ to his followers was: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark 16:15. They were to go teaching all nations "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28:19, 20. This was the work that Christ did as a man on earth, and which he has done through his disciples in all the centuries since. All endeavor that is Christian must be in the line of fulfilling this commission.

In these resolutions passed by the "Christian Endeavor" convention, there is, however, not one reference to Christian work, as defined by these words of Christ, except the vague and weak reference in the seventh, and the last one, pledging the convention to "service to Jesus Christ;" and the nature of that "service" is presumably to be discovered in the light of the resolutions preceding. We look in vain through the record of the life of Christ for any precedent justifying the title of "Christian" to work of the nature described in the first six of these resolutions. His work did not concern municipal politics and government. It was work of a wholly different and higher sort.

The truth is, such work is not true Christian endeavor. It is political "reform" work done in the name of Christianity,—the work of the earthly arm clothed with Christian authority and power, or what appears as such in the public mind. Christian work is the work of Christ by the Spirit, not with any carnal weapons of warfare, but with spiritual weapons, which are "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10:3-5. It overthrows the strongholds and puts to flight the hosts of the enemy not by political agencies, but by "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

"Excluded from Canada" *American Sentinel* 10, 41 , p. 322.

THE *Truth Seeker*, a "Journal of Free Thought and Reform," published in this city, has been excluded from the mails in Canada, under a ruling of the Postmaster General, because of its "scurrilous and blasphemous character."

It seems that the particular feature of the *Truth Seeker*, which has excited the ire of the Canadian authorities, is the pictures which appear each week upon the first and last pages of the paper. These pictures certainly are objectionable from a Christian standpoint. Those appearing on the last page, especially, are certainly blasphemous, and we confess that we do not like them. They are not only wicked because they ridicule sacred things, but they are often grossly unfair. We believe they hurt the *Truth Seeker*; but that they justify its exclusion from the mails is quite another question.

"Blasphemy" is an exceedingly elastic term. In some countries, to speak against the Virgin Mary is to be guilty of "blasphemy." In the early history of Maryland, to speak reproachfully of the Virgin was an offense punishable by a fine of five pounds; and a third offense, by confiscation of all property, and banishment from the colony.

Genuine Christianity has no use for civil power, neither has it anything to fear from the *Truth Seeker*, or from any other paper of like character; and spurious Christianity cannot be trusted with the power to define and punish heresy. Those who favor the exclusion of the *Truth Seeker* and other infidel publications from the mails, would not stop there; they would likewise exclude *everything* that opposes them. At a National Reform Convention held last November in New Castle, Pa., Dr. McAllister, the editor of the *Christian Statesman*, exhibited a copy of the *Truth Seeker* to the audience and called attention to the cartoons on the first and last pages, and said that it was simply "secularism gone to seed." That statement was as grossly unfair as are some of the *Truth Seeker's* cartoons; but that was not the worst thing the Doctor did. He spoke of the AMERICAN SENTINEL in the same connection and classed it with the *Truth Seeker*, though he certainly knew there was an impassable gulf between the two papers.

But bad as was Dr. McAllister's statement, it was not sufficiently strong to satisfy Dr. H. H. George. He arose, and referring again to the *Truth Seeker*, the SENTINEL, and to certain religious liberty tracts that had been distributed in the town, said; "*They all emanate from the*

same source and are of the same character." He could not well have made a statement that was more utterly devoid of the truth. The *Truth Seeker* is, to say the least, agnostic. It is diametrically opposed to the Christian religion, while the SENTINEL is emphatically Christian and is edited by ministers of the gospel, and is supported almost wholly by Christian people. Thus it appears that the same spirit which excludes the *Truth Seeker* from the mails because of its blasphemies, would go farther if it could, and exclude from the mails those Christian papers which do not teach the popular theology of the day. Both Canada and the United State would better endure the evils that they have, rather than place themselves in the power of a lot of theocrats who would speedily bring upon them evils which they know not of.

"Some Political Religion" *American Sentinel* 10, 41 , pp. 322, 323.

IT would be amusing were it not such a serious matter to witness the various attempts of the several political parties and factions in this city to successfully "straddle" the Sunday and excise questions.

We commented two weeks ago upon the attitude of the two great parties upon these questions, showing that both of them had declared in favor of meddlesome and mischievous Sunday legislation while professing to favor liberty. But bad as their utterances were, they have been exceeded in that direction by the anti-Tammany fusion in this city. This fusion has adopted the following so-called excise plank (italics ours):—

We insist that every citizen is entitled by the fact of his citizenship to enjoy the largest measure of personal freedom, consistent with the welfare of the community, and not in conflict with the moral and religious convictions of his fellow-citizens.

While we believe that the sanctity of Sunday should be maintained in the interests of religion, of public morals and of health, through rest from all unnecessary labor on that day, we also believe due regard should be had to the sentiments of that large portion of the community who desire on that day to enjoy some orderly and harmless recreation.

We, therefore, favor and will endeavor to secure such modification of existing laws as will prevent blackmail, partially and oppression, and will enable this city to determine for itself, by popular vote, whether the sale of food, beverages, and other necessaries, shall be permitted on Sunday during such hours under such restrictions as will not interfere with religious observance and exercise.

This sounds very much like a travesty upon even a political platform. It is positively the worst political utterance which we have yet seen. The constitution of the State guarantees liberty of conscience and freedom of worship; but this so-called excise plank promises the individual only "the largest measure of personal freedom" "not in conflict *with the moral and religious convictions of his fellow-citizens*;" which is only saying that a man shall not be permitted to enjoy any freedom other than may be conceded to him by the religious prejudices of his neighbors. This is worse even than the papacy, and all that is wanting to complete the utter inconsistency and the absurdity of it, is another plank protesting against the massacre of Christians by Turks in Armenia, and the killing of Christian missionaries by Chinese mobs in China. The whole trouble in those countries arises from the fact that the persecuted Christians assert the right to a "measure of personal freedom" that is "in conflict with the moral and religious convictions of" their fellow-citizens.

The weakness of this fusion deliverance on the question of personal freedom, is equaled by the absurdity of the party's attitude toward Sunday. That attitude is one of regard for the day as a religious institution, and a conservator of public morals and health, in so far as a belief in "the sanctity of Sunday" is consistent with harmless recreation" and the regular business of selling "food, bever-

323

ages, and other necessaries" on that day, and in so far as beer drinking is conducive to health and public morals! Dubious champions these of the cause of Sunday sacredness! But this is political religion: and the ecclesiastics who have been so long and earnestly laboring to bring religion into politics, ought not to find fault with what the politicians see fit to give them.

"The Sabbath and Liberty" *American Sentinel* 10, 41 , p. 323.

ONE of the principal arguments put forward in support of the demand for Sunday laws, is that they are necessary in order that the workingmen may be free to rest on Sunday; in other words, they are necessary in order that the workingmen may have more liberty.

It is said that "the right of rest for one is the law of rest for all;" and by this is meant that the right of one person to rest on Sunday, demands a law compelling rest on the part of all. In this way men are to be made "free" to enjoy their rights.

This is not the freedom that men need. It is not real freedom at all. Rights are to be secured to people, but not thrust forcibly upon them. A right is of no value to an individual when separated from personal freedom in the matter of its exercise. If the individual does not choose to exercise a given right, to force him to do so only makes that right a curse to him instead of a blessing.

Every person has the right to rest upon the first day of the week; but not every person wishes to claim the right in his practice. A large number believe that another day is the proper day for the weekly rest, and that such rest upon the first day is wholly improper. A still larger class believe in spending the day in any manner that may suit their tastes, whether it be working, or resting, or seeking amusement and pleasure. To enforce Sunday rest upon these classes would not be securing to them a right, but denying one: since the right to Sunday rest is but an outgrowth from the more general right to rest (or not to rest) upon any day of the week, as conscience or convenience may direct; and they would feel that their right had been invaded rather than confirmed. Nor would such enforced rest be any less an invasion of the right of all other persons in this respect, whether they were conscious of the fact or not; for the rights of all classes are the same.

And thus the assertion that "the right of rest for one is the law of rest for all," is self-contradictory, since it is equivalent to saying that "the right of rest for one" denies the right of rest for another. Such a proposition is, of course, an absurdity.

Those who believe Sunday rest to be a duty which they owe to God, should not call for a Sunday law compelling people to rest, in order that they may have "liberty" to do so. They already have the liberty, in common with all persons, to do what is right. Sin is a voluntary, not a compulsory act; otherwise the sinner could not be held responsible. True, the pathway of right doing is not free from obstacles; but under the provisions of the gospel, none of these obstacles can bar any person from the liberty to walk therein.

It is only a lack of faith in God that keeps an individual from doing what he believes it is the will of God that he should do. He is a slave to fear; he has not that soul-liberty which would make him free to obey the dictates of conscience. He who sins is the servant of sin, and all sin's servants are slaves. John 8:34. Such persons might take Sunday rest under the "protection" of a Sunday law, but it is evident that they would be in slavery still. What they need is not a change of circumstances, but a change of heart.

He who will not obey a divine command until he has the "protection" of a human law in doing so, pursues a course that is most dishonoring to the God in whom he professes to believe. His very obedience, rendered under such circumstances, must be offensive.

As regards those who desire Sunday rest on other than religious grounds, they have the privilege of securing such rest by any means which will not invade the equal right of their fellowmen.

There is a liberty which all men need, and their need of this is the world's greatest need to-day. It is the liberty which frees men from the slavery of sin. And there is a "law of liberty," which is perfect (see James 1:25; Ps. 19:7), and insures perfect liberty in the life that conforms to it. And one precept of that law declares: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work; . . . 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." Ex. 20:8-11.

That liberty comes with the attainment of perfect trust in the power of God; and the Sabbath—the memorial of creation—is the divinely-appointed "sign" of that power. See Ex. 31:13; Eze. 20:12, 20.

This shows the relation between God's Sabbath—the seventh day—and that which is liberty in the truest and highest sense. The keeping of the Sabbath signifies allegiance to the true God—the Creator—and that allegiance is a perfect trust in the power of the true God, which casts aside all fear of the consequences of full obedience to his commands.

To all this a Sunday law is contrary. Instead of leading men to trust in God—setting them free in him—it tends to confirm them in the bondage of that fear which debarred them from the path of obedience to their convictions of right. It is the expression of trust in the power of man, which is contrary to trust in God. For, "Thus saith the Lord: Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord." But "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." Jer. 17:5, 7. A like statement is made by the Apostle Paul: "For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." Phil. 3:3.

Thus it is evident that a Sunday law is not for liberty in the case of any man, but against it. It can be nothing more than a badge of the

bondage of those who would take refuge beneath it. It is contrary to the perfect law of liberty, which is the law of God.

"Foreclosing Their Mortgage" *American Sentinel* 10, 41 , p. 327.

SUNDAY, October 6, was spent by the leaders of the anti-Tammany forces of this city in arranging a fusion ticket in the interests of "reform." This action was discussed the next day in the Methodist Preachers' Meeting, after which the following was unanimously adopted:—

The members of the New York Preachers' Meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Church desire to put on record their condemnation of the action of the representatives of political parties and political faction, who, claiming to represent the reform sentiment in this city, spent the hours of Sunday, October 6, in conference over the parceling out of nominations for office on the basis of the number of votes they claimed to control.

We desire to declare that in a political campaign where the chief moral issue is the rigid enforcement of Sunday law this sabbath desecration by the men who claim to represent the moral elements in our politics is an outrageous affront to not only the Christian sentiment of the people, but to the moral sense of all law-abiding citizens.

It will be seen from this that the Methodist preachers are not satisfied simply with the enforcement of the "law" as it stands, but that they demand that Sunday shall be observed as the Sabbath. There is nothing in the so-called Sunday law of New York to forbid politicians to consult together in regard to candidates, or even to hold a convention upon that day. Such action would not be contrary to the statute, nor is it contrary to good morals upon any other hypothesis than that Sunday is the divinely-appointed Sabbath; and this is the very ground upon which action was taken by Methodist preachers.

The politicians had placed themselves upon record as favoring "the maintenance of the Sunday 'law' in the interests of labor and morality." The preachers seize upon this and demand that politicians shall themselves set an example of the kind of "morality" which they propose to foster. It is thus apparent that in pledging themselves to the support of the Sunday "law" in the "interests of morality," the politicians have sold themselves to the preachers, and they must not find fault if the purchasers demand the delivery of the goods.

We are told that Sunday "laws" are not designed to be religious, and that it is not their purpose to secure the religious observance of the day; that they are intended in fact, only "to guarantee to all men the right to rest one day in seven;" but when the politicians exercise that right, in their own way, and spend the "civil sabbath" in arranging their plan of campaign, they are roundly denounced by the preachers as violators of their pledge to "maintain Sunday law in the interests of labor and morality." It is evident, therefore, that the preachers intend that the force of the Sunday "law" shall be to secure not only physical rest, but religious observance, and to forbid everything which is not in keeping with the supposed character of the day.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 41 , p. 328.

WE print on another page an article on "Religion in the Normal Schools," which contains some facts and suggestions worthy of serious consideration.

We are in harmony with the suggestion made in the closing paragraph, that it is only a "matter of simple justice to all denominations, and to those outside of all denominations, that all religious bias should be removed from" all schools under State control or supported wholly or in part by State funds.

We do not take this view, however, simply because of the impossibility of doing equal and exact justice to all concerned in the matter of giving religious instruction, but because in the very nature of the case the State is not qualified to give that kind of instruction. A teacher to properly give such instruction must have not only a religious but a spiritual qualification: and certainly it would be improper for the State to determine who possesses the necessary qualification for giving instruction in matters of religion. It would likewise be manifestly improper for the State to allow the various churches to certify to the qualification of teachers in that respect; therefore, the only thing for the State to do is to omit religious instruction from its curriculum.

Nor do we believe that the morals of the people would suffer in the least from this omission. Religious instruction properly belongs to the home, the church, and the parochial school. In all these places such instruction can be properly given, and by persons properly qualified to give it. But outside of these agencies any attempted religious instruction is almost certain to be merely perfunctory and calculated

only to displace and to cause to be neglected that home training which would otherwise be given.

Germany affords a striking example of what religious instruction in the public schools will do for a people who depend largely upon it. Nowhere, not even excepting in "infidel France," is unbelief so general as in Germany, and formalism in religion so widespread. We believe it would be many times better, both for the schools and the public, if all State schools were purely secular.

THE *Leavenworth* (Kansas) *Standard* thinks it has solved the problem of the persecution of Adventists in Tennessee and other States, and has invited them to come to Kansas. In fact, judging from what the *Standard* says, one would suppose that a general exodus of the Adventists to that State had already begun. Our contemporary says:—

The *Standard's* invitation happened to find those much persecuted people ripe for just such a move and more than willing to flee from the venomous reptiles of bigotry who have made their lives a burden and seek homes in a State where they can live in peace and worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. They will locate in groups in various portions of the State wherever the conditions are found to be most favorable. The *Standard* is now engaged in giving them all the assistance it can in the selection of localities and it hopes to land a fair share of them in this county and city. These people are not Puritans; they believe in religious liberty, and if Kansas can get every last one of them in this and other countries to locate within her borders, she will have accomplished the finest of immigration work she ever undertook.

We cannot think that there is any such movement among the Adventists. It is true that individuals of that faith may be seeking homes in Kansas; but the Adventists are not so anxious to avoid persecution as they are to discharge what they believe to be their duty to the world. They believe that everyone who has truth in advance of others is under obligation to give that truth to the world, and this cannot be done by colonizing in one or two States. Adventists are a missionary people, and no effort has ever been made by them to colonize; and instead of fleeing from States where the laws are unfavorable to them, we find them sending out missionaries into all parts of the world, planting the standard of truth upon every shore. They have established missions in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and in the Islands of the Sea. They have even invaded Russia, thus braving the terrors of exile to Siberia; and we

are satisfied that not until they feel that their work is done will they forsake any neighborhood simply to avoid persecution.

The question of religious liberty cannot be settled by fleeing from bigotry and intolerance, but by meeting it in the Spirit of Christ and with the truth of the gospel, and overcoming it in its strongholds.

IN the New York *Christian Advocate*, of Sept. 19, the editor says:—

When we were in Vienna it caused a great effect to find the little Wesleyan place of worship. The law would not allow it a shape like a church building; it could not have a name; it existed by sufferance. Consequently it was shut up and had a long conflict with the government. Finally certain rights were given to it, and a church was erected, and one Sunday last month, for the first time in Vienna, Protestant church bells rung out, a set of bells having been presented to this Protestant church.

No American Protestant will question the propriety of this little church's "long conflict with the government" in its struggle to occupy the place of a light-bearer to the multitudes that sat in darkness around it. No such person will claim that the "law" which "would not allow it a shape like a church building" or even a name, was not wholly unjust and unworthy of recognition. Yet it was "the law of the land;" and if "the law of the land" ought always to be enforced, simply because it is the "law," the Roman Catholic authorities of Vienna were in the right in trying to extinguish the kindling flame of Protestant public worship.

