

# The American Sentinel 9 (1894)

January 4, 1894

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 1 , pp. 3, 4.

WITH this issue the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the ninth year of its publication.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL was established to opposed all connection between religion and the State, and all interference of religious bodies or organizations with affairs of the Government, and especially to expose the mischievous designs of the National Reform combination which was organized for the sole purpose of drawing the United States Government into an establishment of religion.

THIS National Reform combination never had any other purpose, nor any other aim, than to commit the Government of the United States, by whatever means possible, to the establishment and maintenance of "Christianity" as the national religion, and to the enforcement of "Christian laws, institutions, and usages," and Sunday above all, upon all the people.

FOR, twenty-four years the National Reform Association of professed Protestants, worked steadily alone, to have "the Christian religion" named and legalized as the religion of this nation. In its twenty-fifth year, 1887, it secured the alliance of the National Prohibition party, and the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and with this additional power continued its efforts for the legal recognition of the Christian religion as the national religion. In 1888 this National Reform combination secured the alliance of the American Sabbath Union representing the great "evangelical" churches of the country, and with increased power the whole combination plied their efforts upon the national Government to secure the legal recognition of the Christian religion and the setting up of Sunday as the national holy day. In 1889, the National Reform Association, through the leadership of the American Sabbath Union, secured their long-desired "co<sup>o</sup>peration" of the Catholic Church for national Sunday observance. And in 1892 they were gratified with the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, declaring that "this is a Christian nation," thus giving national, legal recognition of the Christian religion, and this was swiftly followed by the action of Congress in which Sunday was set up as the Sabbath of

the fourth commandment and of this nation, to the express exclusion of the Sabbath of the Lord.

THE aim and purpose of the National Reform combination was precisely the aim, the purpose, and the intense desire of the Church of Rome. Therefore, all these years Rome watched with interested attention the National Reform movement, and waited for that movement to grow to such a state as would be to her advantage to cooperate with. And it was not unadvisedly that in 1889 the Catholic Church joined hands with the National Reform combination, "to bring the Protestant masses over to the reverent observance of the Catholic Sunday." And it was with great gladness that she heard the supreme judicial declaration that "this is a Christian nation," with the citation of Catholic documents to prove it, and also saw Congress set up the sign of her own authority—the Sunday—as the holy day of the nation in express exclusion of the Sabbath of the Lord. It was with supreme satisfaction that she saw her own sign of her own salvation set up here by a national act as the symbol of the salvation of the nation.

IN the columns of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, from the beginning, we have told the National Reformers over and over, that in all their efforts and arguments they were but playing into the hands of Rome. As a sample of our oft-repeated words to this effect we copy the following from Vol. I, number 12 of the SENTINEL:

"Although the Catholic Church apparently takes no very active interest in this movement itself, we may rest assured that there is not a single writer, nor a single official, of the Catholic Church, from the pope to the lowest priest in America, who ever 'for an instant' loses sight of the movement, or of the 'prescriptions' which the pope has given in view of it.

"THEN when the matter comes to the enforcement of the laws, what is to hinder the Catholics from doing it, and that, too, in the Catholic way? Every priest in the United States is sworn to root out heresy. And Monsignor Capel, in our own cities and at our very doors, defends the 'Holy Inquisition.' The refusal to observe Sunday becomes heresy that can be reached by the law, what then is to hinder the Catholics from rooting out the heresy? Certainly when the National Reformers shall have been compelled by the necessity of the situation to surrender to the Catholics, it would not be in their power, even were it in their disposition, to repeal the laws; so there would then be nothing left but the enforcement of the laws—by Catholics, if by nobody else. This view of the case alone ought to be sufficient to arouse every Protestant and every American to the most uncompromising opposition to the National Reform party.

"IT is of no use for the National Reformers to say that they will not allow the Catholics to do these things. For when the National Reformers, to gain the ends which they have in view, are compelled by 'the necessities of the situation,' to unite with Rome, having, *by* the help of Rome, gained those ends, it will be impossible, *without* the help of Rome, *either* to make them effective, or to reverse them, or to hinder Rome from making them effective in her own way. When the thing is done, it will be too late to talk of not allowing this or that. The whole thing will then be sold into the hands of Rome, and there will be no remedy.

"LORD MACAULAY made no mistake when he wrote the following:—

It is impossible to deny that the polity of the Church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. . . . 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 the oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place.—*Essays, Von Ranke.*

"And it is into the hands of this mistress of human deception and oppression that the National Reformers deliberately pro-

2

pose to surrender the United States Government and the American people. But just as surely as the American people allow the National Reform party, or anything else, out of seeming friendship for Christianity, or for any other reason, to do this thing, they are undone.

"WE know that a good many people have regarded the AMERICAN SENTINEL as exerting itself to no purpose, because they think there is no danger of the success of National Reform. But in the National Reform party, *allied with Rome*, there *is* danger. Then put with this the almost universal demand for more rigorous laws, more vigorously enforced, for the stricter religious observance of Sunday—the very thing above all others at which the National Reform movement aims—the danger is increased and is imminent. In view of these facts there is great danger that through the sophistry of the National Reform arguments, the ill-informed zeal of thousands upon thousands of people who favor Sunday laws, will be induced to support the National Reform movement, and so they and the whole nation be delivered into the hands of Rome. There is danger in the National Reform movement. We know it, and by the evidences we here give in their own words, it is high time that the American people began to realize it.

"WE say that if the National Reformers and the Catholics, or any others, want to keep Sunday, let them do it. But heaven forefend that they shall ever succeed in securing the laws that they ask by

which they will compel others to do it. And we do most devoutly pray, God forbid that they shall ever succeed in their scheme of putting into the hands of Rome the power to enforce religious laws, and to correct heresy. God forbid that they shall ever succeed in making free America a slave to Rome.

"The success of the National Reform movement is to support Rome. How many, then, of the American people are ready to enter into the National Reform scheme?"

AND now in view of this we ask a careful consideration of the following important facts and statements: All these years, and even to the very latest document issued November, 1893, the National Reform combination has constantly presented as the basis, and the leading argument, for the governmental recognition of *their* religion, that "this country was settled by Christian men having Christian ends in view." And now that they have secured their long desired governmental recognition of "the Christian religion," the Catholic Church appropriates bodily the argument, and boldly declares that this country was first discovered and settled by *Catholic* Christian men, having *Catholic* Christian ends in view. At the late World's Congress of Religions this was made plain beyond all chance for question. In a paper read by Professor Thomas O'Gorman, of the Catholic University of Washington, D.C., it is presented more fully and compactly than in any other place we have found, and we shall therefore quote largely from it. On this point of the discovery and settlement of the country "by Christian men having Christian ends in view," he says:—

By right of discovery and possession, dating back to almost nine hundred years, America is Christian. On, the waters of Lake Michigan, close to the Convent of La Rabida are moored three Spanish caravels and a little farther away one Viking ship. All three—convent, caravels, and Scandinavian craft—are evidences of an acquaintance between America and the church in times when the only Christianity in existence was Catholic. This fact is sufficient justification for a change I have allowed myself to make. In the programme, this paper has for title, "Relation of the Catholic Church to America." For wider latitude and juster account I make it "Relation of Christianity to America."

The strange Viking boat carries the relation to a period antedating Columbus by almost five hundred years. About the year 1000, Christian colonists from Norway founded in Greenland a Christian community, which for four hundred years—that is, almost down to the days of Columbus—possessed a body of Catholic priests and a continuous line of bishops in communion with the popes of Rome. From Greenland, traders and missionaries pushed westward to the mainland. Trading posts and mission stations, if not permanent settlements, arose on the coasts of New England, and

the natural products of this country found their way to Europe and even to Rome, the capital of Christendom, as payment of the Peter pence from the Catholic people of far away Greenland and Vinland. In the showcases of the Convent of La Rabida in your White City are some of the many contemporary documents which prove these facts, and imply a relation existing long before Columbus, between Rome and the land that was to become in later ages the cradle of the American Republic. For reasons, which it is not my present task to indicate, the intercourse had gradually grown intermittent and had all but ceased when Columbus appeared. At any rate, it had never dawned on the mind of Europe that the far away Scandinavian colony was in a new continent. Greenland and Vinland were supposed to be connected in some way with northern Europe, and to be a southern dip of the known continent into habitable western latitudes from uninhabitable polar regions. So much for the older acquaintance between the church and America.

### **AMERICA DISCOVERED BY CATHOLICS**

The Spanish convent and caravels indicate a relation that began four hundred years ago; a relation which was to Europe the revelation of a new world, what the Scandinavian relation had not been; a relation that has not ceased since, as had the Scandinavian; a relation that at first flitted like some distant dream before the eyes of Spain in the solemn halls of Salamanca, that gradually took on some faint reality beneath the walls of Granada, in the quiet port of Palos, that finally became fact on the newly-found shores of San Salvador, in the shadow of the cross raised on American soil by the successful discoverer. The books, pamphlets, lectures, and articles written in this Columbian anniversary prove beyond a candid doubt that the discovery of America was eminently a religious enterprise, and that the desire to spread Christianity was, I will not say the only, but the principal, motive that prompted the leaders engaged in that memorable venture. Before you can strip the discovery of its religious character, you must unchristen the admiral's flagship [Santa Maria] and tear from her bulwarks the painting of the patroness [the Virgin Mary], under whose auspices the gallant craft plowed her way through the terrors of the unknown ocean.

### **MOTIVES OF THE EARLY COLONISTS**

The inspiration that gave the Old World a new continent was also the cause of its colonization and civilization. Various popes from Alexander VII, 1498, to Leo XI. 1514, approved and legalized discovery and occupation in America. The purpose of their bulls

was to prevent or settle difficulties and wars between rival claimants to the new lands. The indirect results of their intervention were of untold benefit to humanity. That intervention promoted the geographical study and knowledge of the globe, instigated Magellan's voyage around the world, created the partition of the continent, and hence also the colonial system out of which this great nation is born.

Thus the National Reformers see their fundamental argument appropriated by Rome and used to her sole advantage, and not one of them nor yet all of them together, can successfully dispute it for a moment. And so we and they see fulfilled to-day that which we have told them all the time, that in all their efforts they were but playing into the hands of Rome.

AGAIN: The National Reform combination has always made the fallacious claim that the union of *religion* and the State is not the union of *Church* and State; and *vice versa*, the separation of Church and State does not mean the separation of the State from religion. This claim the Catholic Church now appropriates and declares:—

We may truly say that with us separation of Church and State is not separation of the nation from religion.—*Id.*

And thus again we and they see fulfilled that which we told them long ago, and repeatedly.

AGAIN: The National Reform combination has argued that Sunday laws, Thanksgiving proclamations, and other official documents of presidents and governors, laws which uphold "Christian marriage" by prohibiting polygamy, chaplains in army and navy, in Congress and legislatures, and decisions of courts that Christianity is part of the common law,—all prove that this is a Christian nation. All this also the Catholic Church has adopted as proof of *her* claims upon the nation. Professor O'Gorman continues:—

Of what I should call the State's Christianity, I give the following evidences:—not only does the Federal Government make Sunday a legal day of rest for all its officials, but the States have Sunday laws which do not enforce any specific worship, but do guard the day's restfulness. Moreover, certain religious holy days are made legal holidays.

Presidents and governors in official documents recognize the dependence of the nation on God and the duty of gratitude to him. . . .

The action of Congress in regard to Mormonism is an upholding of the Christian marriage, and in all the States bigamy is a crime. Immorality is not allowed by the civil power to flaunt itself in public,

but is driven to concealment, and the Decalogue, inasmuch as it relates to the social relations of man, is enforced.

Celebrations of a public and official character, sessions of State legislatures and Congress are opened with prayer. Chaplains are appointed at public expense for Congress, the army, the navy, the military and naval academies, the State legislatures and institutions. . . .

More than once it has been decided by courts that we are a Christian people, and that Christianity is part of our unwritten law, as it is part of the common law of England.

Such, briefly, is the relation of Christianity to the American Republic, when we consider only its internal life. Are we not justified in concluding that here Christianity has added to her domain a nation which is the most active, the most progressive, and not the least intellectual in this nineteenth century!

When it is borne in mind that by the term "Christianity," Professor O'Gorman means *Catholicism* and Catholicism alone, the force of this array of National Reform "evidences" clearly seen and appreciated.

AGAIN: The Supreme Court of the United States declared that "we are a Christian people" and that "this is a Christian nation." This the National Reform combination hailed as containing "all that the National Reform Association seeks;" and this they have been using ever since as the official and ultimate authority that must settle every question and silence every word of doubt or dissent. As proofs of its declaration that "this is a Christian nation" or that this is the meaning of the Constitution, the Supreme Court not only cited the commission of Ferdinand and Isabella to Columbus, but also "the form of oath universally prevailing;" the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath; the constitutional proviso "that the Executive shall have ten days (Sunday excepted) within which to determine whether he will approve or veto a bill," etc. This whole ground is covered in just two sentences by Professor O'Gorman with direct reference to the Constitution, as follows:—

Our political charter presupposes God and Christianity, presupposes the main facts and the past history of Christianity, and is bound to them by discovery and colonization. The oath required from all officers

of the Federal Government, the exemption of Sunday from their working days, the subscription, "In the year of our Lord" are a recognition of God and imply that the Lord Jesus Christ is the turning point of humanity, the source and beginning of a new order.

ONCE more: The Supreme Court also cited the Declaration of Independence as proof that this is a Christian nation. Professor O'Gorman follows to the same extreme, and then declares that the *Catholic Church* is the foundation of it all. Here are his words:—

Look at the fundamental articles, the formative principles of the Republic,—“All men are created equal; they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; to secure these, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” These are Christian principles asserting God, creation, the rights of the creature, and by implication the duties that are correlative to those rights. To these principles the Catholic Church gave an impregnable foundation when in the council of Trent, she defined that reason is not totally obscured, and will is not totally depraved.

Then in his closing sentences he sums up all, covers the whole ground, and swallows up everything into the Catholic Church, as follows:—

Our roots are in the good, our up-growth must needs be toward the better. The affirmation of any one truth, logically followed out, leads to the knowledge and affirmation of all truth. The American Republic began in the affirmation of certain fundamental evident truths of reason; our dominant tendency, therefore, the law of our progression, is toward complete truth, if we but remain true to the spirit that called us into being, and still, thank God, animates our present living.

We believe that divine Providence led to the discovery of this continent and directed its settlement and guided the birth of this nation, for a new and more complete application to political society of the truths affirmed by reason and Christian revelation, for the upbuilding of a nation as great religiously as it is politically, of a nation that *shall find its perfection in Catholic Christianity*. With that freedom allowed every speaker in this parliament of religions, I affirm my sincere conviction that Catholic Christianity is the fullness of truth, natural and supernatural, rational and revealed; that Catholic Christianity is the strongest bulwark of law and order in this Republic. If ever our country should fail and fall, it is not from the Catholic Church that shall come the shout of triumph at the failure and the fall, for never has she had a fairer field of work than the United States of America.

THUS Rome sets herself forward as the end and all, and hers the prior and supreme right, in all things pertaining to this union of "religion and the State" in this "Christian nation." And the blindness of professed Protestants and of the Supreme Court has given her the

complete legal, legislative, and governmental basis for all her claims. And we say again that there is not one person in the National Reform combination, nor in the whole combination together; not one member of the Supreme Court, nor yet the whole court together; who can successfully dispute the argument or the claim Rome is now making upon the foundation which they themselves have so surely laid for her. And so we and they see fulfilled to-day before the eyes of the whole nation, that which we have all the time told them, that they were only playing into the hands of Rome. To-day Rome is profiting by that in which the National Reformers have always fondly hoped they themselves might be profited.

AND Rome knows it; and all these assumptions and logical claims from National Reform, and Supreme Court, premises, arguments, and declarations, she also backs up with the publicly announced plan of Leo XIII, with respect to the United States and through this for Europe and "all humanity," as follows:—

In his [Pope Leo's] view, the United States has reached the period when it becomes necessary to bring about the fusion of all the heterogeneous elements in one homogeneous and indissoluble nation. . . . It is for this reason that the pope wants the Catholics to prove themselves the most enlightened and most devoted workers for national unity and political assimilation. . . . America feels the need of this work of internal fusion. . . . *What the church has done in the past for others, she will do for the United States.* . . . That is the reason the Holy See encourages the American clergy to guard jealously the solidarity, and to labor for the fusion of all the foreign and heterogeneous elements into one vast national family. . . .

Finally, Leo XIII desires to see strength in that unity. Like all intuitive souls, he hails in the united American States and in their young and flourishing church, *the source of new life for Europeans.* He wants America to be powerful, *in order that Europe may regain strength from borrowing a rejuvenated type.* Europe is closely watching the United States. . . . Henceforth we [Europeans] will need authors who will place themselves on this ground: "What can we borrow, and what ought we to borrow from the United States for our social, political, *and ecclesiastical reorganization?*" The answer depends in great measure upon the development of American destinies. If the United States succeed in solving the many problems that puzzle us, Europe will follow her example, and *this outpouring of light will mark a date in the history not only of the United States, BUT OF ALL HUMANITY.*

That is why the holy father, anxious for peace and strength, collaborates with passion in the work of consolidation and development in American affairs. According to him, the church

ought to be the chosen crucible for the molding and absorption of races into one united family. And that, especially, is the reason why he labors at the codification of ecclesiastical affairs, *in order that this distant member of Christianity may infuse new blood into the old organism.*—*Letter from the Vatican to the New York Sun, July 11, 1892.*

AND this was swiftly followed by the establishment of Satolli as permanent apostolic delegate here to carry out this plan; and Satolli openly declared at the Catholic Congress in Chicago Sept. 5, 1893, not only that this is his place and work here, but commanded the Catholics of the United States to carry out this scheme. His words are as follows:—

In the name of Leo XIII, I salute the great American Republic, and I call upon the Catholics of America to go forward, in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth and in the other the Constitution of the United States. . . .

To-day this is the duty of the Catholics: To bring into the world the fullness of supernatural truth and supernatural life. This especially is the duty of a Catholic Congress. There are the nations who have never separated from the church, but who have neglected often to apply in full degree the lessons of the gospel. *There are the nations who have gone out from the church*, bringing with them many of her treasures, and because of what they have brought, shedding partial light. But cut off from the source, *unless that source is again brought into close contact with them*, there is danger for the future.

Bring them in contact with their past by your action and teaching. Bring your fellow-countrymen, *bring your country into immediate contact with* that great secret of blessedness—*Christ and his church*. And in this manner shall it come to pass the word of the psalmist shall be fulfilled: "Mercy and justice have met one another, justice and peace have kissed." . . . .

Now all these great principles have been marked out in most illuminous lines in the encyclicals of the great pontiff, Leo XIII. He has studied them. Hold fast to them as the safest anchorage, and all will be well. These several questions are studied the world over. It is well they be studied in America, for *here in America do we have more than elsewhere the key to the future*. [Applause.]

Here in America you have a country blessed specially by Providence in the fertility of field and the liberty of its Constitution. [Loud applause.] Here you have a country which will repay all efforts [loud and prolonged applause] not merely tenfold, but, aye, a *hundredfold*. And this no one understands better than the immortal Leo. And he charges me, his delegate, to speak out to America words of hope and blessing, words of joy. Go forward! in one hand

bearing the book of Christian truth—the Bible—and in the other the Constitution of the United States. [Tremendous applause the people rising to their feet]."

The Constitution of the United States as it was made, and as it was intended by its makers to remain, was directly opposed to every principle and every purpose of Rome. The founders of this Government said that "to judge for ourselves and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences is an unalienable right, which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated, and *the reformation from popery carried on*, can never be transferred to another." They said further that, "it is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects which profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility which would *lead us back to the Church of Rome*." Thus certainly did the makers of this Government intend that the people of the United States should never, by any act of the Government, be led back to the Church of Rome; and thus certainly did they intend that the Government of the United States should never touch any question of religion, and specifically "the Christian religion," *in order* that their expressed purpose might prevail,—that the people should not be led back to the Church of Rome and popery.

AND that Constitution, as our fathers made it and intended it, no Catholic was ever commanded by any pope to take in one hand, with the Catholic Bible in the other. But when that Constitution was interpreted to mean that this is a Christian nation, when that Constitution was interpreted according to Rome's principles and the sign of her authority with Catholic documents was cited to support this interpretation, *then* it was, and not till then, that all Catholics were commanded to take this Catholic Constitution in one hand and the Catholic Bible in the other; and with Satolli at their head, go forward to their "hundredfold" reward in the United States, and through this bring again "all Europe" and "all humanity" back into close contact with "the church."

And now with the Catholic Bible in one hand, and the Catholic Constitution of the United States in the other, the Catholic Church steps forth and declares that *this is a Catholic Christian nation*. The arguments which the National Reformers have used all these years, to prove that this is a Christian nation, she now boldly appropriates, and says that they mean that this is a Catholic Christian nation. All the claims which the National Reform combination has presented for the

governmental recognition of religion, the Catholic Church now adopts and declares as the consequence that it is governmental recognition of the Catholic religion.

AND with all this prestige and power already within her grasp she grows enthusiastic, and is now circulating official documents in the United States in which she openly announces the "collapse of Protestantism," and her hope to "missionize" the United States "in half a decade;" and at the same time abruptly challenges all Protestants to show why they keep Sunday; and to cap it all she publishes to the people of the United States the following, which she herself pronounces "bold doctrines to preach to Americans:"—

The friends of Catholicity assure us that, as God in his providence creates a new soul for every human body that is born into the world, so the American Republic was no sooner born from the womb of time than he in like manner created a spiritual republic to be its companion, its protector, and infallible guide through all the eyears of its existence.

They tell us furthermore that as the soul can live without the body, but the body cannot live without the soul; so the Church can live without the Republic, but the Republic cannot live without the Church. In a word, that the Church is necessary to the Republic, and without her spiritual guidance the Republic

4

must inevitably fail as have all the ancient republics of history before her. . . .

Is not this whole country stamped for a Catholic land? With the great doctor, St. Augustine, guarding the Atlantic Coast, and the heroic missionary, San Francisco, the Pacific; with the indomitable apostle, St. Paul, kindling zeal and enthusiasm in the North, and the gentle San Antonio inspiring love and peace in the South; with the Warrior King, St. Louis, in the center, and the great St. Joseph and Notre Dame, the gracious queen of heaven, hard by,—with all these powerful intercessors pleading for her, can we, I say, expect anything less than a glorious triumph for Catholicity in America?

Surely God's plans are manifest. America is the last and greatest of nations; and he means to possess her for himself. . . . The nets of St. Peter will drag this continent from ocean to ocean, till they are filled to breaking with the souls of men that shall be saved.—*The Catholic Church and the American Republic, Historically, Analytically, and Prophetically Considered, 1893, pp. 2, 3, 15, 16.*

NO more proofs are needed to show that upon the basis of the arguments furnished, and the governmental action secured, by the National Reform combination, the Catholic Church now claims, and

with all her native arrogance assume, actual possession of our country. With the mouths of the Protestants, and Congress, and the Supreme Court, and the Executive, completely stopped by their own arguments and actions flaunted in their faces and before the whole country, by the Catholic Church, our country to-day is practically held by the Catholic Church, and, in view of the situation as described in the quotation from No. 12, is therefore practically a Catholic country. And every man and woman who ever aided the National Reform movement, or petitioned Congress for legislation in favor of Sunday, is responsible for it.

THIS is the situation, as it really is to-day in the United States. It is precisely the situation that we have expected, and that we have said would come. We shall have yet much more to say of it: and especially of that which is certainly to come of it. For there are things all-important to come from this, just as certainly as this has come from the National Reform scheme. We knew this was certainly coming from that; and we *know* that these other things are as certainly coming from this. Again we bespeak a serious consideration of the points presented in this paper, and of those which will follow. For not only is the National Reform combination still going on in its blundering blindness, putting yet further power into the hands of Rome, but Rome herself is all zeal and activity to make all her power felt to the utmost.

A. T. J.

**January 11, 1894**

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

MR. SATOLLI, Archbishop of Lepanto, in Italy, is permanently established at the capital of the United States, as the substitute of Pope Leo XIII.

MR. ARTHUR CLEVELAND COXE, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Western New York, has his official seat in the city of Buffalo, in this State.

MR. COXE does not like it, that Mr. Satolli is at Washington or any place else in this country for the purpose for which plainly he is here. And Mr. Coxe has lately been telling Mr. Satolli so, in some open letters published in the newspapers.

OF course, Mr. Satolli being firmly seated at the national capital, and being in possession of immense power, which he can use as he pleases in national affairs, does not care whether Mr. Coxe, who has comparatively no place and absolutely no power, likes or dislikes his presence here.

HOWEVER, Bishop Coxe tells some wholesome truths, states some important facts, and exposes some startling situations which are worthy of most serious thought by the *American* people, whatever Mr. Satolli may think of his communications. Though the bishop's statements are in themselves true enough and worthy of serious thought, yet coming from him they are robbed of their force, as will be seen further on, by the compromising attitude which he holds toward Mr. Satolli's place and power here.

WE shall present liberal extracts from Bishop Coxe's principal letter, not only for the value of the extracts themselves, but also because this matter furnishes such an excellent opportunity to point an important moral for the consideration of vast numbers of people, besides Bishop Coxe, who are personally interested in more ways than one. Last week we printed statements from Leo XIII, Satolli, and Catholic documents, which gave, in their own words, the purpose and aim of Satolli's establishment here, and also Rome's estimate of her position and power in this country. Our extracts from Bishop Coxe's letters will be also interesting when read in view of our discussion on this line in last week's SENTINEL.

AFTER mentioning some points from the past as between France and the Church of Rome, the bishop asks Mr. Satolli to take a look at himself in the mirror of these things, and proceeds as follows:—

After considerable pulse-feeling as to the admission of a nuncio at Washington; after strong denials of any such idea; after evasions and experiments and contradictions by the press; after your preliminary visit to this country and your exulting report abroad, that persons of your quality are here received and treated "like sovereign princes;" you arrived here last year just before our great presidential crisis and were received, indeed, "like sovereign princes." The politicians managed to get up a reception for you in a national vessel. You were landed in New York like another La Fayette. Monetary objections were removed by explanations that "it was only as a visitor to the great Exposition at Chicago" that such a reception was tendered to you! Of course; no doubt! Who can imagine any other motive? But, all the same, you have ever since posed not as a visitor to Chicago, but as a sovereign prince and a

general meddler with affairs everywhere and chiefly among Jesuits at the national capital.

But even had you confined your attention to their immediate concerns, you could not but entangle them more and more, and make affairs worse and worse, with respect to their relations with their countrymen. Your interposition is a wedge, which, if it has divided them into fractions, is not less likely to split our entire population into embittered and hostile camps, endangering a social war. Your apologists assert your great friendship for everything in America, and your disposition to settle everything, in our behalf, so as to prevent future disturbances. As to the future, I am not so sanguine, especially when I observe that even your concessions are *pro tempore*. They are a temporary sop to the American Constitution and dust for the eyes of dotards. The Cahensly doctrine is reserved for a time when things shall be right for its enforcement. The "Syllabus" settles that. The Roman court consents never to enforce its dogmas by persecution—where it is not strong enough.

Hildebrand himself was equally pacific in such cases. "But see," cry the newspapers, "how liberal the modern papacy has become." Just so! It will not put us into the Inquisition—till we are first drugged and then chained.

The aggressions of the Roman court upon the liberties of nations have always been begun by this sort of liberality. "Concede, that you may exact." Such is the inveterate maxim of the pontiffs. Concessions once accepted with thanks, *the principle of intervention becomes an established fact*. It grows and becomes a nuisance. *Then it is too late*. The people remonstrate; they try to break loose, but no, as in Esop's fable, the horse has called in a rider to revenge him on other beasts. The plan succeeds, and now with expressions of obligation, the rider is requested to dismount. But not so. He is firm in his saddle; has a bridle in the horse's jaws; and has spurs and a whip besides. The "ablegate" is a fixture in his seat, and let the horse throw him if he can.

THIS is as complete a statement as could be made of the plans and the situation of Rome with respect to the United States Government to-day. And the statement is complete even to the full meaning of the fable cited. In fact, it is the citation of the fable, especially by Bishop Coxe, which gives point to the whole statement. The statement would be incomplete without the fable. It is true that Rome, in her "ablegate," is a fixture in the American saddle, with the Romish bridle in the horse's mouth, and spurs and whip besides. And it is equally true that Arthur Cleveland Coxe, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Western New York, helped to put the American horse in this

place under the Romish rider. Bishop Coxe took a part in calling in this papal rider for the American horse to revenge him on the other beasts. And now the bishop asks the rider to "dismount." But no, "the ablegate is a fixture in his seat, and let the horse *throw* him if he can."

LET us have the evidence on this point. The United States Government was established, with the total separation of religion and the State. It was one of the fundamental principles of the Government that it should never recognize any religion in any way, and never by any governmental act have anything to do with any religion, and specifically the Christian religion. And this Government was established upon this principle for the definitely expressed purpose that the American people should not be led back to the Church of Rome, that the American people might be kept forever free from the domination of Rome and of popery. This was the perfect freedom and the glory of the American governmental horse.

BUT for years there has been a powerful combination which has endeavored to persuade this perfectly free and powerful

10

horse that he needed a *religious rider*, so that he might properly be revenged on certain other "atheistic" and "godless" beasts, and chiefly that particular beast called "Sabbath-breaking." To make their persuasions more forcible, this combination called to its aid the Catholic Church. This being precisely what Rome wanted most of all, she gladly accepted the call, and prepared to mount as soon as the horse should be persuaded by the other parties to accept the proffered rider. By diligence and persistent effort, and at last under threats, the horse was "persuaded" to accept the proffered religious rider, in order that, at the World's Fair especially, and for all time to come, he might be revenged upon all "ungodly and Sabbath-breaking" beasts. The horse being thus "persuaded" to accept the proffered religious rider, allowed himself to be saddled and bridled, and placed himself in position for the rider to mount. The "*Protestant*" would-be rider is just placing his foot in the stirrup to seat himself upon the horse, when, lo! Rome, in the person of Satolli, at a single bound, vaults into the saddle, seizes the reins, braces himself in the stirrups, and rides boldly.

AND anybody who will take the time to turn to the *Congressional Record* of July 12, 1892, pp. 6700-6701, will find the evidence that Bishop Coxe was one of the persons who, in company with Catholic ecclesiastics, had a part in the persuading of this horse to accept a

religious rider, and in saddling and bridling him for the rider. There, in the last three inches on page 6700 will be seen the words of Archbishop Ireland, Gross, and Riordan of the Catholic Church, calling for this arrangement. And in the first three or four inches on page 6701 will be found the names of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church who called for the same thing. *And the name of Bishop Coxe, of Western New York, is named among them.* All are presented by United States Senator Joseph R. Hawley, of Connecticut. And now, when the bishop, with the others, sees Rome, in the person of Satolli, *instead of themselves*, firmly seated in the saddle and riding so boldly, he wildly calls upon him to "dismount." And by the very force of the situation, Bishop Coxe himself is compelled to answer his own call to dismount. "But not so. He is firm in his saddle; has a bridle in the horse's mouth jaws, and has spurs and a whip besides. The 'ablegate' is a fixture in his seat, and let the horse throw him if he can." Under the circumstances, Bishop Coxe, and every other "Protestant" who had any part in this awful transaction, should hide his head for very shame, and forever blush to lift up his face in the presence of the American people.

BUT the bishop has more to say, and he says it to the following effect:—

But I have more to say. For you have not confined yourself to matters of education only. You have come to establish an *imperium in imperio*; a permanent vice-royalty under the eaves of our Capitol. The President of the United States is a citizen who comes and goes. His official residence is no "mansion" or abiding place. He is its guest who tarries but a night. The vice-president has no official house in Washington. Our chief-justice has none. But your visit to Buffalo was prompted (so it was announced) by your gratitude to one of our worthy citizens, who had undertaken to provide a permanent habitation at our capital for the vice-pope. Thus, *the one irremovable potentate at Washington is the Roman pontiff*, represented by his other self. Queen Victoria, by her viceroy, reigns in India as empress; and *henceforth Leo XIII and his successors will enjoy their supremacy on the Potomac* far more absolutely than it can be exercised on the Tiber. The servile and illiterate Italians, Polacks, Hungarians, and such like are educated, only so far as the ox that knoweth his owner, and they will furnish votes by thousands to any purchaser who contracts with the vice-pope for the supply. All has been fore-arranged, like the lines at Torres Vedras. The Jesuits are there-in their arsenal, "The University." The lobby is organized and sacks the treasury. Now, you come as

generalissimo. Truly, "in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird," but the American eagle has been drugged. He is fast asleep.

"Quenched in dark clouds of slumber lie

The terror of his beak, the lightning of his eye."

But I mean to wake him up. That is my humble task.

VERY good, bishop. But can you wake him up? And, especially, can *you* wake him up, when you yourself were instrumental in drugging him to his undoing? When your voice was heard, with the others, in luring him off his guard that he might be drugged to helplessness and final death, that same voice can never wake him up. Mr. Coxe, your effort comes too late. And even though you should wake him up, what good can it do? What will Satolli care? What will Rome care? Delilah waked up Samson after she had shorn him of his strength and betrayed him to the Philistines. But what did the Philistines care?—Nay, they were rather glad to have him awakened, that he might know how entirely he was in their power, and how completely he was enslaved. You, Bishop Coxe, with others, have played the part of Delilah to this American Samson, in robbing him of the secret of his strength and betraying him to these Romish Philistines. And now, like Delilah, too, you, *you*, "mean to wake him up." Suppose you do, what will these Philistines care? They, too, will be glad to have *you* do it, that this aforesaid noble Samson, may the more certainly know how completely he is shorn of his strength, how entirely he is in their power, and how, blinded and harnessed, he shall be required, slavishly, to tread in the mill of Rome's evil purposes concerning the world.

SUCH is the result of the efforts of the grand combination formed of the National Reform Association, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Prohibition Party, and the American Sabbath Union, to get "the Christian religion" and "the Christian Sabbath" recognized by the Government of the United States. And every man and woman who favored any branch of this combination, or who sent a petition to Congress for the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, or for the recognition of the "Christian Sabbath" or the "Lord's Day" in any other way, is, with Bishop Coxe, responsible for this shameful and awful result.

A. T. J.

**January 18, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 3 , pp. 17-19.**

THE *Christian Statesman* is the only official organ that the National Reform combination has ever had.

IN the paper, August 31, 1881, it was announced, in behalf of the National Reform movement, that they would "gladly accept" the co-operation of Roman Catholics "in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it."

LATER, December 11, 1884, the *Christian Statesman*, editorially announced that—

whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them.

NOT long afterward LEO XIII. issued an encyclical, in which he commanded that—

all Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church.

THE National Reform Association was organized for no other purpose than to have the Constitution and legislation of the United States Government modeled on such principles as would place "all Christian laws, institutions and usages upon an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." It is thus clearly seen that the aims of the National Reform Association, and the aims of the papacy, upon the Constitution and legislation of the United States Government, were identical.

IN December, 1888, the National Reform combination secured the aid and alliance of the American Sabbath Union. At that time "Rev." Wilbur F. Crafts was practically the American Sabbath Union, and the American Sabbath Union was he; and thus it continued for more than a year. But during that year, by the diligent agency of Mr. Crafts, the long desired co-operation of the Roman Catholics with the National Reform combination, was secured.

On the first day of December, 1888, Mr. Crafts wrote a personal letter to Cardinal Gibbons, asking his support to the demand which was then being made upon Congress for a national Sunday law. December 4, the cardinal replied, announcing himself as "most happy" to add his name to those of others who were "laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath," etc. And December 13, 1888, on this letter Mr. Crafts presented before a United States Senate committee "Roman Catholics represented by

letter of Cardinal Gibbons appended, 7,200,000."—*Senate, Mis. Doc. No. 43, Fiftieth Congress, 2nd Session, p. 18.*

DURING the autumn of 1888, Mr. Crafts had been especially active in getting the Knights of Labor, under the leadership of Mr. Powderly, to indorse the demand for a national Sunday law. He became so enthusiastic in this matter that at the general assembly of the Knights of Labor, at Indianapolis, in November, 1888, he let himself out in this fashion:—

Having carefully read and re-read your "declaration of principles" and your "constitution," and having watched with interest the brave yet conservative shots of *your Powderly* at intemperance and other great evils, I have found myself so closely in accord with you that I have almost decided to become a Knight of Labor myself. If I do not, it will be only because I believe I can advance your principles better as an outside ally.—*Journal of United Labor, Nov. 29, 1888.*

This effort was continued through 1889, and later.

IN November, 1889, the first "Congress of Catholic Laymen of the United States" was held in Baltimore, "to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the American hierarchy." Either during this congress or only shortly before, Mr. Crafts held a "correspondence and *conference*" with the managers of the congress to secure the co-operation of Catholics with "Protestants" for Sunday observance by law. Accordingly, a paper was read in the congress by the editor of the *Catholic Universe*, of Cleveland, Ohio, in which it was said:—

What we should seek is an *en cupport* with the Protestant Christians who desire to keep Sunday holy. . . . We can bring the Protestant masses over to the reverent moderation of the Catholic Sunday.

And when the platform was announced and enthusiastically adopted, which expressed the results of the congress, one of the "planks" that was "received with the greatest demonstrations" of approval, and which, with the rest, was adopted "without discussion" and "without a dissenting voice," was the following, which we give in full:—

There are many Christian . . . to which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics, and shape civil legislation for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice and overlooking zealotry, we should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday.

Immediately following this Mr. Crafts announced in a public and printed address, with satisfaction, that—

the National Lay Congress of Roman Catholics, *after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union*, passed its famous . . . in favor of co-operation with Protestants in Sabbath reform. . . . This does not mean that the millennium is to be . . . in a day. This is only a proposal of *courtship*, and the parties therefore have approached each other shyly.

And when it is borne in mind that at that time Mr. Crafts himself was for all practical purposes, the American Sabbath Union, its meaning becomes more pointed for our present purpose, which will be seen presently.

THE National Reform American Sabbath Union Roman Catholic combination succeeded in 1892 in drawing the National Government into the governmental establishment of the Catholic Sunday, "the Christian Sabbath," out of respect for the "Christian religion" and for "the salvation of this nation." The aim of Leo XIII. to have "the constitutions of States and legislation modeled on the principles of the true church," having thus been accomplished, Satolli was immediately sent over and permanently established here as the pope's personal representative, to personally superintend the further progress of the Government in the way of "the principles of the true church." And now, seeing and knowing the meaning of Satolli's permanent official and officious presence here, Mr. Crafts, who, as editor of the *Christian Statesman*, now represents the whole National Reform combination on its "Protestant" side, having done all this and still going on doing all he can in the same line—*he* now curiously and in-

18

nocently, though most pertinently inquires editorially, with direct reference to Satolli and the Catholic Church in the United States, "*Are we cherishing a viper?*"

EDITORIALLY, in the *Christian Statesman* of October 28, 1893, Mr. Crafts asks this most pertinent question, and in this and another editorial in the *Statesman* of December 9, 1893, proceeds at considerable length to answer his own question in a way that is extremely interesting in view of the record which we have reproduced in the preceding notes. Everything he says of the papacy is true enough. But when his knowledge of the papacy, which is thus set forth so clearly, is set alongside of his own actions in forming alliances with the papacy, it fairly sets him and the National Reform

combination in an attitude as iniquitous and as treacherous as the very papacy itself. That the people may see this as clearly as may be, we shall reproduce also as much as space will allow of this phase of the subject, that both phases may stand side by side.

THE first sentence in Mr. Crafts' and the *Christian Statesman's* answer to the question, "Are we cherishing a viper?" is this:—

The most powerful organized enemy, civil liberty, has ever contended against, is the papacy.

True enough, Mr. Crafts; and yet, knowing this, you formed an organized enemy of civil liberty," instead of contending against it. On a pretense of *liberty*, civil and religious, you yourself took the lead in forming an organized alliance with this, as you know, "most powerful organized enemy of civil liberty," and you did it that you might present before Congress a united front in your united demand that our national Government should put itself in the position of the protector and defender of the "Christian religion" and its institutions, chiefly the Catholic Sunday, "the American Sabbath." You succeeded, and having thus "shaped legislation on the principles of the true church," Rome steps in and takes the superintendency of the cause for the future. And now, after all this, you, of all men, *you* raise the query, "Are we cherishing a viper?!" Yes, of course you are; and you *were*, all the time, in 1888 and 1889, in your "correspondence and conference" with Cardinal Gibbons and the Catholic congress, to secure an alliance with it to influence the United States Congress to enter upon a course of religious legislation. Of course you are, and you *have been*, cherishing a viper. And by your cherishing, the viper has been warmed back into active life, and now begins to sting to death both yourselves and the Republic; and now get rid of him if you can!

MR. CRAFTS' second sentence is this:—

For over a thousand years there has not been an hour when this ecclesiastical organization was not a menace to the political liberties of the civilized world.

True enough, Mr. Crafts. And this being so, what was this ecclesiastical organization in that hour, December 1, 1888, when you wrote with your own hand that request to Cardinal Gibbons, the then head of this ecclesiastical organization in the United States, asking him to join you and your fellows in your demand upon Congress for a national law in behalf of religion?

This being true, what was this ecclesiastical organization in that hour, December 4, 1888, when Cardinal Gibbons sent his response

to your letter, expressing himself as "most happy" to join you in your "laudable" work?

This being true, what was that ecclesiastical organization in that hour, December 13, 1888, when you stood before the Blair Committee of the United States Senate, in that magnificent Senate hall, and with your own hand and in your own words presented not only the cardinal's letter but with it and on the strength of it presented the whole solid body of this ecclesiastical organization (7,200,000) in the United States, as joined with you in your efforts to have the Government of the United States committed to the guardianship of religion? According to your own words this ecclesiastical organization was, *in that hour*, "a menace to the political liberties of the civilized world," and therefore a menace to the political liberties of the Government of the United States; and *you knew it*. Then, what were *you yourself* in that hour, as you stood there as the representative of the National Reform combination—what were you and your combination, in your efforts there, in that hour, but equally with this other ecclesiastical organization and through it, "a menace to the political" and religious "liberties" of the American people and "the civilized world"? You know that in that same hour I stood before that same Senate Committee to oppose you and your combination, including this other "ecclesiastical organization," because you and it, and *it through you*, were at that hour a menace to the political and religious liberties of the American people, and of the civilized world. You stood there to help forward this wicked thing in its menacing purposes toward the political and religious liberties of the civilized world. I stood there uncompromisingly to oppose it. Which was in the right? You stood there cherishing that "viper." I stood there to keep the evil thing forever chilled into dormancy so far as our beloved land is concerned, by maintaining the principles established by our governmental fathers for this very purpose. If you and your combination had been doing all the time what I was doing that hour and what we have been doing all the time, would you now be raising the interesting and important query, "Are we cherishing a viper?" Would you?

MR. CRAFTS goes on to answer his question at the following rate:—

She has organized and consummated conspiracies which have horrified all after ages, in her efforts to secure universal supremacy over mankind. . . . There is not an offense against human rights and liberties but may justly be charged against the papacy. Then there

is the fact that both ignorance and superstition result from her supremacy. . . . By her half-heathenish system of Christianity she had held the millions under her authority in the greatest darkness, mental and spiritual. . . . There is absolutely no excuse for the degraded condition of the masses in papal lands, both on this continent and in Europe; and the only reason for it is to be found in the ecclesiastical system which has enthralled them, mind and soul. The papacy has not changed. She cannot change. The fundamental doctrines of her system forbid it. She is so constructed that she must insist on absolute supremacy over men and nations.

This is all perfectly true. And yet, Mr. Crafts, you and your National Reform combination, for years sought and finally obtained, a close alliance with this "half-heathenish system of Christianity" for wholly heathenish purposes—for religio-political purposes. And her principle of *absolutism*, which is the very life of her ecclesiastical system, you yourself persistently sanctioned in your crowding all the Catholics of the country into the support of your schemes, because *the cardinal* had approved it. And you not only thus sanctioned that principle, but you confirmed it in words when you wrote and printed this:—

The [cardinal's] letter is not equal in value to the individual signatures of the millions he represents; *but no loyal Catholic* priest or paper, or *person* will oppose what has been thus indorsed.—  
*Senate Mis. Doc. No. 43, Fiftieth Congress, 2nd Session, p. 18, note.*

Oh, knowing all this which you have said, and yet doing all this which you have done, it is perfectly evident that the "Christianity" which you and the National Reform combination represent, is, in every principle, as certainly half-heathenish as is the papal itself?

IN view of that which we have before shown as to Mr. Crafts' connection and dealings with Mr. Powderly and the Knights of Labor, the following from the editorial of Dec. 9, 1893, is worth considering:—

The retirement of Mr. Terence V. Powderly from the head of that great organization, "The Knights of Labor," has called forth a great deal of newspaper comment. There is one thing that has impressed us for years that seems not to have been noticed in this connection. Mr. Powderly is a Roman Catholic. Those who watched the growth and developments of the organization have not forgotten how diligently the cardinal and the bishops of the church courted it. "The grand master" did not seem adverse, either, to the advances made by these dignitaries. The blessing of a pope or the presence of a cardinal was an event in the annual meeting. It looked at one time as though "the Church" had captured the organization and might proceed to arm and drill it as she is doing with so many of her "benevolent associations."

And yet being "*impressed*" with all this "*for years*," you, yourself, Mr. Crafts, spent some of those very years in drawing into alliance with your religio-political combination, Mr. Powderly and the organization of which he was the head. Knowing that Mr. Powderly was a Catholic, that the organization of which he was the head was largely Catholic, that it was diligently courted by the cardinal and the bishops of "the Church," and that Mr. Powderly was not only "not adverse" to this courtship, but was in direct and official connection with the cardinal,—knowing all this "*for years*" you, yourself, spent years in diligently courting this organization. So diligently did you do this that you actually went so far as to make a proposal of marriage by declaring that you had "almost decided to become a Knight of Labor" yourself, as in 1889 you made "a proposal of courtship" to the papacy itself direct in that "correspondence and conference" connected with the Baltimore congress.

AGAIN, the editorial says:—

For some reason the world is not ready to accept the explanation the Roman Catholic Church puts on her own actions. It may be a great injustice, but it is a fact that the declarations made by the popes and cardinals for the last few hundred years is taken at a great discount.

But, Mr. Crafts, *you* did not make any such discount. You, yourself, received a declaration from Cardinal Gibbons that he was "most happy" to add his name to yours and others in your "laudable" enterprise. And instead of taking it "at a great discount" or any discount at all, you took it at such an infinite increase that whereas the cardinals declaration was that he added only *his* name, you made his one name count for 7,200,000 names. There is not any *very* "great discount" about that.

19

AGAIN this editorial says to the papacy:—

Americans are suspicious of your church. The mass of the people of this country do not believe you are to be trusted with power of any kind.

Yes, *Americans* are suspicious of the papal church. But, Mr. Crafts, your record as a National Reformer does not show that you have been at all suspicious of that church. On the contrary you have acted toward it as though it were the most trustworthy thing in heaven or on earth. Now a question to you, Mr. Crafts: In view of this record of yours, in principle, in purpose, in action are you an American or a papist? Again, in view of this record of yours, it is evident to every

candid mind, that *you* are not one of the people nor is your National Reform combination a company of people who "do not believe that the papal church is to be trusted with power of any kind." On the contrary, you and your fellow-workers, both men and women, have spent your most diligent efforts, for years, with the aid and alliance of the papal church, to get this Government committed to the support of religion and thus clothe the ecclesiastical with civil power here. You succeeded at last. And then too, you, yourself, set to this viperous ecclesiastical tyranny, the wicked example and the baleful precedent, of calling for armed troops to enforce upon the people at the World's Fair the observance of the Catholic Sunday which you had got Congress to set up as the "Christian Sabbath." And now you find the papal "ecclesiastical organization," which you knew had, for every hour of "more than a thousand years, been a menace to the political liberties of the civilized world"—now you find this ecclesiastical organization in the place and wielding the power which you yourselves hoped to possess. Thus by your very lack of suspicion of the papal church, you have succeeded in clothing her with the greatest power of the world, when you knew all the time that she was not "to be trusted with power of any kind."

AND finally, from the editorial of Oct. 28, 1893, we quote as the climax, the sum, and the first condemnation, of all this infamous intrigue, the following:—

The government that cherishes the papacy is cherishing a viper that will some day sting it to the heart.

That is true. And you, Mr. Crafts, and the *Christian Statesman*, knew it all the time. And yet you went to that viper, which had been flung out into the cold by our governmental fathers, as the venomous thing which it is, which they had flung out into the cold to perish, you picked it up, you took it to your bosom, and warmed and cherished it, and, through the success of your religio-political intrigue upon the Government of the United States, the glory of the world, you brought it back to full and active and venomous vigor. You hoped that the hood which you thought you had slipped upon its head would remain, and that you might thus ever use it as a sort of pet in your house for you amusement or service. But, behold, you find that you failed really to hood the thing at the start, and that *now* you can't. You find that you have nourished it back to such active and vigorous life that it has taken possession of the house. And now you, *you* raise an alarm against cherishing a viper! Now you give warning that whosoever

cherishes and warms a viper it "will some day sting" him "to the heart." But who cherished this viper and warmed it back to life? Who picked up and brought into the house, and cherished back to active and vigorous life, this viper which has now taken possession of the American house and which will certainly sting the household to death?—Oh, the National Reform combination did it. And the chiefest instrument of that combination, in the doing of it was you, yourself, "Rev." Wilbur F. Crafts.

And now, in view of this awful record and present consequences of it, and the fearful results which are yet to be wrought by it, we can only in pity, and in the sorrowful tones of our Saviour, when he saw such things going on in his day, exclaim concerning the whole National Reform combination: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell."

A. T. J.

NOTE.—Since the foregoing was written, we have received the *Christian Statesman* of December 30, 1893, containing Mr. Crafts' valedictory, announcing the end of his connection with that paper, and also the end of his "five years of Sabbath reform campaigning." From his record, as truthfully set forth in the foregoing notes, it is plain enough that this valedictory to five years of *such* campaigning is very appropriate, seeing that in these five years and by this campaigning he has done about as much mischief to the American Republic and people as it would be possible for one mortal man to do in the same length of time.

In his valedictory, Mr. Crafts remarks of himself:—

It has been said that Frederick proved himself "the Great," by saying, "I made a mistake." On that basis I could prove myself doubly great by confessing, "I have made two mistakes,—or more."

Yes, Mr. Crafts, you have undoubtedly made "*two* mistakes" in this five years' career—the first one when you originated the American Sabbath Union, and the second when you accomplished the alliance of the National Reform combination and the papacy. And by the same token you are most worthily entitled to the dignity which you have suggested and which we cheerfully accord to you, and in accordance with which we sincerely write,—

Wilbur, the doubly great—.

*Vale*, and we remain as ever,

Truly,

ALONZO T. JONES.

**January 25, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 4 , pp. 25, 26.**

WHAT is now the position and work of the Catholic Church in the United States?

THIS is a question worth careful inquiry, and watchful attention on the part of every one who would not be deceived by this "mistress of witchcrafts and mother of abominations."

THE Government and people of the United States having been sold and delivered, by the National Reform American Sabbath Union combination into the hands of the papacy, it is well for the people to study and understand how the new claimant looks upon her new accession, and what she proposes to do with it.

WE have given in these columns the published purpose of Leo XIII., that "what the church has done in the past for other nations, she will now do for the United States;" and the command of Satolli from Leo to the Catholics of the United States to "bring your country into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness—Christ and his church;" and also the hope of that church "to missionize the entire land in half a decade of years," and that "the nets of St. Peter will drag this continent from ocean to ocean, till they are filled to breaking with the souls of men that shall be saved."

SEEING her purposes so plainly stated, it is well to see what steps have been, and are being, taken to accomplish them. It cannot be expected of course that we should tell all of this in one number of the SENTINEL; not only because there is more than could be given at once, but because it is a constantly active and rapidly growing work. However, we pledge ourselves to watch the thing closely, and to point out as faithfully as is possible the developments of this everlasting "menace" to the political and religious liberties of mankind, which has been so firmly seated in the American saddle by the officious governmental tinkering of Bishop Coxe and others, and of the National Reform American Sabbath Union combination.

THERE were some developments at Cardinal Gibbons' late jubilee, which are worthy of particular note; but which we have not seen mentioned in any paper, outside of the Catholic papers which published full reports of the proceedings. At that celebration Archbishop Ireland delivered a panegyric upon Cardinal Gibbons in which he linked Leo XIII., and the cardinal together as the links which

are to bind together "the church and the age," and himself gave the definition of his expression, "The church and the age," thus: "*Rome is the church; America is the age.*" With this specific definition there will be no difficulty in seeing the archbishop's meaning in the extracts which we shall present.

SPEAKING evidently of the cardinal the archbishop said:—

I indicate the opportunity for the great and singular churchman. His work is to bridge the deep valley separating the age, to clear off the clouds which prevent the one from seeing the realities of the other, to bring the church to the age and the age to the church.

With Rome as the church, and America as the age, it is clear that the archbishop's speech is in the direct line of Satolli's instructions from Leo to the Catholics of America to bring their "country into immediate contact with" "the church."

THE archbishop continues:—

I preach the new, the most glorious crusade. Church and age! Unite them in mind and heart, in the name of humanity, in the name of God. Church and age! Bring them into close contact; they pulsate alike; the God of humanity works in one, the God of supernatural revelation works in the other—in both the self-same God.

And of course for all the purposes of this design, this "crusade," and of those engaged in it the pope is this god who works in both "the church and the age."

THIS is more clearly indicated in another place in the archbishop's speech, as follows:—

Surely, much yet is to be done before the union of age and church is complete, but the work has begun and has progressed in a surprising degree. Let us pray that Leo may live yet many years, and that when death at last comes Leo's spirit may yet dominate in the Vatican, and all will be well. Meanwhile, in America, let Catholics of America cluster around him, inhale his ideas and work with him, as Americans should work, in energy and earnestness. We are especially favored by him. *He lives among us in an especial manner, having sent to us his chosen representative, who makes Leo known to us as no other could; whose words, whose acts, prove to us daily how truly Leo is the pontiff of the age. Monsignor Satolli, the church and the age! Rome is the church; America is the age!* And Monsignor Satolli's command to Catholics of America is: "Go forward, on the road of progress, bearing in one hand the book of Christian truth—Christ's gospel—and in the other the Constitution of the United States."

NEXT the archbishop turns personally to the cardinal and defines his place, thus:—

I have spoken of the providential pope of Rome. I speak now of the providential Archbishop of Baltimore. How oft, in past times, I have thanked God that in this latter quarter of the nineteenth century Cardinal Gibbons had been given to us as primate, as leader, Catholic of Catholics, American of Americans, a bishop of his age and *to his country*; he is to America what Leo is to all Christendom. . . . A particular mission is reserved to the American cardinal. . . . America is watched. The prelate who in America is *the representative of the union of church and age* is watched. His leadership guides the combatants the world over. . . . The ripples of Cardinal Gibbons' influence cross the threshold of the Vatican. . . . The historic incident of the Knights of Labor, whose condemnation Cardinal Gibbons averted by personal interview with Leo, was one of the preparations to the encyclical on the Condition of Labor.

The work of Cardinal Gibbons forms an epoch in the history of the church in America. He has made known, as no one before him did, the church to the people of America; he has demonstrated the fitness of the church for America, the natural alliance existing between the church and the freedom-giving institutions of America. Through his action the scales have fallen from the eyes of non-Catholics, prejudices have vanished. He, *the great churchman is the great citizen*. Church and country *unite in him*, and the magnetism of *the union* pervades the whole land, teaching laggard Catholics to love America, teaching well-disposed *non-Catholics to trust the church*.

NOR is this all theory, nor simply the grandiloquence of a set panegyric. For before that celebration was over there was furnished an object-lesson, which, whether it was pre-arranged or not, was seized upon and made to tell for all the occasion was worth, and in Rome's hand it is worth a great deal. The next night after this speech was made, a great banquet was held in honor of the cardinal and the OC-

26

casino. At that banquet the Vice-president of the United States sat at the right hand of the cardinal. And in response to loud calls for a speech at the table, the archbishop made use of this situation to the following effect:—

I do not know whether or not you appreciate the full value of the union you see typified here to-night, *the union of the Catholic Church and America*, the fraternity between the church and the non-Catholics of the nation. The Vice-president of the United States

comes here and takes his seat alongside the cardinal. This spirit of fraternity *between Church and State, thus typified*, is the result of the work of our American cardinal. . . . In this freest of democracies it was his providential mission to prove that the Catholic Church is at home. . . . Of this our cardinal is proof to all men, to all the world. . . . I wish for him many years of life for the sake of the church and the sake of the country—that he may go to work even more vigorously, bringing into closer contact the old church and the new democracy.

AT the same table the cardinal took occasion to make again the statement which he has taken particular pains to make as often as possible lately, that he "would be sorry to see the relations between Church and State any closer than they are at present," and for fear that "the State might want to have something to say as to the doctrines we teach." Yes, the relations between the State and the Catholic Church are always perfectly satisfactory so long as the State will support the church and enforce her dogmas—in other words so long as the church can use the State and run it in her own interests. But when the State presumes to take a hand in the affairs of the church—that is a thing the church is always very "sorry" to see. That this is the cardinal's idea here, and not the American idea of the total separation of religion and the State, is made plain by other words in the same speech in which he gives the religious characteristics of governmental affairs in the United States as follows:—

Our common law is taken from the common law of England, which is thoroughly permeated with the spirit of Christianity. Where is the Christian Sabbath better observed than it is here? The proceedings of our national and State legislatures are opened with prayer; and still another evidence of our respect and regard for religion is the fact of our setting apart a day each year for special thanksgiving; the President of the United States and the governors of the States calling upon the people by proclamation to return thanks for the blessings they have enjoyed.

NOW all these statements concerning the close relations between "the church," "Christianity," "religion," etc., and America, the United States, etc., are made and repeated upon every possible occasion for a definite and set purpose. The spirit of *aggression* and *usurpation* is the very life of Romanism. And all these are but the first soft, purring steps in the carrying forward and toward the final and complete accomplishment of the aims and orders of Leo, through Satolli, to bring this "country into immediate contact with that great source of

blessedness," the Catholic Church. These statements, which taken alone, and merely by themselves, might appear quite harmless, when taken in view of the definite orders of Leo, the presence of Satolli, and the very spirit of life of the papacy which is aggression and usurpation, then they every one have in them a world of meaning. These statements are made and often repeated for the purpose that they shall be hereafter used as the foundation upon which to build upon, position and decided movements in matters of interference in governmental affairs and use of governmental power. And then when these later movements shall have been made so openly that their evident purpose can be clearly seen by all, and any protest is raised, she will calmly point to these statements and claims so often made in the presence of all *without any protest*; and then shall will say that silence when these statements were so often and so openly made was consent that they were true, and those things being thus confessedly true and the later and open movements follow as the natural consequence. Upon this ground she will impudently claim as of divine and natural right, that which she has usurped from beginning to end, and will coolly observe to all who then resent it, that they ought to have let their voices be heard at the beginning; but that having by silence already and so long consented, now it is too late; possession has been acquired and it is too late for dispute.

THIS is precisely what this is done for, and this is the use that will be made of it in later situations. This is the working of this Romish spirit from the beginning of her existence. Concession in order to exaction; insinuation in order to domination; *everything* in order to absolute possession for purposes of unmitigated oppression—this is the history of Rome and Romanism from the beginning, and this is and will be, her disposition and her course in connection with the United States Government to-day and forward.

AND her position and power here as well as her opportunities, are seen and remarked even from beyond the borders of this country. Not long ago Mr. John P. Hopkins was elected mayor of Chicago. And a dispatch from Montreal to Chicago Dec. 22, 1893, runs as follows:—

MONTREAL, Canada, Dec. 22.—The French Canadian Catholic press of Montreal and Quebec is very enthusiastic over the election of John P. Hopkins, the Catholic Mayor of Chicago. Prominent French-Canadians in Chicago telegraphed Senator Tasse that 6,000 French-Canadians voted for him and assured his election. *La Minerve* adds that the election of a Catholic in Chicago is a great event.

The position of the mayor of Chicago, it says, is equivalent to that of many leaders of States, seeing that the city expends \$38,000,000 annually, as much as the whole of Canada. Though the Late Mr. Harrison did much to give the Catholics their due share of patronage, much still remains to be done.

It would be a mistake to believe that the United States is a tolerant country enough for Catholics. They merely have the crumbs of patronage. This is quite evident when we remember that the ten millions of Catholics in the United States have not a single representative in the Cleveland Cabinet, *though it owes its existence to them.*

Note what a world of meaning is in the last words of this quotation—that the Cleveland Cabinet "owes its existence" to "the Catholics in the United States." This is true. There is no doubt of that. But that and other things of equal importance being true, and this showing the use that is to be made of these things, adds emphasis to the point which we make on the statements which we have herein reproduced from Archbishop Ireland and the cardinal at the jubilee celebration. Yes, there is not the least doubt that the relations between the State and the Catholic Church in the United States are close enough to suit the cardinal and for all practical purposes—for *the present.* And in view of the things here presented we simply ask every American, "Will not the papacy in the United States bear watching both for the present and the future?—for the present preparatory for the future, and for the future in view of the present?"

A. T. J.

NOTE.—The quotations from Archbishop Ireland and Cardinal Gibbons are all found in the *Catholic Times*, of Philadelphia, October 21, 1893.

**"Note" *American Sentinel* 9, 4 , p. 30.**

IN an appeal to its Freethought constituency the *Truth Seeker* says:—

We cannot afford to have any more religious legislation by Congress. Already too many precedents have been established. This country was dedicated to freedom, and it was decreed that Church and State should be separate. It cannot be denied by any honest and intelligent person that the ship of State is rapidly drifting from her secular moorings out into the rock-torn waters of ecclesiasticism. We must at once bring her back to her safe anchorage or meet wreck and death in the near future.

But we shall have more religious legislation by Congress. Eighteen hundred years ago the prophet of God foretold that in this country would be formed an image to the papal beast. This has been done. The Government has surrendered to the united churches; the power is now in the hands of a religious hierarchy as relentless as ever Rome was—a hierarchy that has boasted that it holds the Congress of the United States in its hands—and it now only remains for it to fulfill the remainder of the prophecy of Rev. 13:15-17. The *Truth Seeker* does not believe the word of God, but it cannot deny the facts as they unfold. Our contemporary thinks the rising tide of governmental ecclesiasticism will yet be stayed by a revival of the love of liberty now latent in the American breast; but it is a vain hope. Only the power of God can break the hold that apostate Protestantism and Roman Catholicism has on this fair land, and that power will not be put forth until the time comes for the fulfillment of the promise of the Father to the Lord Jesus Christ: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for then 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."

**"Notes" *American Sentinel* 9, 4 , p. 31.**

"THE czar and the pope," remarks an exchange, "have exchanged autograph letters on the religious situation. It is believed that the disposition on the part of Russia and the Vatican to reestablish a religious *entente* is firmer than ever." It is said that when rogues fall out honest men get their dues; but what happens when tyrants are made friends? If the future is to be judged from the past no good can come to true Christians by any understanding between the pope and the czar. It was over the arrest and trial of Christ that Herod and Pilate were made friends; and our Lord's crucifixion immediately followed.

**February 1, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 5 , pp. 33, 34.**

THERE is abroad a general disposition to apologize and make excuses for, and to flatter the papacy.

THIS is not to be wondered at on the part of what is called the *secular* press of the country, as that is practically controlled, directly or indirectly, by the papacy.

BUT it is a mystery how religious papers, professedly Protestant, can shut their eyes to the encroachments of the papacy, and labor to convince themselves and the public that the papacy is not what it used to be, but is enlightened, modernized, and even *Americanized*.

MYSTERY, though it be, however, it is an undeniable *fact* that the religious papers, professedly Protestant, which stand as the leading Protestant papers of the country, do labor diligently and constantly to convince themselves and the public that the papacy is not what it *really* is.

TRUE, they find it a difficult task which they have thus set themselves, in the face of the numerous bold movements which the papacy is making in her old-time and native spirit before all the people, but yet heroically do they stick to the task and seem determined to accomplish it not only in spite of the difficulties, but in spite of the papacy itself.

THERE is a considerable number of these papers, but the chiefest one, and engaged most earnestly in this difficult and mischievous business, is the *Independent* of this city. It has been thus engaged a good while, but as the papacy grows more bold and its native spirit becomes more openly apparent, the *Independent* seems the more determined to convince itself and others that all these things only mark the further progress of the papacy in enlightenment, and in its modernizing and Americanizing tendency.

FOR instance, last October, there was sent by the Catholic hierarchy an official and authoritative communication to the "editors of Catholic newspapers," commanding them to "learn to be obedient and submissive to superiors;" that "neither they themselves nor those who assist them should attack ecclesiastics, and above all, bishops;" and that "above all, let the name of bishops be sacred among Catholic writers, for to them reverence is due because of their high office and dignity. Nor let them think themselves privileged to examine, critically, what divinely appointed pastors, in exercise of their power, have established," etc. This the *Independent* printed, and then commented upon it, as follows:—

We should like to know upon what meat these our bishops feed that they have grown so great as to be above criticism by the press. Obedience and submission to superiors is right within the limits of administration, but opinion cannot be thus controlled nor the

expression of it limited. A bishop has a right to govern his diocese, but he has no right to pretend that he never makes a mistake or cannot be criticised. We should like to know why a Catholic editor should not have the "privilege to examine critically what divinely appointed pastors have established"? Divinely appointed pastors can establish very unwise things. We are interested to know what those ecclesiastical penalties are by which editors are to be prevented from criticising a bishop's method of administration. We suppose the most effective method will be for the bishop to pronounce his censure upon the journal and forbid his people to subscribe to it. That has been tried in Cincinnati with great success. But it is not the American way of doing things, and we do not believe it is the Christian way of doing things.

And yet, in the very same issue, October 26, 1893, and in the editorial columns, too, the *Independent* says this:—

Archbishop Ireland and Bishop McGolrick appeared last week in Chicago on the platform of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The nearer we come together the better we will like each other.

Archbishop Ireland and Bishop McGolrick were, with the others, the authors of that communication of arrogance and superiority, addressed to editors of Catholic newspapers, which the *Independent* mildly criticises, and then, almost in the same breath, declares of these same men: "The nearer we come together the better we will like each other." Yes, after swallowing such a dose of papal superiority as that, we should think you would. No doubt the more of it you can have the better you will like it all.

ABOUT the same time that the foregoing instance occurred, there occurred also another which is well worth mentioning. The committee of the Inquisition in Rome put upon the *Index Expurgatorius* certain books and writings—that is, it condemned and outlawed them so far as its power now goes. Among these condemned writings was a series of articles by a certain Catholic, which had been printed in three numbers of a leading magazine. When the notice of the condemnation of these writings was published, the *Independent* said of it:—

We now translate the directions given to the faithful in reference to these books:

Therefore, let no one of whatsoever rank or condition dare in future either to publish or to read or to keep these above-mentioned condemned and proscribed works; but let him deliver them over to the local bishops or to the inquisitors of heretical doctrine, under the

penalties which have been prescribed in the index of Forbidden Books.

We understand, then, that any Catholic who has a copy of these numbers of *The Nineteenth Century* is under immediate obligation to mail them to the bishop of his diocese. He is not allowed to keep a perfect file of the volume for 1892 and 1893 under the penalties prescribed. Mr. St. George Mivart has, since the publication of this act, obediently signified his retraction of the opinions advanced in the articles but now condemned as unsound teaching. He has proved himself quite childlike. These articles have been printed in part in a good many Catholic papers, and we do not doubt that they are in the possession of many priests and laymen. We have some curiosity to know how far this injunction to send the interdicted writings to the bishop and no longer to read them has become a dead letter.

*We are in earnest when we say that we want to know whether this edict is a dead letter in the United States.* We have had beautiful addresses in Chicago from Cardinal Gibbons and Bishop Keane and Archbishop Ireland and dozens of other distinguished and representative Catholics, telling us about the liberality of the pope and his sympathy with free institutions, his love for republics and the freedom of the American Catholic Church. WE BELIEVE IT ALL. <sup>11</sup> And yet *what are we to do with such an edict as that* which we have just translated out of the original Latin? Citizens of the United States, American Catholics who love liberty, are forbidden by *an excellent gentleman in Rome* [the pope] either to read or to have in their houses three different numbers of *The Nineteenth Century*? *This is not fiction, it is fact.* A dozens or so of his advisers have passed upon those articles and they say that American Catholic citizens shall not read them. Now *what liberty is there about that?* Why is it not downright spiritual tyranny? *How does it agree with the beautiful sentiments which we have heard?*

34

Is it really expected that this edict will be obeyed? Will Bourke Cockran and will Dr. Bartsell immediately send to Archbishop Corrigan their copies of these three numbers of *The Nineteenth Century*, or of any of the Catholic papers in their possession which have reprinted the articles? We are confused. We are puzzled. We do not know how to work out a problem in which one of the factors is. Two equals three.—*Independent, October 5, 1893.*

But, dear *Independent*, how can you keep from being confused and puzzled with "a problem in which one of the factors is, Two equals three," when you yourself create that factor in the problem by insisting, in the face of all mathematical evidence and principle, that two *does* equal three?

ANY one who will give to papal "figuring" the true value of the factors that enter into all her problems, will never be either confused or puzzled. To the extent of its power the papal Inquisition is now precisely what it always has been. The papacy itself is to-day precisely what it always has been. "This is not fiction, it is fact." This announcement of the Inquisition demonstrates that. And if to-day the papacy had sufficient power in the United States over others than her own membership she would enforce this inquisitional decree upon all, "of whatsoever rank or condition," whether they be Catholic or not. Of course, "we have had beautiful [?] addresses in Chicago" and many other places, "from Cardinal Gibbons and Bishop Keane and Archbishop Ireland and dozens of other distinguished and representative Catholics," and from the *Independent*, and the *Christian at Work*, and the *Evangelist*, and other distinguished and representative "Protestant" papers, "telling us about the liberality of the pope and his sympathy with free institutions, his love for republics," etc., etc., etc. But we do *not* believe a single word of it all. Every word of it all is only a papal lie.

"THE *liberality* of the pope"!!!! Yes, yes, and the "green cheese" of "the moon." "His sympathy with free institutions"!!! is taffy for "broad-minded" "liberal-ideaed" "advanced" "Protestants." "His love for republics"!! Oh, yes, now we have struck it. The pope loves republics. Especially does he love the American Republic. He has actually told us so himself. He has sent Satolli over here as his personal representative, not only to tell us so again and again, but to show to us how much the pope loves the American Republic. Yes, indeed, the pope loves this Republic. There is no doubt of that. The lion loves lambs, too. And even the spider loves flies. And Pope Leo XIII. says of America and its people: "I love them, and I love their country. I have great tenderness for those who live in that land, Protestants and all."—*Chicago Herald, September 5, 1893, p. 9.*

AGAIN: A few weeks ago a Catholic circular, originating from Baltimore, was distributed, raising and agitating the question of the apportionment of the public school fund to the denominational schools in proportion to membership, and stating that this question would be brought before the Maryland legislature this present winter. About the same time a bill to the same purpose was framed by a Catholic, to be presented in the New York legislature, which is not in session. It was given out, as from Archbishop Corrigan, of this city, that the "Catholic authorities" were in no wise responsible for this New York bill. But, Dr. Michael Walsh, editor of the *Catholic Herald*,

and sponsor of the bill, says that "the bill has been examined by the cardinals and clergy at Rome and is approved by them," and that it has also been submitted to and practically approved by the leading clergy and the most prominent men in the Catholic Church in this country." The *Independent* wrote to Cardinal Gibbons, asking him about the Baltimore circular, and whether he or Satolli had signed it. The cardinal answered that neither he nor Satolli had signed any such circular, and further that he was "certain that no such circular has any existence except in the imagination of people ever open to suspicion." As the circular had been described in the daily papers and been published in Catholic papers, the *Independent*, thinking there might be some "misapprehension" on the part of the cardinal as to what its first letter meant, sent a second letter, enclosing a copy of the circular, to which the cardinal replied that it "did not emanate" from him and was not published with his "authorization," but had appeared without his "knowledge and consent."

Next, the *Independent* sent out a letter to the archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States, asking (1) whether it is the policy of the Catholic Church to favor the division of the public school fund; and (2) whether they, personally, would countenance such division. In its issue of January 11, 1894, the *Independent* publishes the replies of *thirty* bishops and archbishops to these questions. Of these thirty replies only *one* says plainly that he is opposed to it; *two* are indefinite; *six* are clearly evasive; while all the other *twenty-one* are in favor of it—some with conditions and others rabidly and unconditionally. And one of these gives the words of Cardinal Gibbons that: "This [Catholic] education our children cannot have in the public schools, therefore we wish to have our own schools; and as we cannot, without the help of the State, *we desire a share of the public school fund* to enable us to have such schools."

Now, from this whole record, it is as clear as day that this Baltimore circular and this New York bill, and the agitation raised by them, are all gotten up only as "feelers" by which to test the public pulse upon this question, which is fraught with the most vital consequences to the Government and people of the United States. As it seems they have found that the time is not yet ripe for its success, they will doubtless let the matter drop for a while to be sprung again as soon as possible, and so, little by little, work the thing along till they can make it win. And yet, as plain as all this is to

anybody who will see, the *Independent* puts forth these words on the subject:—

We should divest ourselves as far as possible of the prejudice which believes that they are in the habit of masking their real intentions and moving in mysterious ways.

BUT why do we need to present any more, or even these, evidences that the papacy is to-day the same politic, deceitful, craft, "mistress of witchcrafts" and "mother of abominations" that she ever was? Why should we seek by these evidences to point out the willing blindness of such papers? When we have the plain and positive statement of Cardinal Gibbons, lately published broadcast in the daily papers, that the papacy is to-day precisely what it always was. Here are his words:—

You must remember that the Catholic Church is the oldest institution in this country. Here, as in the old world, with the passage of time, everything else has changed. Her organization, her principles, her doctrines, her rites, are precisely the same to-day as they were when Columbus first landed. The forms of government have altered, new nationalities with new customs and new ideas have come. . . . But the teachings, the procedure, the forms, the structure of the Catholic Church, are identically what they were when the first Catholic priest raised the cross on American soil.—  
*Catholic Times, October 21, 1893.*

Since Columbus first landed on American soil the Inquisition was carried on to its fullest extent in every one of its horrible methods. Since that date Martin Luther and all Protestants and Protestantism were absolutely condemned and outlawed in the world. Since that date multitudes of Protestants have been persecuted to death, thousands of them being burnt to death, thousands of them being burnt to death, by the "procedure" of the Catholic Church. All this terrible record of the papacy has been made since Columbus first landed on American soil. Cardinal Gibbons declares that she is in all things "precisely" and "identically" the same to-day that she was then. There is not the least doubt that this is the absolute truth. And by the same token all these "beautiful expressions" as to the liberality of the Catholic Church, and the love of the pope for Protestants, are sheer papal lies.

In view of this and the other evidences which we have now presented, which are open and apparent and known to all, what can possibly be the cause of this apparently willful willingness on the part of professed Protestants to make the papacy appear to be what it certainly is not, and what it says itself that it is not? The only

conceivable explanation of it that we can find is, that these professed Protestants have so degenerated that they have become so entirely like the papacy in structure, in aim, and in spirit, that they themselves see that they and the papacy are precisely alike; and being therefore incapable of seeing or admitting that they are wrong, they decide at once that the papacy has changed, and become enlightened and modernized and Americanized. And the evidence upon which they convince themselves that this is certainly so is only that she is so exactly like themselves that there is no perceptible difference, and therefore it must be so and is so.

The Scripture showed long ago that in this country there would arise a living image of the papacy, and when things have come to pass, that the leading Protestant representatives cannot themselves find any material difference between themselves and the papacy, it is evident that the Scripture is fulfilled. Rev. 13:11-17.

A. T. J.

**February 8, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 6 , pp. 41, 42.**

THE papacy is posing before the Government and people of the United States as the support of society and the stay of civil order.

OPPORTUNITIES are sought for and even created on every possible occasion by the dignitaries and prominent men of "the church" to proclaim her as the conservator of public order, and that there can be no assured safety without the "benign offices" of "the church."

IN taking his seat as temporary chairman of the Catholic Congress at Chicago, September 4, 1893, Morgan J. O'Brien, of the Supreme Court of New York, said:—

That the solution of the present social difficulties is to be found in the Catholic Church, we know; for as has been well said, "That church . . . is recognized as the synonym of authority, the foe to lawlessness, and the champion of law and order."

IN the same congress, September 5, Archbishop Watterons, of Columbus, said:—

If society is to be saved from a condition worse in some respects than that of pagan times, it is from the Vatican the saviour must come. . . . Leo XIII. is recalling to the minds of men those great bedrock truths on which the health and life of nations and

society depend. . . . He shows that the papacy is this great social necessity, this universal moral power in the world, the bond of union and the principle of order.

THESE are only samples of what may be found in almost every Catholic speech and Catholic paper. Thus she sounds her own trumpet before her, and, in this as in other things, "Protestant" preachers and papers toot their little horns behind her, saying, "That is so." There are many examples of this, and there have been many in recent years.

FOR instance, in the *Evangelist*, of this city, a Presbyterian paper, whose editor speaks of Cardinal Gibbons as "Our Cardinal," February 9, 1888, a Presbyterian D.D. of Princeton, described the papacy as—

The church of all races, ranks and classes, which gives signs of becoming American as well as Roman, and *the only church* fitted by its hold upon the working masses, to grapple with that labor problem before which our Protestant Christianity stands baffled to-day.

And in the *North American Review* for January, 1894, Bishop Doane, of the "Protestant" Episcopal Church, of Albany, in this State, strikes the same key to the following effect:—

The Roman Catholic Church throughout the world is really two or three absolutely distinct and different things. Whatever one may feel about the schism which it is, and the schisms it has caused; or, however deeply one may deplore the novelties with which it has overlaid the old faith (which, like all novelties, being on the top are the things most thought of and most dwelt on by her people), these are not matters for discussion here or now. In spite of these, she is to every intelligent mind an ancient and venerable portion of the Christian Church; and in her discharge of her ecclesiastical and religious duties, is to be protected and respected, teaching other Christians many lessons of devotion, consistency and courage, which we should do well to learn. Besides this, she is a factor in the lives of thousands of people, citizens of our country, who are kept from evil living by her ministrations and control; and when we consider the fact that the enormous majority of the crowded poor belong to her communion, that perhaps the most turbulent element in our citizenship owes at least a faint and nominal allegiance to her authority, that without the control of her priesthood, we should be powerless to deal, except by brute force, with great masses of the workingmen of America; we must certainly be ready to secure to her every opportunity for doing the legitimate work of a great Christian Church. Over and above this—and I say it with no unkindness—since an overwhelming proportion of the inmates of our institutions of reform consist of her people, it seems right to me,

provided no money for the support of religious services come from the State funds, that her clergymen should have access to the inmates of these institutions under proper regulations. The Roman Church is also a beneficent institution, with multiplied and manifold orders and agencies of mercy and charity, in the support of which, and in their methods of administration, she is not only to be protected, but greatly admired and imitated by others.

And that such papers as the *Independent* and the *Christian at Work*, indorse it all, needs not to be proved by quotations.

THIS claim of the papacy and its admission by Protestants, is worth examination for its own sake, and more in view of the use that is made of it. When viewed in the light of facts of open every day experience, it will be seen to be as void of truth, as perfectly fraudulent, as was ever any claim that was made by the papacy. Nor do we need to go outside of good Catholic authority for evidence to start with. In the Chicago Catholic Congress, September 6, 1893, Archbishop Ireland said:—

We say this is a glorious church of ours—as, indeed, she is—and yet what a fearfully large proportion of those so-called saloons are held by Catholics; and what a fearfully large proportion who lose in them their souls, are children of the church.

And the same day in the congress Mr. M. T. Elder read a paper, in which he stated this and more, thus:—

When I see how largely Catholicity is represented among our hoodlum element, I feel in no spread-eagle mood. When I note how few Catholics are engaged in honestly tilling the honest soil, and how many Catholics are engaged in the liquor traffic, I cannot talk buncombe to anybody.

AMEN, say we. And yet throughout that whole congress, with the exception of Mr. Elder's paper and one more, there was nothing else than one continuous stream of this same "spread-eagle" stuff and "buncombe" as to "the church" being the "champion of law and order" and "the saviour of society." And all this, too, in fact of the patent and conscious fact that "Catholicity" is so "largely represented" among the "hoodlum element" of the nation; and that a "fearfully large proportion" of saloon keepers and those who patronize them are "Catholics" and "children of the church"—yes, of "this glorious church of ours."