THERE is a large amount of humbug in the talk about the workingmen becoming slave to Sunday labor. The workingmen can not on Sunday if they want to. It is not they who are doing the talking about the prospect of such slavery, or who feel any fear of it. It is not an over-amount of labor that they fear, but a scarcity of it, with low wages.

October 24, 1895

"Christ's Kingdom Not of this World" *American Sentinel* 10, 42 , pp. 329, 330.

THIS is a truth plainly stated by Christ when he stood before Pontius Pilate to answer the accusations made by the Jews. John 18:36. Yet, strangely enough, we see to-day multitudes among the most prominent and influential of those who profess to be the

servants of Christ, zealously engaging in movements which aim to make Christ the king of this world.

The language of the Saviour on this occasion was not ambiguous. It leaves no chance to suppose, as some Christians of this day affirm, that Christ's kingdom is not of this world merely in the sense that its elements are not worldly in their nature. "If my kingdom were of this world," said the Saviour, "then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." A kingdom of his world, or which ruled in earthly affairs, and yet would not fight or exercise force in any way to save its king from death, would be an anomaly indeed. Christ's kingdom is clearly not of this kind. It is not "of this world" in any sense in which the expression is capable of application.

Christ refused to be made a king by the people of Judea. We read, "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone." John 6:15. This was just after he had miraculously fed the multitude with bread and fishes. Then, as now, people were entirely willing to live without working, and a king who could supply their wants without cost or trouble to themselves, was just such a one as they desire to have over them. But Christ refused to be placed in any seat of earthly power. They could have a part in his kingdom not by making him their king, but by making themselves subjects of his kingdom of grace, through acceptance of the gospel which he preached.

Upon another, and still more memorable occasion, Christ was offered the kingdoms of this world, and refused the offer. And that offer was one of the three recorded temptations of the devil. We read, "The devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Matt. 4:8-10.

It may be said that such an offer was not one that could be considered, coming as it did from the devil, and involving the hideous act of worship paid to him. But the truth is, that had Christ accepted the offer upon any conditions, it would have been an acknowledgment of Satan's supremacy. The acceptance of a gift is an acknowledgment of the authority of the giver to make the gift. And to accept the kingdoms of this world to-day,—all or any one of them,—

would be to acknowledge the same thing; for they have not changed ownership since the day of Christ's temptation. The devil told the truth when he said that the power and glory of the kingdoms of this earth were delivered unto him. Luke 4:6. By overcoming Adam in Eden, he brought Adam and all his race into subjection to himself, and gained possession of Adam's domain,—the earth. Satan thus became "the prince of this world." John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11. He became such not by right, but by fraud and usurpation, permitted as the inevitable outcome of Adam's sin. Like the existence of sin, Satan's dominion is without right, but is nevertheless a fact. Every sinner is a servant of Satan; and wherever sin reigns, there Satan reigns. The two are inseparable; they must stand and fall together. And as sin has not yet reached its end, but still reigns everywhere, so Satan still continues to be "the prince of this world," having the power and glory of earthly kingdoms in his hands.

And therefore, any and every effort to make Christ the king of this world, whether by the sword or by the ballot, or by any means through which governmental power is obtained and exercised in human affairs, is in reality nothing else than an effort to have Christ take what the devil offered him in the mount of temptation, before his sufferings and death. In other words, it is but an effort to make a friendly compact between Christ and the devil, which can only be consummated by an acknowledgment of the latter's superiority. Doubtless the devil is as willing now to hand over the kingdoms of this world to Christ upon such terms, as he was before Christ endured the agony and shame of the cross. But no more futile attempt could be imagined.

In the kingdom of Christ, sin can have no place; and therefore the only possible kingdom of Christ upon this earth as it is to-day, is a kingdom of grace, entrance into which is secured alone by faith. Satan and sin can (and necessarily must) reign together; but never Christ and sin.

But Christ will one day receive the kingdoms of this world and reign over the earth as its King. It was for this that he came to earth, walked and talked in Judea, suffered in Gethsemane, and bowed his head in death upon the cross. He will take them not by the will of Satan, but against his will; not as a gift from him, but as his conqueror. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." 1 John 3:8. And we also read that he was made a partaker of flesh and blood, "that through death

he might destroy him that had the power of death; that is, the devil." Heb. 2:14. God's purpose is not to remodel that which is of this world, but to destroy it, even the very earth itself. Christ can make no compromise with sin; he cannot reign with sin, even to accomplish—as some might think—its destruction. He will destroy sin, and all that is tainted therewith, in strict accordance with the provisions of that plan which he manifested on earth by his ministry, his sufferings and death, and which is manifested as yet only in the work of the kingdom of grace.

Through the work of grace, he will gather out of the kingdoms of the world, from every nation, and tongue, and people, those who will have him to reign over them. "This gospel of the kingdom," said he, "shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24:14.

330

The transfer of the kingdoms of this world from their present ruler to the hands of Christ, is a momentous and solemn event, plainly foretold in Scripture. Thus we read in Revelation: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." Rev. 11:15.

But what will Christ do with the kingdoms of this world when they are thus delivered up to him? Read the answer in the second Psalm: "I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Ps. 2:7-9.

The same thing is declared in the nineteenth chapter of Revelation. The attitude of Christ toward the kingdoms of this world, and their attitude toward him, at the time he takes possession of them, are there described in language which no one can mistake. We read: "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and He that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. . . . And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." Rev. 19:11-15.

Again, in verse 19, we read: "And I saw the beast [the papacy] and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make

war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army." No picture this of a coming temporal millennium. Not much else does current history record but the doings of the papacy, "and the kings of the earth, and their armies." All the fashion, the wealth, the honor, and power of this world are to be found with them. And the prophetic eye saw them not converted to Christ, but gathered together to make war against him. The two closing verses of the chapter describe their utter destruction.

Again, in the second chapter of Daniel's prophecy, the same thing is set before us. The prophet, in the interpretation of King Nebuchadnezzar's dream, foretold the rise and fall of the great universal empires that should succeed the kingdom of Babylon, with the division of Rome, the last one, into smaller kingdoms, as represented by the iron and clay of the feet of the "great image," and said: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. 2:44. This kingdom was seen in the dream as "a stone cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them in pieces;" and they "became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors, and the wind carried them away, and no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." Verses 34, 35.

This is God's plan for making Christ the King of this earth. It is the gospel plan. And any attempt to make Christ the King of this world, by any of those means through which earthly power is gained and exercised, is only the wildest folly. The motive may be worthy enough, but the effort is absolutely without knowledge.

When Christ's kingdom comes, then, as he has taught us, God's will will be done on earth as it is in heaven. This means that the earth will then be perfect, without sin or sinner. And that will be the new earth; for the present one is "reserved unto fire, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Peter 3:7. It is the preaching of the gospel, and that alone, which can hasten the kingdom of Christ.

"Catholic Shrines and Miracles" *American Sentinel* 10, 42 , pp. 330, 331.

NO one who keeps track of current events, as recorded by the secular press, can have failed to note the frequent mention during recent years of wonderful cases of healing said to have taken place at Catholic shrines, and by the application of relics of Roman Catholic saints.

The well-known Chauncey M. Depew had a wonderful story to relate upon his recent return from Europe, of a notable miracle which he had all but witnessed himself at Lourdes, France, a shrine to the Virgin Mary.

More recently the papers have been full of remarkable stories of wonderful cases of healing in Denver, Col., through the instrumentality of a humble shoemaker, a member of the Roman Catholic Church in New Mexico; and more recently still, the secular press has published the details of a marvelous cure effected in this city through the virtue which is supposed to reside in a fragment of a bone, said to have belonged to St. Ann, mother of the Virgin Mary.

The Roman Catholic Church has always claimed miraculous power for her saints and their relics; and Protestants have always denied the validity of these claims, asserting, for the most part, that the "day of miracles is past." But in recent years there has been among Protestants a revival of faith in the miraculous; and this answer that "the day of miracles is past" is no longer regarded as satisfactory by many people; nor is this strange since there is really no authority for the declaration.

The Scriptures do not teach that miraculous power was ever to cease out of the church; on the contrary, we learn from 1 Cor. 1:7, that the Church, just before the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, will "come behind in no gift;" so that something more than a general denial of miraculous power is required to meet the claims of Rome in this matter.

We do not admit all that is claimed by Rome in regard to miraculous power, but it is not necessary to deny the existence of such power. The fact that miraculous power is possessed by an individual or by a church, does not prove that that individual or that church derives such power from God, or that such an individual or church enjoys the favor of God. Miracles are indeed evidence of power but not of its source.

When Moses presented himself before Pharaoh and delivered to him the divine message, "Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness," ¹⁴⁴ 1 "Pharaoh called the wise men

and the sorcerers;" and "they also did in like manner with their enchantments." ¹⁴⁵2 "And Pharaoh's heart was hardened, neither did he hearken unto them [Moses and Aaron]; as the Lord had said."

Power was certainly manifested through the magicians, but it was not the power of God, for it was used in resisting the servants of God; and in his second letter to Timothy, the Apostle Paul says: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come." ¹⁴⁶3 He then gives a catalogue of the sins which will be common in the last days among men "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." He then adds: "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, *so do these resist the truth.*"

This is a plain prediction that just as miracles were used in resisting the work of Moses and Aaron, so miracles will be used in the last days in resisting the truth of God; hence we see clearly that through miracles are an evidence of the possession of power, they are not necessarily evidence of divine power.

That miracles are to be used in the last days for the purpose of resisting divine truth and deceiving the people, is further shown by the description which is given by inspiration of a persecuting power which is to oppose the work of the people of God just before the second advent of our Lord Jesus Christ. Of this power it is written: "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." ¹⁴⁷4 And again the prophet says: "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." ¹⁴⁸5

This text applies just before the end of the world; for immediately following it is the declaration: "Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

As we have seen, the days of miracles are not passed; but it will not do to blindly follow any church or any individual simply because miraculous power is manifested through that church or that individual. The Lord did not leave his people to be deceived either by "the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive," ¹⁴⁹6 or by miracles wrought by devils to confuse and

bewilder His people, and to give his enemies "occasion to blaspheme." God has given all who will use it a means of proving those who profess to exercise divine power, so that none need be deceived.

The divine touchstone to which all such manifestations are to be brought is the word of God. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." ¹⁵⁰⁷

That word can never deceive those who put their trust in it, and it is the only safety for anybody in these last days. By it the Catholic saints, shrines, and miracles must be tried. If in anything they speak not according to that word it is because "there is no light in them."

What then, is the purpose and what the effect of Roman Catholic miracles? Perhaps this question cannot be answered better than by quoting a paragraph from an article on "The Shrine of St. Ann," in the *Catholic World*, for October, as follows:—

While we hear a great deal—and rightly so—of our American pilgrimage of Ste. Anne de BeauprÉ, comparatively few in this country know anything of the European ancestress, of the mother shrine in the Old World which the Breton sailors, mindful of home and its associations, had in view when, tossed by the storms of the Atlantic, they promised "la bonne Sainte Anne" that if she saved them from the seas they would erect in her honor, and on the very spot where they would land, a new shrine on this distant shore. Saint Ann heard the prayers of her children, we possess our beautiful sanctuary under her protection, which bids fair to become for Canada and the New World what Sainte Anne d'Auray is for Brittany

331

and the Old—the nucleus of the devotion to the mother of the blessed Virgin.

Of course the Roman Catholic reader will discern nothing amiss in this paragraph, but it will sound strange to Protestant ears; for here we discover that objectionable doctrine, the worship of saints, disguised, it is true, under the expression "devotion to;" but it is worship none the less truly.

It will be observed that, according to the *Catholic World*, prayer was offered to St. Ann, and was heard by her upon the ocean, while at the same moment at Auray, in Brittany, pilgrims were offering up their supplications to her; so that we have in this paragraph, not only saint worship, but here is also omnipresence, or at least omniscience attributed to St. Ann. And to-day the new shrine at BeauprÉ, Canada,

is frequented by tens of thousands annually, while other tens of thousands are praying to the same saint in distant Brittany, and St. Ann, two thousand years dead, is supposed to hear them all!

The Scriptures forbid intercourse with the dead. "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that chirp and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?"¹⁵¹⁸

The reason for this commandment is evident: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."¹⁵²⁹ To seek unto the dead is to put them in the place of God. The Scriptures declare that "there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,"¹⁵³ ¹⁰ but saint worship makes many mediators between God and man.

Moreover, the Scriptures declare that the dead "know not anything;" that "his sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them."¹⁵⁴ ¹¹ "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish."¹⁵⁵ ¹² And again: "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun."¹⁵⁶ ¹³

Saint worship, or prayers to the saints, is therefore diametrically opposed to the teaching of the Word of God, and as Roman Catholic miracles foster superstition and idolatry and destroy faith in the Scriptures, they can be regarded only as part and parcel of the working of Satan by which he hopes to deceive the whole world to its destruction.

"Public Sentiment and Persecution" *American Sentinel* 10, 42 , p. 331.

IT is a common idea, but altogether an erroneous one, that persecution cannot exist unless there is public sentiment to support it. The truth is that rarely, if ever, has public sentiment been on the side of persecution. All that is necessary to persecution is a law which, either designedly or accidentally, affords it legal sanction, and a few bigots to take advantage of the opportunity.

Thomas Jefferson recognized this truth when he said, "A single zealot may commence persecution, and better man be his victims."
1571

The fact that the "law of the land" sanctions what is done, entirely outweighs in its practical effect the public sentiment which does not sanction it, unless that sentiment be strong enough to defy the law and prevent its execution. But this is rarely the case, for public sentiment hesitates to rise up against "the law of the land," and so long as their own personal interests are not touched, most people are comparatively indifferent to the wrongs they may see around them. "What is everybody's business is nobody's business;" and in this impotence of the opposing sentiment (which is often not even expressed) the bigot finds his opportunity.

It matters not either that the law was not aimed, in the minds of its framers, at any person's religious rights. Just as with a gun when it is discharged, the important question is not what is aimed at, but what is hit; and when somebody is hit who was not aimed at, he derives neither consolation nor relief from the fact that the bullet was intended for a different mark.

It is a fact that when a religious dogma or institution is given legal support, however innocent the motive which prompts it, a blow is struck at the rights of all those whom the law affects; for no person can enjoy the liberty which God has given in respect to religious observances, and still be bound by a law which prescribes what his attitude shall be toward anything pertaining thereto. And when he yields in one point of such observances, he yields the principle upon which rests the whole structure of his rights and liberties.

"Christianity and the Sword" *American Sentinel* 10, 42 , p. 331.

THE spirit that seeks in this country to force religious dogmas and institutions upon people by the power of the "law," has its counterpart abroad in the spirit that calls for the sword of "the powers that be" to put down heathen opposition to Christian missions. An example of the latter is furnished by a letter from the Rev. Mr. Fulton, an American missionary in China, printed recently and approved in the *Evangelist*, New York. In it, speaking of the late massacre of missionaries by the Chinese, he says:—

There is but a single remedy, if this Munchau rule is to continue, and that is to demand that henceforth foreigners shall have unrestricted right of residence in every foot of Chinese territory, and

that the local authorities and high officials shall be held personally responsible for the life of every foreigner residing within the bounds of their jurisdiction. Nothing short of this will meet the pressing needs of the case. The decapitation of a dozen or more of low criminals will be gladly granted by China, as a very cheap way of allaying the anger of England and America, but this will no more settle the matter than the amputation of an arm will cure leprosy. We must strike at the root, not at the branch. If this demand is not enforced, there is no assured hope for foreigners in China.

Elsewhere in his letter, says the *Nation*, the missionary "reviles the Chinese government in unmeasured terms." That journal comments upon the imprudence of this and similar letters written by the missionaries and published in England and America, and adds: "Imagine a handful of Buddhist missionaries in our own country reviling the government, calling for vengeance on their opponents, demanding foreign intervention on their behalf that they might ram their doctrines down our throats at the point of the bayonet, and some idea may be had of the way our performances must strike the Chinese."

The truth which sadly needs to be emphasized, both in that country and this, is that the arm of the secular power cannot be properly invoked in the defense and furtherance of Christian work. Christianity can never make headway against its foes by the aid of carnal weapons. The one weapon upon which those under its banner must rely to cut their way through all opposition is "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." And this is a far more powerful weapon than any that can be furnished from the arsenals of the world.

The spectacle of Christian missionaries calling for a bloody punishment upon their persecutors and relying upon the bullets and bayonets of their own "Christian" nations to back them up in their work, is a sad indication of the modern degeneracy of Christian effort, under the influence of that spirit which is seeking, both at home and abroad, an alliance with the State.

"The Spirit of Satan" *American Sentinel* 10, 42 , pp. 331, 332.