THERE is another illustration strictly to the point, and which is fresh in the minds of all the people of the country. Everybody knows that for the greater part of the month of January, 1894, the whole executive authority of the State of Florida, from the governor down,

was kept on the alert, and even the authorities of the adjoining State of Georgia—and all in vain, too—to prevent a prize fight, in which one of the principals and a majority of the trainers, etc., were "good" Catholics. And yet not a single official of the Catholic Church said a single word or did a single thing to prevent that fight, when, *if any of these claims on behalf of "the church" are true*, a single word from any of them could have stopped it. This is not saying that "the church" should

42

have come to the aid of the State of Florida. But it *is* to say that if she is of any kind of good to society and civil order, she ought to be able so to instruct and civilize "her children" that they would not want so much to fight that all the power of the State cannot keep them from it. It is also worth remarking in this connection that any one who will read the names in the "sporting" notes of the daily papers, or the "sporting" papers, will have no difficulty in seeing that a "fearfully large proportion" of the prize fighting element, as well as of the saloon element and the "hoodlum element" in general, are "children of the church."

THERE is another fact in illustration of the point which we are making—that the Catholic Church is not in any sense the champion of law and order—and which is late enough to bear an air of considerable "freshness." Thursday night, January 18, 1894, in Kansas City, Mo., an ex-priest was making a speech, when the meeting was broken up by a riot. As is always done in such cases, the "police," instead of quelling the riot and arresting the rioters, arrested the speaker whom the rioters had attacked. Further proceedings are clearly enough described in the following dispatch to the *Atlanta Constitution*, a Catholic paper, January 21:—

KANSAS CITY, MO., January 20.—Had not the police authorities to-day taken extra precautions to guard the life of J. M. McNamara, the ex-Catholic priest, who lectured last Tuesday night when a riot occurred, he would probably have received rough treatment, if not lynched. At his preliminary hearing to answer to the charges of malicious libel and circulating foul and obscene literature, such a large crowd gathered that the authorities decided to transfer the hearing to the county jail, where McNamara was incarcerated. The news that the hearing was to be held there quickly spread, and a mob numbering fully 4,000 people gathered outside of the jail. A number of extra policemen were detailed to endeavor to keep the crowd in order. When McNamara was brought from his cell his countenance was very white. The court

room was packed and the spectators regarded him with anything but friendly glances. When the case was called McNamara's attorneys moved for a continuance, they not having conferred with him, and it was granted, not only for this reason, but because of the threatening aspect of the mob. The hearing was set for Thursday next.

Nobody will have any difficulty in deciding who these rioters were. Everybody knows well enough that this whole mob was made up of the "children" of "this glorious church," which is confessedly so "largely represented" in the "hoodlum element" of the Nation. The despatch further states that a local paper declares that Mr. McNamara in his speech "said nothing that would warrant his arrest on the charges preferred against him." This, however, is evident enough on the face of the report.

NOW, if it be in any sense true that "the Catholic Church is the foe to lawlessness," why does she not antagonize this lawlessness in her own membership? If it be in any sense true that she is "the champion of law and order," then why does she not champion law and order in her own ranks and inculcate the principles of law and order upon her own "children"? If it be in any sense true that "the solution of the present social difficulties is to be found in the Catholic Church," then why does she not solve these social difficulties that are so prevalent amongst her own people? If "it is from the Vatican that the saviour must come," who is to save society from this condition that is fast becoming worse than pagan times, why is it that the Vatican is unable to save its own organization from this condition that is "worse in some respects than pagan times"? If she is in any sense the source of so much good to States and nations, as is proclaimed for her, then why is it that she is not the source of enough good to her own communicants to keep them from overawing the civil authorities and intimidating justice by riotous demonstrations? If it be in any sense true that the Catholic Church is "the synonym of authority," then why is it that she has no authority enough to check the native devilry of her own children?

THERE is an apparent shadow of truth in the observation, that the Catholic Church is better qualified than any other church "to grapple with" the strikes and the consequent riot and violence of "the labor problem" "by her hold upon the working masses." And this because such "a fearfully large proportion" of the strikers, with their rioting and violence, are members in good and regular standing in that church! This is the hold which she has on the working masses. But here is the

question: Having such a hold upon these striking, rioting, violent masses, why is it that she cannot so control them that there will be no danger of any of this evil work, which makes the "labor problem" such a serious and dangerous question to society and to the State? Having already such a hold upon these masses, that she owns the vast majority of them, body and soul, and yet being impotent to prevent any kind of evil or violence from them, what could possibly show more plainly that all this boasting about the Catholic Church being "the champion of law and order," "the synonym of authority," and "saviour of society," etc., etc., is nothing but a downright, huge, and unconscionable fraud?

IF there were any truth at all in these claims put forth in behalf of the papacy by Catholics, and sanctioned by "Protestants," it would prove itself in the quietude and peaceful demeanor of the whole body of the membership of the Catholic Church. There would not be a single saloon keeper, nor a visitor of saloons, nor a user of intoxicants, among all the vast membership of that Church; there would not be a single prize fighter, nor a single rioter, nor a single striker, nor gambler, nor any uncivil person of any kind, among all her children. Instead of this being so however, everybody knows, and facts of daily experience keep it ever within their knowledge, that the opposite is the truth of the matter, and that all these characters are found, and abide, in her communion for ever and everywhere; and that she has no power to prevent it. This is not saying that there are no characters of others kinds in her communion but these; it is only saying what everybody knows, that *these* characters *are* there, and she has no power to cause it to be otherwise. And that as she has no power to cause it to be otherwise; so all the claims put forth in her behalf as being the stay of civil order and the saviour of society are absolutely fraudulent.

THE plain, unvarnished truth is, that the papacy is so entirely the synonym of lawlessness, that the Word of God describes it as the "lawless one" and the very "mystery of lawlessness." It is the corrupter of society, the disabler of States, and the weakener of nations. It never was, and never will be, of any kind of good under the sun. That church is "Babylon the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." The Word of God says so, and it is so.

A. T. J.

**"The Maryland Court of Appeals on Sunday Laws" *American Sentinel*  
9, 6 , pp. 44, 45.**

THE following from the *Baltimore American* of January 24, tells the story of the Judefind case, appealed from Kent County:—

January 23, the Court of Appeals handed down a number of important opinions. The first was the now celebrated Kent County Seventy-day Adventist case, the opinion being written by Judge Boyd. John W. Judefind, a Kent County farmer who had embraced the Seventh-day Adventist faith, was arrested for husking corn on Sunday. He was fined \$5 by a magistrate, appealed to the Circuit Court, was tried before the court, convicted and fined \$5. He brought his case before the Court of Appeals by petition in the nature of a writ of error. First. That section 247 of article 27 of the code is void, because it is in violation of the first paragraph of the fourteenth article of the Constitution of the United States. Second. That said statute is void because it is in violation of article 36 of the Bill of Rights of the constitution of Maryland. Third. That the Circuit Court for Kent County had no jurisdiction to try and convict traverser, since the justice of the peace had no jurisdiction; because the warrant charged no offense under the statute, as it failed to set forth that the husking of corn on Sunday was not a work of necessity or charity; because the warrant was issued and served on Sunday; because the bond of the traverser is void, because it charges "Sabbath-breaking," and no such offense is known to the laws of the State. The attorney general moved to quash the writ of error, on the ground that no writ of error lies to this court from the decision of the Circuit Court on an appeal to it from the judgment of a justice of the peace. That motion, says the court, must prevail.

If the petitioner wanted to try the constitutionality of the law he should have applied for the writ of certiorari upon that specific ground, and this court could then have reviewed the case. Alleged defects in

45

warrant and bond cannot be reviewed here. Having settled the case on the ground that no writ of error lies to this court in the case, the Court of Appeals, for fear that some doubt may rest as to their views of the main issue attempted to be raised to the validity of the arrest under the constitutions of the State and the United States—the Court of Appeals says that the law complained of is not in violation of these codes of organic law. Numerous decisions sustain this view, and nature, experience, and observation suggest the propriety and necessity of one day of rest, and the day generally

adopted is Sunday. There will always be differences as to how the day shall be spent, but the advantage is too apparent to doubt.

In interpreting these differences we must not place unreasonable constructions upon them; but a man, if he defies the law of the State, must expect to be punished. If the petition of the plaintiff be correct, then the law prohibiting the sale of liquor on Sunday, etc., is unconstitutional, as would be most, if not all, of our laws concerning Sunday. The court says that Sunday has been observed as a day of rest from the foundation of the State, and cites *Kilgore vs. Mills et al.* (6G. and J., 274 and 11, Maryland, 313) to prove the position, and it says the laws are looking to a still surer making of the day a day of rest. Writ of error quashed, with costs.

It will be seen that the court went out of its way to sustain the Sunday law of the State of Maryland. There remains but one course for Maryland Adventists, namely, to disobey the law "and quietly suffer the penalty." This is the course advised by President Fairchild in his work on moral philosophy, in such cases, and it is the course which has been pursued by the servants of God in all ages. This was the course pursued by the three Hebrews when commanded to worship the golden image on the plain of Dura. Dan. 3:1-26. The prophet Daniel pursued the same course when forbidden by royal decree to offer any petition to any god or man for thirty days, save of the king only (chapter 6); and the same course was likewise followed by the apostles when forbidden by the magistrates to speak in the name of Jesus. Acts 4 and 5. We are not to resist rulers, neither are we to obey them when to do so is to sin against God. We are to obey God and take the consequences.

**"Wants to Imprison and to Hang Sabbath-Keepers" *American Sentinel* 9, 6 , p. 46.**

A REPRESENTATIVE of the International Religious Liberty Association sends the following to the secretary of the association:—

While working in Chattanooga, some weeks since, I became acquainted with an old journalist and ex-attorney, who, in conversation upon the Sunday movement and legislation, affirmed that Sunday laws and the rights of conscience have nothing to do with each other; but that such laws belong to the civil branch of legislation, and that all violations of Sunday laws should be punished. He further affirmed that as for himself he is in favor of punishing those who break these laws, with imprisonment in jail, and if they violate it a good deal, he would put them in the penitentiary, and for very bad offenses, he would hang them.

This man is simply more outspoken than others; thousands would say the same if they spoke their real sentiments, and other thousands will doubtless come to the same point under stress of what they will imagine are divine judgments sent on the people because of their disregard of Sunday. The Scripture says of the two-horned beast of the 13th of Revelation: "He had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." The image of the beast is apostate Protestantism dominating the civil power, and, like the beast, the papacy, its badge of authority is the false Sabbath.

**February 15, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 7, pp. 49-51.**

IT is claimed and urged on behalf of the papacy that she is the best promoter of a proper and "Christian" civilization.

FOR this reason it is claimed and urged that the Republic of the United States cannot afford to ignore the papacy in the problems which confront the nation in the task of assimilating its immense immigration, so as not to be hindered in its onward march to a complete "Christian" civilization.

AND Mr. Satolli has officially announced that—

Catholic education is the surest safeguard of the permanence throughout the centuries of the Constitution, and the best guide to the Republic in civil progress. . . . The most public opinion and the Government will favor Catholic schools, more and more will the welfare of the commonwealth be advanced.

THIS claim that the papacy is the source and stay of civilization, not only now but through the ages of her existence, and is therefore an important if not an essential factor to the American Republic in the problems which it is called upon to solve in connection with its flood of immigration,—this, like her other claims which we have noted, is sanctioned by professed Protestant papers and leaders, such as the *Independent*, the *Christian at Work*, *et al.* In this they ignore as usual the palpable and suggestive fact that the "fearfully large proportion" of these dangerous and uncivilized immigrants come from Catholic countries, are themselves Catholics, and the direct product of papal "civilization."

AMS the basis and sufficient proof that the papacy is the source and stay of a "Christian" civilization, there is presented by both Catholics and "Protestants," and not less by "Protestants" than by Catholics, the stupendous "fact" that she civilized the barbarians of the fifth century and the middle ages, who annihilated the Roman Empire. This theory Dr. Philip Schaff constantly affirmed, though it clearly contradicted the undisputed and indisputable facts of the history which he himself had written. The truth is that there never was a clearer historical fraud put forth than this claim that the papacy civilized the barbarians who destroyed the Roman Empire, and occupied Western Europe in the middle ages. And since this fraudulent claim is now being so frequently made as the basis for the recognition of the papacy by the United States Government; and as Cardinal Gibbons asserts so plainly and positively that the papacy "is now precisely what she always has been," and that she "can never change," it is worth while to look a little into the connection and dealings of the papacy with the barbarians in the way of civilizing them.

IT must not be forgotten that the papacy had possession of the Roman Empire itself, with all the power of the empire at her command, for nearly a hundred years before the barbarians ever entered the Western Empire with any intention to stay, and more than a hundred years before she had any chance to "civilize" them. It must be remembered too, that her alliance with the empire, and her securing possession of it, were for the express purpose of assuring to it the benefits of a "Christian civilization" and consequent "salvation." Surely here was ample time to test her powers in this direction, before she was ever called upon to "civilize" the barbarians. What, then, was the result? It was this: When, by the union of Church and State, church-membership became a qualification for political as well as every other kind of preferment, hypocrisy became more prevalent than ever before. This was bad enough in itself, yet the hypocrisy was voluntary; but when through the agency of her Sunday laws and by the ministration of Theodosius the church received control of the civil power to compel all without distinction who were not Catholics to act as though they were, hypocrisy was made compulsory; and every person who was not voluntarily a church-member was compelled either to be a hypocrite or a rebel. In addition to this, those who were of the church indeed, through the endless succession of controversies and church councils, were forever establishing,

changing, and re-establishing the faith; and as all were required to change or revise their faith according as the councils decreed, all moral and spiritual integrity was destroyed. Hypocrisy became a habit, dissimulation and fraud a necessity of life, and the very moral fiber of men and of society was vitiated.

ALL the corruptions that had characterized the earlier Rome were thus reproduced and perpetuated *under a form of godliness* in this so-called Christian Rome, the Rome of the fifth century.

The primitive rigor of discipline and manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the ecclesiastics of Rome. The most exorbitant luxury, with all the vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian arts of acquiring wealth universally practiced. They seem to have rivaled in riotous living the greatest epicures of pagan Rome when luxury was there at the highest pitch. For Jerome, who was an eyewitness of what he writ, reproaches the Roman clergy with the same excesses which the poet Juvenal so severely censured in the Roman nobility under the reign of Domitian. <sup>21</sup>

The only possible result of such a course was constantly to increase unto more ungodliness, to undermine every principle of the foundation of society, and really to hasten the destruction of the empire. The pagan delusions, the pagan superstitions, and the pagan vices that had been adopted and brought into the Catholic Church by her apostasy and clothed with a form of godliness, wrought such infinite corruption that the society of which it was the greater part could no longer exist. It must inevitably fall by the weight of its own corruption, if from nothing else.

The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theater going, intemperance, lewdness; in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman Empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous, barbarians. <sup>32</sup>

AND onward those barbarians came, swiftly and in multitudes. They came, a host wild and savage it is true; but a people whose social habits were so far

above those of the people which they destroyed, that savage as they were, they were caused fairly to blush at the shameful corruptions which they found in this so-called Christian society of Rome. This is proved by the best authority. A writer who lived at the time of the

barbarian invasions, and who wrote as a Christian, gives the following evidence as to the condition of things:—

"The church which ought everywhere to propitiate God, what does she, but provoke him to anger? How many may one meet, even in the church, who are not still drunkards, or debauchees, or adulterers, or fornicators, or robbers, or murderers, or the like, or all these at once, without end? It is even a sort of holiness among Christian people to be less vicious." From the public worship of God, and almost during it, they pass to deeds of shame. Scarce a rich man but would commit murder and fornication. We have lost the whole power of Christianity, and offend God the more, that we sin as Christians. We are worse than the barbarians and heathen. If the Saxon is wild, the Frank faithless, the Goth inhuman, the Alanian drunken, the Hun licentious, they are, by reason of their ignorance, far less punishable than we, who, knowing the commandments of God, commit all these crimes. <sup>43</sup>

And Dr. Schaff remarks of this very period, and the consequences of this effort of the papacy at the civilization of the Roman Empire: "Nothing but the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian but essentially heathen world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society." This is precisely how the papacy gave "Christian civilization" and "salvation" to the Roman Empire, when she held full and undisputed possession of it for more than a hundred years. And her work of civilizing the barbarians was after precisely the same order. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, when Cardinal Gibbons assures us that the Catholic Church "is in this world the one thing that never changes." The Burgundians were the first of the barbarian nations to be "converted" to the Catholic Church; and through them she "converted" the Franks. An account of this matter will illustrate the powers and efficiency of the papacy in the work of civilizing the barbarians and thus giving everlasting proof that she is the source of civilization and salvation to nations in general and the American Republic in particular.

THE Burgundians were settled in that part of Gaul which now forms Western Switzerland and that part of France which is now the county and district of Burgundy. As early as A.D. 430, the Huns making inroads into Gaul, severely afflicted the Burgundians, who finding impotent the power of their own god, determined to try the Catholic god. They therefore sent representatives to a neighboring city in Gaul, requesting the Catholic bishop to receive them. The bishop had them fast for a week, during which time he catechised them, and then baptized them. Soon afterward the Burgundians

found the Huns without a leader, and, suddenly falling upon them at the disadvantage, confirmed their conversion by the slaughter of ten thousand of the enemy. Thereupon the whole nation embraced the Catholic religion "with fiery zeal."<sup>54</sup> Afterward, however, when about the fall of the empire, the Visigoths under Euric asserted their dominion over all Spain, and the greater part of Gaul, and over the Burgundians too, they deserted the Catholic god, and adopted the Arian faith.

Yet Clotilda, a niece of the Burgundian king, "was educated" in the profession of the Catholic faith. She married Clovis, the pagan king of the pagan Franks, and strongly persuaded him to become a Catholic. All her pleadings were in vain, however, till A.D. 496, when in a great battle with the Alemanni, the Franks were getting the worst of the conflict, in the midst of the battle Clovis vowed that if the victory could be theirs, he would become a Catholic. The tide of battle turned; the victory was won, and Clovis was a Catholic. Clotilda hurried away a messenger with the glad news to the bishop of Rhiems, who came to baptize the new convert.

But after the battle was over, and the dangerous crisis was past, Clovis was not certain whether he wanted to be a Catholic. He said he must consult his warriors. He did so, and they signified their readiness to adopt the same religion as their king. He then declared that he was convinced of the truth of the Catholic faith, and preparations were at once made for the baptism of the new Constantine, Christmas day, A.D. 496. The pope sent Clovis a letter congratulating him on his conversion. The bishop of Vienne also sent a letter to the new convert, in which he prophesied that the faith of Clovis would be a surety of the victory of the Catholic religion; and he, with every other Catholic in Christendom, was ready to do his utmost to see that the prophecy was fulfilled.

THE Catholics in all the neighboring countries longed and prayed and conspired that Clovis might deliver them from the rule of Arian monarchs; and in the nature of the case, war soon followed. Burgundy was the first country invaded. Before the war actually began, however, by the advice of the bishop of Rhiems, a synod of the orthodox bishops met at Lyons; then with the bishop of Vienne at their head, they visited the king of the Burgundians, and proposed that he call the Arian bishops together, and allow a conference to be held, as they were prepared to prove that the Arians were in error. To their proposal the king replied: "If yours be the true doctrine, why do

you not prevent the king of the Franks from waging an unjust war against me, and from caballing with my enemies against me? There is no true Christian faith where there is rapacious covetousness for the possessions of others, and thirst for blood. Let him show forth his faith by his good works." <sup>65</sup>

The bishop of Vienne dodged this pointed question, and replied: "We are ignorant of the motives and intentions of the king of the Franks; but we are taught by the Scripture that the kingdoms which abandon the divine law, are frequently subverted; and that enemies will arise on every side against those who have made God their enemy. Return with thy people to the law of God, and he will give peace and security to thy dominions." <sup>76</sup> War followed, and the Burgundian dominions were made subject to the rule of Clovis, A.D. 500.

The Visigoths possessed all the southwestern portion of Gaul. They too were Arians; and the mutual conspiracy of the Catholics in the Gothic dominions, and the crusade of the Franks from the side of Clovis, soon brought on another holy war. At the assembly of princes and warriors at Paris, A.D. 508. Clovis complained: "It grieves me to see that the Arians still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God; and, having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their fertile province." Clotilda added her pious exhortation to the effect "that doubtless the Lord would more readily lend his aid if some gift were made;" and in response, Clovis seized his battle-ax and threw it as far as he could, and as it went whirling through the air, he exclaimed, "There, on that spot where my Francesca shall fall, will I erect a church in honor of the holy apostles." <sup>87</sup>

War was declared; and as Clovis marched on his way, he passed through Tours, and turned aside to consult the shrine of St. Martin of Tours, for an omen. "His messengers were instructed to remark the words of the Psalm which should happen to be chanted at the precise moment when they entered the church." And the oracular clergy took care that the words which he should "happen" to hear at that moment—uttered not in Latin, but in language which Clovis understood—should be the following from Psalm xviii: "Thou hast girded me, O Lord, with strength unto the battle; thou hast subdued unto me those who rose up against me. Thou hast given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me." The oracle was satisfactory, and in the event was completely successful.

"The Visigothic kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Franks." <sup>98</sup>

Nor was the religious zeal of Clovis confined to the overthrow of the Arians. There were two bodies of the Franks, the Salians and the Ripuarians. Clovis was king of the Salians, Sigebert of the Ripuarians. Clovis determined to be king of all; he therefore prompted the son of Sigebert to assassinate his father, with the promise that the son should peaceably succeed Sigebert on the throne; but as soon as the murder was committed, Clovis commanded the murderer to be murdered, and then in a full parliament of the whole people of the Franks, he solemnly vowed that he had had nothing to do with the murder of either the father or the son; and upon this, as there was no heir, Clovis was raised upon a shield, and proclaimed king of the Ripuarian Franks;—all of which Gregory, bishop of Tours, commended as the will of God, saying of Clovis that "God thus daily prostrated his enemies under his hands, and enlarged his kingdom, because he walked before him with an upright heart, and did that which was well pleasing in his sight." <sup>109</sup>

Thus was the bloody course of Clovis glorified by the Catholic writers, as the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism. When such actions as these were so lauded by the clergy as the pious acts of orthodox Catholics, it is certain that the clergy themselves were no better than were the bloody objects of their praise. Under the influence of such ecclesiastics, the condition of the barbarians after their so-called conversion, could not possibly be better, even if it were not

51

worse than before. To be converted to the principles and precepts of such clergy was only the more deeply to be damned.

Into the "converted" barbarians, the Catholic system instilled all of its superstition, and its bigoted hatred of heretics and unbelievers. It thus destroyed what of generosity still remained in their minds, while it only intensified their native ferocity; and the shameful licentiousness of the papal system likewise corrupted the purity, and the native respect for women and marriage which had always been a noble characteristic of the German nations.

In proof of this it is necessary only to touch upon the condition of Catholic France under Clovis and his successors.

"It is difficult to conceive a more dark and odious state of society than that of France under her Merovingian kings, the descendants of

Clovis, as described by Gregory of Tours . . . Throughout, assassinations, parricides, and fratricides intermingle with adulteries and rapes.

"The cruelty might seem the mere inevitable result of this violent and unnatural fusion; but the extent to which this cruelty spreads throughout the whole society almost surpasses belief. That king Chlotaire should burn alive his rebellious son with his wife and daughter, is fearful enough; but we are astounded, even in these times, that a bishop of Tours should burn a man alive to obtain the deeds of an estate which he coveted. Fredegonde sends two murderers to assassinate Childebert, and these assassins are clerks. She causes the archbishop of Rouen to be murdered while he is chanting the service in the church; and in this crime a bishop and an archdeacon are her accomplices."

"MARRIAGE was a bond contracted and broken on the slightest occasion. Some of the Merovingian kings took as many wives, either together or in succession, as suited either their passions or their politics."

The papal religion "hardly interferes even to interdict incest. King Chlotaire demanded for the fisc the third part of the revenue of the churches; some bishops yielded; one, Injuriousus, disdainfully refused, and Chlotaire withdrew his demands. Yet Chlotaire, seemingly unrebuked, married two sisters at once. Charibert likewise married two sisters: he, however, found a churchman—but that was Saint Germanus—bold enough to rebuke him. This rebuke the king (the historian quietly writes), as he had already many wives, bore with patience. Dagobert, son of Chlotaire, king of Austria, repudiated his wife Gomatrude for barrenness, married a Saxon slave Mathildis, then another, Regnatrude; so that he had three wives at once, besides so many concubines that the chronicler is ashamed to recount them." <sup>1110</sup>

THIS did the papacy for the barbarians whom she "converted;" and such as she could not thus *corrupt* she destroyed. And this is how she "civilized" the barbarians. The truth is the barbarians were compelled, wearily, to drag themselves toward civilization, weighed down and retarded by this terrible incubus. They were thus compelled to grope their way, and drag both themselves *and her* toward civilization and Christianity instead of being helped by her in any sense. What she did with those whom she could not corrupt, and what she did within her own proper sphere in the way of civilization, we shall see next week.

A. T. J.

**February 22, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 8 , pp. 57-59.**

LAMST week we examined on its merits, and in the light of indisputable historical facts, the claim that the papacy is the source and stay of civilization.

WE found that in the great and leading opportunity which she first sought and found, for the establishment of a permanent "Christian civilization," she proved herself a most deplorable failure—that, instead of purifying and enlightening anything, she corrupted and darkened everything.

WE found that the claim that is made by her, and in her behalf by "Protestants," that she civilized the barbarians who destroyed the Western Empire, is a sheer unmitigated fraud: that instead of converting them she corrupted them; and instead of aiding them in every way, she retarded them in every way. And we promised to show now what she did for those whom she could not corrupt; and what she did within her own proper sphere in the way of helping or blessing mankind.

NOR is this in any sense "threshing over old straw." As it has been authoritatively announced from the Vatican to the American people that "what 'the church' has done in the past for other nations, she will now do for the United States;" and as her "apostolic delegate" is here to guide in the doing of this, it is simply a practical object-lesson to enable the people to take a look at what she has done for other nations. And, assuredly, the time when she had the most untrammelled opportunities to do what she could or would for nations—that is the time which presents the fairest point from which to view her.

BESIDES this, as what she has done for others, she will now do for us; in looking at what she has done for others, we can find profitable lessons which will instruct us to-day, beforehand, that we may be the better able to know what to do. In studying these things we are but studying the lessons which faithful history has taught—alas, however, too much in vain. The Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy, under Theodoric, is the nearest parallel in all history to the situation of the United States Government, as it was established, as related to the papacy. The principles upon which the government of Theodoric

was conducted, are almost identical with the principles upon which the Government of the United States was founded. And what the papacy did for that nation is worth knowing, in view of the statement that what she has done for others she will do for the United States.

THEODORIC ruled Italy thirty-three years, A.D. 493-526, during which time Italy enjoyed such peace and quietness and absolute security as had never been known there before, and has never been known since until 1870. The people of his own nation numbered two hundred thousand men, which with the proportionate number of women and children, formed a population of nearly one million. His troops, formerly so wild and given to plunder, were restored to such discipline that in a battle in Dacia, in which they were completely victorious, "the rich spoils of the enemy lay untouched at their feet," because their leader had given no signal of pillage. When such discipline prevailed in the excitement of a victory and in an enemy's country, it is easy to understand the peaceful order that prevailed in their own new-gotten lands which the Herulians had held before them.

During the ages of violence and revolution which had passed, large tracts of land in Italy had become utterly desolate and uncultivated; almost the whole of the rest was under imperfect culture; but now "agriculture revived under the shadow of peace, and the number of husbandmen multiplied by the redemption of captives;" and Italy, which had so long been fed from other countries, now actually began to export grain. Civil order was so thoroughly maintained that "the city gates were never shut either by day or by night, and the common saying that a purse of gold might be safely left in the fields, was expressive of the conscious security of the inhabitants." <sup>121</sup> Merchants and other lovers of the blessings of peace thronged from all parts.

But not alone did civil peace reign. Above all, there was perfect freedom in the exercise of religion. In fact, the measure of civil liberty and peace always depends upon that of religious liberty. Theodoric and his people were Arians, yet at the close of a fifty-years' rule of Italy, the Ostrogoths could safely challenge their enemies to present a single authentic case in which they had ever persecuted the Catholics. Even the mother of Theodoric and some of his favorite Goths had embraced the Catholic faith with perfect freedom from any molestation whatever.

The separation between Church and State, between civil and religious powers, was clear and distinct. Church property was protected in common with other property, while at the same time it was taxed in common with all other property. The clergy were protected in common with all other people, and they were likewise, in common with all other people, cited before the civil courts to answer for all civil offenses. In all ecclesiastical matters they were left entirely to themselves. Even the papal elections Theodoric left entirely to themselves, and though often solicited by both parties to interfere, he refused to have anything at all to do with them, except to keep the peace, which in fact was of itself no small task. He declined even to confirm the papal elections, an office which had been exercised by Odoacer.

Nor was this merely a matter of toleration; it was in genuine recognition of the rights of conscience. In a letter to the emperor Justin, A.D. 524, Theodoric announced the genuine principle of the rights of conscience, and the relationship that should exist between religion and the State, in the following words, worthy to be graven in letters of gold:—

To pretend to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God. By the nature of things, the power of sovereigns is confined to political government. They have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace. The most dan-

58

gerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief." <sup>132</sup>

Similar pleas had before been made by the parties oppressed, but never before had the principle been announced by *the party in power*. The enunciation and defense of a principle by the party who holds the power to violate it, is the surest pledge that the principle is held in genuine sincerity.

The description of the state of peace and quietness in Italy above given, applies to Italy, *but not to Rome*; to the dominions of Theodoric and the Ostrogoths, but not to the city of the pope and the Catholics. In A.D. 499, there was a papal election. As there were as usual, rival candidates—Symmachus and Laurentius—there was a civil war. "The two factions encountered with the fiercest hostility; the clergy, the Senate, and the populace were divided;" the streets of the city "ran with blood, as in the days of republican strife." <sup>143</sup>

The contestants were so evenly matched, and the violent strife continued so long, that the leading men of both parties persuaded the candidates to go to Theodoric at Ravenna, and submit to his judgment their claims. Theodoric's love of justice and of the rights of the people, readily and simply enough decided that the candidate who had the most votes should be counted elected; and if the votes were evenly divided, then the candidate who had been first ordained. Symmachus secured the office. A council was held by Symmachus, which met the first of March, 499, and passed a decree "almost in the terms of the old Roman law, severely condemning all ecclesiastical ambition, all canvassing either to obtain subscriptions, or administration of oaths, or promises, for the papacy" during the lifetime of a pope. But such election methods as these were now so prevalent that this law was of as little value in controlling the methods of the aspiring candidates for the bishopric, as in the days of the republic the same kind of laws were for the candidates to the consulship.

Laurentius, though defeated at this time, did not discontinue his efforts to obtain the office. For four years he watched for opportunities, and carried on an intrigue to displace Symmachus, and in 503 brought a series of heavy charges against him. "The accusation was brought before the judgment-seat of Theodoric, supported by certain Roman females of rank, who had been suborned, it was said, by the enemies of Symmachus. Symmachus was summoned to Ravenna and confined at Rimini," but escaped and returned to Rome. Meantime, Laurentius had entered the city, and when Symmachus returned, "the sanguinary tumults between the two parties broke out with greater fury;" priests were slain, monasteries set on fire, and nuns treated with the utmost indignity.

The Senate petitioned Theodoric to send a visitor to judge the cause of Symmachus in the crimes laid against him. The king finding that the matter was only a church quarrel, appointed one of their own number, the bishop of Altimo, who so clearly favored Laurentius that his partisanship only made the contention worse. Again Theodoric was petitioned to interfere, but he declined to assume any jurisdiction, and told them to settle it among themselves; but as there was so much disturbance of the peace, and it was so long continued, Theodoric commanded them to reach some sort of settlement that would stop their fighting, and restore public order. A council was therefore called. As Symmachus was on his way to the council, "he

was attacked by the adverse party; showers of stones fell around him; many presbyters and others of his followers were severely wounded; the pontiff himself only escaped under the protection of the Gothic guard" <sup>15</sup> 4 and took refuge in the church of St. Peter. The danger to which he was then exposed he made an excuse for not appearing at the council.

The most of the council were favorable to Symmachus and to the pretensions of the bishop of Rome at this time, and therefore were glad of any excuse that would relieve them from judging him. However, they went through the form of summoning him three times; all of which he declined. Then the council sent deputies to state to Theodoric the condition of affairs, "saying to him that the authority of the king might compel Symmachus to appear, but that the council had not such authority." Theodoric replied that "with respect to the cause of Symmachus, he had assembled them to judge him, but yet left them at full liberty to judge him or not, providing they could by any other means put a stop to the present calamities, and restore the wished-for tranquillity to the city of Rome."

The majority of the council declared Symmachus "absolved in the sight of men, whether guilty or innocent in the sight of God," for the reason that "no assembly of bishops has power to judge the pope; he is accountable for his actions to God alone." <sup>16</sup> 5 They then commanded all, under penalty of excommunication, to accept this judgment, and submit to the authority of Symmachus, and acknowledge him "for lawful bishop of the holy city of Rome."

FROM the foregoing facts as to both sides, the condition of civilization among the "barbarians" and that among the Catholics in the city of Rome, there can be no difficulty in deciding where civilization, and civil order, and peace, and good of every kind, really dwelt. All the blessings of civilization and enlightened principles were found with the "barbarians;" while the violence, the strife, and the determination to be chief, that belong to barbarians, were all found in the Catholic Church, led on by her chief leaders, and in the city of her sole possession and government. The "barbarians" gave to Italy all the blessings of enlightened civilization. The Catholic Church gave to Rome such violence, strife, and bloodshed as could hardly be outdone by barbarians. Nor was this scene in Rome mere a spasmodic affair—this had been the customary procedure in the election of a pope for more than a hundred years.

AND the barbarism of the church in Rome was only the same sort as that which prevailed in the church throughout the empire where there were no heretic "barbarians" to keep order. In the eastern part of the empire the church had everything her own way, with no "barbarian" heretics to check her barbarism anywhere, and the results were correspondingly barbaric. By the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, the faith of the world was finally "settled," and all were forbidden, under severe penalties, "the dispute concerning the faith." But in such barbarism as pervaded all the Catholic Church, neither "the faith," nor laws, nor penalties were of any avail. And there were more and more violent disputes over "the faith" than there had been even before, for the monks were now the ones who took the lead in the controversies and the consequent rioting and barbarism.

In Jerusalem a certain Theodosius was at the head of the army of monks, who made him bishop, and in acts of violence, pillage and murder, he fairly outdid the perfectly lawless bandits of the country. "The very scenes of the Saviour's mercies ran with blood, shed in his name by his ferocious self-called disciples." <sup>176</sup>

In Alexandria "the bishop was not only murdered in the baptistery, but his body was treated with shameless indignities, and other enormities were perpetrated which might have appalled a cannibal." And the monkish horde then elected as bishop one of their own number, Timothy the Weasel, a disciple of Dioscorus. <sup>187</sup>

Soon there was added to all this another point which increased the fearful warfare. In the Catholic churches it was customary to sing what was called the *Trisagion*, or Thrice-Holy. It was, originally, the "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts" of Isa. vi. 3; but at the time of the council of Chalcedon, it had been changed, and was used by the council thus: "Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us." At Antioch, in 477, a third monk, Peter the Fuller, "led a procession, chiefly of monastics, through the streets," loudly singing the Thrice-Holy, with the addition, "Who wast crucified for us." It was orthodox to sing it as the Council of Chalcedon had used it, with the understanding that the three "Holies" referred respectively to the three persons of the Trinity. It was heresy to sing it with the later addition.

In A.D. 511, two hordes of monks on the two sides of the question met in Constantinople. "The two black-cowled armies watched each other for several months, working in secret on their respective partisans. At length they came to a rupture. . . . The Monophysite

monks in the church of the Archangel within the palace, broke out after the 'Thrice-Holy' with the burden added at Antioch by Peter the Fuller, 'who wast crucified for us.' The orthodox monks, backed by the rabble of Constantinople, endeavored to expel them from the church; they were not content with hurling curses against each other, sticks and stones began their work. There was a wild, fierce fray; the divine presence of the emperor lost its awe; he could not maintain the peace. The bishop Macedonius either took the lead, or was compelled to lead the tumult. Men, women, and children poured out from all quarters; the monks with their archimandrites at the head of the raging multitude, echoed back their religious war cry." <sup>198</sup>

These are but samples of the repeated—it might almost be said the continuous—

60

occurrences in the cities of the East. "Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly; or where resistance was made, the two factions fighting in the streets, in the churches: cities, even the holiest places, ran with blood. . . . The hymn of the angels in heaven was the battle cry on earth, the signal of human bloodshed." <sup>209</sup>

In A.D. 512 one of these *Trisagion* riots broke out in Constantinople, because the emperor proposed to use the added clause. "Many palaces of the nobles were set on fire, the officers of the crown insulted, pillage, conflagration, violence, raged through the city." In the house of the favorite minister of the emperor there was found a monk from the country. He was accused of having suggested the use of the addition. His head was cut off and raised high on a pole, and the whole orthodox populace marched through the streets singing the orthodox *Trisagion*, and shouting, "Behold the enemy of the Trinity!" <sup>210</sup>

THIS is enough, but it is not in vain to show the difference between barbarism and Christian civilization in the Roman Empire when the Catholic Church had everything in her own hands and was allowed to show fully what she could do. And what did she do with the Ostrogoths? Why, finding she could not corrupt them with her own barbaric religion, she secured from Justinian the armies of the Eastern Empire and swept them not only out of Italy, but out of existence. The Ostrogoths were one of the three nations that were "plucked up by the roots" to give full place to the papacy. Dan. 7:8, 20, 24, 25. And, behold, now she announces to the Government and

people of the United States, that what she has done for other nations in the past she will now do for the United States. And there is not the least doubt that she will do all in her barbaric power to fulfill this avowed purpose. She will corrupt to the core the whole nation, so far as it is possible for her to do it; and such as she cannot corrupt she will do her utmost to destroy. But, thank the Lord, she cannot destroy them, for God had promised to all these "the victory over his mark and over the number of his name"—a complete and triumphant victory over her and all her barbarism—and these shall stand on the sea of glass before the throne of God. Rev. 15:2, 3.

WHO of the American, or of the world's people, will favor Rome? Who will admit her claims? Who will sanction her pretensions? Who will yield to this mystery of lawlessness? this synonym of worse than barbarism? Who will share the perdition that must come, with the coming of this "saviour from the Vatican"? Who? It is time to decide.  
A. T. J.

**March 1, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 9, pp. 65, 66.**

IT is well worth while to take a look at the facilities which are all made ready to Rome's hands, and which she can use in effecting her purpose to take possession of the Government and people of the United States.

THE chiefest of these is the apostasy of professed Protestants, which has so blinded their eyes that they cannot see that Rome is now what she always was, but causes them to insist always that she has become enlightened, liberalized, modernized, and Americanized, and is therefore to be, not only implicitly trusted, but aided and admired.

CLOSELY akin to this apostasy, in fact the direct descendant of it, is the cowardice of professed Protestants in all things wherein Rome is prominent. We use the word cowardice advisedly, for no such word as apathy or listlessness will in any sense fit the case. No word but the word cowardice will properly characterize the course of many, *very many*, professed Protestants who have not gone so far in apostasy as, like the *Independent* and its kind, to be the apologists, the aiders, and the abettors of Rome.

FOR those, who have not gone so far as that in apostasy, do see many of the encroachments of Rome which seriously threaten the peace of the country and the liberties of the people, and do even acknowledge that they see these things; yet they have not the courage to expose these encroachments and follow them up as the cause deserves, and even acknowledge that they have not the courage to do so. This is the truth, as we personally know it. As one preacher, who by request had prepared and read, in a ministers' meeting, a paper on "Romish Aggressions in the United States," said afterward, "Yes, that is all true, but I don't propose to make a crank of myself by following it up publicly. I prepared that paper because I was requested to do so for the occasion, and that is all I shall do about it."

THE treatment which Bishop Coxe's "Letters to Satolli," received, and which the bishop himself received on account of them, from professed Protestants, is a good illustration of what we are calling attention to. The best portions of his most important letter to Satolli, we reprinted in these columns, January 11, 1894. Anybody who is not totally blinded by Romish gloom, can see that Bishop Coxe stated the exact truth with regard to Mr. Satolli's mission, and place, and work here. It was to be expected as a matter of course that confessed Catholics would resent and denounce and ridicule both Bishop Coxe and his statements. But as a matter of fact professed Protestants did the same thing, who could muster up courage to speak on the subject at all, and practically all the rest simply said nothing. This shows that he who would openly oppose Rome and her mischievous workings must also *meet* the opposition of professed Protestantism. Professed Protestant papers ridiculed the bishop's statements, and rebuked the bishop himself for his "discourteous" and "disrespectful" address to Mr. Satolli. If those persons had lived in Luther's day they would have done the same things toward him for his plain and disrespectful "open letters" etc., to Leo X., and Henry VIII., and others of their ilk. All of which only shows how completely degenerate is the professed Protestantism of to-day.

IT is true that, as we pointed out at the time, although Bishop Coxe's sounding of an alarm was truly put and perfectly appropriate in itself, yet it is really robbed of its force from him by the fact of the bishop's unfortunate connection with the religio-political movement of professed Protestants which committed the Government of the United States to the guardianship of religion, and so created the occasion for Satolli's mission and work here. But commending and emphasizing

the bishop's statements with reference to Rome's aggression and mischievous workings here, while pointing out his unfortunate position,—this is a vastly different thing from ridiculing his statements and rebuking him for discourtesy and disrespect to Satolli and Rome. One is Protestantism of the strictest and most consistent sort; while the other is everything else than true Protestantism of any sort. So long, therefore, as one class of professed Protestants are the constant apologists, aiders, and abettors of Rome; and another class are afraid to make public what they actually see and know of Rome's mischievous designs; and yet another class are so completely handicapped by their own conduct as to destroy the effect of what they do say against Rome's designs—these three classes forming the vast majority of professed Protestants,—it is evident that, so far as Protestantism is concerned, Rome has practically a clear field in which to push herself forward to full possession of the country and all that is in it.

IN addition to this, it is the plain truth that Rome practically controls the press of the whole country. All the leading publications throughout the land are controlled *directly*, by being owned, or managed, or edited by Catholics; or *indirectly* by fear of Rome's influence against those who do own, or manage, or edit them if anything were printed therein which should incur her displeasure. So that it is next to impossible to get into any prominent publication any kind of a fair statement of the case against Rome and her workings in the United States. If any one doubts this he can find it demonstrated to his satisfaction by simply trying it. So certainly is this so, that any paper that devotes any material portion of its space to this subject loses caste at once and is set down as a "disturber of the peace," a "sower of discord," and "a stirrer up of civil and religious strife." So that, therefore, so far as the press of the country is concerned, Rome has also a clear field in which to go forward on her declared mission of possessing America for herself.

ALL these which we have mentioned, important as they are, are yet but of small moment as compared with the field of law which is as fully open to her as it any of the others.

1. All the States in the Union but two have laws requiring the observance of the very chief of all Rome's institutions, the

very sign and acknowledgement of her "infallible" authority,—the Sunday. So that here is all prepared, ready to her hand, the

machinery by which she can compel all to do her bidding in this respect just as soon as she chooses to exercise the power—and until she gets ready to exercise this power herself there are plenty of papalized Protestants who are willing to run the machinery for her, as numerous instances in Arkansas, Tennessee, Maryland, Georgia and other places have abundantly proved.

2. There has been established in the law-procedure of the United States the despotic doctrine that a thing that is "harmless in itself" may be forbidden "as tending to a breach of the peace." Now, the only possible way that an action which is harmless in itself, could tend to a breach of the peace is in having abroad somebody who is of such an overbearing, such a meddling, such a tyrannical, disposition, that anything that does not exactly suit him, even though it be admittedly harmless in itself, so excites the devil in him that he must attack the harmless doer. Thus a breach of the peace is committed. And so to prevent any such breach of the peace in the future, *instead of punishing the breaker of the peace*, a law must be enacted prohibiting all persons from doing any more that thing which is harmless in itself!! And this because it tends to a breach of the peace! The innocent citizen must be made a slave, and the tyrannical meddler must be clothed with power over him. And this because his harmless deeds "tend to a breach of the peace"!!

That is an established doctrine in the judicial system and procedure of the United States. And now the Catholic Church is putting into practice the doctrine, whenever opportunity offers, to prohibit the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution. When a public speaker says anything that Rome does not like, she raises a riot. And then the speaker is arrested and prosecuted for breach of the peace or inciting to riot, and is forbidden to speak any more on any such subject.

And this is the doctrine that is now plainly taught to Catholics in the United States. "Father" Thomas Sherman—son of the late General Sherman—a Jesuit priest, wrote a lecture against organizations opposed to Rome, which was to be delivered, presumably, to Catholics alone, but a page of it, by mistake, got among the manuscript of another lecture which he delivered publicly, and was printed in the *Chicago Herald* of February 6 and 7, 1894. In this page he was dealing with ex-priests, and he sets forth what should be done with them in the following Catholic, Jesuitical, and judicial style:—

For my own part I have no apology to offer for the acts of Catholics in rigorous protest against those wholesale vendors of infamy. The father who slays the corrupter of his child must be left to the Almighty. The man who shoots an anarchist by right is a public benefactor. *These ex-priests are anarchists of the worst stamp.* They appeal to free speech. If free speech means the right to debauch the minds of youth and children at pleasure, then I, for one, say *better free bullets than free speech.* If America will not draw the line between freedom and license, then America means chaos and old night. There is no right to do public wrong, and every town and village must prevent it. Sue for libel. The evil is done when the evil is begun. Of course I know you will not agree with me, but if the blight of corruption were to threaten your own you would *act as the principle of prevention.* There are certain questions that cannot be touched in public without doing great harm. The State exists to preserve public morality.

And the *Western Watchman*, the official Catholic paper of St. Louis, of Jan. 25, 1894, gives similar advice, thus:—

Who came blame them [the riotous Catholics] if they rise up and strike the blasphemers in the mouth? These miscreant travelers should not be protected. If their occupation excites to riot they should be made to choose some other calling. If they cannot be restrained by statute or ordinance, let them carry their hides to the market; and if they get holed, let it be charged to the profit and loss of the business.

This is the very doctrine that has been established by the courts of the United States, even to the United States Supreme Court, that is, prohibit by law that which is harmless in itself, because it tends to breach of the peace, because it excites to riot! And thus this infamous doctrine of the courts of the United States has put into the hands of Rome the legal means by which she proceeds to abolish freedom of speech in the United States. It is, in fact, her own doctrine, and she is very glad to have it established as a part of the judicial procedure of the United States; and gladly avails herself of it in carrying forward her purpose to possess the nation for herself.

3. Another piece of machinery that is made ready to Rome's hand and recognized by the courts, and that is being kept in running order by its inventor, is the Inquisition. It is a literal fact that the Inquisition is being carried on, and has been for nearly three years, in this city of New York, and, to some extent, in other places, as Pittsburg and Allegheny. In New York it is better known as "Parkhurstism," in the other places as "Law and Order League." This Inquisition is not being carried on yet by Rome, but it is being carried on in Rome's own way

by professed Protestants. For no Inquisition was ever more certainly carried on by any Romanist than this is being carried on by those professed Protestants; and no more Jesuitical methods were ever used in the Romish Inquisition than are being used in this Inquisition by Parkhurst and his crew.

This Inquisitor-General Parkhurst has scattered through this city 1,137 spies—one in each election district—who spend their time *not* simply in discovering crimes which have been already committed, but *in inducing people to commit crimes, and even in committing crime themselves* in company of others or *on* the premises of others, in order to entrap, to prosecute, and to imprison these others. These things are being done straight along by these inquisitors, and the worst feature about it is that *the courts* give it the support and sanction of the law. Parkhurst himself and his agents have committed and induced—hired—others to commit with them, unnameable indecencies, and then have voluntarily gone into court and unblushingly told of these indecencies in witness against their victims; and the courts, instead of punishing these chief criminals, accept their testimony and imprison their victims. From these the regular police have adopted the practice (not of the indecencies of course, they are not so bad as that) of trapping people into crime, especially by inducing them to sell something on Sunday and then arresting and prosecuting them. And occurrences of this inquisitorial order are as numerous and about as regular as the recurrence of the days. And it is evident from the whole procedure that the Inquisition was never more certainly conducted by Rome herself, than this Inquisition is being conducted by professed Protestants. And when Rome gets ready to conduct the machine herself, she can do so no more certainly, though she may do so more cruelly, than these professed Protestants are now doing. And thus it is that professed Protestants have established and put in working order, ready for the hands of Rome, the very Inquisition itself.

AND so, from first to last, there is a clear field open to the papacy to advance to the full possession of the country. The facilities are at hand and in working order, and ready for the papacy to use as soon as she gets ready, and until she does get ready professed Protestants are keeping all these facilities well prepared to her hand. And it is a shameful procedure, as well as a deplorable situation.

A. T. J.

**March 8, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 10 , pp. 73, 74.**

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is Christian.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is Christian.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is Protestant.

AND the AMERICAN SENTINEL is American.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is therefore everlastingly and uncompromisingly opposed to every element and every principle of the papacy wherever, and in whatever guise, it may appear.

AND being Christian, Protestant, and American, the opposition of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to the papacy, whether in the guise of a professed Protestantism or in her own proper dress, always has been, and always will be, conducted upon strictly Christian, Protestant and American principles.

THIS subject of opposition to the papacy in the United States needs to be very carefully studied, lest it be done in such a way as to really help her instead of hindering her. The papacy needs to be opposed and must be opposed in her designs upon the United States and the world as well as in every other thing. But this opposition, to avail anything, must be made upon right principles and must be conducted in the right way.

IF opposition to the papacy be conducted upon unchristian principles, it will only increase her antichristian power and influence. If this opposition be conducted upon unprotestant principles the only effect will be to make more widespread the influence of Catholicism. The papacy is un-American, it is true, but if opposition to her is conducted on un-American principles her un-American power and influence is only increased, and her upon the country is more confirmed, and her taking possession of the country is only hastened.

THEREFORE it is that this question of opposing the papacy requires the most careful thought upon the part of all who would engaged in it, lest they be found really aiding her while professedly opposing her, and while really intending to oppose her. This is true in the cease at any time, because of the exceeding subtlety of her

workings; but now it is doubly true, because, in addition to the subtlety of her workings, she has, as we showed last week, such a clear field and such an immense advantage in every way, for the carrying forward of her avowed purpose to possess America for herself.

IT has been seriously proposed to disfranchise Catholics in the United States who will not renounce allegiance to the pope. *But this could never be done on any American principle.* The Catholic's allegiance to the pope is a religious matter—it is a spiritual thing. And to deny or curtail political right on account of religious profession is clearly and entirely un-American. It is a fundamental principle, as well as a constitutional provision, of the Government of the United States, that religious profession shall never have any bearing upon civil rights or political qualifications. To the Catholic the pope is in the place of God, and is the representative of God: he *believes* that allegiance to the pope is allegiance to God. And it is in this sense that the Catholic professes and holds allegiance to the pope. This cannot fairly be denied. His allegiance to the pope is therefore a religious thing, it is a religious profession, and is to him an essential part of his worship as to God. And to propose to abridge his political rights on account of his allegiance to the pope, is therefore plainly to deny civil or political right *on account of religious profession*, and is therefore just as clearly unconstitutional and un-American.

IT will not do to say in answer to this, although it be perfectly true, that the pope's claims to be the representative of God, or to *be* God, are a fraud and an imposture, and therefore the Catholic's belief in the pope and his allegiance to him are a fallacy and are indeed really *nothing* religiously. This is all true, but that does not touch the point here. The Catholic *believes* and *religiously* believes that the pope's claims are genuine, and that his prerogatives are divine: that is the Catholic's religious profession. And the point is that he has the inalienable right to *believe thus* and to hold this religious profession, without question or molestation from any source or for any cause. It is a fundamental American principle and sound American doctrine, that for "each one to believe for himself and to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience is an inalienable right." And that "our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, more than on our opinions in physics or geometry; that therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to the offices of trust and emolument,

unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow-citizens, he has a natural right." This, we say, is sound and fundamental American principle and doctrine. And therefore it is clear that any proposition to make the Catholic's allegiance to the pope a test or impediment against any civil or political right is decidedly un-American. Consequently, any such method as that of opposing the papacy in the United States not only will not succeed but will actually aid her, in that it subverts fundamental principles and breaks down constitutional safeguards. And when these are subverted and broken down for *any cause whatever*, they are subverted and broken down for every cause—they are indeed no more, and the nation becomes but the prey of the violent and the most violent take it by force. Such procedure can only hasten the success and supremacy of the papacy. And therefore the AMERICAN SENTINEL, being American, and opposed to the papacy, can never indorse, nor engage in, any such method of "opposition."

BISHOPE COXE proposed another method of "opposition" to the papacy, which is worth notice, not only because it is an example of how *not* to do it, but because it has been quite widely indorsed. We have given in these columns the bishop's clear statement of the situation as regards

74

the papacy in the United States, and have given him credit for it. And we also give him credit for good *intentions* regarding opposition to the papacy. But *as his* raising the alarm is robbed of its force by the fact of his having helped to create the alarming situation, so his proposed opposition is robbed of all its force by the *method* which he proposes. Here is his proposition as made in his second open letter to Satolli:—

When Buddhists shall have 500,000 votes from this country, we shall find out how to prohibit the Grand Llama from sending his "ablegate" here to contol them. You may force us to make a general law applicable to the pope and the Grand Llama alike.

But how such a law could be made in accordance with any American principle the bishop does not attempt to say, even if he ever took time to think on that phase of the subject. Such a law as Bishop Coxe suggests could not possibly be anything else than a law respecting an establishment of religion and prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Such a law therefore would be in direct violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution, which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion

or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And that the bishop means just such a law, as indeed there could be no other, is made certain by his own words in the sentences immediately following the one above quoted. Here are his words to Satolli:—

Now, look at the French law, established by the First Consul and accepted by the pope himself. Here it is textually translated:—

No individual calling himself nuncio, legate, vicar or commissary apostolic, or availing himself of any other denomination, shall, *without the authorization of the Government*, exercise any function relative to the affairs of the *Gallican Church* upon the soil or any where else.

Any such law as that would be at once to make the Government the head of all religion, which would be but the papacy under another form and under another head. The enactment of any such law, either in word or in principle, would be, at that one stroke, to sweep away every principle of the Government as established by those who made the Government. It would be, at that one stroke, to destroy the Government as it was founded upon American, Protestant and Christian principles, and to set up in its place a government committed to and actuated by papal principles only. That it would be done by professed Protestants would alter neither the principle nor the prospect. Professed Protestants have done such things before. And in all such instances the only thing that ever kept them from being, in all respects, like the papacy itself, was only the limitations upon their power. The only thing that ever kept John Calvin from being to the fullest extent like Innocent the Third, was that he did not have the power of Innocent the Third. The only thing that ever kept either the Puritans of England or of New England, or the Episopalian of England or Maryland, from being, in *all* respects, like the papacy, as they were in *so many* respects, was that they did not have the *power* of the papacy. And if the principles here announced by Bishop Coxe should prevail in the United States, we have no assurance that the people would be any better off under the superintendence of Bishop Coxe than they would be under Archbishop O'Flannagan or Cardinal O'Mulligan. And we positively know that with the principles of the Government, maintained as they were originally established, the people would be far better off with ten thousand "ablegates" here, than they could be without one, under the procedure proposed by Bishop Coxe; for this procedure would open wide the door for every bigot—political, religious, or other kind—in the land, to make himself an "ablegate" over everybody else. And the event would prove that they

would all make themselves such too. Bishop Coxe's proposed remedy is far worse than is the real disease, which we dread equally with him.

NO! Upon American, Protestant, and Christian principles, the Grand Llama has as much right to send an "ablegate" here to control 500,000 Buddhists as he has to send a priest to control five, or as any individual has to be a Buddhist at all: that is, a full, complete and untrammelled right. And under these principles the pope has just as much right to send an ablegate here to control 7,000,000 Catholics, as he has to create a cardinal here, or to appoint a priest here, or as any individual here has to be a Catholic at all: and that is, a perfect right. And no restriction can be put upon that right without, at the same time and in the same act, sweeping away the safeguards of all the rights of all the people. And, surely, every person who will take the time to think must readily decide that it is far better to maintain the principles and the safeguards of all the rights of himself and all the people, *and bear the presence of an "ablegate,"* than to sweep away all the safeguards of all the rights of himself and all the people in an attempt to get rid of the "ablegate."

BUT it may be said, and truly, that the papacy with its ablegate, and in its whole system, is not only religious but political, and interferes in politics and manipulates votes, and thus herself violates the principles of the Government and the Constitution. Yes, that is true. The papacy is nothing if not political as well as religious. "The help of the law and State authority" is an essential element in the work of the papacy. She does interfere in politics and does manipulate votes, and does, thus and otherwise, violate the principles of the Government and the provisions of the Constitution. And there are many professed Protestant church-managers, who have set for her the pernicious example by repeatedly doing the same things. *And this is where they are just like the papacy.* But even though this were not so, and there were no such example set, it is manifestly vain to attempt or expect to defeat the wrong-doing of the papacy, by *doing the same things, and the same way that she does.* No person nor anything can be right by being like the papacy. We can be right only by being entirely unlike the papacy in all things. When the papacy violates the principles, or the Constitution, of the Government, it will not help the matter for *us also* to violate these principles or the Constitution. Violation of American principles by Catholics cannot be stopped by the violation of these principles by people who are not

Catholics. One breach of American principles is not cured, but is increased by a good deal more than double, by the committal of another. Such is not the way to oppose the papacy in the United States. And as the AMERICAN SENTINEL is American indeed, we can never join in or indorse any such "opposition" to the papacy.

THE reader may be ready to ask, "Do you propose to surrender to Rome altogether"?—Oh, no, never! We propose to have the victory over Rome altogether. It may be inquired then, "How do you propose to do it?" Well, we shall tell that later. But in the meantime we beg leave to remark that the present position and work of the papacy in the United States presents a much greater question than the American people realize, and a question which requires much more careful and critical thought than many people have ever yet given to it.

A. T. J.

**"Christianity and the Roman Empire" *American Sentinel* 9, 10 , p. 76.**

THE controversy between Christianity and Rome was not a dispute between individuals, or a contention between sects or parties; it was a contest between antagonistic *principles*. On the part of Christianity it was the assertion of the principle of the rights of conscience and of the individual; on the part of Rome it was the assertion of the principle of the absolute absorption of the individual, and his total enslavement to the State in all things; divine as well as human, religious as well as civil.

Jesus Christ came into the world to set men free, and to plant in their souls the genuine principle of liberty,—liberty actuated by love,—liberty too honorable to allow itself to be used as an occasion to the flesh, or for a cloak of maliciousness,—liberty led by a conscience enlightened by the Spirit of God,—liberty in which man may be free from all men, yet made so gentle by love that he would willingly become the servant of all, in order to bring them to the enjoyment of this same liberty. This is freedom indeed. This is the freedom which Christ gave to man; for whom the Son makes free, is free indeed. In giving to men this freedom, such an infinite gift could have no other result than that which Christ intended; namely, to bind them in everlasting, unquestioning, unswerving allegiance to him as the royal benefactor of the race. He thus reveals himself to men as the highest good, and brings them to himself as the manifestation of that highest

good, and to obedience to his will as the perfection of conduct. Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh. Thus God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, that they might know him, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he sent. He gathered to himself disciples, instructed them in his heavenly doctrine, endued them with power from on high, sent them forth into all the world to preach this gospel of freedom to every creature, and to teach them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them.

The Roman Empire then filled the world,—“the sublimest incarnation of power, and a monument the mightiest of greatness built by human hands, which has upon this planet been suffered to appear.” That empire, proud of its conquests, and exceedingly jealous of its claims, asserted its right to rule in all things, human and divine. In the Roman view, the State took precedence of everything. It was entirely out of respect to the State, that either the emperors or the laws ever forbade the exercise of the Christian religion. According to Roman principles, the State was the highest idea of good. Neander says: “The idea of the State was the highest idea of ethics; and within that was included all actual realization of the highest good; hence the development of all other goods pertaining to humanity, was made dependent on this.”

It will be seen at once that for any man to profess the principles and the name of Christ, was virtually to set himself against the Roman Empire; for him to recognize God as revealed in Jesus Christ as the highest good, was but treason against the Roman State. It would not be looked upon by Rome as anything else than high treason, because the Roman State representing to the Roman the highest idea of good, for any man to assert that there was a higher good, and thus make Rome itself subordinate. Consequently the Christians were not only called “atheists,” because they denied the gods, but the accusation against them before the tribunals was for the crime of “high treason,” because they denied the right of the State to interfere with men's relations to God. The accusation was that they were “irreverent to the Cesars, and enemies of the Cesars and of the Roman people.”

To the Christian, the Word of God asserted with absolute authority: “Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.” Eccl. 12:13. To him, obedience to this word through faith in Christ, was eternal life. This to him was the conduct which showed his allegiance to God as the highest good,—a good as much higher

than that of the Roman State as the government of God is greater than was the government of Rome.

This idea of the State, was not merely the State as a civil institution, but as a divine institution, and the highest conception of divinity itself. The genius of Rome was the supreme deity. Thus the idea of the State as the highest good was the religious idea, and consequently, religion was inseparable from the State. Hence the maxim, *Vox populi, vox dei*,—the voice of the people is the voice of God. As this voice gave expression to the will of the supreme deity, and consequently of the highest good; and as this will was expressed in the form of laws, hence again the Roman maxim, "What the law says is right."

It is very evident that in such a system there was no place for individuality. The State was everything, and the majority was in fact the State. What the majority said should be, that was the voice of the State, that was the voice of God, that was the expression of the highest good, that was the expression of the highest conception of right;—and everybody must assent to that or be considered a traitor to the State. The individual was but a part of the State. There was therefore no such thing as the rights of the people; the right of the State only was to be considered, and that was to be considered absolute. "The first principle of their law was the paramount right of the State over the citizen."

It is also evident that in such a system there was no such thing as the rights of conscience; because, as the State was supreme also in the realm of religion, all things religious were to be subordinated to the will of the State, which was but the will of the majority. And where the majority presumes to decide in matters of religion, there is no such thing as rights of religion or conscience.

Christianity was directly opposed to this, as shown by the words of Christ, who, when asked by the Pharisees and the Herodians whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cesar or not, answered: "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." In this, Christ established a clear distinction between Cesar and God, and between religion and the State. He separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to the State. Only that which was Cesar's was to be rendered to Cesar, while that which is God's was to be rendered to God, and with no reference whatever to Cesar.

The State being divine, and the Cesar reflecting this divinity, whatever was God's was Cesar's. Therefore when Christ made this distinction between God and Cesar, separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to Cesar, and commanded men to render *to* God that which is God's, and to Cesar only that which is Cesar's, He at once stripped Cesar—the State—of every attribute of divinity. And in doing this he declared *the supremacy of the individual conscience*; because it rests with the individual to decide what things they are which pertain to God.

Thus Christianity proclaimed the *right* of the individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience; Rome asserted the *duty* of every man to worship according to the dictates of the State. Christianity asserted the supremacy of God; Rome asserted the supremacy of the State. Christianity set forth God as manifested in Jesus Christ as the chief good; Rome held the State to be the highest good. Christianity set forth the law of God as the expression of the highest conception of right; Rome held the law of the State to be the expression of the highest idea of right. Christianity taught that the fear of God and the keeping of His commandments is the whole duty of man; Rome taught that to be the obedient servant of the State is the whole duty of man. Christianity preached Christ as the sole possessor of power in heaven and in earth; Rome declared the State to be the highest power. Christianity separated that which is God's from that which is Cesar's; Rome maintained that that which is God's *is* Cesar's.

This was the contest, and these were the reasons of it, between Christianity and the Roman Empire.

**March 15, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 11 , pp. 81, 82.**

IT is perhaps expected by the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL that, in discussing opposition to the papacy in the United States, we should say something in regard to the A. P. A.

THIS we are not unwilling to do, both on our own part, and because the A. P. A. has attracted a good deal of attention for some time, and is now being condemned and denounced without measure by prominent politicians, by prominent newspapers, and by the Catholic Church.

TO be condemned by the papacy is in itself an evidence of merit. And as the A. P. A. is unqualifiedly condemned and denounced by the papacy and her "Protestant" apologists in the United States, this in itself it a strong suggestion that there is at the very least *something* about the A. P. A. that is commendable.

WHAT, then, is the A. P. A.? and what is it for? Let it be understood, however, that we are not qualified to speak officially, nor in any other way, as a representative of the A. P. A., nor as in any way connected with it, but *only as an observer*. As an observer though, as one who has studied this subject for a longer time than the A. P. A. has been in existence, if we mistake not, and as one who has studied every phase of the subject that has yet appeared, and some phases which have not yet appeared—as such an observer we may be allowed to express ourselves.

THE initials "A. P. A." signify "American Protective Association." As we understand it, the object of this association is chiefly, and in brief, to protect the American Government and people from the domination of the papacy, by opposing every kind of union of Church and State. It is therefore necessarily opposed to the encroachments of the papacy upon the Government through any of her political scheming or aggression. That there is abundant room and great need of something of this kind being done is evident to every person who has watched, in any sort of fair-minded way, the course of public or governmental affairs for the past twenty years or any part thereof, or who will so watch affairs now. This the regular readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL know full well; because all that the SENTINEL has ever existed for is to point out these very evils and dangers. And now there are so many of them and they multiply so fast we can hardly describe them all as they pass.

THAT such work is proper according to every principle of the Government and Constitution of the United States, is plain to every person who knows the A B C of these principles or of the history of the making of the Constitution and Government of the United States. The Government of the United States was established upon the principles of the total separation of the Government from *any* church or religion and specifically the Christian religion: and this for the express purpose of escaping any establishment of the *Catholic* Church or religion. Jefferson and Madison, and their fellow-workers for civil and religious liberty, declared that "To judge for ourselves and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our

own conscience, is an inalienable right, which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated, and *the Reformation from popery carried on*, can never be transferred to another." They said that "it is 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*." They opposed all governmental favors to "the Christian religion," because, as they said, "Distant as it may be in its present form, from *the Inquisition*, it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance." Thus spoke the heroes and patriots who established on this continent the separation of religion and the State as a governmental principle, and who made the Government of the United States with the principle declared in its Constitution. *And they did it*, as they repeatedly declared, *that the people* of the United States *might not* be led back to Rome, to popery, and to the Inquisition.

AND the maintenance of these principles to-day *for the same purpose for which they were established* is as proper and as honorable as was the establishment of those principles in the beginning. It is as proper and as honorable for men to-day to maintain these principles as it was for Jefferson and Madison to advocate them, and secure their establishment as the principles of the Government, when the Government was made. So far, therefore, as the *object* of the A. P. A. is concerned, it is precisely the object which the makers of the Government had in view when they prohibited any connection of the Government with any religion. In the *object* announced the A. P. A. are in the company of Jefferson, Madison, and their fellow-workers in "the times of '76." This, as to their *object*, we say. Some of their *methods* may be wrong. But even though *some* of their methods be wrong; or even though *all* their methods be wrong, that cannot prove the *object* wrong. Whatever the *methods*, the *object* is as certainly right as that the principles of the United States Government, as founded by our fathers, are right.

OF the political methods of the A. P. A. we know nothing personally. We have seen statements by Catholic papers and their partisans of what these methods are. But if we understand rightly, the methods of the A. P. A. are really known to only the members. And so, not knowing for ourselves these methods, and not being willing to take our information from the avowed enemies of the order, we are prepared to examine, with perfect impartiality, whatever those

methods may be supposed to be. By the report of the case in the Toledo Court, it appears that the A. P. A.'s of that city, at least, are arming. We gave our view of this matter last week, that it is clearly wrong. It is only following the methods of the papacy, and it cannot win in opposition to the papacy. If this be true of the A. P. A.'s through-

82

out the country, then they are all wrong in this particular, and should change their course at once in this matter.

IF it be true that the A. P. A. proposes to accomplish its object by disfranchising or curtailing the political or civil rights of Catholics, that method is certainly wrong. If, however, the A. P. A. proposes to accomplish its object by recognizing the political and civil rights of Catholics equally with all others, while at the same time insisting that every citizen and every candidate for office shall faithfully maintain the fundamental principles of the Government, and the plain provisions and intent of the Constitution, then this is certainly right. If the A. P. A. proposes to accomplish its right object by the application of a religious test in any case, that method is wrong. If the A. P. A. proposes to accomplish its proper object by the test of the fundamental principles of the Government and the provisions of the Constitution *in every case*, then that method *is certainly right*. If the A. P. A. should apply even the test of the Constitution and the fundamental principles of the Government *only to Catholics*, this method would be wrong. If the A. P. A. applies this proper test to professed Protestants and all others like, then this is certainly right. If the A. P. A. opposes only Catholic aggression and encroachments upon the Government, this is not enough. To be right it must oppose "Protestant" aggression and encroachment as well, and also every other that infringes to a hairbreadth the fundamental principles, or the Constitution, of the Government. If the A. P. A. opposes only Catholic interference with the public school, this is not enough. It must equally oppose "Protestant" interference with the public school. If the A. P. A. opposes only religious interference with the public school, this is not enough. To be right and to further its avowed objects the A. P. A. must oppose every shadow and every vestige of Sunday legislation, whether by Congress or State legislatures; it must oppose all Government chaplaincies whether national or State; it must oppose all assumption on the part of the President of the United States or the governor of any State of the prerogative of proclaiming religious exercises on any day; it must oppose all appropriations of public

money to any churches or religious orders for any purpose whatever; it must oppose this joint resolution, which is now before Congress, to add a religious amendment to the national Constitution; it must oppose the assumption, on the part of the judiciary, whether State or national, of insinuating religious matters into their decisions and imposing them upon the people as the law—all this must the A. P. A. do if it will make good its avowed object of protecting the American Government and people from the domination of the papacy, and prevent the union of Church and State. It may be that the A. P. A. is doing all this: We sincerely hope so. It may be also that the A. P. A. is doing all this in the right way and accomplishing the good and proper object of its organization by *right methods* in all things. This also we sincerely hope it is doing; for, as the object of the A. P. A. is certainly right, we sincerely desire to see all its methods right also, so that it can win. And, indeed, we want it to be right, whether it wins or not.

HON. W. F. VILAMS, United States Senator from Wisconsin, in a letter to the *Catholic Citizen* of Milwaukee, condemning and denouncing the A. P. A., says:—

Its enemies accuse the Catholic Church of aggression. When they point out an act which crosses the line of separation [of Church and State] they may call for its repulsion. But the false charge as the basis of a crusade ought to deceive no man.—Copied in *Catholic Mirror*, January 20, 1894.

It is perfectly easy to point out an act of aggression of the Catholic Church which crosses the line. In 1885, the first year of Mr. Cleveland's first administration, while Mr. Vilas himself was a member of Mr. Cleveland's cabinet, the Catholic Church established "The Catholic Bureau of Missions" in Washington, D. C., as stated by Senator Dawes in the Senate July 24, 1890, "for the express purpose of pushing [Catholic] Indian schools on the Government" for support. She succeeded and has been drawing public money ever since for her church work among the Indians, and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, she received \$365,935 of public money for this purpose. And ever since Harrison's first year there have been calls "for its repulsion." President Harrison tried to repel it, but was forced to confess to the nation that he "found it impossible to do that." Did Senator Vilas vote for this appropriation for 1894, and will he vote for its renewal for 1895? or is he doing his duty, under his senatorial oath, to repel it?

BUT it is said, the A. P. A. is a secret organization. This is a queer cry to raise by anybody who knows anything of the papacy. The

papacy is the most secret organization that was ever on the earth. And for people who apologize for the papacy to make against other organizations the charge of "secrecy" is entirely characteristic of the spirit of that craft institution. Senator Vilas remarks on this point, against the A. P. A., thus:—

When a secret organization can make dangerous headway in political affairs among us, it will be time, not for your [Catholics] special alarm, but for terror to us all.

This, in view of Jesuit Thomas Sherman's late piece of manuscript that slipped out, and in view of the general dangerous headway in political affairs of that mistress of secrecy, the papacy, is worthy of a medal for innocence. We are not apologizing for the secrecy of the A. P. A., that is an affair of its own—we are only calling attention to the precious innocence displayed in this sentence of Senator Vilas'. We may be allowed to remark, however, that neither the A. P. A. nor any other organization nor person, can cope with the papacy by secret methods. The papacy being perfect mistress of every method and element of secrecy, there can be no plan of secrecy devised in opposition to her, that can win. She can undermine them all. The Scripture declares that "craft shall prosper" in her hand, and every one is at a disadvantage who attempts to oppose her by crafty or secret methods.

A. T. J.

**"The Limits of Civil Jurisdiction" *American Sentinel* 9, 11 , pp. 82, 83.**

IN an article in these columns last week it was shown that the conflict between Christianity and the Roman Empire was one involving the rights of conscience. Christianity taught that the fear of God and the keeping of his commandments was the whole duty of man; Rome taught that to be the obedient servant of the State was the whole duty of man. This was the irrepressible conflict. Yet in all this Christianity did not deny to Cesar a place; it did not propose to undo the State. It only taught the State its proper place; and proposed to have the State take that place and keep it. Christianity did not dispute the right of the Roman State to be; it only denied the right of that State *to be in the place of God*. In the very words in which He separated between that which is Cesar's and that which is God's, Christ recognized the rightfulness of Cesar's existence; and that there were things that rightfully belong to Cesar, and which were to be rendered to him by Christians. He said, "Render therefore to Caesar

the things that are Cesar's." In these words He certainly recognized that Cesar had jurisdiction in certain things, and that within that jurisdiction he was to be respected. As Caesar represented the State, in this scripture the phrase represents the State, whether it be the State of Rome or any other State on earth. This is simply the statement of the right of civil government to be; that there are certain things over which civil government has jurisdiction; and that in these things the authority of civil government is to be respected.

This jurisdiction is more clearly defined in Paul's letter to the Romans, chap. 13:1-10. There it is commanded, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers." In this is asserted the right of the higher powers—that is, the right of the State—to exercise authority, and that Christians must be subject to that authority. Further it is given as a reason for this, that "there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." This not only asserts the right of the State to be and to exercise authority, but it also asserts the truth that the State is an ordinance of God, and that the power which it exercises is ordained of God. Yet in this very assertion Christianity was held to be antagonistic to Rome, because it put the God of the Christians above the Roman State, and made the State to be only an ordinance of the God of the Christians. For the Roman empire, or for any of the Roman emperors, to have recognized the truth of this statement, would have been at once to revolutionize the whole system of civil and religious economy of the Romans, and to deny at once the value of the accumulated wisdom of all the generations of the Roman ages. Yet that was the only proper alternative of the Roman State, and that is what ought to have been done.

Civil government being thus declared to be of God, and its authority ordained of God, the instruction proceeds: "Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they

83

that resist shall receive to themselves damnation . . . . Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." Governments being of God, and their authority being ordained of God, Christians in respecting God will necessarily respect, in its place, the exercise of the authority ordained by him; *but this authority, according to the words of Christ, is to be exercised only in those things which are Cesar's, and not in things which pertain to God.* Accordingly, the letter to the Romans proceeds: "For this cause pay

ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." This connects Paul's argument directly with that of Christ above referred to, and shows that this is but a comment on that statement, and an extension of the argument therein contained.

The scripture proceeds: "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 anything, 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."

Let it be borne in mind that the apostle is here writing to Christians concerning the respect and duty which they are to render to the powers that be, that is, to the State in fact. He knew full well, and so did those to whom he wrote, that there are other commandments in the very law of which a part is here quoted. But he and they likewise knew that these other commandments do not in any way relate to any man's duty or respect to the powers that be. Those other commandments of the law which is here partly quoted, relate to God and to man's duty to Him. One of them is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" another, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," etc.; another, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" and another, "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," etc.; and these are briefly comprehended in that saying, namely, "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." According to the words of the Christ, all these obligations, pertaining solely to God, are to be rendered to Him only, and with man in this realm, Cesar can never of right have anything to do in any way whatever.

As, therefore, the instruction in Romans 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 fellow men, it is evident that when Christians have paid their taxes, and have shown proper respect to their fellow men, 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.

This doctrine asserts the right of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, as he pleases, and when he pleases. Just this, however, was the subject of the whole controversy between Christianity and the Roman empire. There was never any honest charge made that the Christians did violence to any man, or refused to pay tribute. Therefore, as a matter of fact the whole controversy between Christianity and the Roman empire was upon the simple question of the rights of conscience,—the question whether it is the *right* of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, or whether it is his *duty* to worship according to the dictates of the State.

**"Hearing Before the House Judiciary Committee" *American Sentinel*  
9, 11 , p. 84.**

TUESDAY, March 6, 1894, there was held by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives in Congress, a hearing of the promoters of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States establishing "the Christian religion." The resolution to amend the Constitution runs as follows:—

#### **JOINT RESOLUTION**

Proposing an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States, "acknowledging the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and nations.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein).* That the following amended form of the preamble of the Constitution of the United States be proposed for ratification by conventions in the several States, which, when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the States, shall be valid as a part of the said Constitution, namely:

#### **PREAMBLE**

We, the people of the United States (devoutly acknowledging the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and nations, grateful to him for our civil and

religious liberty; and encouraged by the assurances of his Word to invoke his guidance, as a Christian nation, according to his appointed way, through Jesus Christ), in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.

This hearing on March 6, was only of those who favor this thing. It was in fact a Reformed Presbyterian hearing, something like a car-load of them having come down from Pittsburg and Allegheny. With the exception of Representative Morse, who introduced the resolution into the House, every one who spoke was a Reform Presbyterian preacher. There were eight speakers—H. H. George, T. P. Stevenson, R. J. George, W. J. Robinson, J. M. Foster, R. C. Wylie, D. B. Wilson, and D. McAllister.

The names are all familiar to the old readers of the SENTINEL. And with the announcement of the names the views set forth will be readily recalled as these are all familiar too. It was the design in the arrangement of the speakers to have each speaker present a distinct line of argument, but it was a hard task to carry out the programme. For except in the *heading*, each speech covered about the same ground as all the others in about the same way.

H. H. George opened the discussion, and called out the speakers in succession. He said that both philosophy and revelation demand this recognition of God and Christ by the Government. And to prove the obligation of the Government to do so he cited the fact of "prayers in Congress." He declared that the adoption of this amendment is the only thing that will separate Church and States: that thus the "Church will have its own sphere, and the State its own sphere." This has been the theory of the papacy ever since its original establishment by Constantine. See "Two Republics," p. 496-498 and 717-720.

T. P. Stevenson followed by first presenting "petitions," as he said, from twenty-two out of twenty-four senators of the present Iowa legislature. He said that the petition had been presented for signatures to only twenty-four of the senators of Iowa, and that all these had signed it but two. He presented a petition also from the preachers of Newcastle, Pa., and read letters from "Rev." A. A. Miner, of Boston, Bishop Michalson, "Rev." Clarke, "President of the United Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor," and Joseph Cook; all calling for the immediate adoption of the resolution by Congress. Joseph Cook supported his call with the citation of the Supreme

Court decision of Feb. 29, 1892, that "this is a Christian nation," and a bundle of "precedents." Mr. Stevenson then spoke on his own part and began by citing this same Supreme Court decision, and declaring "the nation's faith in God." He declared that the liberals in demanding the abolition of chaplaincies and all other religious exercises and religious legislation, "are seeking to conform the Government to their own opinions;" that they cite the Constitution as it reads to sustain these views; and that "in seeking to sustain our Christian institutions, we [the National Reformers] ought not to be obliged to meet the effect of the silence of the Constitution as it is employed by those who oppose us." He said that it was not the intention of the makers of the Constitution that such use should be made of it, and mentioned "Story's Comments on the Constitution." But that such was precisely the intention of the makers of the Constitution, Story to the contrary notwithstanding, the history and documents of that time plainly show. See "Two Republics," pp. 681-698.

R. J. George followed, arguing the kingship of Christ—The claims of Christ as Ruler of Nations. He declared that this is "exclusively a question of revelation," "God has commanded all to acknowledge the Son," Psalm 2; "God requires this honor to the Son as to the God—man;" and "this claim rests on the fact that Christ is Redeemer." "He won the crown of thrones, and it is right he should wear the crown of glory."

W. J. Robinson argued the "Divine claim in civil government—Civil government is supreme among men." "It is a Christian nation. Ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people believe in the Christian religion. The Supreme Court declares this a Christian nation." And "in a conflict between atheism and God's Word, atheism appealing to the Constitution, eventually the Supreme Court might decide that though it is a Christian *nation*, it is not a Christian *Government*. And, therefore, this amendment is essential to assure success as a Christian *Government* as well as a Christian *nation*."

J. M. Foster argued "The Nation a Moral Person." He went over the same ground as the others, citing the Supreme Court decision in considerable detail with precedents also, and declared that "lynch law prevails largely in the South, and although this is all forbidden by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments nothing but Christianity can stop it, and therefore there must be this Christian amendment to make the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth effective—that we may have Christianity."

R. C. Wylie proposed to argue "The Practical Effects" of the proposed amendment. But the nearest that he got to it was to go over the ground covered by the others before him and then to declare that "As the educating power of the Constitution is great, this amendment would have a good moral effect upon the people who thing that religion and politics do not go together."

D. B. Wilson said that "the country was settled by Christians," "the laws are Christian and our civilization is Christian." He asked that the amendment, as introduced, should be made to recognize in words "Christ as ruler and his revealed will as the supreme law."

D. McAllister dwelt upon "an historical scene in the United States Senate in 1863," when a resolution almost in the same words as this proposed amendment, and deploring "our national sins" was passed asking the President to appoint a day of humiliation and prayer. It is plain on the fact of it that the resolution cited was written, or originated at least, by a Reformed Presbyterian, probably by Mr. McAllister himself, so that it could well be cited as a precedent for the adoption of this resolution now before the committee. He said that there were no prayers offered in the sessions of the convention that framed the Constitution, and that Franklin's motion to have prayers was defeated by adjournment, "no doubt because of a fear of the entanglements of a union of Church and State." And that it might be "the prerogative of the committee now to go back to the Pilgrim fathers."

Representative Morse closed the discussion by "re-affirming the statements of these learned and eloquent divines who have spoken." He said that "petitions and telegrams by the hundreds" were being received by members in behalf of the proposed amendment. He cited the Supreme Court decision that "this is a Christian nation," "the example of forty States" the inscription on the coins "In God We Trust," etc., but said the Constitution makes no such recognitions. "Why should we not correct the deficiency by recognizing the name that is above very name—God Almighty and Christ as our Saviour?"

The chairman of the committee said he had received hundreds of telegrams and letters without number, calling for the adoption of the resolution; other members of the committee said they were receiving many letters and telegrams also in behalf of it.

No speeches were heard in opposition to the measure. The committee adjourned stating that as there was not a quorum present they would not declare as to hearing the opposition until their regular

meeting on Friday, the 9th inst. Several persons were present to speak in opposition, and it is hoped they may be heard soon. A. T. J.

**March 22, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 12 , pp. 89-91.**

WE have also been asked what we think of the so-called League for the Protection of American Institutions, which is the originator and promoter of this proposed Sixteenth Amendment?

WE are perfectly willing to answer both of these questions. Indeed, we answered them four years ago in these columns; but are ready to answer them again, not only because we are asked, but because this subject comes naturally in the line of our studies and discussion of methods of opposing the encroachments of Rome.

THIS proposed Sixteenth Amendment is framed as follows:—

No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly, or in part, under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.

THERE are two objections to this proposed amendment. *First*, it does not go far enough; and *second*, it is not honest as far as it does go. It does not go far enough because it only forbids "any *State*" to use its property or credit or money for the purposes named, while it leaves the *United States*—the national Government—free to keep on doing it, as it has been doing, to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars ever since 1885. Again, it does not go far enough, in that it only forbids any State to aid, "by appropriation," "any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly, or in part, under *sectarian* or *ecclesiastical* control," while it does not forbid any State even to make appropriations in aid of *religious* institutions, societies, or undertakings, under *State* control. So that there is nothing in this proposed amendment to prevent any State or the national Government from making all the appropriations of property, credit and money that can be obtained, for the support of religion or for religious purposes, so long as the institution or society, or even the church to

which the appropriation may be made, is under *State* or *national* control, and *not* "under sectarian or ecclesiastical control."

THIS is not only so, but is intended to be so, by the chief organizers of the league and the originators of the proposed amendment. And this is where the thing is not honest as far as it does go. And here we begin to tell not what we *think* of this league, but what we *know* of it. The chief, if not the *sole* originators of the league, were James M. King, D.D., of this city, who has always been and is not its secretary; and Hon. John Jay, who was the first president of the league, and continued its president for several years, until his death. And it is a plain and distinct matter of record that both James M. King and John Jay were all this time actively committed to the support of religion *by the State*. Of this there is abundant and undeniable proof, some of which we shall now give.

IT is well known, and a matter of public record, that in 1888 Henry W. Blair, then United States Senator from New Hampshire, introduced a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States, which provided in so many words for the enforcement, by the national power, of the teaching of "the principles of the Christian religion" in all the public schools in the land. February 15, 1889, James M. King, D.D., then the representative of the Evangelical Alliance and now secretary of this league, appeared before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and argued in favor of the adoption of that proposed Blair amendment. He argued earnestly for that "Christianity" which is "a part of American law," and further said:—

The Christianity which has from the beginning characterized our public schools, and which properly belongs to the schools of Christian people, is thus alluded to by the Evangelical Alliance in a recent circular to the American people:—

"Touching the management of our common schools, on the purity of whose teaching depends the character of the nation, this Alliance would earnestly and respectfully entreat all who would maintain in their purity and beneficence our American institutions to have eye to the schools in their own immediate neighborhood; to cherish them with affectionate and jealous care; *to guard them from partisan and sectarian manipulation*; to see that the teachers are fitted for their work, morally as well as intellectually, and that they worthily appreciate the grandeur of their task in training children for their high duties as American citizens. They should clearly understand that while those duties are based upon the broad, tolerant Christianity which our country holds to be, in a modified sense, a part of the American law—*the Christianity revealed in the*

*Bible*, and whose divine origin and birth are judicially recognized—a Christianity not founded upon any particular tenets, but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men—the *Christian ethics* and *influence* thus *authorized* and *demande*d in our schools must never be narrowed or perverted in our State institutions, and least of all in our public schools, by the admission of denominational dogmas or doctrines, or of decrees or maxims at variance with American rights, American principles, or American law, or inconsistent with the fundamental American principle of a complete separation of Church and State."

AGAIN: In the winter of 1889-90 the Supreme Court of Wisconsin decided against the use of the King James version of the Bible in the public schools. The court decided thus upon the strength of the clause in the State constitution forbidding sectarian instruction in the public schools, and which forbids the State to make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. In short, the Supreme Court of Wisconsin decided against the use of the Bible in the public schools, under constitutional provisions which in substance and on their face *are identical with this amendment* which is proposed by the National League for the Protection of American Institutions; yet, on the eighth day of April, 1890, in the New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Dr. King, at the time general secretary of this league, as chairman of the Conference Committee on Religion and Public Education, presented a report, in which are the following statements of what the committee called "principles":—

2. That the separation of Church and State cannot

90

mean, under our form of government, the separation of Christian morality and the State.

3. Historically, and by the highest legal and judicial precedent, we are a Christian nation.

4. It is well settled by decisions in leading States of the Union that Christianity is a part of the common law of the State; "the American States adopted these principles from the common law of England."

5. Education consists in the symmetrical development of the whole man for the purpose of his creation. This purpose is admitted to be moral. Purely secular education is impossible in a land whose literature, history and laws are a product of a Christian civilization.

12. We repudiate as un-American and pagan, and as a menace in the perpetuity of our free institutions, the recent Supreme Court decision in the State of Wisconsin, a decision dictated and defended by the enemies of the public schools, that the reading of

the Bible, without comment, is "sectarian instruction of the pupils, in view of the fact that the Bible contains numerous passages, upon some of which the peculiar creed of almost every religious sect is based. And that such passages may be reasonably understood to inculcate the doctrines predicated upon them." The enemies of the common school declare that "exclusion of the Bible would not help the matter. This would only make the schools purely secular, *which were worse than making them purely Protestant*. For as it regards the State, society, morality, all the interests of this world, Protestantism we hold to be far better than no religion."

In the present state of the controversy, we hold it to be the duty of the citizens of a commonwealth, Christian in its history and in the character of its laws, to deny that the Bible is a sectarian book, and to *claim for it a place whenever the State attempts to educate youth* for the duties of citizenship.

THE New York *Times* criticized this report upon the basis of the fundamental principles of the Government of the United States which maintain the total separation of the State from religion. Thereupon, April 16, 1890, in a long letter to the *Times*, Hon. John Jay, then president of this league, took the *Times* severely to task for its criticism upon Dr. King's report.

The sole object of this letter is to prove that "Christianity is a part of American law," and that therefore Christianity and its interests must be respected and enforced by the law; and he distinctly defends the right of the State "to teach morality," "to approve the ten commandments," and "to instruct children in the law of God and the sermon on the mount." And he assumes the task of "defending American law from the charge of ignoring Christianity," which he declares "is not difficult for even a layman."

BY these evidences it is plain enough that this so-called League for the Protection of American Institutions is a deceitful thing. It does not really intend to protect American institutions. It does not really intend to protect the American public school. For, while proposing that this amendment shall prohibit the State from devoting any money to any *church* school or institution, the league *does intend that the State shall teach the Christian religion in the public school*, and such other educational institutions as can be put under *State* control, and shall use the money of the State for that purpose. The league gives to the word "sectarian" a meaning of its own, a meaning which the word cannot fairly be made to bear, and it intends that under that interpretation, the league's views of the Christian religion shall be

forced upon the people in the public schools and other places, by *the State*, at the public expense.

WE are not alone in the view that by *interpretation* this proposed amendment is to be made to enforce what it does not say. The same day on which Dr. King spoke before the Senate Committee in behalf of the Blair amendment, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association, spoke immediately preceding Dr. King, and presented a memorial, of which the following resolution is a part:—

*Resolved*, That while our schools are and should be Christian no preference or advantage should be given to any one sect or denomination in connection with the public schools. Above all, no sect can justly or fairly claim any share of the public money for the support of its own sectarian schools.

This expresses the same principles precisely as those held by Dr. King and Mr. John Jay. And of this amendment that is framed and proposed by the league, the *Christian Statesman*, of which Mr. Stevenson was then editor, said:—

It ought to receive the immediate and serious support of all loyal Americans.

Then it said:—

*Right interpreted*, the foregoing amendment could not be used in any way as a lever to overthrow the Christian elements in our public schools.

BY these it is plain enough that if that amendment were adopted and were a part of the United States Constitution, and the United States Supreme Court should by it decide against the use of the King James version of the Bible in the public schools, as the Supreme Court of Wisconsin did, then that court would be denounced by this league as an aider and abettor of "the enemies of the common schools," and such decision would be denounced by this league as "un-American and pagan."

THE ideas of Christianity held by this league, and the King James version of the Bible, according to the views of the president and secretary of the league, are *not sectarian*. These are held to be not sectarian, because the leading Protestant denominations all agree that this is proper. With this meaning given to the word "sectarian," these denominations might establish what they would call a national university, say at Washington City. They could put it under State control and then could draw from the public treasury all the money that by any influence they could secure in support of that school, and

so teach their views of Christianity in the school, just as they are now doing with the Indian church schools. All this, even though that amendment were a part of the national Constitution: because the school would not be under *ecclesiastical* control, but *State* control; and, according to their interpretation, the teaching of their views of Christianity and the Bible would not be *sectarian*.

Or, on the other hand, the United States itself might be persuaded, as Senator Edmunds' bill proposed to establish a national university, and these denominations, according to their interpretation of the word "sectarian," could have taught there, at the national expense, their views of Christianity and the Bible. And if these things were not so taught in such an institution, then, according to the "principles" of these originators and officers of this league, and these originators and promoters of this amendment, the league would repudiate the action, and even the institution, as "un-American and pagan, and a menace to the perpetuity of our free institutions."

ACCORDING to their ideas, Christianity and the Bible are not sectarian, therefore they should be taught in the public schools. But if the question to be left to the States, there will be a disagreement between them, as has already appeared in Supreme Court decisions. But if this proposed amendment should be adopted, the whole question would at once be removed from State jurisdiction and made national only. Then if a decision of the United States Supreme Court should be secured sustaining the ideas of the league, that Christianity and the Bible are not sectarian, a national religion would thus be established at one stroke. And as the Supreme Court of the United States has already unanimously declared that "this is a Christian nation," and that "we are a religious people," there is not the least room for doubt that this court would readily enough sustain the views of the league that Christianity and the Bible are not sectarian, and can therefore be taught and supported by appropriations of public money. And thus the far-reaching and dishonest purposes of this league would be accomplished. Therefore, as the ultimate object of this proposed Sixteenth Amendment is to support religion by the State, and is therefore to be used only to establish so-called Protestant or *non-sectarian* Christianity as the national religion, we have all the objection to it that we have to any other effort to establish any other form of Christianity or any other religion as the national or State religion.

So much for this proposed *amendment*, but we are not done with this *league*. There is another piece of its wickedness to be exposed. In the New York legislature of 1890, James M. King D.D., the general secretary of this league, acting in his official capacity as such, had introduced a bill written by himself, upon the subject of public schools and compulsory education. That bill provided that even a parent could not teach his own child in his own home without first passing a successful examination "by a superintendent of schools." The bill was discussed by the Union League Club of New York City, and was referred to a committee of eight members, who were to draw up a report for the action of the club. The committee made a lengthy report, which so ably exposes the mischiefs of the bill, and the mischievous spirit of the league which framed the bill, that we reprint the main points of it. It is worthy of the most careful consideration of every person in the United States, and especially so in this connection, as the editor of the SENTINEL himself heard the author of the bill—Dr. King—declare that he would never cease his effort to secure the enactment of such a law. The report of the committee of the Union League Club, which was unanimously adopted, runs as follows:—

The Committee on Political Reform have had under consideration Assembly Bill No. 106, entitled "An Act to secure to children the benefits of an elementary education, and making an appropriation therefore," and submit the following report and resolution, and recommend their adoption:—

"This bill purports to be in favor of compulsory education and in support of the common schools. Nothing is more important or desirable to the preservation of our institutions than the universal dissemination of knowledge, and, as a means to that end, the most vigorous support of the public schools is needed, consistent with individual liberty. It is believed that every member of this club is a staunch supporter of the common school system, in common with the great body of the citizens, and would do nothing to weaken their hold upon public affection, or impair in any way their usefulness.

"The proposed bill is so extraordinary in its provisions as to require a careful and critical examination. It incorporates within it certain principles and methods

91

of action that are entirely inconsistent with individual liberty and the sacred rights of the family. The bill seems to be, in some measure,

a substitute for the act passed in 1874, but with additional powers and limitations that make it a dangerous and vicious bill."

After describing a number of sections of the bill, the report continues:—

The bill invades the privacy of the domestic circle and supersedes the authority of the parent in the education of children of tender age, and substitutes therefor [*sic.*] persons authorized by act of the legislature to discharge these delicate and important duties.

Although sections three tolerates education in the family circle, it does not leave that to the choice and discretion of the parent, but provides that that teaching shall be under the supervision and control of a "school commissioner or a superintendent of schools, by whatever name known in the city or the State." The same section also graciously provides that in case a child is taught at home, the instruction in the branches specified in the bill shall be at least equivalent to that given in the public schools.

There is also a provision that, in case of the physical or mental condition of a child being such as to render its attendance at school inexpedient or impracticable, a physician's certificate may remit the penalty.

The general effect of the bill is to bring all matters of education, whether in the family circle or in public or private schools, under the supervision of school superintendents or school commissioners. The neglect of the duty of educating children according to these public officials is made a misdemeanor.

This bill proceeds upon the theory that the artificial and intangible body known as "the government" is a better guardian of children than those to whom they owe their existence, and that the most ignorant and incompetent public school teacher in the State is qualified to train any young child, while the most refined, intelligent, virtuous, and loving mother of that child, if for any reason she fails to obtain the consent of the school authorities, is not competent for that purpose. It calls for interference between parent and child at precisely that tender age when the character of the latter is unformed, and when it is in the most need of parental guidance and teaching. An attempt to enforce the provisions of this bill will be likely to lead to violence and breaches of the peace.

However desirable general education may be, it never can be desirable to invade the rights of parents and the sanctity of the family in the manner proposed by this act, under the guise of public instruction.

The bill specifies certain fundamental subjects of education as essential to fit a child as a member of the State. True education consists in the harmonious and symmetrical development of mind and character, and both should proceed together as far as

practicable. In most cases no one is as likely to know the character of children as well as parents, and only in exceptional cases should be taken from them the absolute right to determine what and what kind of education they shall receive. The object of the public school system is to aid parents in the education of their children and not to override the parental control or usurp its place. The bill reduces parents to the humiliating position of being obliged to obtain the consent of the school authorities before they can teach their own children, or select a teacher for them at home, and to the risk of fine and imprisonment if they act without such consent. Such legislation as this tends to destroy individuality and substitutes therefor State control in matters that should always belong to the individual. It is a long step in the direction of Socialism, where all property and all individuals are placed under the direction of government.

Dr. Kittridge, of this city, recently said: "The home is the grandest university in the world, and to its wise and religious education we owe, more than to any educating influence, the scholars and patriots and benefactors of our race." This we believe to be a true statement of the value of the home and home influence; and whatever evils may exist touching the education of certain classes of our citizens, those evils cannot by any possibility justify the subversion of the homes, and home control of children, which serve to lay the foundation for all that is best and holiest in our lives and our country.

The tendency of this bill, if enforced, will be to weaken parental authority over the children, and divide responsibility between the parents and the State authorities for their education. It is in the line of the most vicious class of legislation with which we are afflicted—that of State interference and control in matters with which the State of right ought not to interfere. However paternal the government may be, in this field it should keep its hands off. Whatever may be said in favor of enforced education of those whose education is entirely and grossly neglected, nothing can justify the public scrutiny and control of family education as contemplated by this act.

We therefore submit the following:—

*Resolved*, That the Union League Club deems this bill in the particulars mentioned a menacing invasion of the sacred rights of the family, in the matter of the education of children, and we request the members of the legislature so to vote as to defeat the passage of the bill.

Signed by E. B. Hinsdale, chairman; Edward H. Ammidown, R. M. Gallaway, Cephas Brainerd, Clarence C. Buel, John Jay Knox, D. B. St. John Roosa.

M. M. BUDLONG, *Secretary*.

*Union League Club House, January 28, 1890.*

Such are the purposes, the objects, and the aims of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, John Jay, president, James M. Kind, D.D., general secretary. As the legislation which it proposes is dangerous and vicious legislation, so the league which proposes it is a dangerous and vicious league. Instead of its being for the "protection," it is rather for the *destruction* of American institutions. Therefore the best thing the American people can ever do is to protect American institutions themselves, by giving no place to the dangerous and vicious designs of this dangerous and vicious National League for the Protection of American Institutions. A. T. J.

**"The Pope as Arbiter of the World" *American Sentinel* 9, 12 , p. 92.**

THE agitation having for its object the selection of the pope as arbiter of the world gains strength with passing time. The suggestion has been repeatedly and openly made by papists and very many others looking in that direction, and designed no doubt to further the movement, appear from time to time in leading periodicals. The *Review of Reviews* for March has the following significant article:—

There are not a few signs of the moral desperation which, rightly guided, goads into a new and auspicious career. What seems to be the crying need of the hour is a great European leader, a truly international man, whom kings and statesmen and the common people in every land could trust, who, passing from court to court, from cabinet to cabinet, from one course to another, could negotiate the general desire for peace into a permanent organization, who could charm national pride and sensitive nation honor into loyal submission to a tribunal of international justice and international force. In default of such a modern edition of Peter the Hermit preaching the union of the nations in a crusade against war, Europe may have to wait the authoritative summons of the leagued English speaking peoples, or the spontaneous resolve of the continental proletariat, or the cruel dictate of mutual helplessness following on devastating war. But whatever be the occasion, the one condition of settled peace remains the same: The establishment of a central court, with power to enforce its sentence. Disarmament by mutual arrangement seems scarcely possible or wise, unless accompanied or preceded by this condition. Until a man knows that the law is strong enough to protect him from injury, he can hardly be expected to give up carrying arms; and until nations know that behind the high court of international justice there is material strength enough to prevent or punish the international aggressor, they are not likely

in any fit of amiable enthusiasim [*sic.*] to disband their armies and dismantle their fortresses. That condition observed, the difficulty ought not to be insoluble. Are the powers willing to develop the concert of Europe, or such relics of it as survive, into a properly constituted judicial tribunal? If they are not willing, then there seems to be nothing for it but to let them burn in the hottest purgatory of militarism until such time as they shall be willing. A strange glint of coming possibilities showed itself last month in the Bavarian Diet. Two Ultramontane members, while denouncing the acceptance of the Army Bills, "proposed the institution of an international court of arbitration for the settlement of European quarrels, under the presidency of the pope." His holiness is said to be preparing an encyclical on the general question.

The final and everlasting judgment of the papacy is certain. But before that time comes we may expect to see that wicked power exalted to the tops of the mountains. "For God hath put in their hearts [the hearts of the rulers of Europe] to fulfill his will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the [papal] beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled." Then shall that wicked power boast herself, saying, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. 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."

**March 29, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 13 , pp. 97, 98.**

IN studying how best to oppose the encroachments of the papacy, it is only to state the truth to say that nothing but genuine Protestantism, consistently manifested, can ever successfully oppose the papacy in anything.

YET it is likewise only to state the truth to say that that which passes for Protestantism to-day, the average, popular, professed Protestantism of to-day, is so lacking in every essential element of true Protestantism, that it has become powerless for any purposes of opposition to the papacy, or for any other purpose that can be accomplished by Protestantism.

THE professed Protestantism of to-day calls upon Congress, and State legislatures, and the courts, to decide religious questions and controversies, and to enact laws embodying religious doctrines and enforcing church dogmas; it prosecutes at the law, fines and

imprisons dissenters from the legalized doctrines; and even has gone so far as to demand of the national executive the mustering of the regular troops to enforce upon the people, at the point of the bayonet, the recognition and observance of religious dogmas and institutions. Any or all of this is anything but true Protestantism in any sense.

AT the second Diet of Spires, held in 1529, there was presented the *Protest*, which originated, and gave to those who made it, the title and name of *Protestants*. And in summarizing this protest the historian states its principles as follows:—

The principles contained in the celebrated protest of the 19th of April, 1529, constitute *the very essence of Protestantism*. Now this protest opposes *two abuses of man* in matters of faith; the *first* is the intrusion of the civil magistrate; and the *second* the arbitrary authority of the church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate, and the authority of the word of God above the visible church. In the first place it rejects the civil power in divine things, and says with the prophets and apostles, *We must obey God rather than man*. In the presence of the crown of Charles the Fifth, it uplifts the crown of Jesus Christ.—  
*D'Aubigne, Hist. Ref. Book XIII., chap., VI., page 521.*

THE professed Protestants of to-day claim that Sunday is the Christian Sabbath; that it is the great charter of their religion; that it is, indeed, the very citadel of their faith. Now do they oppose the intrusion of the civil magistrate into this great question of the civil magistrate into this great question of their religion?—No, indeed. Everybody knows that so far are they from opposing any intrusion of the civil magistrate that they actually *require* the civil authority to intrude upon the discussion and decision of the question and the enactment of laws requiring its observance; and also require the courts to intrude themselves into it whenever the law is called in question; and further call upon the executive to further intrude the civil authority by exerting all the power vested in him. All this they have done and are doing before the eyes of all the people.

NOW as it is the very essence of Protestantism to *oppose* the intrusion of the civil magistrate in religious things; and as these do not oppose this, it plainly follows that they are not Protestants, and that their religion and work is not that of Protestantism. As it is the very essence of Protestantism to oppose the intrusion of the civil magistrate in things religious; and as these people, professing to be Protestants, not only do not oppose it, but actually require the whole magisterial power of the State and United States Governments to

intrude there; it follows that these people are not Protestants at all, and that neither their movement nor their work is Protestantism in any sense.

SECONDLY, it is the essence of Protestantism to oppose "the arbitrary authority of the Church."

NOW, for the institution of Sunday or for Sunday observance, in any way, there is no authority but the arbitrary authority of the Church. Professed Protestants not only know this, but they openly say it. The American Sabbath Union itself, which is composed of the leading "Protestant" churches, in one of its own official publications, in answer to a call for a citation to a command of God for Sunday observance, plainly says: "We admit there is no such command." The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, also, in one of its own publications, inquiring about the change of day from the seventh to the first, says that Christ "did not command it." There are other such statements also—too many to cite here. Well, then, as they know that there is no command of God for Sunday observance; and as the Church power only is that which requires its observance; this is proof in itself that the only authority for it is the arbitrary authority of the Church.

YET more than this. Even though Christ had commanded it, for the Church to require, and enforce upon men, its observance by law—this would be nothing else than to assert the arbitrary authority of the Church. *Because*, Christ himself has said, "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge [condemn] him not." As therefore Christ leaves every man free to observe his words or not, for the Church to compel any man to do it, it to put herself above Christ, and do what *he* does not do. And this, in itself, is only to assert the arbitrary authority of the Church. So that whether there be a command of God for Sunday observance or not, in this matter the result is the same; to do as the professed Protestant churches of the United States have done and are doing, in requiring Sunday observance of all by law, is nothing else than to assert the rightfulness of the arbitrary authority of the Church.

BUT it is *the essence of Protestantism* to oppose the arbitrary authority of the Church. Therefore, as the professed Protestants of the United States have not opposed the arbitrary authority of the Church in this matter of Sunday observance, it plainly follows that they are not Protestants. As it is the essence of Protestantism to oppose the arbitrary authority of the Church, and as these professed

Protestants, not only do not oppose it, but actually assert it and openly maintain it, it unmistakably follows that they are not Protestants at all; and that their position

98

is not that of true Protestantism in any sense.

THIS proves that to oppose the Sunday institution itself, to oppose the Sunday movement in all its parts, to oppose Sunday laws in any and all their phases, to oppose and deny the right of congresses, or courts, or executives, to touch the question of Sunday observance, or any other religious question in any way, and to reject entirely the authority of any such action when it is asserted—*this* and this only *is Protestantism*. Even admitting that Sunday were the Sabbath, those who observe it can be Protestants only by opposing it can be Protestants only by opposing it can be Protestants only by opposing all intrusion of the magistrates into the question; by opposing all attempts of the Church to require its recognition or observance by law, and by asserting their own individual right to observe it as they choose, without any dictation or interference from anybody. This alone is Protestantism.

THIS is the living, present, absolute truth. There is no discount on it at all. "Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate," even though the magistrate calls himself a Christian and a Protestant, and proposes to enforce the "Christian Sabbath." "Protestantism sets the authority of the word of God above the visible Church," even though the Church calls itself Protestant. Protestantism "rejects the civil power in divine things, and says with the prophets and apostles: 'We must obey God rather than man,'" and that, too, *as God commands* it, and not as *man* commands it, nor as man *says* that God commands it. Protestantism opposes and rejects every human intrusion, whether of the magistrate or of the ecclesiastic, between the soul and Jesus Christ, and everlastingly maintains the divine right of the individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience exercised at his own free choice.

TRUE Protestantism insists that "the Bible and the Bible alone," "the written word of God," "thus saith the Lord," is the only rule of faith and the religion of Protestants. But it is the very certainty of truth that there is no Bible, no written word of God, no "thus saith the Lord," for the Sunday institution, or for Sunday observance, or for the intrusion of Cesar—the civil power—into the things of God or of the Church; and the professed Protestants of to-day know it, and have said so over

and over. Indeed, Protestantism has always known that there is no Scripture, but only Church authority, *tradition* only, for the institution of Sunday. It was exactly here that the Council of Trent drew the line between Protestantism and Catholicism, and this, too, at the expense of Protestantism, because of its inconsistency. Yet, in spite of the history and the fact, in spite of their own knowledge of the history and the fact, in spite of the Scripture, and in spite of all this inconsistency, the professed Protestantism of to-day persistently stultifies itself by violating every principle of true Protestantism and acting upon papal principles only.

HERE are some words of as much solemn weight as ever, as true to-day, and of the popular Protestantism of to-day, as they ever were at any other time:—

The Reformation was accomplished in the name of a spiritual principle. It had proclaimed for its teacher the word of God; for salvation, faith; for king, Jesus Christ; for arms, the Holy Ghost; and had by these very means rejected all worldly elements. Rome had been established by "the law of a carnal commandment;" the Reformation, by "the power of an endless life." . . .

The gospel of the Reformers *had nothing to do with the world and with politics*. While the Roman hierarchy had become a matter of diplomacy and a court intrigue, the Reformation was destined to exercise *no other influence over princes and people* than that which proceeds from the gospel of peace.

If the Reformation, having attained a certain point, became untrue to its nature, began to parley and temporize with the world, and ceased thus to follow up the spiritual principle that it had so loudly proclaimed, it was faithless to God and to itself. Henceforward its decline was at hand.

It is impossible for a society to prosper, if it be unfaithful to the principles it lays down. Having abandoned what constituted its life, it can find naught but death.

It was God's will that this great truth should be inscribed on the very threshold of the temple he was then raising in the world, and a striking contrast was to make the truth stand gloriously prominent.

One portion of the reform was to seek alliance of the world, and in this alliance find a destruction full of desolation.

Another portion looking up to God, was haughtily to reject the arm of the flesh, and by this very act of faith secure a noble victory.

If three centuries have gone astray, it is because they were unable to comprehend so holy and so solemn a lesson.—*D'Aubigne, Id., Book XIV, chap. 1.*

As the case stands to-day it is demonstrated that not only *three* centuries but three *and a half* centuries have gone astray because of

their unwillingness or their inability to comprehend so holy and so solemn a lesson. And what, now, is the patent result?—Nothing short of the sheer collapse of popular Protestantism as a moral force in the world. The crowning act that demonstrated this was that procedure in 1892, by which the professed Protestantism of the United States, and of the world even, positively required, under threats of the only force at its command, the United States Government, to intrude itself into the realm of religion and conscience, to legalize the arbitrary authority of the Church, and thus to set the magistrate above the conscience and above the word of God. And this crowning act which marked the collapse of popular Protestantism was accompanied by an open confession of this collapse in the procedure by which professed Protestantism called together all the other religions of the world for the purpose of instituting a comparison among them in order to discover and formulate "a new, complete and perfect religion for all mankind." And so there met in the "World's Parliament of Religions" the three great divisions—Heathenism, Catholicism and popular Protestantism. Catholicism saw at once, and announced, "the collapse of dogmatic Protestantism." And proceeded to make the fullest use of the "opportunity" thus opened to Catholicism. By their experiences in the parliament the heathen discovered this collapse and afterward announced it to their nations, as the following report, made by the Japanese priests, who returned from the parliament, shows:—

When we received the invitation to attend the Parliament of Religions our Buddhist organizations would not send us as representatives of the sect. The great majority believed that it was a shrewd move on the part of Christians to get us there and then hold us up to ridicule or try to convert us. We accordingly went as individuals. But it was a wonderful surprise which awaited us. Our ideas were all mistaken. The parliament was called because the Western nations have come to realize the weakness and folly of Christianity and they really wished to hear from us of our religion, and to learn what the best religion is. There is no better place in the world to propagate the teachings of Buddhism than in America. During the meetings one very wealthy man from New York became a convert of Buddhism, and was initiated into its rites. He is a man of great influence, and his conversion may be said to mean more than the conversion of ten thousand ordinary men, so we may say truthfully that we made ten thousand converts at that meeting. Christianity is merely an adornment of society in America. It is deeply believed in by very few. The great majority of Christians

drink and commit various gross sins, and live very dissolute lives, although it is a very common belief and serves as a social adornment. Its lack of power proves its weakness. The meetings showed the great superiority of Buddhism over Christianity, and the mere fact of calling the meetings showed that the Americans and other Western peoples had lost their faith in Christianity and were ready to accept the teachings of our superior religion.—*New York Independent, Dec. 14, 1893, p. 15.*

And the missionary in Japan, who sends this, says that the report was received with "great applause," and that these statements "will be thoroughly believed by the masses of the people." Well, why should not the statements be believed by the masses of the people? The statements are true, and are fairly put, and a person does not need to be in Japan to discover it.

As we have said, Catholicism saw this collapse at once. Heathenism discovered it by experience in the parliament. And anybody who has carefully read the speeches made in the parliament cannot fail to see that it is so. The speeches of the heathen and of the Catholics are superior in every respect to the speeches of the representative "Protestants," and in some respects, far superior. In the speeches of the heathen and the Catholics, and especially of the heathen, there was the keen searching analysis of scholarly attainment and the sober earnestness of conviction, that will always make an impression; while the speeches of professed Protestantism were chiefly characterized by the lightness of leaves in the wind, the instability of water, and the uncertainty of the waves of the sea. All this is easily seen by a comparison of the speeches made in the parliament. And that that is precisely the measure of the effect that the speeches and proceedings had upon those who attended the parliament or who have studied the speeches, is clear to every one who has moved to any extent among the people since. Thus, by seeking the arm of the national power to hold her up, and meeting upon a common basis of inquiry both heathenism and Catholicism, popular Protestantism has openly confessed her conscious inability to stand alone and her conscious lack of Christian truth, and so has confessed her utter collapse as a moral force or as a power for good in the world.

A number of years ago a leading thinker in Europe declared in truth of Protestantism as it is in Europe, what it is in the United States: "Protestants, there are some, but Protestantism is dead." "The collapse of dogmatic Protestantism" is an accomplished fact.

But Protestants will never cease out of the land, and may they increase abundantly.

A. T. J.

**April 5, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 14 , pp. 105, 106.**

"ROME never changes." This is the oft-repeated boast of the papacy, and it is true.

IT is true, too, in a much larger sense than many realize, even of those who believe the proposition.

IN its spirit, in its disposition, in its essential nature and characteristics, Rome is the same to-day that it was two hundred or five hundred years *before Christ*.

BETWEEN Rome's beginning and our day, between 753 B.C. and 1894 A.D., she has appeared in different outward forms, she has taken on different phases, such as the kingly, the republican, the imperial and the papal, but it has been Rome all the time—Rome in spirit, in nature, and in essential characteristics.

THERE is no world-power that occupies so large a place in the Bible as does Rome. Rome, from its rise in ancient time and in its pagan form, through all its career, its merging into the papal form, and clear on to its impending ruin in our own day, is traced in all its workings, and is marked in its every essential feature, by the pen of inspiration. And it is Rome all the time and always the same—cunning, crafty, insinuating, arrogant, violent, persecuting and bloody—always actuated by the same spirit and pursuing steadily the same policy. So constant, so persistent, and so characteristic is this policy, that it is singled out in the Scripture and distinctly defined as "*his* policy."

IN the eighth chapter of Daniel there is a prophecy of the career of Media and Persia, of Grecia under Alexander, and then under Alexander's successors, and of the power that should succeed these which by every evidence of Scripture and history, is demonstrated to be Rome only. And in that place it is briefly but powerfully sketched thus:—

And in the latter time of their [Alexander's successors] kingdom when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall

destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

Thus it is distinctly declared that "through *his policy* also, he shall *cause craft to prosper* in his hand," "and by *peace* shall *destroy* many." To know what this "policy" is, is to know Rome from beginning to end. To understand the workings of this "policy," is to understand the workings of Rome so well, even to-day, that she can never deceive nor get any advantage of him who understands it. IN Rollin's ancient history there is an analysis of this Romish policy and its workings in the progress of Rome to power and dominion over all the ancient nations. And so entirely is this "his policy" ever, that Rollin's analysis of it as it was manifested in ancient times is as perfectly descriptive of Rome's policy and its workings to-day as it is of it in ancient days. Here are the historian's words:—

The reader may perceive from the events above related, one of the principal characteristics of the Romans, which will soon determine the fate of all the States of Greece, and produce an almost general change in the universe; I mean a spirit of sovereignty and dominion. This characteristic does not display itself at first in its full extent; it reveals itself by degrees; and it is only by an insensible progress which at the same time is sufficiently rapid, that we see it carried at last to its greatest height.

It must be confessed, that this people, on some occasions, show a moderation and distinterestedness, which from a superficial view, seems to exceed everything we meet with in history, and which we feel it incumbent on us to praise.

Was there ever a more glorious day than that in which the Romans, after having carried on a long and dangerous war, after crossing seas and exhausting their treasures, caused a herald to proclaim, in a general assembly, that the Roman people restored all the cities to their liberty, and desired to reap no other fruit by their victory than the noble pleasure of doing good to nations, the bare remembrance of whose ancient glories sufficed to endear them to the Romans? The description of that immortal day can hardly be read without tears and without being affected with a degree of enthusiasm of esteem and admiration.

Had this deliverance of the Grecian States proceeded merely from a principle of generosity, void of all interested motives; had the whole tenor of the conduct of the Romans been of the same nature with such exalted sentiments, nothing could possibly have been more august, or more capable of doing honor to the nation. But if we penetrate ever so little beyond this glaring outside, we soon perceive that this specious moderation of the Romans was entirely

founded on a profound policy; wise, indeed, and prudent, according to the ordinary rules of government, but at the same time very remote from that noble disinterestedness so highly extolled on the present occasion. It may be affirmed that the Grecians then abandoned themselves to a stupid joy, fondly imagining that they were really free, because the Romans declared them so.

Greece, in the times I am now speaking of, was divided between two powers; I mean Grecian Republics and Macedonia; and they were always engaged in war; the former, to preserve the remains of their ancient liberty, and the latter, to complete their subjection. The Romans, perfectly well acquainted with this state of Greece, were sensible that there was no necessity of apprehending any difficulty from those little republics, which were growing weak through length of years, by intestine feuds, mutual jealousies, and the wars they had been forced to support against foreign powers. But Macedonia, which was possessed of well discipline troops, inured to all the toils of war, which had continually in view the glory of her former monarchs, which had formerly extended her conquests to the extremities of the globe, which still harbored an ardent, though chimerical desire, of attaining universal empire, which had a kind of natural alliance with the kings of Egypt and Syria, sprung from the same origin and united by the common interests of monarchy; Macedonia, I say, gave just alarm to the Romans, who, from the ruin of Carthage, had no obstacle left with regard to their ambitious designs but those powerful kingdoms that shared the rest of the world between them, and especially Macedonia, as it lay nearest to Italy.

To balance, therefore, the power of Macedon, and to dispossess Philip of the aid he flattered himself he should receive from the Greeks, which, indeed, had they united all their forces with his, in order to oppose his common enemy, would perhaps have made him invincible with regard to the Romans, they declared loudly in favor of those republics, made it their glory to take them under their protection, and that with no other design, in outward appearance, than to defend them against their oppressors; and farther, to attach them by still stronger ties, they hung out to them the specious bait, as a reward for their fidelity. I mean liberty, of which all the republics in question were inexpressibly jealous, and which the Macedonian monarchs had perpetually disputed with them.

The bait was artfully prepared and as eagerly swallowed by the generality of the Greeks, whose views penetrated no farther. But the most judicious and most clear-sighted among them discovered the danger that lay concealed beneath this charming bait, and accordingly, they exhorted the people from time to time, in their public assemblies, to beware of this cloud that was gathering in the

West; and which, changing on a sudden into a dreadful tempest, would break like thunder over their heads, to their utter destruction.

106

Nothing could be more gentle and equitable than the conduct of the Romans in the beginning. They acted with the utmost moderation towards such States and nations as addressed them for protection; they succored them against their enemies, took the utmost pains in terminating their differences, and in suppressing all troubles which arose among them, and did not demand the least recompense for all these services done for their allies. By these means their authorities gained strength daily and prepared the nations for entire subjection.

Under the pretense of manifesting their good will, of entering into their interests and of reconciling them, they rendered themselves as sovereign arbiters of those whom they had restored to liberty, and whom they now considered, in some measure, as their freedmen. They used to depute commissioners to them to inquire into their complaints, to weigh and examine the reasons on both sides, and to decide their quarrels; but when the articles were of such a nature that there was no possibility of reconciling them on the spot, they invited them to send their deputies to Rome. But afterwards they used to summon those who refused to be reconciled, obliged them to plead their cause before the Senate and even to appear in person there. From arbiters and mediators having become supreme judges, they soon assumed a magisterial tone, looked upon their decrees as irrevocable decisions, were greatly offended when the most implicit obedience was not paid to them, and gave the name of rebellion to a second resistance. Thus there arose, in the Roman Senate, a tribunal, which judged all nations and kings, and from which there was no appeal. This tribunal, at the end of every war, determined the rewards and punishments due to all parties. They dispossessed the vanquished nations of part of their territories, to bestow them on their allies, from which they reaped a double advantage; for they thereby engaged in the interest of Rome such kings as were in no way formidable to them, and weakened others whose friendship the Romans could not expect, and whose arms they had reason to dread.

We shall hear one of the chief magistrates in the republic of the Achæans inveigh strongly in a public assembly against this unjust usurpation, and ask by what title the Romans were empowered to assume so haughty an ascendant over them; whether their republic was not as free and independent as that of Rome; by what right the latter pretended to force the Achæans to account for their conduct, whether they would be pleased should the Achæans, in their turn,

officially pretend to inquire into their affairs, and whether there ought not to be an equality between them. All these reflections were very reasonable, just and unanswerable, and the Romans had no advantage in the question but force.

They acted in the same manner, and their politics were the same with regard to their treatment of kings. They first won over to their interests such among them as were the weakest, and consequently, the less formidable; they gave them the title of allies, whereby their persons were rendered, in some measure, sacred and inviolable, and was a kind of safeguard against other kings more powerful than themselves; they increased their revenues and enlarged their territories, to let them see what they might expect from their protection which had raised the kingdom of Pergamos to such a pitch of grandeur.

After this the Romans invaded, upon different pretenses, those great potentates who divided Europe and Asia. And how haughtily did they treat them even before they had conquered. A powerful king, confined within a narrow circle by a private man of Rome, was obliged to make his answer before he quitted it; how imperious was this! But how did they treat vanquished kings? They commanded them to deliver up their children, and the heirs of their crowns, as hostages and pledges of their fidelity and good behavior; obliged them to lay down their arms; forbade them to declare war, or to conclude any alliance without first obtaining their leave; banished them to the other side of the mountains, and left them, in strictness of speech, only an empty title and a vain shadow of royalty, divested of its rights and advantages.

We have no room to doubt that Providence had decreed to the Romans the sovereignty of the world, and the Scriptures had prophecied their future grandeur; but they were strangers to those divine oracles; and besides, the bare predictions of their conquests was no justification with regard to them. Although it be difficult to affirm, and still more so to prove, that this people had from their first rise, formed a plan, in order to conquer and subject all nations; it cannot be denied, if we examine their whole conduct attentively, that it will appear that they acted as if they had a foreknowledge of this, and that a kind of instinct determined them to conform to it in all things.

But, be this as it may, we see, by the event, to what this so much boasted lenity and moderation of the Romans was confined. Enemies to the liberty of all nations, having the utmost contempt for kings and monarchies, looking upon the whole universe as their prey, they grasped with insatiable ambition, the conquest of the whole world; they seized indiscriminately all provinces and kingdoms, and extended their empire over all nations; in a word, they prescribed no other limits to their vast projects than those

which deserts and seas made it impossible to pass.—*Book XVIII., chap. I., section VII., under "Reflections on the Conduct of the Romans," etc.*

THIS statement of Rome's policy and its workings is as true and as appropriate in the case of the Roman Church and the American Republic to-day, as it is in the case of the Roman State and the Grecian Republics in all time. It describes the policy of Leo XIII. and the ultimate purpose of it toward the Government and people of the United States; toward the workingmen; as the self-appointed intermediary between capital and labor; and the would-be world's arbiter, to-day, as truly as it describes the policy of the Roman Senate and its ultimate purpose toward the governments and peoples of Grecia and the other nations of antiquity. Nor is the identity of this policy in Rome to-day, and in Rome of old, denied by the papacy. In fact, it is asserted by the papacy, and the continuance of this policy from ancient Rome is the acknowledged inspiration of modern Rome.

WHEN Imperial Rome was falling to ruins under the violent inroads of the barbarians of the North, the spirit and policy of Rome not only survived but was deepened and perfected in papal Rome. And this spirit and policy were consciously and intentionally continued by the popes of the time and was conscientiously received and diligently cultivated by each succeeding pope.

INNOCENT I., A.D. 402-417, was pope when the barbarians first overran the Western Empire and attacked, and even sacked, the city of Rome. And "upon the mind of Innocent appears first distinctly to have dawned the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet, and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline."<sup>221</sup> He was succeeded by Zosimus, March 18, A.D. 417—December 26, 418, who asserted with all the arrogance of Innocent, all that Innocent had claimed. He not only boasted with Innocent that to him belonged the power to judge all causes, but that the judgment "is irrevocable;" and accordingly established the use of the dictatorial expression, "For so it has pleased the apostolic see," as sufficient authority for all things that he might choose to command. And upon this assumption, those canons of the Council of Sardica which made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, he passed off upon the bishops of Africa as the canons of the Council of Nice, in which he was actually followed by Leo, and put tradition upon a level with the Scriptures. He was succeeded by Boniface I., 419-422, who added nothing to the power or authority of the bishopric of Rome, but

diligently and "conscientiously" maintained all that his predecessors had asserted, in behalf of what he called "the just rights of the see," in which he had been placed. He was succeeded by Celestine I., 422-432, who, in a letter written A.D. 428, plainly declared: "As I am appointed by God to watch over his church, it is incumbent upon me everywhere to root out evil practices, and introduce good ones in their room, for my pastoral vigilance is restrained by no bounds, but extends to all places where Christ is known and adored." <sup>23</sup>2 It was he who appointed the terrible Cyril his vicegerent to condemn Nestorius, and to establish the doctrine that Mary was the Mother of God. He was succeeded by Sixtus III. 432-440, who, as others before, added nothing specially to the papal claims, yet yielded not an iota of the claims already made. He was succeeded by Leo I., "the Great A.D. 440-461. Such was the heritage bequeathed to Leo by his predecessors, and the arrogance of his own native disposition, with the grand opportunities which offered during his long rule, added to it a thousandfold. "All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone." <sup>24</sup>3 At the very moment of his election he was absent in Gaul on a mission as mediator to reconcile a dispute between two of the principal men of the empire. He succeeded in his mission as mediator to reconcile a dispute between two of the principal men of the empire. He succeeded in his mission and was hailed as "the Angel of Peace," and the "Deliver of the Empire." In a sermon, he showed what his ambition embraced. He portrayed the powers and glories of the former Rome as they were reproduced in Catholic Rome. The conquests and universal sway of heathen Rome were but the promise of the conquests and universal sway of Catholic Rome. Romulus and Remus were but the precursors of Peter and Paul. Rome of former days had by her armies conquered the earth and sea: now again, by the see of the holy blessed Peter as head of the world, Rome, through her divine religion, would dominate the earth. <sup>25</sup>4

THIS is Rome; Rome always, and Rome ever the same. This is "his policy"—craft and hypocrisy, hypocrisy and craft, always employed to feed an insatiable ambition for universal dominion. "Rome never changes," that is true. In "policy," in spirit, in working, in

essential nature, it never has changed and it never can change. In all this, Rome is just as bad as it can be, and yet thinks itself better than God, and therefore how would it be possible to change? No, sir, Rome never changes,—That is the truth. She never can change,—And that is the truth.

A. T. J.

**April 26, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 17 , p. 129.**

WHEN the Republic becomes a religious State and the Bible is made the code of civil procedure as of religion, the laws will be formulated upon the Bible as interpreted by the ecclesiastics. Such a condition will be papal, and the church which so rules will be a papal church by whatever title it may chose to name itself.

WHEN the Church and State become identical in this country, the Church being really the ruling power, as it will be,—then instead of being gracious, persuasive, amiable, the expression of the authority of the reigning hierarchy will become stern, commanding, terrible. No course will remain to the dissenter but utter submission to its creed, or the endurance of such penal suffering as the ecclesiastical authorities may require the civil officers to inflict.

**May 3, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 18 , p. 137.**

TO reject the trust is to deny the Author of truth. That he might lead men to deny God and his Word, Satan has sought, from the beginning, to bring the divine statutes into contempt. This he has done by subtle perversion of truth; thus establishing in the minds of men erroneous views of the character of God, and incorrect ideas of the teaching of Scripture.

THERE can be no peace between truth and error. That conflict admits of no armistice. The armies of truth carry no flag of truce. There can be no cessation of hostilities. The contest is to the end. It is a strife between the statutes of man and the divine law of Jehovah, between the religious truth of God's Word and the religious error of human fable and tradition. What will be the result? Truth will win. Error will be vanquished. The eternal ages of God will be ushered in.

**May 10, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 19 , pp. 145, 146.**

TWO years ago a few preachers invaded the capitol of the United States and demanded of Congress legislation in behalf of religion and the churches, and they got it.

THESE preachers had with them a few genuine petitions which they fraudulently multiplied into millions and used so threateningly that the scared vision of Senator Hawley and others multiplied them into many millions more.

THUS under threats these preachers demanded that Congress should openly violate the spirit, the letter, and the whole history of the Constitution; and that at the same time each member of Congress should violate his oath to maintain the Constitution. For these preachers knew perfectly well that what they were thus demanding was in every element of it contrary to the plain language and meaning of the Constitution. All this, however, was nothing to them so long as they could get Congress to do that which *they* had firmly settled in their minds ought to be done.

UNDER the threats and other persuasions thus brought to bear, Congress did surrender to the demands of the preachers, and did do the unconstitutional thing that they had determined should be done. And thus Congress did make the Government of the United States subordinate to the religious element as expressed through these threatening ecclesiastics. So certainly is this true, and so well did the ecclesiastics know it, that when Congress would have retraced its false step and reversed its unconstitutional action they simply raised their threatening voices to a louder clamor than ever, and Congress still yielded to the clamor for fear that more mischief would be done if it did not yield than if it did.

ALL this is a matter of history with which all the people of the land are acquainted. And Senator Hawley, all know, also, was the grand chief advocate of the movement in Congress. It was he who made the most, and the most lengthy, speeches in its favor. He it was who challenged his fellow-senators to "vote against it if you dare," under the dread alternative of "How many of you would come back here again?" He is was, and Senators Colquitt and Frye, who declared that the "salvation of the nation" depended on this subordination of the

Government to the demand of the preachers, this subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power in this nation.

AND now behold there is another set of preachers coming up to Washington to invade the capitol with demands for legislation to suit themselves. They are coming by the hundreds and thousands from all directions. True they are not as well dressed as were the previous ones: they do not look quite as scholarly as those others; it is probable that these do not wear as many gold rings and diamond studs as did those; nor do these come at half fare or lowest excursion rates in elegant trains on all the railroads. Yet they are certainly coming, and what is just as certain is that in principle this new set of preachers preach the same identical gospel as did the others—the gospel of the personality, the paternity, and the divinity, of the Government.

BUT, lo! Senator Hawley stands up in his place and denounces this new set of preachers as "not representative," and their errand so fraught with the elements of anarchy that when some of his fellow-senators acts toward these as he did toward the others he hesitates not to denounce their action as "anarchistic." It is true that these new preachers do not come with a few "representative petitions" on paper, which they will fraudulently multiply into millions. No, these come in their own proper and individual persons, and in their own proper persons they propose to "petition;" and no man can deny that they can speedily and in very fact be multiplied into millions. And as to their being representative, they are just as certainly representative as were those preachers who went there before, and whose bad cause Senator Hawley was so prompt to espouse. No man can deny that Coxe, Kelly, Browne, and Frye, are as completely representative as were Crafts, Cook, Shepard, and George. The truth is that they are far more so. And as to the movement of these new preachers containing the elements of anarchy, it is no more true of these than it was, and is, of the others. And in one sense not nearly so much; for the others originated and carried to successful issue, the first movement to undermine every principle of government and order. And in so doing they set the example which these are now following only too fully.

WHY, then, should Senator Hawley denounce these when he supported the others? Senator Peffer denounced the others and favors these. Senator Peffer and his confreres are more consistent than are Senator Hawley and his. For when the principle has once

been recognized by legislation in behalf of one class, it is only fair and consistent enough that it should be followed in favor of any other class, on demand. Senators Pepper, Allen, and others, in favoring these are but following in the steps already taken by Senators Hawley, Frye, and others, in favoring those other preachers. And to be consistent Senators Hawley, Frye, Quay, and all the others who surrendered to the clamor and threats of those other preachers in their demand for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, should now be just as prompt in surrendering to the clamor of the preachers of the "commonweal," and just as diligent in advocating their demands.

IS it possible that those senators, and indeed Congress altogether, were so thoughtless in 1892, as not to be able to discern that when they surrendered to the clamor and threats of the ecclesiastics for unconstitutional legislation, or even for any purpose, they were establishing a precedent that could be followed by every other element in the land? Could they not see that when they plainly announced that they not only yielded to the religious sentiment, but that they did not "dare" to do otherwise—could they not see that in this they were but making an open bid for every discontented or self-assertive

146

element in the nation to come before Congress in the same way, and secure consideration of their demands by the same means? In 1892, Congress thus sowed to the wind, and neither the men who led in that transaction, nor anybody else, should be surprised if in 1894 they should be called upon to reap the whirlwind. And that which is now in sight, perplexing and dangerous as it is, is but a summer's breeze as compared with the destructive storm that is surely and speedily to come. And all in this same line of things, too. The men who, in 1892, established the evil precedent of "legislation by clamor and threats," will have ample opportunity yet to see their pernicious example followed to the nation's undoing. They were told of these things before, but they would not hear. These things will tell of themselves henceforth, and those men will hear.

A. T. J.

**"The Breckinridge-Morse District Sunday Bill" *American Sentinel* 9, 19 , pp. 149-151.**

[At the hearing on the Breckinridge Sunday bill for the District of Columbia, held before the House Committee on the District, Jan. 6,

1891, Alonzo T. Jones, editor of this paper, addressed the committee. Much of his address is just as applicable to the Morse bill, which is now before the Commissioners and the District Committees. The following is taken from what was there said before the committee by Mr. Jones.]

THERE is enough virtue in Jesus Christ, and enough power in that virtue, to enable a man to do right in the face of all the opportunities and all the temptations to do wrong that there are in this world. That virtue and that power are freely given to every man who has faith in Him who brought it to the world. Why, then, do not these men, these professed ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ,—why do they not endeavor to cultivate in men that faith in Christ which will empower them to do right from the love it of, instead of coming up here to this capitol, and asking you gentlemen of the national legislature to help men to do what *they* think right by taking away the opportunity to do what *they* think to be wrong. Virtue can't be legislated into men.

But there is yet more of this. I read now from the same book (Craft's "Sabbath for Man"), page 428:—

Among other printed questions to which I have collected numerous answers, was this one: Do you know of any instance where a Christian's refusing to do Sunday work, or Sunday trading, has resulted in his financial ruin?" Of the two hundred answers from persons representing all trades and professions, *not one is affirmative.*

Then what help do the people need? And especially what help do they need that Congress can afford? Wherein is anybody being "forced to labor on Sunday?" Where is there any danger of anybody's being forced to labor on Sunday? Ah, gentlemen, this effort is not in behalf of the laboring men. They do not need any such help as is proposed in this bill. That claim is only a pretense under which those who are working for the bill would hide their real purpose. And just here I would answer a question that has been asked, in which there is conveyed a charge that we have no sympathy with the workingmen. It has been asked, "Why is it that you—the AMERICAN SENTINEL—have no words to say in favor of the law to assure the workingman his Sunday rest, but instead oppose those who are in favor of it?" I answer, It is because we have more respect for the workingmen of this country than to think of them that they are so lacking in manliness, and have so little courage and ability to take care of themselves, that it is necessary for the Government to take charge of them, and nurse and coddle them like a set of grown-up babies. And

therefore it is in the interest of manliness and courageous self-dependence that we object to the church managers coming to the national legislature to secure a law under such a plea as this, whose only effect would be to make grown-up babies of what should be manly men. We have respect for the laboring men in this matter, and we want them all to have the respect of their employers. Therefore we would ever encourage and help them to stand so courageously by their convictions of right and duty, as that to each one his employer may be led to say, as did this railroad superintendent to that engineer, "I respect your position, and you shall never be called on for Sunday work again."

Gentlemen of the committee, if evidence can prove anything, then the evidence which I have here read—not from an opponent, but from the chiefest factor in the movement in favor of this bill—proves to a demonstration that the object of this bill, as defined in the title, and as pleaded here to-day, is absolutely unnecessary and vain. This evidence proves to a demonstration that nobody in this District, nor in the United States, nor in the world around, is being forced to labor on Sunday. Not only this, but it demonstrates that there is not the slightest danger of anybody in this nation ever being forced to labor on Sunday; because actual "gain" and "worldly prosperity" lies in the refusal to work on Sunday, and it is certain that in this land everybody is free to refuse. This evidence, also coming from the source whence it does come, demonstrates that the title of the bill does not define its real object, but is only a pretense to cover that which is the real purpose—to secure and enforce by law the religious observance of the day.

Now, as to Sunday in the Constitution, will the gentleman who has just spoken on the opposite side, or will any of these gentlemen, insist that the phrase "Sundays excepted," in the Constitution, bears the same relation to the President as they by this bill, would make the Sunday bear to the people of the District of Columbia? Is there any inhibition in it? Is the President forbidden by it to perform any secular labor or business on that day? Cannot the President go a-fishing, or do anything on that day, and that, too, without any inhibition whatever by the Constitution? Does that phrase in the Constitution mean anything else than simply the recognition of the legal *dies non*? That is just what it is, and that is all that it is. And against this we have not a word to say in itself; but when it is proposed to take this mere legal no-day and stretch it into the creation of a precedent that will sanction

an act of Congress prohibiting everybody from doing any manner of work, labor, or business pertaining to this world, on Sunday—then we most decidedly protest. If these men are ready to go so far as that in the construction and use of a mere non-committal phrase, what would they not do under the authority of the specific words of a sweeping statute?

But Mr. Elliott—Rev. J. H.—says Sunday laws have been sustained as constitutional by the Supreme Court of the States. True enough. But what does that amount to in a question as to the laws of Congress? I would like by some means, if possible, to get into the minds of these men who are supporting Sunday laws, the fact that the decisions of the Supreme Courts of the *States* have no bearing upon a *national* question. Let them bring a decision of a national case. There is no such case, and no such decision, for the simple reason that no such statute has ever been enacted by Congress, because it is forbidden by the Constitution. Therefore such a question has never come within the province of the United States Supreme Court. And every one of the decisions of the States, in reference to this question, have been rendered upon the basis of religion. Mr. Elliott—Rev. George—cited here to-day the decisions of the Supreme Courts of New York and Pennsylvania. I am glad he did, because both these decisions sustain the constitutionality of the Sunday laws *upon the basis of Christianity as the common law*, which clearly shows that *religion* is the basis upon which rest Sunday laws and the decisions which sustain them. All the original thirteen States were formerly the thirteen Colonies, *and every one of these Colonies had an established religion*, and therefore Sunday laws, as is proved by the old Maryland statute of 1723, cited here to-day, which is now the Sunday law of the District of Columbia. Thus the original thirteen States had Sunday laws, and this is how they got them. The younger States have followed these in Sunday legislation; and as the Supreme Courts of the original thirteen States have held such laws to be constitutional, the Supreme Courts of the younger States, from these, have held so also.

But the United States Government has no religion and never had any. It is forbidden in the Constitution. Therefore I say, We should like, if it were possible, to get these men to understand that though the Supreme Courts of the States have declared Sunday laws to be valid under the constitutions of those States, such decisions can have

no bearing whatever upon Sunday laws under the Constitution of the United States.

MR. GROUT—Will you quote that part of the Constitution to which you refer?

MR. JONES—Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or *prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*"

Congress can make no law upon the subject of religion without interfering with the free exercise thereof. Therefore the Seventh-day Adventists, while observing Saturday, would most strenuously oppose any legislation proposing to enforce the observance of that day. That would be an interference with the free exercise of our right to keep that day as the Sabbath. For we already have that right—

THE CHAIRMAN—Would this law take away your right to observe the Sabbath?

MR. JONES—Yes, sir. I was about to prove that it does interfere with the *free exercise* of our right to observe it; and having done that, I will prove that this bill does *distinctly contemplate* the taking away of the *right* to observe it.

First, as to its interference with the free exercise of our right to observe the Sab-

150

bath. I take it that no one here will deny that now, at least, we, as citizens of the United States, have the constitutional right to observe Saturday as the Sabbath, or not to observe it, as we please. This right we already have as citizens of the United States. As we already have it by the Constitution, their proposal to give it to us is only a concealed attempt to deprive us of it altogether. For if we consent to their right or their power to grant it, the power to grant carries with it the power to withhold. In consenting to the one we consent to the other. And as the granting of it is, as I shall prove, *for a purpose*, and for a *price*, the withdrawing of it will surely follow just as soon as the purpose of it is accomplished, and especially if the price of it is not fully and promptly paid.

Now this bill positively requires that whosoever does not observe Sunday shall "conscientiously believe in and observe" another day of the week. We do not keep Sunday. The bill does, therefore, distinctly require that we shall conscientiously believe in and observe another day. We maintain that we have the constitutional right to rest on Saturday or any other day, whether we do it conscientiously or not, or whether we conscientiously believe in it or not. Haven't we? Congress has no constitutional power or right to require anybody to

"conscientiously believe in" anything, or to "conscientiously observe" anything.

But when it is required, as is proposed in this bill, who is to decide whether we conscientiously believe in it or not? Who is to decide whether the observance is conscientious or not? That has already been declared in those State Sunday laws and decisions which have been referred to here to-day as examples for you to follow. It is that the burden of proof rests upon him who makes the claim of conscience, and the proof must be such *as will satisfy the court*. Thus this bill does propose to subject to the control of courts and juries our conscientious convictions, our conscientious beliefs, and our conscientious observances. Under this law, therefore, we would no longer be free to keep the Sabbath according to the dictates of our own consciences, but could keep it only according to the dictates of the courts. Gentlemen, it is not enough to say that that would be an interference with the *free exercise* of our right to keep the Sabbath; it would be an absolute *subversion* of our right so to do.

Nor is it for ourselves only that we plead. We are not the only ones who will be affected by this law. It is not our rights of conscience only that will be subverted, but the rights of conscience of everybody—of those who keep Sunday as well as those who keep Saturday—of those who are in favor of the law as well as those of us who oppose the law. When the law requires that those who do not observe Sunday shall conscientiously believe in and observe another day, by that it is conclusively shown that it is the conscientious belief in, and observance of, Sunday itself that it required and enforced by this law. That is, the law requires that everybody shall conscientiously believe in and observe some day. But every man has the constitutional right to conscientiously believe in and observe a day or not as he please. He has just as much right not to do it as he has to do it. And the legislature invades the freedom of religious worship when it assumes the power to compel a man conscientiously or religiously to do that which he has the right to omit if he pleases. The principle is the same, whether the act compels us to do that which we wish to do, or whether it compels us to do that which we do not wish to do. The compulsory power does not exist in either case. In either case the State assumes control of the rights of conscience; and the freedom of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience is gone, and thenceforth all are required to worship according to the dictates of the State.

Therefore, in opposing this bill, and all similar measures, we are advocating the rights of conscience of all the people. We are not only pleading for our own rights to keep the Sabbath according to the dictates of our own consciences, but we are also pleading for their right to keep Sunday according to the dictates of their own consciences. We are not only pleading that we, but that they also, in conscientious beliefs and observances, may be free from the interference and dictation of the State. And in so pleading we are only asserting the doctrine of the national Constitution. In the history of the formation of the Constitution, Mr. Bancroft says that the American Constitution "withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, *the citadel of conscience*, the sanctuary of the soul." Let the American Constitution be respected.

Now to the point that this bill, through its promoters, does distinctly contemplate the taking away of the *right* to observe the Sabbath. I read from the bill the exemption that is proposed:—

This act shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday, as a day of rest.

Now why is that clause put in the bill? The intention of the law-maker is the law. If, therefore, we can find out why this was inserted, we can know what the object of it is. During the past year Mr. Crafts has advertised all over this country, from Boston to San Francisco, and back again, and has repeated it to this committee this morning, that the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists are the strongest opponents of Sunday laws that there are in this country, and that they are doing more than all others combined to destroy respect for Sunday observance. All this, and yet these are the very persons whom he proposes to exempt from the provisions of the law, which is expressly to secure the observance of Sunday!

Why, then, does he propose to exempt these? Is it out of respect for them, or a desire to help them in their good work?—Certainly not. *It is hoped by this to check their opposition until Congress is committed to the legislation.*

How do we know this?—We know it by their own words. The lady who spoke here this morning as the representative of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union—Mrs. Catlin—said in this city, "We have given them an exemption clause, and that, we think, will take the wind out of their sails." Well, if our sails were dependent upon legislative enactments, and must needs be trimmed to political breezes, such a

squall as this might take the wind out of them. But so long as they are dependent alone upon the power of God, wafted by the gentle influences of the grace of Jesus Christ, such squalls become only prospering gales to speed us on our way.

By this, gentlemen, you see just what is the object of that proposed exemption—that it is only to check our opposition, until they secure the enactment of the law, and that they may do this the easier. Then when Congress shall have been committed to the legislation, it can repeal the exemption upon demand, and then the advocates of the Sunday law will have exactly what they want. I am not talking at random here. I have the proofs of what I am saying. They expect a return for this exemption. It is not extended as a guaranteed right, but as a favor that we can have if we will only pay them their own stated price for it. As a proof of this I read again from Mr. Crafts' book, page 262:—

The tendency of legislatures and executive officers toward those who claim to keep a Saturday-Sabbath is to over-leniency rather than to over-strictness.

And in the convention held in this city Jan. 30, 31, 1890, Mr. Crafts said that this exemption is "generous to a fault," and that "if there is any fault in this bill it is its being too generous" to the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists. But I read on:—

For instance, the laws of Rhode Island allow the Seventh-day Baptists, by special exception, to carry on public industries on the first day of the week in Hopkinton, and Westerly, in each of which places they form about one-fourth of the population. This local-option method of Sabbath legislation after the fashion of Rhode Island or Louisiana, if generally adopted, would make not only each State, but the nation also, a town heap, some places having two half Sabbaths, as at Westerly, some having no Sabbath at all, as at New Orleans, to the great confusion and injury of interstate commerce and even of local industry. *Infinitely less harm* is done by the usual policy, *the only constitutional or sensible* one, to let the insignificantly small minority of less than one in a hundred, whose religious convictions require them to rest on Saturday (unless their work is of a private character such as the law allows them to do on Sunday), *suffer the loss of one day's wages* rather than have the other ninety-nine suffer by the wrecking of their Sabbath by the public business.

Why, then, do they offer this "special exception"? Why do they voluntarily do that which they themselves pronounce neither constitutional nor sensible?—It is for a purpose.

Again I read, and here is the point to which I wish especially to call the attention of the committee. It shows that they intend we shall pay for the exemption which they so over-generously offer:—

Instead of reciprocating the generosity shown toward them by the makers of Sabbath laws, these Seventh-day Christians expend a very large part of their energy in antagonizing such laws, seeking, by the free distribution of tracts and papers, to secure their repeal or neglect.

Exactly! That is the price which we are expected to pay for this generous exemption. We are to stop the distribution of tracts and papers which antagonize Sunday laws. We are to stop spending our energy in opposition to their efforts to promote Sunday observance. We are to stop telling the people that the Bible says "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and that Sunday is not the Sabbath.

But have we not the right to teach the people that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," even as the Bible says, and that only the keeping of that day is the keeping of the Sabbath according to the commandment? Have we not the right to do this? Have we not the right to tell the people that there is no scriptural authority for keeping Sunday, the first day of the week? Why, some of these gentlemen themselves say that. Mr. El-

152

liott here—Rev. George—confesses "the complete silence of the New Testament, so far as any explicit command for the Sabbath, or definite rules for its observance, are concerned." Many others speak to the same effect. Have we not as much right to tell this to the people as they have? They do not agree among themselves upon the obligations of Sabbath-keeping, nor upon the basis of Sunday laws. In every one of their conventions one speaks one way and another in another and contradictory way. Have we not as much right to disagree with them as they have to disagree with one another? Why is it, then, that they want to stop our speaking these things, unless it is that we tell the truth?

More than this, have we not the constitutional right freely to speak all this, and also freely to distribute tracts and papers in opposition to Sunday laws and Sunday sacredness? Does not the Constitution declare that "the freedom of speech, or of the press," shall not be abridged? Then when these men propose that we shall render such a return for that exemption, they do propose an invasion of the constitutional [*sic.*] guarantee of the freedom of speech and of the

press. Why, gentlemen, this question of Sunday laws is a good deal larger question than half the people ever dreamed of.

**May 17, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 20 , pp. 153, 154.**

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is Christian, Protestant, American.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is therefore uncompromisingly and everlastingly opposed to every element of the papacy from beginning to end.

HOWEVER, from a survey of all the field of the operation of the papacy, which is only political and worldly, we have found, and our readers must have seen, what an immense disadvantage it is, under which any form of opposition must be carried on which is in any way political or according to worldly methods.

TO-DAY, every conceivable political or worldly advantage is with the papacy. So entirely is this so that those very provisions of the United States Constitution, which were intended to be an everlasting barrier against any encroachment of religion upon the Government, and against any recognition of any religion by the Government,—these very provisions are now taken advantage of by the papacy to crowd herself upon the Government and to take possession of it for her own purposes.

THE Constitution of the United States declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or position of trust under the Government." The papacy takes advantage of this to get her agents into every office or position of trust that is possible, and then uses all the opportunities of that office or position to favor the papacy and to give her fuller hold upon the Government. And just as soon as any exposure of it is made she raises the cry of "persecution" and of "bringing religion into politics!" And as certainly as any opposition is attempted she denounces it as "a violation of the Constitution" by making "a religious test" a qualification for office!

AGAIN, the Constitution says that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The papacy takes advantage of this also to do whatever she pleases to crowd herself upon the Government in every possible way, knowing that she can never be interfered with because "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion!"

And when any attempt is made on the part of anybody to interfere with her schemes, she raises the cry of "violation of the Constitution," and "attacking religious liberty." Thus the very provisions of the Constitution, which were intended to protect the country and people from the domination of religion and Rome, are made the shelter under which Rome and her religion shall be made to dominate the country and people.

THIS is the grand discovery that Leo XIII. has made with reference to the Constitution of the United States. And this is one grand reason why Leo commands all Catholics in the United States to bear in one hand the Catholic Bible and in the other the Constitution of the United States as they "go forward" on their great mission to bring their "country into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness"—the Church of Rome. This is why Leo has such great love for the American Constitution—it prohibits any political or governmental interference with his mischievous and unconstitutional schemes. And professed Protestants have set the example of these encroachments of religion and the Church upon the Government, and have actually joined hands with the papacy in the accomplishment of some of them. Having thus betrayed the Government to the papacy, they have robbed themselves of all power of protest, and have greatly increased the already great advantage of the papacy.

THE secret of this great advantage that the papacy holds is that peculiar "policy" by which she can so fully and constantly "cause craft to prosper" in her hand. She is such a perfect mistress of every kind of deceitful invention that there is no kind of human working that can successfully contend with her. To attempt to oppose her by any kind of crafty method, is not only to be so far just like her, but at the last to find yourself so far outdone in craftiness as to be made ashamed that you ever tried it. To attempt opposition to her *now* by any political or governmental method, even though it be right, is to find yourself at such an immense disadvantage as to make all such effort practically useless. And what is the use of putting forth strenuous efforts when every evidence demonstrates that they are only in vain. It is only exhausting yourself for nothing.

SO we are brought again to the question, What shall be done? Shall we sit still and do nothing?—No, no. We are to be more active, and do more than ever before. How then shall it be done?—There is one way to do it, and only one. *That is* with the Word of God, the everlasting gospel. This method gives to him who employs it *every*

advantage of position and of power over the papacy and all her workings. It gives every advantage in *position*, because the papacy knows nothing of the gospel, and in contending with him who uses that method only she is all at sea. It gives every advantage in *power*, because the gospel itself is the power of God, and in contending with him who depends upon the power of God and is allied to it only, the papacy is impotent. This is the true Christian way, this is the true Protestant way, to oppose the papacy; and in this way there is no such thing as defeat or failure; for what seems to be failure is victory, and what appears to be defeat is triumph. This has been clearly and abundantly proved in history. This is true of the time of Luther and the rise of Protestantism. So long as Protestants held faithfully to the gospel alone and depended only upon its power, the papacy which then possessed all the power of Europe, was powerless before them. Martin Luther, the chief and leader of the opposition to the papacy in that day, was personally attacked with all the power, cunning, and craft, of the papacy; by the published decree of the emperor in behalf of "holy church," he was outlawed in all Europe, and everybody was commanded, under penalty of treason, to take him and deliver him up, and receive the

154

reward due to so good a work. Yet for all this the papacy was unable ever to lay a hand on him or do him harm, and he died at last peaceably and in his bed an everlasting victor over all the power of the papacy; and, living and dying, a proof to all the world of what a man can do in opposition to the papacy who depends upon the gospel alone and allied to the power of God only. And so long as Protestantism was faithful in its allegiance to the gospel and the power of God only, so long the tide of the Reformation swept irresistibly onward. But the moment this allegiance was slackened, this tide was checked; and as this allegiance has lessened the tide was reversed. And now that this allegiance of professed Protestantism has wholly ceased and papal principles and methods only are recognized or employed, the papacy once more overflows and possesses all the power of earth. But the gospel has not ceased. The Word of God is not bound. The power of God is not slack toward those who believe. The everlasting gospel abides, and is to be preached with the attendance of the power of God in such measure as the world has never seen, and which is to accomplish indeed what

Luther longed to see—the complete overthrow and engulfing of the papacy and all her abominations.

THIS is the way, and the only way, of assured and complete success in opposing the papacy to-day. This is the way that the AMERICAN SENTINEL takes and which it is going to follow to the end. This is the way of true Christianity. This is the way of true Protestantism, and we want everybody to go this way. Come with us, and we will do thee good, for God has promised victory over the beast and over his image, and a song of triumph to all who take this way.

A. T. J.

**"The Breckinridge-Morse District Sunday Bill" *American Sentinel* 9, 20 , pp. 157, 158.**

[At the hearing on the Breckinridge Sunday bill for the District of Columbia, held before the House Committee on the District, Jan. 6, 1891, Alonzo T. Jones, editor of this paper, addressed the committee. Much of his address is just as applicable to the Morse bill, which is now before the Commissioners and the District Committees. The following is taken from what was there said before the committee by Mr. Jones.]

THE intent of the makers and promoters of this bill is to subvert the constitutional rights of the people. The intent of the law-maker is the law. As, therefore, *by their own words*, the intent of this exemption clause is to stop all effort to teach or to persuade people to keep the Sabbath instead of Sunday; as the intent of the body of the bill is to compel all to keep Sunday who do not keep the Sabbath; and as the intent of both together is to "scoop all in" and "make sure work," it follows inevitably, and my proposition is demonstrated [*sic.*], that the promoters of this legislation do distinctly contemplate the taking away of the right to observe the Sabbath in this nation, and to allow the keeping of Sunday only.

There is another consideration in this which shows that the State will be compelled to take official and judicial cognizance of the conscientious beliefs and observances of the people. It is this: When a law is enacted compelling everybody to refrain from all labor or business on Sunday, excepting those who conscientiously believe in and observe another day, then there will be scores of men who know that in their business—saloons, for instance—they can make more money by keeping their places of business open on Sunday than on

another day, because more men are idle that day. They will therefore profess to observe another day and run their business on Sunday. This is not simply a theory, it is a fact proved by actual examples. One of the very latest I will mention. I have here a clipping from the *Southern Sentinel*, Dallas, Texas, February 4, 1890, which I read:—

Right here in Dallas we have an example of how the law can be evaded. Parties have leased the billiard hall of the new McLeod Hotel, and have stipulated in their lease that they are conscientious observers of the seventh day [though to the best of the common knowledge and belief they are not]; that, in consequence, their business house will be closed on Saturday, and will open on Sunday.

MR. GROUT.—If they are known to be conscientious worshipers, and keepers of the seventh-day Sabbath, what defense would they have?

MR. JONES.—The defense would still be a claim of "conscientious belief in, and observance of, another day." The claim indeed might not be sincere. And if there were any question of it in the community, it would certainly be disputed, and the court would be called upon to decide. Thus you see that by this bill the United States courts will be driven to the contemplation of conscientious conviction and compelled to decide upon the sincerity of conscientious beliefs and observances. And thereby it is proved that the introduction and advocacy of this bill is an endeavor to commit Congress and the Government of the United States to the supervision of the conscientious convictions of the people.

Now, gentlemen, to prevent this was the very purpose of the First Amendment to the Constitution. It is well known, as I have stated, that the colonies which formed the original thirteen States had each one an established religion. When it was proposed to organize a Federal Government, the strongest influence that had to be met and overcome was jealousy of a national power—a fear that a national power would override the powers and interfere with the domestic affairs of the States. It was this that caused the adoption of the First Amendment to the Constitution. Their affairs of religion and the exercise thereof being the dearest of all, are first assured protection. Fearing that the national Government might enact laws which would restrict or prohibit the free exercise of the religion of any of the people of any of the States; or that it might adopt or indorse some one of the religious establishments of the States, and thus form an alliance which might annihilate both political and religious individuality; that

the political individuality of the States and the religious individuality of the people might be free; for themselves and their posterity the people declared that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

It is not to be inquired whether there was any danger of that which they feared, they feared it and that is enough. And because they feared it, because they were so jealous—rightly jealous too—of their religious rights and conscientious convictions, they guarded these, as they intended and supposed, *forever*, from any supervision or cognizance whatever on the part of the national Government. And upon this I quote now more fully the words of Bancroft, to which I merely referred a little while ago:—

Vindicating *the right of individuality* even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power: *but the American Constitution*, in harmony with the people of the several States, *withheld from the Federal Government* the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and, *not from indifference*, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power.—*History of the Formation of the Constitution, Book V, chapter 1.*

Thus, says the historian, there is by the Constitution "perfect individuality extended to conscience." This individuality, these rights, are as dear to us and as sacred as they were to the fathers of our nation, yet no more so to us than to other people. Therefore, gentlemen of the committee and the representatives of the people, by your respect for the Constitution and your oath to support it, and in behalf of the sacred rights of all the people, we implore you to give no heed to any demand

158

for legislation, which in any way, to the least degree, proposes to touch the conscientious beliefs or observances of a solitary individual in all the land; give no heed to this bill, which, in its very terms, proposes to commit Congress to the supervision of conscientious beliefs, and proposes to drive the national power into a field where the makers of the national power forbade it to go, and to compel it to assume jurisdiction of questions which they have forbidden it even to consider.

Now as to the petition—that petition shows what this bill means. Both this bill and the Senate bill, "which includes this," were framed

and introduced upon this petition. If we know what the petition asks for, we shall know also what the bills are intended to give. Here is the petition—I read the one for the national law, "which includes this:"—

*To the House of Representatives of the United States—*

The undersigned organizations and adult residents (21 years of age or more) of the United States hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding in the United States mail and military service, and in interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, *except works of religion.*

That is the petition which they are circulating. That is the petition which they present to you. That is the petition upon which these bills were framed. They ask you to stop everything on Sunday—"all Sunday traffic and work," all "work, labor, or business," "*except works of religion.*" And yet they have the face to plead before the public, and in the presence of this committee, that this question "has nothing to do with religion." Nothing to do with religion when it prohibits everything "except works of religion"? If this is not a religious petition, why do they "except" only "works of religion"?

Except works of religion, and works of *real* necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who *religiously and regularly* observe another day of the week by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.

Of traffic, work, labor, or business, the exception is works of *religion*; of the people, the exception is only of those who *religiously* and regularly observe another day. Those who are to observe the day named must be religious that day; those who do not observe the day named must be religious, and regularly so, some other day of the week. Now, gentlemen, these bills were framed upon this petition. The intention of the petition is the intention of the bills. Therefore it is plain as the day that the object of both this bill and the Senate bill is the enforced conscientious belief in, and religious observance of, a rest-day.