IT is a significant fact that in the closing decade of the nineteenth century—the boasted era of civilization [*sic.*—the world is witness a revival of superstition, intolerance and barbarism.

There is a decided trend toward the theories and practices of the Dark Ages. We have in this country a practical illustration of this in the widespread crusade in behalf of more stringent Sunday legislation, and a stricter enforcement of Sunday "laws" already on the statute books.

The same disposition is manifested in like manner in other countries; and in Austria the same trend is seen still more clearly in the attitude of the government toward the Jews. It is stated that one of the leaders of this movement in Vienna, one of the chief magistrates of the city, has secured a majority of two-thirds of the city council in favor of the anti-Semitic policy. "The program of the party," remarks an exchange, "has a genuine medieval frankness and brutality. It proposes, according to report, not only to keep Jews out of municipal service, but to oust those who are already in that service; to prohibit them from making any contracts with the municipal government, and to abrogate all such contracts now in existence; *and to exclude Jewish children from the public schools.*"

But Austrian intolerance has not exhausted itself upon the Jews. It is proposed also to exclude Protestant teachers from the schools, and to entrust the work of education to the Roman Catholic clergy. It is believed that this policy is inspired directly from Rome.

This same spirit that, as before intimated, imprisons men in this country for exercising their God-given right not to observe Sunday, is closely akin to the spirit which, breaking out in mob violence, inflicts torture that would shame savages.

The daily papers have recently published stories of horrible cruelty scarcely surpassed even in the Dark Ages. Within a week, two men have suffered in this country at the hands of mobs, not simply death, but horrible torture and mutilation. One poor wretch was taken to a railroad track, where his fingers were laid upon the rails and one by one mashed into a shapeless mass by blows of a hammer, after which he was shot to death, or as the papers expressed it, "was filled full of lead."

Another man, for a similar offense, was taken to the scene of his crime, and his ears were cut off, and then his fingers and thumbs, one at a time, after which he was hung.

That the crimes for which these men suffered, excite the wrath of the people, is not strange; and were their executioners content with depriving them of life, it would perhaps not occasion surprise, though even that could by no means be justified; but the infliction of such

torture is ominous. It indicates a mental and moral condition that is abnormal; as

332

remarked before, it is only part and parcel of the spirit that manifests itself in bigotry and intolerance. In China it slaughters missionaries; in Armenia it murders Christians; in Austria it excludes Jewish children from the public schools; in the United States it persecutes Adventists and tortures criminals; and everywhere it betrays unmistakably the fact that "the devil has come down having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time."

"The Law of Justice" *American Sentinel* 10, 12 , p. 332.

JUSTICE is law; and by it all men, always and under all circumstances, are bound. It is law that is adhered to by God himself.

Blackstone, the great commentator, speaks of justice under the term "law of nature," and says:—

This law of nature being c?val with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times. No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.

This is simply the statement of a truth which has, from time immemorial, obtained almost universal recognition in human transactions. It is the basis upon which such transactions, where one party has not had power to dictate to the other, have been conducted. It is the standard with which all human legislation, actually or ostensibly, seeks to conform. And when human legislation is changed, by the action of those bodies vested with legislative power, it is for the real or apparent purpose of a closer conformity with its dictates.

A recognition of these simple facts, in any case where there is a question of the enforcement of human law, would save any person from the compulsion that such law must be allowed to prevail simply because it is "the law of the land." The real law of the land is always justice, and nothing is law that is not justice. And human legislation, as Blackstone has said, derives all its force from the fact that it is, actually or supposedly, an expression of the law of justice as applied to the particular cases with which it deals.

He who considers himself bound to enforce a "law" simply because it has obtained recognition as the law of the land, forgets that he is bound, for that very time and occasion, by this law of justice. He cannot absolve himself from obligation to this law by any plea of duty to a statute, and applying to the same thing—coincident, of course, with every good statute—is a law of justice; and by that law he is bound in the very case under his consideration. If the human statute is at variance with it, he is bound to disregard the former rather than the latter. He must disregard one or the other; and he cannot properly or consistently, under the plea of enforcing law, set aside the real law in the case,—the law of right—of which that he would enforce is but a counterfeit.

The only question to be considered is, What is justice? This question once settled, the path of duty is plain. The citizen must conform his life to that law, and the official is bound by it in his enforcement of "law," and not by any "law" at variance therewith.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 42 , p. 336.

THERE is something wrong with the perceptions of the person who refrains from Sunday work as a matter of conscience, and yet is not satisfied to make that sacrifice to his religion unless it is made by others likewise, and that without reference to their own conscience in the matter.

THE *Independent*, of the 10th inst., has this:—

On the Jewish Day of Atonement, in this city, the cessation of business almost made a Sunday out of Saturday in some of the principal streets. It was proved possible for Jews to keep one Sabbath in the year; and if one, why not all?

Sure enough! Why not? And if Jews can keep the Sabbath, why must Christians have a law to enable them to keep Sunday?

POPE LEO XIII. has written to the Catholic hierarchy of America, condemning congresses of religion. It is said that the projectors of the World's Fair Congress of Religions expected it would lead to further congresses merging all sects and creeds. It is not probable, however, that the pope fears this: but Roman Catholics cannot meet other creeds on terms of equality. Rome assumes to be *the* church.

THE "Sunday Reform Leaflet," issued at Columbus, O., says: "In the interest of American homes we need the weekly day of sweetness and love." But Christianity makes every day a "day of sweetness and love," and nothing less than this is needed "in the interest of

American homes." It is our opinion that without these graces during six days of the week, the "weekly day of sweetness and love" will be much more of a farce than a reality.

ONE plea for the Sunday law says, "Close all on Sunday and no loss to any; there should be equal rights in trade." But such a law does not give equal rights to those who feel conscientiously bound to close their business on the seventh day—the busiest day of the week. Nor can the law undertake to see that all men have equal advantages in trade. It is only for Sunday that a law is asked to enforce simultaneous closing of places of business. A man's advantage in trade depends almost wholly upon his location, his resources, and his energy and ability in conducting his business.

THERE are several cases still pending against Adventists at Graysville, Tenn., for Sunday work. They will be tried probably the first week in November. Among these cases is the indictment against E. R. Gillett, the old soldier, who, having aided in conquering the South in war, moved to Tennessee to assist in carrying forward that conquest by the arts of peace. He is loved and respected by all who know him, only excepting the misguided men who have invoked the "law" against him.

Quartermaster Gillett, with his honorable record in the army and in the Iowa legislature, will doubtless bear himself equally well as a soldier of Jesus Christ in a Tennessee chain-gang.

IT is a fact worthy of notice that leading Catholic prelates are becoming much more outspoken than formerly in the matter of Sunday observance. That the papacy should favor a general and marked deference on the part of the people to the Sunday-sabbath, is not at all strange, in view of the importance that institution has in the papal economy, being the uplifted sign of her authority in spiritual things, and also the badge of the homage paid the papacy by Sunday-keeping Protestants. With her characteristic prudence, Rome refrained from taking the lead in the Sunday crusade, lest it should be given a Romish stamp which would prejudice it in the public mind. But she sees that it is safe and expedient to follow closely the "Protestant" lead in the matter, giving her powerful support to what is done, until this Protestant indorsement of her claims and her methods shall in turn become a most powerful aid to her.

WE noted in these columns last week, the imposition of a fine and costs upon a Seventh-day Adventist in Texas, because he refused to work on the roads upon the seventh day, "the Sabbath of the Lord."

This man's defense was that he could not conscientiously work upon that day, and that under the constitution of Texas he could not be legally required to work upon any day set apart by his religion as a day of rest and worship. Article 1, Section 6, of the State Constitution, is as follows:—

All men have a natural indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and no human authority ought in any case whatever to control or interfere in matters of religion; and it is the duty of the State to pass such laws as may be necessary to protect equally every denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of worship.

This was read to the court by this Seventh-day Adventist, but he justice(?) held that it did not cover the case, and so imposed a fine and costs, amounting to \$20.25. The defendant promptly appealed the case to the higher court where he hopes to get justice.

By the way, what would the good Sunday-keepers of Texas think of a "law" under which they were liable to be required to work the roads on Sunday? Would they not regard it as an infringement of their rights of conscience?

REFERRING to the Sunday crusade in that city, the *Boston Herald* of the 6th inst., say:—

It will behoove the police commissioners to pause before they undertake to prohibit the Jews from transacting business on Sunday so long as they observe the Jewish Sabbath. It is an assault on religious liberty that has been one of the bulwarks of our commonwealth from its foundation.

The *Providence Journal* likewise ventures the opinion that "if the laws of Massachusetts sanction the arrest of all the Jews in Boston who are found keeping their shops open on Sunday, they need reforming as badly as did the ancient Puritanical proscriptions when emigrants from Massachusetts Bay found their way to Rhode Island and Providence plantations."

This is all well enough so far as it goes; but why exempt only those who "observe the Jewish Sabbath"? If the prohibition of Sunday work rests upon "moral" grounds, as it has been held to do in most States, how can anybody be consistently exempted from the provisions of the "law"? And if it rests upon sanitary grounds why not exempt all who rest upon some other day? Why cannot people see the utter inconsistency and impropriety of all "laws" which forbid honest employment on any day?

October 31, 1895

"The 'Reasons' Then and Now" *American Sentinel* 10, 43 , pp. 337, 338.

BEFORE another number of this paper reaches the reader, at least two more Seventh-day Adventists will have been placed upon trial for their faith; one in Maryland, and other in Tennessee.

It is denied that the prosecution of these men is persecution, for "it is only enforcing the civil law." "They are not fined, imprisoned, or worked in the chain-gang for their religion, but only for violation of civil law." "They are left perfectly free to observe Saturday if they wish to do so, and they must respect *our* rights." Such are some of the excuses offered for pursuing with the "law," conscientious, upright men, whose lives are admitted to be above reproach.

It is not for the purpose of soliciting sympathy for Seventh-day Adventists that we state these facts, but to secure consideration of the principles involved. The contention that it is not religious persecution fails, in view of the facts as we have repeatedly given them to the public; for while Seventh-day Adventists are singled out and punished, frequently for the most trifling acts of unobtrusive private work, men who observe no day, or who at least frequently work on Sunday and do not observe the seventh day, are not molested. True, it would not make the "law" any better or justify its existence if all who violated it were prosecuted, but the purpose of its enforcement against Seventh-day Adventists would not be so apparent.

But, as before remarked, it is not for the purpose of exciting sympathy that we present these facts. It is that by seeing the evil of the practical workings of such "laws," men may be led to examine the principles, to recognize the moral obligation resting upon every man to obey God regardless of consequences; and also to recognize the fact that there is an infallible standard of right and justice in all things. This perfect law of moral action is revealed in the Word of God, while in our civil relations this undeviating and perfect rule of action is written in the very law of our being.

This latter truth is expressed in the Declaration of Independence, in the words: "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. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men."

This law of justice which, when obeyed, secures to every many civil liberty, is seen and recognized in proportion as the individual members of civil society recognize moral obligation; hence the largest measure of civil liberty is enjoyed in those countries that have most gospel light. Civil liberty is however incidental to, rather than the object of, the gospel. The purpose of the gospel is to bring men into harmony with God by writing the divine law in their hearts; ¹⁵⁸ 1 and this law being the "law of liberty" ¹⁵⁹ 2 not only gives true liberty to every one who is conformed to it; but it leads such an one to award to his fellowmen everything which he claims for himself.

The underlying principle of Christianity is supreme loyalty to God *and perfect recognition of the equality and rights of our fellow-creatures*. The Scriptures sum up all human duty in two precepts: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;" and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." ¹⁶⁰ 3 And again: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." ¹⁶¹ 4 This is the perfect law, in obedience to which there is perfect liberty.

According to the pagan conception of the rights of man and of civil society, divinity inheres in the State; hence the maxim: "The voice of the people is the voice of God." This is a denial alike of a positive moral standard and of inalienable right. Under such a system toleration may exist, but liberty is impossible.

The Son of God came into the world to set men free, and to teach the divine truth that there is an absolute standard of right established by God himself; and that nothing which is contrary to that standard is of any binding force whatever, or imposes upon the most humble man any obligation at all.

In the familiar words of the Saviour, "Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's," the Lord declared the absolute independence of every man from every other man *in everything pertaining to God*; and it was to teach this doctrine that the followers of Christ were sent into all the world.

The doctrine was not new, for it was divine; and the same truth which our Lord taught, and which his disciples were commissioned to teach, was truth as soon as there was a moral creature in existence. The three Hebrews asserted their independence of human

government in their relations to God when they refused to worship the golden image.¹⁶² 5 Daniel asserted the same principle when he disobeyed the king's commandment and prayed to God three times a day as he had done aforetime.¹⁶³ 6 But it was not until the gospel commission was given to the apostles that this doctrine was preached to the world in its fullness. And the preaching of this gospel of liberty was accounted treason against the State.

Paganism was so interwoven with the manners, customs and government of the people, that to introduce another religion was indirectly to attack the civil polity of Rome.

Even in the every-day-affairs of life, the Christian was compelled to run counter to the religious prejudices of his heathen neighbors. Gibbon says:—

The Christian, who with pious horror avoided the abomination of the circus or the theater, found himself encompassed with infernal snares in every convivial entertainment, as often as his friends, invoking the hospitable deities, poured out libations to each others' happiness. . . . Every art and every trade that was in the least concerned in the framing or adorning of idols, was polluted by the stain of idolatry.

The dangerous temptations which on every side lurked in ambush to surprise the unguarded believer, assailed him with redoubled violence on the day of solemn festivals. So artfully were they framed and disposed through the year, that superstition always wore the appearance of pleasure, and often of virtue. . . . On the days of general festivity, it was the custom of the ancients to adorn their doors with lamps and with branches of laurel, and to crown their heads with garlands of flowers. This innocent and elegant practice might have been tolerated as a mere civil institution.

338

But it most unluckily happened that the doors were under the protection of the household gods, that the laurel was sacred to the lover of Daphne, and that garlands of flowers, though frequently worn as a symbol either of joy or mourning, had been dedicated in their first origin to the service of superstition. The trembling Christians who were persuaded in this instance to comply with the fashions of their country and the commands of the magistrates, labored under the most gloomy apprehensions from the reproaches of their own conscience, the censures of the church, and the denunciations of divine vengeance.¹⁶⁴ 7

To transgress these time-honored social customs was more than simply to offend the religious sensibilities of the people. Any disrespect to the gods of Rome was disrespect to the Roman State, because the two were so closely connected. These pagan rights

which were so interwoven with the lives of the people, were not merely religious, but they were civil institutions as well; hence, to become a Christian was to be arrayed not only against the religion of Rome, but against the Roman Empire. It was for this reason that pagan Rome persecuted the early Christians.

Such was the logic of paganism in the palmy days of the Roman Empire, and such the "justification" of intolerance in the American Republic in the closing decade of the enlightened 19th century. In his dictum in the King case in Tennessee, August 1891, United States Judge Hammond said of Sunday enforcement:—

The courts cannot change that which has been done, however done, by the civil law in favor of the Sunday observers. The religion of Jesus Christ is so interwoven with the texture of our civilization and every one of its institutions, that it is impossible for any man or set of men to live among us and find exemption from its influences and restraints. Sunday observance is so essentially a part of that religion that it is impossible to rid our laws of it, quite as impossible as to abolish the custom we have of using the English language, or clothing ourselves with the garments appropriate to our sex. The logic of personal liberty would allow, perhaps demand, a choice of garments, but the choice is denied. So civil or religious freedom may stop short of its logic in this matter of Sunday observance. It is idle to expect in government perfect action or harmony or essential principles, and whoever administers, whoever makes, and whoever executes the laws, must take into account the imperfections, the passions, the prejudices, religious or other, and the errings of men because of these.

There is in this much of mere sentiment. But it was not for a theory merely that Rome pursued the Christians. Rome claimed to be supreme, to hold in her hands absolutely the destiny of every citizen. To become a Christian was to challenge the supremacy of Rome; it was to deny the authority that was claimed by the Roman State.

Thus what we call persecution in Rome was to the Romans, simply enforcing the law. From their standard they could pursue no other course. The emperors were under solemn obligation to their subjects to maintain unimpaired the authority of the Empire, and the better the emperors, the more regard they had for the government, the more conscientious in the discharge of their duties, the more intolerant they were toward those who challenged their authority.

The Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, was a man of spotless character. "This man," says John Stuart Mill, "a better Christian in all but the dogmatic sense of the word, than almost any of the ostensibly

Christian sovereigns who have since reigned, persecuted Christianity." And why? Because as Mill says: "No Christian more firmly believes that atheism is false, and tends to the dissolution of society, than Marcus Aurelius believed the same things of Christianity." ¹⁶⁵⁸

As a ruler Marcus Aurelius "deemed it his duty not to suffer society to fall to pieces; and saw not how, if its existing ties were removed, any others could be formed which could again knit it together. The new religion openly aimed at dissolving these ties; unless, therefore, it was his duty to adopt that religion, it seemed to be his duty to put it down. Inasmuch, then, as the theology of Christianity did not appear to him to be true or of divine origin," "the gentlest and most amiable of philosophers and rulers, under a solemn sense of duty, authorized the persecution of Christianity."