The question then which would inevitable [*sic.*] arise upon this is, What religion is it whose works of religion only shall be excepted? That question would have to be answered. It would have to be answered by the United States courts or by Congress. But whenever, or by whichever, it shall be answered, when it is answered, *that moment you have an established religion—a union of Church and State.* You cannot go back if you take the first step. The last step is in

the first one, and we beg of you, gentlemen of the committed, and of these men themselves, for their own sakes as well as ours, *do not take the first step.*

We all know that the most wickedly cruel and most mercilessly inconsiderate of all governments is that in which the ecclesiastics control the civil power. And how are you going to escape it under such laws as here proposed? Who is to enforce these Sunday laws? Who, indeed, but those who are working for them? Certainly those who are opposed to them, or indifferent about them, will not enforce them. Who then are they who are working for the enactment of these laws? Who organize the conventions and count out the opposite votes? Who appeared here before your committee to argue in favor of it? Who, indeed, but the Church managers? for you saw how summarily the Knights of Labor part of the delegation was squelched.

Well, then, if it is the Church which secures the enactment of the law, it will be the Church that will have to see to the enforcement of the law. In order to do this she will have to have police and courts which will do her bidding. This is her great difficulty now. There is now no lack of Sunday laws, either in the States or the Territories, but the laws are not enforced. In order to get executives and police and courts who will enforce the law to her satisfaction, the Church will have to elect them. Then, as said Mr. Crafts in this city the other day, they will form "Law and Order Leagues to enforce" the Sunday laws. Here then is the system: The Church combines to get the law enacted; the Church secures the election of officers who will do her bidding; the Church forms "Law and Order Leagues" to make sure that the officers do her bidding and enforce the law. Where, then, will the State appear, but in the subordinate position to formulate and execute the will of the Church? Then you have the Church above the State, the ecclesiastical superior to the civil power. This is just what is in this national Sunday-law movement; and this is what will certainly come out of it. It is inherent there.

But when George III. undertook to make the military superior to the civil power, our liberty-loving fathers declared it tyranny and avowed such things should not be in this land. And now when a movement reaches the national capitol which bears in itself an attempt to make the *ecclesiastical* superior to the civil power, it is time for the America people to declare that this is tyranny also, and resolve that no such thing shall be in this land. That attempt one hundred and fourteen years ago grew out of the "divine right of kings" to govern, and the

doctrine that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This attempt now grows out of the divine right of *the ecclesiastics* to govern, and likewise that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The president of the American Sabbath Union, which is the originator of this national Sunday-law scheme, has definitely declared in so many words that "governments do not derive, their just powers from the consent of the governed;" and one of the secretaries of an auxiliary union has as definitely stated that "this movement is an effort to change that feature of our fundamental law."

Gentlemen, when such doctrines as these are openly avowed, and when such an attempt as this is made by those who avow them, to embody them in national law, it is time for all the people to declare, as the Seventh-day Adventists decidedly do, that this nation *is, and of right ought to be*, FREE AND INDEPENDENT OF ALL ECCLESIASTICAL OR RELIGIOUS CONNECTION, INTERFERENCE, OR CONTROL.

**May 24, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 21 , pp. 161, 162.**

"HOW shall a man be just with God?"

THIS has been the great inquiry of men ever since the days of the man of Uz, and long before.

IN fact this has been the great inquiry of all men in all ages; it is the great inquiry still; and is yet to be a far more absorbing topic than it is now.

AT each of the three great religious epochs of the world's history—the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage; the Apostolic Age; and the Era of the Reformation—this has been the one great question at issue; and in our day it is again to be the great question at issue in the great controversy which is to be the culmination of all questions and of all earthly ages.

"HOW shall a man be just with God?" is an always has been the one single question at issue between Christianity and the papacy. And, as we have abundantly shown in these columns that it is now the avowed aim of the papacy to dominate this nation, and even "all mankind," and "all mankind" *through* this nation, it is evident that this nation is the pivot of the aim of the papacy. "The saviour from the

Vatican" is now proposed as the saviour of this nation and of all the others. And as Christianity is ever uncompromisingly opposed to the papacy; and as the one great question that is ever at issue between Christianity and the papacy is "How shall a man be just with God?" it follows plainly enough that in our day this is to be the great question, not only in this nation, but in all the world.

HOW then are men made righteous—justified, saved from sin—according to the way of the papacy?—It is by penance. Proof?—Here is it: "*Penance*, by which the sins that we commit after baptism are forgiven." The sacrament of penance, in which the forgiveness of sins is granted to the penitent."—*Catholic Belief*, pp. 80, 366. One of these says that penance is the means by which the sins that we commit "*after baptism*" are forgiven. It is, therefore, important to know when, according to that system, baptism is to be administered; and by this to know how many sins can be committed *before* baptism. Here is the authoritative statement on that point:—

From what has been said, you may well judge how reprehensible is the conduct of Catholic parents who neglect to have their children baptized at *the earliest possible moment*, thereby risking their own souls, as well as the souls of their innocent offspring."—*Faith of our Fathers*, p. 313.

Well then, as baptism is to be administered to the child at the earliest possible moment, it were literally impossible for such person ever to commit any sins except after his baptism. And as penance is the means of obtaining the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism, it follows plumply, and as plainly as that two and two make four, that, according to the papacy, penance is the way of forgiveness of all sin, is the way of justification, of salvation. There is no escaping this conclusion from these premises. And indeed the papacy has no desire to escape this conclusion, for this is her specific doctrine. In his discussion of "The Sacrament of Penance," in his book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," which was written for the enlightenment of his "separated brethren," Cardinal Gibbons deals altogether with "forgiveness of sins" and "justification." This in itself is conclusive evidence that, in the papal system, penance and forgiveness of sins, are one and the same thing. This is "the remedy for sin" and "the means for the justification of the sinner."

PENANCE being the means of justification, the way of salvation from sin, what then is penance? Here is the authoritative answer:—

In the case of those who have fallen into mortal sin after baptism, when the guilt of such sin and the everlasting punishment

due to it are forgiven, there still very often remains a *debt of temporal punishment*, to be paid by the sinner. This *debt* remains, not from any imperfection in the power of absolution in the sacrament of penance, nor from any want of efficacy in the atonement of Jesus Christ; but because by God's will, chastisement for past sins helps us to compensate for the imperfection in our repentance, and serves as a correction.—*Catholic Belief*, p. 191.

Now when the guilt of the sin, and the everlasting punishment due to it, are both forgiven and so have passed from the sinner, and yet he is not saved until a debt of temporal punishment has been paid by himself; then upon what does his salvation turn? and who is his saviour?—Plainly his salvation turns altogether upon the punishment; and as this debt of punishment is to be paid by the sinner himself, it just as certainly follows that the sinner is his own saviour. And thus penance, punishment, is the papal way of salvation. Nor is this all—but the Lord himself is made responsible for it, so that it is literally set forth as the divine way of salvation and the divine means of justification. For it is plainly said that this debt of punishment, to be paid by the guiltless sinner remains "because *by God's will* chastisement for past sins helps us to compensate [to pay for] the imperfection in our repentance, and serves as a correction." As the Lord forgives both the guilt and the everlasting punishment of the sin, and yet by his own will has fixed it that the sinner must still pay a debt of punishment in order to be justified and saved, then it is certain that, according to the papal system, God has made punishment, which is penance, the means of justification and the way of salvation.

AND indeed this is also further stated by this same authority, as follows:—

From this we see that . . . He has not dispensed us from doing with the help of his grace what we can to punish ourselves for the offences and outrages we have offered to God. Good sense tells us that this is both right and just.—*ib.*, p. 192.

Everybody who will think on the subject can easily enough see that instead of its being good sense, it is an utter lack of every element of sound sense that tells a man that it is in any sense either right or just that he should punish himself to save himself from himself. Yet as punishment is the only way of salvation known to the papacy, and as sin is its own saviour, even this thing of a man's punishing himself to save himself from himself is logical enough. And so essentially is punishment—penance—the papal way of salvation that even the dying thief, whom the Lord Jesus himself pardoned on the

cross, is made to do penance. Here are the words:—

The pardon granted to the penitent thief in the saving words: "Amen, I say to thee, this day thou shalt be with me in Paradise" (St. Luke 23:43), can not be taken as proof that we are dispensed by God from doing works of penance. *That was a wonderful and special grace granted under extraordinary circumstances, namely, when the blood of redemption was actually being shed upon the cross; moreover, the dying thief, besides bearing testimony to the divinity of Jesus Christ, confessed his guilt, and, in the spirit of penance, suffered the torment of his crucifixion, and the cruel breaking of his limbs, as penalties justly due to his sins.—lb., p. 193.*

ALL this doctrine that men must punish themselves to save themselves springs from the utterly false, even heathenish, idea that God is harsh, stern, forbidding, and exacting, instead of gentle, loving, winning, and merciful. It looks upon him as so ill-tempered and stern that he has to be "moved" by men's doings so well that they get him into a good humor, and by punishment making themselves such pitiable objects that he can finally be persuaded by the pope, or somebody else, to yield and "save" them. And here is that thought authoritatively expressed:—

We stand in continual need of actual graces to perform good acts, both before and after being justified. . . . The good acts, however, done by the help of grace *before justification*, are not, *strictly speaking*, meritorious, but serve to *smooth the way* to justification, to move God.—*lb., pp. 76, 77.*

Thus by her own showing, the god of the papacy is of such a disposition and character that it is necessary for *men*, wicked men, to do "good acts" in order to move him; and then, after they have thus moved him, it is still essential that they shall pay "a debt of temporal punishment," in order to induce him to allow them the justification which they have so hardly earned. To such a god as that it is no wonder that the Inquisition is a pleasing tribute.

BUT such is not the God of the Bible. Such is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such is not his way of justifying men. Such is not his way of salvation. Here is his own announcement of his name, which is simply the proclamation of his character and his disposition toward all mankind: "I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee. . . . And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed: The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in

goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." This is the true God.

"Merciful"—full of the disposition to treat people better than they deserve. Mercy is not to treat people as they deserve. It is not merely to treat people better than they deserve, in an outward way. It is not to wait till one is "moved" by good deeds and punishments to grant what has been thus already earned. No, no. It is the *disposition*, the very heart's core of the being, to treat all persons better than they deserve. This is the Lord, the true God. "He doth not afflict from the heart, nor grieve the children of men." Lam. 3:33, margin. "He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust." Ps. 103:10-14. His mercy is great above the greatness of the heavens. Ps. 118:4.

"Gracious"—extending favor. And that without measure; for it is written: "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Eph. 4:7. And the measure of the gift of Christ is but the measure of "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." And this is the measure of the full and free favor that God has extended to every soul on this earth, just where he is, and just as he is. And this boundless grace to every one, brings salvation to every one in the same measure as is given the grace, which is the measure of the gift of Christ. For again it is written: "The grace of God *which bringeth salvation*, hath appeared to all men." Titus 2:11. As the grace, the favor, of God is full and free to every one; and as this grace brings salvation; so the salvation of God is a full and free gift to every one. Though it is freely given, he will compel no one to take it. As it is freely given, it must be freely received. And the receiving of the free gift of God is the exercise of the faith which he has also freely given to every man. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, *it is the gift of God.*" Eph. 2:8. "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed." Rom. 4:16.

THIS is God's way of justification: by grace, through faith; and of faith, that it might be by grace. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus whom God hath set

forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare *his righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past, through *the forbearance* of God." Rom. 3:24, 25. Justification is the free gift of God through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, who is altogether the free gift of God. For "as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon *all men to justification* of life." Rom. 5:18. And the receiving of this gift of justification, this gift of righteousness, as the free gift of God which it is, this is the exercise of the faith which God has given. And this is justification, this is righteousness, *by faith*. "Even the righteousness *of God* which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference." Rom 3:22. The faith being the gift of God, the righteousness which it brings and which it wrought by it is the righteousness of God. And this is righteousness, justification, *by faith alone*, of which by her own boast the Catholic Church knows nothing; and in so boasting advertises her utter lack of Christianity.

TRUE, men are to repent, and they will repent when they find God as he is in truth, as he is revealed in Jesus Christ. For "it is the goodness of God" that leads men to repentance; and repentance itself is the gift of God. Rom. 2:4; Acts 5:31. True repentance being the gift of God, is perfect in itself, and needs no punishing of ourselves to compensate for the imperfection in it. But when the repentance is of ourselves, it has no merit that can bring to us any good, and all the punishment of ourselves that could ever be inflicted by ourselves or in ten thousand purgatories never could compensate for the imperfection of it. For it is simply impossible for any man to save himself by punishment or in any other way.

THE salvation, the justification, offered to mankind by Christianity, is altogether of God by faith. The salvation, the justification, offered to mankind by the papacy, is altogether of self by penance. The salvation offered by Christianity saves to the uttermost all who will receive it. The salvation offered by the papacy brings to utter destruction all who follow after it. And yet the professed Protestantism of to-day recognizes "Christianity" in the papacy! Than this, nothing could possibly show more plainly how completely apostate such Protestantism is, not only from true Protestantism, but also from true Christianity.

A. T. J.

**May 31, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 22 , pp. 169-171.**

"WHATSOEVER is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23.

FAITH is of God and not of ourselves (Eph. 2:8); therefore whatsoever is not of God is sin.

WHATSOEVER is of God is righteousness: faith is the gift of God: and whatsoever is of faith is therefore righteousness, as certainly as that "whatsoever is *not* of faith is sin."

JESUS CHRIST is the Author and Finisher of faith (Heb. 12:2), and the Word of God is the channel through which it comes and the means by which it operates. For "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10:17. Where there is no word of God there can be no faith.

THE word of God is the most substantial and most powerful thing in the universe. It is the means by which all things were produced. It carries in itself creative power. For "by the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." "For he spake and it was; he commanded and it stood fast." Ps. 33:6, 9. And when this world was thus made, and darkness covered all the face thereof "God said, Let there be light: And there was light."

THUS the word of God is self-fulfilling, and of itself accomplishes the will of God in every one who receives it as it is in truth the word of God. "When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it *not* as the word of *men*, but as it is in truth *the word of God*, which *effectually worketh* also in you that believe." 1 Thess. 2:13. Thus to receive the word of God; to yield the heart to it that thus it may work in the life; this is genuine belief, this is true faith. This is the faith by which men can be justified, made righteous indeed. For by it the very will of God, as expressed in his own word, is accomplished in the life by the creative word of him who has spoken. This is the work of faith. This is the righteousness—the right doing—of God which is by faith. Thus "It is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Thus the character, the righteousness, of God is manifested in the life, delivering from the power of sin, to the saving of the soul in righteousness.

THIS is justification by faith alone. This is justification by faith, without works. For the faith being the gift of God, coming by the word of God, and itself working in man the works of God, needs none of

the work of sinful man to make it good and acceptable to God. The faith itself works in man that which is good, and is sufficient of itself to fill all the life with the goodness of God, and needs not the imperfect effort of sinful man to make it meritorious. This faith gives to man good works, instead of being itself dependent upon man for "good works." It is not expressed by "faith *and* works;" but by "faith *which* works," "for in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but *faith which worketh* by love." Gal. 5:6. "Seest thou how *faith wrought?*" Jas. 3:22. "Remembering without ceasing, you work *of faith*;" "and the work *of faith* with power." 1 Thess. 1:3; 2 Thess. 1:11. And, "This is the *work of God*, that ye *believe on him* whom he hath sent." John 6:29. This is "the faith of God" which Jesus exhorts us to have (Mark 11:22, margin); which was manifested in him; and which by his grace is a free gift to every soul on earth.

NOW of this faith it is the boast of the Catholic Church that she knows nothing. This is the very doctrine of faith, and of justification by faith, which produced the Reformation and made original, genuine Protestantism. And of this faith, and of the Reformation which was produced by it, the Catholic Church speaks thus:—

As in revolutions the leaders try to gain the people over by the bait of promised independence, so at the time of the so-called Reformation—which was a revolution against church authority and order in religion—it seems that it was the aim of the Reformers to decoy the people under the pretext of making them independent of the priests, in whose hands our Saviour has placed the administering the seven sacraments of pardon and of grace.

They began, therefore, by discarding five of these sacraments. . . . They then reduced, as it appears, to a matter of form, the two sacraments they professed to retain, namely, Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. To make up for this rejection, and enable each individual to prescribe for himself, and procure by himself the pardon of sins and Divine grace, independently of the priests and of the sacraments, they invented an *exclusive means, never known in the church of God, and still rejected* by all the eastern churches and *by the Roman Catholics throughout the world*. . . . They have framed a new dogma of *Justification by Faith Alone, or by Faith only*.

Luther invented, as we have said, the doctrine, and was the first to affix such a meaning to the word *faith*. . . . And from that period only there existed man who saw in the word "faith," occurring so frequently in Holy Scripture, that which has never been seen by the fathers, doctors, saints, and by the whole Church of God.—*Catholic Belief*, pp. 365, 366, 374.

These extracts are enough to show, and they declare plainly enough, that the Catholic Church does indeed know nothing of the faith which is of God, and which, because it is of God, bears in itself sufficient power and merit to justify and save the sinner who will allow it to work in him the righteousness of God. What meaning then does she affix to the word "faith"? Here it is:—

These texts, all of which refer to saving faith, prove beyond a doubt that not trust in Christ for personal salvation, but the *faith of the Creed*, . . . is the faith availing for justification.—*Ib.*, p. 370.

But who made the creed?—Men, and men only. Constantine was the chief agent in the making of the original Catholic creed, the Nicene creed. Men being the sole authors of the creed, and "faith" being "the faith of the creed," it follows at once that that faith is solely of themselves, of their own manufacture, and not the gift of God at all, and is therefore not true faith at all. For the true faith, the faith that really saves, is "not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." And as men only made the Catholic creed, and as Catholic faith is only "the faith of the creed," it is as certain as anything can be that the Catholic faith is a base counterfeit that she would pass off upon all the world, and by force too, to supplant the true faith.

IT is not enough, however, to say that

170

it is a mere human invention; it comes from lower down than that. And she herself has given us the means of tracing it to its original. Here it is:—

By *faith* is not meant a trust in Christ for personal salvation, but evidently a firm belief that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ, the Son of God, that what is related of him in the Gospel is true, and that what he taught is true.—*Ib.*, p. 369.

Now there are recorded in the Scriptures several examples of this same identical "faith" here defined. And now, as we read these examples, and have the plain word of God as to what they were who held this "faith," we can have no difficulty in knowing the real nature and origin of the Catholic faith, "the faith of the creed."

Here is one: "And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him." Luke 4:33-35.

Here is another: "And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And he straightly charged them that they should not make him known." Mark 3:11, 12.

And here is another: "And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way. And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" Matt. 8:28, 29.

And yet another: "Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth. And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, which did so. And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" Acts 19:13-15.

In these examples there is every element of the "faith" above defined and set forth as the "saving faith" of the Catholic Church. Every one of these devils showed "evidently a firm belief," and actually proclaimed it, "that Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ, the Son of God"! And that legion of them that found a home with the swine and set the whole two thousand of them crazy, showed also "evidently a firm belief that what is related of him in the Gospel is true." For from the beginning of the gospel in this world it had been related of him that he should bruise the devil's head; and it was indeed related of him that he should destroy the devil. And that this legion of devils had "evidently a firm belief" that this is true is clearly shown by their terrified inquiry, "Art thou come hither to torment us *before the time?*" They thoroughly believed that this time of torment was coming, as it had been related; and what they feared now was that it was to befall them "before the time."

Not only do these examples supply every element of that which is authoritatively defined and set forth as Catholic "saving faith," showing it to be but the faith of the devils, but the Scripture plainly states that that is just the kind of faith that it is. Here are the words: "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; *the devils also believe*, and tremble." Jas. 2:19. There is the plain word of the Lord, that this "faith" that is proudly set forth as the Catholic faith is simply the faith that the devils have. And *it does not save them*. It has no

power to change their lives. They are devils still. And, moreover, Jesus forbade them to preach this "faith."

This is precisely "the faith of the creed." It is of themselves and not of God. And being only of themselves, it is impotent to bring to them any virtue to change the life; it is powerless to work in them any good. Being incapable of working, it is a faith that is dead. And those who hold it, realizing that it is lifeless and so unable to do anything for *them*, are obliged to give it the appearance of life by doing great things for *it* in the multiplication of dead works. For, works that are not of faith, that are not wrought by the faith itself, are dead works. They are worse than valueless, for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Any faith that is not able to itself to produce, to work, but works of God in him who professes it, is a dead faith. It is "the faith of the creed." It is the "faith" of the devils. It is the "faith" of the papacy. And when such "faith" is passed off for Christianity, it is the mystery of iniquity, wherever it is found. And therefore it is that the Scripture, immediately after describing this "faith" of the devils, exclaims: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" "Seest thou how *faith wrought* with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" Jas. 2:20, 22. Thus the works by which faith was made perfect, were wrought by the faith itself. When the faith is living, the works of faith appear just as certainly as when the tree is living the fruit appears in its season.

The only thing that will be accepted in the judgment is *works*. The only works that will be accept in the judgment are works of *righteousness*. And the only righteousness that will be accepted or countenanced in any way whatever in the judgment is the righteousness of *God*. And this righteousness is a free gift to men, and is wrought in man by faith alone—"even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference."

It is true that "the Church" says that "this faith," "the faith of the creed," this faith of the devils, "leads to trusting in Christ, and to all other virtues." But it is a notable fact that it has not done this for the devils. And it is just as notable and just as apparent that "this faith" has not, in all these hundreds of years, led the Catholic Church to trusting in Christ nor to any other virtues.

BUT she gives an illustration to show the difference between the faith of Christ and "the faith of the creed," and here it is:—

To show the unfairness of taking the word "*faith*," occurring in the Holy Scripture, in this new Protestant sense of trust in Christ for pardon, to the exclusion of any other dispositions or means, and not in the Catholic sense of belief in revealed truths, . . . allow me to use the following illustration: Suppose a man afflicted with a grave disease sends for a physician of repute. The physician comes and prescribes, and to inspire the patient with more confidence, tells him, "Only believe in me and you will be cured." Can we suppose that the poor sufferer, on the departure of the physician, would say: "I shall take no medicine, for the physician said: 'Only believe and you will be cured'" This way of reasoning and acting seems impossible to be adopted in regard to the cure of the body, but respecting the cure of the soul it is an unhappy matter of fact that thousands of persons fall into this sad mistake.—*Catholic Belief*, pp. 374, 375.

NOW there is not the least doubt that this statement perfectly illustrates the difference between the faith of Christ and Catholic faith, for it proceeds altogether upon the view that there is no more power or virtue in the word *of God* than there is in the word of *a man*; that the word of Christ, the heavenly Physician, has no more power to cure than has the word of an earthly physician. And that is indeed just the difference between true faith, the faith of God, and Catholic faith, "the faith of the creed"—and of the devils.

True faith finds in the Word of God, the word of the heavenly Physician, the living—creative—power of God to accomplish all that that word says. When the centurion asked Jesus to cure his sick servant, Jesus said, "I will come and heal him." But the centurion said, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." And Jesus himself decided this to be "*faith*," and even "*so great faith*" as he had not found in Israel, and then said to the centurion, "Go thy way; and *as thou hast believed*, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour." Matt. 8:5-13. A nobleman also came to Jesus beseeching him: "Sir, come down ere my child die. Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man *believed the word* that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way." And when the man neared his home "his servants met him, and told him, saying, Thy son liveth. Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. So the father knew that it was at *the same hour in which Jesus said* unto him, *Thy son liveth*; and himself believed, and his whole house." John 4:46-53.

This is faith, genuine faith. It finds in the word of God itself all sufficiency to accomplish all that the word expresses. And over and over again, in fact in all the cases recorded in the New Testament, it was believing the word spoken and thus receiving the power of that word to accomplish of itself the thing that was spoken—it was this faith that healed the sick, restored the palsied, made the impotent to talk, and *forgave the sinner*. This is believing God. This is faith.

But when the word of God is held to be as powerless as the word of a man; when the word of Jesus Christ is held to be as empty of healing virtue as is the word of a mere human physician; when the word of the living God is thus reduced to the level of the word of men, and to all intents and purposes is received as the word of men, and the words of men themselves, formulated into a creed, are really put in the place of the word of God; then such belief, such faith, is only of themselves and is as powerless and as empty of saving virtue as are the men themselves. It is the same story over again, of the effort of men to save themselves by themselves from themselves. And this "faith" that is altogether from men themselves, that stands only in the words and wisdom of men, this "faith of the creed" that is

171

identical with the "faith" of the devils—this, by her own showing, by her own boast, and by her own illustration, is the faith of the Catholic Church. Very good. We accept her showing in the case. Undoubtedly it is the truth. The illustration is perfectly satisfactory.

THERE is another statement that she makes which so clearly reveals again the essential nature of the "faith" which is held, and the salvation that is offered, by the Catholic Church, that it is worth quoting. Here it is:—

We seem to hear Jesus, our heavenly Physician, say: I died for all, and thereby prepared in my blood a remedy for all. If you would have the merits of my passion and death applied to you, to free your souls from sin, you must . . . believe that I am what I declare myself to be, and believe what I teach. *Do also what I have told you to do, and then you shall have the merits of my passion and death applied to you and you shall be justified.*

This is in very substance, and even in terms, the old covenant. It is identical with the covenant "from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage." Gal. 4:24. Here are the terms of the old covenant, the covenant from Sinai. "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, *if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my*

covenant, *then* ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." "And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Ex. 19:4-6, 8. Their agreement to obey his voice indeed, was an agreement to keep the ten commandments indeed. For when his voice was heard from Sinai the ten commandments alone were spoken. And of these it is written: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. So that in substance this covenant from Sinai, just as certainly as this Catholic statement, says, I have done this great thing for you. Now, if you would have the benefit of it, believe what I teach, *do also what I have told you to do*, and *then* you shall have it and you shall be justified. And the people all said they would do it, and this, too, *with the hope of being justified*. These two statements are identical in substance and in doctrine. The thought of both is that man must *do* righteousness in order to *be* righteous, instead of first *being* righteous in order to *do* righteousness.

It will not do though to say that as the Lord made the statement from Sinai, therefore this statement from Rome is truth. The Lord had a purpose in this covenant from Sinai even though it did then "gender to bondage." That covenant from Sinai corresponds to Hagar in the family of Abraham. The children of that covenant, the people who entered into it, correspond to Ishmael, the child of Hagar. As Hagar was a bondwoman, so the child that was born of her was a bondchild. And thus she gendered to bondage. As Hagar represents the covenant from Sinai, and her child was a bondchild, so the covenant from Sinai gendered to bondage and the children of that covenant were bondchildren.

Moreover, Ishmael was "born after the flesh." And as Ishmael represents the children of the covenant, so they were "after the flesh" and knew only the birth of the flesh. Knowing only the birth of the flesh, and minding only the things of the flesh, they thought themselves capable of fulfilling all the righteousness of God. The Lord knew full well that they could not do it; but they did not know it, and they would not believe that they could not do it. In order to convince them that they could not do it, and enable them to see it so plainly that they themselves would confess their inability to do it, the Lord gave them a full and fair opportunity to try. Within forty days they had

fully demonstrated their utter inability to do what the Lord had told them, and what they had freely promised to do. They were in deeper bondage than ever. They were *then* willing to have the Lord deliver them from the bondage of sin to the liberty of righteousness by his own power, through his own word, in his own promise, even as he had delivered their father Abraham. In a word, they were then willing to attain to righteousness, to be justified, *by faith*, instead of trying to obtain it by works. They were willing to be children of promise, instead of children of the flesh. Having found by this experience that "the minding of the flesh is enmity against God, and it not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," they were willing to be born again and of the Spirit of God, rather than to trust longer to the ways of the birth of the flesh. Having found that by this old and temporary covenant they were *lost*, they were willing to be saved by the new and everlasting covenant, which is this: "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." In this covenant there is no "if." It depends not upon what we shall do, but upon what God will do "unto all and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference. For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

Such was the covenant from Sinai, such was its nature, and such its purpose. And that the recording of it, with the nature and experience of those who caused it to be made and who entered into it, was necessary for future ages, is demonstrated by this repetition of it in the Catholic system of "faith." That covenant was faulty, as it rested upon the promise of the people to obey God's law without faith in Jesus Christ; but this repetition of it is infinitely faulty and altogether bad, as compared with the original example. For there, although it was their own sinfulness and self-righteousness that led to the making of it, yet through the sad experience of it God would draw them away from themselves to the knowledge of Christ. While here and in this, the Papacy takes the very revelation of the gospel of Christ itself and perverts it into the old covenant, and through this perversion draws men away from Christ to the exaltation of self. It puts the old covenant in the place of the new. It puts works in the place of faith. It puts bondage in the place of freedom. It puts

ceremonies in the place of Christ. And it puts man in the place of God.

This is the papacy, and this her doctrine of "faith." And as God said of Hagar and Ishmael in the family of Abraham, and of the covenant from Sinai and its children in the family of Israel, so he says of this same wicked thing as it would be in the family of Christianity: "Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." Gal. 4:30.

There never was a truer description of the papacy than that given in a quotation in these columns a few weeks ago, in the words that pronounced it "a method of forgetting God, which shall pass as a method of remembering him."

A. T. J.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 22 , p. 168.**

A FREETHOUGHT exchange, attempting to make a point on a note in our columns, asks: "Why should there be any mystery about righteousness?" Well, there should not be, but the fact remains that there is. There never would have been any such mystery had sin never entered the world; for God's will, which is perfect righteousness, would have been perfectly done in all created intelligences. But sin having once entered and all flesh being contaminated by sin, the mystery is the restoration of men to a condition of complete harmony with God. This change is wrought by the power of God. The apostle exhorts: "Be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God." Man's work is to desire the good; it is God's work to confer that good by the renewing of the mind, the transformation of the character, the formation of "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

**June 7, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 23 , pp. 177-179.**

ONE of the Catholic speakers at one of the celebrations in Chicago last year scouted the idea of being "saved by character instead of by dogma."

LIKE everything else in the line of Catholic teaching, this is directly the opposite of the truth; for the truth is that men are saved by character.

IT was expressly that men might be saved by character that Jesus Christ came into the world in human flesh and lived through the course of human life from infancy to manhood. And without this character which was wrought out in Christ in the flesh, no man can be saved.

BUT even though it were true that men are saved by dogma rather than by character, still it would not by any means follow that men are saved by papal dogma. For the papal dogmas are not true. For instance, it is declared to be "a dogma divinely revealed" that the pope is infallible. This dogma we shall examine upon its claimed merits later on. There is another one that we wish to examine just now, and this is the dogma of

### **"THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.**

It may be well to remark in beginning that there is a large number of Protestants as well as other non-Catholics who entertain the mistaken view that the doctrine of the immaculate conception refers to the conception of Jesus by the Virgin Mary. The truth is that it refers not to the conception of Christ by Mary, but to the conception of Mary herself by her mother. The official and "infallible" doctrine of the immaculate conception as solemnly defined as an article of faith by Pope Pius IX., speaking *ex cathedra*, on the 8th of December, 1854, is as follows:—

By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, we declare, pronounce, and define, that the doctrine which holds that the most blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a special grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved free from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and, therefore, is to be firmly and steadfastly believed by all the faithful.

Wherefore, if any shall presume, which may God avert, to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let them know, and moreover understand, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck as regards the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the church.—*Catholic Belief*, p. 214.

IN these days of the general acceptance of Catholicism as Christianity, and the compromises with the Catholic Church, and apologies for her, it is well that we should study such things as this, that we may know for ourselves what is their real effect upon the doctrine of Christ, and what their consequences in those who accept the dogma. The first consequence of it is to make the Virgin Mary, if not actually divine, then the nearest to it of any creature in the universe, and this, too, in her human nature. In proof of this we have the following statements of Catholic fathers and saints:—

The ancient writer of "De Nativitate Christi," found in St. Cyprian's works, says: Because (Mary) being "very different from the rest of mankind's human nature, but not sin, communicated itself to her."

Theodoret, a father who lived in the fifth century, says that Mary "surpassed by far the cherubim and seraphim in purity."

In the Greek liturgy of St. Chrysostom, a father of the fourth century . . . the following words are directed to be chanted by the choir during the canon of the mass: "It is truly meet that we should praise thee, O mother of God. . . . thou art the mother of our God, to be venerated in preference to the cherubim; thou art beyond comparison more glorious than the seraphim.'

"Theodore, patriarch of Jerusalem, said in the second council of Nice, that Mary 'is truly the mother of God, and virgin before and after child-birth; and she was created in a condition more sublime and glorious than that of all natures, whether intellectual or corporeal.'"—*Id. pp. 216, 217.*

These statements show that in the view of the Catholic Church and of the dogma of the immaculate conception, the nature of Mary was so "very different from the rest of mankind," but "more sublime and glorious than all natures," and "surpassed *by [so] far* the cherubim and seraphim" as to be "beyond comparison more glorious than" they, and therefore to be venerated "in preference" to them. This then puts the nature of Mary infinitely beyond any real likeness or relationship to mankind.

Having this clearly in mind, let us follow to the next step. And here it is in the words of Cardinal Gibbons:—

We affirm that the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Word of God, who, in his Divine nature is, from all eternity, begotten of the Father, consubstantial with him, was in the fullness of time again begotten, by being born of the Virgin, thus being to himself from her maternal womb, a human nature of *the same substance with hers.*

As far as the sublime mystery of the incarnation can be reflected in the natural order, the blessed virgin, under the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, by communicating to the Second Person of the unalterable Trinity, as mothers do, a true human nature *of the same substance with her own*, is thereby verily and truly his mother.—  
*Faith of Our Fathers, pp. 198, 199.*

NOW put these two things together. First, we have the nature of Mary defined as being but only "very different from the rest of mankind," but "more sublime and glorious *than all natures*," thus putting her infinitely beyond any real likeness or relationship to mankind as we really are.

Next, we have Jesus described as taking from her a human nature of the *same substance* as hers.

It therefore follows as certainly as that two and two make four, that in his human nature the Lord Jesus is "very different" from mankind, is further from us than are the cherubim and the seraphim, and is infinitely beyond any real likeness or relationship to us as we really are in this world. And in this it follows also that the dogma of the immaculate conception puts Jesus Christ infinitely beyond the reach of mankind: as far beyond our reach indeed as though he had never offered himself at all. Thus completely does the doctrine of the immaculate conception rob the world of Jesus Christ, the Saviour, to just the extent that the doctrine is received.

We know the answer that "the Church" makes to this—that Mary and Joseph especially, and all the other saints, intercede with him for those who would have his help, and that through these he is enabled to reach mankind though he himself is so far beyond us. But this is as great a fraud as is all the rest of the scheme. For the Virgin Mary and Joseph and all the rest of the saints *are dead*, and can not intercede for anybody. For the Word of

178

God says plainly that "the dead know not anything." Eccl. 9:5. And "in death there is no remembrance of thee." Ps. 6:5. And Jesus said to his disciples all, "Whither I go ye can not come." John 13:33.

Thus with Mary and Joseph and the other saints, *all dead*, and consequently unable to intercede to anybody, the fact is doubly demonstrated that the dogma of the immaculate conception puts Jesus Christ infinitely beyond the reach of mankind and robs the world of the Saviour to the extent that that dogma is received.

THE truth is, that the Lord Jesus, in his human nature, was made *lower* than the angels, and took our nature of flesh and blood just as it

is, with all its infirmities. The Scriptures are as plain as anything can be on this point, and are worthy to be set down here against this papal invention. Having found that the papacy puts Christ as *far away* from men as possible, it will be well to know how *near* to men he really is.

IN the first chapter of Hebrews, Jesus, the Son of God, is presented in his divine nature as equal with God and as God indeed, the Creator and Upholder of all things as "so much better than the angels," that he has "a more excellent name than they," and as so much higher than the angels that "all the angels of God worship him." In the second chapter of the same book, he is presented in his human nature as "lower than the angels," even as man himself. Thus it is written: "One in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou *madest him a little lower than the angels*; thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. *But we see Jesus*, who was made a little *lower than the angels*." Thus, instead of his human nature being "beyond comparison" higher than angels, cherubim, and seraphim, it was made as much lower than they as man himself was made lower.

Nor is it only as man was lower than the angels *before he sinned*. It was *not* as man was lower than the angels in his *sinless* nature, that Jesus was made lower than the angels in his human nature; but as man was lower than the angels in his *sinful* nature, as he is since he by sin became subject to suffering and death. For so it is written: "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for *the suffering of death*. . . . *that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man*. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect *through sufferings*." Thus, as man in his sinless human nature was made a little lower than the angels, and then by sin stepped still lower to suffering and death; even so Jesus, that he might bring him back to the glory of God, in his love followed him down even here, partakes of his nature as it is, suffers with him, and even dies *with* him as well as *for* him in his *sinful human nature*. For "he was numbered with the transgressors"—He died as a malefactor between two malefactors. This is love. This is Jesus our

*Saviour*, for he comes to us where we are, that he may reach us and lift us up from ourselves unto God.

YET this blessed saving truth is even more plainly stated, thus: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." He, in his human nature, took the same flesh and blood that we have. All the words that could be used to make this plain and positive are here put together in a single sentence. See: The children are partakers of flesh and blood. Because of this *he* took part of the same. But that is not all: He *also* took part of the same flesh and blood as the children have. Nor is this all: He also *himself* took part of the same flesh and blood as we. Nor yet is this all: He also himself *likewise* took part of the same flesh and blood as man. Thus the Spirit of inspiration so much desires that this truth shall be made plain and emphatic that he is not content to use any fewer than all the words that could be used in the telling of it. And therefore it is declared that just as, and just as certainly as, the children of men are partakers of flesh and blood, *he also, himself, likewise*, took part of the same flesh and blood as we have in the bondage of sin and the fear of death. For he took this same flesh and blood that we have, in order "that through death he might deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

Therefore, instead of its being true that Jesus in his human nature is so far away from men, as they really are, that he has no real likeness nor relationship to us, it is true that he is in very deed our kin in flesh and blood relation—even our Brother in blood relationship. For it is written: "Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is *not ashamed to call them brethren*, saying, I will declare they name unto my brethren." This great truth of the blood-relationship between our Redeemer and ourselves is clearly taught also in the gospel in Leviticus. There was the law of redemption of men and their inheritance. When any one of the children of Israel had lost his inheritance, or himself had been brought into bondage, there was redemption provided. If he were able of himself to redeem himself or his inheritance, he could do it. But if he were not able of himself to redeem, then the right of redemption fell to his nearest of kin in blood-relationship. It fell not merely to *one* who was *near* of kin among his brethren, but to *the* one who was *nearest* of kin who was able. Lev. 25:24-28, 47-49; Ruth 2:20; 3:12, 13; 4:1-12.

Thus there has been taught through these ages the very truth which we have found taught here in the second chapter of Hebrews: the truth that man has lost his inheritance and is himself also in bondage. And as he himself can not redeem himself nor his inheritance, the right of redemption falls to the nearest of kin who is able. And Jesus Christ is the only one in all the universe who is able. He must also be, not only *near* of kin, but the *nearest* of kin; and the nearest of kin by blood-relationship. And therefore he took our very flesh and blood, and so became our nearest of kin. And so also, instead of being farther away from us than are the angels and cherubim and seraphim, he is the very nearest to us of all persons in the universe.

He is so near to us that he is actually one with us. For so it is written: "Both he which sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are *all of one*." And he and we being one, he being one with mankind, it is impossible to have a mediator between him and men, because he and mankind are one and "a mediator is not a mediator of one." Gal. 3:20. And as certainly as Jesus Christ is one with mankind and "a mediator is not a mediator of one," so certainly this truth at once annihilates the "intercessions" of all the Catholic saints in the calendar even though they were all alive and in heaven instead of being all dead.

BUT the Scripture does not stop even yet with the statement of this all-important truth. It says further: "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Heb. 4:15. Being made in his human nature, in all things like us we are, he could be, and was, tempted in all points like as we are.

As in his human nature he is one with us, and as "himself took our infirmities" (Matt. 8:17), so he could be "touched with the *feeling* of our infirmities." He felt just as we feel and knows all about it, and so can help and save to the uttermost all who will receive him. As in his flesh, and as in himself in the flesh, he was as weak as we are, and of himself could "do nothing" (John 5:31), when he "bore our griefs

and carried our sorrows" (Isa. 53:4), and was tempted as we are, feeling as we feel, by his divine faith he conquered all by the power of God which that faith brought to him and which in our flesh he has brought to us.

And thus "what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the *likeness of sinful* flesh." did. The law could not bring us to God nor could it find in the flesh the righteousness which it must have, because the flesh had fallen away from God and could not reach him again. But though the sinful flesh could not reach God, yet God in his eternal power and infinite mercy could reach sinful flesh. And so "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us full of grace and truth." "God was manifest in the flesh," even "sinful flesh, and for sin 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." Rom. 8:3, 4.

Oh! His name is called Immanuel, which is "God with us"! Not God with *him* only, but God with *us*. God was with *him* in eternity, and could have been with him even though he had not given himself for us. But man through sin became without God, and God wanted to be again with us. Therefore Jesus became us, that God with him might be God with *us*. And that is his name because that is what he is.

179

Therefore and finally, as certainly as in his human nature, Jesus Christ is one with us, and as certainly as God with him is God with us, so certainly the nature of the Virgin Mary was just like that of all the rest of us, and so certainly the dogma of the immaculate conception is an absolute fraud.

**"A Defect in the Constitution" *American Sentinel* 9, 23 , p. 179.**

UNDER this heading, a writer in a western paper proposes to secure religious liberty to every citizen of the United States by a constitutional amendment "clothing Congress with power to protect the citizens of the various States from religious persecution under the form of State laws." There is very much in the article in question that might be criticised, but for the present only one or two points will be noticed.

The article referred to is an attempted defense of religious liberty, else it would not occasion remark. But coming as it does from one, who is beyond doubt a friend of liberty of conscience, the article demands attention.

The first proposition calculated to startle the thoughtful advocate of religious liberty is this:—

In the exercise of such rights [rights of conscience], there must of necessity be some limitations. . . . The rule, therefore, seems to be that no man has the right, or should have the power, to violate in the name of religious conscience those great fundamental principles of morality which mankind intuitively understand to be so manifestly correct that they need no demonstration.

It is to be presumed that the writer of the foregoing uses "morality" in the popular sense of the duties of man to man. But even in that sense his statement is objectionable. There must *not* of necessity be limitations in the exercise of the *rights* of conscience. Not that every man, or that any man, should be permitted to do whatever his conscience tells him is right to do; but simply because that which infringes in any way the equal right of another is not a *right*. There is a difference between conscience and the rights of conscience. No man can have any right, either of conscience or otherwise, to infringe the rights of others. *Rights* never cross, never conflict; but conscientious convictions often do.

But the article in question contains something far more startling than this to which reference has been made. The same writer says in the same article: "As stated above, a man should be protected in the enjoyment of his religious convictions, so long as he is not guilty of practicing immorality or other *wrong*." Now this certainly covers all the ground possible. No matter how restricted the definition given to immorality, the expression "other wrong" covers all the ground not covered by the former, and leaves a man the liberty (?) to do anything that does not offend either God or man; and that in the opinion of his fellow-men; for he is to be protected in the enjoyment of his religious convictions only so long as he is not guilty of practicing immorality—that is, if our supposition as to the sense in which the word is used be correct, wrong to man—or other wrong, which must, in this case, be sin against God. The only question that remains is, Is a certain course of action wrong? does it offend either God or man? If so it can be forbidden, according to the logic of the writer referred to. The most ardent National Reformer or bigoted papist never claimed more than this.

Civil government has nothing whatever to do with right or wrong, that is with the abstract quality of actions determined by the standard of morals; but only with *rights* and *wrongs*, that is with acts themselves in their relation to person, property, or reputation of

individuals, or to the public. Right and wrong has to do with moral obligation from the standpoint of the divine law; wrongs, with human relations. Blackstone says that wrongs may be either public or private. The latter he defines a "civil injuries immediately affecting individuals;" the former as "crimes and misdemeanors which affect the community." Murder, assault, theft, etc., are private election frauds, riot, etc., are public wrongs.

Of course the things enumerated are all immoral, and so sinful; but while the injury is done to men the sin is against God, and as such is cognizable only by the divine Judge. Primarily all sin is against God for it is his law that is violated: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. This fact is recognized in the 51st Psalm. David had committed the two greatest wrongs possible against Uriah, yet he said to the Lord: "Against thee, thee only, have I *sinned*." The civil law properly deals with wrongs against men; but never with sin against God as such. But all sin is immoral; hence, to say that "a man should be protected in the enjoyment of his religious convictions, so long as he is not guilty of practicing immorality or other *wrong* in the name of his faith," is only to say that the individual ought not to be molested unless those in authority adjudge him guilty, either of sin against God or crime against man. The writer of the article in question has made a mistake. His religious-liberty "bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it: and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it."

**June 14, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 24 , pp. 185, 186.**

BEFORE the Lord Jesus Christ went away from the world, he said to his disciples, "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you."

AMS he was about to ascend to heaven from the Mount of Olives, he said again to his disciples, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. . . and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

THE presence of Christ with his people is thus an assured fact. Nor is it only with them in an outward and separate sense, but with them in the inward and essential sense of oneness with them. He is *with* them by being *in* them. And so it is written, "I will dwell in them,

and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." 2 Cor. 6:16.

BUT his name is Immanuel, which is "God with us." "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." Therefore the presence of Christ with his people is the presence of God also. It is the presence of both the Father and the Son, for they "are one." And so he has said, "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John 14:23.

AN abode is a dwelling-place. We will come unto him, and make him our dwelling-place. "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, *with him also* that is of a contrite and humble spirit." Isa. 57:15. "My presence shall go with thee." Ex. 33:14. And as God is real, and Christ is real, so their presence is real. Their presence with the believer in Jesus is a real presence. This is the true real presence.

How, then, is this real presence manifested? Here is the answer to that question: "Strengthened with might *by his Spirit* in the inner man; *that Christ may dwell in your hearts,*" "that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. 3:16, 17, 19. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2:9. Thus it is by the Holy Spirit that Christ dwells with his people. It is by the presence of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer that the real presence of Christ is manifested to those and in those that are his. For "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. 8:9.

THIS is more fully stated in the Saviour's last talk with his disciples (John 14:16-23), before his death. He says, "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you." As he will not leave his children comfortless, he gives them the Comforter. He gives them the Comforter, because he will come to them. Consequently, it is by "the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost," that Christ dwells with his people, and that his real presence is manifested to them and in them. So he says: "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; *whom the world can not receive*, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. . . . At that day *ye shall know* that I am in my Father, and ye in me and *I in you.*" In the day that the child of God receives the Holy Spirit, he knows that Christ dwells in him; he knows the real presence of Christ with him and in him.

This Spirit of truth, the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, which brings the presence of Christ, the world can not receive, "because it *seeth* him not, neither knoweth him." And the world sees him not because it does not *believe*. Instead of *believing*, that it may *see*, the world wants to *see*, that it may *believe*. And so, because the world sees not the Spirit of God, and therefore can not receive him and can not know him. But to those who do believe, and therefore do receive him, Jesus says, "Ye know him for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." The promise of the Spirit is received "through faith," and then we know him. So that it is literally true that by *faith* we *know* God and the things of God.

FAITH is not speculation. It is not a guessing at things. It is not a taking for granted that of which there is not, and cannot be, any certainty. Faith is the means of attaining to knowledge which cannot be reached in any other way. And it is absolute knowledge too. Instead of faith being the taking at a venture things of which there is no certainty, it is that which introduces us to the very certainties of the universe itself. If the world could see God or the things of God with worldly eyes, and could know God or the things of God by worldly knowledge, this would reduce God and all the things of God to the level of this world and the things of this world. And this would be only to confirm, by the sanction of God, this world forever in its own ways as they are. But God wants to lift the world up to himself and his ways, instead of having the world bring him down to its own level to confirm its own wickedness. And in order that the world may be brought to God and his ways, it must see with other than worldly eyes and know with other than worldly knowledge. It must see with the eyes of God and know with the knowledge of God. And that it may do this, God has made to all the world the gift of faith. By faith we see that which without it cannot be seen, and by faith we know that which without it cannot be known. By faith we see him who is invisible (Heb. 11:27), and the things that are eternal (2 Cor. 4:18). By faith we know him who is the Author and Fountain of knowledge, and that which passeth knowledge. Eph. 3:19. So, while the world cannot receive the Spirit of God because it seeth him not neither knoweth him, they who are of faith can receive him. And having received him they see him, though he be invisible, and know him. To these he says, "Ye know him; for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you." And, "Ye see me." And, "I will manifest myself to him."

SUCH is the true doctrine of the real

presence of Christ with those who are his, and of his manifestation to them and in them. In one word this is the gospel. Without it there is no gospel of Christ. The Lord's own definition of the gospel is that it is Christ in believers, the hope of glory. And here it is: "Be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel which ye have heard. . . . Whereof I am made a minister . . . to fulfill the word of God; even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints; to whom God would make know what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles *which is Christ in you*, the hope of glory whom we preach." Col. 1:23-28. Christ in men the hope of glory; God manifest in the flesh; this and this alone, is the gospel of Christ. And therefore Paul tells us that "It pleased God to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen." Gal. 1:15, 16. Not revealed *to* him only, but revealed *in* him, and revealed *to* him by being revealed *in* him. He was to preach Christ in men, the hope of glory; but he could not possibly do this unless he knew Christ in himself, the hope of glory. It was not enough to preach about this—he must preach this in very fact. It was not the thing to do to preach *about* him, but to preach *him*.

So along with the twelve: they knew of him, and he had been revealed to them in an outward way; but this was not enough. He commanded them to tarry in Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high, and said, "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." He also said to them: "It is expedient for you that I go away. For if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." He had been with them now three years or more, and yet there were some of them who were not converted, and none of them really knew him for what he was. And even while he was speaking these things they did not understand him.

It was expedient for them and for us that he should go away that the Comforter might come. For one moment of the presence and the power of the Holy Spirit in the heart and upon the mind would give more of the knowledge of Christ than would ten thousand years of outward observation. They were to preach him in men the hope of glory, and to do this they must know him in themselves—not outside of themselves and with the natural observation only. And when he had

gone back to heaven and on Pentecost had shed forth the abundance of his Spirit, converting the heart and enlightening the mind, though he was so far away from them in his bodily form, yet his real presence was actually nearer, and they knew infinitely more of him and his teachings from the first day that they ever saw him than they did in all the time that they were with him as he was on the earth. Then they could preach him. Then they could preach him as he is. Then and not till then were they prepared to preach the living gospel which is the living "Christ in you the hope of glory."

THUS "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. And this treasure we have in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us. . . . Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." 2 Cor. 4:6, 7, 10. "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but *Christ liveth in me*; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. 2:19, 20.

SUCH is the Scripture doctrine, the true doctrine, of the real presence of Christ with his people and in his people. It is the presence of Christ himself in the believer by the creative power and overshadowing of the Spirit of God. This is the mystery of God. Col. 1:26, 27.

We ask the reader to study it carefully, and preserve this paper till our next issue, when we shall examine the papal doctrine of the "real presence.

**"The Commonweal of Christ" *American Sentinel* 9, 24 , pp. 186-188.**

THE religious phase of the Coxey movement is as strange and weird as the movement itself is ominous. By it the influence of fanaticism is added to the urgent demands of physical necessity; and the Coxey "soldiers" marching toward Washington in pursuit of the phantom Government Bounty, are transformed into veritable crusaders, inspired by that strongest of all motives, religious zeal.

So-called orthodoxy has for years taught that sometime a millennium of peace and plenty will come wherein every man will sit under his own vine and fig tree; and in the dire necessities of the evil times upon which we have fallen, men have conceived the idea of ushering in that age of peace by their own efforts—by war if necessary. And so we find the *Labor Advocate* saying: "Coxey's army went in peace, but if there is not relief granted soon, the next army will go with their war paint on."

Thus far only two divisions of this army have actually reached Washington; but the spirit is not dead; neither have the causes that gave rise to the movement ceased to exist. And, as before remarked, to the desperation of dire want has been added the spirit of religious fanaticism.

Speaking in the United States Senate, May 10, of the Coxey movement, a Southern senator said:—

Its divisions and corps are moving upon this Capitol from every quarter of the compass save one. From every section of this Union save that one section they are coming, and we are confronted with the marvelous spectacle of portions of the people in every section except in one turning a listening ear to the appeals of Mr. Coxey and his lieutenants. The section in which the Commonwealth Army, as it is called, has received few or no recruits is the South.

Senator Gordon's words were probably true when uttered, but they are only technically true now. There may be no divisions actually marching from the South, but the same spirit of unrest that has brought forth organized armies in the North and West is bearing a like fruit in the South; and there the religious phase is more marked than in other sections of the country. Southern blood is warm, and Southern religious zeal is ardent; and what the first Commonwealthers merely hinted at or claimed with becoming modesty, namely, a divine commission and a spiritual goal, their Southern brethren assert with a positiveness born of honest though mistaken conviction. The *Commonweal*, published at North Birmingham, Ala., in its issue of May 31, publishes the following:—

**The Alabama Army OF THE Commonwealth of Christ.**

(RESERVES)

PROCLAMATION OF PRINCIPLES.

PEACE ON EARTH, GOOD WILL TOWARD MEN, BUT DEATH TO INTEREST

ON BONDS.  
CESSATION OR REPUDIATION

STARVING IN THE MIDST OF PLENTY! ENSLAVED IN THE MIDST OF DEMOCRACY! EXERCISING EVERY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT! We are brought into a condition of DIRE DESTITUTION, DESOLATION AND DESPERATION by the PUBLIC PROSTITUTES OF PLUTOCRACY.

"We hold: that there are certain SELF-EVIDENT, (constitutional) OSSIFIED rights; among which are, life, liberty and happiness." The "Right of Pursuit" has NOT OSSIFIED. It has been "o'er well" EXERCISED. WE HAVE BEEN IN IT. The guarantee of its "inalienable" nature has been more than fulfilled; we have been utterly unable to shake it off; yea, we have been ALLOWED TO DISSIPATE in the DESOLATION of "PURSUIT," until we are DESTITUTE, DESOLATE AND DESPERATE, but not DESPONDENT, thank God; and our BURDEN BEARING BODIES are TIRED, and the conditions are hard and press heavily, but THEY are not OSSIFIED.

We hold: with all plutocracy's prostitutes, that all "constitutional rights" are for a SOOTHING DECEPTION, to make a PEACEFUL SLAVE, and with all HONOR ABLE STATESMAN, ancient and modern, that they are "CORDS which BIND the WEAK," but "COBWEBS through which the STRONG BREAK WITH IMPUNITY."

We hold: that the "inalienable" nature of all "CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS" are ADMITTED and the EFFECTIVE EXERCISE of NONE PERMITTED.

We hold: that the Constitution BINDS us to the DEAD PAST, BLINDS us to the ever LIVING PRESENT and GLORIOUS FUTURE, and SHIELDS our enemies from our RIGHTEOUS WRATH.

We hold: that, as long as God and man produces, an "overproduction," as long as the producer is entitled to what he produces, Legislators are responsible for his successful (harmless) spoliation and robbery; and as long as the Divine and human producers, produce a sufficiency, Legislators are responsible for general prosperity; and will be so held by a brave and honest people.

We hold: that "existence is perpetual subsistence," hence, that all human existence, all government, subsists by and through the producer—the man that labors.

We hold: that all Natural, monopolies naturally, belong to the people.

## **LAND**

We hold: that, the land is the God-given heritage of all the people, "Shall not be sold forever," and that His fiat is sufficient. Hence we declare, that USE and OCCUPANCY is the only Christian title, and that man's necessities cover the ground.

## **LABOR**

We hold: that, the producer owns all that he produces and that "he that defraudeth him thereof is a man of blood." "If he will not labor, neither shall he eat." We declare that the producer, now, creates ten dollars and fifty cents per day, and gets one dollar per day.

## **MONEY**

We hold: that, the same cause which produces the value of a corner lot, the aggregation of the people and their necessities, produces money, the Vehicle for the exchange of those necessities; therefore, the FIAT of a Self-governing people makes money, which is the final, the greatest expression of their Sovereignty, and the Resting Place of Freedom: Hence we declare; that, the people are entitled to a FULL supply of money, which will destroy our greatest enemy,

187

INTEREST. Interest must be destroyed, or it will destroy us.

The source, the cause and the expression; (of prosperity and peace.)

## **LAND, LABOR AND MONEY, SHALL BE FREED**

We hold: that, the only way in which the people can possess (not pursue) "happiness," is through the REFERENDUM and INITIATIVE.

We hold: that, the public prostitutes, trusted as public servants, contemning the Constitution, on the first day of May, 1894, by excluding the people from their Capitol, their National Home, the Citadel of the Nation's laws, and denying free speech, declared themselves Masters of the people and Murderers of Liberty; and as Pontius Pilate, the Chief Priests, Scribes and Elders slyly secured the condemnation and crucifixion of the Father of Freedom, so have they the lineal descendants, secured the condemnation and persecution of the Forerunners of Liberty. With liberty lying prone in her own home; with freedom destroyed and free speech suppressed; with the HALLS of liberty prostituted and the highways

patrolled; with the spawn of corruption in our offices of justice; with our respectable poor, hungry and ragged, and afraid to ask to work for bread, for fear of imprisonment; with a complaint of wages, a call to arms; with the State in the bloody hands of "BLACK belt HEROES" anxious to kill; with the Government (both State and national) a Despotism, an organic part of the great gold parasite conspiracy against human liberty; the great head of which is a Jew, the little head of which is a Drunken Hangman; with a "rifle diet" continually offered. Is it strange that you, American Sons of Freedom, to save that freedom, are getting ready to take the "diet"?

With a rotten Representative Republic, that is not and cannot be a government "Of the people, By the people and For the people;" with the Useful Masses in possession of this fact, and the knowledge, that the whole slimy scheme was hatched out of the same nest of Vipers, from which came the parasite bank scheme, and was formulated and foisted onto the people, by one Alexander Hamilton, an alien, a gold bug, a tory and a traitor, in the employ of English Parasites, the same as Judas John Sherman is an was when he engineered through the Crime of 1873, and the same as the Drunken Hangman is and was when he, with paramount patronage, forced through the crime of 1893.

### **GOD'S COMMON PEOPLE**

know that the political crime of all ages; the crime of 1787, which displaced the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union between the States, and destroyed all semblance of Self-government as contained in them in the "referendum;" and perpetrated by the Dear Democratic Party in its innocent youth, when it was young and good, was like the Sayer election law, the finest work of the sharp men of the craft; and like that was fathered by a fool who thought an Infernal Infamy an eternal honor.

With the Jew money system and the English wage slave system fastened upon us; with the "highest expression" of our Shackles forged by her; with that which should bear the impress of our Sovereignty, bearing the image of a Vulture and the initials of an Englishman who made the design to look more like a buzzard than an American eagle; when we look at these public crimes, and at the CORMORANT conditions that surround us, we are almost paralyzed by the "Eternal fitness of things."

With the "ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION IN THE HOLY PLACES," "THE TIME IS RIPE AND IT NOW HERE," WHEN YOU MUST AWAKE! AROUSE YOURSELVES!! TAKE ACTION OR TAKE SLAVERY!!!

Your "Inalienable" rights are OSSIFIED; you can look at, you can listen to plutocracy's sirens sing of them; and you can exercise—the PURSUIT of them.

Christ the incarnation of God, the Creator of liberty and Father of Freedom both celestial and civil, was crucified, beaten with Roman rods and pierced with Roman spears; Coxey and Carl, Heirs of the Spirit of Liberty and sons of the People's Forerunners of Civil freedom! have been thrown into prison, beaten with American clubs and pierced with plutocracy's lies.

Cromwell, a farmer, raised an army of "Psalm Singers," as the plutes called them then, to establish the Commonwealth of England. He called on the House of Commons and CUT OFF the head of Charles. Cromwell established the CommonWEALTH, brought "wealth" within the reach of the people of "common" birth (within the reach of all who possessed the cunning and cruelty of the wolf). Crowned "interest" (which before was a felon), which created plutocracy. Coxey, a farmer, and Carl, raised an army of "Hoboes," as the plutes call them now, to establish the CommonWEAL of Christ; they have called on the House of Congress and—will establish the COMMONWEAL—The Commongood, the Commonwelfare; DESTROY INTEREST; DEPOSE PLUTOCRACY; PREPARE THE FOOT STOOL; SET UP THE KINGDOM, AND

### **CROWN CHRISTIANITY**

If you are a good socialist you believe in the teachings, and will be a soldier in the Commonweal and a SON of Liberty. If you believe in Christ you must believe in His teachings; if you love Him you want to live in the midst of them, in manifestation not simply in mind. "Faith without works is dead." The time has come when His Kingdom is to be established.

### **THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD OF MAN**

People of Alabama, Freeman; put on your Armor, Organize yourselves! If you love your liberty; if you love your children; if you love the memory of your Sires who have always borne the brunt of battle and the ensign of freedom, STRIKE NOW before it is too late.

### **PLUTOCRACY IS ORGANIZED**

Our brothers are organizing all over the country. (By organizing you can march to the polls in companies and be sure of getting your votes counted as cast.) Alabama's name is first in the galaxy

of American Stars, and she must not be last in the Kingdom of Liberty, the COMMONWEAL OF CHRIST.

You know, we all know that interest bearing bonds have ENSLAVED US, EATEN US UP. All know that non-interest bearing bonds—"Greenbacks"—fought the civil war, vanquished the bravest and best soldiers on earth and Saved The Union. All the five million idle men and their famishing wives and children are willing to take, hungering to get, these NON-LICE bearing bonds—Greenbacks—in exchange for their labor; and this is what we are demanding through Gen. Coxe, and this is the secret of the plutes fighting to Desperation and Destruction.

We demand the creation of greenbacks. They insist upon the creation of "Graybacks." This is the issue! Are you a Greenbacker fighting for the expression of Your Sovereignty, the exercise of Self-government; or are you a "Grayback" feeding upon the body politic, Denying and Denouncing the expression of Your Sovereignty, the exercise of Self-government? The question is Greenbacks and Liberty, or Graybacks and Slavery?

## **THERE CAN BE NO SELF-GOVERNMENT WITHOUT FIAT MONEY**

Fiat money is to Self-government what the expression activity is to the soul and body. Picture to yourself a soul and body without power of expression, the power to act, and you will see the condition of a people denied the exercise of the power to CREATE and CONTROL their own currency. The "Ossified Man" is the type of our condition. Picture to yourself a body without a soul, a corpse with power to rattle its bones, and grin, and finally to stink, and you see the condition of a Republic without the Referendum and Initiative.

If gold, or gold and silver gives your money power, then gold or gold and silver is Sovereign, NOT YOU; and they who control them are your Masters. The Commonweal of Christ is the only organization demanding your Sovereignty. The People's Party has sold out to the Silver Bugs, hence we have two Gold Bug parties and one Silver Bug party.

The plutocrats and their sleuth hounds of Sodom will see you and your children starve; as they looked out of the windows of the American "Den of thieves and robbers" and saw Carl Browne and your brave brothers clubbed on the head and afterwards SENT TO JAIL IN HANDCUFFS, so they would see all the Christian Commonwealers starve to death and rot in the streets before they will pass our bills, for they would bring death to the "graybacks" and life to this living corpse of Self-government; prosperity and happiness to the people.

Gen. Coxey and Carl, and all the Commonwealers have sworn that they will besiege Washington until our bills are made laws.

You may have little faith in the power of Gen. Coxey, but you should remember that Abraham had no power of himself when he went to Sodom. He went in the Name of God, and Gen. Coxey went to the modern Sodom in the Name of God also. God told Abraham that if he could find as many as five good people in Sodom he would spare the city. He found four. The city was destroyed.

To the present time Coxey's mission has been similar to Abraham's. He went in the Name of God and found two (the woman who took Carl out of jail and the man that took Jones out). Do you believe that the modern Sodom will be saved? Does God change?

Thousands from the West are on the way to help our Brothers in Christ. Thousands more are organizing at home to be ready to help. This is what we have done, and ask you to do. Do you want your name recorded in the Commonweal of Christ? Are you going to be a helper in the resurrection and enthronement of liberty and surround your name with a halo of glory from that light on which all the eyes of God's common people are resting, and in which all their hopes are centered?

"Where the Spirit of God is there is liberty." Are you, are Southerners too weak to rock the Cradle of Liberty, too cowardly to help kill the Serpent that is STRANGLING the babe?

Must the Ark of the Covenant be given to another people? Or will you stand by, Sepulchered in Selfishness, and see your brothers of the West bear the burden and wear the Crown; or will you, like the vulture-hearted plutes, let the Vanguard starve in the streets of the city that cannot lay claim to even the virtue of hell—Good Resolutions."

### **THE STRUGGLE IS ON: THE QUESTION IS WHICH SIDE ARE YOU ON?**

It can not be foiled or sidetracked. Are you with the Chief Priest, Scribes, Pharisees and Elders, or are you with God's common people?

### **IN THE NAME OF ALMIGHTY GOD AND LIBBERTY, WE CALL UPON YOU TO ORGANIZE**

Recommend a good man whose soul is in the cause and forward his name to me and I will commission him as County Recruiting officer, with full instructions to organize you so that you can stand for your common good, or secure the counting of your ballots.

## JOHN BUNYAN WARE

*Commander-in-Chief.*

### Staff Officers

J. R. WILLIAMS, *Chief of Staff.*

W. L. METHVIN, *Adjutant-General.*

A. E. WILLIAMS, *Assistance Adjutant-General.*

W. T. WILLIAMS, *Quartermaster General.*

REV. CYCLONE DALE, *Chief of Commissary.*

J. H. BEAN, *Assistant Chief of Commissary.*

LEANDREW J. SMITH, *Colonel of Staff.*

D. A. WILLIAMS, *Colonel of Staff.*

J. W. DOWNING, *Medical Director.*

J. W. MAKENSON, *Assistant Medical Director.*

L. C. THORNLY, *Courier.*

*Birmingham, Alabama, May 23, 1894.*

That labor of all kinds has grievances nobody acquainted with the facts can deny. The creators of wealth are certainly entitled to a fair share of the product of their labor; that they do not get it is shown by statistics; but the remedy is not to be found in the direction of the march of the Commonweal. As long as human nature is as it is, "the poor shall never cease out of the land." Socialism is impracticable; anarchy would bring only more abject slavery. Man is as powerless to relieve the present distress as he is to change his own nature. Help can come alone from God; but it will not come by means of the so-called Commonweal.

In speaking of the present condition of affairs, the Spirit of God has said by the Apostle James:—

Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days. Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter. Ye have condemned and killed the just; and he doth not resist you. 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. Jas. 5:1-7.

It will be observed that a part of this statement is general, and a part specific. First, two classes are brought to view, namely, those who have heaped together treasure "in the last days" (Revised Version), and the laborers whose hire has been kept back by fraud. Then another class is introduced, namely, the just, the people of God. To them the counsel is:—

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 hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the judge standeth before the door. Take, my brethren,

188

the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience. Jas. 5:7-10.

God's people will not at this time be found engaged in any Coxey movement, nor in any appeal to force. They will heed the admonition: "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." But "God executeth judgment for the oppressed;" therefore, "strengthen ye the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not: behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense; he will come and save you. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes. And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there: And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Isa. 35:5-10.

But this will never be brought about by the so-called Commonweal. The inhumanity of labor toward labor shows that unrenewed and unregenerate human nature is not different in the poor man from what it is in the rich man; and if the wealth of the world were to-morrow given to the toiling millions, and the implements of industry were put into the hands of those who are now rich, oppression would not cease. Human nature would assert itself as it does now, and the hand of oppression would speedily be as heavy as it is to-day. The only purpose that can be served by the religious phase of the Coxey movement will be to excite religious fanaticism, cause the Coxey "soldier" to imagine himself an instrument of vengeance in God's hand, and so remove the influences of Christianity which have hitherto restrained men, and fill the land with violence in the name of Christ.

**June 21, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 25 , pp. 193-195.**

THE Christian doctrine of the real presence is "Christ in *you*."

THE Catholic theory of the real presence is "Christ in *the eucharist*."

THE Christian doctrine of the real presence is Christ in the believer by the creative power and overshadowing of the *Spirit of God*. The Catholic theory of the real presence is Christ in the eucharist by the *word of the priest*.

IN the Christian doctrine of the real presence there is an inward change or conversion of the soul of the believer himself by the power of the Holy Spirit, by which he is made a "new creature." In the Catholic theory of the real presence there is what is called an "inward change or conversion" of the bread and wine, or the wafer of the communion into the very flesh and blood of Jesus Christ by the word and at the will *of the priest*.

NOR is any of this mere captious criticism or prejudiced statement. It is all the straight truth. And that all may see that it is so, we herewith give the authoritative proof. First, as to the real presence of Christ being in the eucharist. Here is the statement:—

Among the various dogmas of the Christian church there is none which rests on stronger scriptural authority than the doctrine of the real presence of Jesus Christ in the holy eucharist. The fathers of the church, without an exception, re-echo the language of

the apostle to the Gentiles, by proclaiming the real presence of our Lord in the eucharist. . . . I have counted the names of sixty-three fathers and eminent ecclesiastical writers flourishing between the first and the sixth century, all of whom proclaim the real presence—some by explaining the mystery, others by thanking God for this inestimable gift; and others by exhorting the faithful to its worthy reception.—*Faith of Our Fathers, by Cardinal Gibbons.*

AND that it is in the eucharist instead of "in you" is shown by the following words:—

Redemption satisfied eternal justice, but it did not satisfy the Saviour's love; this still required the eucharist. The Saviour's love is a consuming passion, and his love achieved the blessed sacrament. There is not true lover but would work a miracle to attain a perfect union with the beloved. Our Saviour had the power, and he wrought the miracle of the real presence. . . . On the altar behold the infinite longing of your Saviour.—*Philip O'Neil, in Catholic Mirror, January 20, 1894.*

Every one knows that example loses much of its efficacy in passing through the medium of history, and that virtues perceived at a distance of eighteen centuries are not sufficiently eloquent to move our hearts. It was then very necessary that the divine Model of the elect should dwell in the midst of us full of grace and truth, and that he should offer to each one the living picture of the same virtues which charmed the witnesses of his mortal life and attached to him so powerfully the hearts of his disciples. This need Jesus Christ satisfies *in his eucharistic life*. Could Jesus Christ manifest more strikingly his unspeakable tenderness for sinners, and his ardent zeal for their salvation, than he does *in the adorable sacrament* in which he condemns himself to remain on the earth so long as there is one soul to save?—*Religion in Society, by Abbe Martinet, Introduction by Archbishop Hughes, of New York, p. 180, Sadlier & Co., Barclay St., N. Y.*

AND that it is at the word and will of the priest that this is all done, is shown plainly enough and strongly enough to satisfy anybody, in the following words:—

To obtain from us this abnegation of self it was not enough that the Son of God obeyed Mary and Joseph for thirty years, made himself, during his public life, the servant of all, and delivered himself, without resistance, to his executioners. For eighteen hundred years that he has reigned at the right hand of the Father, he never has ceased to give to men the example of the most universal and humiliating obedience. Every day multitudes of priests, be they fervent, lukewarm, or vicious—it is the same—summon him where it pleases them, give him to whom they will,

confine him under lock and key, and dispose of him at their will.—*Id.*,  
*p. 182.*

AND that by the words or ceremony of consecration pronounced by the priest there is what is called an "inward change or conversion" of the bread and wine, or the wafer, into the very flesh and blood of Christ, is shown in these words:—

The holy eucharist is the true body and blood of Jesus Christ under the outward appearances of bread and wine. . . . This most blessed sacrament contains *truly, really, and substantially*, though not perceptibly to our senses, nor with their natural accidents. . . . the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity; which can never be separated from his body and blood. . . . The Catholic Church teaches that before consecration, that which on the altar appears to be bread and wine, is simply bread and wine; and that after the consecration of that bread and wine, what appears to be bread and wine is no longer bread and wine, but the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Something remains, namely, the outward qualities or *species* of bread and wine, and something is changed, namely, the inward, invisible *substance* of that bread and wine, into the body and blood of Christ; this *inward change or conversion* is what is called *transubstantiation*.—*Catholic Belief, pp. 93, 95.*

HAVING found so full and so plain a statement of the Catholic theory of the "real presence," it is only proper that we should have an official and highly authoritative "argument from the New Testament," which is set forth as sustaining the theory: even an "argument" by Cardinal Gibbons. He presents "three classes of arguments" on the point, but his first one will be all-sufficient for this occasion. Here are his words:—

I shall select three classes of arguments from the New Testament which satisfactorily demonstrate the real presence of Christ in the blessed sacrament. The first of these speaks of the promise of the eucharist. . . .

To begin with the words of the promise. While Jesus was once preaching near the coast of the sea of Galilee, he was followed as usual by an immense number of persons, who were attracted to him by the miracles which he wrought, and the words of salvation which he spoke. Seeing that the people had no food, he multiplied five loaves and two fishes to such an extent as to supply the wants of five thousand men, besides women and children.

Our Lord considered the present a favorable occasion for speaking of the sacrament of his body and blood, which was to be distributed, not to a few thousands, but to millions of souls; not in one place, but everywhere; not at one time, but all days, to the end

of the world. "I am," he says to his hearers, "the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the desert and died. . . . I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread which I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world. The Jews, therefore, disputed among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said to them, Amen, amen, I say to you: Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up on the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

If you had been among the number of our Saviour's hearers on that occasion, would you not have been irresistibly led, by the noble simplicity of his words, to understand him as speaking truly of his body and blood? For his language is not susceptible of any other interpretation.

When our Saviour says to the Jews: "Your fathers did eat manna, and died. . . . but he that eateth this (eucharist) bread shall live forever," he evidently

194

wishes to affirm the superiority of the food which he would give, over the manna by which the children of Israel were nourished. . . .

But the best and most reliable interpreters of our Saviour's words are certainly the multitude, and the disciples who were listening to him.—*Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 327-330.

NOW the manifest truth is, that the multitude and the disciples *at that time*, were just as bad and as unreliable interpreters of Christ's words as are any other people who are unconverted and doubt his word, and who therefore receive heavenly things in an earthly way. For all this were *that* multitude, and the disciples *at that time*.

It is difficult to conceive how the cardinal could have made a selection that would more clearly show the utter falsity of the Catholic interpretation of this Scripture, than does this reference which he has chosen. For it would be hard to find in all the record another "multitude" that was altogether so worldly-minded and unbelieving as was this one.

These were the people who were going to take Jesus by force and make him king. And because of this he departed from them and went away alone. When darkness had come his disciples took a boat and started over the sea toward Capernaum, but they were met by a heavy wind which held them back. Then Jesus came walking on the sea, and they received him into the ship, and immediately they came to the land where they were going. The next day, many at least of

those who had been fed with the miraculous bread, crossed over the sea also and came to where he was; and knowing that he had not gone with the disciples, they asked him, "Rabbi, when camest thou hither? And Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled." This shows that their minds were earthly and their desires, even with relation to him, were altogether selfish.

This is further shown by the fact that although they themselves had seen the whole multitude fed with the five loaves and two fishes, and had themselves eaten of the miraculous bread, and were at that very time following him for more bread, yet directly in the face of all this, they had the hardness of heart to say to him, "What sign shewest thou, then, that we may see, and believe thee? What dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, he gave them bread from heaven to eat." They themselves the day before had eaten bread from heaven as certainly as had their fathers in the desert. And he who had given them the bread the day before, was the same one who had given the manna in the desert. But they did not believe in him. Then he said to them, "I am the bread of life. . . . Ye also have seen me and believe not. . . . The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, "I am the bread which came down from heaven." Having thus doubted, and murmured, and opposed him, so far, is it any wonder that, when he said, "The bread that I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world," they should murmur again and "strive among themselves ?" And, behold, these worldly-minded, selfish, unbelieving, opposing, murmuring, striving people, are the ones whom the cardinal commends as "the best and most reliable interpreters of our Saviour's words"!

And these people who understood neither the Saviour nor anything that he said, in any proper sense at all—of these the cardinal says:—

They all understood the import of his language precisely as it is explained by the Catholic Church.—*Id.*, p. 330.

We do not doubt it in the least. We believe that this is the exact truth. And as certainly as the cardinal herein tells the truth, it follows that the Catholic Church, in explaining it "precisely as" those people "all understood" it, confesses herself "precisely" as worldly-minded, as selfish, as unbelieving, and as much opposed to the Lord, as those people were.

Nor is the cardinal any more fortunate in his commendation of the disciples at that time as "the best and most reliable interpreters of our Saviour's words." For it is not only several times plainly stated in the Scriptures, but anybody who will read the four gospels can plainly see, that the disciples, as well as the multitude, did not understand the Saviour's words. They, too, were filled with the same idea as all the others, that if Jesus was the promised Messiah he was surely to set up a visible kingdom at once and give the Jews their coveted dominion over all the earth. And though the disciples never went so far as to propose to take him by force and make him king, they were most grievously disappointed when he died without making himself the king that they were expecting. The first time that Jesus spoke to them definitely and plainly of his sufferings, and death, and resurrection, Peter actually rebuked him and told him to pity himself instead of talking that way, and told him that such things would never be unto him. Here is the conversation: "From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and the chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. But he turned and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offense unto me: for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men." And though he told them this at least twice more as plainly as words could make it, and mentioned it five other times besides, making eight times at least that he told them of his rejection, and death, and resurrection, yet for all this not one of them knew a thing about what was going to befall him. And when he had actually been crucified, they knew nothing of the coming resurrection, and were hardly to be convinced of it even after it had been accomplished.

All this darkness of mind and failure to understand the import of his language was but the direct result of their consuming ambition for worldly power, and their selfish desires with reference to high places in the kingdom that they were so positive was to be then set up by the Saviour. There was among them a constant strife and dispute as to which of them was to be the greatest and have the highest place in their much coveted kingdom. So thoroughly were they imbued with this ambition, that at the last supper, almost in the presence of Gethsemane and his dying agonies, when the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was instituted—even there they continued the "strife

among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest." Luke 22:19-27. Nor did this failure to understand the things of the Lord end with the resurrection. At the very hour of his ascension, when he had promised the descent of the Holy Ghost, they interposed their long mistaken idea of the kingdom, with the inquiry: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Nor did this misunderstanding of his words end until, at Pentecost, the Spirit of God had taken full possession of them, enlightening their minds and hearts and converting their souls, and thus enabling them to see heavenly things in a heavenly, instead of an earthly, way.

Such were the disciples, and such their inability to understand the Saviour's words at the time to which the cardinal refers, when he says that they "understood the import of his language precisely as it is explained by the Catholic Church." That is, when they were unconverted, when they were so filled with worldly ambition and selfish desire for earthly power and dominion that they could not understand at all even his plainest words when they were repeated over and over. And men in such a condition as this, the cardinal declares, "understood the import of his language precisely as it is explained by the Catholic Church." There is no doubt whatever, that this is precisely the truth of this matter. And as certainly as it is the truth, so certainly does it demonstrate that the Catholic Church does not understand our Saviour's words at all. And so certainly does it demonstrate also that the Catholic Church is unconverted, and so filled with worldly ambition and selfish desire for power and earthly dominion that she is incapable of understanding the Saviour's words, as were the disciples when they were in this condition.

This much is demonstrated by the cardinal's citation and approval of the example of the multitude, and of the disciples who did *not* abandon their Master. And of those of the disciples who at that time *did* abandon the Saviour, the cardinal says, too, that their interpretation of the Saviour's words was "precisely as it is explained by the Catholic Church," and that this interpretation "led them to abandon their Master:" and that "had they interpreted his words in a figurative sense, it would not have been a hard saying, nor have led them to abandon their Master."—*Id.* 330. Now it were literally impossible for any interpretation to be right which could lead anybody to abandon Jesus Christ. And that interpretation could only be right which would lead them to abide with him. Now the cardinal admits that a figurative sense of these words would not have led them to

abandon the Master, while the interpretation which the Catholic Church gives did lead them to abandon him. Then upon the cardinal's own proposition it is certain that the figurative sense of these words is the right one.

And further, from the cardinal's own proposition, it is perfectly plain that as certainly as the literal sense of these words led them to abandon Jesus Christ, and as certainly as this is "precisely as it is explained by the Catholic Church," so certainly is this evidence that the Catholic Church has abandoned Jesus Christ, the Master.

Such is the Catholic doctrine of the real presence, and such are its inevitable results. Such also is the difference between the papal dogma of the real presence, and

195

the Christian truth of the real presence of Christ.

The Christian truth of the real presence of Christ converts the soul of the believer: the papal dogma pretends to convert the bread and wine. The Christian truth of the real presence of Christ believed, makes man subject to God in everything; the papal dogma makes God subject to man in everything. The preaching of the Christian truth of the real presence of Christ in the believer, is the revelation of the mystery of God; the preaching of the papal dogma of the real presence is the proclamation of the mystery of iniquity. The Christian truth of the real presence of Christ is the sum of the mystery of God; the papal dogma of the real presence is the sum of the mystery of iniquity.