But Christianity finally prevailed in the Roman Empire to the extent that Rome acknowledged the right of every man to freedom of conscience, and proclaimed such freedom to all. It was then that the papacy, though in its infancy, took from the world the liberty which had been won for it through the sufferings of the early Christians, and another system was established more intolerant, more despotic, even than paganism.

Through the Dark Ages this power held sway over the consciences of men. In the Reformation of the 16th century the true principle was again asserted; and to this the liberty of conscience which we enjoy to-day is due. But the high-water-mark of human liberty has been reached and already the ebb has commenced. Men are turning again to pagan maxims and methods. Again, to the State is assigned the place which belongs alone to God. "'Law' must be enforced whether right or wrong," and "nothing ispersecution which is authorized by 'law.'"

Thus reasoned the pagans when endeavoring to stamp out Christianity because it opposed itself to the laws of the Roman Empire prior to the rise of Constantine; thus reasoned the papacy in the Dark Ages, and thus reasons the popular Christianity and so-called Christian civilization of to-day. And if the principles advocated in the 19th century in the United States are true, then all the persecution of the past stands justified, for it has only been the enforcement of civil law.

"Conscience in Politics" *American Sentinel* 10, 43 , p. 338.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROOSEVELT has written a letter to a leading representative of the "good government" political party in this State, in which, while expressing his admiration for the "conscience vote" in politics, he also affirms that this vote should pay due attention to "questions of expediency."

Mr. Roosevelt is a warm supporter of the fusion ticket, and asserts that the "good government" party, in running a separate ticket, furnishes an example of "the conscience vote gone wrong." This vote ought in other words, to be given to the fusion party, because that is the only one that can hope to be successful against those who are deemed the enemies of political purity.

This brings up the simple but important question whether the voter's conscience is to reform politics, or allow itself to be "reformed" thereby. It appears to us that any good conscience which has "fused" with the principles of the fusion platform, has suffered principles of the fusion platform, has suffered and downward "reform" quite equal in extent to the elevation it seeks to bring to the politics which it touches.

The reader will remember that this fusion platform advocates a Sunday which, while suppressing all "unnecessary" labor in the interests of public morality and health, admits of "orderly and harmless recreations," and such a measure of freedom in the selling of beer, tobacco, and the necessaries of life as may be deemed not in conflict with the pursuance of religious exercises and devotions. We cannot see how any one who regards Sunday as a sacred day, can be blamed for inability to make his conscience fuse with this idea of Sunday observance.

Such facts clearly point out the necessity of keeping politics and religion entirely separate. If religion has any proper place in politics, then, in the issue which is now before the people, the conscientious voter must vote for such a degree of Sunday observance to be enforced by law as his conscience tells him to be right and in harmony with his convictions as to the character of the day. And he who believes Sunday to be a sacred day cannot, without violating his conscience, vote for the establishment of any observance which is not in harmony with that conception.

The truth is, that when religion is dragged into politics, the result is always a degradation of religion, and in very many instances, a

degradation of the consciences of the voters. And this is certainly not the way to secure the purification and elevation of politics.

"Neither Incredible Nor Inconsistent" *American Sentinel* 10, 43 , pp. 338, 339.

THE bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, assembled at Minneapolis, Oct. 22, issued their "pastoral address," in which, we are told, the chief points of interest are the references "to the massacre of Christian missionaries in China, and the Sunday observance law." Concerning the latter the address says:—

Recent events in some parts of our country compel us to call your earnest attention to a widely spread and determined attack upon the use and purpose of the weekly day of rest known at the beginning of the Christian era, as the Lord's day. It is declared in the law of God to be his own day, and by the Saviour of man to be "made for man." It is protected by a divine command and by the perpetual sanctity of a human right. Men may and ought to worship God every day, but for the greater assurance of this duty on day in seven has, with the formal sanction of all Christian civilization, been set apart for its due observance. This order cannot be disturbed without grave evils to the individual and the family, to society and to State.

It seems almost incredible that our modern life should be capable of bringing into play any powers of evils that could seriously threaten the existence of so divine and beneficent an institution. And yet the peril and disaster of such a menace confront Christian people in wide areas of the country. We exhort you, dear brethren, to meet this menace with unfaltering courage and resolute determination, and in no opportunity that may be presented to decline battle with the insatiate greed of the liquor traffic and the growing desire for popular pleasures and amusements, which with increasing boldness claim all days alike for their uses.

These words are, of course, spoken with reference to "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." It is the growing disregard of this day as a religious institution that is viewed by these bishops as an occasion of alarm and an "almost incredible" feature of "our modern life."

Yet these bishops know very well that the day "declared in the law of God to be his own day, and by the Saviour of man to be 'made for man,'" is not the first day of the week at all, but the seventh day. They know that God's Word never calls the first day of the week the Sabbath, or a sacred day, or commands anybody to keep it. It is by

the will and the wisdom of man that the reverence and honor due the seventh day of the week, and given to it by God's people of old, have been transferred to the first day.

Now, cannot these bishops, and all other people as well, see that there is nothing more "incredible" in this modern laxity of Sunday observance, then there was in the transfer of Sabbath obligations from the seventh day to a day never called the sabbath by divine sanc-

339

tion? Is it not plain that the same authority which can erect an institution, can also without blame, pull it down or set it aside? This is certainly true; and since Sunday as a religious institution rests wholly upon the will and wisdom of man, we fail to see any act of impropriety, or occasion for surprise, if by the same will and authority, as represented in the present generation, this institution is changed from a day of rest and religious devotions, to one of "popular pleasures and amusements."

We are presenting the case in accordance with the logic of the bishops' position, and that of all those who observe Sunday as the "Christian sabbath." We do not want the world, or any part of it, to disregard God's holy day. No person can do this without suffering incalculable loss. But when we take the position that this day is the first day of the week, standing as we then do upon the will and authority of man rather than upon the Word of God, we thereby sanction the very thing which we would so earnestly seek to prevent.

If we would, without inconsistency, raise our voice against Sabbath desecration, we must do so from the standpoint of the word and authority of God alone.

**"Maryland's Pledge of Religious Freedom" *American Sentinel* 10, 43 ,
p. 339.**

THIS pledge or guarantee of freedom to the citizens of Maryland in the practice of religion, is contained in Article 36 of the Constitution of 1864, which is now in force. That article declares:—

That, as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore no person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless under the color of religion any man shall disturb the

good order, peace, or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights.

It would seem that such a declaration as this in the fundamental law of the State should constitute a bulwark of liberty behind which the citizen might, without molestation, quietly practice that form of religion which his conscience might dictate, even though his practice should be at variance with that of the majority of citizens around him. Certainly a constitutional guarantee of religious freedom is a meaningless thing if its design is not to protect those in the minority; for the majority have the power to protect themselves. And in all cases where the minority is sufficiently powerful to command the respect of their opponents, such a constitutional guarantee of protection would doubtless be of force; but in case the minority whose privileges are in question is very weak in numbers, so as to be most in need of protection, as is true of the Seventh-day Adventists in Maryland, it seems that the constitutional guarantee is without any force whatever.

In proof of this, we have but to cite the case of Mr. Faust, an Adventist shoemaker in Baltimore, who was arrested for working at his trade in his own house on Sunday, with closed doors, and so quietly that the arresting officer had to peep in at the window to discover that any work was being done. Mr. Faust was indicted by the grand jury, and is now awaiting the summons of the trial court.

The parties who instigated this persecution are themselves more worthy of indictment, according to the spirit if not the letter of the constitutional provision under consideration; for that expressly guards against injury to any citizens "in their natural, civil, or religious rights." And the injury done in this case was no less grievous or less to be condemned because it was not done "under the color of religion." It was religious prejudice and animosity that prompted the whole proceeding; and certainly no worse motive for infringing upon "natural, civil, or religious rights" could be found.

It is useless to deny that the Sunday work done by Seventh-day Adventists is the direct result of their religious views. They are religious people, believing in the binding obligation of the Sabbath, as well as of the other precepts of God's law. Most of them, before becoming Adventists, were observers of the first day of the week, and such they would doubtless be to-day did they not believe the seventh day to be the Sabbath according to the testimony of God's Word.

That they now labor on the first day of the week, is in most cases due entirely to this change of religious belief.

Furthermore, as the SENTINEL has often stated, the Adventists see that it is impossible to sanctify the seventh day, as the Word of God commands, without making a separation between it and the other days of the week; and to do this, according to the directions of the fourth commandment, they must make that day, and that alone, the weekly day of rest. In other words, they must rest on the seventh day and treat the first day as a working day, after the example set by the Creator.

It is therefore from the free exercise of their religion, and from that only, that their disregard of the first-day sabbath arises. And the fundamental law of the State guarantees to them, in common with all others, freedom and security in this respect. There is nothing in ordinary, quiet, peaceful labor that is against "the good order, peace, or safety of the State." Indeed, there is nothing that now menaces the interests of the State in this respect more than the fact that so many men are averse to honest labor, and are trying to get a living by some other means.

It is obvious that we have reached a time when even a constitutional guarantee is inadequate to afford the weak minority protection in the exercise of religion against the prejudice and bigotry of the majority. And this, coming upon the end of our one hundred years' practice of the principle of liberty to all in the exercise of religious belief, constitutes a portentous and baleful sign of the times before us.

"Human Authority and Infallibility" *American Sentinel* 10, 43 , pp. 339, 340.

THE *Christian Statesman*, of Oct. 19, discusses the authority of the "powers that be" from what it conceives to be the Protestant standpoint, in contrast with the authority claimed by Catholics for the pope of Rome. The *Statesman* does not believe in the doctrine of papal infallibility, or in the infallibility of any man, State, or Church; nevertheless it claims that the State, aided by the counsel of the Church, has the right to speak in enunciation of the claims of the divine law as applied to human affairs, and command obedience thereto from every citizen.

Just what is to be gained by choosing a fallible State, counseled by a fallible church, as authority for determining the will of God, in preference to an "infallible" pope, the *Statesman* does not make clear. For our own part, if obliged to choose between the two, we would prefer the latter, since in that case, believing our authority to be infallible, we would not be continually harassed by the fear that it might, notwithstanding the wise counsel of the fallible church, be in the wrong. We would feel that in such a matter we could not afford to run any risks.

"The truly Christian State," says the *Statesman*, "acknowledging as it will the ultimate authority of God and its own subjection to Christ and his law, will avoid many of the mistakes into which the nations of the world have almost constantly fallen. But it will give evidence in many ways of its fallibility. And yet in the midst of their errors of judgment in legislative enactments and governmental administration, the 'powers that be' may claim the true authority that comes from God in all they justly do for the maintenance of human rights." Of course whatever is "justly" done by the State "for the maintenance of human rights" has the sanction of God. He has ordained them expressly for this purpose, and there is no dispute among any persons who believe in God upon this point.

But it is not true that the State has any right to speak as an interpreter of the divine will, or that any person is bound to obey it when it presumes so to do. The *Statesman* admits that there will be "errors of judgment in legislative enactments and governmental administration;" and this alone invalidates the *Statesman's* position. For when the State makes one of its "errors of judgment in legislative enactments," and commands its subjects to do that which is wrong, what course is the citizen to pursue? Is he to yield to the law of the State, knowing that the law of God commands him otherwise? for the law of God commands everything that is right, and prohibits all that is wrong.

So long as the State keeps within its God-appointed sphere, confining the exercise of its power to the maintenance of human rights, no good citizen will question its authority or desire to disobey its injunctions. But when it presumes to pronounce upon questions of religious duty, as set forth in God's moral law, it touches upon that concerning which no fallible power has any right to issue a command. The plan of salvation would be a failure without an absolutely infallible authority to which every person is to be subject upon such points.

That authority is the Word of God, interpreted by the Spirit of God, given to every person in answer to the prayer of faith. "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God," and "God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." 1 Cor. 2:10. Wherefore it is also written, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." James 1:5. We are to come to God, and not to any man or organization of men,—to the divine word, interpreted by the Spirit of God, and not to the fallible State directed by the counsel of the fallible church, for guidance in the pathway of righteousness. Every person may thus be infallibly guided in every point of moral obligation.

The State is altogether out of her sphere in attempting to act the part of a moral guide. The very means by which the State is constituted precludes it from any right in this respect, for the ballot, representing the opinion of the majority, can never in this wicked world where Christians are so sadly in the minority, determine the question of any person's fitness for the position of dictator to his fellowmen on moral questions, whether he has the "aid" of the church's counsel or not. Even were the majority of voters Christians, this would not help the matter, since the fallibility of human judgment would prevent

340

any certainty that their choice would be the right one. And even could they unerringly select the very best man for their purpose, the fallibility of those same men would still constitute a fatal defect in the working of the plan. It would only be putting the best men in the place of God, and thus erecting a standard of moral authority infinitely below that which the need of the race demands.

In other words, not the authority which commands men, but the individual commanded, must be responsible for any deviation on his part from the pathway of moral rectitude. God could not hold any person accountable for wrong doing while there was a possibility that the authority to which he had been made amenable might be itself in the wrong.

According to the *Statesman's* plan, "a wise State" would not "refuse to receive the aid that the church can give toward a better understanding of the divine criterion of national conduct." In other words "the State would show its wisdom if, when some difficult question had to be decided in its counsels, and it was at a loss to know what was the requirement of the divine standard for nations, it

would apply to the church of Christ for help in the interpretation of that perfect law." This is precisely what the "wise State" did in the Dark Ages. Nor was the proceeding such a difficult and dangerous one then as it will be now; for there was none then to dispute with the church of Rome the title of "Church of Christ," while now the number of contestants would be almost legion. What church shall it be that shall be privileged to thus direct the State in matters which involve an interpretation of the divine law? Shall it be Catholic or Protestant? and if Protestant, which one of the many Protestant sects? Does any one suppose that this question can be settled without a bitter contest? "Old controversies will be revived and new ones will be added;" the cause of pure religion will be neglected, unscrupulous hypocrites will seek church connection for political ends, and the church will sink lower and lower until it will present a literal fulfillment of the prophetic words, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Rev. 18:2.

And this terrible picture is actually ere long to be realized, in the consummation of the movements which are everywhere fast dragging the Church into politics. And at that time the call will be sounded, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18:4.

"The World's 'Christian' Nations" *American Sentinel* 10, 43 , p. 341.

THE Apostle Paul, addressing the Christian Church at Corinth, wrote: "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh. For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

The Christian's warfare is different in its weapons, its nature, and its results, from that warfare which is "after the flesh." As the text declares, the Christian does not war "after the flesh," yet his warfare is not one-sided and incomplete, but is directed against every foe that can oppose him. It is the only warfare that needs to be conducted in this world.

But it is not the kind of warfare that the world most generally sees and for which the greatest preparations are made, even by those who profess to be Christians; and in the light of the word of God spoken

by Paul, how wickedly absurd appears the idea so commonly advanced by certain would-be reformers, that the leading civilized nations of the earth, which manifest a regard for religion, are Christian. By a mere comparison with pagan nations, it is plainly evident that the so-called Christian nations of our day are no more Christian in character than are those of "darkest Africa." Such a comparison we find in the New York *Sun* of Oct. 25. The *Sun* says:—

A delegate to the Convention of the American Board of Foreign Missions gave warning that if China were not speedily Christianized, she would endanger the civilized nations by raising vast hordes of fighters able to swoop down upon them. Brother Hyde does not seem to have thought of the fact that it is the Christianized nations of Europe which keep the vast hordes of fighters and do most of the fighting. In view of the armed millions and the many wars of the great powers of Christendom, we do not see how he can believe that the Christianization of China would prevent her from raising great fighting armies. When Christianized, she would probably want to keep up with European Christendom, in which case her armies would be larger than the combined armies of Russia, Germany, France, Austria, Italy, and England,—all Christian countries.

The *Ying Ping*, or national army of pagan China, added the other Chinese armies, is smaller, in proportion to the population from which it is drawn, than the army of any of the Christian countries of Europe. The army needed in pagan India is small as compared with that needed in Christian Germany. Japan, since she adopted the customs of Christian nations, has raised an army far greater than she ever had before.

It is the Christian countries, not the pagan ones, that have set the example of maintaining gigantic military establishments. There have been ten times, or twenty, or a hundred times, more fighting and bloodshed in Christian Europe within the past century than in pagan China, though the population of China is probably greater than that of all Europe.

We do not see, therefore, how it can be supposed that the Christianization of China, if China after her Christianization shall follow the example of the Christian powers, is to prevent her from raising armies as big as Christian armies, and as savage on the field of battle as Christian armies.

The pagan races of continental Asia are far more peaceful than the Christian races of continental Europe.

The Christian English, French, Dutch and Spaniards have butchered untold numbers of pagan Asiatics. It is possible that the Christianization of the Asiatics might be the means of leading them to retaliate upon their Christian enemies in Europe. If China shall

ever be Christianized, and shall then put in the field armed hordes equal to those of Christian Europe, and able to fight as hard and as long as the Christians, she will be the foremost military power in the world.

We suppose that the *Sun* here uses the terms, "Christian" and "Christianization" in sarcasm. But the trouble is that through the prevailing low conception of Christianity, mere civilization is mistaken for it by very many minds. The degree of civilization which prevails to-day is indeed largely due to the influence of Christianity, and civilization is very good so far as it goes; but it falls infinitely short of being Christianity itself.

The Scriptures tell us something about a real Christian nation. We learn from it that a Christian nation will be saved from earth in the kingdom of God. Speaking of the time when the Lord God will "swallow up death in victory" and will "wipe away tears from off all faces," when his people will say, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us," the prophet says: "In that day shall this song be sung in the land of Judah: We have a strong city; salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks. Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth, may enter in." Isa. 26:1, 2. And, as we also learn from the Scriptures, the "truth" must be kept by each individual, for himself, in his own heart, to secure his entrance into the "strong city" of God's salvation. So that the only "Christian nation on earth is the "nation" of those who, among all peoples and in all climes, keep the truth of God in their hearts.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 10, 43 , p. 344.

THOSE who still uphold Sunday laws notwithstanding the use that is made of them to persecute conscientious observers of the seventh day, try to make much out of the fact that no effort is made to interfere with the latter in their seventh-day rest and worship. But, as is evident from the case of the Adventist arrested in San Antonio, Texas, for refusing to do road work, as commanded by the roadmaster on the seventh day, the same spirit which endeavors to force these people to rest on Sunday, also seeks to compel them to labor on the day which they regard as the Sabbath. It is in both cases simply the spirit of disregard of the consciences and rights of a class politically insignificant, and holding an unpopular religion. It is simply a fortuitous circumstance that determines how this disregard shall be

expressed,—whether by compelling the Adventists to rest on the first day, or compelling them to work on the seventh.

THE fact that Sunday is not kept by a part of the people, is regarded by certain others who do keep it, and with whose liberty to keep it no one thinks of interfering, as a "ruthless invasion of the very sanctuary of God by the destroying foot of the Philistine." These are the words of a Paulist priest, Rev. Alexander Dole, but they voice the sentiment of those who are pushing the Sunday crusade. Yet these same ones, when the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists is under consideration, say that the religion of the Adventists is not interfered with at all by the Sunday laws, since they are left perfectly free to rest and worship on the seventh day. The Sunday-law advocates must not only be left perfectly free in the matter of their own Sunday observance, but others who do not believe as they do must observe it also, else there is "a ruthless invasion" of that which Sunday-keepers hold sacred; but a law which leaves everybody free to disregard the seventh day, and furthermore puts those who do observe it in the chain-gang for working on the first day, is no invasion whatever of that which is held sacred by the Adventists! If this be consistency, then consistency is not a jewel.

November 7, 1895

"God's Sovereignty and the 'Powers that Be'" *American Sentinel* 10, 44 , pp. 345, 346.

A CORRESPONDENT writes that he is unable to harmonize the idea of God's sovereignty in earthly affairs, with the statement made recently in the SENTINEL that the power and glory of the kingdoms of this earth are delivered into the hands of Satan.

As we have said before, the condition expressed by the latter statement arose from the fact that Satan overcame Adam, the father of the race, in the garden of Eden. We know that "of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage." 2 Peter 2:19. Thus Adam was brought into bondage to Satan, and this bondage is the bondage of sin. Sin is the will of Satan, being the opposite of righteousness, which is the will of God. That which holds an individual in this bondage is called the "law of sin and death." Rom. 8:2.

From this law, which works in the natural heart of every man, there is no escape but by "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus;" in

other words, by the provisions of God's grace as revealed in the gospel. And as "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23), all are in bondage to sin, subject to the law of sin and death, save such as have been "born again" by the Spirit and Word of God.

These latter, sad to say, are but a small minority among the multitudes that people the earth; and as it is to-day, so it has been in all ages of the world. Multitudes have ever thronged the broad, smooth road that leads to perdition, while only the few have traversed the narrow, rugged way that leads to life.

Hence, in all ages of the world, the multitudes have been on the side of Satan. They have been sinners, doing his will in every sin that they committed. And such have been by far the greater number of those who have sat upon the thrones and stood in the high places of earthly kingdoms.

We cannot trace the history of earthly kingdoms and arrive at any other conclusions. Their power and splendor have not been used for the glory of God, but for the glorification of man, and through man, for the glorification of him whom every sinful man serves, that is, Satan. This is why they have fallen, one after the other, and gone down in ruin.

Yet God has never vacated the throne of universal sovereignty. There can be no *rightful* rule that is contrary to his, but this does not alter the fact that such rule does exist. We see it on every side of us. We see the reign of sin, in the low places and in the high, producing all that is evil and contrary to the will of God. God could blot this out in a moment and assert his rightful rule; but he does not do so, since he will demonstrate to every being in the universe that his ways are just, and that his kingdom is not based upon the principle that "might makes right." Thus sin, though without a shadow of right in God's universe, must be permitted, until the work of God for men shall be finished, and his purpose in man's creation carried out.

God has ordained "the powers that be," since there must be government on the earth. He is the rightful ruler, but he will rule only where he has the willing consent of his subjects; he will rule only where obedience springs from love. This is the highest, the best obedience, and he will accept no other. He will not be the ruler of automatons nor of slaves. The obedience of every one of his subjects must be consistent with their perfect freedom.

Hence, another rule is instituted by him among men, in their sinful state, but instituted to supply the place of God's direct rule only so far as concerns the securing of public order and peace. These are necessary conditions to human progress and to the realization of his own purposes in the earth. This is the rule of those who exercise "the powers that be." And because their rule, as ordained by Him, is thus limited, it is not necessary that they should themselves be righteous.

The case of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, furnishes a good illustration. His rule was ordained of God. In the prophecy of Jeremiah we read that God said: "I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him; . . . and it shall come to pass, that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the LORD, with the sword, and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand." Jer. 27:5-8.

Here Nebuchadnezzar is called the servant of God; yet he was not a righteous man. He was a heathen king, and a worshiper of idols. He set up a great idol in the plains of Dura, as we read in the prophecy of Daniel, and commanded all his subjects to worship it, and cast the three Hebrew worthies into the fiery furnace because of their refusal to do so. In all this he was the servant of Satan. And the power and glory of his kingdom, wielded as these were by the king and the heathen men of his court, Daniel and his fellows excepted, were in the hands of Satan, for he controlled them as his servants. Yet God overruled in certain things, and made the king an instrument in his hands to serve him, though ignorant of God, in the accomplishment of his divine purpose.

The power of King Pharaoh, who refused to let the Israelites depart from Egypt, was also ordained of God, for we are plainly told that God raised him up to his high station that he might be an instrument through which would be manifested God's greatness and power. And Pharaoh faithfully served the devil in his cruelty and wicked obstinacy, yet God overruled events so that the purpose he had in view was accomplished. Thus Pharaoh was in a sense the

servant of God, and his power and station were ordained of God; but no one will question that the power and glory of his court, with its magicians, soothsayers, and idolators, were under Satan's control.

The "powers that be" to-day are ordained of God, and we are commanded to be subject unto them in things pertaining to the exercise

346

of their legitimate authority. Yet the present kingdoms of this world are not kingdoms of righteousness, but are full of every kind of iniquity. When Christ takes the kingdoms he will "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel," and they will be utterly swept away, as described in Dan. 2:35. Yet under their rule we have order and peace and the security afforded by laws which are in the main intended for the restraint of evil-doers. But the full and perfect sovereignty of God which is his right cannot be established here so long as there remain those who will not render to him willing, loving obedience in all things. When the time shall come that his will is to be done here as it is in heaven, there will be no further need of the powers that be.

"An Item for Tennessee, Georgia, Et Al" *American Sentinel* 10, 44 , p. 346.

OCTOBER 10, 1895, two Americans, of whom the writer was one, and six Armenians, *all Seventh-day Adventists*, were starting from Constantinople to go out to the head of the bay of Nicomedia. As the time was in the midst of the late uprising of the Armenians in Constantinople, naturally enough all Armenians were held under suspicion, and were subject to search for arms or correspondence. And as we Americans were in company with Armenians our valises were also searched. In the valise of one were a number of letters, etc., in English. This of course was not understood by the Turkish officers, and consequently the whole party was arrested and put under an armed guard to be kept until we could be taken to the chief of police for examination.

A few minutes after we had been arrested, another officer with a squad of soldiers was passing, and seeing us guarded by a squad of soldiers also, he turned aside to see why it was. When he came up he recognized one or two of the Armenians, and knew them to be Seventh-day Adventists. He at once said to the other officers: "Oh, these men are Sabbatarians; you need not be afraid of them; they are all right." The other officers not knowing what the standing of the

"Sabbatarians"—the title given to the Seventh-day Adventists by the Turks—is, could not let us go without authority. They immediately treated us with marked respect however, moved the guard back a considerable distance and gave us seats, while the two chief officers jumped into a carriage and drove rapidly away to the headquarters of the Imperial Police to see further about it. In about half an hour, or perhaps less, they were back again with the word from headquarters that the "Sabbatarians" were all right, and were not to be suspected, and with orders to let us go at once. Immediately, therefore, with such respectful and repeated bows and salutes as to amount almost to an apology, we were conducted by one of the officers aboard the ship; and the officer who had first recognized us came aboard, shook hands with us, and wished us a pleasant journey.

This is the way that Turkey treats the Seventh-day Adventists when they are known. Instead of putting them into prison or the chain-gang, she sets them free when by mistake they are taken prisoners. Instead of hunting them with suspicion, cruelty, and persecution, she orders that they are not to be molested. From this fact it is plain that Tennessee, Georgia, Illinois, and other States of the boasted "Christian nation" of the United States could very well learn some lessons in justice and government from the abhorred Turk whose government is held by Christian(?) nations as hardly fit to be on the earth.

It will not do to say that here we had broken no law, while in those States the Seventh-day Adventists break the law; *first*, because here as soon as it was stated that we were Seventh-day Adventists *there was no sort of inquiry* as to whether we were breaking any law—that fact alone settled all such questions; and *secondly*, when such a government as Turkey can hold Seventh-day Adventists above suspicion, just *because* of their known character as Seventh-day Adventists, then any law of any other government, and above all any law of such government as that of the States or the United States, that makes them subject to constant surveillance, arrest, prosecution, imprisonment, and chain-gangs, is an unjust, illegal, and barbarous law. Such law shows that the *government*, and not the people, is wrong.

It is a queer comment on Western civilization and religion that harmless people are safer in Constantinople than in Chicago, and safer under the government of Turkey than under the government of the American States. But such is the living fact in the experience of

Seventh-day Adventists, who by the testimony of both American and Turkish judges, are harmless people. All this too was done by the Turkish power altogether on its own part, without any petition or communication from the Seventh-day Adventists.

A. T. J.

Constantinople, Oct. 17.

November 14, 1895

"The Powers That Be" ¹⁶⁶¹ *American Sentinel* 10, 45 , pp. 357, 358.

IN support of the doctrine that civil government has the right to act in things pertaining to God, the text of Scripture is quoted which says, "The powers that be are ordained of God." This passage is found in Rom. 13:1. The first nine verses of the chapter are devoted to this subject, showing that the powers that be are ordained of God, and enjoining upon Christians, upon every soul, in fact, the duty of respectful subjection to civil government. The whole passage reads as follows:—

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

It is easy to see that this scripture is but an exposition of the words of Christ, "Render to Cesar the things which are Cesar's." Rom. 13:7, taking up the same thought, says, "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." These references make positive that which we have stated,—that this portion of Scripture (Rom. 13:1-9) is a divine commentary upon the words of Christ in Matt. 22:17-21.

In the previous chapter we have shown by many proofs that civil government has nothing to do with anything that pertains to God. If the argument in that chapter is sound, then Rom. 14:1-9, being the Lord's commentary upon the words which are the basis of that argument, ought to confirm the position there taken. And this it does.

The passage in Romans refers first to civil government, the higher powers,—not the highest power, but the powers that be. Next it speaks of rulers, as bearing the sword and attending upon matters of tribute. Then it commands to render tribute to whom tribute is due, and says, "Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Then he refers to the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth commandments, and says, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

There are other commandments of this same law to which Paul refers. Why, then, did he say, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"? There are the four commandments of the first table of this same law—the commandments which say, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything;" "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Then there is the other commandment in which are briefly comprehended all these,—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength."

Paul knew full well of these commandments. Why, then, did he say, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"? *Answer*—Because he was writing concerning the words of the Saviour which relate to our duties to civil government.

Our duties under civil government pertain solely to the government and to our fellowmen, because the powers of civil government pertain

solely to men in their relations one to another, and to the government. But the Saviour's words in the same connection entirely separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to civil government. The things which pertain to God are not to be rendered to civil government—to the powers that be; therefore Paul, although knowing full well that there were other commandments, said, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" that is, if there be any other commandment which comes into the relation between man and civil government, it is comprehended in this saying, that he shall love his neighbor as himself; thus showing conclusively that the powers that be, though ordained of God, are so ordained simply in things pertaining to the relation of man with his fellow-men, and in those things alone.

As, therefore, the instruction in Rom. 13:1-10 is given to Christians concerning their duty and respect to the powers that be; and as this instruction is confined absolutely to man's relationship to his fellowmen, it is evident that when Christians have paid their taxes, and have shown proper respect to their fellowmen, then their obligation, their duty, and their respect *to the powers that be*, have been fully discharged, and those powers never can rightly have any further jurisdiction over their conduct. This is not to say that the State has jurisdiction of the last six commandments as such. It is only to say that the jurisdiction of the State is confined solely to man's conduct toward man, and never can touch his relationship to God, even under the second table of the law.

Further, as in this divine record of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no reference whatever to the first table of the law, it therefore follows that the powers that be, although ordained of God, have nothing whatever to do with the relations which men bear toward God.

As the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man, and as in the scriptural enumeration of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no mention of any of the things contained in the first table of the law, it follows that none of the duties enjoined in the first table of the law of God, do men owe to the powers that be; that is to say, again, that the powers that be, although ordained of God, are not ordained of God in anything pertaining to a single duty enjoined in any one of the first four of the ten commandments. These are duties that men owe to God, and with these the powers that be

can of right have nothing to do, because Christ has commanded to render unto God—not to Cesar, not by Cesar—that which is God's.

This is confirmed by other scriptures:—

"In the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah king of Judah, came this word unto Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Thus saith the Lord to me: Make thee bonds and yokes, and put them upon thy neck, and send them to the king of Edom, and to the king of Moab, and to the king of the Ammonites, and to the king of Tyrus, and to the king of Zidon, by the hand of the messengers which come to Jerusalem unto Zedekiah king of Judah, and command them to say unto their masters, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Thus shall ye say unto your masters: I have made the earth, the man and the best that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come, and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him. And it shall come to pass that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the sword, and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand.

In this scripture it is clearly shown that the power of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, was ordained of God. . . . Nebuchadnezzar was plainly called by the Lord, "My servant," and the Lord says, "And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon."

Now let us see whether this power was ordained of God in things pertaining to God. In the third chapter of Daniel we have the record that Nebuchadnezzar made a great image of gold, set it up in the plain of Dura . . . Then a herald from the king cried aloud:—

To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up; and whose falleth not down and worshipeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace.

In obedience to this command, all the people bowed down and worshiped before the image, except three Jews,—Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. This disobedience was reported to Nebuchadnezzar, who commanded them to be brought before him, when he asked them if they had disobeyed his order intentionally. He himself then repeated his command to them.

These men knew that they had been made subject to the king of Babylon by the Lord himself. . . . Yet these men, knowing all this, made answer to Nebuchadnezzar thus:—

O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. . . . Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.

Then these men were cast into the fiery furnace, heated seven times hotter than it was wont to be heated; but suddenly Nebuchadnezzar rose up in haste and astonishment, and said to his counselors, "Did we not cast three men bound into the midst of the fire?" They answered, "True, O king." But he exclaimed, "Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." The men were called forth:—

Here there is demonstrated the following facts: First, God gave power to the kingdom of Babylon; second, he suffered his people to be subjected to that power; third, he defended his people by a wonderful miracle from a certain exercise of that power. Does God contradict or oppose himself?—Far from it. What, then, does this show?—It shows conclusively that this was an undue exercise of the power which God had given. By this it is demonstrated that the power of the kingdom of Babylon, although ordained of God, was not ordained unto any such purpose as that for which it was exercised; and that though ordained of God, it was not ordained to be authority in things pertaining to God, or in things pertaining to men's consciences. And it was written for the instruction of future ages, and for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come.