**"The Pope as an Arbitrator" *American Sentinel* 9, 25 , p. 195.**

APROPOS of an article in these columns some weeks ago on "The Pope as International Arbitrator," is the following from the European edition of the New York *Herald*:—

ROME. May 19, 1894.—A copy of the World's Columbian Exposition Memorial for International Arbitration has been sent by Mr. W. E. Blackstone to the holy father, who is very much pleased with it, and has expressed his satisfaction at this new effort to maintain and consolidate peace among nations. The *Civilt? Cattolica* to be published to-day contains on this subject an important article by Father Brandl, one of the most talented and best known ecclesiastical writers. The article is supposed to give the Vatican ideas about arbitration. It begins by showing the exceptional importance [*sic.*] of the memorial, which was not presented to a peace Congress or to a special Parliament, but to all

the governments of the world, and was sent by the United States through their diplomatic representatives.

### **RIGHT vs MIGHT**

Then on to discuss on what basis international arbitration might be conducted, it proposes that this basis should be not merely one of utility, which is movable and variable, but of law, the moral strength of which is invariable and universal. But the law of right must replace the anarchy of principles now reigning among many people, which anarchy has to be corrected by the schools and the press. Without this there would be no unity of view and consequently no unity of will, so that any effort to bring about international arbitration would resolve itself into the simple expression of a wish.

### **HOW TO FORM THE TRIBUNAL**

One of the greatest difficulties of the whole question is to be decide in what way the supreme tribunal of arbitration should be formed. After showing that instead of nominating this tribunal on every occasion it would be better to have it sit in permanence and in a neutral land, the *Civilt? Cattolica* asks:—"But who enjoys such universal confidence as to be chosen arbitrator? Is there a man whose qualities may inspire such a confidence?"

"Yes, there is," is the answer, "he is the pope.

The *Civilt? Cattolica* then tries to prove this assertion by historical examples and by the unique position of the pontiff.

The persistency with which this idea is being kept before the world is highly significant. Indeed the whole present policy of the papacy is in line with the suggestion, and shows as clearly as possible that to attain this position of influence and power is the settle purpose of the pope, and that in this the whole hierarchy is one with him.

**June 28, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 26 , pp. 201-203.**

IN studying the errors of the papacy the question naturally arises, How came such a falling away from the truths of the gospel as taught by the Lord Jesus Christ himself and by his apostles, endued, as they were, by the Spirit of God? The answer is, It was by the self-exaltation of the creature above the Creator.

WHEN Paul was at Thessalonica, he preached to the people about the second coming of the Lord. And after he went away he wrote them a letter, in which he referred to the same subject, in these words: "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:15-17.

THE Thessalonians, forgetting the instruction they had received from the apostle personally on this subject, misinterpreted his words and concluded that the Lord was coming in their day. This coming to the apostle's knowledge, he wrote them a second letter, in which he exhorts them thus: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." 2 Thess. 2:1-8.

ALL this Paul had taught the Thessalonians when he was with them, as he reminds them in the fifth verse: "Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" Then, having recalled to their minds the fact, he simply appeals to their knowledge, and says, "And now ye know what withholdeth that he [the son of perdition] might be revealed in his time." This plainly sets forth the prophecy of a great falling away or apostasy from the truth of the gospel. The purity of the gospel of Christ would be corrupted, and its intent perverted.

THE falling away of which Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, is referred to in his counsel to the elders, or bishops, of the church at Ephesus, whom he called to meet him at Miletus. To them he said: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." Acts 20:29-31.

THIS warning was not alone to the people of Ephesus in the three years that he was there. It is seen through all his epistles. Because of this readiness of individuals to assert themselves, to get wrong views of the truth, and to speak perverse things, the churches had constantly to be checked, guided, trained, reproved, and rebuked. But it was not alone nor chiefly from these characters that the danger threatened. It was those who from among the disciples would arise *speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them*. Through error of judgment, a man might speak perverse things with no bad intention; but the ones here mentioned would speak perverse things purposely and with the intention of making disciples for themselves—to draw away disciples after them instead of to draw disciples to Christ. These would pervert the truth, and would have to pervert the truth, in order to accomplish their purpose. He who always speaks the truth as it is in Jesus, will draw disciples to Jesus, and not to himself. The draw to Christ will be his only wish. But when one seeks to draw disciples to himself, and puts himself in the place of Christ, then he must pervert the truth, and accommodate it to the wishes of those whom he hopes to make his own disciples. This is wickedness; this is apostasy.

THERE was another consideration which made the danger the more imminent. These words were spoken to the bishops. It was a company of bishops, or elders, to whom the apostle was speaking when he said: "Of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." From that order of men who were chosen to guide and to care for the Church of Christ, from those who were set to protect the church—from this order of men there would be those who would pervert their calling, their office, and the purpose of it, to build up themselves, and gather disciples to themselves in the place of Christ. To watch this spirit, to check its influence, and to guard against its workings, was the constant effort

of the apostle; and for the reason as stated to the Thessalonians, that they mystery of iniquity was already working. There were at that time elements abroad which the apostle could plainly see would develop into all that the Scriptures had announced. And scarcely were the last of the apostles dead when the evil appeared in its practical workings; and to study the growth of this apostasy is only to study the growth of the papacy, for it was the papacy in its earlier stages.

NO sooner were the apostles removed from the stage of action, no sooner was their watchful attention gone, and their

202

apostolic authority removed, than this very thing appeared of which the apostle had spoken. Certain bishops, in order to make easier the conversion of the heathen, to multiply disciples, and above all, to increase their own influence and authority, began to adopt heathen customs and forms.

WHEN the last of the apostles was dead, the first century was done; and within twenty years of that time the perversion of the truth of Christ had become widespread. In the history of this century and of this subject the record is,—

It is certain that to religious worship, both public and private, many rites were added, without necessity, and to the offense of sober and good men. <sup>26</sup>1

And the reason of this is stated to be that—

That Christians were pronounced atheists, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. For unenlightened persons are prone to estimate religion by what meets their eyes. To silence this accusation, the Christian doctors thought it necessary to introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of the people, so that they could maintain themselves really to possess all those things of which Christians were charged with being destitute, though under different forms. <sup>27</sup>2

This was at once to accommodate the Christian worship and its forms to that of the heathen, and was almost at one step to heathenize Christianity. No heathen element or form can be connected with Christianity or its worship, and Christianity remain pure.

OF all the ceremonies of the heathen, the mysteries were the most sacred and most universally practiced. Some mysteries were in honor of Bacchus, some of Cybele; but the greatest of all, those considered the most sacred of all and the most widely practiced, were the Eleusinian, so called because celebrated at Eleusis in Greece. But

whatever was the mystery that was celebrated, there was always in it as an essential part of it, the elements of abomination that characterized sun worship everywhere, because the mysteries were simply forms of the widespread and multiform worship of the sun. Among the first of the perversions of the Christian worship was to give to its forms the title and air of the mysteries. For, says Mosheim:—

Among the Greeks and the people of the East, nothing was held more sacred than what was called the mysteries. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say that they also had similar mysteries, or certainly holy rites concealed from the vulgar: and they not only applied the terms used in the pagan mysteries to Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's supper, but they gradually introduced also the rites which were designated by those terms.<sup>283</sup>

Of the Eleusinian mysteries, Anthon says: "This mysterious secrecy was solemnly observed and enjoined on all the votaries of the goddess; and if any one ever appeared at the celebration, either intentionally or through ignorance, without proper introduction, he was immediately punished with death. Persons of both sexes and all ages were initiated at this solemnity, and it was looked upon as so heinous a crime to neglect this sacred part of religion, that it was one of the heaviest accusations which contributed to the condemnation of Socrates. The initiated were under the more particular care of the deities, and therefore their lives were supposed to be attended with more happiness and real security than those of other men. This benefit was not only granted during life, but it extended beyond the grave, and they were honored with the first places in the Elysian fields, while others were left to wallow in perpetual filth and ignominy."

THERE were the greater and the lesser mysteries. The greater were the Eleusinian in fact, and the lesser were invented, according to the mythological story, because Hercules passed near Eleusis, where the greater mysteries were celebrated, and desired to be initiated; but as he was a stranger and therefore could not lawfully be admitted, a form of mysteries was adopted into which he could be initiated. These were ever afterward celebrated as the lesser, and were observed at Agræ.

THESE mysteries, as well as those of Bacchus and others, were directly related to the sun. Says the *Encyclopedia Britannica*: "The most holy and perfect rite in the Eleusinian Mysteries was to show an

ear of corn mowed down in silence, and this was a symbol of the Phrygian Atys."

THE Phrygian Atys was simply the incarnation of the sun, and the mysteries being a form of sun worship, the "sacred" symbols cannot be described with decency; for the worship of the sun was only the deification and worship of the reproductive organs, and it is not necessary to describe the actions that were performed in the celebration of the mysteries after the initiation, any further than is spoken of by the apostle with direct reference to this subject. "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret." Eph. 5:11, 12.

IT was to accommodate the Christian worship to the minds of a people who practiced these things that the bishops gave to the Christian ordinances the name of mysteries. The Lord's supper was made the greater mystery, baptism the lesser and the initiatory rite to the celebration of the former. After the heathen manner also a white garment was used as the initiatory robe, and the candidate having been baptized, and thus initiated into the lesser mysteries, was admitted into what was called in the church the order of *catechumens*, in which order they remained a certain length of time, as in the heathen celebration, before they were admitted to the celebration of the Lord's supper, the greater mystery. Nobody at all familiar with the rites of the Catholic Church to-day, need be told that confirmation and the white dress for the first communion, are simply relics of paganism.

MOSHEIM testifies that before the second century was half gone, before the last of the apostles had been dead forty years, this apostasy, this working of the mystery of iniquity, had so largely spread over both the East and the West, that it is literally true that "a large part, therefore, of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries."

NOR is this all. The worship of the sun was at this time universal. These apostates not being content with so much of the sun worship as appeared in the celebration of the mysteries, adopted the heathen custom of worshiping toward the east. So says Mosheim:—

Before the coming of Christ, all the Eastern nations performed divine worship with their faces turned to that part of the heavens where the sun displays his rising beams. This custom was founded upon a general opinion that God, whose *essence* they looked upon to be *light*, and whom they considered as being circumscribed

within certain limits, dwell in that part of the firmament from which he sends forth the sun, the bright image of his benignity and glory. The Christian converts, indeed, rejected this gross error [of supposing that God dwelt in that part of the firmament]; but they retained the ancient and universal custom of worshiping toward the east, which sprang from it. Nor is this custom abolished even in our times, but still prevails in a great number of Christian churches. <sup>294</sup>

The next step in addition to this was the adoption of the *day* of the sun as a festival day. To such an extent were the forms of sun-worship practiced in this apostasy, that before the close of the second century the heathen themselves charged these so-called Christians with worshiping the sun. A presbyter of the church of Carthage, then and now one of the "church fathers," who wrote about A.D. 200, considered it necessary to make a defense of the practice, which he did to the following effect in an address to the rulers and magistrates of the Roman Empire:—

Others, again, certainly with more information and greater verisimilitude, believe that the sun is our god. We shall be counted Persians perhaps, though we do not worship the orb of day painted on a piece of linen cloth, having himself everywhere in his own disk. The idea no doubt has originated from our being known to turn to the east in prayer. But you, many of you, also under pretense sometimes of worshiping the heavenly bodies, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise. In the same way, if we devote Sunday to rejoicing, from a far different reason than sun worship, we have some resemblance to those of you who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury, though they too go far away from Jewish ways, of which indeed they are ignorant. <sup>305</sup>

And again in an address to all the heathen he justifies this practice by the argument, in effect: You do the same thing, you originated it too, therefore you have no right to blame us. In his own words his defense is as follows:—

Others, with greater regard to good manners, it must be confessed, suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians, because it is a well-known fact that we pray toward the east, or because we make Sunday a day of festivity. What then? Do you do less than this? Do not many among you, with an affectation of sometimes worshiping the heavenly bodies, likewise move your lips in the direction of the sunrise? It is you, at all events, who have admitted the sun into the calendar of the week; and you have selected its day, in preference to the preceding day, as the most suitable in the week for either an entire abstinence from the bath, or for its postponement until the evening, or for taking rest and banqueting. <sup>316</sup>

This accommodation was easily made, and all this practice was easily justified, by the perverse-minded teachers, in the perversion of such Scriptures as, "The Lord God is a sun and shield," and, "Unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings." Mal. 4:2.

As this custom spread, and through it such disciples were multiplied, the ambition of the bishop of Rome grew apace. It was in honor of the day of the sun that there was manifested the first attempt of the bishop of Rome to compel the obedience of all other bishops, and the fact that this attempt was made in such a cause, at

203

the very time when these pretended Christians were openly accused by the heathen of worshiping the sun, is strongly suggestive.

FROM Rome there came now another addition to the sun-worshiping apostasy. The first Christians being mostly Jews, continued to celebrate the Passover in remembrance of the death of Christ, the true Passover; and this was continued among those who from among the Gentiles had turned to Christ. Accordingly, the celebration was always on the passover day,—the fourteenth of the first month. Rome, however, and from her all the West, adopted *the day of the sun* as the day of this celebration. According to the Eastern custom, the celebration, being on the fourteenth day of the month, would of course fall on different days of the week as the years revolved. The rule of Rome was that the celebration must always be on a Sunday—the Sunday nearest to the fourteenth day of the first month of the Jewish year. And if the fourteenth day of that month should itself be a Sunday, then the celebration was not to be held on that day, but upon the next Sunday. One reason of this was not only to be as like the heathen as possible, but to be as unlike the Jews as possible: this, in order not only to facilitate the "conversion" of the heathen by conforming to their customs, but also by pandering to their spirit of contempt and hatred of the Jews. It was upon this point that the bishop of Rome made his first open attempt at absolutism.

WE know not precisely when this began, but it was practised in Rome as early as the time of Sixtus I., who was bishop of Rome A.D. 119-128. The practice was promoted by his successors, and Anicetus, who was bishop of Rome A.D. 157-168, "would neither conform to that [Eastern] custom himself nor suffer any under his jurisdiction to conform to it, obliging them to celebrate that solemnity on the Sunday next following the fourteenth of the moon." <sup>327</sup> In A.D.

160, Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, made a journey to Rome to consult with Anicetus about this question, though nothing special came of the consultation. Victor, who was bishop of Rome A.D. 192-202, likewise proposed to oblige only those under his *jurisdiction* to conform to the practise of Rome; *but he asserted jurisdiction over all*, and therefore presumed to command all.

"Accordingly, after having taken the advice of some foreign bishops, he wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates commanding them to imitate the example of the Western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition by the pen of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who declared in their name, with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart in this manner from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the Church of Rome."

IN view of these things it will readily be seen that between paganism and this kind of Christianity it soon became difficult to distinguish, and the third century only went to make any distinction still more difficult to be discerned.

**"The Christian State: a Political Vision" *American Sentinel* 9, 26 , pp. 203, 204.**

THE commencement exercises of the University of Nebraska were held June 13. The commencement oration was delivered by Prof. George Herron, an Iowa minister and educator. The following is a synopsis of his address, as published in the *Nebraska State Journal*:—

At the suggestion of the honored chancellor of the university, I am to speak to you to-day of a new political vision. I come to you conscious of the responsibility belonging to every word spoken upon such a subject, on this occasion and in these anxious days of social strain and political change. Because of my knowledge of how much greater are the hour and opportunity than the thoughts and powers of the speaker, what I shall say to you has been wrought out in deep trouble of spirit. But the sense of my own inadequacy has been lost in the faith that there would be present with us the Spirit of the reigning Christ, whose subject I am, in whose name I speak, and to whose political wisdom and authority I am here to bear witness. For my political vision is the Christian State.

The peoples are looking for a political order that shall associate men in justice. The old ways of political thinking and doing have exhausted themselves. The civilization of to-day is the camp of a vast unorganized and undisciplined army, without leaders and without method, yet perfectly conscious of some conflict near at hand which shall issue in a new beginning of history.

I do not fear to have our civilization full of trouble and complaint. I can conceive of nothing more fearful than to have the present order of things exist without discontent. The world is full of discontent, but it is the discontent of God with the degradation of men under the tyranny of material dominion. Society is moving quickly toward revolution, but it is revolution from anarchy to order; from industrial slavery to social freedom; from political atheism to the kingdom of God.

The revolution comes as the social creation of the world. It comes because men are learning at last through experience and suffering that the race is not an aggregation of individuals, but one body, one humanity, of which all individuals are members; that it is not natural, but violent, that these members should strive with each other for place and life in the body. The civilization that now builds upon the assumption that men are antagonists and not members of one social body is fundamentally anarchical.

The most significant fact of modern life is the political faith in Christ that is rising from the waking social consciousness of the world. With a divine instinctiveness, this consciousness is turning to the person of Jesus as the social ideal that can alone perfectly satisfy man's social nature. The people believe, though they cannot define their belief, that the real Jesus is the one human life perfectly socialized.

There is not a school of religion or politics that will not to-day agree that the teachings of Jesus, if actually received and practiced as the spirit of human actions and institutions, would procure that perfect justice which would secure perfect peace. The one universal fact of human history is that humanity is conscious of a quality of right, potential within, which finds its perfect development and incarnation in the moral nature and person of Jesus.

### **MUST BECOME CHRISTIAN**

The State must become Christian if it is to be the organ of the social unity which is the present search and determination of the peoples, and which it is the true mission of the State to accomplish.

I see nothing strange or unreasonable about the proposal to make the mind of Christ the mind of our legislation. If such a mind as Christ's can inspire and direct the whole action of one man, it is not impossible or incomprehensible that such a man should inspire

men collectively or politically. It does not seem mystical to me to believe that the mind of Christ shall become the creative spirit of political action and express itself in the statutes of the State. I believe that the kingdom of God is to be realized in the State rather than in the Church, and that it will be politically rather than ecclesiastically organized. I look for a movement that shall be a great political revival of the righteousness of Christ, a movement that shall have no other purpose than the translation of the mind of Christ into the Constitution and legislation of the nation, and the making of his mind the national political sense. Such a movement would not begin with a declaration of independence and would raise no cry for rights. It would begin with a confession of the mutual dependence of all men, and issue a sacred call for the fellowship of sacrifice. Association, not individual liberty, would be the movement's watchword and hope of glory. It might be among the despised things of the world in its beginning, but it would fulfill the apostle's vision of the mighty Michael and his host of warrior angels casting out the great dragon which symbolized the worship of material forces. With the inspired leadership of men who would love not their life unto death, it would conquer the nation and begin the Christian State which would be the political realization upon the earth of the divine government of the world which Jesus disclosed. For Jesus is the real King of America, though the religious Pharisees and political Sadducees say that we have no king, but the majority.

First, the Christian State will be the organized democracy of the people. Nothing can be more presumptuous than the literature which treats of the triumph or failure of democracy. As yet democracy can scarcely be said to be tried.

### **CORPORATIONS CONTROL**

We Americans are not a democratic people. We do not select the representatives we elect; we do not make our own laws; we do not govern ourselves. Our political parties are controlled by private, close political corporations that exist as parasites upon the body politic and give us the most humiliating and degrading despotism in political history. Our legislation is determined by a vast system of lobby. We are anything but democratically governed. Our American Senate is seriously reminding us of the court of Louis XVI. The people of America to-day do not know how to utter their true political word and are no longer able to express their true political faith through their institutions.

In a pure democracy the people will be their own legislators and make their own laws directly without any intermediary legislative institution. There will be institutions to receive and enforce the

legislation of the people. But representative legislation and representative government are as distinctly two forms of government as the absolute and the limited monarchy. There can be no true democracy with representative legislation. And representative legislation has accomplished the beginning of its own doom. There have been few important measures before our State or national legislature during the past decade which could not have been decided with intelligence and character, with thoroughness and promptness wholly beyond the moral or intellectual comprehension of the representatives chosen to legislate on the people's behalf. Not the centralization but the diffusion of power is the lesson of history and the safety of the present.

### **COMPETITION MEANS SLAVERY**

Second, the Christian State will be the organized economy of the people. Political freedom can realize itself only through industrial freedom. In the sphere of production and distribution is the common life fulfilled. The government of the future will be mainly concerned with the social being and industrial relations of the people. Unless democracy will retreat from the field it must take possession of the industrial world. Neither Christianity nor democracy can be fulfilled or make much further progress except through the association of men in economic commonwealth. Industrial freedom through economic association is the condition of the realization of both democracy and Christianity. The condition of competition is absolutely inconsistent with the Christian ethics. Either the principle of competition must come to an end or Christianity will come to an end. Competition can never give anything but tyranny and slavery. The Christian State alone can be the organ of a democracy of industrial peace and social justice; the organ of an economic conservation and development of the natural resources which the whole people have received as a gift and trust from God; the organ of an economic distribution and exchange of the productions of the people.

### **NO JUSTICE IN COURTS**

Third, the Christian State will be the organized law of the people. I use the term law in its most comprehensive sense. Probably not since the Roman age into which Christ came has such attention been given to statute making and judicial decision as by our own nation at this time. The judgments of the law are not now the justice of the people, nor their education in life. Our courts do not impress the common spirit with the moral majesty and holy

nature of the law. We know, and no legal sophistry can conceal, that one's standing in legal judgment depends upon the material or political interests he represents and his ability to purchase technical skill. Somehow, whether we like to have it said or not, the enactments and decisions of law have become instruments in the hands of the cunning and powerful to exploit and oppress the ignorant and weak.

There is no likeness between the Christian ideal and that of the anarchist, as Christians sometimes foolishly

204

and unthinkingly admit. The Christian organization of a State would be its perfection, the anarchist philosophy would be destructive. Government is not transient nor a necessary evil, but eternal in the heart of God.

As progress ascends life will form itself in more and more perfect and more universal organizations and tend less and less to institutions. And the Christian State can have no other ideal of organization than Christ.

God created and sent this American nation to be an example and a witness of the power and wisdom of Christ unto the political salvation of the world. He appointed and anointed this nation to seek and fulfill the righteousness of his kingdom. We have failed. We have betrayed our trust and forsaken our mission. We are a fallen nation, an apostate people. Except this nation be born again and waken to a mighty national consciousness of God it cannot be delivered from that blind fatalism which is the optimism of apostates and hypocrites, nor will it see the salvation and glory of the Christian State. Only those who are able to bear the reproach of Christ and be disgraced before the politics and religion of this day can arouse and organize the Christian conscience of the nation and prepare the way of the Christian State that shall fulfill the kingdom of God. Are we ready to be offered?

The picture of the present political and economic condition of our country is not overdrawn: it is none too dark. "Judgment is turned away backward and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."

It is also true that in Jesus Christ alone is there help. But Christ does not reform men in the mass. Christianity is an individual matter, and for this reason it is vain to talk of the State becoming Christian. It is vain to talk of the State being born again. That can be true only of the individual. It is the work of the Spirit of God.

For the reasons just given the mind of Christ can never find expression through political parties, nor through the State. It is only

as "Christ is formed within," only as he reigns in the heart, that any man can either have or express the mind of Christ. But Christ dwells, not in political parties, not in the State, but in the individual. "Behold I stand at the door and knock: if any *man* hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him." And again: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned." Christianity is altogether a personal matter.

From what has been said, it follows that it is foolishness to talk of Jesus as the real American King. Christ is not yet King of this world, and he is certainly not King of any one country. Satan is, by our Lord himself, three times called the prince of this world (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). Satan's, it is true, is a usurped dominion, which will ere long be wrested from him and restored to man through Christ, but not by political action. The Father himself has promised this and will perform it in his own good time and way. God the Father, addressing the Son, says: "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."

It is not until the judgment sits and the books are opened (Dan. 7:10), that the dominion and glory, and kingdom are given to the Son of man (Verse 14); and then follows in due course the destruction of all rival powers to make place for the everlasting, immortal kingdom of Christ, whose "dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that shall not be destroyed." "And the kingdom shall not be left to other people" (Dan. 2:44), for its subjects will all be immortal. Says our Lord of that kingdom: "They which are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; *neither can they die any more*; for they are equal unto the angels." Luke 20:35, 36.

There are too many in this day, who, like the Jews of old, would by force take Jesus and make him king for their own aggrandizement; but from such he still withdraws himself, for he dwelleth with him that is of a contrite heart, and that trembles at his word.

**July 5, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 27 , pp. 209-211.**

THE Scripture was fulfilled; there had, as shown in these columns last week, come a falling away.

BUT that there should come a falling away, was not all the prophecy—through that falling away there was to be revealed "that man of sin," "the son of perdition," "the mystery of iniquity," "that wicked," who would oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; and who when he should appear, would continue even till that great and notable event—the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

REFERRING again to the scripture quoted last week from 2 Thess. 2: 2, it is seen that *self-exaltation* is the spring of the development of this power. As that scripture expresses it, "He opposeth and exalteth *himself*." Or, as another scripture gives it, "He shall magnify *himself* in his heart." And another, "He magnified himself even to the Prince of the host"—the Lord Jesus Christ. And yet another, "He shall also stand up *against* the Prince of princes." That is, he shall reign, or assert authority above, and in opposition to, the authority of Christ; or, as the thought is developed by Paul, this power would oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple—the place of worship—of God, showing himself that he is God.

REFERRING also again to the instruction of Paul to the elders who met him at Miletus, there is seen a prophecy of this same spirit of self-exaltation,—a wish to gain disciples to themselves instead of to Christ. They would prefer themselves to Christ, thus at once putting themselves above him, in opposition to him. And this would be developed from among the bishops. "Of *your own selves* shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples *after them*."

THIS spirit was actively manifested in opposition to the apostle John while he was yet alive, for he says: "I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes who loveth to have the pre<sup>l</sup>minence among them, receiveth us not." 3 John 9.

According to the word of Christ, there is no such thing as pre<sup>l</sup>minence, or mastership, or sovereignty of position, among men in the church. There was once an argument among his disciples as to who should be counted the greatest, and Jesus called them unto him, and 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 in warning his disciples of all times against the practice of the scribes and Pharisees of that time, who were but the popes of their day, he says they "love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. . . . 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. 23:6-12.

IN the church each member has the same rights as any other member; but for the good of all and the mutual benefit of all concerned, as well as better to carry on His work in the world, the Lord has established His church, and with it a system of church order in which certain ones are chosen to exercise certain functions for the mutual benefit of all in the organization. These officers are chosen from among the membership by the voice of the membership. Of these officers there are two classes, and two only,—bishops and deacons. This is shown by Paul's letter to the Philippians—"Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Chap. 1:1.

BISHOPS are sometimes called elders; but the same office is always signified. When Paul gave directions to Titus in this matter, he said: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless. . . . For a *bishop* must be blameless, as the steward of God." Titus 1:5-7.

This is further shown in Acts 20, to which we have before referred; when Paul had called unto him to Miletus "the *elders* of the church" of Ephesus, among other things he said to them: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*,"—*episkopoi*—bishops.

PETER also writes to the same effect: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the

oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." 1 Peter 5:1-3.

This text not only shows that the terms "elder" and "bishop" refer to the same identical office, but it shows that Peter counted himself as one among them; and that not only by his precept but by his example he showed that in this office, although overseers they were not *overrulers* or lords.

SUCH is the order in the Church of Christ, and as every Christian is God's freeman and Christ's servant, it follows, as has been well stated, that "monarchy in spiritual things does not harmonize

with the spirit of Christianity." <sup>210</sup> 331 Yet this order was not suffered long to remain. A distinction was very soon asserted between the bishop and the elder; and the bishop assumed a precedence and an authority over the elder, who was now distinguished from the bishop by the title of "presbyter" only. This was easily and very naturally accomplished.

For instance, a church would be established in a certain city. Soon perhaps another church or churches would be established in that same city, or near to it in the country. These other churches would look naturally to the original church as to a mother, and the elders of the original church would naturally have a care for the others as they arose. It was only proper to show Christian respect and deference to these; but this respect and deference was soon *demanded*, and authority to require it was asserted by those who were the first bishops.

AGAIN: as churches multiplied and with them also elders multiplied, it was necessary, in carrying forward the work of the gospel, for the officers of the church often to have meetings for consultation. On these occasions it was but natural and proper for the seniors to preside; but instead of allowing this to remain still a matter of choice in the conducting of each successive meeting or assembly, it was claimed as a right that the one originally chosen should hold that position for life.

THUS was that distinction established between the elders, or presbyters, and the bishops. Those who usurped this permanent authority and office took to themselves exclusively the title of "bishop," and all the others were still to retain the title of "presbyter." The presbyters in turn assumed over the deacons a supremacy and

authority which did not belong to them, and all together—bishops, presbyters, and deacons—held themselves to be superior orders in the church over the general membership, and assumed to themselves the title of "clergy," while upon the general membership the term "laity" was conferred.

IN support of these three orders among the "clergy," it was claimed that they came in proper succession from the high priests, the priests, and the Levites of the Levitical law. "Accordingly, the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites." <sup>342</sup>

THESE distinctions were established as early as the middle of the second century. This led to a further and most wicked invention. As they were now priests and Levites after the order of the priesthood of the former dispensation, it was necessary that they also should have a sacrifice to offer. Accordingly, the Lord's supper was turned into "the unbloody sacrifice." Thus arose that which is still in the Roman Catholic Church the daily "sacrifice" of the mass discussed in these columns three weeks ago. With this also came a splendor in dress, copied from that of the former real priesthood.

THE estimate in which the bishop was now held may be gathered from the following words of a document of the second century:—

It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord himself. It is well to reverence both God and the bishop. He who honors the bishop has been honored of God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does (in reality) serve the devil. <sup>353</sup>

The next step was that certain bishops asserted authority over other bishops; and the plea upon which this was claimed as a right, was that the bishops of those churches which had been established by the apostles were of right to be considered as superior to all others. As Rome was the capital of the empire, and as the church there claimed direct descent not only from one but from two apostles, it soon came to pass that the Church of Rome claimed to be the source of true doctrine, and the bishop of that church to be supreme over all other bishops. In the latter part of the second century, during the episcopate of Eleutherius, A.D. 176-192, the absolute authority of the Church of Rome in matters of doctrine was plainly asserted in the following words:—

It is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the church,— those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the

apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father. Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vain-glory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings (we do this, I say); by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the bishops. For it is *a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church*, on account of its *preîminent authority*. . . . Since, therefore, we have such proofs, *it is not necessary to seek the truth among others* which it is easy to obtain from the church; since the apostles, like a rich man depositing his money in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth, so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For *she is the entrance to life*; all others are *thieves and robbers*.<sup>364</sup>

When this unwarranted authority was asserted during the bishopric of Eleutherius, it is not at all strange that his immediate successor, Victor, A.D. 192 to 202, should attempt to carry into practice the authority thus claimed for him. The occasion of it was the question of the celebration of what is now Easter, as already related last week. This action of Victor is pronounced by Bower "the first essay of papal usurpation." Thus early did Rome not only claim supremacy, but attempt to enforce her claim of supremacy, over all other churches. Such was the arrogance of the bishops of Rome at the beginning of the third century.

THE character of the bishopric, in A.D. 250, is clearly seen by the words of Cyprian:—

Not a few bishops who ought to furnish both exhortation and example to others, despising their divine charge, became agents in secular business, forsook their throne, deserted their people, wandered about over foreign provinces, hunted the markets for gainful merchandise, while brethren were starving in the church. They sought to possess money in hoards, they seized estates by crafty deceits, they increased their gains by multiplying usuries.<sup>375</sup>

As the bishopric became more exalted, and arrogated to itself more authority, the office became an object of unworthy ambition and unholy aspiration. Arrogance characterized those who were in power, and envy those who were not. And whenever a vacancy occurred,

unseemly and wholly unchristian strife arose among rival presbyters for the vacant seat. "The deacons, beholding the presbyters thus deserting their functions, boldly invaded their rights and privileges; and the effects of a corrupt ambition were spread through every rank of the sacred order." <sup>386</sup>

These rivalries caused divisions and discussions which gave opportunity for the further assertion of the dignity and authority of the bishopric. Cyprian, "the representative of the episcopal system" as Neander relates, declared that—

The church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers. . . . Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the church, and the church in the bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop, that he is not in the church.

<sup>397</sup>

He insisted that God made the bishops and the bishops made the deacons, and argued thus:—

But if we [bishops] may dare anything against God who makes bishops, deacons may also dare against us by whom they are made. <sup>408</sup>

Not long afterward, there arose another subject of controversy, which caused much contention with far-reaching consequences. As the bishops arrogated to themselves more and more authority, both in discipline and doctrine, "heretics" increased, Whosoever might disagree with the bishop, was at once branded as a heretic, and was cut off from his communion, as Diotrephes had counted as a heretic even the apostle John. Upon this point, Cyprian, the representative of the episcopal system, further declared:—

Neither have heresies arisen, nor have schisms originated, from any other source than from this, that God's priest is not obeyed; nor do they consider that there is one person for the time priest in the church, and for the time judge in the stead of Christ; whom if, according to divine teaching, the whole fraternity should obey, no one would stir up anything against the college of priests; no one, after the divine judgment, after the suffrage of the people, after the consent of the co-bishops, would make himself a judge, not now of the bishop, but of God. No one would rend the church by a division of the unity of Christ. <sup>419</sup>

He therefore argued that if any person was outside of this system of episcopal unity, and was not obedient to the bishop, this was all the evidence necessary to demonstrate that he was a heretic. Consequently he declared that no one ought "even to be inquisitive

as to *what*" any one "teaches, so long as he teaches out of the pale of *unity*." In this way the truth itself could be made heresy.

Of the condition of the bishopric in 302, when the Diocletian persecution began, Eusebius says: "They were sunk in negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and were almost on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity." Also

211

some who appeared to be pastors were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.

The scripture was fulfilled. There *had* come a falling away; there was a self-exaltation of the bishopric; and THE TIME WAMS COME WHEN THE MAN OF SIN SHOULD BE REVEALED.

**"Why Not?" *American Sentinel* 9, 27 , p. 211.**

THE *Evangelist* has the following paragraphs which are suggestive:—

The *Independent* notes that the Southern Assembly has given one of its committees a task of no small difficulty. It will grow out of the case of Miss Sadie Means. She was an active Christian, who, in seeking employment, finally found it in the telephone exchange, at Columbia, S.C., where she was obliged to work, or at least to be in attendance, for two or three hours on Sunday. The session of her church took notice of the matter, and finding her unwilling to give up the situation, she being obliged to earn her living, asked her to withdraw from the church. This she refused to do, and thereupon the session expelled her, by a majority vote. The case was taken to the Presbytery, and action of the church or session was sustained. Then she appealed to the Synod, where, after a protracted discussion, the decision was reversed. And now the church has just had the case before the Assembly, where the decision of the Synod was reaffirmed, thus fully restoring the young lady to her place in the church. Lest the cause of Sabbath observance should suffer by this constituted to report on the whole subject. Our contemporary says:—

The Committee on the Sabbath had reported a healthier sentiment on Sabbath observance, though there has little gain in the way of Sunday traveling or baseball. It had discussed what is necessary Sunday work, and had admitted that if hotels and street cars are a Sunday necessity, then a Christian may be employed by them and work on Sunday, taking remuneration therefor, and that some might argue that telephone and telegraph companies are equally a necessity. The committee struck out these references to certain possibly necessary work and appointed a committee of seven whose business it shall be to report to the next Assembly stating just exactly what work is necessary on the Sabbath and may be engaged in. Really this is a serious task, and is putting the Assembly into very difficult legislative work. We had supposed that about all that we can do it to lay down the general principle of Sabbath observance and leave the application of it to the individual conscience enlightened by the Spirit of God. It will be a very curious thing for the committee to report that the mail may or may not be carried on Sunday, that a milk cart may or may not travel, or that a church member may telegraph the news of sickness or death, but cannot be a telegraph clerk. Shall we have, as the old Rabbinites gave us, a law how far one can walk to church on the Sabbath: or shall we be told that one may drive a span of horses on the Holy Day but not drive tandem?

The question suggested by this is, Why not? The Southern Presbyterian Church, in common with most other Protestant denominations, demands that the State shall do this very thing, namely, specify certain things that may not be done on Sunday; and shall the church be less explicit in the rules that are to govern its members than is the State with its citizens? Another incongruity is that in this matter the State is more strict than is the Presbyterian Church. The work that Miss Means does in Columbia on Sunday is under the law of South Carolina illegal, and she might be arrested and fined \$1.00 and costs every time she is found engaging in it. It is safe to say too that if she were a Seventh-day Adventist she would be so arrested and fined, and every Presbyterian preacher in the State would protest loudly against any modification of the statute, denounce "Sabbath-breaking" as anarchy, and demand the enforcement of the law. Somehow or other there is still a good deal of inconsistency in the world notwithstanding the blazing light of the Nineteenth century.

The *Evangelist's* note contains however much good sense. Such a code of rules as is contemplated would be entirely out of place in the church and is equally out of place in the State. But we doubt if either the *Evangelist* or the Southern Presbyterians see it in this light.

**"Religious Persecution in Maryland" *American Sentinel* 9, 27 , pp. 211, 212.**

MAY 20, Elder S. B. Horton, a Seventh-day Adventist minister, at present located at Church Hill, Md., where he has been laboring for some months, and where a small church of that faith has been raised up, received the following notice, which we give *verbatim et literatim*:—  
Church Hill, Md.

We the undersigned company of citizens of Co. Q. A. [meaning Queen Anne County] do hereby notifie you Mr. Horton wife and the young man that you have there as a spye to move out by the 21st of June 1894 (that is tomorrow) with your goods and chattels and not to return for we have put up with you as long we intend. As you are causing our heretofore law abideing citizens to be brought before the Justice of the peace for violation, to serve a term in Jail or the house of correction, whereas their families will have to suffer the wants of support. All due respect to you as man but none of your doctrine. We are a determined set. CITIZENS OF VACINITY.

**(Cross-bones and bloodstains.**

Writing to a brother minister concerning this notice, Elder Horton says:—

I have been preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ. I have treated all men with consideration, and have been recognized as a citizen, having been called upon to pay town taxes, and have not interfered with the civil or religious rights of men. They charge me with stirring up the people and teaching them anarchy, when, as a matter of fact, I have endeavored only to hold forth the word of life which is the Holy Scriptures. For this they are seeking my destruction.

Some of our church company have been arrested for working on Sunday ostensibly, but in reality because they are keeping the Sabbath of Almighty God. It is well known that others work on Sunday without protest. But "Satan has come down with great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time," and the poor misguided opponents of the truth are being deluded into fighting against God and his people. I well know that the words of the Saviour, "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you," are just as true to-day as when spoken in person by the Lord. And I well know that our Master was accused of perverting the nation, stirring up and teaching the people contrary to the established religion. But the

Lord has said, "Remember the word that I said unto you. The servant is not greater than his lord, If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you. . . . But all these things will they do for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me. . . . These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." And so the Lord's will be done, "for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is

212

able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day."

At this writing, Elder Horton is still at Church Hill, and will doubtless remain there until it is thought best by the officers of the Atlantic Conference, under whose directions he is laboring, to go elsewhere. True, the people of Church Hill may do him violence. Such things have happened even in the nineteenth century, and in "free America," but they can go only as far as God permits; and in this case as in all others, he will make the wrath of men to praise him, and the remainder of wrath he will restrain. Elder Horton's confidence is not misplaced. The ill temper of the people of Church Hill, or we should say of a portion of the people of Church Hill, will only fall out to the furtherance of the gospel; others will have a curiosity to know what all the stir is about, and when they discover that Elder Horton teaches only Bible doctrine, being able to give a "Thus saith the Lord" for every position taken, and doctrine inculcated, some of them will be honest enough to obey the truth notwithstanding the wrath of men and devils.

There is nothing meaner than the spirit of persecution. These Church Hill people profess great indignation because Adventists do not obey the civil law in the matter of keeping Sunday, and then they unlawfully warn a man out of town and threaten him with violence if he refuses to go! What regard they must have for the law of the State, to be sure!

**"Wants More of the Same Kind" *American Sentinel* 9, 27 , pp. 212, 213.**

SUNDAY, June 10, Senator Daniel J. Bradley, an Independent Democrat of Brooklyn, and a member of the legislative committee which is now investigating the police department of this city, took a little tour of investigation on his own account disguised as a countryman. Starting out from his cigar store in Brooklyn,—which was

doing business as usual,—the senator directed his steps toward New York. This is his story as related in the *Evening Sun*:

I strolled aimlessly up the Bowery and at every five steps I saw barkeepers peering from their doors and beckoning to their old customers to come in. And the policemen were all there standing in front of saloons and looking as nonchalant as cigar store Indians, but never looking toward the doors from which men emerged wiping their mustaches and heaving sighs of relief.

When I reached Steve Brodie's saloon, near Grand Street, I paused to look at the trophies of the bridge jumper, and it was then that the event of the day occurred. A well-dressed young man came out of the saloon, and, after sizing me up, inquired if I had the time. I pulled out my watch, which is a pretty good one, and told him the time. He then politely asked if I would have a drink. I winked at him and declined, and he turned and went sorrowfully up the street.

I suppose that he wanted to give me some knock-out drops and get my week's share of the tobacco store receipts. But when he saw that wink he knew I was fly, and departed.

If it wasn't for looking at the calendar nobody would know that it was Sunday on the Bowery. Clothing, hat, shoe, and furnishing stores were all open wide.

This, it must be remembered, was in a city and State which have a Sunday law. But the law is not enforced. As has been

214

brought out in the investigations of the legislative committee of which Senator Bradley is a member, the police are bribed to wink at violations of the law. Those who pay are permitted to keep open; those who refuse or neglect to contribute regularly are arrested. Thus the law serves only to corrupt the police force.

But notwithstanding the use made of the Sunday law already on the statute books, Senator Bradley wants more of the same sort, and told a reporter that he intends to introduce a bill at the next session of the legislature to close everything on Sunday except restaurants and drug stores—and policemen's extended palms; the latter close only on a bribe or on the collar of some poor victim who refuses to "divvy up."

**"'Orthodoxly' Insane" *American Sentinel* 9, 27 , p. 213.**

JUNE 18, a bright little school boy was murdered in this city by his father who had become insane by brooding over the death of his wife which had taken place some months previously. The insane father after sending three bullets into his child's brain turned the weapon on himself. The father was much attached to the boy and the neighbors

now recall the fact that he was often heard to remark, "When I go, Walter will go with me." The boy, an exceptionally manly little fellow, was also much attached to his father. The secret of this sad affair is thus told by the *World*:—

Upon the table at which the distracted father was seated when the tragedy took place was an open hymn book. The covers had been bent so that it could not close, and inmates of the house now remember that throughout the early afternoon they heard the old man singing the verses of the hymn at which the book was opened. It was entitled "Beautiful Beckoning Hands," and read as follows:—

Beckoning hands at the gateway to-night,  
Faces a shining with radiant light,  
Eyes looking down from your heavenly home,  
Beautiful hands they are beckoning, come.  
Beckoning hands of a mother, whose love  
Sacrificed life its devotion to prove;  
Hands of a mother, to memory dear,  
Beckoning higher the waiting ones here.

This hymn has always been a favorite with Forshay, out by a singular coincidence he had on Sunday evening heard it sung for the first time by its author, Rev. C. C. Luther, who is temporarily filling the pulpit of Dr. Knapp at the Macdougall Street Baptist Church. It was after a visit to his wife's grave at Greenwood Sunday afternoon, that Forshay had taken his youngest boy (he never went anywhere without him) to the church. On their return from church that evening he had taught the bright little boy the hymn, and together they had sung it over many times.

So it seems that this utterly unscriptural hymn was responsible in some degree at least for this terrible tragedy. The Bible declares, "The dead know not anything" (Eccl. 9:5); and that "his sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not" (Job 14:21); that "his breath goeth forth, he returned to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish" (Ps. 146:4); but popular theology teaches, as does the hymn referred to, that the dead are conscious in heaven beckoning to their friends on the earth. If this were true, and they were so beckoning, and it were possible for those left behind to rejoin the departed by death, what would be more natural than just such an act as that committed by an "orthodoxly" insane father?

**"An Iniquitous Proposition" *American Sentinel* 9, 27 , p. 214.**

THE latest proposed Sunday iniquity is "the introduction of literature on Sabbath observance into school books." It is scarcely

necessary to say that it was a committee of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod that proposed this. Commenting on this scheme an exchange well says:—

Talk of Church meddling with or control of secular affairs, but did any one in the United States ever before hear of a proposition so outrageously audacious and insolent as that revealed by the name of this Covenanter committee? What wonder that such Protestants as these are opposed to the division of the public school funds in the interest of the Catholics! They want it *all* to serve their own purposes; they want to make the common schools, supported by the taxation of all classes of the people, the propagating grounds of their own narrow and intolerant notions. Of a piece with this demand is that of several Protestant lay organizations that only Protestant teachers shall be employed in the State schools. A western newspaper, mouthpiece of one of these sectarian societies, in declaiming against all teachers who are not Protestants, indignantly asks why Catholics should be allowed to teach in Protestant schools. *Protestant*, mind you, not *public* or *common* schools. It has come to this, that the schools of the people are held by one division of the church to be its property now, while the other division holds that they should be *its* private possession as soon as possible; and both agree in demanding that religion of some kind shall be taught therein all the time. All this in plain denial of the letter and spirit of the Constitution and of the law of equal freedom.

Dr. H. H. George was chairman, and of his report the *Christian Reformer* says:—

Dr. H. H. George . . . reported that he had corresponded with three leading school-book publishers; viz.: Ginn & Co., Boston; Potter & Co., Philadelphia; and the American Book Company, New York. The first mentioned thought it a grand idea, and would like to have the matter continued, and suggested that some sample manuscripts be prepared and submitted to the company. The second, or representative of the Pooter & Co. firm, could see no objection to it, and would be quite willing to consider it further. The American Book Company did not know that it would be expedient. They were aiming to meet any public demand in the line of school books, but had not known of any demand in the direction of Sabbath literature for such books. The committee deems it advisable to take further steps to prepare some discussion of the subject of the Sabbath in a graded series to suit the different school readers, and also a more analytic discussion of the subject for the text-book on physiology, and have them submitted to these and other book firms.

This is a monstrous proposition. Mr. George and his conferees would be horrified at the idea of turning the common schools over to the Catholics, even where papists are in the majority; but they deliberately plan to seize the schools in the interests of their Sunday propaganda. School books have quite enough of the errors of so-called orthodoxy in them now without making them vehicles for conveying into every home the claims of the false Sabbath.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 27 , p. 216.**

THE *News*, of Paris, Tenn., objects to our criticism of the courts of that State for lending themselves to the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists. The *News* remarks:—

We do not believe the courts have convicted in this case upon the grounds of "religious persecution," but as justice blindfolded and knowing no man, religion or creed.

It makes not a bit of difference what the *News* believes; its unbelief cannot change the facts. In deciding one of these Sunday cases in Tennessee, Judge Hammond said:—

Sectarian freedom of religious belief is guaranteed by the constitution [of Tennessee]; 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 by the practices of his creed.

The courts cannot change that which has been done, however done, by the devil 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.

This grants the very thing that the *News* denies, namely, that Sunday laws are religious, and that they rest upon the religious prejudices of those having control of legislation. The *News* should remember that it is better to be right than to be popular; better to stand for principle than for dollars and cents.

Another point(?) made by the *News* is this:—

We are a firm believer in religious freedom and the rights of every man being untrammled when it comes to divine worship, provided he does not practice and preach a religion that is detrimental to the public welfare. In this case we have no fight to

make on the religious principles held by the believers of the Adventist Church, but as Sunday is regarded as the day of rest by all the States of the Union, and by the majority of the people, we do object to the practice of some in publicly going about their work on the day that is recognized and most generally held as being the Sabbath, or day of rest.

There are tens of thousands of just such firm believers in religious freedom. But of what value is it to any man to have the right to believe what he pleases if he is denied the right to practice as he believes? The Adventists believe that they ought not only to rest on the Sabbath day, but to habitually devote Sunday to secular pursuits. Of what avail is it for them to do the one if they neglect the other? Some people have a religion so flexible that it can be readily adapted to their convenient; but not so the Adventists; with them the observance of the Sabbath and the secularization of Sunday is a sacred duty. They regard the Sabbath as the memorial of God's creative power, and as the pledge of his power to recreate, to make new, and to sanctify. On the other hand they regard the Sunday as a false Sabbath, a counterfeit of God's holy day, the mark of badge of the "mystery of iniquity," the "man of sin," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, showing himself that he is God." But those who have little or no conscience themselves, but have been accustomed to follow the multitude, settle themselves down in a sort of satisfied self-righteousness and cannot understand why others should dare to displease the multitude—as though the multitude were God. Such forget, if they ever knew, that the Christian rule is: "We ought to obey God rather than men."

THIS note from the *Christian Cynosure* on the International Sunday-school Lesson for June 3, is a fair sample of the nonsense by which Sunday sacredness is sustained:

.1. *The Passover instituted.*—Ex. 12:4. "This shall be to you the beginning of months." Their year had hitherto begun on the seventh of September. This change to the middle of March was to typify their new national life. The winter of their bondage was over; it was therefore fitting that they should date time from a fresh starting point. So the Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, and all Christendom reckons time from what is called "the Christian era." "They shall take to them every man a lamb." This was an entirely new ordinance.

Does the writer of this note mean to imply that the Sabbath was changed at the exodus? or does he mean simply that the change of the Sabbath are parallel? If the latter, the folly of the proposition is but

little less plainly marked than it would be in the former. A very essential element is lacking to make the cases at all parallel. In the case of the change of the beginning of the year the fact is plainly stated in the inspired record; while in the pretended change of the Sabbath the Scriptures are as silent as the grave, and do not so much as hint at any change by divine authority.

**July 12, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 28 , pp. 217-219.**

AMS shown last week, there had come as early as the latter part of the third century of the Christian era, a falling away from the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, so that the way was fully prepared for the setting up of the papacy; but the perfect development of that power was not yet complete.

IN order to its perfect development the papacy must have the aid of the State. Before the bishop of Rome could be exalted to the place he was to occupy and be recognized by all the world as the head of the Church, other bishops must be forced into submission to him by the strong arm of civil power, and the forces were at work that were to accomplish this.

ONE very important factor in the setting up of the papacy was the Emperor Constantine. Coming to the throne, Constantine found Christianity a growing religious power in the empire, and after a time he conceived the idea of turning this new religion which seemed to be displacing paganism, to his own account; likewise the bishops, as we have seen, were grasping for civil power. As Draper says: "It was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics; it was the aim of the bishops to make politics a branch of theology." Both were in a measure successful.

OF the state of the Church at that time, Eusebius bears this testimony:—

When by reason of excessive liberty we sunk into negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and we were almost, as it were, on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity, then the divine judgment, which usually proceeds

with a lenient hand, whilst the multitudes were yet crowding into the church, with gentle and mild visitations began to afflict its episcopacy, the persecution having begun with those brethren that were in the army. But as if destitute of all sensibility, we were not prompt in measures to appease and propitiate the Deity; some, indeed, like atheists, regarding our situations as unheeded and unobserved by a providence, we added one wickedness and misery to another. But some that appeared to be our pastors, deserting the law of piety, were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves. <sup>421</sup>

The persecution had caused all these divisions and disputes to be laid aside. Every other interest was forgotten in the one all-absorbing question of the rights of conscience against pagan despotism. Thus there was created at least an outward unity among all the sects of whatever name professing the Christian religion in any form. Thus was molded a compact power which permeated every part of the empire, and which was at the same time estranged from every material interest of the empire as it then stood. Here was power, which if it could be secured and used, would assure success to him who would gain it, as certainly as he could make the alliance. This condition of affairs was clearly discerned at the time. Constantine "understood the signs of the times and acted accordingly."

"TO Constantine, who had fled from the treacherous custody of Galerius, it naturally occurred that if he should ally himself to the Christian party, conspicuous advantages must forthwith accrue to him. It would give him in every corner of the empire men and women ready to encounter fire and sword. It would give him partisans not only animated by the traditions of their fathers, but—for human nature will even in the religious assert itself—demanding retribution for the horrible barbarities and injustice that had been inflicted on themselves; it would give him, and this was the most important of all, unwavering adherents in every legion in the army. He took his course. The events of war crowned him with success. He could not be otherwise than outwardly true to those who had given him power, and who continued to maintain him on the throne.

<sup>432</sup>

CONSTANTINE was not the only one who saw this opportunity, but he being an accomplished politician, succeeded, while others failed. In addition to the advantages which offered themselves in this asserted unity of the churches, there was a movement among the

bishops which made it an additional incentive to Constantine to form the alliance which he did with the church. Although it is true that all the differences and disputes and strifes among the bishops and sects had been forgotten in the supreme conflict between paganism and freedom of thought, there is one thing mentioned by Eusebius that still remained. That was the ambition of the bishops "to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves." Nor was it alone government in the church which they were anxious to assert; but *government in the State as well, to be used in the interests of the Church*. For, as Neander testifies, "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. <sup>443</sup>

This theocratical theory of the bishops is the key to the whole history of Constantine and the church of his time, and through all the dreary period that followed. It led the bishops into the wildest extravagance in their worship of the imperial influence, and coincided precisely with Constantine's idea of an absolute monarchy.

THE idea of the theocracy that the bishops hoped to establish appears more clearly and fully in Eusebius's "Life of Constantine" than in any other one production of the time. There the whole scheme appears just as they had created it, and as it was applied in the history of the time. The Church was a second Israel in Egyptian bondage. Maxentius was a second Pharaoh, Constantine was a second Moses. As the original Moses had grown up in the palace of the Pharaohs, so likewise this new Moses had grown up in the very society of the new Pharaohs. Thus runs the story as told by Eusebius:—

Ancient history relates that a cruel race of tyrants

218

oppressed the Hebrew nation; and the God who graciously regarded them in their affliction, provided that the prophet Moses, who was then an infant, should be brought up in the very palaces and bosoms of the oppressors, and instructed in all the wisdom they possessed. And when he had arrived at the age of manhood, and the time was come for divine justice to avenge the wrongs of the afflicted people, then the prophet of God, in obedience to the will of a more powerful Lord, forsook the royal household and estranging himself in word and deed from those by whom he had been brought up, openly preferred the society of his true brethren and kinsfolk. And in due time God exalted him to be the leader of the whole nation, and after delivering the Hebrews from the

bondage of their enemies, inflicted divine vengeance through his means upon the tyrant race. This ancient story, though regarded by too many as fabulous, has reached the ears of all. But now the same God has given to us to be eye-witnesses of miracles more wonderful than fables, and from their recent appearance, more authentic than any report. For the tyrants of our day have ventured to war against the supreme God, and have sorely afflicted His church. And in the midst of these, Constantine, who was shortly to become their destroyer, but at that time of tender age, and blooming with the dawn of early youth, dwelt, as God's servant Moses had done, in the very home of the tyrants. Young, however, as he was, he shared not in the pursuits of the impious; for from that early period his noble nature (under the leading of the Divine Spirit), inclined him to a life of piety and acceptable service to God.

<sup>454</sup>

Galerius sought to prevent Constantine's joining his father in Britain, and how Constantine succeeded in eluding his vigilance. By the theocratical bishops this was made to be the flight of the new Moses from the wrath of the new Pharaohs. Thus the story continues:—

The emperors then in power, who observed his manly and vigorous figure and superior mind with feelings of jealousy and fear, . . . carefully watched for an opportunity of inflicting some brand of disgrace on his character. But he, being aware of their designs (the details of which, through the providence of God, were more than once laid open to his view), sought safety in flight, and in this respect his conduct still affords a parallel to that of the great prophet Moses. <sup>465</sup>

As the original Moses, without the interposition of any human agency, had been called to the work to which the Lord had appointed him, so the theocratical bishops had the new Moses likewise appointed directly by the authority of God:—

Thus, then, the God of all, the supreme Governor of the world, by his own will, appointed Constantine, the descendant of so renowned a parent, to be prince and sovereign; so that, while others have been raised to this distinction by the election of their fellow men, he is the only one to whose elevation no mortal may boast of having contributed. <sup>476</sup>

Eusebius knew as well as any other man in the empire that the legions in Britain had proclaimed Constantine emperor, precisely as the armies had been doing in like instances for more than a hundred years. He knew full well that Constantine held his title to the imperial power by the same tenure precisely as had all the emperors before him from the accession of Claudius. In short, when the bishop

Eusebius wrote this statement, he knew that he was writing a downright falsehood.

WHEN Constantine marched against Maxentius, it was the new Moses on his way to deliver Israel. When the army of Maxentius was defeated and multitudes were drowned in the river, it was the Red Sea swallowing up the hosts of Pharaoh. When Maxentius was crowded off the bridge and by the weight of his armor sank instantly to the bottom of the river, it was the new Pharaoh and "the horse and his rider" being thrown into the sea and sinking to the bottom like a stone. Then was Israel delivered, and a song of deliverance was sung by the new Israel as by the original Israel at their deliverance. In describing this, Eusebius uses these words:—

"Let us sing unto the Lord, for He has been glorified exceedingly; the horse and his rider has He thrown into the sea. He is become my helper and my shield unto salvation." And again, "Who is like to thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness, marvelous in praises, doing wonders?"<sup>487</sup>

Such adulation was not without response on the part of Constantine. He united himself closely with the bishops, of whom Eusebius was but one, and in his turn flattered them. Eusebius says:—

The emperor was also accustomed personally to invite the society of God's ministers, whom he distinguished with the highest possible respect and honor, treating them in every sense as persons consecrated to the service of God. Accordingly they were admitted to his table, though mean in their attire and outward appearance; yet not so in his estimation, since he judged not of their exterior as seen by the vulgar eye, but thought he discerned in them somewhat of the character of God himself.<sup>498</sup>

This worked charmingly. Throughout the empire the courtly bishops worked in Constantine's interest; and as only Licinius now remained between Constantine and his longed-for position as sole emperor and absolute ruler, the bishops and their political church followers prayed against Licinius and for Constantine. As these "worldly-minded bishops, instead of caring for the salvation of their flocks, were often but too much inclined to travel about and entangle themselves in worldly concerns,"<sup>509</sup> Licinius attempted to check it. To stop their meddling with the political affairs of his dominions, he forbade the bishops to assemble together or to pass from their own dioceses to others. This only tended to make the bishops more active, as the acts of Licinius could be counted as persecution. Licinius next went so far as to remove from all public office whoever would not sacrifice to the gods; and the line was quickly drawn once

more in his dominion in favor of paganism. This caused Constantine's party to put on a bolder face, and they not only prayed for Constantine against Licinius, but they began to invent visions in which they pretended to see the "legions of Constantine marching victoriously through the streets at midday." <sup>51</sup>10

These enactments on the part of Licinius furnished the new Moses with an opportunity to conquer the heathen in the wilderness, and to go on to the possession of the promised land and the full establishment of the new theocracy. War was declared, and Constantine, with the labarum at the head of his army, took up his march toward the dominions of Licinius.

ANOTHER step was now taken in furtherance of the theocratical idea, and in imitation of the original Moses. It will be remembered that, after the passage of the Red Sea, Moses erected a tabernacle, and pitched it afar off from the camp, where he went to consult the Lord and to receive what the Lord had to give in commandment to Israel. Constantine, to sustain his part in this scheme of a new theocracy, and as far as possible to conform to the theocratical plans of the bishops, likewise erected a tabernacle, and pitched it a considerable distance from his camp. To this tabernacle he would repair and pretend to have visions and communications from the Lord, and to receive directions in regard to his expected battle with Licinius.

He soon carried this matter somewhat further, and provided a tabernacle in each legion, with attendant priests and deacons; and also another which was constructed in the form of a church, "so that in case he or his army might be led into the desert, they might have a sacred edifice in which to praise and worship God, and participate in the mysteries. Priests and deacons followed the tent for the purpose of officiating therein, according to the law and regulations of the Church." <sup>52</sup>11

Such was the original of State chaplaincies. And it is but proper to remark that the system, wherever copied, has always been worthy of the original imposture.

The outcome of the war between Constantine and Lucinius was the defeat and subsequent murder of the latter. And when, in violation of his solemn oath to his sister Constantia, Constantine caused Licinius to be executed, the courtier-bishop, Eusebius, justified the wicked transaction as being the lawful execution of the will of God upon the enemy of God.

WHEN Constantine went to take his seat as presiding officer in the Council of Nice, his theocratical flatterers pretended to be dazzled by his splendor, as though an angel of God had descended straight from heaven, and Eusebius, who sat at Constantine's right hand that day, thus testifies:—

And now, all rising at the signal which indicated the emperor's entrance, at last he himself proceeded through the midst of the assembly, like some heavenly messenger of God. <sup>53</sup>12

Constantine, to sustain his part in the farce, declared openly in the council that "the crimes of priests ought not to be made known to the multitude, lest they should become an occasion of offense or of sin;" and that if he should detect "a bishop in the very act of committing adultery," he would throw "his imperial robe over the unlawful deed, lest any should witness the scene," and be injured by the bad example. <sup>54</sup> 13 And when the council was closed, and the creed for which they had come together was established, he sent a letter to the "Catholic Church of the Alexandrians," in which he announced that the conclusions reached by the council were inspired by the Holy Spirit, and could be none other than the divine will concerning the doctrine of God.

AFTER the council was over, he gave a banquet in honor of the twentieth year of his reign, to which he invited the bishops and clergy who had attended the council. The bishops responded by pretending that it seemed to be the very likeness of the kingdom of Christ itself. At the banquet "the emperor himself presided, and as the feast went on, called to himself one bishop after another, and loaded each with gifts in proportion to his deserts." This so delighted the bishops that one of them—it was James of Nisibis, a member of that monk-

219

ish tribe that habitually lived on grass, browsing like oxen, was wrought up to such a height that he declared he saw angels standing round the emperor. Constantine, not to be outdone saw angels standing around James; and pronounced him one of the three pillars of the world. He said, "There are three pillars of the world; Antony in Egypt, Nicolas of Myra, James in Assyria." <sup>55</sup>14

Other instances of this mutual cajolery might be given, but space forbids. It was thus that the Church played the harlot with the world in the early part of the fourth century. And thus it was by proving recreant to the Lord and by courting the favor of corrupt princes, that the bishop of Rome was at last exalted to that place where he is

described as sitting "in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

**"Charging God Foolishly" *American Sentinel* 9, 28 , pp. 222, 223.**

SUNDAY, July 1, Dr. MacArthur, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, this city, preached from the text, Psalms 7:9; "Oh, let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end, but establish the just." Referring to the numerous disasters of the previous Sunday and to the assassination of President Carnot, Dr. MacArthur said:—

Last Sunday will go down into history as an epoch-making day.

The whole world mourns the work of a vile anarchist. His act as cruel as it was senseless. Had Carnot been a tyrant king, a harsh czar, or an autocratic sultan, his assassination wouldn't have been a matter of so much surprise.

Referring to the loss of forty lives just outside of New York harbor from the capsizing of a tug with a fishing party on board, the preacher denounced the average Sunday excursion as a drunken brawl. And of the time of Carnot's assassination he said:—

Carnot's assassination was sad. It was sadder still that it happened on Sunday, and the saddest because he was on his way to a theatre.

It is thus that every calamity is turned to account in the interests of Sunday sacredness. Every minister knows that God does not require a single soul to keep Sunday, that he has nowhere in his Word intimated that it is a sacred day, and yet no opportunity is lost to impress the people with the idea that sooner or later God's vengeance will overtake all who do not reverence this counterfeit of the true Sabbath. But the Lord hath declared: "Judgment also will I lay to the line, and righteousness to the plummet: and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding place." For the Sunday Sabbath "bed is shorter than that a man can stretch him-

223

self on it: and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it." Surely this "turning of things upside down" in the interests of Sunday sacredness "shall be esteemed as the potter's clay; for shall the work say to him that made it, He made me not? or shall the thing that is framed say of him that framed it, He had no understanding?" That is virtually what those do say who advocate the claims of the false Sabbath.

But it may be insisted that more accidents occur on Sunday than on other days and that this fact can be accounted for only on the supposition that God sends his judgments upon those who dishonor that day. But it is by no means certain that more disasters take place on Sunday than on other days when an equal number of people are idle, and when so many unskilled persons are engaged in handling boats, etc. But even if it were demonstrated that out of an equal number of pleasure seekers more were injured on Sunday than on other days, it would not prove that it was the judgments of God against those who refuse to honor the day. From the first chapter of Job we learn that Satan has a limited power over the elements and that when permitted he can use them in the destruction of life and property. Then why not account for Sunday disasters by saying that Satan the more securely to fasten his deceptions on the world and the more completely to root out God's Sabbath, the memorial of his creative power and the pledge of his power to re-create, causes the disasters which are seized upon by the friends of Sunday as evidences of God's special care for that day? Certainly God is not using his power to degrade his own day and to exalt its rival and counterfeit.

**"Must but Can't" *American Sentinel* 9, 28 , p. 223.**

THE Des Moines *Register* remarks that "the national Government must at the earliest date possible withdraw all support from sectarian Indian schools. This complication between the Government and the various church denominations still exists and is still a menace to the spirit of our country, which is against all connection between Church and State."

Well, the earliest possible moment in which the Government can stop this thing is the present; but it will not stop; and yet the *Register* says it must. Why then does not the Government do at once that which it must do at the earliest possible moment? It does not do it simply because Congress, a part of the Government, won't let it; and Congress won't let it because so many members of that body know that if they offend Rome they will have to retire from politics; in short, they could not "come back" to Washington again; and that this threat is potent with the average congressman was amply demonstrated in the matter of the World's Fair legislation. Congressmen confessed it openly. And now the nation is well nigh helpless in the grasp of Rome

because of the recreancy of so-called Protestants to Protestant and American principles.

**July 19, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 29 , pp. 225, 226.**

SINCE Easter Sunday last, the attention of the people of the United States has been stirred, watching the armies of the "Industrials," the strikers and their consequent violence, and the calling out of armed troops because of the troubles in a connected line of States reaching from the Pacific to the Atlantic,—California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Seeing these things carried on so continuously, every man is asking his neighbor, "What does this mean?" "What is to be the end of this matter?"

THESE things are not meaningless; they are full of meaning in many more senses than one, but there is one meaning that they have above all others. And, seeing these things that everybody sees, let us inquire at the source of all truth, what they really do mean; for if the Word of God has spoken on these things and told us anything as to what they mean, then we may be certain of that meaning, whatever other meaning may be in it all. And the Scriptures have spoken in more than one place, describing the condition of things which is now before the eyes of all people, not only of the United States, but of all the world.

Turning first to James, fifth chapter, there is the description of a time, and a condition of affairs, in which the rich are afraid of what is coming, and hold together their treasure in heaps in which the gold and silver is cankered; while on the other hand, there is a cry of the laborers against the rich, and of real distress, indeed, because their wages are kept back; and while these are in distress and are crying out because of it, these same rich ones are nourishing their hearts and living in pleasure and wantonness.

NOW any one can see plainly enough that this exactly describes the situation as it is all over the United States to-day; and every one knows that this situation has been brought about by precisely the methods here described. There is certainly no room for any difference of opinion in this. The strife between the laborers and the rich, between "capital and labor," has been brought on by the insatiable

desire of those who are already rich, to gather together all that was possible. Men whose income has been a million a year when there was any sign that that income might be lessened a little, would cut down the wages of the laboring men a few cents more or less all around, while in most cases these wages were already so low that they would no more than supply the necessaries of life.

Now it is hardly too much to suppose that a man with an income of a million could subsist on a half or three quarters of a million a year, or such a part of a year as might tide over a period of business depression, thus allowing the balance of the million income to remain in payment of the wages of laborers. If all the wealthy men of the country had done this from the beginning, there would to-day be no more of a contest between capital and labor, no more of a cry of the laborers against the rich, than there would be a cry of the earth against the rain.

FOR more than a year there has been all over this land a continuous cry of "hard times," caused by the scarcity of money, while, as a matter of fact, all this time there has been more money in this country than ever before. In the summer of 1893, when so many banks were closed, and when there was the greatest "scarcity of money," there were hundreds of millions of dollars simply on deposit in the banks of New York City alone, to say nothing of the other great cities of the country. The trouble is not that money is scarce in itself, but what there is is hoarded, and it is this hoarding of the money that makes the scarcity.

And being so hoarded, the money is cankering. In the month of May, 1894, some workmen in a money vault, employed in recounting the money there, were in danger of being drowned in a flood of silver of which the canker had eaten up the strong sacks in which it was stored. Money that can have a chance to circulate will never canker; but to-day, although there is so much money, it is hoarded and held so closely together it can only canker. And this Word says that the cankering of it will be a witness against those who have so hoarded it and held it back from circulation while the cries of distress are heard throughout the land.

AND those who have the money so hoarded, even as this Word also says, are living in pleasure and even wantonness. And when a woman will give a grand reception, costing hundreds of dollars, *in honor of a dog*,<sup>561</sup> while almost within hearing from her doors are the cries of hungry people, certainly such a course is fitly described as

"wanton." This may be an extreme case; but admitting that it is, it is only an extreme case in a long series of like though perhaps not identical wantonness on the part of the over rich.

And yet it is said that "capital is shy" and will not venture forth when there is so much disturbance and such an unsettled state of affairs generally. But if this capital would only venture forth in legitimate investments, instead of venturing so much in selfish pleasure, and such wantonness as giving grand receptions in honor of dogs, there would be no such unsettled condition of affairs as would cause capital to be afraid to venture in legitimate and beneficial enterprises. This is not, however, in any way to sanction or excuse the violence that so largely attends the laborers' side of the controversy, any more than it is to sanction or excuse the wantonness of the rich.

HOWEVER, we are not discussing the question of capital and labor, or their relations or antagonisms, we are simply inquiring of the Scriptures, What is the meaning of the present condition and course of things? And every one knows that the foregoing statements exactly describe the situation as it is. Well, then, this being the situation as described in this scripture, what does the scripture say as to the time when this shall be? This same scripture answers plainly that this was to be in the "last days." And every-

226

body sees now the very things that are set forth in this scripture. Then every person has before his eyes, and held irresistibly upon his attention, the positive proofs that we are in the last days.

The Scriptures having spoken of the rich and of the poor; of the hoarding of wealth and the keeping back of the wages; of the fear of the rich and the cries of the laborers—having spoken of these two classes, it now speaks of a third, or rather, *to* a third, thus, "Be patient, therefore, *brethren*." These are the Lord's people who are now spoken to, for he said, "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Matt. 12:50. So in the times described in the previous verses, in the last days, the Lord gives a word of counsel to his own people, and he gives this counsel *because* of the times that are here described; so he says, "Be patient, *therefore*, brethren." And what further?—"Be patient, therefore, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord*."

Then the great meaning, above all other meanings, which all these things bear to the people of the world to-day is, that the Lord is

coming. These are signs, evidences, clear and plain, of the coming of the Lord, that are being held before the eyes and upon the attention of all the people, so that it is impossible that they should not see them. Whether the people will believe that these are signs of his coming, or not, is for the people themselves to decide. The Lord has fixed upon these things in his Word, and says that that is what they are. And those who would be the brethren and the people of the Lord, must see in all these things that meaning which the Lord says is there; namely, that the Lord is coming.

The scripture continues: "Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it until he receive the early and the latter rain." As certainly as the sowing of the seed by the farmer means a certain result, and the farmer certainly expects that result, so certainly these things which are described in this chapter, and which all the people now see, mean a certain result, and mean that the people seeing these things can as certainly expect that result as the farmer may expect the result from his sowing. Then, just as the farmer, when he has planted his grain, waiteth patiently for the harvest, so the Lord would have his people wait patiently for that harvest, which is to be the end of this sowing, and "the harvest is the end of the world." Matt. 13:39.

Consequently the scripture continues to counsel of God, "Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the Judge standeth before the door." Then the coming of the Lord is so near, and the Judge, standing before the door, is so nearly ready to open that door and call all men to account, that it is too late to indulge grievances, complaints, and grudges against others. Of course, there is never time for any such thing as that, but now, of all times that there have ever been in the world, there is the least time for such things and the greatest risk in indulging them. "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh," "the Judge standeth before the door," and as "every one of us" is to "give account of himself to God," and as that account is about to be called for, the thing to do is for every one to have his account so squared up each day and each hour, that if the Judge should open the door and call for the account, it can be rendered with joy and not with grief.

**"Christianity Legally Defined in Rome" *American Sentinel* 9, 29 , pp. 230, 231.**

IF the mutual flattery of Constantine and the bishops had concerned only themselves, it would have been a matter of very slight importance indeed; but this was not so. Each side represented an important interest. Constantine merely represented the State, and the bishops the church; and their mutual flattery was only the covering of a deep-laid and far-reaching scheme which each party was determined to work to the utmost, for its own interests. "It was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics; it was the hope of every bishop in the empire to make politics a branch of theology." Consequently, in their mutual toadyism were involved the interests of both the church and the State, and the welfare of human society for ages to come.

Therefore, to the reign of Constantine the Great must be referred the commencement of those dark and dismal times which oppressed Europe for a thousand years.

When the alliance was formed between Constantine and what was represented to him as Christianity, it was with the idea on his part that this religion formed a united body throughout the empire. As has been shown, this was true in a certain sense; because the persecution as carried on by Galerius under the edicts of Diocletian was against Christianity as a profession, without any distinction whatever as to its phases, and this caused all the different sects to stand together as one in defense of the principles that were common to all. Therefore the essential unity of all the professions of Christianity, Constantine supposed to be a fact; and from all his actions and writings afterward it is certain that representations had been made to him by the bishops in a stronger measure than was true, and in an infinitely stronger measure than he found it in practice to be.

The alliance with Christianity on Constantine's part was wholly political. It was merely a part of the political machinery by which he designed to bring together again the divided elements of the empire into one harmonious whole, as contemplated by Diocletian. It being represented to him by the bishops who met him in Gaul in A.D. 311, that Christianity was a united body which, if he would support it, would in turn be a powerful support to him, he accepted their representations as the truth, and formed the alliance solely as a part

of his political designs, and to help him to forward his declared "mission to unite the world under one head."

But, although the alliance was formed with what was supposed to be Christianity as a whole, without any respect to internal divisions, it was very soon discovered that each particular faction of the Christian profession was ambitious to be recognized as *the one* in which, above all other, Christianity was most certainly represented. The bishops were ready and willing to represent to Constantine that Christianity was one. They did so represent it to him. And although he entered the alliance with that understanding, the alliance had no sooner been well formed than it devolved upon him to decide among the conflicting factions and divisions just where that *one* was to be found.

The Edict of Milan ordered that the church property which had been confiscated by the edicts of Diocletian, should be restored to "the whole body of Christians," without any distinction as to particular sects or names. Thus runs that part of the edict:—

And this we further decree with respect to the Christians, that the places in which they were formerly accustomed to assemble, concerning which also we formerly wrote to your fidelity, in a different form, that if any persons have purchased these, either from our treasury, or from any other one, these shall restore them to the Christians, without money and without demanding any price, without any superadded value or augmentation, without delay or hesitancy. And if any have happened to receive these places as presents, that they shall restore them as soon as possible to the Christians, so that if either those that purchased or those that received them as presents, have anything to request of our munificence, they may go to the provincial governor, as the judge, that provision may also be made for them by our clemency. All which it will be necessary to be delivered up to the body of Christians, by your care, without any delay.

And since the Christians themselves are known to have had not only those places where they were accustomed to meet, but other places also, belonging not to individuals among them, but *to the right of the whole body of Christians*, you will also command all these, by virtue of the law before mentioned, without any hesitancy, to be restored to these same Christians, that is, to their body, and to each conventicle respectively. The aforesaid consideration, to wit, being observed; namely, that they who as we have said restore them without valuation and price, may expect their indemnity from our munificence and liberality. In all which it will be incumbent on you to exhibit your exertions as much as possible to the aforesaid

body of Christians, that our orders may be most speedily accomplished, that likewise in this provision may be made by our clemency for the preservation of the common and public tranquillity. For by these means, as before said, the divine favor with regard to us, which we have already experienced in many affairs, will continue firm and permanent at all times.

But that the purpose of this our ordinance and liberality may be extended to the knowledge of all, it is expected that these things written by us, should be proposed and published to the knowledge of all. That this act of our liberality and kindness may remain unknown to none. <sup>571</sup>

This was proper in itself. But Constantine and the bishops had formed an alliance *for political purposes*. The bishops had lent to Constantine their support, the fruit of which he was enjoying, and now they demanded that the expected return should be rendered. Accordingly, the restoration of the property of the Christians under the Edict of Milan had no sooner begun, than the contentions which had been raised before the late per-

231

secution, between the church of Rome and the churches of Africa, were not only made to assume new and political significance, but were made an issue upon which to secure the imperial recognition and the legal establishment of the Catholic Church. As the rule had already been established that all who did not agree with the bishops of the Catholic Church were necessarily heretics and not Christians, it was now claimed by the Catholic Church that therefore none such could be partakers of the benefits of the edict restoring property *to the Christians*. The Catholic Church disputed the right of heretics to receive property or money under the Edict of Milan, by disputing their right to the title of Christians. This forced an imperial decision upon the question as to who were Christians. The dispute was raised in Africa. Anulinus was proconsul in that province. And to settle this question, Constantine wrote thus to him:—

It is our will, that when thou shalt receive this epistle, if any of those things belonging to the *Catholic Church* of the Christians in the several cities or other places, are now possessed either by the decurions or any others, these thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to their churches. Since we have previously determined that whatsoever *these same churches* before possessed, shall be restored to their right. <sup>582</sup>

Thus it was made evident that the imperial favors were meant only for the Catholic Church. But it was not enough that Constantine should decide that all his favors were for the Catholic Church; he

must next decide *which was the Catholic Church*. This he did in 313 in another letter to Anulinus, thus:—

It is my will that these men within the province entrusted to thee in the Catholic Church *over which Cecilianus presides*, who give their services to this holy religion, and whom they commonly call clergy, shall be held totally free and exempt from all public offices, to the end that they may not, by any error or sacrilegious deviation, be drawn away from the service due to the Divinity, but rather may devote themselves to their proper law, without any molestation. So that, whilst they exhibit the greatest possible reverence to the Deity, it appears *the greatest good will be conferred on the State*.<sup>593</sup>

Following this two councils were called by the emperor to settle disputes between those claiming to be the proper representatives of the Catholic Church—the first was held October 313, the second, in August of the following year. They both decided in favor of Cecilianus and the party presided over by him.

The question as to which was the Catholic Church having been decided, Constantine, in his next epistle, could add yet another distinguishing title. As we have seen, the Edict of Milan—March, A.D. 313—ordered that the churches should be restored to the Christians—"the whole body of Christians"—without distinction. When the Catholic Church asserted its sole right to the designation "Christian," and backed its assertion with political reasons, which were then peculiarly cogent, the imperial epistle ran—March, A.D. 313—"to the *Catholic Church* of the Christians." When the emperor wrote to Melchiades appointing the first council under the imperial authority, his epistle ran—autumn, A.D.—"the *holy Catholic Church*." When he wrote to Chrestus—summer, A.D. 314—summoning him to the second council under imperial authority, he referred to the doctrine of the Catholic Church as embodying the "*most holy religion*." When it had been decided which was "the most holy Catholic religion," he addressed an epistle to Cecilianus—A.D. 316—announcing imperial favors to "the *legitimate and most holy Catholic religion*," and empowered Cecilianus to assist the imperial officers in preventing any diversion from the most holy Catholic Church.

It was thus that that which on its face appeared only innocent and highly proper—indeed a necessary act of justice, restoring to its rightful owners property unjustly confiscated, resulted inside of three years in the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church as the religion of the empire.

**"They Can Do Nothing Against the Truth" *American Sentinel* 9, 29 , p. 231.**

SOME weeks ago Elders J. O. Johnston and E. W. Webster, two Seventh-day Adventist ministers, pitched a tent at Brushy Creek, N.C., and began a series of meetings. They had continued about four weeks when they were served with the following notice, which we give *verbatim et literatim*:—

June 16 94

Rev. Johnson, C. We Will give you Wone week to get away if  
you don't you halt to take what follows wee mean what wee say

Good Bey

The man who left the notice disturbed the meeting by asking questions and making threats, but all went well for a week, and then came a mob to wreck the tent and to drive the Adventists away. But owing to the good offices of the man who owned the lot on which the tent was pitched, and several other of the best citizens, their rage was quieted and no harm was done. As usual in such cases the agitation only increases interest to hear what the Adventists have to say, and they are making friends right in the neighborhood where violence was threatened only a few days before.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 29 , p. 232.**

JULY 9, Mr. Weadock (Dem., Mich.) introduced in the House a bill amending the statutes relative to second-class mail matter so as to read as follows:—

Mailable matter of the second class shall embrace all matter exclusively in print and regularly issued at stated periods from a known office of publication without addition by writing, mark, or sign. Any newspaper 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 the United States are at peace, shall be excluded from the mails.