Thus God has shown that, although the powers that be are ordained of God, they are not ordained to act in things that pertain to men's relation toward God. Christ's words are a positive declaration to that effect, and Rom. 13:1-9 is a further exposition of the principle.

Let us look a moment at this question from a common-sense point of view. Of course, all we are saying is common sense, but let us have this in addition: When societies are formed, each individual

surrenders certain rights, and as an equivalent for that surrender, has secured to him the enjoyment of certain others appertaining to his person and property, without the protection of which society cannot exist.

Each person has the natural right to protect his person and property against all invasions, but if this right is to be *personally* exercised in all cases by each person, then in the present condition of human nature every man's hand will be against his neighbor. That is simple anarchy, and in such a condition of affairs society cannot exist. Now suppose a hundred of us are thrown together in a certain place where there is no established order; each one has all the rights of any other one. But if each one is individually to exercise these rights of self-protection, he has the assurance of only that degree of protection which he alone can furnish to himself, which we have seen is exceedingly slight. Therefore all come together, and each surrenders to the whole body that individual right, and in return for this surrender he receives the power of all for his protection. He therefore receives the help of the other ninety-nine to protect himself from the invasion of his rights, and he is thus made many hundred times more secure in his rights of person and property than he is without this surrender.

But what condition of things can ever be conceived of among men that would justify any man in surrendering his right to believe—which in itself would be the surrender of his right to believe at all? What could he receive as an equivalent? When he has surrendered his right to believe, he has virtually surrendered his right to think. When he surrenders his right to believe, he surrenders everything, and it is impossible for him ever to receive an equivalent; he has surrendered his very soul. Eternal life depends upon believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, and the man who surrenders his right to believe, surrenders eternal life. Says the Scripture, "With the mind I myself serve the law of God." A man who surrenders his right to believe, surrenders God. Consequently, no man, no association or organization of men, can ever rightly ask of any man a surrender of his right to believe. Every man has the right, so far as organizations of men are concerned, to believe as he pleases; and that right, so long as he is a Protestant, so long as he is a Christian, yes, so long as he is a man, he never can surrender, and he never will.

November 21, 1895

"How Are the Powers that Be Ordained? ¹⁶⁷¹" *American Sentinel* 10, 46 , pp. 365, 366.

HOW are the "powers that be," ordained of God? Are they directly and miraculously ordained, or are they providentially so? Did God send a prophet or a priest to anoint Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, or did he send a heavenly messenger, as he did to Moses and Gideon? Neither. Nebuchadnezzar was king because he was the son of his father, who had been king. How did his father become king?

In 625 B.C. Babylonia was but a province of the empire of Assyria; Media was another. Both revolted, and at the same time. The king of Assyria gave Nabopolassar command of a large force, and sent him to Babylonia to quell the revolt, while he himself led other forces into Media, to put down the insurrection there. Nabopolassar did his work so well in Babylonia that the king of Assyria rewarded him with the command of that province, with the title of King of Babylon.

Thus we see that Nabopolassar received his power from the king of Assyria. The king of Assyria received his from his father, Asshur-bani-pal; Asshur-bani-pal received his from his father, Esar-haddon; Esar-haddon received his from his father, Sennacherib; Sennacherib received his from his father, Sargon; and Sargon received his from the troops in the field, that is, from the people. Thus we see that the power of the kingdom of Babylon, and of Nebuchad-

366

nezzar the king, or of his son, or of his son's son, was simply providential, and came merely from the people.

Take, for example, Victoria, queen of Great Britain. How did she receive her power? Simply by the fact that she was the first in the line of succession when William the Fourth died. Through one line she traces her royal lineage to William the Conqueror. But who was William the Conqueror? He was a Norman chief who led his forces into England in 1066, and established his power there. How did he become a chief of the Normans? The Normans made him so, and in that line it is clear that the power of Queen Victoria sprung only from the people.

Following the other line: The house that now rules Britain, represented in Victoria, is the house of Hanover. Hanover is a province of Germany. How came the house of Hanover to reign in England? When Queen Anne died, the next in the line of succession was George of Hanover, who became king of England under the title

of George the First. How did he receive his princely dignity? Through his lineage, from Henry the Lion, son of Henry the Proud, who received the duchy of Saxony from Frederick Barbarossa, in 1156. Henry the Lion, son of Henry the Proud, was a prince of the house of Guelph, of Swabia. The father of the house of Guelph was a prince of the Alamanni who invaded the Roman Empire, and established their power in what is now Southern Germany, and were the origin of what is now the German nation and empire. But who made this man a prince? The savage tribes of Germany. So in this line also the royal dignity of Queen Victoria sprung from the people.

And besides all this, the imperial power of Queen Victoria as she now reigns is circumscribed—limited—by the people. It has been related, and has appeared in print, and although the story may not be true, it will serve to illustrate the point, that on one occasion, Gladstone, while prime minister and head of the House of Commons, took a certain paper to the queen to be signed. She did not exactly approve of it, and said she would not sign it. Gladstone spoke of the merit of the act, but the queen still declared she would not sign it. Gladstone replied, "Your Majesty *must* sign it." "*Must* sign!" exclaimed the queen; "*must* sign! Do you know who I am? I am the queen of England." Gladstone calmly replied, "Yes, Your Majesty, but I am the PEOPLE of England;" and she had to sign it.

The people of England can command *the queen* of England; the power of the people of England is above that of the queen of England. She, as queen, is simply the representative of their power. And if the people of England should choose to dispense with their expensive luxury of royalty, and turn their form of government into that of a republic, it would be but legitimate exercise of their right, and the government thus formed, the power thus established, would be ordained of God as much as that which now is, or as any could be.

Personal sovereigns in themselves are not those referred to in the words, "The powers that be are ordained of God." It is *the governmental power*, of which the sovereign is the representative, and that sovereign receives his power from the people. Outside of the theocracy of Israel, there never has been a ruler on earth whose authority was not, primarily or ultimately, expressly or permissively, derived from the people. It is not particular sovereigns whose power is ordained of God, nor any particular form of government. *It is the genius of government itself*. The absence of government is anarchy. Anarchy is only governmental confusion. But says the Scripture, "God

is not the author of confusion." God is the God of order. He has ordained order, and he has put within man himself that idea of government, of self-protection, which is the first law of nature, and which organizes itself into forms of one kind or another, wherever men dwell on the face of the earth. And it is for men themselves to say what shall be the form of government under which they shall dwell. One people has one form; another has another.

This genius of civil order springs from God; its exercise within its legitimate sphere is ordained of God; and the Declaration of Independence simply asserted the eternal truth of God, when it said: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." It matters not whether it be exercised in one form of government or in another, the governmental power and order thus exercised is ordained of God. If the people choose to change their form of government, it is still the same power; it is to be respected still, because it is still ordained of God in its legitimate exercise,—in things pertaining to men and their relation to their fellow-men; but no power, whether exercised through one form or another, is ordained of God to act in things pertaining to God; nor has it anything whatever to do with men's relations toward God.

Except in the nation of Israel, it is not, and never has been, personal sovereigns in themselves that have been referred to in the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God." It is not the persons that be in power, but *the powers that be in the person*, that are ordained of God. The inquiry of Rom. 13:3 is not, Wilt thou then be afraid of the person? but it is, "Wilt thou then not be afraid of the *power*?" It is not the person, therefore, but the power that is represented in the person, that is under consideration here. *And that person derives his power from the people*, as is clearly proved by the scriptural examples and references given. "To the people we come sooner or later; it is upon their wisdom and self-restraint that the most cunningly devised scheme of government will in the last resort depend." ¹⁶⁸²

December 5, 1895

"The Inevitable Outcome" *American Sentinel* 10, 48 , pp. 377, 378.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL has long raised its voice in emphatic protest against the movement on the part of the leading churches to

organize their forces for the purpose of exercising a controlling hand in political and civil affairs.

There can be but one outcome to this movement if the hopes of its promoters are realized, as there is now every prospect that they will be; and it is not difficult to state what this will be, for history will repeat itself in our day, as surely as like causes produce like effects.

There is more in this matter than a mere theory of the proper functions of the State, or of the true spheres of the Church and the civil power. We are confronted not only by a theory, but by a terrible prospective condition, even nothing less than the ruin of both the State and the Church, with every individual who is a participant in this religio-political scheme.

In 1892 the churches, or leading representatives of the same, besieged Congress with petitions and threats demanding that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday. The demand was based upon religious grounds, namely, the plea that the Fair ought not to be kept open on the "Christian sabbath;" and it was religious sentiment against what was viewed as a desecration of the sabbath, that inspired the petitions to Congress and moved Senators Quay, Hawley, and others to quote from the Scriptures and argue that the demand of the Church should be granted. In the summer of that year Congress capitulated, and it was decided by act of Congress that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the sabbath to be observed by the American people.

The church leaders who had been foremost in demanding this action were naturally elated, and one of them went so far as to say, "We have learned that we hold Congress in our power," while another declared that thereafter the voice of the Church would be heard more frequently in the legislative halls. And certainly there has been no disposition manifested by the church leaders who cherish like sentiments to recede from their vantage ground in this respect.

To-day the organization of the churches and church societies for political ends is much more complete than was the case in 1892. The society of Christian Endeavor and kindred organizations have grown enormously since that time, and are still growing; and their tremendous power, wielded it is true in many ways for good and always no doubt with good intentions, is ready, alas, to be exercised to the full to advance a mistaken conception of the nature of true Christian work; in others words, to promote the movement whose real and only meaning is a union of Church and State.

As stated before, the outcome of this movement, as concerning both the State and the Church, is not difficult to foresee. It can be discerned both in the light of history and of revelation. The eye of Omniscience, foreseeing the events of our day no less plainly than those of antiquity, discerned it from the first, and the Word of the Almighty is not silent concerning a matter which so directly concerns the interests of his people and his cause. That Word tells us of "great Babylon," the prophetic title designating an apostate, world-loving church; of the manner of her apostasy and its result. In Rev. 18:1, 2, we read: "And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." These words picture the result of a flood of worldliness in the Church, and the prophet in holy vision was looking down the line of future events to a time when such would be the condition of the professed Church of Christ. He was looking forward even to our own day.

Let us see what will result to the Church from the success of the present movement to bring the Church with the mighty power of its numbers, organization, and influence, into the arena of political strife.

Is it not plain to every intelligent person that this movement must open upon the Church the floodgates of worldliness? What is it that debars worldliness from the Church of Christ? Is it not the fact that Christ's kingdom is not of this world,¹⁶⁹ 1—that it offers no worldly inducements of any kind to those who enter its fold, but that instead there is promised them persecution, with a daily cross and self-denial? For it is written: "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution;"¹⁷⁰ 2 and Jesus said, "He that will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me."¹⁷¹ 3 This causes a separation between the world and the Church, and worldly men, so long as they retain their worldliness, look with no favor upon her, and regard her adherents as fools. For unto the world the gospel of Christ is foolishness.

But let it be seen that the Church has become a power in politics,—that only those upon whom the Church looks with favor are likely to succeed in political contests,—in other words, that office-holding under the civil government is well-nigh impossible without the aid of the Church, and all but assured with her aid, and there will at once be a

marked change on the part of worldly, unscrupulous men toward the Church. They will as assiduously court her favor as before they shunned her counsel. They will seize upon any cheap method of posing as men of morality and piety. Already we have before us examples of this kind. And as the surest means of appearing well in the Church's eye, they will flock into the Church and boldly make their way into the very inner courts of the sanctuary. There hypocrisy and worldly ambition, clothed in pious garb, will pose in the place of Christian virtue. There base men will stand side by side as co-workers with those whose lives are actuated by Christian principles, making the temple of God an arena of their strifes and intrigues. The language of James 3:16, completes the description: "Where envying and strife is, there is confusion, and every evil work."

Thus will the Church, having turned from the way of righteousness, speedily become in

378

very truth "the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." And this will be the utter ruin of the Church,—the nominal church, those visible organized bodies which in name and profession represent the Church of Christ, as many of them as shall have entered into this unholy alliance with the world. And this is the time of which the prophet writes: "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." ¹⁷²⁴

Of this terrible result to the Church there can be no manner of doubt. It will be but a repetition of what has been. History tells us of a similar fall experienced by the Church soon after the days of the apostles, which resulted in the development of the papacy. There was an alliance between the Church and the civil power. The Church wanted laws enacted which would suppress upon Sundays certain places of amusement which drew the people away from attendance at the house of worship. The church historian, Neander, says of this:—

Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the Church to some religious festival, they proved a great hindrance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart. Church teachers . . . were, in truth, often

forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church. ¹⁷³⁵

This was in the latter part of the fourth century. In A.D. 401, at a church council held at Cathage, it was enacted that "On Sundays and feast-days, no plays may be performed." ¹⁷⁴⁶ That this might be made effective, a petition was addressed to the emperor, Honorius, praying "that the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast-days, to some other days of the week," citing as one reason for the same, that "the people congregate more to the circus than to the church." ¹⁷⁵⁷

In A.D. 425, a law was secured closing theaters and other places of amusement on Sundays and other feast-days, "in order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance." ¹⁷⁶⁸ Thus did the Church seek an alliance with the State in those early days, and thus did the papacy develop and grow into power until, utterly apostate and corrupt, though nominally the Church of Christ, she dominated the State, and wielded its power to persecute and scatter the true people of God. Then was ushered in that awful period of human history known as the Dark Ages.

To-day, the Church is again seeking an alliance with the civil power. What is that alliance? It is one whose basis is the exchange of her power at the ballot box for the legislation which she demands. Leading clergymen who speak for the Church are now giving politicians and aspirants for public office to understand that they cannot succeed against its influence and its vote; and already they do understand it, and the game of politics is being adapted to this new feature. No astute and far-sighted politician now ventures to ignore the decrees of the Church in a matter involving a moral or religious question; and as such questions are forced by the Church more and more into the sphere of civil legislations with the Church will be more and more obvious to unscrupulous aspirants for positions of public trust.

When this Church and State movement shall have proceeded to the point where church relationship becomes no longer a matter of self-denial but a means of the gratification of selfish ambition,—when church connection shall have shifted from the basis of principle to that of policy, then know that the ruin of the Church is nigh!

This dreadful consummation the AMERICAN SENTINEL does not wish to see, and would do all in its power to avert; and therefore it lifts its voice in protest and warning against the Church's entrance into the

field of political strife. It points to the divinely-ordained principle of the entire separation of the State and the Church, and calls upon men to render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's; to let the State make manifest the power of the civil arm in the sphere for which it was ordained, while the Church shows forth the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Will the Church see her peril and turn from the evil path into which she has been led, making God and his omnipotent word the source of her power? It so, well; but it not, then erelong a trumpet voice will be heard proclaiming in her mist, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

"Guarding the Rest Day" *American Sentinel* 10, 48 , p. 378.

A GROWING fear is agitating many minds throughout Christendom, that the world will lose its rest day. A prominent churchman has declared that "the more we assimilate Sunday to other days by the amusements, the occupations, the teaching and reading and thinking with which we fill it, the greater is the danger that ultimately we shall lose it altogether." So it is proposed to guard against such a loss by "every sanction which the law can furnish."

So far as Sunday is concerned, this fear is doubtless well grounded. There is a growing tendency to disregard the religious distinction which that day has for several centuries enjoyed, and to make it a day for secular pursuits and pleasures; and there is no power on earth that can stop it. The distinction between it and other days of the week, excepting the seventh, is one which rests only upon human authority and custom, and to human authority and human power it must look for that which is to save it from being swept away.

Many men have observed, and do now observe the day from conscientious convictions of duty, believing it to be the day divinely instituted and given to man to be kept holy. But with the knowledge that it is not and never was a holy day,—now fast being disseminated throughout the religious world,—and that its claim to sanctity rests on nothing but the traditions of men, while the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, which all men are bound to observe, as the fourth commandment declares, there springs up naturally in men's minds a disregard for the Sunday, which the argument of law is powerless to cure. No human law ever changed the convictions of a

person's heart. The most that human law can do is to make some of those who do not believe Sunday to be a sacred day, act as though they did believe it; that is, to make hypocrites; for all who do believe it to be of a sacred character will observe it without the law. This is the only additional guard that secular enactments can throw around the day,—a guard of hypocrites.

But how is it with "the Sabbath of the Lord," the seventh day? Is there any danger that it will be lost? We hear no such fear expressed. Though its adherents are very much less numerous than the number who profess allegiance to Sunday, none of them have any doubt that it is sufficiently guarded and secure. It comes regularly once in each week, and shows no tendency whatever to get lost. The masses not only of the world but of Christendom, are against it, but it is losing no ground. On the contrary, its cause is moving steadily forward, and the number of its adherents is growing in all parts of the world day by day. No human law gives it aid, no popular church party gives it sanction, no men of wealth and influence are behind to push it forward; yet it moves onward with a power and majesty which discomforts and confounds its enemies.