This is a very far-reaching provision. There are times when disobedience to law becomes a sacred duty. Who now believes that the infamous Fugitive Slave Law ever ought to have been obeyed? Many people disobeyed it as a matter of conscience, and many papers counselled [*sic.*] disobedience. Similar cases may arise in the future.

Notwithstanding the ordinance of civil government, God is still the great moral Governor; to him every soul is responsible; to him every

free moral agent must give account. There never can be any conflict between a *legitimate* exercise of civil authority and the claims of the divine law. And yet the fact remains that there have been many and serious conflicts. Civil governments have frequently required of their subjects that which the divine law forbids, and have forbidden that which the divine law requires. What then shall the Christian citizen do in case the civil law requires that which the law of God forbids? His invariable answer to all such demands must be, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

Nor is this the expression 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 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 arise. 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 unrighteous, and, at the same time, a recognition of government as a grave interest.

Apply this principle to the Sunday laws of several of the States. These laws require all to observe Sunday. With some to do this is as veritably to render an act of homage to a heathen deity as it would have been for the three Hebrew worthies to have fallen down before the great image set up in Babylon. To obey is to sacrifice conscience. Suppose that some paper in such a case published this extract from President Fairchild's amendment to the postal laws such a paper could be excluded from the mails, and even the book itself could be regarded only as incendiary matter, dangerous to the welfare of the State. Is not the amendment too sweeping in its terms? The times are evil, but they demand no such drastic and dangerous measure.

THE *Christian Advocate* of this city says of the second coming of Christ:—

There is not a vestige of evidence that goes to show that He will appear in a thousand years from now. Not even the angels in heaven know when He will come.

But these words are themselves an evidence that the event is near. Says the scripture: "There shall come in the last days scoffers, . . . 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." 2 Peter 3:3, 4.

The *Advocate* confesses total ignorance of the coming of that day, but the Word of God says that sudden destruction shall come upon those who say, "Peace and safety," and adds, "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." 1 Thess. 5:3, 4. Those who know nothing about it will be destroyed because they don't want to know and willfully turn away from the truth. The Lord says of the signs of the second coming of Christ: "Now learn a parable of the fig tree: When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. *Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.* Matt. 24:32-34. And yet the *Advocate* says it may be a thousand years distant, and that we can know nothing about it!

**July 26, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 30 , pp. 233, 234.**

THERE is another passage of scripture, in the same line of things as that noticed last week, that so fully describes the present situation, in another phase of it, that it is worth noting.

ALL men see the way that things are going, and they know that the times are perilous, and they resort to combinations of different sorts by which, if possible, to save themselves from results which they see must certainly follow, even viewed from the standpoint of the world. The laborers combine in unions, leagues, etc., to save themselves from what seems to them must certainly come. The farmers do the same, and the capitalists do the same.

NOW, in the eighth chapter of Isaiah, this course of things is described, and the word says: "Associate yourselves, O ye people, and ye shall be broken in pieces; and give ear, all ye of far countries: gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces; gird yourselves,

and ye shall be broken in pieces. Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand: for God is with us. For the Lord spake thus to me with a strong hand, and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people, saying, [that is, the Lord says to us], 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 I will wait upon the Lord, that hideth his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him." Isa. 8:9-17.

THUS it is clearly shown that in the time of waiting and watching for the coming of the Lord, there will be this time of general distress and fear, in view of what is coming; and also this time of association and combination and confederation of many together to save themselves from that which they fear. It shows also that none of these associations, combinations, or confederacies will help those who enter into them. But the word which they speak "shall not stand;" the counsel which they take together will "come to nought;" and the combinations which they make, and even they, themselves, in those confederations, "shall be broken in pieces."

NO, no. Confederation or association of men will not save them in this time. Every effort made in that way will only increase the trouble and the danger which they hoped to escape. This also is apparent to every one who looks at these things as they are to-day; for never was there a time in the world when there were such vast combinations of capital, and never was there a time when capital was so insecure. Never were there such vast organizations and combinations of labor, and never was labor in a worse plight. Unions, federations, combinations, will not help matters. These evils will grow worse and worse. Men themselves will grow worse and worse. 2 Tim. 3:1-5, 13. And by no combination or invention can men save themselves from themselves.

NONE but the Lord can save, even temporally, in this time. Therefore, in the presence of these things, when men are in fear in dread, their hearts moved as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind, He counsels us, "Stablish your hearts," let your hearts be fixed, so that you shall be safe and unmoved when others are in fear and in dread. "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," that is, for a refuge, a place of safety and security, a dwelling-place, a

shelter in the time of storm. For, "he that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty;" and in the shadow of his wings can we make our refuge till these calamities be overpast.

ANOTHER scripture in this line, worthy of note, is in Habakkuk, first and second chapters. There, in the first chapter, is related how that in vision the Lord caused the prophet to see violence and strife, grievances and contentions, injustice and oppression. "O Lord, how long shall I cry, and thou wilt not hear! even cry out unto thee of violence, and thou wilt not save! Why dost thou show me iniquity, and cause me to behold grievance? for spoiling and violence are before me: and there are that raise up strife and contention. Therefore the law is slacked, and judgment doth never go forth: for the wicked doth compass about the righteous; therefore wrong judgment proceedeth." Verses 2-4. In astonishment the prophet inquired how that the Lord, who is of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look upon iniquity,—how he could look upon such a scene as this and not do something; how he could keep silence while there was such treacherous dealings, and the wicked devouring the man who is more righteous than he. Verses 13-15.

AFTER the prophet had presented thus his earnest inquiry, he says: "I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reprov'd. And the Lord answered me, and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry. Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith." In Hebrews 10:36, 37, this passage of scripture is applied directly to the coming of the Lord in these words: "For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry. Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."

IN Habakkuk, the counsel of the Lord to the prophet proceeds to describe those men who enlarge their desire as the grave (which is one of the things that never

say, I have enough); and who are as death, that is, will never let go that which they have gained, and cannot be satisfied. He also describes on the other hand, those who are oppressed and robbed by these, and says: "Shall not all these take up a parable against him, and a taunting proverb against him, and say, Woe to him that increaseth that which is not his! how long? . . . Shall they not rise up suddenly that shall bite thee, and awake that shall vex thee, and thou shalt be for booties unto them?"

HERE is a description of the very things that are going on. There is a cry against the rich that there must be a more equal distribution of the good things of this world. Already the cry has been often raised, How long shall this continue? Already threats have been made, not secretly, but openly and loudly, not by the lowest of the rabble, but by men in high places, that the wealth that is so abundant and that is hoarded shall be made booty for those who have not. Booty is that which is taken away by violence, and in view of the looting that has occurred in the Chicago strikes, and other places in Illinois, this time seems to have begun.

HERE, also, is the word of a man to that effect, who, to-day, is Secretary of State of one of the States of the Union, and was such when the statement was made:—

I want to make a prediction. It is that there will be no overt act until the next election, then simultaneously with the returns, the flames will shoot up into the air from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

And here is another, not by a man in any official position, but one who spoke for thousands:—

In Massachusetts the workingmen were browbeaten and not heard. If things go on in this way, and the rich and the lawmakers turn their backs upon the poor, refusing to listen to the workingmen, there will follow an epidemic of assassination. Bombs will be exploded, and all the devices known for taking off oppressors will be the fate of our delinquent legislators and capitalists.

In view of what has occurred within the present year in Europe, it would seem that there the epidemic of assassination has even already begun, and with such a stirring up as this in the United States, with what has already appeared, it would seem also that such things could not be far off here.

AND the scripture which we are examining continued to describe this very element: "Because thou hast spoiled many nations, all the remnant of the people shall spoil thee; because of men's blood, and for the violence of the land, of the city, and of all that dwell therein."

Hab. 2:8. If we have not now reached the time when there is violence in the city, and in the land, and amongst all that dwell therein, certainly things cannot go on much longer as they have been going since last Easter day, without bringing the country, and even the civilized world, positively to that condition. And the Lord said more than once, As it was in the days of Noah, "so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." In the days of Noah the earth was "filled with violence," and for these three months and more, continuously, violence has almost covered this land from ocean to ocean.

AND the time when this should be is also made clear by the statement that it is among the "*remnant of the people*." The remnant of anything is the last portion of it. The scripture speaks of the remnant of the church and the remnant of God's people, plainly referring to the last stage of the church and the last of God's people who should be upon the earth,—those who shall be delivered at the coming of the Lord. But here is the remnant, not of the church, nor of God's people, but the remnant of all the people, the remnant of the people of the earth, and that is just as clearly the last of the people that should be upon the earth. And these things which are being carried on before the eyes of all the people, this continual strife and violence that is being manifested throughout the land, and throughout the civilized world, this the scripture said would be in the time of "the remnant of the people." Therefore it is certain that the people that are now upon the earth are the remnant, the last of the people who shall be upon the earth. "The great day of the Lord is near, it is near, and hasteth greatly, even the voice of the day of the Lord." "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

**"Why They Work on Sunday" *American Sentinel* 9, 30 , p. 236.**

ADVENTISTS work on Sunday not from sheer willfulness nor merely to assert a right which they may or may not exercise at their pleasure, but because they regard it as a sacred duty to habitually devote Sunday to secular purposes; and this 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 is simply to defeat the object of the divine law, and to set up a counterfeit of the memorial which God has ordained to keep in remembrance the fact

that he is the Creator of the heavens and the earth. It follows as inevitably as night follows day that W. B. Capps, now in the Weakley County Tenn., jail, is there for conscience' sake.

**"Intolerant as National Reformers" *American Sentinel* 9, 30 , p. 236.**

THE *Ironclad Age*, an atheistic paper, printed in Indianapolis, Ind., has upon its editorial page of its issue of the 14th inst., these two notes:—

At Wilmington, N.C., one man sued another. As the plaintiff arose to testify, objection was made on account of his disbelief in a god. After some consideration by the judge, the man was allowed to testify on condition that he declared his belief in a god. To the great surprise of all present he did so. But as his non-religious views were well known, he prejudiced his case to such an extent that no conviction can be had. And such is our boasted religious liberty.

We trust that the time will come when the cheerful doctrine of eternal torture will no longer be bellowed forth at camp-meetings and other godly assemblages by insane sensational rascals. We trust the time will come when such work will be interdicted by law.

In view of the second paragraph quoted, what right has the *Ironclad Age* to find fault that a witness is required to avow his belief in God before being permitted to testify?—None whatever. Of course the North Carolina practice is wrong. Every man ought to be permitted to testify in a court of justice under the pains of perjury without any reference to his religious belief, and without any prejudice against him because of his faith or lack of faith; but the state of affairs that the *Ironclad Age* hopes to see would be much worse than the evil complained of. The National Reformers would overthrow the First Amendment to the Constitution in the interests of what they imagine is Christianity; the atheists of the *Ironclad Age* school would equally overthrow it in the interests of the blackest kind of infidelity, the very midnight of unbelief. There is small difference between the intolerance of atheism and the intolerance of so-called Christianity; both are utterly destructive to soul liberty, and both are from the enemy of all righteousness. That this is true is evident from the fact that the *Ironclad Age* takes its stand with the enemies of the Constitution which declares that "Congress shall make no law concerning an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

**"Will Congress Rest Under It?" *American Sentinel* 9, 30 , pp. 237, 238.**

THERE is upon the statute books what is known as the salary docking law, that is a law whereby a congressman absent from his seat without leave, unless on account of sickness, forfeits his salary for the time he is thus absent. July 11, Mr. Powers, of Vermont, reported to the House from the Judiciary Committee his bill repealing this salary docking law. The report ridicules the excuse for absence made by representatives in these words:—

It is apparent that the excuse of sickness is one easily made, and it is suspected that it is sometimes assigned as reason for absence without any diagnosis of ailments by medical experts. In other words, the enforcement of this section practically makes every member a pathologist on the subject of disease, which is not a qualification for service in Congress mentioned in the Constitution, and so for this reason the law is plainly unconstitutional. It is believed that each house of Congress can, by an appropriate rule, better enforce the attendance of members than by a statute operative as a penal statute and evaded by every subterfuge.

How seriously this is intended it is of course impossible to say. The idea that the law in question is unconstitutional on

238

the ground alleged is utterly absurd. This certainly could not have been meant to be taken seriously. But is the idea that because the law is evaded it ought to be repealed any better? Scarcely. If congressmen ought to be paid for neglecting their business when they should be attending to it, then ought this law to be repeated, but not otherwise. If our law-makers are so dishonest as to demand pay for work they do not do, and so utterly lost to all sense of decency as to falsify in order to get what does not in either justice or law belong to them, then indeed have we become one of the basest of nations and a hissing and a reproach to the world. Will Congress rest under the imputation thus put upon it by Mr. Powers, or will it show itself to be clear in this matter?

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 30 , p. 240.**

THE pope has decided that burning of the dead "may be allowed under special conditions." Upon this the *Investigator* remarks: "There was a time when popes of Rome decided that burning of the living was perfectly proper. Leo XIII. thinks cremation 'heretical in principle.'

How tenderly Romanism handles dead men, but how roughly it has handled live ones."

THE *Catholic Review* of this city suggests that—

Wherever there is a public library, the Catholics of the neighborhood should combine to raise a fund to contribute, say, one hundred first-class Catholic books to it. If they don't do this, they will lose of great chance to spread knowledge of the truth. Is there such an opportunity where you live!

Protestants ought to see to it that every library is likewise supplied with anti-Catholic literature.

SOME of the people of Church Hill, Md., are still threatening violence against the Adventists. Elder Horton, the Adventist minister in charge of the work there, has again been threatened with personal violence; and one night recently a mob attacked the large tent in which meetings are held, and partly demolished it. They also did some damage to the new church building, now nearly ready for dedication. They declare that the building shall never be dedicated. The Adventists are very certain that it will be both dedicated and used after dedication.

ONE of the strangest things in human nature is the tendency to accept from government rights as favors, and to be devoutly thankful to government for them. Thus we find a Fourth of July orator near Lincoln, Neb., saying that notwithstanding the fact that our Government "is not as true to the Constitution as it once was," "we should be thankful for what our country has done for us, and *for the privileges still granted us.*" The connection shows that the "privileges" have reference to rights of conscience, to believe and practice according to the dictates of conscience. The man who can be thankful for such privileges "*granted*" by government, could be thankful if he were about to be hung.

If we may believe the Declaration of Independence, there are such things as inalienable rights; rights not only not conferred by government, but rights of which government has no right to deprive a single man, however humble. Among these are rights of conscience. In 1829, Hon. Richard M. Johnson said, in a report to the United States Senate:—

What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are exercised not in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, or which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens.

This is true, but what then becomes of the idea of being thankful to government "for the privileges still granted us"? In 1827 Lord Stanhope said, in the British House of Lords:—

The time was when toleration was craved by dissenters as a boon; it is now demanded as a right; but *the time will come when it will be spurned as an insult.*

But that time can never come to people who are taught that religious liberty is a *privilege granted* by government. It is granted by God only, and the government that touches it is a tyranny, whatever its form or by whatever name it may be called.

THE Boston *Investigator* has this to say about the failure of the National Reformers to interest Congress in their raid on the Constitution:—

The God-in-the-Constitution fanatics are waking up to the fact that they were sat down upon when the Judiciary Committees of both Houses refused to submit the proposed amendment to the Constitution to Congress. After all the flourish of Christian trumpets and grand boasts of the National Reform Association that the nation was to be made a Christian nation, Congress would not even listen to the petitions asking to have the preamble of the national Constitution amended to suit Joseph Cook, Wilbur F. Crafts, Rev. Dr. George, and a few other fossilized ministers. Good-bye, God-in-the-Constitution party.

As all are aware, we have not the slightest sympathy with the so-called National Reform movement; but it is bound to succeed. Whether they will yet secure the proposed amendment, we do not pretend to say; but the churches already dominate the Government; and according to the dictum of the supreme court, that "this is a Christian nation," all that the National Reformers demand can be practically done without the amendment. We shall yet hear much more from the God-in-the-Constitution party, though in just what shape, time must reveal.

THE case of W. B. Capps, the Seventh-day Adventist, now serving a sentence of fifteen months in a Tennessee jail, for doing ordinary labor on Sunday, has revived the question, Why do Adventists work on Sunday? The answer is, Believing the papacy to be antichrist, and holding the Sunday Sabbath to be the badge of its power, with Adventists the observance of Sunday would be equivalent to rendering homage to antichrist; hence their steady refusal to obey Sunday laws, and their willingness to suffer imprisonment, (as Mr. Capps is doing), the chain-gang, (as several Adventists have done), or even death itself, rather than to so much as appear to regard

Sunday as other than a common working day. It is not therefore, as many seem to regard it, simply a matter of choice of days, but is with the Adventists a vital question directly affecting their salvation.

THE state of mind of the rulers, in at least a part of Europe, is thus described by a foreign correspondent of the *Sun*, in its issue of July 15:—

The French authorities are in a state of alarm approaching panic over the warnings of fresh anarchist plots. The information has been furnished principally by London and other foreign police, and extraordinary precautions have been taken to prevent the execution of the bloodthirsty designs. These measures are so stringent that all foreigners in France are likely to suffer inconvenience. Merely stopping to admire the architecture of the public buildings is likely to lead to arrest on suspicion, as an innocent Englishman found who gazed curiously for five minutes at the foreign office on Thursday. The customs inspectors have been instructed to investigate the contents of everything larger than a small orange. The bill for the suppression of anarchy, which is almost certain to pass the chamber next week, is one of the most drastic pieces of legislation in history. It literally fulfills Macaulay's prophecy that it might prove necessary to destroy liberty in order to preserve civilization. It almost forbids people to think anarchy. It certainly forbids them to mention it in a private letter. It tries offenders without a jury, and on conviction sends them to solitary confinement, and possibly to Cayenne.

Macaulay was by many regarded as a pessimist when he predicted such a condition as now exists; but his "pessimism" was simply the result of an intimate acquaintance with human nature. But even had he been less acute than he was he might have drawn his conclusions from the Scriptures of truth. Speaking by inspiration of God, the Apostle Paul wrote: "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, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." 2 Tim. 3:1-5. And our Saviour foretold a time when men's hearts should be "failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." Luke 21:26. That time of peril and of fear has come; and the next thing is the coming of the Lord.

**August 2, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 31 , pp. 241, 242.**

THERE is just one more scripture, in the same line discussed last week, that we will notice in connection with the present order of things in this country and the world.

THIS is the word spoken by the Lord himself, when he was upon the earth, in answer to the question by his disciples as to what should be the sign of his coming and the end of the world. He answered as follows: "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." Luke 21:25, 26.

THE signs in the sun, and in the moon, and the stars, have long been in the past. The sun was to be darkened, and the moon to be turned to blood, and the stars were to fall from heaven, before the great and terrible day of the Lord should come. Joel 2:31, 32; Rev. 6:12-17. These signs in the sun and moon were fulfilled in the wonderful dark day of 1780.<sup>60</sup> 1 In November, 1833, the word was fulfilled which said the stars should fall from heaven, "even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs when she is shaken of a mighty wind."<sup>61</sup>  
<sup>2</sup>

THESE signs are then long in the past, and from them it is evident that we are nearing the coming of the Lord. But there are other signs mentioned which are nearer to us than those—signs that are even right around us, and so persistently thrust before our eyes and upon our attention that it is impossible not to see them. There is upon the earth to-day such distress of nations with perplexity as never has been before. Nations have been distressed before, but not so greatly distressed, nor with perplexity. An individual of a nation may be distressed and may be able to see and find a way of escape; but when either an individual [*sic.*] or a nation is not only distressed but perplexed, then there is no knowing which way to turn. Each thing that is resorted to, to relieve the distress, only increases the perplexity. And this is precisely the condition in which the nations, as nations, and as governments, are to-day—through fear of war, through financial distress, through socialistic threats, and anarchistic explosions.

IN view of all these things, and others which have been mentioned, men's hearts are now, as never before, failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth. All these things are before us and around us. They have all come to pass and are here, and the very next thing that the Saviour mentions is this, "The powers of heaven shall be shaken. And *then* shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." Luke 21:26, 27. So that after these there is no other sign given us of the coming of the Lord. For the shaking of the powers of heaven occurs in immediate connection with the coming of the Lord, so that this is not, in itself, a sign of the coming of the Lord, but is the convulsion of nature itself at the coming of the Lord. So that it is a literal truth that every sign which the Saviour gave in this list of signs of his coming, is either far in the past or is now passing before the eyes of all the people upon the earth. The next thing is the coming of the Lord himself.

THE Saviour comments upon this and says: "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Luke 21:28. "So likewise ye when ye shall see all these things, know that it [margin "he"] is near, even at the doors." Matt. 24:33. So that when the signs in the sun, and in the moon, and stars began to appear, then redemption *drew nigh*. Now, when we see not only that the signs in the sun, moon, and stars are all long in the past, but that the distress of nations with perplexity, the sea and waves roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things that are coming upon the earth, are passing in the presence of all the people—now, we know that *he is near, even at the doors*.

AND this is the answer which the Lord has given to that question which every man is asking his neighbor,—What do these things mean? The word of God says that these things mean that the harvest is ripe, that the end is near, that the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. And his counsel to all the people is, therefore, "Get ready! get ready! get ready!" "Stablish your hearts," "Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; . . . and he shall be for a sanctuary;" "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh, and knocketh, they may open unto him *immediately*." Luke 12:35, 36.

"For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning: lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, WATCH." Mark 13:34-37.

NOR does the Lord leave men to themselves in this all-important matter of getting ready for his coming. He himself will fully prepare every soul for this great and glorious event, who will surrender himself to the Lord and to the working of his divine will. He has predestinated man to be conformed to the image of his Son. To this end he has called all men.

Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together; who hath declared this from ancient time? who hath told it from that time? have not I the Lord? and there is no God else beside me; a just

242

God and a Saviour; there is none beside me. Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God, and there is none else. Isa. 45:22.

What does he say to do in order to be saved? "*Look* unto me and be ye saved." "*Look*"!

As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.

When Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, the word was, "Look and life." And whosoever looked was cured of the poisonous bites of the serpents. So he says to-day:—

*Look* unto me, and be ye *saved*, all the ends of the earth.

If you are blind and cannot see, and therefore unable to look, then he comes to you and says:—

*Hear*, and your soul shall live. Isa. 55:3.

If you are both blind and deaf, and can neither see nor hear, then he says:—

*Speak* ye unto the Rock. . . . and it shall give forth his water. And that Rock was Christ. Num. 20:8; 1 Cor. 10:4.

If you are blind, and deaf, and dumb, and can neither see, nor hear, nor speak, then he says:—

"O *taste* and see that the Lord is good." Ps. 34:8.

If you are blind, and deaf, and dumb, and have lost all sense of taste, and there is only one single faculty remaining, he says use that, and

*Feel* after him, and find him. Acts 17:27.

Thus the God of Israel, the Lord Jesus Christ, has brought his glorious salvation, his eternal salvation, within the reach of every individual in this world who can either see, or hear, or speak, or feel. And that is all he asks of you. That is God's ways of salvation. Will you accept this salvation and so be justified by the Lord, and thus by him be prepared to be glorified at his glorious appearing which is now so near, and of which there are so many signs?

**"There Are 'Protestants' and Protestants" *American Sentinel* 9, 31 , pp. 242, 243.**

NOT everything that is called Protestant is such in reality. There are Protestants so-called, who are, unintentionally though it be, constantly strengthening the hands of Rome by the interests of their religion. How this is, appears in the following, from the *Catholic Review*, of July 14:—

The Rev. Mr. Buffum, of the Third Baptist Church, Greenville, Norwich, Conn., unintentionally supplies an unanswerable argument why there should be public Catholic schools. In a sermon preached in his church a few evenings ago before the anti-Catholic organization called the Order of United American Mechanics, he said concerning our public schools: "These are Protestant schools, for the nation if Protestants. These schools were made by the Bible and with the Bible. They suit seven out of eight of our people. Are they not good enough for the eighth man? Will you pull out the prop from beneath this magnificent structure simply to suit a foreign taste for the Romanesque? Why not bring in an element the Romanist cannot contend against—the Word of God? No teacher dominated by priests should teach in any public school. Catholics should not be elected to school boards. There should be no compromise. The battle will be fought to a finish." If the present public schools are Protestant, why not then have enough public Catholic schools to educate the Catholic children? There are Protestant teachers in our common schools, Protestant preachers as superintendents, Prot-

243

estant preachers in the boards of education, the Protestant edition of the Bible is read in many of them, Protestant histories are taught in them. Protestant hymns are sung and the Protestant version of the Lord's Prayer is recited in some of them. These are facts. The

public schools in many places are, as the Rev. Mr. Buffum says, Protestant schools. We will not object to that if, as an offset, we have public Catholic schools. Be just. Give us what you have. No inequality should be tolerated. No union of the State with the Protestant Church any more than with the Catholic Church, should be allowed. Let us have similar rights, similar privileges, similar duties—justice all around.

What can "Protestants" of the Buffum school answer to this papal challenge? If our public schools are indeed Protestant, does not justice demand that they be made at once purely secular, or else that there be established also Catholic, Jewish and Agnostic public schools? To ask such a question is to answer it: our public schools should be secular and nothing else.

**"No Conscience in Sunday Keeping" *American Sentinel* 9, 31 , p. 246.**

THE *Christian Statesman*, of July 7, says: "Men have no conscience, as we understand it, on the Sabbath question without the fourth commandment. *It is not an ethical axiom that one day of the seven should be put to sacred uses.* Conscience on such a question cannot exist without a 'Thus saith the Lord.'" But what then becomes of conscience in the matter of Sunday observance? It is manifest that there can be no such thing, for there is absolutely no "Thus saith the Lord" for Sunday keeping, *and the Statesman knows it.*

But our contemporary continues: "Missionaries tell us that they find great difficulty in getting converts to observe the Sabbath [Sunday, the *Statesman* means], Bishop Thoburn says: 'When a man becomes a Christian he knows, without five minutes' teaching, that he must avoid all immoral practices, but he does not know that he must rest one day in seven.' And how should he?" inquires the *Statesman*. "And how will the missionary undertake to strengthen his conscience on that important question? He must do it, of course, by means of the fourth commandment which says, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.'"

We want to ask, What, in the face of this statement of fact, becomes of the claim that Sunday is a civil institution, based, so far as the State is concerned, on the physical necessity of a day of rest? It is simply abandoned.

That which the *Statesman* asserts is absolutely true, except that the fourth commandment has nothing to do with Sunday. There is absolutely nothing in nature to give even a hint of one-seventh part of

time for rest, much less any particular seventh part. Whole nations have risen, become strong and flourished for centuries without any knowledge of a weekly rest day; and nations exist to-day enjoying just as good health and living just as long without a regular weekly rest day as do those who observe Sunday most strictly. The whole physical necessity argument is a "pious" fraud, invented in this country to bolster up Sunday laws under a system of government in which Church and State is supposed to be absolutely divorced, and in which the highest lawmaking power is inhibited from making any "law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Let the *Statesman* never again attempt to justify Sunday laws upon other than strictly religious grounds.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 31 , p. 248.**

THE *Christian Statesman* says that the Government, by its mail contracts, requires "hundreds of thousands to set at naught the law of the Most High," in the Sunday mail service. Will the *Statesman* please to be more definite and point out the divine law which prohibits the carrying of mail on Sunday? Our contemporary must realize that the claims of the Sunday Sabbath are at a great disadvantage because without the vestige of biblical authority. What would not the whole National Reform outfit give for one "Thus saith the Lord" for Sunday observance! But they have it not. The wealth of the world could not buy it, and so they must continue to steal the livery of heaven in which to serve the pagan Sunday. Oh, the wickedness of applying the fourth commandment to Sunday!

THE National Reform Association has one of its secretaries at Albany trying to secure the adoption of a so-called "Christian" preamble to the new constitution. The present preamble reads thus:—

We, the people of the State of New York, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings, do establish this constitution.

It would seem that this ought to satisfy even a National Reformer, but it don't, and so Mr. Weir, a citizen of Pennsylvania, wants this adopted in its stead:—

We, the people of the State of New York, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings, as a Christian people in the name and by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, on whose shoulder is the government, do establish this constitution.

This is monstrous. To begin with, the people of this State are not, properly speaking, thankful to God for freedom; they are not, in any proper sense, a "Christian people;" and certainly as long as Tammany bears rule, the government of New York is not on Christ's shoulder. Let no lie be incorporated into our fundamental law. Let the old preamble stand; or better yet, substitute this:—

We, the people of the State of New York, in order to secure to ourselves and our posterity the benefits of good and stable government, do establish this constitution.

AND now let the National Reformers rise up in their wrath and pronounce curses both loud and deep on the nation: the attorney for the District of Columbia has decided that ordinarily the word "daily" would not include Sunday, that being a *dies non*, but that in the matter of removing garbage it means just what it says. "Garbage is accumulated on Sunday as well as on other days," writes Mr. Thomas, "and since its presence is just as objectionable to health on Sundays as on other days, the word 'daily,' it seems to me, must be considered as used in the contract with reference to the service to be performed, and must, therefore, in the nature of things, include Sundays."

Now let Mr. Crafts declare that the nation cannot be preserved without religion, nor religion without the Sabbath, nor the Sabbath while the District of Columbia removes its garbage upon Sunday. Let Dr. George renew his onslaught on Congress, and let Joseph Cook expand his broad palm and closing his fingers one by one, clinch the Sunday argument in this most unhappy and inconclusive way.

**August 9, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 32 , pp. 249, 250.**

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

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

INDEED, to those who have been carefully studying the public movements of the last two or three years, this widespread spirit of violence and lawlessness has been expected; and now, instead of

expecting it to end at the limits that it has reached, widespread though it be, it is expected to become universal.

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

LET us recite the facts in the case: From 1888 till 1892 the combined churches, Prohibition party, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, tried their best to get Congress and the whole Government of the United States to do what the leaders of the combination knew to be an unconstitutional thing, and which, being done, they have again declared to be unconstitutional; that is, to espouse the Sunday-Sabbath cause. As Congress did not respond readily enough to suit them, they added threats to their "petitions" and their former efforts. These threats of the combined "Protestant" religious element of the country, were to the effect that they pledged themselves and each other that they would never again vote for or support for any office or position of trust any member of Congress, either senator or representative, who should refuse to do their bidding to pass the church-instituted provision closing the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—the "Christian Sabbath," the "Lord's Day," etc.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The question now to be decided by the management is, whether it is advisable further to urge a doubtful contest, upon a matter that is aggravating an already *extensive and bitter hostility* against

Chicago and the Exposition, which even if ultimately successful, would be *as likely to be fraught with disaster* as benefit to the enterprise.

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

250

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

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

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

The court was composed of Circuit Judge Howell E. Jackson, now a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, and District Judge E. S. Hammond. The opinion was written by Judge Hammon, and was filed August 1, 1891. Then in the *Memphis Appeal-Avalanche* of August 30, there was published a four-column article by Judge Hammond, dated August 12, and entitled "The Sunday Habit," which is little if anything else than a defense of the decision that had

been rendered on this subject August 1. In this article the Judge confesses that "the logic of this [his] position may lead to a union of Church and State undoubtedly;" but that the support of Sunday by the civil power, and by persecution, "is a necessity of statesmanship" upon "the policy of securing the public peace." The danger to the public peace, and the source of it, if Sunday laws were disregarded by those who have a "distaste for, or a disbelief in, the custom;" of it they were attacked by a proposal to abolish them, is set forth as follows:—

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

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

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

This statement and those of representatives Reilly and Houk, are the deliberate opinions of representative men, and officials in official place: men who were in position not only to know, but in which they were obliged to consider the question in all its bearings. And when, having so considered the question, they set forth this as their deliberate conclusion, then nothing more is needed to demonstrate that the church element, that is managing and supporting the Sunday cause in the United States, is one of *the most dangerous elements in the United States*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN view of such an example as this, should it be thought surprising that lawlessness should be manifested by others throughout the whole country as never before, and that violence should cover the land from ocean to ocean?

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

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

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

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

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

IT was because of this evil example of "the best people of the land," this principle of violence and lawlessness, forced upon the Government by the combined churches of the country—it was because of this that we have expected nothing else than that violence and lawlessness would spread through the land, and that we still expect it to become universal. This is not to say that the particular *phases* of lawlessness that have of late been manifested in so many

parts of the country, have been carried on by the human actors therein in conscious and intentional pursuance of the example of lawlessness set by the churches; but it *is* to say that *there is a spirit of things* that must ever be taken into account. There is the Spirit of order, and there is the spirit of disorder. And when the Spirit of order has been so outraged, and the spirit of disorder chosen and persistently followed instead, as it has been in this case—and that too by the very ones who profess to be the representatives of the Spirit of order in the earth—then things are given over to the spirit of disorder and lawlessness, and nothing remains but that this spirit shall prevail and increase until it becomes universal. And we have no hesitation in saying that every man and woman who took part in this movement of the church-combine upon the Government is responsible for the consequences, violent and lawless as those consequences may be.

**"No Longer Astonished" *American Sentinel* 9, 32 , pp. 251, 252.**

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

251

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

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

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

**"Is Man Immortal?" *American Sentinel* 9, 32 , pp. 251, 252.**

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

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

or rather, had it possessed him, would have prevented the shocking tragedy you mention.

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

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

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

C. W.

SWARTZ.

*Hillsdale, Mich.*

It is true, as Mr. Swartz says, that so-called orthodoxy teaches not only the immortality of the soul, but also that "no murderer hath eternal life abiding him." But this is nullified very largely by the

definition given to the term "eternal life." Life and death are not by "orthodoxy" permitted to have their natural and obvious meaning, but are made to mean misery and happiness. In this fact lurks the evil. Clothe a man with eternal life and he will readily take the chances on his condition in eternity. This argument prevailed with our first parents. It was when assured by the serpent that they should not surely die, but should be as gods that they took the forbidden fruit. The Lord says (Ezk. 13:22): "With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not turn from his wickedness, by promising him life." 'Orthodoxy' departs from the truth far enough to accept as one of its tenets Satan's first great lie. Is it strange that many who accept this tenet go one step further and imagine that life a happy one?

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

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

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

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

252

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

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

**"Satolli, Sunday Laws, and Salvation" *American Sentinel* 9, 32 , pp. 252, 253.**

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

The letter further says:—

If there are saloon keepers in your parish who call themselves Catholics, and yet carry on their business in a forbidden and disedifying way, or sell on Sundays, either openly or under any sort of guise or disguises, in violation of civil law, and to the hurt of order and religion and the scandal of any part of the community, you will refuse them absolution, should they perchance come to receive the

sacraments, unless they promise to cease offending in these or other ways and to conduct their business blamelessly if they can, or get out of it and keep out of it altogether.

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

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

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

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

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

253

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

**"An Interesting Question" *American Sentinel* 9, 32 , p. 253.**

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

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

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

**"Hoist with Their Own Petard" *American Sentinel* 9, 32 , pp. 254, 255.**

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

Two Seventh-day Adventists ministers, named respectively Jones and Howard, moved their tent in which meetings are conducted, and their household goods, by boat, from a point near Annapolis to Kent Island, Md., landing at the wharf of the Chester River Steamboat Company. After paying for the use of the dock one of them proceeded

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

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

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

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

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

Middletown, Del., July 28, 1894.

TO THE COMMITTEE,  
*Stevensville, Kent Island, Md.*

DEAR SIRS: I have received the proposition made by your body to Messrs Jones and Howard, ministers of the gospel and licensed by the Seventh-day Adventist Conference, which I have the honor to represent as president. From their statement of the kind manner

in which you requested them to leave the place and offered to refund some items of expense incurred by

255

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

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

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

Another reason for declining to leave Kent Island as proposed by you, is that we have the same *civil* right to peacably [*sic.*] go and come and labor in your midst as any other individuals. We are quiet, upright citizens of a common country. It is an insult, though not intended, to ask us to leave the community like characters dangerous to the welfare of our fellow-men. We are not criminals and shall not accept to be treated as such without protest. We will appeal to the authorities to protect us in the inalienable rights of all men. Our fathers fought for the freedom of this land and we still claim it for ourselves and everybody else. We have no more

privileges than others, but we are entitled to the same. Would either of the gentlemen of the committee consent to be driven from his lawful labor either by bribes or intimidation? His answer is ours. We may possibly suffer for our faith but we cannot yield and still at heart be men. Civil and religious liberty are involved and we will sacrifice the principle of neither to save ourselves trouble from persons who ignore the God-given right of all men.

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

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

Yours very respectfully, H. E. ROBINSON,  
*Pres. Atl. Conf. Seventh-day Adventists.*

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

**August 16, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 33 , pp. 257, 258.**

THE President of the United States has appointed a board of commission of "arbitration," in consequence of the Chicago strike.

IN the way that this has been brought about, however, there could not be a more complete misnomer than to call it a board or commission, or anything else, of *arbitration*.

THERE is not a single element of arbitration in it. For arbitration is "the hearing and determining of a controversy by a person or persons *mutually agreed upon by the parties to the dispute.*"

NOW these persons have not been "mutually agreed upon by the parties to the dispute." There has been no sort of an agreement in the matter by the parties to the dispute. Indeed, only one of the parties to the dispute called for it or had anything to do with it in any way. This board or commission, or whatever it is called in that respect,

therefore, is entirely lacking in the very first elements that attach to a board or commission of *arbitration*.

INDEED, the idea of any mutual agreement or action on the part of the parties to the dispute seems not to be contemplated in the act of Congress under which this commission is appointed. For the act provides that "the services of the commission to be ordered at the time of the President, and constituted as herein provided, *may be tendered by the President* for the purpose of settling a controversy such as contemplated, either *on his own motion* or upon the application of *one of the parties* to the controversy, or upon the application of an executive of a State." Thus is it clear that there is no such thing as a mutual agreement of the parties to the dispute respecting who shall be the arbitrator, nor even that there shall be an arbitration of the controversy at all. The appointment of the commission and the tendering of its offices may come altogether from the outside, and the nearest that it gets to the parties is that it may be appointed and tendered upon the application of *one of the parties* to the dispute. Thus in any and every phase the procedure lacks every element of arbitration. Yet for all this lack, the commission has been appointed; it is called a commission of arbitration, and is expected to have, indeed, "shall have," "all the powers and authority given in section 2 to a board of arbitration"!

NOW, if the action of this board is to have any force whatever—whether its decision is to be enforced by the power of the Government upon the party adjudged by it to be in the wrong, or whether it is to be only by the "moral influence" of the weight of the Government in favor of the other party, putting the party adjudged to be in the wrong to the disadvantage of publicly disagreeing with the national Government; in either case the result can be only *dictation* instead of arbitration. If the decision of the committee is not intended to have any real force either governmental or moral, then the procedure amounts simply to a piece of meddling which in itself is suggestive of dictatorship. But it may be asked, Shall the Government do nothing? Answer: The Government, State or national, as the case may be, shall see to it that all parties shall keep the peace in all respects, whatever their differences or disputes may be. This the governmental power may do and keep itself and all others in place.

YET there is no doubt that the decision of this commission is intended to have force of some sort, and that, apparently, in no small measure. And as the commission, with the procedure altogether, it

totally lacking in the elements of arbitration, whatever force it may exert will be nothing else than the assertion of the principle of dictation. This is true also in another way; because it is intended by those who are engineering this that if this does not bring the desired result then the next step is to be legislation establishing "compulsory arbitration" in so many words. But compulsory arbitration is a contradiction in terms. The very suggestion of compulsion destroys all idea of arbitration. The only word that will properly express the idea of "compulsory arbitration" is the plain and simple word *dictation*. This plain and simple word, however, is rather too strong to start with, and so it must be covered up with the self-contradictory expression, "compulsory arbitration;" and even to this the way must be smoothed by the practice of a pretended arbitration that is not arbitration at all in any true sense of the word.

WITH the action of the committee, however, we have nothing to do. It matters not which way it decides nor what it does. It is the establishment of the principle and the fixing of the precedent, with which we are concerned; it is this and this only that we are discussing. It is the logical tendency of this sort of "arbitration" that we desire to trace. We are simply inquiring what is wrapped up in this thing, and what therefore must inevitably come out of it.

IT is worth remarking that this idea and practice of "arbitration" is not intended nor expected to put an end to strikes. In fact, it is the doctrine of one of the chiefest of the leaders of organized labor that without contention there can be no arbitration, and without a strike there can be no contention. In remarking upon the appointment of this committee by President Cleveland, Mr. Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, said:—

If President Cleveland has made any stipulation that the strike should be called off as a preliminary, he has made arbitration impossible; for that means the attainment of a settlement between contending forces, and *after the strike ceases the contention has ceased*.

According to this doctrine, and according to all the probabilities in the case, there is no room for doubt that strikes will continue, and continue to increase in extent and violence, as they have done ever since labor-unions were first organized in this country.

CONSIDER, then, that strikes will continue, and that this kind of "arbitration"

will also continue. It is hardly to be expected that the decisions will *always* be in favor of the strikers. If this is expected, then this only adds to the procedure another element of dictation. If there is any probability that the decision of the "arbitrators" will at some time be against the strikers and in favor of the operator, then this carries with it also the probability that there will come a time when the decision of the "arbitrators" will not be at all satisfactory to the strikers. Then they will denounce the board as being allied with capital against labor, and will refuse to accept it as a settlement. In other words, they will strike against the decision of the "arbitrators." Suppose this commission had been appointed in time to reach Chicago at the height of the contest last month, and by any possibility had found and decided that the Pullman Company was justified in the stand that they had taken, is there a man in the United States who supposes that Debs and his committee would have accepted such a decision and ordered off the strike? In view of their open denunciation of the President of the United States for merely ordering troops to Chicago to maintain the laws of the United States, is it at all supposable that they would have accepted a decision actually in favor of the Pullman Company or the board of railway managers?

AMS certainly as there is a probability that a decision will fall sometime against the strikers, so certainly also there is a probability that the strikers will sometime strike against the decision. But a strike against the decision of the "arbitrators" will be nothing less than a strike against the Government itself.<sup>621</sup> Then as certainly as such a thing as that ever happens, there will be a dispute between labor and the Government, *which dispute will have to be arbitrated*. Then who shall be the "arbitrators" to settle this dispute? Neither the Government nor capital nor labor can do it, because these are all parties to the dispute. There cannot be one chosen from each of the three parties in dispute, because as the Government will have already decided in favor of capital, and the strike is now against both, this would give a board of two to one against labor to start with. Plainly, then, the Government and capital and labor will all be excluded from conducting any arbitration between the Government and labor. There is one element remaining, and but one, that could do it, *and that is the Church*. This is the only element remaining sufficiently separated from all parties to such a dispute, to be qualified to come between them in the character of arbitrator. And she will occupy the place as surely as it shall ever be made. And the place

will be made as surely as this sort of "arbitration" that has been started shall continue. And it is just as likely to continue as that the contest between "capital and labor" shall continue.

THUS there can be, and almost certainly will be, created the much-coveted opportunity for the Church further to insinuate herself into the place of control and guidance in governmental affairs. And as to what church it will be, in the last resort at least, there can be no shadow of doubt. It will be *the Catholic Church*. For some considerable time Cardinal Gibbons has been advocating a national board of arbitration, such as is now begun. Besides this, as so vast a majority of the discontented, agitating, striking, violent, element, are members in good and regular standing in the Catholic Church, it will be urged, and urged successfully, that she is entitled to a representative on the board. More than this probability, she has a representative on this board that has been lately appointed by the President, namely, Francis Kernan, who finished his education at that Jesuit seat of learning Seton Hall College, Orange, N.J. And if Mr. Magone, who was first named, is not also a Catholic, the fact is contradictory to the suggestion of his name.

THIS is the logical outcome and the sure result of this scheme of "arbitration" that has been begun in the United States. And when the Catholic Church shall have made firm her footing here in this thing, made shall have thus put herself in the place of chief "arbitrator" in national affairs for, and to, this great American nation, then in this also Europe will be drawn to follow the example, and thus in another way will the papacy be lifted to the headship and control of the world. And thus will the great ambition of Leo XIII. be accomplished in having the pope recognized and referred to as the great "arbiter" of all national differences.

IN times of such difficulties as those that have covered this country the present year, and which will be continued along the line that we are here discussing, both in this country and in Europe—in times such as these, it is with peculiar force that the papacy suggests itself to the minds of rulers and statesmen as the source of the greatest help. In times of violence, strife, anarchy, and revolution, when the very foundations of States and even of society itself seem to be moved, it is almost instinctively that the European statesman especially grasps the hand of the papacy. The papacy has passed through revolution after revolution, and complete anarchy itself is no terror to it.

THE papal church not only saw, but *caused*, the fall of the Roman Empire. And as that empire was the "mightiest fabric of human greatness" ever set up, so its fall was the most terrible ever seen in history. Yet the papacy not only passed through it, but she gathered new strength from it all. The Catholic Church thrives on revolutions; the perplexities of States are her fortune; to her, anarchy is better than order, unless she can rule. She is so completely the mistress of every kind of deviltry that it matters not what phase of it presents itself, she can manipulate it to her own advantage. Therefore when revolution is imminent and anarchy threatens, it is almost instinctively that rulers and statesmen grasp the ever-proffered hand of her who has survived the anarchy of the Middle Ages and the revolutions of fifteen centuries.

IT is with perfect satisfaction that the papal church sees the Government of the United States taking the step that involves "arbitration" between itself and its own violent and lawless citizens. For she knows that as the vast majority of these violent lawless ones are her own subjects, so the outcome must certainly redound to her profit and her exaltation. As she has already announced that "the solution of the present social difficulties is to be found in the Catholic Church;" and that "if society is to be saved from a condition worse in some respects than pagan times, it is from the Vatican the savior must come;" so she is most gratified to see the steps taken that inevitably involves herself and her power as this savior. And she has also announced that, as "the United States succeed in solving these problems, Europe will follow their example," and these, too, will turn to her as their savior. This is the publicly announced plan of the Roman Catholic Church, and everything is drawing her way, and she is glad of it. This is the means by which she ascended to her height of power and dominion before; this means will surely raise her to that place again. From her experience before, she knows how to take advantage of the like means now to raise herself to the place of power and dominion such as she had before, only greater as the world is larger now than it was then. Mgr. Satolli made no mistake when he declared, in behalf of the papacy, that in America more than anywhere else lies the key of the future. Mgr. Satolli is here to turn that key. It can be turned many ways to favor the aims of the papacy. And in no one way can it be turned more to favor the papacy than in the manipulation of this idea of "compulsory arbitration." This is

simply dictation, and it will end in the dictation of the papacy to the nation and to the world.

**"Too Late to Deny It" *American Sentinel* 9, 33 , pp. 258, 259.**

IN the *Catholic World* for August, "Rev." Walter Elliott, a Roman Catholic missionary, tells of his experience among the Seventh-day Adventists in Michigan. "Father" Elliott says:—

The sect is the most venomous enemy of Catholicity in these parts. . . . And yet some of our Catholic journals have favored it on the question of the observance of the Sunday as against Protestantism generally. I am persuaded that this is bad policy, to say the least of it. If Protestants, as a body, are mistaken as to the office of scripture, they are right as to the day of the Lord. Do not be too eager to make men give up the truth by showing them that they are "illogical." . . . Our policy is to favor the right side among our jarring brethren, rather than to compel consistency. Say to them, First be right, and then be consistent and get wholly right. To play off error against inconsistency is not fraternal. Furthermore, the Seventh-day Adventists incline to be Old Testament Christians, Puritans of the worst sort, and are making a propaganda of much energy, and not without results. If what the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* calls the Christian Sabbath shall lose its place in our national customs, and if its legal observance shall drop out of the competency of our legislators, the end will be the abolition of a general observance of any day of rest and prayer at all—a calamity of the first order. I have been almost everywhere assailed with quotations from one of our oldest and most respectable Catholic journals against the scripture basis of the observance of the first day of the week—claiming that it has not any scripture authority whatever, is wholly without a scripture basis, etc. Such, however, is not the sense of the Catholic Church.

The "reverend" "father" seems to be hard hit by the quotation from "one of our oldest and most respectable Catholic journals," but his denial is vain. He quotes Catholic authorities in support of his position, but that is also vain. It is not the *Catholic Mirror* alone (the old and respectable journal referred to) which asserts the fact that there is no scriptural authority for Sunday observance. "The Faith of Our Fathers," by Cardinal Gibbons, has on page 111, this paragraph:—

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.

In "Catholic Belief," a standard Catholic work, published in this city by Benziger Brothers, and indorsed by Cardinal McCloskey, June 5, 1884, we find this on page 251, from the Creed of Pius IV.:—

I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same church.

The dagger refers to a foot-note as follows:—

That is, I admit as points of *revealed truth* what the church declares the apostles taught as such, whether clearly or not clearly expressed or *not even mentioned in the written word of God; as, for instance, that baptism is to be conferred on infants, that Sunday instead of Saturday (called the Sabbath) is to be kept holy; and moreover, I admit those points of discipline which the church holds as established by the apostles, or by their successors as lawful rulers of the church in the early centuries of Christianity, such as points of liturgy or of church government.*

We have italicized the salient part of this note to call attention to the fatal confession which it contains in reference to two cherished dogmas of so-called orthodoxy. Priest Elliott will have to add this and the cardinal's book to his *Index Expurgatorius*. But it will be hard for him to conceal the naked truth. The fact is as it is, and it would be none the less a fact if every papist in the world denied it. There is no scriptural authority for Sunday, and this politic priest knows it. It may have been "bad policy" for the Catholics to tell the truth on this point; but they have told it as their published works abundantly prove.

**"True Protestantism" *American Sentinel* 9, 33 , p. 259.**

A CORRESPONDENT calls attention to the too prevalent idea that the term "Protestant" applies to "all who are not Roman Catholic," and asks that the SENTINEL aid in correcting that idea. This the SENTINEL is doing and will continue to do. It is true, non-Catholics are not necessarily Protestants, but it is also true that many professed Protestants are not Protestants at all.

The word "Protestant" as applied to those who oppose the papacy, is derived from the word "protest," which appeared in the famous document presented by the dissenting princes at the Diet of Spires, April 19, 1629.

The Diet of Spires, in 1526, decreed religious liberty, but in 1629 the Roman Catholic princes proposed to annul the decree of 1526

and declare instead that "the ministers shall preach the gospel, exclaiming it according to the writings accepted by the holy Christian [Roman Catholic] Church."

Against this proposed decree the princes who espoused the Reformation protested in the following noble words:—

Moreover, the new edict declaring the ministers shall preach the gospel, explaining it according to the writings accepted by the holy Christian Church; we think that, for this regulation to have any value, we should first agree on what is meant by the true and holy Church. Now, seeing that there is great diversity of opinion in this respect; that there is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; that 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 it 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 fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God.

For these reasons, most dear lords, uncles, cousins, and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we PROTEST by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, and who will one day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people neither *consent* nor *adhere* in any manner whatever to the proposed decree, in *anything* that is *contrary to God*, to *his holy Word*, to *our right conscience*, to *the salvation of our souls*, and to the last decree of Spires.

This was Protestantism in the 16th century, and it is true Protestantism in the closing years of the 19th century. True Protestantism says: "There is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God." He who teaches or practices contrary to this is not a Protestant. True Protestantism says: "The Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine." He who teaches any other doctrine is not a Protestant. True Protestantism pledges itself "to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only Word, such as it is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to

it." Where true Protestantism is found to-day this pledge is maintained.

When the civil power attempts to prohibit the exercise of this great privilege and duty, either in precept or practice, true Protestantism arises in its Christian manhood and refuses either to "consent" or "adhere in any manner whatever," and makes its protest in the face of kings, and princes, "lords, uncles, cousins and friends," and "before all men and all creatures." This is true Protestantism; but it is more, it is true Christianity, and none but a true Christian can be a true Protestant though he may be opposed to the Roman Catholic Church and belong to an anti-Roman Catholic society.

We recommend to our correspondent and to all others who wish to examine this matter further and do missionary work among their neighbors to secure copies of a little thirty-two page tract, entitled, "Protestantism, True and False," published by the International Religious Liberty Association, and for sale at the SENTINEL office. A second edition of this tract has just been issued, which contains three appendixes of valuable new matter. Those who read the tract on its first publication ought to get a copy of the second edition, price 4 cents, \$2.00 per hundred.

**"Saint Worship" *American Sentinel* 9, 33 , p. 261.**

AT Saint Anne de BeauprÈ, a small town on the St. Lawrence River, about twenty-three miles below Quebec, is located a Roman Catholic shrine. To this shrine more than one hundred and fifty thousand "pilgrims" will resort during the year 1894. Some will come from the United States, but a majority are French Catholics from the Catholic Province of Quebec. Excursionists or "pilgrims" flock to the shrine of "St. Anne," by boat and by rail, led by their parish priest, and on landing march to the church, chanting the litany with pious ardor. They bring with them the maimed, the sick, the halt, and the blind, believing that "St. Anne" will cure them. On the arrival of a pilgrimage they immediately repair to the church of "St. Anne," where mass is celebrated for their benefit, and then begins the worship of "St. Anne."

But who is "St. Anne"? Let a book entitled, "Manual of Devotion to Good St. Anne," containing the official indorsement of "Cardinal Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec," answer: "St. Anne is the mother of the mother of God" (p. 73), "the mother of Mary and the

grandmother of Jesus" (p. 71), "who from all eternity was more agreeable to God than all other mothers, the Blessed Virgin excepted." p. 132. Where does the cardinal get this astonishing information? Let the book again reply:—

The sacred Scriptures speak very little of many holy personages whose destiny was bound up with the work of our redemption. A single page would contain all that is directly related therein of the Blessed Virgin, and scarcely is St. Joseph mentioned at all, while the *life*, the *virtues*, and *even the name* of St. Anne *has been left in complete oblivion*. The ever blessed and beloved name of St. Anne has been transmitted to us *only by tradition* and by the gratitude of *Christian nations* (p. 70).

But why make pilgrimages to St. Anne de BeauprÈ? Why ask "St. Anne" to heal the sick? Is "St. Anne" at BeauprÈ? Oh, no; only "a notable fragment of a finger bone of St. Anne" (p. 73). Where was it obtained?

St. Anne, after her holy death, was buried near Jerusalem; but later on her sacred remains were deposited in the church of the "sepulchre of our lady" in the valley of Jehoshaphat. During the reign of the Roman Emperor Trajan, in the first century of Christendom, the venerable body of St. Anne, or rather the greater portion of it, was brought over to the town of Apt, in the diocese of Avignon (France) where it is still held in deep veneration. <sup>631</sup>

Concerning the removal of these precious remains, it is reported that one day a mysterious bark was seen to approach the shores of France. It had neither sail nor rudder, but God was its pilot. Never had the ocean borne a greater treasure. For in the bark were St. Lazarus, with his pious sisters, St. Mary Magdalene and St. Martha, together with several other saintly women. They were fleeing from Palestine, their country, carrying away with them [a] number of priceless relics, the most precious among which was the hallowed body of St. Anne. . . . However, on account of the reigning persecutions, St. Anne's body had to be buried in the ground to protect it against sacrilegious hands, and at length the place where it had been secreted was *wholly forgotten*. Pp. 1-4.

Not to weary the reader longer with details, this Cardinal-indorsed story goes on to say that "a miracle caused the discovery of the hiding place" in 792, seven hundred years after its loss. When found, it is asserted that the case bore the words: "Here lies the body of St. Anne, mother of the Glorious Virgin Mary." From the discovered body the "notable fragment of a finger bone of St. Anne" was secured and exhibited at BeauprÈ in 1670. "Finally in 1891, after long and constant entreaties, the chapter of Carcassone has graciously

condescended to divide into two equal parts its valuable relics of St. Anne, namely, the hand bones, and to share this priceless object with our church." So according to this childish story there is at BeauprÉ, Quebec, "a fragment of a finger bone of St. Anne" and the half of her "hand bones." This is the reason a hundred and fifty thousand "pilgrims" will visit the place this year, and prostrate themselves on the floor before a glass case containing a part of the relic, and crowd, as the writer has seen, like sheep at a salt lick, around this decaying fragment of mortality, hoping to kiss the glass that covers it. The blind, the halt, and the maimed, aided by friends and relatives, struggle to touch, not the hem of the garment of *Jesus*, "who ever *liveth* to make intercession for us," but the decaying "fragment of the finger bone" of the "*grandmother* of Jesus." More anon.

**August 30, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 34 , pp. 265, 266.**

JOACHIM PECCI, as Leo XIII., is pope of Rome, and of all that the word Rome suggests.

THIS Joachim Pecci, as "Leo XIII., Pope," has recently—June 21—addressed a communication "to the Princes and Peoples of the Universe."

BUT why does this man Pecci presume to speak to the princes and peoples *of the universe*? What causes Joachim Pecci to think that the universe will listen or care to listen to what he has to say?

OH, he thinks that he is God on earth! He actually tells "the princes and peoples of the universe" that "We"—there seems to be more than one of him—"We hold the regency of God on earth." And he tells it with an air that suggests that he really expects the universe to take seriously and believe the ridiculous statement.

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. Yet there are so many princes and peoples who actually believe this ridiculous and blasphemous thing, and there are so many more who will admit tacitly or otherwise this ridiculous and blasphemous claim, and all together will therefore give such place to this claim and such force to these words, that for this reason and no other, it is well to set forth the principal points in this communication to "the universe."

IN calling all the universe to "the unity of the Catholic faith," he first designates those outside the pale of Christendom, next the Eastern churches, next the Slavonic race, and lastly the Protestants. He so longs for the Protestants in particular that he says, it is with "burning charity" that he turns toward these. Yes, there is no doubt of that. Those who have exercised this same "regency" before him have always had a burning charity for Protestants. John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and thousands of other Protestants, were literally burned to ashes by it. *We*—and there are *actually* more than one of *us*—we desire to see no more manifestations of this "burning charity" anywhere in "the universe."

THAT part that is the most important to the people of the United States—that part that will be the most taking to the professed Protestants in the United States, and that will be pushed to the front most here, is the passage in which he states the relations of the Church to the State. Here it is:—

It [the Church] is invested with power to make laws, and in the exercise of this power it is just that it should be free, even as this is just to all in any way depending on its authority. This liberty, however, need not arouse rivalries and antagonisms, for the Church aspires to no power and obeys no ambitions. What it desires solely is to preserve among men the exercise of virtue, and by this means assure their eternal salvation. And so it uses condescension and maternal processes. More than this, having regard to the requirements of all societies, it sometimes waives the exercise of its own rights, as has been shown abundantly by its conventions with different States. Nothing is farther from its thoughts than to trespass upon the rights of civil authority, which in return should respect the rights of the Church and beware of usurping any part of them. . . . God, Creator and Ruler of the world, of his high foresight, has given forth government of human societies, both civil and sacred authorities, wishing thereby, no doubt, to keep them distinct, but forbidding all rupture and conflict between them. This is not all. The Divine will and the general good of societies require that the civil power should be in harmony with the ecclesiastical power.

The State has its own rights and duties. The Church has hers. Between them there should be the bonds of strictest concord. So would surely be suppressed the unrest visible in the relations of Church and State—an unrest for many reasons perilous and grievous to all good people. So, without confusing or separating rights, all citizens would render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things which are God's.

That all *sounds* very well, and looks nice enough on paper, but like fly-paper, or the sugared pill, its sweetness is all on the surface and very thin at that. As thin as it is, however, it is altogether likely that it is thick enough to cause many professed Protestants to think that instead of a sugar pill it is a perfectly rounded bulb of solid sweetness, or instead of mere fly-paper and poisoned too, it is a whole hive of honey. Let us set alongside of this a passage on this point, written only three years ago by this same Mr.

266

Pecci, writing then as now as "Leo XIII., Pope." Here it is:—

It is the Church that proclaims from the gospel those teachings by which the conflict can be put an end to, or at least made far less

bitter; the Church uses its efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by its precepts the life and conduct of men; . . . *and acts on the decided view that for these purposes* recourse should be had in due measure and degree, to the help of the law and of State authority.

This shows that "the bonds of strictest concord" that should be between the Church and the State are such bonds as shall bind and the State to do the bidding of the Church and be her obedient tool in helping the Church in "its efforts not only to enlighten the mind but to direct by its precepts the life and conduct of men."

HE next condemns, without measure, "the Masonic sect." We are not qualified to defend Masonry; but we know perfectly well that, admitting the truth of all that he says of Masonry, most, if not all, of it is true with far more force of the papacy. Here it is:—

It is a formidable power which has long oppressed all nations, and especially Catholic nations. Insolently proud of strength, resources, and successes, it spares no pains in these our troubled times to affirm and extend its dominion everywhere. From the dark caverns where it once plotted it has invaded our cities in broad daylight. . . . Most deplorable is it that wherever it enters it permeates all classes and all State institutions, as though it would constitute itself the sovereign arbitrator of all things. This we hold specially regrettable, for the perversity of its opinions and the iniquity of its designs are flagrant. Under cover of protecting the rights of men, and reforming society, it assails Christian institutions. . . . Marriage, the idea of the family, the education of youth, it strives to deprive of their Christian character, aiming also at the destruction of the popular respect for divine and human power. The cult it orders is the cult of nature. And it holds up the principles of nature as the one measure and the one rule of truth, honesty, and justice. Thus, as we see, man is driven to the ways and habits of an almost pagan life, if the abundance and refinement of seductions do not drive him still lower.

He says that it is in that very city of Rome, "the capital of the Catholic world, that it has established headquarters;" and with vastly more force it is true of the papacy that in the city of Washington, "the capital of the modern world," the church of Rome has established headquarters, that mean only mischief to the United States and to the world. His wish concerning Masonry is thus expressed:—

May the divine mercy upset these dark designs, and may Christian people understand that they must do away with this sect, and shake off, once for all, its shameful yoke.

Such is his "burning charity" toward them and all the rest of us, just as it always has been.

BEFORE closing he covertly pays tribute to his own authority as supreme, and warns all of what they may expect if they are not subject to it. This he puts thus:—

Reason yields to some the lawful right to command and enjoins on others to obey. In this obedience there is nothing hurtful to human dignity, since, speaking strictly, God is obeyed rather than man, and God reserves his most rigorous judgments for those who command *unless they represent his authority* in conformity with right and justice.

And lastly, he does not miss the opportunity to set himself forth as the "mediator of peoples and governments" in these times of disorder and "prevailing unrest" in the present, and of "fear of the future." And here are his words on that:—

Lastly, if we reflect upon what the Church can do as a mother and mediator of peoples and governments, helping all by its authority and counsel, we shall see how important it is that all nations should adopt the same feeling and profession in matters appertaining to the Christian faith. While our mind dwells on these thoughts and our heart prays for their realization, we see in the far distant future *a new order of things unfolding itself*. We know nothing sweeter than the contemplation of the great benefits which would result naturally from it. . . . The virtue of these benefits would not be limited to civilized nations. It would go far beyond, like a broad, fertilizing river. . . . Especially do we implore princes and rulers in the name of their political foresight and solicitude for the interests of their peoples, to weigh our designs equitably, and second them by their favor and authority. Were only a part of the fruits that we expect to ripen, the benefit would not be small amid the present rapid downfall of all things, and when to the prevailing unrest is joined fear of the future.

Thus he invites princes and rulers to help forward his grand scheme of insinuating himself into the place of dictator of the nations, and obediently enforce his dictates upon the people of the world.

THIS communication of "Leo XIII., Pope," was taken up and discussed by the *Tribune* of this city in a "tone and manner" which the *Catholic World* is "much pleased to acknowledge" as "most respectful and amicable." And this fact, the *Tribune* being Protestant, the *Catholic World* says "furnishes one of the best arguments which can be adduced in proof of the legitimacy and validity of the claim which the pope makes to be the vicegerent of God on earth and the divinely commissioned teacher of the Christian religion to all mankind." The

argument is, that if the *Tribune* and others who speak and act as it does on this subject were really Protestant, they would not show any respect or courtesy to such a document issued upon such claims as is this. But being Protestants and receiving it with its claims "with respect and courtesy," this is declared to be "a powerful proof" that the claims that are made are legitimate and valid. We are not real certain but that there may be something in this view of the matter. For when anybody can treat with respect and courtesy a communication addressed as this one is, asserting the supremely ridiculous and blasphemous claims that this one does, then it would seem that such person really supposed that there might be something in the claim that was worthy of respect and courtesy. And when anybody, professing to be a *Protestant*, does such a thing, it would seem that it is not far from a tacit concession of some sort to the legitimacy and validity of the claim.

IN this same number of the *Catholic World* a prominent Catholic describes Seventh-day Adventists as being of the last remnants of "consistent Protestantism." We are glad that they recognize even a remnant of consistent Protestantism, and we are glad that they recognize us by name as being this remnant. It is therefore doubtless expected by them that we shall not receive this communication with any respect or courtesy. This is right. Their expectation is fulfilled so far. Therefore, in closing, we may be allowed to state that we have no more respect for Joachim Pecci as "Leo XIII., Pope," addressing the princes and peoples of the universe, and notifying them that he holds "the regency of God on earth," or addressing anybody else in any other way, than we have for any other man who should set forth the ridiculous and blasphemous claims that he does.

**"The Rights of Conscience" *American Sentinel* 9, 34 , pp. 266, 267.**

THE question of the rights of conscience has been brought very prominently before the country by the case of Private Charles O. Cedarquist, Company A, Second Infantry, the particulars of which case are thus given in the official report, copied in the *Congressional Record* of August 3, as follows:—

*Charge.*—"Disobedience of orders, in violation of the twenty-first article of war."

*Specification.*—"That Private Charles O. Cedarquist, Company A, Second Infantry, having been ordered by his superior officer, Second Lieut. Edwin V. Bookmiller, Second Infantry, in the

execution of his office, to take a rifle and proceed at once with his target practice, did refuse to obey, and did disobey said order. This at Bellevue Rifle Range, Bellevue, Nebr., June 17, 1894.

*Pleas.*—"In bar of trial." Not sustained by the court. The accused then pleaded "Not guilty."

*Findings.*—"Guilty."

*Sentence.*—"To be confined at hard labor under charge of the guard for the period of six months, and to forfeit to the United States \$10 per month of his pay for the same period."

The defense in this case was "limited to the contention that the order in respect of which disobedience was charged was an unlawful one in that, first, it enjoined a duty to be performed on Sunday in violation of orders and regulations limiting Sunday labor in the Army to the measure of strict necessity; and second, that the act required to be done would have been a violation of section 241 of the criminal code of Nebraska."

The view taken of the matter by the court was—

That a commanding officer has a discretion under existing orders to require target practice by his command on Sunday in a case of necessity, is undoubted. The evidence in this case fails to fix upon the commanding officer of Bellevue Rifle Range, Nebraska, any abuse of discretion in the issue of the order complained of by the accused. The legality of that order and the obligation of the accused to obey it when duly transmitted to him cannot, in the opinion of the reviewing authority, be questioned. It was not for him to judge the necessity for the issue of the order. That discretion pertained to his commanding officer, and once exercised, whether erroneously or not, it was the duty of the accused to obey.

The sentence of the court-martial was approved by Brig. Gen. Brooke, who, however, commuted it with this remark:—

The sentence is approved, but in view of the peculiar circumstances attending the commission of the offense, is mitigated to confinement at hard labor for two months at the station of his company. It is desired, however, that it shall be understood that, in view of the warning held out in this order, offenses of the character charged in this case will not in the future be regarded as fitting ones for the exercise of clemency.

August 1, Mr. Cedarquist was released by order of the President, communicated in the following telegram:—

Adjutant-General's Office, Washington,  
August 1, 1894.

COMMANDING GENERAL, *Department Platte, Omaha, Nebr.*:—

The unexecuted portion of the sentence awarded Private Cedarquist, promulgated in the General Court-Martial Orders No. 45, current series, from your headquarters, is this day remitted by the President, and you will cause the man to be released at once. This action, however, is not in any manner to be regarded as a justification of the disobedience of orders on the part of the soldier. The officer who ordered target practice on Sunday, in violation of the order of President Lincoln, given in November, 1862, must be brought to trial for his disobedience of orders.

By order of the Secretary of War.  
GEO. D. RUGGLES, *Adjutant-General*.

Speaking in the House on the 2nd inst., to a resolution asking that the facts of case be laid before Congress, by the War Department, Mr. Grosvenor of Ohio, said:—

It appears by the record of the court-martial that on the day in question some officer of the United States

267

Army ordered the company of troops to which Cedarquist belonged to go upon a rifle range somewhere in the neighborhood of Omaha and engage in the business of firing at target. It appears by the record that the soldier respectfully declined to go, stating at the time that it was improper and unlawful to make such a requirement, and that he was conscientiously opposed to doing that duty on the Sabbath day.

This shows that the real defense was the rights of conscience. Private Cedarquist (mistakenly, it is true) regards Sunday as the Sabbath, as he has a right to do; and having the courage of his convictions, he dared to obey God (as he supposed) rather than man. In so doing he stands vindicated and approved by the Government of the United States. But having established this precedent, will the Government consistently adhere to it? or will it respect only the Sunday conscience? In other words, was the real purpose of the President to vindicate the rights of conscience, as such and in *any* man, or to honor Sunday? Time will tell.

But be this as it may, the Cedarquist case opens up again the whole question of the rights of conscience, *i.e.*, of how far conscientious convictions should be recognized and respected by the State. Can the plea that a man acted conscientiously ever be admitted as a justification for violation of law?

That this plea had weight in the Cedarquist case there can be no doubt. Had it been evident that this man had no regard for Sunday, that he had no conscience in the matter, but that his disobedience

was willful insubordination, the case would have occasioned no remark and would have received no attention from the President. It is probably true that owing to the prevailing agitation of the Sunday question, this case has received more attention than it would have received had the issue been raised over any other matter, but that does not remove the fact that the President of the United States, and through him, the Government of the United States, has recognized the principle that even private soldiers have rights of conscience which ought to be respected. But, again, the query arises, where shall the line be drawn? It is clear (1) that government cannot become the judge of men's consciences; and (2) 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 fellow-men. 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 forbearing 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

consciences, 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.

The Government has acted upon this principle in the Cedarquist case; will it, we again ask, adhere to it consistently to the end? or will it regard conscience only in the Sunday-keeper, and ignore it in the Sabbath-keeper, as several of the States have done and are doing? We shall see. As for us, we expect nothing else than that the procedure in this case will be lifted far above all the rights of conscience and of everything else, and will be made to do service in the exaltation of Sunday and its exclusive support by the Government of the United States.

**"Saint Worship" *American Sentinel* 9, 34 , pp. 267.**

SHOULD Paul come forth from his grave and visit the shrine of "Good St. Anne of BeauprÈ," near the city of Quebec, Canada, his spirit would again be stirred within him as "he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." He would not see the "temple of the great goddess Diana," but the temple of the "valiant," "invincible," "blessed," "holy," "glorious St. Anne," "Mother of the Queen of Angels," "Mother of the Mother of God." Instead of hearing Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen shouting for "the space of two hours," "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," he would find the people saying, day and night, "O good, O glorious, O pious, O merciful, O incomparable Mother Anne." Instead of beholding the people prostrate before the shrine of the "goddess Diana," he would see them kneeling before a gilded statute of "St. Anne" imploringly saying, "Grant, O Good St. Anne, that henceforth I may show myself more worthy of thee, so that, one day, I may be united to thee in heaven." He would see the people crowding the marts of the church buying, not the "Holy Scriptures which," as Paul wrote to Timothy, "are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus," but memorial beads, chains, medals, rings, books, and images of "Good St. Anne" with which, through faith in St. Anne, they hope for protection from the ills of this life and "eternal glory through her intercession."

All this idolatry is practiced by the church claiming to be Christian, to be "the only true church," the "spouse of Christ," the "holy Catholic Church." When the servant of God raises his voice against such apostasies, as of old, its votaries are "full of wrath," "the whole city is filled with confusion" and, as in the case of the Baptist mission at Quebec on August 7, the servant is stoned and the house of worship wrecked by a Roman Catholic mob.

All this idolatry is sanctioned and encouraged by Pope Leo XIII. in three briefs dated Jan. 28, 1886, Jan. 16, 1887, and May 5, 1887; and a "Pontifical Bull," dated April 26, 1887. And now this man comes forth with an encyclical letter declaring "we hold the regency of God on earth," and invites us to return to his idolatrous and blasphemous worship, to the veneration of "a venerable fragment of a finger bone of St. Anne," and the worship of the "Glorious Mother of the Mother of God," "the Grandmother of Jesus Christ." He also sends a "Delegate Apostolic" and assures us that "what the church has done in the past for others she will do for the United States," that is, what she has done for the Province of Quebec in teaching her poor, deluded, superstitious votaries to pray the following prayer, she promises to do for the people of the United States, and teach them to forsake the "one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ," and divide that place with the woman "St. Anne," whose "life," "virtues," and even "name" "has been left" by the inspired Word of God, "in complete oblivion."

All the quotations regarding St. Anne, referred to in this article, are from a work entitled "Manual of Devotion to Good St. Anne," published by General Printing Office, A. Cot  & Co., Quebec, 1891, and is indorsed by Cardinal Taschereau, archbishop of Quebec. Read the following cardinal-indorsed prayer to "St. Anne:"—

## **PRAYER**

### *Praise to St. Anne.*

Hail, holy Anne, illustrious daughter of David and descended from a race of kings! The Eternal Father cherishes thee as the Mother of His beloved Daughter and the Grandmother of His divine Son. Hail, holy Anne, the Son of God, the eternal Word loveth thee, because thou didst give Him so pure, so good, so holy a Mother. Hail, holy Anne, worthy spouse of the virtuous Joachim! The Holy Ghost holdeth thee in great esteem, because thou didst give unto

Him so worthy, so beautiful, so perfect a Spouse. Hail, holy Anne, Mother of Mary, the immaculate Virgin! The whole court of Heaven beholdeth thee with admiration, because thy happiness surpasseth that of all other mothers. Hail, holy Anne, joy of the Angels! All the blessed spirits hold thee in reverence because thou didst give birth to Mary, their august and gentle Queen. Hail, holy Anne, fruitful vine! All the Saints honor thee as the sacred tree whence sprang that lovely flower who is their delight in Heaven, and that worthy fruit which was their joy during their exile on earth. Hail, holy Anne, valiant woman, invincible fortress! The whole Church celebrates thy praises as the Mother of the spotless Virgin, who has always triumphed over every heresy. Hail, holy Anne, sure help of mankind! The just and the sinner alike invoke thee as their beneficent protectress and their powerful advocate before God. Hail, holy Anne, brilliant star that guideth the shipwrecked to port. The exile and the pilgrim look on thee as their stay and their charitable conductress. Hail, holy Anne, mirror of all virtue, in which all who are called to a higher life find a model of perfection, and all Christians find aid in the accomplishment of their duties. Hail, holy Anne, consoler of the unfortunate! In thee the widow finds support, the orphan a mother, the prisoner deliverance, the sick health, and the dying hope. Hail, holy Anne, help of all who implore thy assistance! Thy intercession is all-powerful with the Sacred Heart of Jesus; and Mary, thy immaculate Daughter, beareth thy petitions to the foot of the throne of our thrice-holy God.

*Ejaculation.*—Good St. Anne, obtain for me the grace of honoring God in his Saints. Pp. 103-5.

"Come unto *me* [not 'grandmother' Anne] all ye that labor and are heavy laden and *I* will give you rest." Matt. 11:28.

**"Peter's Sword" *American Sentinel* 9, 34 , p. 271.**

A CORRESPONDENT writes:—

The position taken by you, if I mistake not, is that it is wrong to use the sword of the State either to propagate or defend Christianity. How do you harmonize the instruction of Christ in Luke 22:36, with the above positions?

This scripture, taken with its contexts and the recorded events following, and the SENTINEL'S position, are in perfect harmony. To show the harmony, the text with the two following verses are quoted:

He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one. For I say unto you, that this that is written must be accomplished in me, and he was reckoned among the transgressors; for the things concerning me have an end. And they said, Lord, behold here, are two swords. And he said unto them, it is enough.

The swords were not wanted for defense, but for the fulfillment of prophecy,—“this that is written of me must be accomplished.” Two swords among eleven disciples are declared to be “enough;” another proof that they were not wanted for defense. Only one sword was used, hence one was “enough.” The sword was wanted to fulfill the prophecy,—“he was reckoned among the transgressors [Greek, *anomos*, lawless].” Peter in resisting the arrest of his Master and striking the servant, transgressed the civil law, and as Christ was his companion, “he was reckoned among the transgressors” or lawless ones. There was in the disciples, and especially in Peter, some of the transgressor's spirit, manifested in the use of the sword in the garden (John 18:10), and on other occasions. Peter and John proposed the murder of the unbelieving Samaritans (Luke 9:54), which showed an utter misconception of the spirit of the gospel, and a willingness to transgress the laws of the State.

This instance of Peter's use of the sword brought to the surface the transgressor's spirit, and besides fulfilling prophecy, furnished an opportunity to rebuke the transgressors, and to forever forbid the use of carnal weapons in the defense of Christianity. This he did in healing the wounded ear (Luke 22:51), the Lord's last miracle before his crucifixion, and in the words, “Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.” Had these words been obeyed by all of Christ's professed followers from that day to this, it would have prevented the murder of millions of martyrs.

**"Note" *American Sentinel* 9, 34 , p. 271.**

THE *Monitor*, a Roman Catholic paper published in San Francisco, has this to say about the *Independent* of this city:—

There is a paper in the East called the *Independent*. It is one of the ablest Protestant papers of its kind in the world. But it is broad-minded, generous, and truthful according to its light. While it is a thorough-going Protestant organ, yet it speaks of the pope's encyclical in terms of deep sympathy and it pays tribute to his piety and sincerity. If all the others were like the *Independent* how soon the Catholics and Protestants would learn to like each other better as they knew each other more.

To get the full significance of this it is necessary to bear in mind to what the pope's encyclical invites “the peoples of the world.” This the encyclical itself does not tell, but the article entitled “Saint Worship,”

on another page of this paper reveals something of the nature of the feast which Rome has prepared for her guests. Truly, "if all the others were like the *Independent* how soon would the Catholics and Protestants learn to like each other better;" yea, how soon there would be no Protestants even in name, and all the world would be worshipping finger bones of the various satins, and other objects of popish superstition.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 34 , p. 272.**

LET no reader of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, while enjoying the comforts of home and the free exercise of religious convictions, forget that a fellow-man is confined in a Tennessee jail for no other offense than following the dictates of his conscience in the matter of Sabbath observance. In this connection it might be well to also remember that in Maryland and Georgia several Sunday cases are now pending. It is almost a foregone conclusion that in at least two or three of these cases imprisonment will follow. Still other States have upon their statute books the necessary laws for inaugurating an era of persecution, and the National Reformers of the various schools and under various names, are fast manufacturing the public sentiment which will ere long set the machinery of the law in motion against those who honor the Bible Sabbath and disregard the papal Sunday.

CATHOLICS are persecuting Methodist missionaries in South America. The Methodists petitioned Archbishop Ireland to petition Satolli to petition the pope to become the champion of religious liberty in South America, where there is a chance to put his beautiful theories set forth in the United States, into actual practice. This was a perplexing matter. These sugar-coated religious liberty pills were for American Protestant palates and not for Spain or South America. Satolli replied as follows:—

DEAR SIR: Your letter of June 22 and document dated July 12 came duly to hand. The enclosed copy of the encyclical letter of our holy father is, I think, the most fitting reply I can make.

The encyclical addresses princes and peoples, calling them back into the Roman Catholic Church. The answer to the Methodists who ask for liberty in South America from papal persecution is in substance "come back into the Roman Catholic Church and you can have it." Methodists, and all lovers of equal liberty, will spurn such an answer. But it is the same answer which persecuted Seventh-day Adventists are receiving in Maryland, and elsewhere, from

Methodists. When the Seventh-day Adventist asks freedom from Methodist persecution the answer is, "Keep Sunday and you can have it." That is, come back to the practice of our church's view of the Sabbath and the persecution will cease.

SPEAKING recently in Allegheny, Pa., on "Law *versus* Lawlessness," Rev. J. S. Hutson, pastor of the Nixon Street Baptist Church, said:—

The many labor troubles in this country are not conflicts between capital and labor, but conflicts between intelligent Christian citizenship and ignorance, vice and anarchy. In those days when they had no king in Israel every man did what was right in his own eyes. God was their king and the principle of subjection was religious, but the people generally were irreligious. The same thing has been true in all ages and is emphatically true to-day. The race of man, apart from Christ and Christianity, is unwilling to be governed by just and wise laws. Well, we know the result of a strike for a larger liberty and higher wages. The result has always been the same. It is strange that men should be so slow to learn and so ready to forget the meaning of those old-time phrases, "Thou Shalt" and "Thou Shalt Not."

In olden times God himself was the lawgiver and king, and every man was personally responsible to him for his conduct. The purpose of Christ and Christianity is to bring man back into subjection and under the authority of God.

And the speaker might have added that it is the purpose of National Reformers and American Sabbath Unionists to accomplish this, not by the preaching of the gospel and by getting men converted, but by civil law; and that the authority of God to which they propose to bring men, is the authority of God as interpreted by these pseudo-reformers; and that under their proposed régime men are not to be personally responsible to God, but to civil rulers for the discharge of their duties to God. These so-called reformers want to share with Leo XIII. the "regency of God on earth." Is Mr. Hutson one of them? or is he a true Baptist?

**September 6, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 35 , pp. 273, 274.**

LAMST week we showed the absurdity of any suggestion of a "regency of God" as is not only suggested but *claimed* by the head of the Catholic Church, "Leo XIII., Pope."

THIS claim of a regency of God, however, is of the same piece with the suggestions, and claim that *man* is head of the body of Christ, which is his church, as is claimed by, and in behalf of, the pope of Rome; and which is indeed the foundation claim of the papacy.

IN the Scriptures the Church of Christ is described under the figure of the human body as God made it. The relationship between Christ and his church is shown and illustrated by the relationship that exists between the human body and its head; and the relationship between Christ and the members of his church is illustrated by the relationship between the members of the human body and the head of that body as God has placed it.

"THE church is his body." Eph. 1:22. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." 1 Cor. 12:27. The members of his church are "members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones." Eph. 5:30. As with the members of the human body, the members of his church are also "members one of another" (Rom. 12:5); therefore "the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you." "For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? . . . But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him." 1 Cor. 12:14. These scriptures all speak of the Church of Christ.

NOW, Christ is the head of this body, which is his church. He is the head of this church, which is his body. For "He is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead." Col. 1:18. "God raised him from the dead . . . and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." Eph. 1:19-23. And it is Christ *himself*, too, who is head of this church. Not Christ by a representative; not Christ by a substitute, a vicar, or a regent; but Christ himself, in his own proper person. This is certainly true, because in stating this same thought under the figure of a *building*, the Word declares that Christ *himself* is the chief corner stone, "the *head-stone* of the corner." And here are the words: "Ye are God's building." 1 Cor. 3:9. In Christ "All the building fitly framed together growth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation [a dwelling-place] of God through the Spirit." "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but

fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ *himself* being the chief corner stone." Eph. 2:21, 22, 19, 20. "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:11, 12. Thus it is as certain as that the Scripture is true, that the head of the Church of Christ is "Jesus Christ himself." Not Christ by a representative; not Christ by a substitute, a vicar, or a regent; but Christ himself in his own proper person.

YET the claim of the papacy is, that *a man* is head of the Church of Christ. The claim of the Catholic Church is, that the head of *that* church is the head of the Church of Christ. The claim of the church of Rome is, that the bishop of Rome is head of the Church of Christ—in the place of Christ—as the "representative," the "substitute," the "vicar," the "regent," of Christ. Here is the authoritative statement, if any were needed in proof of a thing that is so notorious and undenied as is this. It is well to set it down here, however, for the sake of the contrast between this absurd claim and the truth as it is in Jesus Christ and his written word. So we quote from Cardinal Gibbons:—

Says the Council of Florence (1439), at which also were present the bishops of the Greek and the Latin Church, "We define that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole church, the father and doctor of all Christians; and we declare that to him, in the person of blessed Peter, was given by Jesus Christ our Saviour, full power to feed, rule and govern, the universal church."

The pope is here called the *true vicar* or representative of Christ in this lower kingdom of his church militant; that is, the pope is the organ of our Saviour, and speaks his sentiments in faith and morals.—*The Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 154, 155.

It was the Council of Chalcedon, 451, that first addressed the bishop of Rome as "the head, of whom we are the members."

LET us look at this claim of the Catholic Church in view of the statements made in the Scriptures on this point. As we have seen, the Church of Christ is his body in this world, and he is its head. God is the builder of this body, the Church of Christ, as he was the builder of the human body in the beginning; for "God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him." Now, take a human body as God made it, with the head in its place as God set it. In the place of that head, which God gave to that body, you put a

"representative" head—a substitute head. In the place of the true head, which God set to that body, you put a "regency" head—another head to occupy the place in the absence of the true head—then what have you? Take away the head from a human body, and you have left only a *dead body*. This is the very first and the only result of taking away the head. And even though you set another head on this headless body, it is still only a dead body.

NOW this is precisely the case of the church of Rome. It was once the Church of Christ; its members were members of the body of Christ; and Christ was its head. It had life from Christ its living

274

head, the life which is by faith, so that its "faith was spoken of throughout the whole world." Rom. 1:8. But, there came "a falling away." 2 Thess. 2:3. The bishops and councils of the church put away Christ, the true head whom God had set, and put another, a *man*, in his place, as head of that church. The putting away of Christ, its living head, left it only a lifeless body; and the putting of another head in his place did not, and could not, give life to that lifeless body. So far as spiritual life is concerned—the real life of the Church of Christ—the church of Rome is as destitute of it as is a human body with its own head cut off and another head put on in its place. Thus the church of Rome is destitute of the life that vivifies the Church of Christ, and partakes only of the elements of death. The only hope for it, or for those that are connected with it, is to recognize that it is indeed spiritually dead, and have Christ the life-giver raise them from the dead, and connect them with himself as their living head, that thus they may live indeed.

WARNING was given against this very course of that church in the first days of the Church of Christ, and the same warning is yet given. In the second chapter of Colossians it is written: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, *which is the head* of all principality and power. . . . Let no man beguile you of your reward in a *voluntary* humility and worshiping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind; and *not holding the head*, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world,

*are ye subject to ordinances after the doctrines and commandments of men?* Which things indeed have a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting [punishing, margin] of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh."—Verses 7-10, 18-23. This is the divine warning against the spirit that made the papacy, against the papacy itself, against all its workings, and against its very nature. Men, fleshly-minded men, ambitious men, in the church, not being dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, holding the rudiments of the world and *not holding the head*—these were the men who put away from the people of Christ the true and living head, and put a man, one of their own sort, in his place. And to supply the lack of Him and his life they imposed upon the people a host of forms and ordinances, and commandments and doctrines of men, and voluntary humilities, and will-worshiping, and punishings of the body in penances and pilgrimages, and worshiping of angels, and saints, and dead people called saints. And this is the body of which "Leo XIII., Pope," is the head. This is the church of Rome, with a man as its head, in the place of Christ. This is the Catholic Church. And this is how the bishop of Rome obtained his "regency of God on earth."

THERE is another figure used in the Scriptures that forcibly illustrates the absurdity and iniquity of the claim of the church of Rome in this matter of the headship of the church. It is the relationship that exists between husband and wife in the marriage bond. In the fifth chapter of Ephesians, in speaking "concerning Christ and the Church," it is done under the figure of the marriage relation, with Christ in the place of the husband, and the church in the place of the wife. And the Word says, "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Saviour of the body. Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. . . . This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church."—Verses 23, 24 32. The relationship of the church to Christ is thus plainly shown to be the same as that of the wife to her own husband. As the husband himself, and *not another man*, is the head of the wife; so Christ himself, and *not another*, is head of the church.

NOW, suppose another man should propose to put himself in between a husband and his wife, to speak to her the sentiments of her husband in faith and morals (?), what would the loyal wife do?—Everybody knows that she would resent such an intrusion, and would promptly repudiate all such proffers. But, suppose another man

should not only propose to put himself in the place of the husband to the wife, but that the wife should agree to the proposal and actually accept this other man in the place of her husband to speak to her the sentiments of her husband in faith and morals, then what is that but treason to her own husband, apostasy from her marriage vows, and adultery with this other man? And what kind of faith and morals have you in that case?—Everybody knows that that would be nothing but unfaithfulness and immorality.

NOW, upon her own showing, upon her own claim, this is precisely the case of the Catholic Church. She claims to be "the bride of Christ." She claims that she is "the spouse of Christ." And yet she has accepted another, a man, as the "representative" of her husband, as the "substitute" for her husband, to occupy the place of her husband in his absence, to speak to her "his sentiments in faith and morals." She not only has accepted another in the place of her husband, but she openly boasts of it and actually proclaims it as the chiefest evidence of her faithfulness, her morality, and her purity. How could the unfaithfulness, the apostasy, the immorality, and the impurity, of that church be more plainly shown than in this which is her boast?

HOW could the complete abandon, and the essential wantonness, of a wife, be more clearly demonstrated than in citing the confirmed fact of another man's occupying the place of her husband to her, as evidence of her faithfulness and purity? Would not such a boast, and for such a purpose, be the strongest possible evidence that that woman's native modesty and moral sense had become absolutely deadened? Yet this is precisely the case of the Catholic Church. She has accepted another to occupy the place of her husband to her. She constantly boasts before the world that this fact is evidence of her faithfulness, her morality, and her purity; and insists that all the world shall fall in with her in this course, in order that they may all be faithful and moral and pure! How could she more clearly demonstrate that all true sense of faithfulness, of morality, and of purity, has become completely obliterated from her consciousness? That a confirmed adulteress and harlot should boast of her iniquity as being the only way to righteousness, is certainly nothing else than the very mystery of iniquity itself. And such is the church of Rome.

SUCH is the merit, all that it has, of the claim that the Catholic Church is the true church; and that the bishop of Rome, the head of the church, is the head of the Church of Christ and "holds the regency of God on earth."

**"Still Courting Rome" *American Sentinel* 9, 35 , p. 276.**

THERE are "Protestants" and Protestants. The former are those who, while bearing the name, declare by their acts that Protestantism has no reason for existence, no excuse for being; that Rome is Christian, one of the "grand divisions of the Redeemer's army," etc. Such "Protestants" have no use for the caution given by the Apostle John: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed." Rome comes bringing another doctrine, namely, salvation by penance instead of salvation by faith, and yet "Protestants" do, in effect bid her God-speed, as witnesseth the following from the *Pilot*, the leading Catholic paper of Boston:—

**Chautauqua Sends Greetings**

On Wednesday, August 8, a very interesting incident occurred. It was the receipt of a telegram by the Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D.D., president of the Catholic Summer School, from Bishop John H. Vincent, the chancellor and founder of Chautauqua. It read:—

Chautauqua, N.Y., August 7.

By a vote of 5,000 Chautauquans to-night Chautauqua sends greeting and best wishes to the Catholic Summer School.

JOHN H. VINCENT.

Wednesday night, just before Father Pardow's lecture, Dr. Conaty read the telegram to a crowded audience, which received it with enthusiasm and loudly applauded this answer:—

The scholars of the Catholic Summer School of America are deeply grateful for Chautauqua's cordial greeting, and send best wishes to Chautauqua in return.

THOS. J. CONATY, *President*.

But this is only what we might expect. Years ago "Protestants" declared: "Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate with us in resisting the progress of political atheism we will gladly join hands with them." This Chautauqua gush is only a part of the programme.

**"A Righteous Decision" *American Sentinel* 9, 35 , pp. 276, 277.**

SOME months since a Roman Catholic died in Buffalo, N.Y., leaving seven children. Previous to her death she divided among these children \$1,200. She then made a will by which she

bequeathed the whole of her remaining estate, \$1,000 in trust to Nicholas Bashman, to be used by him in paying for "masses for the benefit of my poor soul, and for the benefit of the soul of my deceased husband." The seven children contested the will. Mr. Bashman had been left with discretionary power to pay the money for the masses to any church he chose. The attorney for the children appeared before the surrogate, and opposed the admission of the will to probate on the following grounds:—

1. That the trustee has too much discretion.
2. That a *soul* has no standing in a temporal court.
3. That the trust is illegal, not being for the benefit of any living human being.

In arguing the case he set forth the following points:

- a. The very existence of the soul after death has never been proved.
- b. That its alleged immortality has never been sustained by facts.
- c. That the whole subject of a hereafter is a matter of pure speculation.
- d. That the law requires that trust should be for the benefit of living human beings, and this creates a trust for the benefit of a soul which may possibly be nonexistent.
- c. Further, he raised the question whether the soul, it immortal, would derive any benefit from the masses said.

At the hearing of the case recently it was shown, in addition to the facts already stated, that the maker of the will was of sound mind and memory, and the will was properly made. She directed that all her debts, doctor's bills, and funeral expenses should be paid, and that the balance should be applied to masses, as already stated. In rendering his decision the judge said:—

The intent of the testator is the rule of construction. The most sacred duty the court can perform is to give

277

full force to the intentions of the deceased. . . . She had a right to appropriate her money as she deemed reasonable and proper, to offer masses for the remission of her and her dead husband's sins. The direction, "a Roman Catholic Church in Buffalo," is not indefinite.

The court very properly declined to consider the question of the immortality of the soul, dismissing it with the remark that it was enough to know that the testator believed it. The decision is just. The property of the testator was her own. She might have directed that it should be used in erecting a monument to her memory, or to

providing a memorial window to some church, but instead she elected that it should be devoted to masses for herself and her deceased husband. It is true that the masses could be of no possible benefit to either herself or her husband, but that is a question outside the jurisdiction of any civil court.

**"Too True" *American Sentinel* 9, 35 , p. 278.**

THE hidden aim of the advocates of church taxation is disclosed by the Boston *Congregationalist*, which says: "The amount of property in the United States in church buildings and equipment is very large, being in 1890, according to the census report, \$679,694,439. But of this amount Roman Catholics control only \$118,069,746. If an attempt by Protestants to weaken the power of Catholics were wise under any circumstances, it evidently would not be wise for Protestants to advocate, for that purpose mainly, the taxation of church property." The *Congregationalist* does not condemn the attempt to injure the Catholics, it only calls attention to the fact that this ought not to be done in a way that will hurt the Protestant sects more than it will the Catholic Church. But to weaken the Catholics—that is the object of the champions of church property taxation.—*Catholic Review*.

It is too true that much of the opposition on the part of so-called Protestants to State aid to religious institutions is not because of adherence to a principle but with the view of injuring Rome. Such "Protestants" are always ready to avail themselves of State aid in any way that offers. Several denominations saw no impropriety in accepting money from the Government for the support of mission schools among the Indians until they discovered that the Catholics were getting the lion's share. Then they refused to accept further bounties from the civil power and demanded that Rome should support her own schools also. The reason for the change of front was too obvious. The time to have protested successfully was when the evil was in its infancy, and before they had themselves eaten of the Government's pottage. But the birthright has been sold, and now they find no place for repentance though they seek it carefully with tears.

**"Seventh-day Adventists and the Authorities of Basle" *American Sentinel* 9, 35 , pp. 278, 279.**

AMS our readers are aware, for some time in the past the police authorities of Basle, Switzerland, have been endeavoring to compel

H. P. Holser, the manager of the Seventh-day Adventists' publishing house in that city, to suspend operations on Sunday. Mr. Holser has been arrested several times, and fines have been imposed and finally collected by the sale of his household effects; he refusing to pay voluntarily.

Subsequent to the seizure of his goods, Mr. Holser was again arrested, and August 16 he was fined 200 francs and sentenced to three weeks' imprisonment. If the fine is not paid, as it will not be, the term of imprisonment will be sixty-one days. Mr. Holser, who is a minister, writes thus to a brother minister in London, of his trial:—

Basle, August 18, 1894.

DEAR BROTHER WAGGONER:—

I had much more time than at former hearings, and could state our position more fully than ever, though not as fully as I should like. When I opened my Bible to read some passages, they did not seem to relish that sort of argument.

This being the sixth offense, they did not seem much inclined to hear from me. The president acted as uneasy as though he were sitting over a hornet's nest; but as I had been shut off too soon at other times, I insisted on stating our position, and succeeded in getting much more time than on former occasions. After I made my plea the State's attorney spoke, stating that the law was very plain, that I had been punished repeatedly and still insisted on working, instead of appealing to the higher authorities to settle the question as to whether the police authorities were doing us injustice, but instead had circulated a pamphlet in the city to bring the police authorities in disrepute. He would not advise imprisonment, for this would only be furnishing us an advertisement; but would propose a higher money fine—300 francs. He also stated that I seemed to be ignorant of the fact that the State had no creed! *i.e.* nothing to do with religion.

Time was then allowed me, in which I replied to the points which he made, showing that Sunday is a religious day, and if the religion were taken away, our difficulty would soon cease. Sunday is to be found only where Christianity is found. And when the French Revolutionists rejected so-called Christianity, they rejected the Sunday as a part of it. Also that our work in itself was not of a nature to disturb people if they were not influenced by religious prejudices. On the green in front of our house is ten times as much noise as our work makes; there is shooting, football, companies of soldiers drilling, and officers shouting, so that the little noise which we make is entirely drowned. Yet all this does not disturb people. This proves that it is not the noise that disturbs

people, but it is our religion; it is because we don't believe as they do; and their being disturbed on such grounds is purely papal; and for us to yield to their demands under such circumstances would be the same as bowing to the papacy; God expressly warns us against doing this. So, although Sunday may be called a purely civil day, it does interfere with our religious rights. I intended to make more points, but the judge interrupted me, and closed the hearing. After having been out about ten minutes, I was called back to hear the sentence. The judge closed with the statement that if we did not stop work he would next order that the house be closed altogether.

The reports in the papers were quite fair. One point they made particularly clear, for which I am glad, and that is, we declared that we could never obey Sunday laws, as that was the same to us as obeying man rather than God.

And appeal has been taken to a higher court, and the result is awaited with interest. It is evident that the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists for refusing to obey laws enforcing obedience to a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, is becoming world-wide. But this state of things is just what they have been expecting for more than forty years. They have declared that the governments of earth would attempt to cause all men to worship the papacy or a system made in the image of the papacy, and that this would be done by attempting to force all men to observe Sunday, the mark of Roman Catholic power. Events are multiplying on every hand showing the fulfillment of these predictions. These events have, for forty years, been expected through faith in the prophetic word of God, but it has been only recently that they have seen the persecutions which are a fulfillment. They have, for more than forty years, declared that the Sunday Sabbath was exclusively a Roman Catholic institution, and now in 1893, Cardinal Gibbons' paper, the *Catholic Mirror*, comes forward declaring the "Christian Sabbath" (Sunday) to be the "genuine offspring of the Catholic Church," without scriptural authority for its support; and further that the observance of it by Protestants who profess to take the Bible for their guide, is "indefensible, self-contradictory, and suicidal;" and further still, challenges the whole Protestant world to disprove its position.

For more than forty years Seventh-day Adventists have declared that Sunday laws were an attempt to enforce obedience to this Roman Catholic dogma, and now in 1894 a Roman Catholic member of the Canadian Parliament, in a speech against a Sunday law, declares that by the bill the author "seeks to compel a great number

of his fellow-citizens to *disobey* the Word of God, and *obey* the words of a church, (Roman Catholic) of which they (Seventh-day Adventists) do not approve." Again only a few days ago Mr. Pax, a Catholic priest, of Sleepy Eye, Minn., declared in a published letter, that "The imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists. . . . for performing bodily labor on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, proves that the Government assumes the right to enforce a religious dogma of the Catholic Church."

There is no doubt of the correctness of the position. And now let Seventh-day Adventists in all the world, with one heart and one mind, stand resolutely and refuse to "worship the beast and his image and receive his mark."

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 35 , p. 280.**

A KENTUCKY woman who opposes the renomination of Col. W. C. P. Breckinridge for Congress, has written a letter "To the Men and Women of the Blue Grass," in which she says: "What we need from the Ashland district is a clean, pure man, with brains enough to know that it is a man's actions and not his religious twaddle that make for righteousness, and not brains enough to fool a whole community for half a century into thinking him a Christian gentleman when he is directly the reverse." This is unkind to National Reform, the stock in trade, of which is high profession; not that many engaged in this movement are not highly moral men, but they are—unwittingly, it is true, but none the less really—doing all in their power to commit the whole nation to a course of hypocrisy similar to that pursued by the father of the Breckinridge Sunday bill. To dub the nation "Christian" will no more make it such than did years of false profession make a Christian gentleman of the "hero" of the worst scandal that has ever shocked Washington society.

IT is stated that Cardinal Gibbons has received a letter from the pope "couched in very affectionate terms," inviting him to visit Rome. This he proposes to do, it is said, probably before the close of the present year. It is supposed that the pope wishes to consult the cardinal about matters of importance relative to the interests of "the church" in America. It is intimated that Satolli is to be clothed with still greater authority by the pope, and that the cardinal's visit to Rome may have something to do with the contemplated enlarging of the powers of the papal delegate. Protestants who sneeze when papal

dignitaries take snuff, will of course feel flattered that the pope is paying so much attention to this country; but others will watch to see what new phase of the popish conspiracy against American institutions will unfold next. It will not be forgotten that according to the pope himself, "what the church has done in the past for others she will do for the United States;" and until this dire threat has been retracted Americans cannot feel otherwise than apprehensive, and start at every new evidence of the pope's affection for, and interest in, this country.

THE *New York Observer* has this to say about how Sunday is observed by Roman Catholics in Japan:—

The Romanists in Japan have a special dispensation from the pope, allowing them to labor half of the Sabbath day and attend to their religious services the other half. But in spite of these concessions, Romanism does not receive the favor given Protestantism. A half-breed religion wins no one's respect. Even the Japanese can see through the hollow sham which the pope offers them and despise it.

Why should the Japanese "see through the hollow sham which the pope offers them and despise it," any more than so-called Protestants in other countries? It seems that the Japanese take only half of this papal sham—a false Sabbath—while the *Observer*, and with it nearly all the Protestant world, has greedily swallowed the whole of it, even though warned by Rome herself that it rests only on the authority of the church, and that the Protestants have no right to any part of it.

But if the Japanese are to accept Sunday at all, why not take it just as the pope gives it to them? As a "Christian" institution it was made by the papacy, and what authority other than the papacy can so well tell how it ought to be observed. The intent of the lawmakers is the law; and who better than the Roman Catholic Church can tell the meaning of her own law for the observance of the false Sabbath which she has given, not alone to her own votaries, but to the world? The *Observer* has in this matter of Sunday observance not a leg to stand upon in opposition to Rome. If Protestants would only teach the heathen that which the Bible says about the Sabbath, teach them to keep the Bible Sabbath instead of a base counterfeit, then might they properly criticise this dispensation granted by the pope to Japanese Catholics; but so long as they adhere to the papal day, they should keep silence as to the papal manner of observing it. Let Rome do what she will with her own.

**September 13, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 36 , pp. 281, 282.**

SATOLLI, "apostolic delegate" to the United States in an address delivered before the Catholic Congress in Chicago, Sept. 5, 1893, made use of the following words, with the immediate results indicated in brackets:—

Here, in America, you have a country blessed of Providence in the fertility of field and I the liberality of its Constitution [loud applause]. Here you have a country which will repay all efforts [loud and prolonged applause], not merely tenfold, but, aye, a *hundredfold*. And this no one understands better than the immortal Leo. And he has charged me, his delegate, to speak out to America words of hope and blessing, words of joy. Go forward! in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth—the Bible—and in the other the Constitution of the United States. [Tremendous applause, the people rising to their feet.]

When we heard these words we remained seated. There were "Protestants" who joined in the "tremendous applause," but we didn't and wondered why they did.

BUT does not this utterance indicate a change in papal attitude toward the Bible and liberty of conscience?—No: "Rome never changes." When she recommends the Bible it is with a Jesuitical mental reservation. To explain: In the first place Rome did not refer to the Protestant, or King James' Version. This is evident from the following quotation from Mgr. Segur's "Plain Talk about Protestantism of To-day," a Roman Catholic book indorsed by Joannes Josephus, Episcopus Boston, and for sale at all Catholic book stores. The author says on page 118: "The Protestant Bible is only a false skin, in which infidelity and resolution wrap themselves." Now did Satolli mean the Catholic Bible as it reads. He meant the Catholic Bible as interpreted by the Roman Catholic Church. In proof we submit the following from the creed of "Pope Pius IV.," which every Catholic is taught to recite and to which every prelate is required to subscribe:—

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*.

*Unanimous* consent of the fathers! In order then to interpret the Scriptures the Roman Catholic must possess all the books written by

all the "fathers" during a decade of centuries and must "go forward" carrying all this "in one hand." It can't be done. The poor fellow would have to charter a freight train. Nevertheless it must be done for Pope Leo XIII., speaking on the same subject and quoting the above rule, says:—

The professors 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.

Has the "church" and "the fathers" yet interpreted all the Bible so that if one should possess all the writing of all the "fathers" and "doctors" of the church he would then have all the Bible interpreted?—No: and Leo XIII. says no. He says there are "passages of Holy Scripture which have not as yet received a certain and definite interpretation." Has the "church" ever published a list of the passages interpreted by "our holy mother, the church, whose place it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scripture," together with those which have not been thus interpreted so that the Roman Catholic could go forth "bearing" this official "Bible" "in one hand"?—No: she has not. And now we challenge any man, whether Protestant or Catholic, Jew or Gentile, black or white, bond or free, to arise, and, resisting for the moment the impulse to applaud, tell us what, if not the soul-destroying dogmas of the papacy, Satolli meant the Catholic should go forward carrying in that "one hand."

AND now let us examine "the Constitution of the United States" which Satolli tells Roman Catholics to go forward bearing in that "other" hand. But rest assured it is no more the Constitution of the United States as written by its framers and interpreted by the spirit of their times than is Satolli's "Bible," the Bible written by the prophets and apostles and interpreted by the Spirit of God. That the Roman Catholics have long ago repudiated the true interpretation of the Constitution is evident from the following utterance of the *Catholic World*, for September, 1871, Vol. 13, page 736:—

But as it [the Constitution] . . . is interpreted by the *Protestant principles*, so widely diffused among us . . . *we do not accept it* or hold it to be any government at all, or as capable of performing any of the proper functions of government; and if it continues to be interpreted by the *revolutionary principle of Protestantism*, it is sure to fail. . . . *Protestantism*, like the heathen barbarism which Catholicity subdued, lacks the element of order, because it rejects authority [the authority of the pope] and is necessarily incompetent to maintain real liberty or civilized society [like that of Spain and

Mexico]. Hence it is we so often say that if the American Republic is to be sustained and preserved at all it must be by the *rejection* of the *principles* of the *Reformation* and the *acceptance* of the *Catholic principle* by the American people.

TO show that the interpretation of the Constitutions here so vigorously condemned is the *true* interpretation, and that the "principles of the Reformations" are *the* principles of the Constitution, further quotations are cited:—

No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity, by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Cesar only that which is Cesar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman empire, than it was shorn of its character of universality, and enthralled by an unholy connection with the unholy State; and so it continued till the new nation,—the least defiled with the barren scoffings of the eighteenth century, the most general believer in Christianity of any people of that age, the chief heir of the *Reformation in its purest forms*,—when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a State.

Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained of God in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power.—*Bancroft's, History of the Formation of the Constitution, book 5, chap. 1, pars. 10, 11.*

The Constitution of the United States is therefore the "*chief heir* of the *Reforma-*

282

*tion* in its *purest form*," and the "principles of the Reformation" so savagely assailed are *the* principles of the Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution understood that separation of Church and State and liberty of conscience was the result of the Reformation. Madison and Jefferson, the champions of a separation

of Church and State in the constitutional convention which framed the constitution, said, in a petition signed and presented by them to the Virginia Assembly in a struggle which resulted in disestablishing the church in that colony, and from which struggle they came to the national convention:—

We would also humbly represent, that the only proper objects of civil government are the happiness and protection of men in the present state of existence, the security of the life, liberty, and property of the citizens, and to restrain the vicious and encourage the virtuous by wholesome laws, equally extending to every individual; but that the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can only be directed by reason and conviction, and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the universal Judge.

To illustrate and confirm these assertions, we beg leave to observe that to judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an unalienable right, which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated and the *Reformation from popery* carried on, can never be transferred to another.

When, therefore, the Roman Catholic condemns that interpretation of the Constitution which recognizes the "principles of the Reformation," he condemns the Constitution as interpreted by its framers. Rome's interpretation of the Constitution of the United States is in harmony with the papal principle which curses the separation of Church and State; <sup>64</sup> 1 curses the denial of the church's right to use force; <sup>65</sup> 2 curses the claim that priests may be punished by civil courts for their crimes; <sup>66</sup> 3 curses the doctrine that "it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State to the exclusion of all other modes of worship;" <sup>67</sup> 4 curses the claim "that persons coming to reside therein [in a Catholic country] shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship;" <sup>68</sup> 5 curses the rights of conscience as a most "fatal pestilence," etc., etc., and yet tells its votaries to "go forward! in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth—the Bible—and in the other the Constitution of the United States." And when she says it there is a "tremendous applause, the people rising to their feet." Protestants, Americans, keep your seats!

**"Significant" *American Sentinel* 9, 36 , p. 282.**

THE following statement of facts raise the query, Who are the antichrists?—

The lynching troubles in Colorado seem to be the work of an oath-bound league, in which officers of the State and Federal Government are implicated, as well as men who have hitherto been reckoned good citizens. This is part of the oath found on the person of a prominent resident of the State: "In the presence of Almighty God and these witnesses, whom I have this day chosen as my associates and companions, I,—, do most solemnly and sincerely promise and swear that I will do my duty at any and all times, as may be planned and agreed upon by these, my sworn companions, in exercising just and needed punishment on anarchists and such other criminals and murderers and strikers in Cripple Creek, and their fellow-sympathizers, either in high or low positions, the executive of the State not excepted, as we shall deem guilty of crime against law-abiding citizens of the United States, where human lives have been wantonly sacrificed, real and personal property destroyed or stolen, and many happy homes broken up." The order constituted itself judge, jury, and executioner, proceeding against such "as we shall deem guilty of crime," and there was no appeal from their decisions.

These men override all law in the interests of law! They commit high crimes in the name of law and order! They bind themselves by an oath to do unlawful acts and at the same time dub themselves, "The best people of the State, the law-abiding element" etc. But for this course they have eminent example. Anarchy is in the very air and the only escape from it is in strict and conscientious adherence to the rule: "Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

**"Saint Worship" *American Sentinel* 9, 36 , pp. 282, 283.**

THE doctrine of saint worship, as taught and practiced by the Roman Catholic Church, puts poor humanity in the place of Christ and robs the sinner of a Saviour, and the Saviour of the office of the "one mediator between God and men." To show this a number of quotations are published below. The reader will be tempted to regard the quotations as manufactured for the purpose of burlesquing the Roman Catholic doctrine, but they are all taken from a work entitled "Manual of Devotion to Good St. Anne," a work containing the indorsement of "E. A. Card. Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec," and printed by the "General Printing Office, A. CotÈ & Co., Quebec." The writer's attention was first called to the work by seeing it in the hands

of pilgrims at the shrine of "St. Anne" at BeauprÈ, Que., and afterwards he purchased it of the official booksellers near the church of St. Anne. No words of comment can be so strong and fitting as the words of God, hence each quotation is followed by an appropriate text of scripture.

"O GLORIOUS parents [St. Joachim and St. Anne] of the Queen of Mercy, she will never refuse to pray for those recommended to her by you! Vouchsafe then to recommend me to her and beg of her to inscribe me among her servants and clients: thereby shall I be inscribed in the book of life. If you will do this, Mary will grant me her favor and I *shall be saved*." Pp. 167, 168.

"Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the fruit of her womb? yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold I have graven thee upon the palms of My hands." Isa. 49:15, 16. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life." John 6:47. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou *shalt be saved*." Acts 16:31.

"MY powerful protectors, Joachim and Anne, this is my most ardent wish and ye can obtain it for me. Say one word in my favor to your beloved Daughter; tell Mary I would rather be the least of *her servants* than command the whole world; beg of her not to reject me because of my unworthiness. Thus ye will have *saved a soul*, and what could be more worthy of the father and mother of her *through whom salvation* has come to us." Pp. 175, 176.

Thus saith the Lord: "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm." Jer. 17:5. "Being made perfect, He became the author of eternal *salvation* unto all them that *obey him*." Heb. 5:9. "But God, who is *rich in mercy*, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved); and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us *through Christ Jesus*. For *by grace* are ye *saved* through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast." Eph. 2:4-9.

"AND since thy blessed Daughter Mary has been entrusted by our Lord with the glorious task of distributing to souls that precious liquor of *divine love*, do thou beg of her to pour a large measure of it into my heart." Pp. 134, 135. "St. Anne, obtain for me the love of Jesus crucified." P. 252.

"The *love* of God *is* shed abroad in our hearts *by the Holy Ghost* which is given unto us." Rom. 5:5. "Behold what manner of *love* the

Father *hath* bestowed upon us." 1 John 3:1. "But after the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward men appeared, . . . which *he shed on us abundantly through* Jesus Christ our Lord." Titus 3:4, 6.

"PLEAD for me with the *Advocate* of sinners [Mary] that she may obtain for me the grace of repentance and the pardon of all my iniquities." Pp. 84, 85.

"And if any man sin, we have an *advocate* with the Father, *Jesus Christ* the righteous: and *he* is the *propitiation for our sins*, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2:1, 2.

"GOOD St. Anne, come to my aid; obtain for me from Jesus, *through the merits of thine own sacrifice*, that he may vouchsafe to change my disposition." P. 216.

"But this man, after he had offered *one sacrifice for sins for ever*, sat down on the right hand of God." "For by *one offering* he hath *perfected for ever* them that are sanctified." Heb. 10:12, 14.

"GLORIOUS and holy Queen [St. Anne], . . . the just, the penitent and sinners claim thee as their powerful *advocate* with God, for by *thy intercession* the just hope for an increase of *grace*, the penitent for *justification* and sinners for *forgiveness of their sins*. Be thou then compassionate and merciful, and whilst here below, we are invoking thee; do thou be pleading for us in heaven. Do thou exert the great influence in our favor and let not those who put their trust in *thee* be lost. Show thyself to be always the refuge of sinners, the resort of the guilty, the consolation of the afflicted, and the assured help of thy faithful clients." Pp. 182, 183.

"And if any man sin, we have an *advocate* with the Father, *Jesus Christ* the righteous: and *he* is the propitiation for our sins." 1 John 2:1, 12. "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but *by me*." John 14:6. "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God *by him*, seeing that *he* ever liveth to make *intercession* for them." Heb. 7:25. "Who was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our *justification*. Therefore being *justified by faith*, we have peace with God *through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom* also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of

283

the glory of God." Rom. 4:25; 5:1, 2. "In whom we have redemption through *his* blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Col. 1:16. "To the Lord our God belongeth *mercies* and *forgivenesses*." Dan. 9:9. "*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. Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in the Lord his God." Ps. 146:3, 4.

"SWEET Jesus, I thank thee for all the graces which in thy infinite goodness thou hast lavished upon St. Anne; for having chosen her among all women to be thy grandparent on earth and exalted her in heaven with so great a power of *working miracles*. In the *name* of *her great merit* I humbly recommend myself to the infinite mercy of thy divine heart." Pp. 365, 366.

"Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the *name* of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even *by him* doth this man stand here before you *whole*." "Neither is there *salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men* whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:10, 12.

"THE sacred Scriptures speak very little of many holy personages whose destiny was bound up with the work of our redemption. A single page would contain all that is directly related therein of the Blessed Virgin, and scarcely is St. Joseph mentioned at all, while the *life*, the *virtues* and even the *name* of *St. Anne* are left in *complete oblivion*. The ever blessed and beloved name of St. Anne has been transmitted to us *only* by *tradition* and by the gratitude of Christian nations." P. 71.

"From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto *salvation through faith*, which is in *Christ Jesus*. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be *perfect, thoroughly* furnished unto *all* good works." 2 Tim. 3:15, 16, 17. "Why do ye also *transgress* the commandments of God by your *tradition*?" "Thus have ye made the commandments of God of none effect by your *tradition*." "But *in vain* do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the *commandments of men*." Matt. 15:2, 6, 9.

**"Back Page" American Sentinel 9, 36 , p. 288.**

THOSE who read carefully the article on the first page of this paper will wonder how anybody could have been deceived by the papal platitudes about going forward bearing in one hand the popish bible and in the other an emasculated and distorted constitution; the one falsely labeled "The Book of Christian Truth," the other "The Constitution of the United States." It is not so strange, however, that under the magnetism of a gifted orator, an audience largely in

sympathy with the speaker should be moved by his eloquent words rather than by sound reason; but it is more than passing strange that such a paper as the *Independent*, of this city, should, months after the utterance of such a sentiment, quote it in cold type as though Mgr. Satolli had really meant the Bible as it is, and the Constitution of the United States as it reads. And yet this is done in an article in the *Independent*, of August 16. It is true that it is not an editorial utterance, but it appears in the paper without dissent, and is evidently approved. But let no true Protestant be deceived by such Jesuitical utterances. Rome curses alike the Protestants' Book of sacred truth and the patriot's copy of the Constitution of the United States. Read the article referred to in this paper, and then when Rome asks for applause, Keep your seat.

WE have said before that these Saturday-Sabbath people are the worst enemies of the Lord's day we have to contend with in our effort to secure a quiet Sabbath; it looks from this that they are the worst enemies the State has to contend with in its battle with anarchy.—*Christian Statesman*, Sept. 1, 1894.

This is just what "these Saturday-Sabbath people" have expected for forty years. We have all that time known from the Scriptures of Truth that those who were loyal to God's Government would be denounced as enemies of civil government. The following quotation from "Great Controversy," page 409, proves that we have been looking for just this thing:—

Those who honor the Bible Sabbath will be denounced as enemies of law and order, as breaking down the moral restraints of society, causing *anarchy* and corruption, and calling down the judgments of God upon the earth. Their conscientious scruples will be pronounced obstinacy, stubbornness, and contempt of authority. They will be accused of disaffection toward the Government. Ministers who deny the obligation of the divine law will present from the pulpit the duty of yielding obedience to the civil authorities as ordained of God. In legislative hall and courts of justice, commandment-keepers will be censured and misrepresented. A false coloring will be given to their words; the worst possible construction will be put upon their motives.

But Adventists are not the enemies of civil order; and to all such accusations, whether from pulpit or press, they reply in the words of Elijah to the wicked Ahab: We "have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and hast followed" the man of sin by observing his false Sabbath.

**September 20, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 37 , pp. 289, 290.**

ON the eighth of December the Roman Catholic Church celebrates the "Immaculate Conception" of Mary the mother of Jesus.

THE dogmatic term "immaculate conception," signifies that Mary was not "shapen in iniquity" and conceived in sin like the rest of humanity (Ps. 51:5); and this dogma logically followed the one, previously proclaimed, that Mary never committed a sin; notwithstanding the declaration of God that "all have sinned."

THIS unscriptural doctrine, which was "infallibly" proclaimed by Pope Pius IX. in 1854, is but one of a series of dogmatic decisions, covering many centuries, by which the mother of our Lord has been transformed into a goddess, crowned "Queen of the whole universe"<sup>691</sup> and "seated on the right hand of Jesus," "to fill the first place after God in heaven and on earth."<sup>702</sup>

THE papal discussion of the question of "immaculate conception," which was "infallibly" settled by Pope Pius IX. in 1854, was carried on for centuries between two powerful Roman Catholic societies, the Franciscans who violently favored it, and the Dominicans who violently opposed it. So furious and bitter was the contention that Pope Sixtus IV. published a bull in 1483, threatening to send both parties to heel if they did not stop calling one another heretics. At length the Jesuits took sides with the Franciscans and secured the papal decision of 1854.

THE opponents of the doctrine, besides declaring it to be unscriptural, asserted that it was absurd, and said, "On the same principle you would be obliged to hold that the conception of her ancestors in an ascending line was also a holy one, since otherwise she could not have descended [*sic.*] from them worthily."<sup>713</sup> The logic of this objection is apparent, and unless met it would necessitate the "immaculate conception" of Mary's whole pedigree, which would include David, who, speaking for the race as well as for himself, says: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. 51:5.

IN order to head off this fatal logic, some one who was born in sin, must later rise above this condition, be freed from human sinful flesh,

after which, from these superhuman bodies, could be born "immaculate," or sinless flesh.

ROMAN CATHOLIC tradition, which, according to the teaching of the church, is declared to be "more clear and safe" <sup>724</sup> than the Bible, says that Joachim and Anne were the parents of Mary the mother of Jesus. <sup>735</sup> And it is by them, we are told, that the great feat of lifting the ancestry of Mary from sinful flesh to sinless flesh was accomplished.

OF these traditional parents of Mary it is stated that "they showed themselves always so *perfect* in their whole conduct, that one need not marvel that from such *perfection* should come forth the one whose luster is as the *mirror* of *all goodness* in ages past and to come." <sup>746</sup>

BUT "St. Anne" and "St. Joachim" were not born sinless; how then was this perfection attained? Let the cardinal-indorsed work ask the same question and answer it: "By what gradation of virtues and perfection did she [St. Anne] *raise herself* to make this thing possible? Let us remember what Mary was from the first instant of her creation, and we shall then be able to form an idea of what must have been her mother. Must not the *stem* be worthy of the *flower*, and the vase worthy of the perfume it contains? On leaving the hands of God, still under the actions of his creating breath, the soul of Mary was joined to a most pure body, forever virginal and immaculate like itself." <sup>757</sup> "However holy Joachim and Anne were at the time of their marriage, they were not yet sufficiently so to give such a daughter as Mary to the world. By *multiplying* their *fasts*, their *alms*, through so many long years in order to obtain this grace from God's goodness, they made rapid progress in perfection and in the love of God, and at length arrived at that degree of purity and holiness desired by the Holy Ghost." <sup>768</sup> "Thus *mortification* and *sacrifice* had done their work in St. Anne and St. Joachim, purifying, refining, and not leaving in them even the *shadow* of *defilement*. God could take of that *presanctified* earth to create his well-beloved daughter," <sup>779</sup> "who, after God, sees none superior or equal to herself, either in *holiness*, in *glory*, or in *power*," <sup>7810</sup> "*purser* than the angels, *holier* than the archangels." <sup>7911</sup>

BUT why all these theological disputes, and furious contentions, and papal bulls of anathema, and infallible decisions in the Roman Catholic Church, concerning the "immaculate conception" of Mary and immaculate purity of St. Anne and St. Joachim? It was to "sanctify the royal blood whence our Saviour was to be born." <sup>8012</sup>

Mary was declared sinless because the blood transmitted "to Mary, was to form the Divine Flesh." <sup>81</sup> 13 "St. Anne and St. Joachim" are represented as making themselves immaculate because "the blood of Joachim and Anne, passing through the most pure heart of Mary, was to become the blood of Jesus." <sup>82</sup>14

AFTER the storm of contention is over and the Franciscans and Jesuits have won, and the thunder of the Vatican finished the creation of a saviour, what do we behold? We see a saviour whose blood was "purified" by "mortification and sacrifice" of his grandparents, and whose "divine flesh" was "formed" by blood "made" "*purier* than the angels, *holier* than the archangels" through his "grandmother" and grandfather's "mul-

290

tiplying their fasts, their alms," and "good works."

OH how this frustrates the grace of God! "For by grace are ye saved through *faith*; and that *not of yourselves*: it is the *gift* of God. *Not of works*, lest any *man* should boast. For we are *his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus* unto good works." <sup>83</sup>15 Instead of creating Christ Jesus *by* mortification and sacrifice, *by* multiplying fasts, and good works the Christian is created *in* Christ Jesus *unto* good works. Instead of *saving* our Saviour *by our* works we are *saved by our Saviour from our* works. Instead of his being the workmanship of *our* work, "we are *his* workmanship, created in Christ Jesus, *unto* good works."

AGAIN this antichristian saviour is represented as clothed, not with the sinful flesh of Abraham, but with "divine flesh," "purier than the angels and holier than the archangels." The papal saviour is therefore so high above man, who is "shapen in iniquity" and clothed with sinful flesh that it takes a ladder, reaching from earth to heaven, to touch him. He is so far removed from fallen men that it requires a bridge to span the abyss which separates him from his saviour. This is not only the logical deduction from the doctrine of the "immaculate conception" of Mary and the "immaculate" lives of St. Anne and St. Joachim, but it is the admitted doctrine and daily practice of the Roman Catholic Church. Here it is:—]

She [Anne] is the Mother of her who is purier than the Angels, holier than the Archangels, higher than the Thrones, more powerful than the Dominations, more enlightened than the Cherubims, more inflamed with divine love than the Seraphims. She is the Mother of her who is called and who is the eldest Daughter of the Father, the true Mother of the Son, the Spouse of the Holy Ghost. She is the

Mother of her who is "full of grace," of her who has bestowed, and still bestowes ransom on the captive, strength to the weak, sight to the blind, consolation to the afflicted, hope to the desponding, an overflow of joy to the Angels, human flesh to the Divine Word, a Worshiper worthy of His greatness to the Eternal Father, a temple worthy of His holiness to the Holy Ghost. Anne is the Mother of her who is the *ladder* to heaven, the anchor of the shipwrecked, the star of the mariner, the *bridge* whereby God crossed the abyss which separated as from him. <sup>84</sup>16

Away with your Mary "ladder" and immaculate "bridge!" Jesus Christ is the ladder and its lowermost round reaches as low as the lowest sinner. In order that he might reach sinful men, "verily he took on him the nature of angels' but he took on him the seed of Abraham." <sup>85</sup>17 "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, *he also himself likewise took part of the same.*" <sup>86</sup>18 What! part of man's sinful flesh? Yea, verily. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, and for sin, condemned sin *in the flesh.*" <sup>87</sup>19 "For we have no an high priest which cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities; but was in *all* points tempted *like* as we are, yet *without* sin. Let us therefore come boldly to the throne of grace [without the papal ladder] that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need." <sup>88</sup>20

AND now Pope Leo XIII. has the hardihood to invite us away from this Saviour who is so close to us that he dwells *in* us and condemns sin in our sinful flesh as he condemned sin in the sinful flesh which he inherited from his mother Mary,—he calls us away from this Saviour to a saviour who was born from "immaculate" flesh, "purer than the angels, holier than the archangels," and who, therefore, *cannot* be touched with the feelings of our infirmities, and must be touched with a "ladder." He calls us to a saviour so widely separated from us that there must be a "bridge" constructed to span the chasm. And he asks us to trust our eternal life to this human structure, whose spans are made of "fasts," and "mortifications," and "good works." And besides inviting us to trust our salvation to this phantom "bridge," he demands toll for the passage of our soul at every span of its almost limitless length; while our Saviour, "without money and without price," "freely," reaches over the battlements of heaven and, while holding fast to the throne of the Infinite with the arm of omnipotence, encircles us with his long human arm, that arm that is "not shortened that it cannot

save," and presses us lovingly to that bosom that is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities."

And now instead of accepting the invitation of Pope Leo XIII. we, on the contrary, invite, with the words of our Saviour, him and all his deluded followers who are trusting for salvation to human ladders and bridges, and all others who know not our Lord: "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 any burden is light." <sup>89</sup>21 "And the spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." Rev. 22:17.

**"St. Anne' vs. the Saviour" *American Sentinel* 9, 37 , pp. 290, 291.**

MORE quotations are printed below from the Roman Catholic work, "Manual of Devotion to Good St. Anne." Fearing that the reader may doubt the genuineness of the quotations we repeat that the book contains the indorsement of "E. A. Card. Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec," and is published by "General Printing Office, A. CotÉ & Co., Quebec," and can be secured by addressing the publishers. Price 50 cents. The quotations are followed, as in last week's article by scriptural comments. We have italicized some of the most prominent features in the couplets, but were all the points emphasized the larger portion of the matter would appear in italics.

To our Roman Catholic readers we say that the matter is not published for the purpose of ridiculing Catholics nor Catholic doctrines, but from love for the souls of Roman Catholics for whom Christ died; and with the hope of exalting in their minds the Lord Jesus Christ to the place he occupies by the will and word of God, which place, by the teaching of this book, is given to "St. Anne."

"O GOOD Jesus, be compassionate to the faithful servants of *thy grandmother* St. Anne, show them thy mercy, and *for love of her* extend to them a helping hand in all their necessities. O Mary, Mother of God, vouchsafe always to protect those who pay homage to thy blessed mother and serve her with a devout heart." P. 362.

"Then one said unto Him, Behold, Thy mother and Thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak to Thee. But He answered and said unto him that told Him, *Who is My mother?* and who are My brethren? And He stretched forth His hand toward His disciples, and said, *Behold My mother* and My brethren! For *whosoever shall do the will*

*of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, my sister, and my mother."* Matt. 12:47-50.

"O WISE and potent Mother, who hast so much power and merit before God and who reignest in glory with the Queen of Paradise, thy blessed Daughter Mary, *never let thy heart forget* my needs. I am indeed thy unworthy *servant*, but I treasure in my soul the thought that my devotedness *to serve thee* will be the *pledge* of my *salvation*." Pp. 364, 365.

"Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the fruit of her womb? Yea, *they may forget, yet will I not forget thee*. Behold I have graven thee upon the palms of My hands." Isa. 49:15, 16. "Then said 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. 4:10. "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain *salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ*," not through St. Anne.

"O SWEET advocate, *present thyself for me before the throne of divine Majesty* that by thy *meditation* I may obtain pardon of the evil I have done, strength henceforth to overcome my passions, and grace to spend all my days in good works." P. 365.

"*No man cometh to the Father, but by me*." John 14:6. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, *now to appear in the presence of God for us*." Heb. 9:24. "For there is one God, and *one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*." 1 Tim. 2:5.

"BLESSED was the womb that bore thee, O Mary! Blessed was she who had the happiness of carrying thee in her arms and watching over thy slumbers! P. 65.

"And it came to pass as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. But he said, Yea rather, *blessed are they that hear the word of God, and kept it*." Luke 11:27, 28.

"HAIL, blessed Root, whence sprang the beautiful flower and delicious fruit which which have consoled and rejoiced both heaven and earth. Even the *most hardened souls* obtain grace and pardon when they invoke thee with confidence, the saddest *hearts* are consoled by thee, if they have recourse to thee in their sorrow." P. 369.

"Come now let us reason together, saith the Lord, though your *sins* be as *scarlet*, they shall be as *white as snow*; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." Isa. 1:18. "And I will give them, one

heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I [not "St. Anne"] will take the *stony heart* out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh." Ezek.

291

11:19. "Surely *he* [not "St. Anne"] hath *borne* our *griefs* and carried our *sorrows*." Isa. 53:4. "For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, [not to "St. Anne"], that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Heb. 4:15, 16.

"HOLY Mother St. Anne, by that great power which God hath given unto thee, show thyself my mother my consoler, and my advocate, *reconcile* me to God whom I have so deeply offended." P. 370.

"But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be *saved from wrath through him*. For if, when we were enemies, we were *reconciled* to God *by the death of his Son* [not by "Mother St. Anne"], much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Rom. 5:8-10.

"HOLY Mother St. Anne, by that great power which God has given unto thee, . . . *console* me in my trials." P. 370.

"For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our *consolation* also aboundeth by christ." 1 Cor. 1:5. "Now our Lord Jesus Christ *himself* [not "St. Anne"], and *God, even our Father*, which hath loved us, and given us *everlasting consolation* and good hope through grace, *comfort* your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work." 2 Thess. 2:16, 17.

"STRENGTHEN me in all my combats; aid me in my day of need." P. 370.

"I can do all things *through Christ* which *strengtheneth me*." Phil. 4:13. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is *no help*." Ps. 146:3.

"AID me in my *day of need*." P. 370.

"Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace [not to "Mother Anne"], that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in *time of need*." Heb. 4:16.

"DELIVER me from all danger." P. 370.

"Call upon *me* [not on "St. Anne"] in the day of trouble: *I will deliver thee*, and thou shalt *glorify me*" [not "Grandmother Anne"]. Ps. 50:15.

"HELP me at the hour of death and open to me the doors of Paradise. Amen." P. 370.

"Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou [not "St. Anne"] art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me." Ps. 23:4. "Then said Jesus unto them again, Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers; but the sheep did not hear them. I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved." John 10:7-9.

"HOLY Mother Anne, *make peace* for me with my Lord and my God whom I have offended." P. 376.

"Let him take hold of *my* strength, that he may make *peace with me*; and he *shall* make peace with me." Isa. 27:5. "Therefore being justified by faith, we *have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ*," [not through "St. Anne."] Rom. 5:1.

"MY heart, alas, my inclinations and my will are attached to vanity, to the world and to sensuality. This great love which God bears towards me, the many benefits He has bestowed upon me, neither touch, nor rouse me from my guilty sloth. [God's infinite power and love being too weak (?) the Romanist has recourse to "St. Anne."] Good St. Anne, change these unholy dispositions." Pp. 379, 380.

"Despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering; not knowing that the *goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance*?" Rom. 2:4. "*I, if I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me.*" John 12:32.

"MY dear Mother St. Anne, I have unbounded confidence in thy prayers; I place in thy blessed hands my soul, my body, and *all my hopes*, both in this world and in the *world to come*." P. 383.

"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. Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose *hope* is in the *Lord his God*." Ps. 146:3-5. "Should not a people seek unto their God? *on behalf* of the *living* should they seek unto the *dead*?" Isa. 8:19, (R.V.) "Mother Anne," if such a person ever lived (the Scripture does not give the name of Mary's mother) is dead, but the Lord Jesus Christ "*ever liveth*" to make intercession for us. Heb. 7:25.

"HONOR," "*Praise, thanksgiving, glory, and love to my powerful and beloved St. Anne!*" "forever." Pp. 104, 325, 392.

"And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them

was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive *power*, and riches, and wisdom, and *strength*, and *honor*, and *glory*, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, *Blessing*, and *honor*, and *glory*, and *power*, *be unto him that sitteth upon the throne*, and unto the *Lamb for ever and ever.*" Rev. 5:11-13.

**"Two Solid Grounds for Sunday Rest" *American Sentinel* 9, 37 , pp. 291, 292.**

UNDER the foregoing heading, *Sunday Reform Leaflets*, for September, has the following:—

There are two solid grounds on which Sunday laws rest; one, the right of the prevailing religion of the country (be it Jewish, Christian, or Pagan) to have its day of worship free from disturbance; and the other, the right of every man to an equal share in a rest-day from toil.

As regards the first, if this were a Jewish country, the Jewish worship on Saturday should be peculiarly protected from molestation. If it were a Mohammedan country, Friday should be in a like manner protected. This is simple common sense applied to things as they are, and no action of doctrinaire theory. Where there is a conflict of sacred days, as among Jew, Christian, and Mohammedan, all can not be protected, and hence the majority must determine the question. This certainly distinguishes the sacred day, but does no harm to those who do not count it sacred. It only obliges them to be courteous. The inequality in the matter is only such as in some things must obtain among the freest people.

As regards the second ground; physiologists, physicians, staticians [*sic.*], and sensible observers in general, have agreed that man's body and mind need a complete rest at an interval of about seven days. But man will not take that rest from labor unless he is obliged by law to do so. His greed for gain will make him ruin health in his own case, or (worse still) make him force his employÈes to ruin theirs by continuous work. The law, therefore, must make and enforce a rest-day. But what day shall it take? Again common sense says: "Take the day which the majority of the community, from religious reasons, already regard as a rest-day." So the civil law, providing for man's physical well-being, appoints and enforces a rest-day from labor, which is the same day on which all the Christian community worship, and in which the civil law, for other reasons, protects them in worshipping.

That it is not the purpose of Sunday laws, to keep the "day of worship free from disturbance," is evident from such statutes themselves. There is not a Sunday law in any State in the Union which clearly makes this discrimination. Illinois makes the nearest approach to it. But even in that State work is not prohibited alone in public places and near churches, nor are the more noisy kinds of work interdicted and the most quiet kinds permitted, as would necessarily be the case if the design of the law was to prevent disturbance; but even there the line is drawn, as it is almost universally, between "worldly employments" and "works of necessity and charity;" the former are prohibited, the latter are permitted. Moreover, the courts of the various States, in enforcing Sunday statutes, do not inquire whether anybody was disturbed or not, but only was secular work done, the same not being a work of "necessity or charity."

Certainly, the farmer plowing in his own field on Sunday, even if close to a church, could cause no disturbance to any one, other than a mental annoyance. It is true that in other countries such "disturbance" is prohibited; and so in Spain everybody is required to stand with uncovered head while a religious procession is passing; but certainly the founders of this Government contemplated nothing of that sort. Of course it is a great mental annoyance to the Spanish papist to see a Protestant stand with covered head while the Host (the consecrated wafer) is borne along the street; but should the law require the Protestant to remove his hat for that reason?—Certainly not; and no more should it require that the whole community respect Sunday because even a majority in the community are mentally annoyed at any disrespect to the day, in its sacred character.

"As regards the second ground," it is no better than the first. Even granting, for sake of the argument, all that is claimed in regard to the need of stated rest (but it is not granted), the State would not be justified in requiring all to rest at the same time. Probably a very large majority of the people of this country have employment which, in a measure, renders them independent of others in the matter of when they shall work. Thousands do rest on the seventh day, "according to the commandment," and others might do so if they would. But in a number of States even those who have rested on the seventh day are required, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, to rest also on Sunday. Thus Mr. Capps, lying in a Tennessee jail, rested regularly on the Sabbath; this certainly met fully all the supposed requirements of

his physical nature. Yet under a "civil" statute, existing, as *Sunday Reform Leaflets* would have us believe, for civil reasons, he is imprisoned for nine months for not resting also on Sunday. The fact is, and it is becoming more and more patent every day, that Sunday laws exist only because of the religious intolerance of a majority of the people, because those having control of legislation demand them in the

292

interests of religious dogma and unscriptural dogma, at that; they would, however, be no better in principle if the dogma were true, instead of false as it is.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 37 , p. 296.**

AMONG the many unscriptural doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, one of the most pernicious is the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. What the doctrine is was told in these columns June 7. It is further discussed this week. Let no reader fail to familiarize himself with this subject; for whoever accepts the immaculate conception of Mary, by the same act surrenders the Christ of the New Testament. If Mary was without sinful tendencies then Christ is without human sympathy, not being as the Scriptures declare he is, "touched with the feeling of our infirmities;" nor could he, in that case, have been "tempted like as we are." Surely he who accepts this doctrine must with it adopt the sad lament, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."

THE article on another page, "Catholics and Social Action," is deserving of careful attention, not because of any merit in it, but because of the significance of the facts which it states.

No pope of modern times has labored to untiringly as has Leo XIII. to make the papacy necessary to the governments of the earth. Papal rehabilitation has been the supreme object of his reign; and that the papacy has regained very much of its lost prestige under his leadership, cannot be denied.

It is asserted, and truthfully so, too, that the papacy has designs on this country; that for years it has been the deliberate purpose of Rome to dominate the United States in the interest of "the true church." But this is not all; Rome means that her sway shall be universal, and Leo XIII. has left no act undone, no word unspoken, the tendency of which would be to advance the interests of the papacy.

Personal qualities and political and social conditions have alike been favorable to the designs of the present pope. A born diplomat, he is personally *gratus* to the crowned heads and rulers of the world. Moreover the times have been favorable to the ambition of the pope to become arbitrator of the world. Peoples have been uneasy and rebellious, and rulers have been perplexed and troubled by domestic broils and problems, while for years the nations have been armed to the teeth, ready at a word to rush to battle, each bent on the destruction or subjugation of its neighbors. Of course each nation has been deeply concerned to retain the loyalty of its people, and to make friends wherever it could. Thus the papacy, which holds in its hands the allegiance of millions in every land, has become, as never before since the Reformation, a supposed necessity to the rulers of the world.

THE article, "Absence of Faith in Protestantism," printed on another page, under "Significant Paragraphs," contains much food for reflection. Is there or is there not a vital principle in Protestantism? Are there or are there not vital reasons in the minds of their votaries, for the existence of the several sects of Protestantism? The denomination that does not hold doctrines, a steadfast belief in which is vital to the Christian life, has no reason for existence. Christian charity means love for God and for souls for whom Christ died, not indifference to the truths of God's Word.

To change one's religion from conviction is noble, and honors God; but to do so as a mere matter of convenience or of wordly [*sic.*] profit is ignoble, and dishonors God. Luther said: "I consent. . . . to resign my person and my life to the emperor's disposal; but the Word of God—never!" How different this from the course pursued by so many so-called Protestants of to-day—by the scions of royalty no more than by thousands of others, just as responsible to God as though of royal blood.

But the fault is not attributable, as the *Monitor* supposes, to Protestantism, but to the denial of the fundamental principle of Protestantism, which is that "there is no sure doctrine but such as is comformable [*sic.*] to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine." Inspired by this conviction, many of the German princes of Luther's day, noble father's of a degenerate posterity, said to their royal kindred:—

We PROTEST by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, and who will one day be our

Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people neither *consent* nor *adhere* in any manner whatever to the proposed decree, in *anything* that is *contrary to God, to his holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of our souls*, and to the last decree of Spires.

But not so the degenerate Protestantism of to-day which makes merchandise of faith and thereby gives to the enemies of the Lord great occasion to blaspheme.

**September 27, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 38 , pp. 297, 298.**

"THE infallibility of the pope"—where does it come from? and how does he get it?

THE claim of infallibility on the part of the pope, is but the plain and logical consequence of the other claims made on his part.

THE claim of the headship of the Church of Christ, or of "the regency of God on earth," as is claimed by the pope and for the pope—either of these logically demands that he shall claim infallibility also.

BUT as we have seen, the claim of any such thing as a regency of God is supremely ridiculous and blasphemous; and the claim that any other than "Christ himself" is head of his body, is preposterous and supremely immoral; so the claim of infallibility on the part of any man anywhere is the embodiment of all these.

LET us examine this claim of the infallibility of the pope. And in order to do this more fairly and fully, let us see what is the exact statement of the claim as officially and "infallibly" pronounced. Here it is:—

Wherefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of the Christian people, we, the sacred council, approving, teach, and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when discharging the office of pastor, and teacher of all Christians, by reason of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church—he, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals: and that, therefore, such

definitions of the said Roman pontiff are of themselves unalterable and not from the consent of the church.

Consequently, Catholics believe that the pope is infallible when he teaches the faithful *ex cathedra*, that is, "*from the chair*" of St. Peter, in matters of *faith or morals*.—*Catholic Belief*, p. 69.

FROM this it is seen that there is no claim that infallibility attaches to the pope except when he speaks "*ex cathedra* that is, from the chair of St. Peter;" and he speaks "*ex cathedra*" only when he speaks (a) "as the father and doctor of all Christians;" (b) "discharging the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians;" (c) and then only as he speaks on a question of faith or morals. That is to say: If he speaks or writes only as a priest, a bishop, or a theologians, he is not claimed to be infallible, nor is that which is so spoken or written claimed to be infallibly true. If he speaks about the weather or the crops, or the loss of his temporal power, or politics generally, or his great "love for Protestants"—in none of this is it claimed that infallibility attaches to him or anything that he says. It is only when he speaks on a doctrine "regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church," that he or anything that he says is claimed to be infallible: and even then he or it is not infallible unless at the same time he speaks as the "father and doctor of all Christians," and also "in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians," *as the successor of St. Peter*. All three of these elements are essential to *ex cathedra*, and *ex cathedra* is essential to his infallibility. And this is the doctrine of "the infallibility of the pope."

THAT this analysis is correct, can be seen from the following statement of the case, by Cardinal Gibbons:—

Bear in mind, also, that this divine assistance that makes him infallible is guaranteed to the pope, not in his capacity as a private teacher, but only in his *official* capacity, when he judges of faith and morals as head of the church. If a pope, for instance, like Benedict XIV., were to write a treatise on canon law, his book would be as much open to criticism as that of any doctor of the church.

Finally, the inerrability of the popes, being restricted to questions of faith and morals, does not extend to the natural sciences, such as astronomy or geology, unless where error is presented under the false name of science, and arrays itself against revealed truth. It does not, therefore, concern itself about the nature and motions of the planets. Nor does it regard purely political questions, such as the form of government a nation ought to adopt, or what candidates we ought to vote for. . . .

What, then, is the real doctrine of infallibility? It simply means that the pope, as successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, by virtue of the promise of Jesus Christ, is preserved from error of judgment when he promulgates to the church a decision on faith or morals.—*Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 147, 148.

It is only fair to state also that from the dogma above quoted, as well as from the cardinal's statement of the doctrine, it is plain that the question of just what is embraced in the phrase, "faith or morals," is left wide open. So that whatever the pope chooses to say is faith or morals, that *is* faith or morals. Therefore as a matter of fact the question of how narrow or how wide the application of this infallibility is or may be, is left entirely to be decided as the wish of the pope, or the interests of the papacy may demand on the particular occasion of the application of the doctrine. It *may* be so narrow as to touch but one single point or phase of a single abstract question, or it may be so wide as to embrace every interest of man in all the relation of life pertaining to this world and the next.

FROM the dogma itself and from the cardinal's statement of the doctrine, it is perfectly clear that it is not claimed that infallibility attaches to *the man* at all, who happens to be a pope, but that it attaches to *the pope* who happens to be a man. For instance, Joachim Pecci happened to become a pope. When he was just plain Joachim Pecci and nothing else, no hint of a claim of infallibility ever attached to him. And if he had always remained plain Joachim Pecci no hint of any such thing, in the mind of anybody, would have ever attached to him. When he became "Father Pecci," a priest, it was the same way; when he became Bishop Pecci, it was the same way; when he became Archbishop Pecci, it was still the same way; and when he became Cardinal Pecci it was yet the same way—in none of these positions was any thought of infallibility ever connected with him in the mind of anybody. And if he had always remained in any one of these positions, no thought of infallibility ever would have been connected with him.

IT is perfectly plain, then, that outside

298

of the *office* of pope there is no thought of infallibility connected with the man who happens to become pope. As priest, or bishop, or archbishop, or cardinal, no vestige of it attaches to him in the mind of anybody. Yet it was by a vote of 363, against *two*, bishops, archbishops, and cardinals, that the doctrine was established that infallibility does attach to him when he happens to become pope.

This, too, while not one of the 363 made any kind of claim of infallibility on his own part! In this, therefore, we are treated to the absurd suggestion that 363 elements of absolute *fallibility* could *infallibly* settle the doctrine that *infallibility* is connected with one of their own absolutely fallible selves when he happens to be made pope!—No, this is not quite the full statement of the case yet; for when the 363 had voted it, it was not infallibly fixed until the pope had *ex cathedra* proclaimed it. That is to say, the 363 fallibles voted it infallibly so, then he of whom, till this, it was not *infallibly* so, proclaimed it infallibly so, and thus it became infallibly so. In other words, 363 fallibles voted his infallibility when he speaks *ex cathedra*; but this could not be infallibly certain till he himself had infallibly proclaimed it; and he could not infallibly proclaim it until it was infallibly so! *Like produced totally unlike. Out of nothing SOMETHING CAME!*

AGAIN: The pope *must* be chosen from among the cardinals, and this by the vote of the cardinals themselves. But not one of the cardinals makes any claim of any shadow of infallibility connected with himself. Yet these men, not one of whom has any shadow of it, elect one of themselves pope and then, lo! he has it! To-day, he is completely destitute of it, and to-morrow he is clothed with it: and all this because a number of persons as completely destitute of it as he was, put some ballots in a box which elected him pope! And so, on a second count, it is clear that "the infallibility of the pope" springs from the law of, like produces totally unlike; and, out of nothing something comes.

THIS is where the infallibility of the pope *comes from*. This is the source of the thing, in the abstract. Now let us inquire, How does it become so connected with him as to be available on demand? That we may arrive at the point of this inquiry in the easiest way, let us trace the thing onward from the point which we have reached. Not only is it true that as a mere man, or as a priest, or a bishop, or an archbishop, or a cardinal, there is no shadow of infallibility attaching to him; but even more than this, when he, being a cardinal, is elected pope, not even yet is he infallible. And when, by his coronation, he is duly installed in the office of pope—even yet he is not infallible. Not till all this has been passed through by him, and then, *in addition*, he as pope sits in "the chair of St. Peter," and from that particular *phase of the office* speaks as the head of the church—not till then does any principle of infallibility attach to "the Roman Pontiff," according to the

dogma of "the infallibility of the pope." Therefore, as infallibility does not attach to him except as he occupies that *particular phase* of the office, as successor of St. Peter, it follows plainly enough that it comes to him *from that seat*. As in the seat he has it, and out of the seat he does not have it, there is no other possible conclusion than that all the infallibility the pope ever has he gets from the seat which he occupies when he speaks, "*ex cathedra*, that is, *from the chair* of St. Peter."

AGAIN: This is seen from the very language of the dogma of infallibility itself, and it is the inevitable logic of that language. The dogma declares that he is infallible, *not* by the divine assistance promised to him *in himself*, nor in him *from those who elected him*, but "by the divine assistance promised to him *in blessed Peter*." As it is promised to him only "in blessed Peter," there has to be some connection formed between him and "blessed Peter," or else he cannot have it. But how can this connection be formed? Oh! it is claimed that Peter occupied the seat of the bishopric of Rome, and that when the "Roman Pontiff" sits in that seat the necessary connection is formed between him and "blessed Peter," that makes infallibility available as occasion may require. Therefore it is the only logic of the dogma, that the pope gets his infallibility in its concrete form so that it is available, altogether *from the seat* which he occupies when he speaks, "*ex cathedra*, that is, *from the chair* of St. Peter." By this we would not insist that this seat must necessarily be the identical, literal chair in which papal "tradition" says that Peter literally sat. We are willing to allow that the pope may speak *ex cathedra* from another than that identical, literal chair, and that such speech would be as much "infallible" as though spoken from that literal chair. But we do insist, and the dogma and the whole theory of papal "infallibility" demands it that as it is not in *the man*, nor in *the ecclesiastic*, nor in the election, nor in the office *apart from that particular phase* of it, it is inevitably derived from that seat, whether it be the identical chair in which Peter is said to have sat, or any other, or none at all.

LET no one say that in tracing the infallibility of the pope altogether to *the seat* which he occupies when he speaks "from the chair," we are carrying the thing too far, and taking an advantage merely for the sake of advantage, by a mere play upon word. This is not so. It is nothing else than the plain, sober, consequence of the words of the dogma; and of the cardinal's statement of the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope. It is not true of the doctrine of the infallibility of

the pope, to say that it attaches to him by virtue of *that office* rather than by *the seat* which he occupies when he speaks *ex cathedra, in the exercise of the office*. For he may hold *the office* of pope and exercise the ordinary duties and prerogatives of that office as long as he lives, and yet no claim of infallibility attach to anything that he ever does or says, or to him in the doing or saying of anything; because during the whole time of his occupying that office there may be no occasion for him to speak *ex cathedra*. For it is only when so speaking that it is claimed that infallibility attaches to him or to anything that he says. It is a fact that Leo XIII. has never yet spoken "*ex cathedra*," and therefore has never yet exercised the prerogative of infallibility. But he does hold the *office* of pope and has exercised all the duties of the office that occasion has demanded—and all this without infallibility attaching to what he has said or done, or to him in the saying or doing of it.

IT is therefore certain that the infallibility claimed for him does not come to him simply by virtue of *his office as pope*. The source of it is back of that yet. And as he may occupy that *office* and exercise all the duties of that office that occasion demands, to the end of his office and his life, without ever being called upon to speak "*ex cathedra* defining a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church;" as it is only when he so speaks that infallibility is claimed to attach to him or anything that he says; and as, so to speak—to speak "*ex cathedra*"—is in itself to speak "from the chair," from the seat, "of St. Peter," it follows plainly, soberly, and inevitably, without any play upon words, that all the infallibility that the "Roman Pontiff" ever can have, comes to him not by virtue of the *office* which he holds, but altogether from *the seat* which he occupies when he speaks "*ex cathedra*, that is, 'from *the chair*' of St. Peter;" defining "a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the whole church."

IT is in *the seat* and not in the office at all. It is not connected with the office except as *that particular prerogative* of the office is exercised upon the particular question of faith or morals, and in that particular way, namely, "*ex cathedra*, that is 'from the chair' of St. Peter."

THEREFORE the only conclusion that can ever be honestly or logically derived from the dogma of the infallibility of the pope is that all the infallibility that the pope has or ever can have, he gets solely from this conception of "*ex cathedra*." And as it is as plain as A, B, C, that no such thing as infallibility could ever possibly come from a

sheer abstraction, it follows just as plainly that the only source of "the infallibility of the pope" is the "law" that, out of nothing something comes.

THIS is the truth. Of course it is an absurd conception; but let not the people of these States or of the United States laugh at this absurd claim on the part of the pope until they are sure they are entirely clear of all such conception in their own practice, or in their own consent even. This phase of the subject, however, will be discussed next week.

**"A Backslidden Baptist" *American Sentinel* 9, 38 , pp. 298, 299.**

THE International Religious Liberty Association addressed a letter to the secular and religious papers of the country asking them to join in protest against the imprisonment of Mr. Capps, a Seventh-day Adventist, for doing common farm labor on Sunday. It was expected that Baptists, above all others, would be most unanimous in their protest; but we fear, from the returns which are coming in, that in this we are to be disappointed. The *Alabama Baptist*, of Aug. 9th, whose motto is, "Speaking the truth in love," replies as follows:—

Now, Baptist believer in liberty of conscience as we are, we cannot accept the invitation. We do not see persecution in the case. The people of Tennessee, like those of other States, by statute law recognized the Christian Sabbath as God's holy day, and they de-

299

clared that certain things must not be done on that day. Mr. Capps did one of those things, and thereby violated the law. Whether the law be good or bad, or whether Mr. Capps' convictions or conscience may be right, are not questions to be considered. The simple fact is that he deliberately violated a plain law of the State, of long standing, and which expresses the will of a large majority of the people, and he could not reasonably expect anything else than to pay the penalty of such violation.

As a part of our comment we introduce the following quotation from the Baptist *Examiner*, of this city, which is an effort to convert another Baptist organ to the scriptural and time-honored Baptist principle of religious liberty:—

We did not expect that any Baptist would defend the prosecution of otherwise inoffensive Christians for labor on the first day of the week that disturbs nobody else. The *Baptist and Reflector*, of Nashville, however, undertakes to justify this persecution in the State of Tennessee, which is similar to the cases that have recently occurred in Maryland and Georgia. 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. If there is any body of Christians that has solemnly and stoutly protested against such persecution, no matter who were its victims or its authors, it is the Baptists. We have never before seen an attempt at justification of religious persecution in the Baptist Church newspaper. We hope never to see one again.

And now to show how "easy" it would have been for the persecutors of Baptists to have justified themselves "by the use of similar arguments" we will put the "arguments" of the *Alabama Baptist* into the mouth of Massachusetts Puritans and address them to Elder Holmes and other Baptist victims.

The people of this colony, like those of other colonies, by statute law recognized sprinkling as God's holy mode of baptism, and they declared that baptism by immersion or rebaptism must not be done. Mr. Holmes did both of these things, and thereby violated the law. Whether the law is good or bad, or whether Mr. Holmes' convictions or conscience may be right, are not questions to be considered. The simple fact is that he deliberately violated a plain law of the colony, of long standing, and which expresses the plain will of a large majority of the people, and he could not reasonably expect anything else than to pay the penalty of such violation.

We appeal to all Baptists. Are the cases not parallel? The penalty in the case of Elder Holmes was thirty pounds or thirty lashes. The penalty in the case of Mr. Capps was \$68.65 or 280 days' imprisonment. Elder Holmes conscientiously refused to pay the fine and was whipped. Mr. Capps conscientiously refused to pay the fine and was imprisoned. And the difference between Mr. Capps and the editor of the *Alabama Baptist* is that Mr. Capps is the legitimate successor of Elder Holmes in suffering for conscience' sake, and the editor of the *Alabama Baptist* though claiming to be a Baptist, is a legitimate successor of Cotton Mather in defending the persecutors of a Seventh-day Adventist who is suffering for conscience' sake.

**"Did the Roman Catholic Church Ever Persecute?" *American Sentinel* 9, 38 , pp. 299, 300.**

*Donahoe's Magazine* for September has an article in which it is denied that Rome ever persecuted. In answer to a question, "Why does not the Catholic Church publicly disavow and condemn all sorts of religious persecution"? it is replied:—

One good reason why the church does not do this is because she has never sanctioned or approved religious persecution of any kind.

And of the Inquisition, this statement is made:—

As to the Inquisition, every well-informed reader knows that whatever punishments were inflicted upon heretics during the time of its existence, were carried out by the civil, not by the ecclesiastical authorities. "As for the Roman court," says the Rev. James Kent Stone, a convert to Catholicity, who is now known as Father Fidells, speaking on the subject of the Inquisition, "I am not aware that the smallest proof has ever been given that its proceedings [*sic.*] were other than mild and conservative."

And, again the editor makes the statement that "Rome did nothing that calls for disavowal now."

Likewise, Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," says: "The Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of civil and religious liberty."—Page 265.

In one sense, and in one sense only, is the denial of persecution by the Roman Catholic Church true: It was the civil arm, that is, the State, that executed the penalty against heretics. But this is making a distinction without a difference, since it was the ecclesiastical authorities who instigated and insisted upon the persecution.

In 1229 the Council of Toulouse "passed forty-five articles, instructing the bishops to bind by an oath a priest in every parish, and two or more laymen, to search out and apprehend heretics and those who sheltered them. Heresy was to be punished with the loss of property, and the house in which a heretic was found was to be burned. . . . Every two years, males from fourteen years upwards, and females from twelve years upwards, were obliged to repeat an oath to inform against heretics. The neglect of the annual confession was a sufficient ground for suspicion, as was also the possession of the Scriptures, especially in translations. In spite of these measures and the rigorous execution of them, especially in Southern France, the desired result was not secured. The bishops were accused of apathy, and were themselves made subjects of the Inquisition by the papal chair. In 1232 and Gregory IX. appointed the Dominicans a standing commission of inquisitors in Austria, Germany, Aragon, Lombardy, and in Southern France. At the same period was organized the so-called 'soldiery of Jesus Christ against heretics.' . . . The suspicion of heresy was made a sufficient ground for apprehension; and, by a bull of Innocent IV. in 1252, resort was had,

if necessary, to torture, to extract a confession."—*Schaff-Herzog, art. Inquisition.*

The "Encyclopedia Britannica," art. Inquisition, says:—

The germ of the Inquisition lies in the duty of searching out and correcting error entrusted to the deacons in the early churches. The promise in the Anglican Ordinal that the priest will be "ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word" is a pale reflection of this ancient charge. The episcopacy thus providing the instruments, the temporal power soon offered to enforce the sentences of the church; the edicts of Constantine and his successors now began that double system which, by ordaining that heretics should be dealt with by the secular arm, enabled the church to achieve her object without dipping her own hands in blood.

As before remarked, it is in this sense and in this sense only, that the Roman Catholic Church can, by any possibility, claim that she never persecuted. But no student of history will be deceived by such sophistry. The Inquisitors were the agents of "the church." They were commissioned by the pope and acted for him. It was at the Council of Toulouse, in 1229, that the title of Inquisitor was first applied to the agents of the papacy. Prior to this time it was applied only to those who inquired into matters of taxation. "But the thing itself," says the "Cyclopedia Britannica," Art. Inquisition, "was far older than the name." The same authority continues: "In 1184 the Synod of Verona cursed all heretics and their shelterers, ordered relapsed persons to be handed over to the secular arm for capital punishment, confiscated their property, and clearly indicated that the new Inquisition would go far beyond the older episcopal function. The synod did not hesitate to threaten easy-going bishops, urging them to more frequent and more searching visitations, standing over them as a superior power. And henceforward Inquisition becomes more systematized, with papal not episcopal authority; it was developed by those three masterful pontiffs, Innocent III. (1198-1216), Gregory IX. (1227-1241), and Innocent IV. (1243-1254), who all, regarding the supremacy of Rome as the keystone of society, claimed authority over men's souls and bodies, above the authority of prince or bishop. Thus, soon after his accession, Innocent III. sent two Cistercians, Guy and Regnier, to visit the dioceses of Southern France and Spain, "to catch and kill the little foxes," the Waldensians, Cathari, and Patarines, to whose tails were fastened firebands to burn up the good corn of the faithful."