The reason of this is simple. It is "the Sabbath of the Lord." He is behind it and in it. His power is with it. Upon his word it rests. Small wonder then that it flourishes without the aid of human laws, influence or wealth. Human power will turn against it, but that will make no difference. It is guarded and upheld by the Word of the Lord, and can no more be vanquished or lost than can God himself.

The only way to get the Sabbath is to get Christ. The only way to keep the Sabbath is to keep Christ. In Christ is rest; without him there is no rest. "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Would not this gracious invitation of the Master be as good to present to the poor workingman as a law compelling him to rest(?) whether he will or no?

In Christ the workingman and every other man will find his rest, and he will not find it in any other way. He will find the Sabbath; for he is Lord of the Sabbath, the Creator of all things, and the Institutor, with his Father, of the day of rest. He kept it. The keeping of the Sabbath is a part of his life; and therefore those who have his life in them will keep it too. And they will not be afraid of the consequences, whether it be loss of position, loss of wealth or influence, or persecution from those who know not God. If they meet all these,

they will still have as much as the Saviour had here on earth, and they ask no more.

When Christ can be put into the heart by human law, then Sabbath rest can be given to an individual by law, and not before. Until then, it is useless to talk of throwing guards around the Sabbath by human enactments.

December 12, 1895

"The Ruin of the State" *American Sentinel* 10, 49 , pp. 385-387.

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. ¹⁷⁷ 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. ¹⁷⁸ 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

386

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 now 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 communication 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. ¹⁷⁹³

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." ¹⁸⁰⁴

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 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 Heracles (Herenles) 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 Apollo was originally a sun-god, but afterward was distinguished from the sun.

¹⁸¹⁵

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*." ¹⁸²⁶ The Saviour said, "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." ¹⁸³⁷

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." ¹⁸⁴⁸

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

387

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, that 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.

December 19, 1895

"The New Era of Intolerance" *American Sentinel* 10, 50 , pp. 393, 394.

AMS we are near the close of the nineteenth century, the testimony of facts tells us unmistakably that our nation is not progressing toward the goal of complete human liberty and enlightenment. And the same may be truthfully said of the world in general.

It is true, there are many appearances of progress; the achievements of the human intellect in the realm of scientific discovery continue their rapid pace, dazzling the minds as well as the eyes of not a few, and the world is full of boasting and promises of great things on the verge of our realization. But it continues also to be full to overflowing with human misery and want; and it is full also of Utopian schemes for their relief. It is full of the idea of obtaining a living by some easier way than by hard, honest labor, and of gaining wealth and distinction by some more rapid and striking method than was known to our plodding ancestors. But real progress lies in the discovery and adoption of sound, true principles of human conduct and government. It is wholly distinct from progress in scientific discovery, and has no connection with mere politics or with the schemes of Utopian dreamers.

The trouble is, no real progress has been made toward reforming human nature. That is the same to-day as it was in the Dark Ages, or in any other period of human history. The evil in men's hearts is intolerant of goodness; the selfishness of men does not scruple to disregard justice and human rights. Men hate their fellowmen as fiercely, and are as bigoted in the assumption of their own virtue and wisdom, as was the case in ages past. The darkest passions of human nature were never more conspicuous in the social world than they are to-day.

It is not strange, therefore, that even in the midst of the progress and enlightenment of the nineteenth century, there should come a revival of intolerance; that men should exhibit again that disregard of human rights which led to the persecutions of other times. The old controversy between good and evil was never dead, and cannot die so long as both exist. There have come lulls in the fierceness of the strife, but no approach to a reconciliation between the opposing forces, for no such thing is possible. Evil-minded men are no more pleased at the rebuke of a righteous life to-day, than was Cain when he slew his brother.

That religious intolerance does exist to-day, and is manifested in our land in open religious persecution, under legal sanction, is attested by existing facts. That this persecution is spreading and that the principles by which it is sanctioned are fast gaining ground in public credence, is likewise attested. In 1889, the case of R. M. King, a Tennessee farmer, who was arrested for quietly working in his field on Sunday, attracted general attention as a striking departure from the established principles and policy of government in this country. But other cases quickly followed, not only in Tennessee but in other States; and to-day no one case of such persecution attracts particular notice. Last summer, the spectacle of eight conscientious Seventh-day Adventists serving a sentence in the chain-gang in Rhea County, Tenn., for not keeping Sunday, caused widespread comment by the secular press; but simple individual arrests for such an "offense" have become occurrences too common and familiar to justify, from a newspaper standpoint, particular mention.

For a time this manifestation of religious intolerance seemed to have a sectional aspect, being confined to some southern States; but ere long it became evident that it was not due to sectional differences in customs and views. It appeared in the northern States, particularly in Illinois, where several cases of seventh-day observers arrested for

Sunday work are now pending the decision of the superior court, to which they were appealed. From a legal standpoint, this intolerance has seemed even more unjustifiable in the North than in the South, since it was manifested in direct contravention of a part of the Sunday statute which declares that the latter shall not be construed to prevent the exercise of the right of conscience by whomever may observe any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath. Such persecution is therefore directly contrary to the evident intent of the statute itself.

This intolerance is growing and spreading, and will continued to do so, being based on the depravity of human nature, and the false principles of government which are being diligently inculcated by certain zealous but blind guides in the religious world, tending directly to a union of Church and State. It should be noticed also that modern theories of government are getting rapidly away from the great principle of individualism, which was the underlying idea in the structure of government reared by our forefathers. The doctrine that the Individual in government has nothing centering in himself, but is merely a circumstance in the general scheme of control and guidance for the body politic, seems now to have met with almost universal acceptance by the modern theorists and exponents of governmental philosophy.

But this doctrine is false, and destructive of the very foundations of good government. Individualism in government is a fact, and cannot be theorized or legislated out of existence. At the very foundation of all forms of human organization, lies the individual; and it is no more possible to disconnect that organization from the individuality of its component units, from their wills, their sentiments and their inclinations, than it is to make a machine which will run itself. Republican government is, as Lincoln defines it, government "by the people" as well as for them. It is not a scheme for controlling the individual wills of the people by some central power which assumes the office of a parent; but it is a reflection, a sort of composite photograph, of those wills, concerning that with which civil government has to do; and whatever affects those wills affects the government itself.

All just government leaves individuality alone; desiring its free development, rather than its repression. It recognizes that the individual has certain liberties arising from the very fact of his existence, and centering in himself, and which cannot rightfully be disturbed even under the plea of the "greatest good to the greatest

number." When those liberties are disturbed, the individual suffers. Under a repressive government which denies the absolute right of the individual to

394

anything in his possession, but holds him bound to surrender any and every liberty whenever it shall be deemed necessary to the general welfare, the development of strong, self-reliant and self-respecting individual character, which is the real strength and life of a nation, is hindered and in time well-nigh suppressed; and in its place there springs up a paternalism which is despotism in its worst form.

There is one mighty force in the world to-day which stands for individualism; and that is the gospel of Jesus Christ. There is one government in which individualism finds full recognition, and that is the government of God. God is not a despot. He will have no slaves in his kingdom, but only free men. No person will ever get there who does not enjoy perfect individual freedom in every respect. His kingdom and government are perfect; and the nearer any earthly government can approach to his *in respect to the individual freedom enjoyed by all its subjects*, the better will that government have become.

We have fallen upon evil times. The tide of human progress in the governmental recognition of natural rights is turning backward towards intolerance, and the dragon of religious persecution is rearing his head, while the people slumber on, forgetful that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," or deeming this an outgrown proverb. But while the everlasting gospel is yet proclaimed, the cause of human individual liberty will not perish from the earth. To that gospel the liberty-loving soul must look henceforth.

"Christian Sociology" *American Sentinel* 10, 50 , pp. 394, 395.

WILBUR F. CRAFTS, Ph. D., author of "The Sabbath for Man," "The Civil Sabbath," etc., has given to the world another book, "Practical Christian Sociology." ¹⁸⁵¹

This book contains over five hundred pages, and the key-note of the whole work is "the salvation of society through the Kingship of Christ." ¹⁸⁶²

"In order to solve social problems," says our author, "the Church needs to be reminded that the Kingship of Christ as the salvation of society and the Saviourship of Christ in its relation to the individual, are equally and often together proclaimed in the Bible." ¹⁸⁷³ And it is

this phantom, "the salvation of society," which is pursued throughout the entire work in question. It is this thought, therefore, which, more than all others in this book, demands our attention.

"The heart of Christian sociology," says Dr. Crafts, "is the Kingship of Christ. The individual is saved by his cross, but society is saved by his crown, that is, by the application of the law of Christ to all human associations—to the family, the school, the shop, the church, the State."

"The law of Christ, which is to be thus applied, includes," says our author, "more than that trilogy of love, the 'new commandment,' the Golden Rule, and the Royal Law. Those two words of Christ, 'my commandments,' include many other New Testament laws. The general opinion that there are only ten commandments is not more unscriptural than the equally common opinion that the Decalogue is not strictly a part of the law of Christ. It is his not only in that he indorsed it, but also in that he originally proclaimed it. The divine Person who gave the law on Sinai was seen, and therefore the Son, for "no man hath seen God [that is, the Father] at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared [or revealed] him." ¹⁸⁸⁴

In these quotations truth and error are found side by side. It was indeed the Son who spoke the law from the quaking mount;

395

it is his law because he proclaimed it; and in this as well as in redemption he and "the Father are one." But where in all the Word of God are we taught that "society is saved by his crown"?

Dr. Crafts answers this question by citing the Lord's Prayer: "Thy kingdom come; they will be done as in heaven so on earth." But what warrant is there in these words for the declaration that Christ is the Saviour of society, in any other sense than that he is the Saviour of the individuals who compose society?

True, the Scriptures teach that this earth is yet to be filled with "the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters covers the sea;" ¹⁸⁹⁵ that "the tabernacle of God is [to be] with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." ¹⁹⁰⁶ But this is not spoken of men in their mortal state, nor of the earth in its present condition.

The Scriptures tell us plainly that instead of growing better and better until all are converted to Christ, "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived;" ¹⁹¹⁷ until at

last just before the second coming of Christ, it will be as it was in the days of Noah. ¹⁹²⁸

In a letter to his son in the gospel, the apostle Paul says of the last days:—

This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy. Without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." ¹⁹³⁹

And in view of these things the apostle gave Timothy, and all who should come after him, this solemn charge:—

I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the quick and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom: preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching. For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but, having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts; and will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables. ¹⁹⁴¹⁰

And it might now be appropriately said: "The time has come when they will not endure sound doctrine," for rejecting the plain teaching of the word of God, the Church has gone after the fable of the world's conversion, and kindred errors calculated to lure souls to death.

But destruction, not conversion, awaits the kingdoms of this world. "Ask of me," says the Father to the Son, "and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. *Thou* shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." ¹⁹⁵¹¹

Writing of this destruction and of the lack of faith in the last days, the apostle Peter says:—

There shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished; but the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire

against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. . . . The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up. . . . Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. ¹⁹⁶12

It is in this new or renewed earth, promised in Isa. 66:22, that God's will is to be done as it is in heaven; and to pray: "Thy kingdom come; thy will be done as in heaven so on earth," is to pray for everything which must attend it, including the utter destruction of all things earthly as they now exist.

"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," ¹⁹⁷13 is not a promise of temporal inheritance, but of an everlasting possession. God's people are strangers and pilgrims in the earth in its present condition as was Abraham, and like him they look for "a city which hath foundation, whose builder and maker is God." ¹⁹⁸14

The purpose of the gospel is to prepare subjects for the future glorious kingdom of God, not to save human society as at present constituted. Society as it now exists, or as it is possible in this mortal state, is not to be saved by the kingship of Christ. The first act of Christ when he receives from the Father the kingdoms of this world will be to dash in pieces and utterly destroy civil society as we know it, to make way for that society wherein they "neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." ¹⁹⁹15

Christ is now a priest upon his Father's throne. ²⁰⁰16 He is now by the power of his word and the divine influences of his Spirit preparing subjects for the kingdom promised him, and which will be given to him by the Father at the conclusion of his work as priest. He himself connects his second advent and the taking of his kingdom in these words: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory*: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." ²⁰¹17 The apostle Paul likewise connects Christ's appearing and his kingdom in his charge to Timothy: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing and his kingdom*; preach the word." But our

author, and others of like mind, would take Christ by force and make him king, and install themselves as his representatives on earth to declare his will and to administer his law, or rather their version of that law. But whether they realize it or not, the success of their scheme would be nothing less than the establishment of another papacy. Christ has however no accredited human representatives on earth except his ministers, and their commission only authorizes them to preach the gospel; it gives them no authority to exercise civil power. The language of Christ's representatives should be: "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." ²⁰²18 But such is not the language of the papacy nor of its image, formed and managed by "Protestants" who, instead of protesting against papal methods, avail themselves of those methods for the furtherance of that which they imagine to be the gospel.

"Freedom Toward God" *American Sentinel* 10, 50 , p. 396.

THERE is one thought which alone should deter all men from any interference with their fellows in matters of conscience; it is this: that every man being accountable to God, must be left perfectly free in things pertaining to God. Were God to commission any man or set of men to exercise authority in his name in matters of conscience, he would be bound by the acts of his agents and could not call to account his creatures who had obeyed in good faith his authorized agents.

Civil government is an absolute necessity to social moral beings in a state of alienation from God. Without it no man would be secure in the exercise of his rights, and men in their selfishness would destroy one another. To prevent this, and to secure to men the enjoyment of those temporal blessings with which God has surrounded them, the Creator ordained the powers that be for the purpose of guarding the rights of the weak against the aggressions of the strong.

That men should be self-governing in affairs pertaining to their relations with each other, is necessary in order that they may be left

free to develop moral character. If every transgression by man against his fellowman was visited with swift and certain punishment man would not be left free to develop character; but being terrorized, he would through fear do those things which he ought to do from love. On the other hand, had God not endowed man with the faculty of self-government, and with a certain sense of justice which leads them to organize themselves into civil governments for mutual protection, no man would be secure in his natural right, because judgment against an evil work being long deferred, the hearts of the sons of men would have been fully set in them to do evil, and the earth would have been filled with violence.

But reasoning is not necessary to establish the proposition that men are, and of a right ought to be, free and independent of all human dictation in matters pertaining to God. Every man desires such freedom for himself. This being true, the Golden Rule expresses every man's duty to every other man in the premises: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." The man who would that some other man should coerce him in matters of religious faith and practice, is the only man who can, with a shadow of consistency, even so much as attempt to coerce any other man.

The Golden Rule honestly obeyed, would secure to every man true religious liberty.

¹ D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, Book 9, Chap. 5.

² Report of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, communicated to the Senate, and adopted by resolution, Jan. 19, 1829. See American State Papers, class vii. page. 269.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Christian Statesman*, Nov. 25, 1893.

⁵ D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, book xiv., chap. 8.

⁶ *Id.*, chap. 11.

⁷ "His Holiness Pope Pius IX. and the Temporal Rights of the Holy See, as involving Religious, Social, and Political interests of the Whole World, by M. I. Rhodes." D. and I. Sadler & Co., New York, p. 48.

⁸ Note in Catholic Bible.

⁹ Bishop McQuaid, of Rochester, N.Y.

¹⁰ Archbishop Ireland.

¹¹ "Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine," by Rev. Henry Ruberville: Imprimatur, the Right Rev. Benedict, Bishop of Boston: Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 2 Barclay Street, New York, 1853, page 58.

¹² "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," by Mgr. Segur: Imprimatur, Joannes Josephua Episcopus, Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co., Boston, 1868, page 223.

¹³ For a condensed grouping of the testimony of the standard historical authorities, descriptive of the character and spirit of the early councils which established the creed of the Roman Catholic Church, see "Two Republics," chapters 14-19. Review and Herald Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

¹⁴ See "Two Republics," chapter 22, and "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation," chapter 7. Review and Herald Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

¹⁵ A Catholic Dictionary, "Authorized American Edition," Benziger Brothers, New York: "Printers to the Holy Apostolic See," 1893. Article, "Albigenses."

¹⁶ "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," Funk and Wagnall's Co., New York, 1891. Article, "The Massacred of St. Bartholomew's Day."

¹⁷ 2 Thess. 2:7, (R.V.)

¹⁸ 1 Peter 2:20-23.

¹⁹ Matt. 5:11, 12.

²⁰ Luke 6:11.

²¹ John 8:44.

²² Ex. 20:10, and Ezek. 20:12.

²³ *North British Review*, Vol. 18, p. 409.

²⁴ "Doctrinal Catechism," by Rev. Stephen Keenan, Imprimatur, John Cardinal McCloskey: Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay Street, New York, 1878, p. 174.

²⁵ "An Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine," by Rev. Henry Tuberville: Imprimatur, the Right Rev. Benedict, Bishop of Boston: Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay Street, New York, 1823, p. 58.

²⁶ "Plain Talk About the Protestantism of To-day," by Mgr. Segue: Imprimatur Joannes Josephus Episcopus, Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co., Boston, 1868, p. 213.

²⁷ Elliott's Debate on the Federal Constitution, Vol. III, p. 330.

²⁸ Works of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. VII, p. 3.

²⁹ Report of the United States Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads communicated to the Senate, January 19, 1829; Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, Chairman.

³⁰ The Supreme Court of California, April term, 1858, *ex parte* Newman.

³¹ Committee report submitted by Richard W. Johnson to United States Senate, and adopted January 18, 1827.

³² *Id.*

³³ "The Sphere of the State," Professor Hoffman, Union College, 1890.

³⁴ See American Encyclopedia, article, "Armada;" also History of Protestantism, by Wylie, Vol. 3, chap. 17.

³⁵ Some of these torture instruments captured from the defeated Armada can be seen in the British Museum.

³⁶ History of Protestantism, Vol. 3, chap. 16.

³⁷ This expression is used by the New York *Sun's* Romans Catholic correspondent, writing from Rome in that paper of May 5, in praise of the pope's letter to the English people.

- ³⁸ Neal vs. Crew, 12 Ga., 93.
- ³⁹ Hill vs. Wilker, 41 Ga., 449.
- ⁴⁰ Karwisch's case, 44 Ga., 204.
- ⁴¹ Neander's Church History, translated by H. J. Rose, p. 185.
- ⁴² We take this article from the *Herald*, of Roseland, La., March 22, 1895, which paper credits it to the *Weekly Commercial*, of Memphis, but does not give the date of the paper from which it took it. The date given in the date line, May 28, causes us to think, however, that it appeared in the *Commercial* last year. The pressing need of some authority for Sunday other than the law of the State has been increasingly felt in Tennessee for several years.
- ⁴³ Roger de Hoveden's Annals, Bohn's Ed., Vol. 2, p. 487.
- ⁴⁴ Hoveden, Vol. 2, pp. 525-528.
- ⁴⁵ Alexander Hamilton, Federalist I.I.
- ⁴⁶ Works of Jefferson, Vol. 7, p. 3.
- ⁴⁷ *Id.*
- ⁴⁸ Cardinal Gibbons, in "Faith of Our Fathers," Forty-first edition, 1892, page 111.
- ⁴⁹ "A Doctrinal Catechism," by Rev. Stephen Keenan, Imprimatur, John Cardinal McCloskey, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay St., New York, pages 354, 355.
- ⁵⁰ "A Sure Way to Find Out the True Religion," by Rev. T. Baddely, D. and J. Sadler & Co., 33 Barclay St., New York.
- ⁵¹ "Revised Statutes of England, from 1235-1685, A.D." (London, 1870.) Pages 779, 780.
- ⁵² "American Encyclopedia," Article, "Roger Williams."
- ⁵³ See page 229.
- ⁵⁴ From Dr. Barnes' Practical Sermons.
- ⁵⁵ Rom. 7:14.
- ⁵⁶ "Binney's Theological Compend Improved." By Rev. Amos Binney and Rev. Daniel Steele, D.D. Hunt & Eaton, New York.
- ⁵⁷ See page 235.
- ⁵⁸ From "Old Glory," by James G. Clark, in *Arena* for May.

⁵⁹ From "Old Glory," by James G. Clark, in *Arena* for May.

⁶⁰ John 19:7.

⁶¹ Dan. 8.

⁶² Dan. 6.

⁶³ United States Senate, Jan. 19, 1829.

⁶⁴ Lowell's "Present Crises."

⁶⁵ The utter heartlessness and hypocrisy of this utterances will be better understood when it is known that the *Commercial-Appeal* is published Sunday as on other days, in flagrant violation of the Sunday statute of Tennessee.

⁶⁶ Isa. 59:14.

⁶⁷ "Decline and Fall," chap. 37, par. 3.

⁶⁸ Lowell's "Present Crisis."

⁶⁹ Lowell's "Present Crisis."

⁷⁰ Lowell's "Present Crisis."

⁷¹ From introduction to "American State Papers Bearing on Religious Legislation," by Prof. William Addlum Blakely, of the University of Chicago.

⁷² It (the term "law of nature") is not used among them that is learned to the laws of England to reason what thing as commanded or prohibited by the law of nature and what not; but all the reasoning in the behalf is under this manner:— As when anything is grounded upon the law of nature, they say that reason and that such a thing be done, and if it be prohibited by the law of nature, they say that it is against *reason*, or that reason will not suffer it to *be done*.—*St. Germain's Doctor and Student, ii, 17.*

⁷³ The Jew who is forced to respect the first day of the week when his conscience requires of him the observance of the seventh also, may plausibly urge that *the law discriminates against his religion* and in forcing him to keep a second sabbath in each week unjustly though by indirection, *punishes him for his belief*.—*Cooley's "Constitutional Limitations," page 245.*

⁷⁴ "History of the Reformation," by D'Aubigne, chap. 2, book 2, par. 4.

⁷⁵ Council Trid de Libria Prohibitio, p. 281 of Lepsic ed. Quoted by Wylie, in "The Papacy," book 2, chap. 2

⁷⁶ Given at Rome, June 29th, 1816, and addressed to the Archbishop of Geneva, Primate of Poland.

⁷⁷ "The Papacy," by J. A. Wylie, LL.D., pp. 181, 182.

⁷⁸ *Id.* p. 186.

⁷⁹ Segur's "Plain Talk About Protestantism of To-day," a Roman Catholic book, indorsed by Joannes Josephus, Epicopus Boston, and for sale at all Catholic book stores. Page 118.

⁸⁰ Reference is here made to the case of J. Q. Allison, of Austell. Ga. who was tried at Douglassville, May 15, for violation of the Georgia Sunday law, and was sentenced to pay costs, amounting to \$27.00, or to default of payment, to serve twelve full months in the chain-gang. His offense was plowing in his own field on Sunday in a place open only to the observation of those who spied upon him. Mr. Allison very properly refused to pay a single cent, and would have been sold into the chain-gang had not an unknown friend paid the costs and secured his release.

⁸¹ Adventists have however been denied their constitutional rights in this that they have been required to make up the time "lost" by keeping the Sabbath. Other and sterner measures of compulsion are inevitable.

⁸² The judge before whom J. Q. Allison was tried, said to him: "I understand you are a good man: your neighbors say you are: there is nothing in the world against you." But notwithstanding this, his honor advised him to leave the State, and said:

"If you come up before me again, I will put you where it will be a long time before you can get out of the State."

⁸³ James G. Clark, in *Arena* for December, 1894.

⁸⁴ From "Old Glory," by James G. Clark, in *Arena* for May.

⁸⁵ From "Old Glory," by James G. Clark, in *Arena* for May.

⁸⁶ 1 Kings 18:17.

⁸⁷ Dan. 6:13.

⁸⁸ Dan. 6:15.

⁸⁹ Luke 23:14.

⁹⁰ John 19:12.

⁹¹ John 19:19.

⁹² Acts 17:7.

⁹³ Eccl. 1:9.

⁹⁴ "Faith of Our Fathers," pp. 292, 293.

- ⁹⁵ Dr. Baxter, "As to Roger Williams," p. 90.
- ⁹⁶ "History of the United States," Vol. I, p. 319.
- ⁹⁷ Mass. and its early History, p. 104.
- ⁹⁸ *Idem*, p. 110.
- ⁹⁹ "Emancipation of Massachusetts," p. 140.
- ¹⁰⁰ Bancroft's "History of the United States," Vol. I, p. 545.
- ¹⁰¹ Bancroft's "History of the United States," Vol. I, p. 546.
- ¹⁰² "Emancipation of Massachusetts," p. 170.
- ¹⁰³ Luke 18:8.
- ¹⁰⁴ Published by American Baptist Publication Society, 1420 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.
- ¹⁰⁵ The authority which Mr. Burrage cites, is—"History of Plymouth Plantation." Coll. Of Mass. Hist. Soc. Vol. III., p. 319.
- ¹⁰⁶ History of the United States, Vol. I., pp. 312, 313.
- ¹⁰⁷ Butler's Catechism, p. 28, edition of 1877, published by Hoffman Bros., Milwaukee, Wis.
- ¹⁰⁸ "An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine," p. 58. Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay St., New York, 1833.
- ¹⁰⁹ "Doctrinal Catechism," p. 174; Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay St., New York, 1876.
- ¹¹⁰ The statute to which reference is here made was passed by the Maryland assembly in 1649, thirteen years after Roger Williams and others who had suffered persecution in Massachusetts, had established, at Providence, as Arnold says, "a pure democracy, which *for the first time* guarded jealously the rights of conscience by ignoring any power in the body politic to interfere with those matters that alone concern man and his Maker." It was not, however, until March 14, 1648, six years before the act of toleration was passed in Maryland, that the "Patent for Providence Plantations" was issued, prior to which time the legislation of the colony was without royal sanction.—See "Patent for Providence Plantations," and foot note to the same, in "Charters and Constitutions," Vol. 2, p. 1594.
- ¹¹¹ "Faith of Our Fathers," p. 272; edition of 1893.
- ¹¹² "History of the United States," by Bancroft, Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10, p. 168.

¹¹³ "Archives of Maryland Assembly," Vol. I, p. 244. See also Bancroft's "History of the United States," Vol. I, part. 1, chap. 10, pp. 168, 169.

¹¹⁴ Roger Williams was expelled from Massachusetts in January, 1636. "Within two years," says Bancroft, "others fled to his asylum. The land which he occupied was within the territory of the Narragansetts. In March, 1638, an Indian deed from Cabonicue, and Miantonomah made him the undisputed possessor of an extensive domain."—*History of the United States, Vol. I, Part I, chap. 15, p. 235*. This, it should be remembered, was eleven years before the Maryland act of toleration. Moreover, Rhode Island had religious liberty from the first day of its settlement; and five years before the Maryland act of toleration. Williams published and defended in England his views of religious liberty. Bancroft says:—"The principles which he [Williams] first sustained amid the bickerings of a colonial parish, next in the general court of Massachusetts, and then introduced into the wilds on Narragansett Bay, he found occasion, in 1644, to publish in England, and to defend as the basis of the religious freedom of mankind."—*Id.*, p. 254.

¹¹⁵ "History of the United States," by Edmund Ollier, Vol. I, p. 77; published by the Cassell Publishing Co., New York.

¹¹⁶ "History of the United States," Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10, p. 161.

¹¹⁷ *Id.*, p. 166.

¹¹⁸ *Id.*, p. 167.

¹¹⁹ *Id.*, p. 168.

¹²⁰ "History of the United States," Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10, p. 188.

¹²¹ "Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, and other Organic Laws of the United States," compiled under the order of the United States Senate, by Sen. Ferley Poore, p. 812. The original charter is in Latin, but an excellent translation of a portion of it may be found on page 72 or "The Relation of Religion to Civil Government," published by Putnam's Sons, New York.

¹²² "History of the United States," Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10, p. 158.

¹²³ The "American Cyclopaedia," article "Calvert," says: "It does not appear that Lord Baltimore, or any of the settlers, had an intention on founding the colony of proclaiming absolute religious freedom, and one of the first acts of the assembly of 1639 was to make the Roman Catholic religion the creed of the State." We have not verified this statement, but the assembly of 1640 declared that the "holy church, within this province, shall have and enjoy all her rights, liberties, and franchises, wholly and without blemish." See Bancroft's "History of the United States," Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10.

¹²⁴ "Faith of Our Fathers," pp. 268, 269.

- ¹²⁵ See the article, "New York Democrats and the Sunday Law," on this page.
- ¹²⁶ "An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine," p. 58. Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay St., New York, 1833.
- ¹²⁷ "Doctrinal Catechism," p. 174; Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay St., New York, 1876.
- ¹²⁸ Mark 16:15.
- ¹²⁹ Matt. 28:29.
- ¹³⁰ John 15:18-21.
- ¹³¹ Matt. 24:37.
- ¹³² Gen. 6:5.
- ¹³³ Luke 18:8.
- ¹³⁴ Rom. 1:16.
- ¹³⁵ Luke 13:23.
- ¹³⁶ Matt. 7:13, 14.
- ¹³⁷ Matt. 24:14.
- ¹³⁸ Acts 15:14.
- ¹³⁹ 2 Peter 3:3.
- ¹⁴⁰ 2 Tim. 3:1-5.
- ¹⁴¹ 2 Tim. 4:1-4. (R. V.)

¹⁴² Since writing this there has come to our notice the following from a sermon by Bishop Coxe, before the Episcopal General Convention at Minneapolis. As reported in the New York *Independent*, of October 10, the bishop said: "The last days seem to have come and 'the perilous times' are upon us. The apostle's terrible portraiture of final apostasy is paralleled by what comes to us in journals, as every day's report. Shameless nudity in bathing, and semi-nudity in evening attire, with lascivious dances, long banished by Christian decorum from social life, are flagrantly characteristic of American manners. Suicides, murders, outrages too awful to be named; scandalous marriages, husbands and wives slaying one another, or seeking divorces, which even heathen lawgivers would not tolerate; the decay of family ties beginning with 'disobedience to parents,' and the loss of 'natural affection;' all this leading to scorn of law; contempt for magistrates; lawless revenges, and cruel retributions; the decay of conscience in public men; the corruption of whole legislatures; Socialistic anarchy and threats of a warfare upon society, with torch and dynamite, and with nameless inventions, the product of our boasted science; such are the staple of journalism of which the constant 'evil communications corrupt good manners,' or aggravate what is already bad. Worse than all, in some respects, is the chronic cowardice which has settled upon men who should be watchmen to discover and martyrs to perform."

¹⁴³ Rev. 14:17-19.

¹⁴⁴ Ex. 5:1.

¹⁴⁵ Ex. 7:11.

¹⁴⁶ 2 Tim. 3:1.

¹⁴⁷ Rev. 13:13, 14.

¹⁴⁸ Rev. 16:13, 14.

¹⁴⁹ Eph. 4:15.

¹⁵⁰ Isa. 8:20.

¹⁵¹ Isa. 8:19. (R.V.)

¹⁵² Matt. 4:10.

¹⁵³ 1 Tim. 2:5.

¹⁵⁴ Job 14:21.

¹⁵⁵ Ps. 146:3, 4.

¹⁵⁶ Eccl. 9:5, 6.

¹⁵⁷ "Notes on Virginia," query 17.

- 158 Jer. 31:33.
- 159 James 1:25.
- 160 Matt. 22:37, 39.
- 161 Matt. 7:12.
- 162 Dan. 5:1-20.
- 163 Dan. 6:1-22.
- 164 "Decline and Fall," Chap. XV., par. 15, 16.
- 165 "Mill on Liberty."
- 166 From Part I, "Rights of the People, or Civil Government and Religion."
- 167 From Part I, "Rights of the People, or Civil Government and Religion."
- 168 Bryce, American Commonwealth, chap. 24, last sentence.
- 169 John 18:36.
- 170 2 Tim. 3:12.
- 171 Luke 9:23.
- 172 Rev. 18:4, 5.
- 173 "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. 2, Sec. 3, part 2, div. 3, par. 5.
- 174 Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," Fifth Carthaginian.
- 175 Neander, "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. 2, Sec. 3, part 1, div. 3, par. 5.
- 176 *Id.*
- 177 Schaff, "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, sec. 27, par. 12.
- 178 "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. 2, Sec. 2, part 3, div. 1, last par.
- 179 1 Kings 18:21-24.
- 180 Verses 35-39.
- 181 Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Art. Baal.
- 182 John 4:24.

¹⁸³ Matt. 15:9.

¹⁸⁴ See Ex. 20:8-11.

¹⁸⁵ Funk & Wagnalls, New York, London and Toronto.

¹⁸⁶ P. 28.

¹⁸⁷ P. 26.

¹⁸⁸ Pp. 22, 26.

¹⁸⁹ Isa. 11:9.

¹⁹⁰ Rev. 21:3.

¹⁹¹ 2 Tim. 3:13.

¹⁹² Matt. 24:37; Gen. 6:5.

¹⁹³ 2 Tim. 3:1-5.

¹⁹⁴ 2 Tim. 4:1-4. (R. V.)

¹⁹⁵ Ps. 2:8, 9.

¹⁹⁶ 2 Peter 3:3-13.

¹⁹⁷ Matt. 5:5.

¹⁹⁸ Heb. 11:9, 10.

¹⁹⁹ Luke 20:35, 36.

²⁰⁰ Zach. 6:13.

²⁰¹ Matt. 25:31, 32.

²⁰² 2 Cor. 5:18-20.