"In Italy," says the "Britannica," "the Inquisition was established under Dominican supervision as early as 1224. Inquisitors were at a later time brought into England to combat the Wickliffite opinions." Of the Inquisition in Spain, the same work says: "The motive of strictly religious fanaticism influenced, not the monarchs, but the Dominican instruments of the Holy Office;" and so persuaded by the minions of the pope, Ferdinand sent to Rome to solicit the establishment of such a tribunal. Sextus IV. granted the request in 1478, and it was by this pope

300

that the infamous Torquemada, a Dominican "father," was commissioned Inquisition-General for Castile and Leon. Rome must do more than keep the pupils of her own schools in ignorance of history if she would escape the terrible responsibility of her acts in the Dark Ages; she must blot from the pages of history the black record; but that she can never do. Nor would she do it in the sense of changing the facts if she could; for "Rome did nothing that calls for disavowal now." She would do the same thing again if she could, and wishes now only to conceal the facts. But why do even this; for, are not "Protestants" in our own and other lands persecuting Christians to-day and making the same excuse, namely, "We are only enforcing the civil law"? Yea, verily. The papal spirit still lives, not alone in the Roman Catholic Church, but in the natural heart; and as long as it does so live, there will be religious persecution under color of "civil" statutes; and it will be excused as "only enforcing civil law." The modern Protestant Inquisition differs from the Inquisition of the popes only in degree. The principle is the same.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 38 , p. 304.**

WE begin this week the publication of several articles on papal infallibility. We ask them a careful reading. Of course infallibility does not attach to the pope in any way, except in the minds of his votaries. It is altogether a vanishing quantity. It is claimed that it inheres only in a certain prerogative of the office of pope, namely, in *ex cathedra* utterances; and to this term the Vatican council of 1870 affixed such a definition that almost any utterance, on almost any subject, may be held to be *ex cathedra* or not *ex cathedra*, at the sweet will of the pope himself, or of those who are affected by the utterance. This is of course to leave a loophole by which to escape from the many glaring errors, to say nothing of the downright wickedness of many of the

popes of Rome. That which part of the church accepts as *ex cathedra* may be denied by another part; or that which one pope has spoken "from the chair of St. Peter," as he supposed and intended, may by another pope be ignored, or set down as simply an opinion on canon law or a deliverance on discipline. Three inquiries have recently been made from this office of as many high Roman Catholic officials in this country concerning *ex cathedra* utterances by the present pope. One of these officials (the highest in rank in the United States) replied: "It is not very often that the popes are obliged to speak in such a manner [*ex cathedra*]; but they have done so in many instances, as did Leo XIII. on a recent occasion." When asked what the recent occasion was, and where an authentic copy of the utterance could be obtained, "the prince of the church" twice evaded the question. One archbishop and another archbishop's chancellor replied that they had no knowledge of an *ex cathedra* utterance by the present pope. It is therefore evident that the pope's infallibility is altogether chimerical, derived from an imaginary function of a man-made office, from the will of the "sovereign pontiff," and dependent upon the interpretation of those to whom it is addressed. This is papal infallibility, and it is to faith in this that Leo XIII. invites "the rulers and peoples of the universe."

ONE of the most significant of our "Significant Paragraphs," this week, is that in which it is related that a Methodist preaching, in Ohio, exclaimed at a recent camp meeting: "God bless the Roman Catholic Church of to-day."

"Rome never changes." The Roman Catholic Church of to-day is, according to her own boast, the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Ages. Cardinal Gibbons says, in "The Faith of Our Fathers," page 71:—

Perpetuity, or duration till the end of time, is one of the most striking marks of the Church. By perpetuity is not meant merely that Christianity in one form or another was always to exist, but that the Church was to remain forever in its integrity, clothed with *all* the attributes which God gave it in the beginning. For, if the Church lost any of her essential characteristics. . . . she could not be said to be perpetual, because she would not be the same institution.

Again, on page 83 of the same book, we find these words:—

Amid the continual changes in human institutions, she [the Roman Catholic Church] is the one institution that never changes. . . . She has seen monarchies changed into republics, and republics consolidated into empires—all this has she witnessed, while her own divine constitution has remained unaltered.

That Rome adapts herself in some measure to different ages is true; but that she changes in character is not true. Her doctrines, her purposes are the same now as the Middle Ages, and if she could she would push back the car of human progress to the position it occupied when she dominated the civilized world, and the Inquisition tortured its victims and hunted its enemies where it would. Says Brownson, a Roman Catholic writer, whose work is on sale in all Catholic book stores: "Always will the period from the sixth to the end of the fifteenth century stand out as most glorious in the annals of the race."—*Liberalism and the Church*, page 182.

No, "Rome never changes," and she is sorry that the world has changed. She is sorry that there was ever such an era as that of the Reformation. She is much grieved at the existence of the various Protestant sects, of which the Methodist Episcopal Church is one. And yet a Methodist preacher says, "God bless the Roman Catholic Church of to-day." If Rome is the Church of God, there is no excuse for Methodism; its inception was wickedness, its continuance is presumption. But if Rome is, as the Scriptures characterize her, "the mystery of iniquity," "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," how dare any man bearing the name of Protestant, bid her God speed?

**October 4, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 39 , pp. 305-307.**

LAMST week we said: Let not the people of these States, or of the United States, laugh at the absurd conception from which springs the "infallibility" of the pope of Rome until they are sure that they themselves are entirely clear of all such conception in their own practice, or in their *consent* even.

THIS word of advice is strictly appropriate, for the simple reason that in nearly all the States, and in the United States, there is established in its very essence the papal principle of infallibility: namely, that authority to act for the public in matters of religion and religious observances, is derived from *the seat* that is occupied by the officious official at the time of his officious action.

IN all the States of this Union, and in the Government of the United States there are officials—especially legislative and judiciary—who exercise prerogatives that are either usurped wholly, or else

derived solely from *the official seat* which they occupy, and from nothing else under the sun. And the vast majority of the people consent to it without a word, while perhaps a majority of these justify it in their actions and in the practice of the officious officials.

IT is a fact too notorious to require any proof, that in the legislative and judicial proceedings of the government of the States and of the United States, laws are made, construed, and confirmed, and executed which establish religious dogmas and institutions and enforce them upon the people. For instance, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided for the people of the United States that "this is a religious people," and accordingly that "this is a Christian nation." And the Congress of the United States has decided for the people that the fourth commandment "means" that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the Sabbath, and have fixed that interpretation in the legislation of the nation to be enforced upon all the people. The same things, and other like things, have been done by the legislators and judges of all the States, except one or perhaps two. And not only do the vast majority of the people consent to it, but thousands upon thousands of the people justify it, while nearly the whole religious element of the nation—professed Protestants too—actually require it, and, indeed, so far as lies in their power, force it.

NOW where did these men who happen for the time to be legislators or judges, get their right to do these things? How did they become possessed of the prerogative to interpret the Scriptures and decide religious questions for the people? No one will allow that any one of these persons merely as a man, simply as a private citizen, ever had, or ever could have had, any shadow of right to interpret the Bible or decide any religious question for any other man or citizen in any way, much less to decide it and fix it in an authoritative rule to be enforced upon all, or upon any man, in the State or nation. So certainly is this true that if any one of these men, when he was merely a man and a private citizen, had undertaken to do such a thing his action would have been swiftly resented as a piece of unbearable impertinence. Yet, lo! when he is an official he not only does this very thing, but it is expected by multitudes of the people that his action in this shall be accepted by all as valid, and be received as authoritative, and be respected and obeyed accordingly. Yesterday any such action would have been resented by everybody, while to-day it must needs be accepted and respected by everybody! But what

wrought this so important a change in the condition and prerogatives of the man?

OH, yesterday he was but a man like all the rest of us, while to-day he is in official position. But what caused this change? How did he get into that official position?—It was all done simply by the votes of man like himself—his fellow-citizens. Yesterday he was as destitute as all the others of every shadow of such prerogative, while to-day he is amply clothed with it: and all this because, as with the other pope, enough men as destitute of it as himself, voted for him to elect him to that office; or because he was appointed to the office by a man who was so elected. Yet even this is not the full statement of the case; because even when he is elected he does not possess it until he has been "sworn in" to the office, and even then he does not possess it in available form until he takes his seat in the legislative hall or on the judicial bench and acts officially *from that seat*. As a mere man or private citizen no one will allow that he has any shadow of right or authority to act for another in any question of religion or religious observance; when he is elected he does not have it till he is sworn in; and even when he is sworn in he does not have it until he acts from his official seat.

IT is therefore perfectly plain that all our legislators and judges get all the authority and prerogative that they exercise in matters of religion, precisely *where* and precisely *as* the pope of Rome gets his, namely, *from the seat* which they occupy when they speak by the whole people. For as no one of them as a man or a private citizen had any shadow of such authority, it is impossible that any one of them could have derived this prerogative from anything that made him an official, except upon the principle from which the other pope derives his, namely, that like produces totally unlike, and out of nothing something comes. And as even when he has become an official by the votes of those who had no shadow of any such right or authority, this prerogative is not available until he occupies the official seat, it follows inevitably that it is *the seat* alone from which the legislator or the judge obtains all his right, all his authority, and all his prerogative, to speak or act in questions of religion or religious observances for all the people.

CONSEQUENTLY no legislator or judge who ever did, or who ever shall, act in the making or enforcing of a Sunday law, or any other law touching religion or reli-

gious observances or religious obligation of any kind, can ever consistently object to the claim of the infallibility of the pope of Rome, or laugh at the absurd conception of the source from which that infallibility comes to him, laughable as it undoubtedly is; because every such legislator and every such judge has in such action made the precise claim and has acted upon the very principle that the pope of Rome makes and acts upon in his "infallibility."

THE absurdity, and much more than this—*the danger*—of this evil principle was clearly seen by the men who made the Government of the United States, and was specially guarded against by them in the total separation of religion and the State and the absolute prohibition of any State official from touching in his official capacity any question of religion in any way. This is why they observed, and so pointedly, that "it is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects which profess the Christian faith *without erecting a claim to infallibility* which would lead us back to the church of Rome." And this—

1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth "that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence." The religion, then, 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 a 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 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 a member of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the universe; and if a member of civil society who enters into any subordinate association must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority, *much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular civil society do it with a saving of his allegiance to the universal Sovereign.* We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society, and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance.

2. Because, if religion be exempt from the authority of society at large *still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body.* The latter are but the creatures and vicegerents of the former. Their

jurisdiction is both derivative and limited. It is limited with regard to the co-ordinate departments; *more necessarily is it limited with regard to the constituents*. The preservation of a free government requires not merely that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power be invariably maintained, but more especially that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people. The rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are tyrants. The people who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves *nor by any authority derived from them*, and are slaves.

And because they were "well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord of both body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his almighty power to do; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, *civil as well as ecclesiastical*, who being themselves but *fallible and uninspired men*, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true *and infallible*, and *as such* endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time;" and "that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion, is a dangerous fallacy which at once destroys all religious liberty."

SUCH are the noble and weighty words of Madison and Jefferson as they conducted the campaigns that established the principle of the total separation of Church and State in this country, and for the enlightenment of all countries. And these words clearly show that they well understood both the fallacy and the danger of the prerogative of "infallibility." They saw readily enough that all the authority that any man ever could have over another in matters of religion could only be by sheer usurpation, and contained in itself all the elements of the papacy, even to the extreme element of infallibility. And knowing both the fallacy and the tyranny of the principle, they exposed it as it deserved, and repudiated it, and, as they hoped, delivered the people of this nation from it forever, by fixing in the supreme law the absolute prohibition of the governmental power from ever touching any question of religion in any way. This they did that the people of this splendid nation—the last, the greatest, and the best—might be forever

free from anybody here ever "erecting a claim to infallibility which would lead us back to the church of Rome."

LET no one jump to the conclusion that the foregoing argument applies with equal force against civil authority "because no legislator, or judge, or other civil official can exercise even civil authority until he has been duly installed in office and occupies his official place." For although it is true that no man can exercise the authority of legislator, or judge, or other civil office, *even after he has been elected*, until he has been duly installed in the office, and only then when he acts from the official seat or place; yet it is equally true that when he does so act, he exercises only the authority and prerogative that from the beginning were in himself as a man and a citizen, and that were also in all his fellow-men and fellow-citizens. All the legitimate authority that he exercises in office, except in the degree of it, was inherent in himself, and in all concerned, simply as men and citizens. Every person, *merely as a man in the world*, has within himself full right, authority, and prerogative to act, even to the use of force, to protect from violence the life, person, or property of himself or any of his fellow-men. For instance, any man who sees another setting fire to his property or the property of his neighbor, has full and inherent right, even to the application of force, to prevent that man from accomplishing his purpose. It is equally so in the event of any other threatened danger to the life, property, or person of himself or any other man.

WITHOUT organization, however, that is, without *government*, it would devolve upon each individual, of himself and for himself, to exercise this authority, and would lead to every man's hand being against his neighbor. Therefore, in order that this inherent right and authority of every man may be the better exercised in behalf of all, men enter into organization and establish an order of government for this very purpose, and such an order of government as to them seems best calculated to accomplish this purpose. This is the origin and object of civil government.

THIS organization having been formed, each man is now a *citizen* as well as a man; and all this right, authority, and prerogative, that inhered in him as a *man*, still are inherent in him as a *citizen*—the only change that is undergone is in the *manner* of the exercise of these inherent qualities. That is to say: As the object of the organization that has been created is to relieve the individual from the *personal* exercise of this authority, the more fully to secure all in the

unmolested enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, each one now *by vote* delegates to one of their number the exercise of his authority in this matter to be exercised by the chosen one as the representative of all. And he who is thus chosen acts with the duly delegated authority of all. And in all this he acts with no authority, neither does he exercise any prerogative, that he did not in himself possess before—*except in degree*. Whereas before the organization he must of necessity act for himself and from himself alone, *now* he acts for himself and for hundreds or thousands of others who, equally with himself, possessed this authority in himself; now he acts from the delegated authority of all these, who by vote have duly clothed him with the right and power to exercise for them the authority which inhered in them as individual men.

AND although when elected he cannot exercise this delegated authority until he has been duly installed in office, this is not because he derives any additional authority, prerogative, or characteristic, from the seat or official position itself; but because that, as his fellow-citizens have signified their confidence in him for the exercise of the authority which they have delegated to him, it is necessary and but proper that he should respond by submitting to the forms that have been established, and pledge himself to his fellow-citizens for the faithful exercise of the authority which they have delegated to him. The oath or affirmation of office, and whatever other ceremonies or pledges required in the installation in office of the elected one, are but the response of mutual obligation on his part to the delegation of authority on the part of the electors; and are not in any sense used with any idea that from these ceremonies or from the office itself he derives any additional dignity, authority, or prerogative whatever. So in no instance does any legislator, or judge, or other civil officer, acting in civil things, ever act with any authority or exercise any prerogative which he *in himself* did not possess, or that those who voted for him did not in themselves possess *before he was elected*; or which they did not have full right and power to delegate to him to be exercised in their behalf and for the better service of all concerned.

NOT so however is it in matters of religion. That pertains to man's duty or relationship to God. These come not from himself. They are laid upon him by the Lord; and are therefore incapable of being delegated, incapable of being exercised by any one in behalf of

another. And as the exercise of these powers, the performance of these duties, and the fulfillment of these

308

relationships are incapable of being delegated, and so incapable of being exercised by any one in behalf of another; it absolutely follows that no legislator, or judge, or other official *of any kind* can ever have any authority in matters pertaining to religion in any way. Consequently any attempt to exercise any authority over, or for, another in matters of religion, springs from sheer usurpation. And if it be denied that it is sheer usurpation then the only conceivable source from which such authority or prerogative could be derived is *the seat* which said official occupies when he acts officially. And thus we are brought again to the absurd conception of the source from which "the infallibility of the pope" is derived.

AND the professed Protestant churches of the United States and of the world, in appealing to the government, or allowing officials, without protest, to act in matters of religion; and the legislators and judges of the States, and of the United States, and of the world in acting in matters of religion, as they have done and as they continue to do, are in very principle and in actual practice committed to the identical conception of infallibility to which the papacy is committed in the dogma of the "infallibility of the pope." And this, too, without as much as the seeming justification that the papacy claims: for the papacy does claim that "blessed Peter" did occupy the official seat which the pope occupies when he speaks "*ex cathedra*," and therefore "infallibly;" but no one can ever even claim that Peter ever occupied any seat that ever was or ever shall be occupied by any legislator or judge in any of the States or the United States—not even when they decided *ex cathedra* that "this is a Christian nation," or that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the Sabbath according to the "meaning" of the fourth commandment.

SO the professed Protestants of the United States and of the world, and the legislators and judges of the States, the United States, and of the world, who presume to act officially and governmentally in matters of religion, will have to clear their skirts of the smirch of "infallibility" before they can ever consistently indulge any smiles at the absurdity of the claim of "the infallibility of the Roman pontiff." All these will have to abdicate the exercise of the prerogative of infallibility themselves, before any of them shall ever be able consistently to criticise or reject the exercise of it by another, even

though that other be the pope of Rome. In short, all these will have to cease to be popes themselves before they can consistently object against the pope of Rome.

THE basis of the papal claim as derived from "blessed Peter" will be examined next week.

**"A Persecuting Baptist" *American Sentinel* 9, 39 , pp. 307, 308.**

THE *Alabama Baptist*, of August 9, attempts to justify the persecution of W. B. Capps, who is now serving a sentence of nine months in the county jail at Dresden, Weakely County, Tenn., for plowing in his field on Sunday, by the following argument:—

The law does not compel him to violate his convictions by working on Saturday, neither should he violate the law and the convictions of the people by working on their holy day. If Mr. Capps cannot have the law changed to suit his religious views, he ought to go where there is no such law.

The *Baptist Examiner*, of September 13th, says, in replying to like "arguments" which appeared in the *Baptist and Reflector*, of Nashville, Tenn: "It would have been easy, by similar arguments, for those who persecuted Baptists in the past, to have justified their conduct and policy." How true! and why can't the *Alabama Baptist* see it? Its arguments are similar to the arguments of John Cotton, in his justification of the persecution of Elder Holmes. And to show the similarity we will put the words of the *Alabama Baptist* editor, with slight changes into the mouth of the persecutor of Baptists.

The law does not compel him (Obadiah Holmes) to violate his convictions by being sprinkled himself, neither should he violate the law and the convictions of the people by baptizing by immersion. If Mr. Holmes cannot get the law changed to suit his religious views, he ought to go where there is no such law.

John Cotton and his associates, in the persecution of Baptists, thought Baptists "ought to go where there is no such law," and the Baptists refusing to go were whipped, imprisoned, and banished, and now the editor of the *Alabama Baptist* thinks the same of Seventh-day Adventists: and since he thinks they "ought to go," and they think like Baptists of Massachusetts that they ought to stay, it follows that the John Cotton, of the *Alabama Baptist*, is in favor of banishing Seventh-day Adventists in 1894 as the John Cotton, of Massachusetts was in favor of banishing Baptists in 1651.

Although the *Baptist Examiner* says it is easy to show that the cases of the persecutors are similar, the editor of the *Alabama Baptist* thinks it is easy to show that the case is different. And now hear him try it:—

This case is different from those in which patriots and Christians, especially Baptists, have felt called upon to resist laws that were evidently unjust, and which were intended to be restrictive and proscriptive of one party or creed and in favor of another. This Tennessee statute, like those of other States, restrains those who indorse it as well as those who do not.

This attempted defense of the Tennessee persecutions is the old threadbare excuse of the persecutor. "When we were persecuted we were 'patriots and Christians,' but you 'violate the law' and are therefore lawless and unchristian." This was the way the Puritans of colonial days talked about the Baptists. Thomas Shepard, of Charlestown, in a sermon entitled "Eye Salve," told the governor and magistrates of Massachusetts that "Anabaptists [a nickname for Baptists] have ever been looked at by the godly leaders of this people as a scab," and the president of Harvard College said, "such a rough thing as a New England Anabaptist is not to be handled over tenderly."

But, now, all this is changed. Baptists no longer suffer imprisonment, whipping, and banishment. From a small minority they have grown powerful, until in some localities, they have a controlling influence. And, now, forgetting their own sufferings, once and again the persecuted becomes the persecutors, and thereby furnish another proof of the correctness of the statement of the report of the committee on Sunday mails, communicated to the House of Representatives, March 4th and 5th, 1830, that "every religious sect, however meek in its origin, commenced the work of persecution as soon as it acquired political power."

If the Tennessee Sunday law is not both "restrictive and proscriptive of one party or creed and in favor of another," then the Massachusetts law requiring all Baptists to attend the established church was neither. It restricts Seventh-day Adventists to five days' work instead of six, and therefore attempts to make them pay a tax of 16  $\frac{2}{5}$  per cent. more than is assessed on other citizens. It is proscriptive, since in the language of the *Alabama Baptist*, the State of Tennessee, "by statute law," "recognized the Christian Sabbath [Sunday the first day] as God's holy day," as against the commandment of God which requires the observance of the seventh

day, and which Seventh-day Adventists choose to obey rather than the commandment of the State. The State has come out in favor of the "party or creed," which teaches the first day is the Sabbath, and thereby proscribes the party which teaches that the seventh day is the Sabbath. The statement that "this Tennessee statute, like those of other States, restrains those who indorse it as well as those who do not," is a childish excuse. When the Baptist ministers—John Clark, Obadiah Holmes and John Crandall—were forcibly taken to church in compliance with the law compelling *all* to attend the State church, it was not persecution, according to the *Alabama Baptist*, since it restrained those who indorsed it as well as those who did not. According to this modern expounded of Baptist principles of religious liberty, all John Cotton needed to say to these Baptist ministers when they protested, was, "Oh, this law restrains me from remaining away from church the same as it does you. It restrains those who indorse it as well as those who do not."

Now, we expect that the *Baptist Examiner*, of this city, and other consistent Baptists, will write to the *Alabama Baptist*, as did the brethren of the Puritans in England, and protest against the prosecuted turning persecutor, and it is probable that the *Alabama Baptist* will want to reply, We therefore print a part of the letter written by John Cotton, which the *Alabama Baptist* can use in full with a few changes in names:—

One of them, Obadiah Holmes, being an excommunicate person himself, out of a church in Plymouth patent, came into this jurisdiction, and took upon him to baptize, which I think himself will not say he was compelled here to perform. And he was not ignorant that the rebaptizing of an elder person, and that by a private person out of office and under excommunication, are all of them manifest contestations against

308

the order and government of our churches, established, we know, by God's law, and he knoweth by the laws of the country. And we conceive we may safely appeal to the ingenuity of your own judgment, whether it would be tolerated in any civil state, for a stranger to come and practise contrary to the known principles of the church estate? As for his whipping, it was more voluntarily chosen by him that inflicted on him. His censure by the court was to have paid, as I know, thirty pounds, or else to be whipt; his fine was offered to be paid by friends for him freely; but he chose rather to be whipt; in which case, if his sufferings of stripes was any worship of God at all, surely it could be accounted no better than will worship. The other, Mr. Clarke, was wiser in that point, and his

offense was less, so was his fine less, and himself, as I hear, was contended to have it paid for him, whereupon he was released. The imprisonment of either of them was no detriment. I believe they fared neither of them better at home; and I am sure Holmes had not been so well clad for years before.

But be pleased to consider this point a little further: You think to compel men in matter of worship is to make them sin, according to Rom. 14:23. If the worship be lawful in itself, the magistrate compelling to come to it, compelleth him not to sin, but the sin is in his will that needs to be compelled to a Christian duty. Josiah compelled all Israel, or, which is all one, made to serve the Lord their God. 2 Chron. 34:33. Yet his act herein was not blamed, but recorded among his virtuous actions. For a governor to suffer any within his gates to profane the Sabbath, is a sin against the fourth commandment, both in the private householder and in the magistrate, and if he requires them to present themselves before the Lord, the magistrate sinneth not, nor doth the subject sin so great a sin as if he did refrain to come. But you say it doth but make men hypocrites, to compel men to conform the outward man for fear of punishment. If it did so, yet better be hypocrites than profane persons. Hypocrites gives God part of his due, the outward man; but the profane person giveth God neither outward nor inward man.

And now we wish that the editor of the *Alabama Baptist* would not use this letter at all, or any of his own similar arguments, but that he would see the error of his way, repent and do works meet for repentance.

**"The Catholic Church and Religious Liberty" *American Sentinel* 9, 39 , p. 308.**

THE Roman Catholic Church professes to be, and always to have been, the champion of civil and religious liberty. But this profession is as disingenuous as is the advice of Satolli to the people of this country, to "go forward bearing in one hand the book of Christian truth—the Bible—and in the other hand the Constitution of the United States." It has recently been shown in these columns, that, shorn of its verbiage, this means only, Go forward bearing in one hand the Catholic Bible, as interpreted by "the church," and in the other, the Constitution of the United States, likewise interpreted by "the church."

It is the same when Rome talks of *religious liberty*. Cardinal Gibbons says: "A man enjoys religious liberty when he enjoys the free right of worshipping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance

with his duties to God. Every act infringing on his freedom of conscience is justly styled religious intolerance. This religious liberty is the true right of every man, because it corresponds with a most certain duty which God has put upon him."—*Faith of Our Fathers*, page 264.

It will be observed that the cardinal says: "This religious liberty is the true right of every man." What religious liberty?—Why, "the free right of worshiping God according to the dictates of a *right* conscience," to be sure. And who is to determine what is a "right conscience"?—The Roman Catholic Church, of course. And it is "*this religious liberty*" which "is the true right of every man," according to Cardinal Gibbons.

That this is the real meaning of the cardinal's words is evident from the following, on page 268 of his book previously quoted:—

The church is indeed intolerant in this sense, that she can never confound truth with error; *now can she admit that any man is conscientiously free to reject the truth* when its claims are convincingly brought home to the mind.

On page 85 of the same work the cardinal says:—

The church has authority from God to teach regarding faith and morals; and in her teaching she is preserved from error by the special guidance of the Holy Ghost.

And again, on page 88, we read:—

Not only does our Lord empower his apostles to preach the gospel, but he commands, and under the most severe penalties, those to whom they preach to listen and obey. . . . We see on the one hand that the apostles and their successors have received full powers to announce the gospel; and on the other, that their hearers are obliged to listen with docility, and to obey not merely by an external compliance, but also by internal assent of the intellect.

All this must be taken into consideration in weighing the cardinal's definition of religious liberty. Here are the legitimate and ever necessary deductions from the quotations made from his book:—

1. The Catholic Church has full authority to teach faith and morals.
2. That which she teaches must be received.
3. No man is conscientiously free to reject that which the Roman Catholic Church teaches.
4. A man enjoys religious liberty when he enjoys the free right to worship God according to the dictates of a right conscience.
5. No man who does reject the teaching of the Catholic Church can have a right conscience.

Which is only saying that a man enjoys religious liberty when he enjoys the free right to meekly accept the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, and does so accept them; but not otherwise.

The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward religious liberty is further defined by the cardinal on pages 268 and 269, thus:—

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. The ruler may even enter into a compact in order to secure to his subjects this freedom in religious matters; and when once a compact is made, it must absolutely be observed in every point, just as every other lawful and honest contract. This is the true Catholic teaching on this point, according to Becanus and all Catholic theologians. So that if Catholics should gain the majority in a community where freedom of conscience is already secured to all by law, their very religion obliges them to respect the rights thus acquired by their fellow-citizens. What danger can there be, then, for Protestants, if Catholics should be in the majority here? Their apprehensions are the result of vain fears, which no honest mind ought any longer to harbor.

This is not a disavowal of the right of the Catholic Church to coerce people to matters of faith and morals, but is rather an assertion of the right. "*Religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it.*" Exactly! and who is to judge when it will do more harm to repress "religious liberty"? Who, indeed, but "the church!" And hence it follows that the much-vaunted Roman Catholic "religious liberty" is only a limited degree of religious toleration, depending entirely on that policy by which the prophet declared of that power of which the papacy is the legitimate successor: "Through his policy also he shall

cause craft to prosper in his hand." Surely Rome is well called "the mystery of iniquity."

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 39 , p. 312.**

IF anything had been lacking to show the power of Rome in this State it would be supplied by the action of the late Constitutional Convention. This convention, which had a Republican majority, started in with a flourish of trumpets to so amend the constitution of the State as to forever prohibit appropriations to sectarian schools. To this end the educational article was adopted as follows:—

ARTICLE 2. Section 1. The legislature shall provide for the maintenance and support of a system of free common schools, wherein all the children of this State may be educated.

Section 2. The corporation created in the year one thousand seven hundred and eighty-four, under the name of the regents of the University of the State of New York, is hereby continued under the name of the University of the State of New York. It shall be governed and its corporate powers, which may be increased, modified or diminished by the legislature, shall be exercised by not less than nine regents.

Section. 3. The capital of the common school fund, the capital of the literature fund, and the capital of the United States deposit fund, shall be respectively preserved inviolate. The revenue of the said common school fund shall be applied to the support of common schools; the revenue of the sold literature fund shall be applied to the support of academies, and the sum of \$25,000 of the revenues of the United States deposit fund shall each year be appropriated to and made part of the capital of the said common school fund.

Section 4. Neither the State nor any subdivision thereof shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used, directly or indirectly or permit either to be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection of any school or institution of learning, wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught.

This article alone would not have accomplished all that was to be desired, for it still leaves the door wide open for that colorless thing called "unsectarian religious instruction," and which is unsatisfactory to man and displeasing to God; but it would have cut off all appropriations to distinctively sectarian institutions. This was not to be, however; the Roman Catholics rallied their forces and "influence," and, invoking all the saints in the calendar and all the political "pull" in

Tammany, succeeded in getting the following provision inserted in the section on charities:—

Nothing in this Constitution contained shall prevent the legislature from making such provision for the education and support of the blind, the deaf and dumb and juvenile delinquents as to it may seem proper, or prevent any county, city, town or village from providing for the care, support, maintenance and secular education of inmates of orphan asylums, homes for dependent children or correctional institutions, whether under public or private control. Payments by counties, cities, towns and villages to charitable, eleemosynary, correctional and reformatory institutions wholly or partly under private control for care, support and maintenance may be authorized, but shall not be required by the legislature. No such payments shall be made for any inmate of such institutions who is not received and detained therein pursuant to rules established by the State Board of Charities. Such rules shall be subject to the control of the legislature by general laws.

This leaves the sects an open door to the State treasury, and we may expect to see the usual shameless scramble of papists and "Protestants" for funds at each recurring session of the legislature. As usual, however, Rome will be in the van and will bear off the lion's share; thanks to the weak-kneed "Protestantism" that truckles for votes and denies a principle for lucre.

BISHOP KEANE, Rector of the Catholic University at Washington, returned recently from Rome, and is, according to the *World*, of this city, authority for the statement that Mgr. Satolli is ere long to be clothed with supreme authority in Roman Catholic Church affairs in this country. Hitherto appeals have been made either to Mgr. Satolli or direct to the propaganda at Rome, at the option of the appellant; but when the contemplated change shall have been made, all cases must first go to the vice-pope at Washington, after which the pope in Rome can permit an appeal to himself, if he sees fit.

It is also stated that the pope will issue another important encyclical in November, which will deal with "the questions of political government," and will contain a reiteration of the pope's "views of democracy, not along in this country, but abroad." The letter will be addressed specially "to the Catholics of the United States, and will recite anew the position of the church here." Bishop Keane believes that "it will transcend in importance the encyclicals on the labor and parochial school questions."

According to Bishop Keane, the pope finds in American political as well as religious affairs an unceasing source of interest. "The pope

believes America is to be the bulwark of the Catholic Church of the future, and rejoices that the political evolutions of the Old World are on the lines of democracy followed in the United States."

The pope is said to have asked all kinds of question relative to political matters in this country, and to have manifested a lively interest in all things American. He wished to know about the American Protective Association, and the use of troops in the recent labor troubles. He was much interested when told that the military took no sides but simply appeared as guardians of property.

Probably His Craftiness was weighing the chances of becoming arbitrator of the differences between labor and capital in this country.

Why does the pope believe "America is to be the bulwark of the Catholic Church of the future"? and why does he rejoice "that the political evolutions of the Old World are on the lines of democracy followed in the United States"? Simply because democracy is the people, and Leo believes that he can use the people better than he can the princes. That many of the people stand ready to be hoodwinked, seems evident; but while, as Lincoln said, it is possible to fool all the people part of the time and some of the people all the time, it is not possible to fool all the people all the time. The pope may, yea, will, largely realize his expectations in this country, but not all will be deceived by him, or by the system which he represents.

**October 11, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 40 , p. 313.**

THE Lexow Committee, appointed by the legislature to investigate the Police Department of this city, has resumed work after its summer vacation and astounding revelations of depravity and corruption are being made.

FROM top to bottom the government of this city seems to be reeking with corruption. Bribery and extortion have been found everywhere. Perjury is so common that, as a member of the legislative committee expresses it, "the atmosphere is blue with it."

THERE may be honest policemen and police judges in this city, but according to the published reports of the doings of the Lexow Committee, they are scarce. Policemen make arbitrary arrests and false charges and police justices, so-called, either wink at these things or shamelessly abet them. "Judgment is turn away backward,

and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."

A MAN was found dead recently in this city, and on his person was found a "prayer for the repose of the soul of Catherine Carr." Following the prayer was the promise that—

They who shall repeat this prayer every day, or hear it repeated, or keep it about them, shall never die a sudden death, nor be drowned in water, nor shall they fall into the hands of their enemies, nor be burned in any fire, nor shall be overpowered in battle, nor shall poison take any effect on them, and if you see any one in the fits lay this prayer on his or her right side, and he or she shall stand up and thank you. Believe this for certain which is written here; it is true as the holy evangelists. They who keep it about them shall not fear lightning or thunder, and they that repeat it every day shall have three days' warning before their death.

It is in such senseless superstitions that Rome educates her votaries, and it is to faith in such vanities that Leo XIII., pope, invites "the princes and peoples of the universe." And it is upon such superstition that "Protestants" invoke the divine blessing, saying: "God bless the Catholic Church of to-day!"

**"Christ or Peter—Which?" *American Sentinel* 9, 40 , pp. 313, 314.**

THE dogma of papal infallibility is, that the pope is "infallible," *not* by any promise to *him* himself either as an individual or as an official, but "by the divine assistance promised to him *in blessed Peter*."

Therefore, in the study of this subject, it is proper enough to inquire, How do they find this thing promised to Peter? and, Was there in fact ever any such thing promised to Peter, or to the pope "in blessed Peter," or in anybody else?"

The claim being that this thing is promised to him only "in blessed Peter," it is essential, as we have seen, to make some sort of a connection between the pope and Peter. And, as we have also seen, this essential connection is made when the pope speaks "*ex cathedra*, that is, 'from turn out that no such thing as infallibility was ever promised to Peter at all, then it would follow that even the chair of St. Peter cannot supply to the pope the much desired infallibility.

The truth is, that this promise of infallibility to Peter, and, consequently, to the pope, "in blessed Peter," springs from the same law that we have already found to be the source of the "infallibility" of the pope, namely: the law that, like produces totally unlike, and out of

nothing something comes. It is in fact created by two enormous assumptions—*first*, that the Church of Christ "must have a visible head," and *secondly*, that Peter is that head. The first of these assumptions is thus stated by Cardinal Gibbons:—

Unity of government is not less essential to the Church of Christ than unity of doctrine. Our divine Saviour never speaks of his churches, but of his Church. He does not say: "Upon this rock I will build my churches," but "Upon this rock I will build my Church," from which words we must conclude that it never was his intention to establish or to sanction various conflicting denominations, but one corporate body, with all its members united under one visible head; for as the church is a visible body, it must have a visible head.—*Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 24, 25.

Upon this leap in logic; upon this jumped-at conclusion; upon this sheer assumption, that the Church of Christ "*must have a visible head*,"—upon this is built the whole papacy with its claim of infallibility and everything else that it claims to have and to be. But nothing could be more false than the idea that the Church of Christ has or "*must have a visible head*." Jesus Christ himself is head of the Church; for it is written: "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ." And, "Ye are the body of Christ and members in particular." And He "is the head of the body, the Church." The Lord Jesus lived in this world a whole lifetime *as man*, subject to all the weaknesses and infirmities of a man; for he said of himself, "Of mine own self I can do nothing." And as he said likewise to all men, "Without me ye can do nothing," and likewise of himself, "Of mine own self I can do nothing," it is perfectly plain that in this world he put himself in the place where man is; yet he was led of the Father all the way, for he said, "The Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works." Thus he did not assert himself, and take *of himself*, his own way, but he trusted the Father, and was led of him, and was taught of him, as all of *us* must be who shall be saved by him. He did not of himself follow his own way, but only as he was guided by the Father; that is to say, that *the Father was his head* all the time that he was in this world as man; and the Father, as that head, was all this time *invisible*. And this is to show and does show plainly that in showing to man the way that he must take, Jesus Christ lived the Christian life in this world *without a visible head*. For the Lord Jesus to have asked in this world for a *visible head* to be his guide, would have been to deny the Father. And for any professed believer in Jesus to ask for a *visible head* to be his guide, is to deny Jesus Christ. The Christian is to see Him who is

invisible. Heb. 11:27. The Christian is to look at the things that are not seen. 2 Cor. 4:18. And the invisible things of God are clearly seen. Rom. 1:20. So that nothing could more plainly expose the essential earthliness and carnality of all the papal con-

314

captions than does this demand that there shall be "a *visible* head" to the Church of Christ. Any church that has a visible head is not, and cannot be, the Church of Christ. And such is the Roman Catholic Church.

Against says the cardinal:—

His Church is compared to a human body. In one body there are many members all inseparably connected with the head. The head commands and the foot instantly moves, the hand is raised and the lips open. Even so our Lord ordained that the Church, composed of many members, should be all united to one espoused visible head, whom they are bound to obey.—*Id.*, p. 92.

The Church of Christ is the body of Christ, it is true. And Christ himself is the head of this "his body, which is the Church." And to take away Christ, the true head of this body, and put another—a man—in his place, is only to take away all life from the church and so leave it only a lifeless thing so far as the Lord or spirituality is concerned. To take away the true head of any body and put another head in the place of the true one, is to destroy the life of that body. Even though the substitute head be really fastened on in some way, all that there can be of the thing is but a *dead form*. And such is the Catholic Church, according to every idea of it that is set forth by the papacy itself.

Again we quote from the same authority:—

The church, in fine, is called in Scripture by the beautiful title of bride or spouse of Christ, and the Christian law admits of only one wife.—*lb.*

True enough this is, *in itself*. And that same Christian law admits of only one *husband*. Now, in this scriptural symbol, Christ occupies the place of husband to the wife. And as the Christian law admits only of one husband, it follows as plainly as can be, that for another person to put himself in the place of husband to this wife—the church—is positively to violate the Christian law. And for any wife—any church—claiming to be the bride or spouse of Christ, to allow another person to take the place of Christ, the true husband, to her, is positively to violate the Christian law, and so to proclaim herself an adulteress and a harlot. And such is the Catholic Church, according to her own authoritative statement.

To claim that Peter was the first to occupy this illegitimate place toward the "spouse of Christ," or that this "spouse" accepted Peter as the first substitute for her true and living husband—this does not in the least alter the essential immorality of the thing, nor does it relieve it of the just charge that it is a positive violation of the Christian law which admits only of one husband. "For the woman that hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband *so long as he liveth*. . . . So, then, if while her husband liveth she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that *ye should be married to another even to Him that is raised from the dead*." Rom. 7:2-4. Thus, according to the Scripture, the Christian, and in this the Christian Church, is married to Christ—"to him that is raised from the dead"—*as long as he liveth*. Therefore, for any Christian church to be joined to another husband *while Jesus Christ liveth*, is to be called by the Scriptures of truth "*an adulteress*."

Now, so the Catholic Church claims to be "the spouse of Christ," and yet claims "another man" as her visible husband, her "visible head," to "speak to her his sentiments in faith and morals;" as this is her own showing, and she pretends to make no other, she is therefore obliged to claim that Jesus Christ *is dead*, or else confess that she is an adulteress. And in either case it is perfectly plain that she is not the bride or spouse of Christ; for if she will claim that he is dead and that therefore she has right to be joined to this other one, then she is not *his* spouse but the spouse of *the other man*; while if she will not allow that Christ is dead, "then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress," and in this she is just as certainly not his spouse. So from her own showing and upon her own claims it is certain that the Catholic Church is not in any sense a Christian church.

It is therefore perfectly clear that in the first of her assumptions, namely, that "the church must have a visible head," the papacy is all at sea. How, then, is it with her other assumption, that Peter was appointed that visible head, and so the pope by succession from him, and therefore "by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter," "is infallible" "when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, 'from the chair' of St. Peter?" Here are the cardinal's words on that:—

Let us now briefly consider the grounds of the doctrine [of the infallibility of the pope] itself. The following passages of the gospel, spoken at different times, were addressed exclusively to Peter. "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "I, the Supreme Architect of the universe," says our Saviour, "will establish a church which is to last till the end of time. I will lay the foundation of this church so strong and deep on the rock of truth that the winds and storms of error shall never prevail against it. *Thou, O Peter, shall be the foundation of this church*, it shall never fall, because thou shalt never be shaken; and thou shalt never be shaken because thou shalt rest on Me, the rock of truth." The church, of which *Peter is the foundation*, is declared to be impregnable, that is, proof against error. How can you suppose an immovable edifice built on a tottering foundation? for it is not the building that sustains the foundation, but the foundation which support the building.—*Id.*, pp. 150, 151.

On this same passage of scripture the author of "Catholic Belief" comments as follows:—

As the Church of Christ was to last beyond the life-time of St. Peter, even to the end of the world, and as the church is not a lifeless, material building, but a living body of man requiring a living head to rule them and to be a foundation to that great society, this promise of Christ, of making Peter a rock, was meant not only for Peter, but also for his successors. There must be proportion between the building and its foundation. The building, namely, the visible church, being a living, successive body of men, the *foundation* also, that is, the visible ruling power which sustains the whole superstructure, must be living and successive. Therefore the successors of St. Peter, as the supreme visible rulers of the church, are such, like St. Peter, the rock or the visible foundation of it.—*Catholic Belief*, pp. 94, 95.

Now on their very face these statements plainly show that the conception which they define is utterly incongruous and fails at every turn, as applied to Peter or any other man or succession of men. And all that is needed to annihilate the whole theory, is but to read two or three passages of scripture which speak directly on this subject. Even admitting that the word Peter means a stone or rock, and that therefore Peter was a rock, allowing the scripture to explain its own statements it is seen that this is far from proving that Peter was *the* rock upon which the Church of Christ was to be built.

For it is written: "Other foundation *can no man* lay than that *is* laid, *which is Jesus Christ*." 1 Cor. 3:11. And again: "Ye are built upon *the foundation* of the apostles and prophets, *Jesus Christ himself* being

the chief corner stone. *In whom* [in Jesus Christ himself, not in Peter] *all the building* fitly framed together growth unto an holy temple in the Lord. *In whom also ye are builded together* for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. 2:20-22. Please note particularly that this scripture does *not* say that Ye are built upon the foundation *which is* the apostles and prophets; neither does it say, Ye are built upon the foundation, the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; but it does say, "Ye are built upon the foundation *of* the apostles and prophets," that is, Ye are built upon the foundation *upon which* the apostles and prophets are built.

Ye are built upon the foundation *of* the apostles and prophets. And who is the foundation of the apostles? and prophets? Answer: "Jesus Christ himself," and "other foundation *can no* man lay than that *is* laid *which is Jesus Christ.*" Therefore, as "the foundation of the apostles and prophets" is "Jesus Christ himself," and as Christians are "built upon the foundation *of* the apostles and prophets," it is settled by the Scriptures of truth, that whoever is not built upon "Jesus Christ himself" as the only foundation that is laid, or that can be laid, is not a Christian; and any church that is not built upon "Jesus Christ himself" as the only foundation that is laid, or that can be laid, is not in any sense a Christian church.

And such, by her own exclusive claim, is the Catholic Church. She does not claim to be "built upon the foundation *of* the apostles and prophets," which is "Jesus Christ himself," as the only foundation. She claims to be built upon *one of the apostles himself* as the foundation. The Church *of Christ* is not built on any such "foundation." The Church of Christ is not built on a foundation of dust, nor even on a rock that is made out of dust. It is built upon the eternal, *self-existent*, Rock, which is "Jesus Christ himself."

Next week we will examine the inspired testimony of Peter himself upon this question.

**"Insulating from Heresy" *American Sentinel* 9, 40 , pp. 314, 315.**

THE *Christian Advocate*, of this city, tells this story, the scene of which is only a few miles distant:—

Two weeks ago last Sunday a citizen of Stapleton, S. I., was thrown from his buggy, inflicting injuries which resulted in his death. His wife was a communicant of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, of Stapleton; he was a Protestant. She applied to the Roman Catholic pastor for permission to bury her husband in St.

Mary's cemetery. He felt compelled to deny the request. She then applied to another priest in the neighboring town, and at the same time wrote to Archbishop Corrigan. The archbishop being absent from the city, the second priest appealed to use his influence with Mgr. Farley, and at eleven o'clock on Tuesday the monsignor and the two priests above referred to met and had a conference with this, to the . . . , probably astonishing result. The desired permission was granted, "on condition that the grave be lined and bottomed with brick." The local priest told the undertaker, the undertaker told the widow, the widow agreed to have the grave lined! The undertaker arranged for the construction of the brick work, and the unconsecrated ruin was buried in unconsecrated brick in consecrated ground.

The *Advocate's* comment is: "We know that glass is an insulator against electricity, but learn now that, according to Roman Catholicism, bricks will insulate a

315

cemetery from heresy. We have compared several accounts of this transaction, and are in a state of surprise as to why the grave did not have to be roofed with brick."

The *Observer* repeats the story and remarks: "Such is the mummery to which the Church of Rome holds in the year 1894, and in the United States of America. There is still some protesting for faithful Protestants to do." The *Observer* is quite right; and it is also well to remember that "Rome never changes," and that it is to faith in such nonsense that Leo XIII. invites the "princes and peoples of the universe." It should likewise be borne in mind that though Rome has not changed, there are those who are called "Protestants" who exclaim, "God bless the Catholic Church of to-day!"

**"'Christian Nation' Curses" *American Sentinel* 9, 40 , pp. 317, 318.**

AMONG the falsehoods of the father of lies, few are more disastrous to true Christianity than the "Christian nation" error. No one acquainted with pure and undefiled Christianity, who attended the World's Congress of Religions, and listened to the withering denunciations of the crimes of so-called Christian nations by representatives of heathen religions, could fail to see that the heathen judges and condemns Christianity by the crimes committed by nations claiming to be Christian. The missionary from the "Christian nation" has come to them, accompanied with "Christian nation" soldiers, bayonets, swords, muskets, and cannons. "Christian

nations" have massacred their people and robbed them of their homes. The missionary from the "Christian nation" has been followed by "Christian nation" opium and "Christian nation" "fire water," and the people who survived "Christian nation" lead and steel, have been debauched by "Christian nation" opium and whiskey. All this has been so deeply impressed upon the heathen mind, that the real Christian missionary must first explain the difference between the Christianity of Christ and the Christianity of a "Christian nation," before the seeds of truth can take root.

But the baneful influence of the "Christian nation" idea is not alone manifest in heathen lands; its poisonous effects are seen at home. Not long since a revivalist began work for the salvation of sinners in the congregation of Rev. Mr. Bradley, a Methodist, at Williamsport, Pa. At the close of the first service, the evangelist asked all the Christians in the audience to rise, and to his great astonishment the entire audience stood up. The puzzled preacher dismissed the audience and hastened to inquire of the local pastor the meaning of the vote. The pastor explained that since this nation was understood to be a Christian nation, the people believed that when born into this nation they were in a sense born Christian. "Now," said the pastor, "to-morrow night ask them the same question, and then, after they are again seated, ask all those to rise who have been born again—converted—and see if there is not some work to be done." The evangelist followed this advice, and, in response to the

318

call for men and women to arise, who had been born again, only a few arose. He had now torn the mask from his "Christian nation" sinners, and he began in earnest an effort to convert "Christian nation" sinners to the Christianity of Christ.

And now that so many D.D.'s are turning their attention to doctoring the Christianity of this "Christian nation" by the application of legal lotions, let *Christians* redouble their efforts to convert "Christian nation" sinners, those "having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof," as well as common sinners.

**October 18, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 41 , p. 321.**

NO greater mistake could be made than to suppose that to habitually treat Sunday in all respects as an ordinary day is not a

matter of conscience with Seventh-day Adventists. The Christian's rule of life is: "Whether ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God;" and the Adventist following his plow on Sunday is as truly serving God as when going to church on the previous day.

BUT the State has no right to inquire whether an act is done conscientiously or not. If any act does not infringe the equal rights of others, the State has no right to forbid it, whether conscientiously done or not. The Sunday-keeper is no more entitled to undisturbed rest on the first day of the week than the Sabbath-keeper is to undisturbed rest on the seventh day; and since the Sabbath-keeper can rest and worship while the Sunday-keeper is at work, so can the Sunday-keeper rest and worship equally as well while the Sabbath-keeper works. The question of conscience cannot be considered by the State further than this: If any law affects the conscience and not the equal rights of men, that fact alone proves that it is outside the domain of proper civil legislation.

EVERY clause in every Sunday law in the world that exempts those who "conscientiously" believe in and observe another day is a confession that such legislation is improper. Every such provision is a confession that the keeping of a Sabbath is a question directly affecting the conscience and not affecting natural rights. No statute against murder, or assault, or robbery, or slander, or arson, ever contained a clause exempting from its penalties persons who might violate it conscientiously. And why?—Simply because such things are not matters of conscience but are matters of right, natural, human rights; and no man has any right to take another's life or property, or to burn his house, or blacken his reputation under any circumstances. No amount of conscientious conviction can, by any possibility, confer any such right. Rights exist independently of conscience; they are not created by conscience, but exist in the nature of things according to the divine order, and one man's conscience cannot of right trench on another's rights. But that is just what is done when the conscience of the majority is incorporated into statutes for the government of the minority, however small that majority may be.

**"Christ or Peter—Which?" *American Sentinel* 9, 41 , pp. 321, 322.**

IN our consideration of the claim of papal "infallibility" last week, we found that Christ and not Peter is the rock upon which the Church is built. But let us have the word of the Lord by Peter himself on this

point. Thus it is written by the hand of Peter: "As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: if so be ye have tasted that *the Lord* is gracious: *to whom coming as unto a living stone*, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also as lively stones are *built up a spiritual house*, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore it is also contained in the Scripture, Behold I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you, therefore, that believe, he is precious; but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner." 1 Peter 2:2-7. That the "stone" here referred to is none other than Jesus Christ himself, and not Peter in any sense, is clear from the words spoken by Peter in another place, thus, speaking of "Jesus Christ of Nazareth," whom the Jews had crucified, he says. "This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." Acts 4:10, 11.

In the first of these passages from the words of Peter, he says that this "is contained in the scripture," and then quotes a portion of this "scripture." Let us turn to that scripture to which Peter here refers, and which *he* says means "Jesus Christ of Nazareth," and see what it does say in full. Here is it: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion *for a foundation*, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, *a sure foundation*; he that believeth shall not make haste." Isa. 28:16. Peter himself says that *this stone* which is laid "for a foundation" is "Jesus Christ of Nazareth," and that "*this stone*"—this "Jesus Christ of Nazareth"—"*is the head*." And Peter says that it is to *this "living stone"* that men must come in order to be of the building of Christ—in order to be of this "spiritual house," which is the Church of the living God.

Now, to every one who cares for the truth only, the testimony of Peter *himself* is better than the testimony of the Catholic Church *about* Peter. And to every such one the inspired testimony of Peter himself as to who is the foundation and head of the Church, is far better than is the uninspired and self-interested testimony of the Catholic Church and her popes *about* Peter. The inspired testimony of Peter himself is that "Jesus Christ of Nazareth" is "the stone," the "living stone," which is the "sure foundation" and "the head" of the building of God, this "spiritual house," which is the Church of Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. This is also the inspired testimony of

the apostle Paul. In other words, this is the testimony of Jesus Christ himself, that *he* and *he alone* is the foundation and head of the apostles and prophets and of the whole Church of Christ, and that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, *which is Jesus Christ*."

And this word demonstrates that the claim of the papacy that Peter is the foundation and head of the Church of Christ is as false, fleeting, baseless, and intangible, as is "the stuff that dreams are made of." It therefore and of necessity follows that the "infallibility of the pope," as derived from "the divine assistance promised to him *in blessed Peter*," is also as false, fleeting, baseless, and intangible, as is "the stuff that dreams are made of." Thus, again, we are brought to the fact

322

that "the infallibility of the pope" springs altogether from the law that, out of nothing something comes!

There is another statement in the foregoing quotation from Cardinal Gibbons that is worth noticing in this connection. It is that in which he makes Jesus say to Peter, "Thou, O Peter, shalt be the foundation of this church. It shall never fall, because *thou shalt never be shaken*." In noticing the words of Christ to Peter that he had prayed for him, that when he should be sifted as wheat, his faith fail not, the cardinal further says: "Therefore the faith of Peter will always be firm" (page 152); that, consequently, the faith of Peter's "successors" would always be firm, and therefore these "successors" would always be infallible in the faith.

This argument, like all their other ones in favor of the infallibility of the pope, is utterly groundless, from the divinely recorded fact that Peter was shaken and that his faith did fail more than once. For it was after these words were spoken by the Lord that Peter denied him *three times* and declared that he did not know him. It will not do to say that this was not a point "regarding faith or morals," and that therefore infallibility was not involved. It was entirely a question of faith and morals.

It was a question of *faith*, for the knowing of the Lord Jesus is nothing else than a matter of faith; and to deny him is nothing else than to deny the faith by which alone he is known.

It was a question of *morals*, too, because to make his denial as emphatic as possible, Peter then and there "began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this man of whom ye speak." Mark 14:71.

And it is certain that to curse and to swear involves a question of morals.

Therefore it is certain, by the divine record, that Peter did fail and did decide wrongly on a question of faith and morals. And this divinely recorded fact annihilates the claim of the infallibility of the pope, as derived in succession from Peter, "when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, 'from the chair' of St. Peter," or from anywhere else, "regarding a question of faith or morals," or anything else.

If this fact and the logic of it would be dodged by the plea that this all occurred before the day of Pentecost, and therefore before Peter was endowed with the Holy Ghost; this plea will fail also because of the divinely recorded fact that *after Pentecost* Peter failed again, and this, too, upon the very pivotal point of the faith. Here is the word of the Lord as to that:—

But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that *they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel*, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law, for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. Gal. 2:11-16.

Here is the divine record that Peter "was to be blamed" in this matter, and this "because he walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." And the particular point of the truth of the gospel that was involved in this transaction of Peter's, was the all-important question of *how are men to be justified?* Is it by faith? or is it by works? Is it by the faith of Christ? or is it by works of the law? Is it by faith without works—a faith *which* works? or is it by "faith *and* works," with all the trust in the works? Is it by Christ alone? or is it by Christ *and something else?* This was the question that was involved in the course of Peter there. It was nothing less than the supreme question

of faith and morals. And on this supreme question of faith and morals *Peter there decided wrongly*. He decided this great question *not* according to the truth of the gospel. This is the truth by the word of God, and it therefore annihilates all the claim of the infallibility of the pope as derived from "blessed Peter" when he speaks "from the chair of St. Peter" or from anywhere else, "regarding a question of faith or morals" or anything else.

Cardinal Gibbons seems to see the danger to "the infallibility of the pope" from this fact, and he therefore says of it that—

St. Paul criticised his [Peter's] conduct on a point *not affecting doctrine*, but discipline.—*Id.*, p. 128.

But this will never do, even for him; because this question that was then up between Paul and those Jews who professed the faith, and who constantly followed up Paul and opposed the gospel, and by whom Peter, and even Barnabas, was carried away from the truth of the gospel—that question we say that was then up between Paul and those Jews was the very question that was up between the Reformers and the papacy *in the Reformation*. And the Council of Trent, which was called especially to consider the questions raised by the Reformation, treated this question altogether as a question *of doctrine*, and not of discipline at all. So, for the cardinal to say that Paul criticised Peter's conduct "on a point not affecting doctrine," while it was the very point that the Council of Trent treated as altogether affecting doctrine—this will not do even for him: this fact destroys his argument and annihilates even this plea by which he would save "infallibility" to Peter and to the pope "in blessed Peter."

So, then, the conclusion of the whole matter is simply this: As the claim of "the infallibility of the pope" is solely that it is "promised to him in blessed Peter," it follows plainly enough that if it was not in Peter, then even, according to their own dogma, the pope does not have it, and no bishop of Rome ever did have it. And by the divine record it is certain that Peter at least *twice* decided wrongly "regarding faith and morals."

Therefore by the divine record it is made perfectly certain that the infallibility of the pope or of any other man or set of men, derived from "the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter," or in anybody else, when he speaks "*ex cathedra*," or any other way, on a question "regarding faith or morals," or anything else, is utterly without any shadow of foundation in any right conception imaginable.

Every argument adduced in its favor is sheer fallacy; and analysis of every claim upon which it is based only develops the *finale* that, out of nothing something comes. Yet, as the thought that out of nothing something comes, involves either creation or absurdity, and as this claim of infallibility is seriously asserted by and in behalf of the papacy, this is but the development of the assertion of creative power as the prerogative of the papacy. It is the usurpation by the papacy, of the essential prerogative of the Creator. It was therefore perfectly fitting to the subject and to the occasion, that, when the decree of the infallibility of the pope was passed in the Vatican Council, Pius IX. should pervert to this blasphemous service the dying words of our Creator and Redeemer, and rapturously exclaim, "It is finished."

But as any claim on the part of a man in any place, of the prerogative of creation, is but absurdity and nothingness; so this claim of the papacy, which, by every analysis, develops only the *finale* that out of nothing something comes, is only supreme absurdity and absolute nothingness. It is the most unconscionable piece of imposture that was ever proposed to be imposed upon mankind. It is the greatest humbug in the most gigantic system of humbuggery that ever there was in the world. It is the culmination of the blasphemous claim of this "the mystery of iniquity," beyond which it is impossible even for it go to.

**"The Release of Mr. Capps" *American Sentinel* 9, 41 , pp. 322, 323.**

LAMST week we promised our readers additional facts in connection with the release of Mr. Capps, the Seventh-day Adventist, who was imprisoned in the country jail of Dresden, Weakley Co., Tenn., for doing farm labor on Sunday. On investigation we learned that under date of August 10, the *American Hebrew*, of this city, appealed for donations in the interests of Mr. Capps, in a strong editorial entitled, "A Sacrifice for Principle." Following the narration of the facts in connection with the prosecution, the editorial says:—

This is inhumanity and injustice. It is the most barefaced religious persecution. It is outrageous that a judge should so construe the law as to inflict such punishment for such an alleged offense. It is abominable that any legislative body should allow its statutes to remain so that they can be so construed.

But, with all our indignation and protestation, there is a more sacred duty, and that is to provide for the destitute family of this martyr. A committee has been organized to collect funds for this

purpose, and we trust that our co-religionists will be generous in adding their share. We will gladly receive all sums for this object, and will transmit them to the committee, after acknowledging the receipt thereof in our columns.

To this appeal the following persons responded: Mr. Waldheim, \$3.; J. C. Levy, 140 Nassau St., New York, \$2; Sabbath Observer, 50 cents; A. J. Bloomberg, 50 E. Sixty-fifth St., \$1; Moses A. Dropsie, Philadelphia, \$50; D. M. Piza, \$5; making a total of \$61.50.

Accompanying his remittance Mr. J. C. Levy made the following comments:—

Capps is a martyr to the cause of religious liberty in the bigoted State of Tennessee. He is punished for obeying the law of God, which the law of Tennessee says shall not be obeyed in its jurisdiction.

We may talk as we please about religious liberty and the separation of Church and State in this country, but it does not wholly exist. The religious majority in our *free* land, when it can safely do so, oppresses the minority.

All honor to Capps! Let him work out in jail the punishment which the State of Tennessee exacts for believing that religious liberty exists within its borders, but meanwhile let his poor family be provided for.

Later the *American Hebrew* decided to

323

apply the amount contributed to the payment of the fine, which was done. The balance was donated to Mr. Capps.

The issue of the *American Hebrew* of October 5 contained the following editorial note:—

### **In the Land of Religious Liberty**

Some weeks ago we appealed in these columns for aid for a party in Tennessee, who was imprisoned and fined for working on his farm on Sunday. He belongs to a Christian sect that observes Saturday as the Sabbath. The response to our appeal brought in \$61.50. Although a collection was being made in behalf of the cause by persons in the West, we deemed it advisable to consult Chas. E. Buell, of Plainfield, New Jersey, as to the manner in which the money should be applied, since that gentleman had brought the matter to our attention. It was concluded that the wisest plan would be to pay the fine and have Mr. Capps released, the surplus to be given him after that, to enable him to start afresh, as his imprisonment had well nigh ruined him. We therefore forwarded

\$34.87 to J. J. Thomason, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Weakley Co., in Dresden, Tenn.

Mr. Capps wrote gratefully acknowledging the kind act of the *American Hebrew* and its friends.

All lovers of liberty will feel kindly toward the *American Hebrew* for interesting itself in this case of a persecuted fellow-citizen; and the contributors have manifested the spirit of an "Israelite indeed."

While Mr. Capps and his brethren are conscientiously opposed to paying fines assessed under these oppressive Sunday laws, yet when others, unsolicited, pay the fines and release them from custody, they can but joyfully return to their families, with gratitude to those whose liberality has secured their freedom.

May "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" bless our Hebrew friends!

**"The Papacy and the Temporal Power" *American Sentinel* 9, 41 , p. 324.**

THE New York *Sun*, of the 9th inst., has an editorial article, in which is discussed the relations of the papacy and the civil power in Italy.

In a speech, noted in these columns two weeks ago, Premier Crispi said that there must be a union of forces against anarchism under a banner inscribed, "For God, our King and our Country."

Crispi's utterance is properly regarded as a bid for the favor of the pope; but judging by the Roman Catholic press of Europe, the pope will accept nothing short of abject surrender of the Italian government and a restoration of the temporal power, at least in the city of Rome.

"Some light," remarks the *Sun*, "is thrown upon this subject by the London *Tablet*, which collects in a recent number the comments of several Italian newspapers that are supposed to represent with more or less fidelity the views of Leo XIII. The purport of their declarations is that a restitution of the temporal sovereignty of the pope cannot be looked for, and that, in the absence thereof, no compromise between the papacy and the civil power in Italy is possible."

If Crispi would make peace with the pope he must follow in the footsteps of Henry the IVth. The *Sun* says:—

It is true enough that the pilgrimage the Canossa involves penance and restitution no less than professions of faith. The German Emperor who made the memorable journey recognized its implied obligations, and Bismarck, when seeking the support of

German Catholics in the Reichstag, acknowledged that he must earn it by repealing most of the Falk laws.

The *Voce della Verita* congratulates Crispi on his conversion, but asks for some tangible evidence of it in "the restoration of the Decalogue and the divine law which," it says, "the Italian government has not merely forgotten, but trampled under foot."

The *Unit Catolica*, suggests that "before talk of reconciliation should come mention of reparation. To Signor Crispi we would put the question, 'Are you ready to undo the work of the revolution in regard to the church; to restore to the pope effective and tangible sovereignty, liberty, and independence within the limits assigned by history and the pontifical rights; in a word, to overturn from top to bottom all that constitutes modern Italy?'"

Other more or less pertinent opinions are quoted, all of the same import, namely that there can be no reconciliation without restoration. The *Sun*, however, thinks that "these Italian Catholic editors are inclined to be more papistical than the pope; as if, in other words, they are disposed to ask too much, and above all, too much at once." But Italy is in dire straits, and an abject surrender to the pope need surprise no one.

The temper of the papacy upon this question cannot be mistaken. A writer in the *Tablet*, referring to resolutions passed every year by Catholic congresses, urges that these are useless until public opinion changes in Italy, or until the Catholics of France, Spain, and Austria are ready to do more than pass resolutions; says:—

Not until the Catholics of these three States, or even of one of them, acquire the supremacy over the anti-Christian portion of their fellow-subjects and hold in their hands the destinies of their country, can they invite the two hundred million of Catholics, in the rest of the world, to aid them by furnishing money and volunteers for the undertaking, which should be carried out in the name of the whole Catholic community.

"This is the real spirit of the papacy," says another London paper, "the encyclicals on peace and good-will amongst men notwithstanding."

**October 25, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 42 , p. 329.**

WE note that six Christian ministers in Cleveland recently attended the dedication of a new synagogue in that city, and united with Jewish rabbis "in delivering discourses of exultation."

COMMENTING on the fact stated in the preceding paragraph, the *Sun* of this city says:—

This whole thing is wonderful. Was there ever another occasion upon which a half dozen Protestant clergymen of as many denominations united with two rabbis at the dedication of a synagogue? The clergymen judiciously refrained from making any allusion to the gospels in that place. We guess they were more shrewd than the Apostle Peter or the Apostle Paul would have been under the circumstances.

This is certainly true. "This whole thing is wonderful," and it is not hazarding too much to say that not one of the apostles would have gone into a synagogue without taking Christ with him. There is a vast difference between Christian charity and unchristian indifference.

THE Christian is required to love all men; yea, the Christian does love all men, for that is the Spirit of Christ; and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." Moreover the Christian will do good to all men as he has opportunity; but the latter he cannot do by encouraging them in error, and the former he does not do except as he does it in the Spirit and power of his Master.

OUR Saviour himself, and his apostles and the early Christians, preached the gospel to the Jews declaring that without Christ there was no salvation. When they went into the synagogues it was to preach Christ; and upon no occasion did they by word or act admit that Judaism without Christ was as good as Christianity, or that there was salvation in it. But this is virtually what those Cleveland preachers did when they joined with Jewish rabbis in dedicating a house from which the name of Christ must be excluded, or if admitted at all, admitted only to be denied.

ON the occasion referred to one of the ministers is credited with these words: "Is there, after all, such a difference between us? Have we not one God?" Doubtless to the minds of many this latter question admits only of an affirmative answer; but the truth is that God, the true God, is revealed to us only in Christ. Says the Saviour: "Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." It follows that there can be no true worship of the true God except through Christ, and the Christian who by word or act denies this, thereby denies his Lord. To insist that Hebrews shall enjoy equal civil and religious rights with all other men, is Christlike,

and honors our divine Lord, for Christian charity requires this; but to admit that Judaism is to-day acceptable worship of the true God is to deny Christ and put him to an open shame.

**"Seeing the Invisible" *American Sentinel* 9, 42 , pp. 329-331.**

THE Christian is to see, and does see, the invisible. He is to "look at the things that are not seen" (2 Cor. 4:19), and he is to see—he can see—the things that he looks at.

"The things that are not seen are eternal:" and the things that are eternal are the things of God; for he is "the King, eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God," and "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen" (Rom. 1:20), though not with the natural eyes—the eyes of this world.

There are things even of the natural order, which are invisible to the natural eyes unaided. There are innumerable worlds that cannot be seen at all—that are invisible—without the telescope; there are the countless forms of life in this world of ours that are invisible without the microscope. And all men are eager, and delighted, to use either the telescope or the microscope whenever it is possible, in order that they may see these things that are otherwise invisible. And the invisible things even of the natural order awake more interest, and engage more profound study than do the visible things.

Why should not then the invisible things of the spiritual order awake interest and arouse study as well as the invisible things of the natural order? It may be answered that they do. Yes, that is true; but the interest shown, and the study carried on, in this line, is so largely done in a defective way, that, practically, the effort amounts to very little, and brings no benefit to the greater part of mankind.

The one grand defect, and, indeed, a fatal one, in the efforts of the greatest part of mankind to see the invisible things of the spiritual order, the invisible things of God, has always been that it is attempted to be done in the natural way and with the natural faculties. Because of this the gods of the heathen have always been but the reflection of the natural character of the worshipers, and even then must needs be represented before the devotee in some shape visible to the natural eye, whether it be in the form of the heavenly bodies, or of sticks or stones, or of graven or molten images, or of pictures. So that all false worship—all idolatry—is but the result of effort to grasp the spiritual in

the natural way, to comprehend spiritual things with the natural faculties.

But it is eternally true that "spiritual things are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2:9-14. The truly spiritual things—the things of God—it is impossible truly to discern in any other than the truly spiritual way. For "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John 4: 24. It is only by the Spirit of God that the things of God can be discerned. For, as it is written: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things that God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things; yea, the deep things of God." 1 Cor. 2:9, 10.

Thus it is evident that God has put within the reach of man the means by which he can see "the invisible things of him." And the Spirit of God and the revelation which he by that Spirit has given, are the means by which men may know the things of God and may see the

330

invisible things of him. For, again it is written: "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God *knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God*. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; *that we might know the things* that are freely given to us of God." 1 Cor. 2:11, 12.

Although it be eternally true that spiritual things are only spiritually discerned; and although it be evident that it is by the Spirit of God alone that the things of God are known; yet it is also true that even this good Spirit men desire to see—they desire that it shall be *visible*—before they will receive it, even as it is written: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, *whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not*, neither knoweth him." John 14:16, 17. Thus the sole means by which the things of God can be made known to the world—even this the world insists shall be discerned and known in the worldly way. But this will never do. This the Lord could never, by any means, allow in any degree.

God can never accommodate himself nor his ways to the ways of this world. This world is wrong, and all its ways are wrong ways. And for the Lord to accommodate himself in anything to the ways of this world, would be only to confirm the world in its wrong ways. If the

world could see God, or the things of God, *with worldly eyes*, and could know God or the things of God with worldly knowledge, this would at once reduce God to the level of this world, and all the things of God to the level of the things of this world. And this would be only to confirm, by the sanction of God, this world forever in its own ways as they are, making the ways of this world the ways of God, and making iniquity and transgression and sin eternal.

But God wants to turn this world from its own ways unto himself, that it may know him as he is. He wants to lift this world up to himself and to his ways, instead of allowing the world to bring him down to its own level and to confirm it in its own wickedness. And in order that this may be accomplished, he must, in the very nature of things, require that the world shall see with other than worldly eyes, and know with other than worldly knowledge. The world must forsake all worldly elements and all worldly methods, and accept and use exclusively the means which God has supplied, or else it can never see God as he is in truth. And whosoever will do this will see him as he is, and everywhere, and to all eternity. He who would refuse the use of the telescope and the microscope, the means by which alone he can see the invisible things of the natural order, might strain his eyes till the faculty of sight should be lost, in an effort to see those things, *and all in vain*; for without these instruments he simply *cannot* see the things which he would see. Even so the things of God can no man see, who refuses to use the means which God has supplied for this purpose. Without the instruments which God has supplied, man may strain all his powers to the breaking point in the effort to see God as he is in truth *and all in vain*; without these he simply *cannot* see him. And this, not because God has arbitrarily fixed it so that he *shall not* see him if he does not do so, and so, and simply and only because that if he will not use the instruments by which alone the invisible things of God may be seen, literally he *cannot* see them. "Except a man be born again [born *from above*, margin] he *cannot* see the kingdom of God." John 3:3.

What, then, are the instruments by which men may see the invisible things of God? We have read that "the Comforter," "the Spirit of Truth," "which is the Holy Ghost," the world cannot receive "because it *seeth him not*, neither knoweth him." And further, on this it is written that "we receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*." Gal. 3:14. That is to say, therefore, not only that the world cannot receive the Spirit of God because it *seeth* him not, but that the world *sees* him

not because it does not believe. Instead of *believing*, in order that it may see, the world wants to see in order that it may *believe*. But to those who believe and therefore do receive him, Jesus says, "Ye *know* him, for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you;" and, "Ye see me;" and "I will manifest myself to him." So that it is literally true that *by faith* we know God and the things of God, and see the invisible things of God.

It was "by faith" that Moses endured "as seeing him who is invisible." Heb. 11:27. It is written that "the pure in heart shall see God;" and he purifies the heart "by faith" (Acts 15:9); and therefore it is by faith that men see him who is "the invisible God." Col. 1: 15. And in order that all men may see "the invisible things of him," and "him who is invisible," "God hath dealt to *every man the measure of faith.*" Rom. 12: 3. Faith is "the gift of God." Eph. 2:8. It is not the gift of God in the sense that the natural faculties, as reason, sight, hearing, etc., are the gifts of God, so that it should be of ourselves. It is the gift of God in the sense that it is from above and beyond ourselves, a supernatural faculty bestowed since sin entered, and acting only at the free choice of the individual himself. "For by grace are ye saved, *through faith*, and *that not of yourselves*; it is the gift of God." "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17); and the word of God is able to make things to be seen which before did not appear, and which indeed were not; so that faith, acting through the word of God, sees in very truth, and sees clearly, the invisible things of God.

True faith, the faith that is the gift of God, the faith of which Christ is the Author, the faith of which the word of God is the channel—this faith hears the word of God and depends upon the divine power of that word itself to accomplish the thing which that word says. For when the centurion came to Jesus asking that his servant should be healed, he said to the Lord, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." Thus he expected the word of the Lord itself to accomplish that which it said when the Lord should but speak the word. And this the Lord pronounced not only "faith" but "great faith:" even such as he had not found in Israel. And this, too, in the face of the fact that the Scripture, upon the knowledge of which Israel was greatly priding itself, had long before plainly stated this very thing, in these words: "As the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the

eater; *so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please.*" Isa. 55:10, 11.

To expect the word of God to do the thing which that word says, and to depend wholly upon that word itself to do it, this the Lord Jesus pronounces faith. This is true faith. This is the faith by which men can see the invisible thing of God as certainly and as easily as by the telescope and the microscope they can see the invisible things of the natural order. This is the faith *which works* by love purifies the heart, so that he who is thus "pure in heart shall see God," *invisible though he be*. For this is the faith by which he who exercises it sees the invisible. This is the faith which, working through the word of God, accomplishes the new birth (1 Peter 1:23) by which a man is enabled to see the kingdom of God, which "except a man be born again *he cannot see*" at all.

This is why it is that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Faith is of God, and whatsoever it works is the work of God; while whatsoever is not of faith is not of God, but is of the world. And all that is in the world is not of the Father, but is of the world. 1 John 2:16. Whatsoever is not of faith is of the world, is of the nature of the world, and is of the way of the world, and perverts the way of God to the ways of the world, and demands that God shall accommodate himself to the world and accept a worship that is altogether of the nature and spirit of this world.

No stronger proof, therefore, could possibly be given, of the absolute falsity, the sheer worldliness, and the utter naturalness, of any system of religion, than that it must needs avail itself of *visible* representations of the object of its worship. And of all the systems of religion that are in the world, there is no one which insists more upon the *visible* and upon seeing the visible than does the Roman Catholic system. It is essential to that system that it shall have "*a visible head*." It must needs have a *visible* kingdom. It must have a *visible* sacrifice. Professing to worship the Crucified One, the Catholic Church must have *visible* "crucifix" by which to do it. Professing to glory in the cross of Christ, she must have a multitude of *visible* crosses of her own by which to do it. There must be a visible interpreter of the Scriptures. And for all the worshipers according to that system, there must be *visible* representations of the object worshiped, in the shape of images and pictures. Throughout the whole system the one chief essential is the seeing of the *visible*.

While this paragraph is being written, there comes to hand an encyclical of Leo XIII., pope, "On the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin," in which, describing the purpose of the rosary, that is, of the beads which are used by Catholics in their prayers, he says: "The rosary is arranged not for the consideration of dogmas of faith and questions of doctrine, but rather for putting forth facts to be perceived *by the eyes* and treasured up in the memory." Even though it be recognized that the invisible exists and is to be worshiped, yet it can be comprehended and worshiped only through, and by the aid of, *the visible*. This is the characteristic of all heathenism and of all idolatry. And this is only to say that by this characteristic the Catholic

331

system of religion is demonstrated to be essentially heathenish and idolatrous.

We know full well of the plea that is made in defense of the use of images, pictures, etc., in the worship of the Roman Catholic Church; that is, that "the honor which is given them is referred to the originals which they represent, so that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads or kneel, we adore Christ and venerate his saints, whose likeness they represent;" and "the bowing before an image outside of us is no more to be reprehended than the worshipping before and internal image in our own minds; for the external image does but serve the purpose of expressing visibly that which is internal."—*Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 285, 287. But if they only saw Him whom they profess to worship, they would not need any image of him, either external or internal, nor any representation of him either visible or otherwise. They could then be true worshipers, worshipping him who is invisible, in spirit and in truth.

This plea that is made in justification of the use of images and of the visible, is in itself the greatest condemnation of the use of images and of the whole system of Roman Catholicism; for it is a confession of inability to see the invisible, and therefore a confession that the whole system is destitute of true faith and a stranger to the new birth, and altogether without God.

The Catholic system being confessedly unable to see the invisible, is clearly not of faith. And as whatsoever is not of faith is sin, it is perfectly clear that the whole Catholic system is a system of sin. And the professed Protestantism that panders to it, that compromises with it, that courts it, and that is "wheeling into line with it," is simply like

unto it. The one is "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," "the mystery of iniquity," "the beast;" and the other is "the image" of it.

**"Did the Roman Catholic Church Ever Persecute?" *American Sentinel*  
9, 42 , p. 331.**

IN our issue of September 27, we discussed this question at some length, quoting first a negative answer from *Donahoe's Magazine*, and then some affirmative testimony from Schaff and Herzog and from the "Encyclopedia Britannica." It is the purpose of this article to carry the investigation still farther, and this time we shall quote only Roman Catholic authorities.

In his book, "The Faith of our Fathers," pages 284-286, Cardinal Gibbons says:—

But did not the Spanish Inquisition exercise enormous cruelties against heretics and Jews? I am not the apologist of the Spanish Inquisition, and I have no desire to palliate or excuse the excesses into which that tribunal may at times have fallen. From my heart I abhor and denounce every species of violence, and injustice, and persecution of which the Spanish Inquisition may have been guilty. And in raising my voice against coercion for conscience' sake, I am expressing not only my own sentiments, but those of every Catholic priest and layman in the land.

Our Catholic ancestors, for the last three hundred years, have suffered so much for freedom and conscience, that they would rise up in judgment against us, were we to become the advocates and defenders of religious persecution. We would be a disgrace to our sires, were we to trample on the principle of liberty which they held dearer than life.

And when I denounce the cruelties of the Inquisition, I am not standing aloof from the church, but I am treading in her footprints. Bloodshed and persecution form no part of the creed of the Catholic Church. So much does she abhor the shedding of blood, that a man becomes disqualified to serve as a minister at her altars who, by act or counsel, voluntarily shed the blood of another. Before you can convict the church of intolerance, you must first bring forward some authentic act of her popes or councils sanctioning the policy of vengeance. In all my readings, I have yet to find one decree of hers advocating torture or death for conscience' sake. She is indeed intolerant of error; but her only weapons against error are those pointed out by St. Paul to Timothy: "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove entreat; rebuke with all patience and doctrine."<sup>90</sup> 1

But you will tell me: Were not the authors of the Inquisition children of the church, and did they not exercise their enormities in her name? Granted. But I ask you: Is it just or fair to hold the church responsible for those acts of her children which she disowns? You do not denounce liberty as a mockery, because many crimes are committed in her name; neither do you hold a father accountable for the sins of his disobedient children.

These are the cardinal's own words as recorded in his own book. Two points should be specially noted: first, he does not say that "the church" never used against heresy other weapons than those "pointed out by St. Paul to Timothy;" though that is the idea that he evidently seeks to convey; for, second, he attempts to lift the odium of the Inquisition from "the church" and place it upon the "children" of "the church;" as though to individuals and not to "the church" belonged the responsibility for the Inquisition and the crimes against humanity committed by it. But this will not do. The Inquisition was an institution of the Roman Catholic Church; and it was instituted by the visible head of that church for the express purpose of using against "error" weapons never pointed out by St. Paul to Timothy, nor to anybody else; namely, the weapons of civil pains and penalties. That this is true is not only admitted, but is asserted in a Roman Catholic book,<sup>91</sup> 2 published in this city in 1891, and approved by Cardinal Gibbons himself. On pages 58, 59, of the work referred to, we read:—

For many ages after the conversion of Constantine it was easier for the church to repress heresy by invoking the secular arms than by organizing tribunals of her own for the purpose. Reference to ecclesiastical history and the codes of Justinian and Theodosius shows that the emperors generally held as decided views on the pestilent nature of heresy, and the necessity of extirpating it in the germ before it reached its hideous maturity, as the popes themselves. They were willing to repress it; they took from the church the definition of what it was; and they had old established tribunals armed with all the terrors of the law. The bishops, as a rule, had but to notify the appearance of heretics to the lay power, and the latter hastened to make inquiry, and, if necessary, to repress and punish. But in the thirteenth century a new race of temporal rulers arose to power. The Emperor Frederic II. perhaps had no Christian faith at all; John of England meditated, sooner than yield to the pope, openly to apostatise to Islam; and Philip Augustus was refractory towards the church in various ways. The church was as clear as ever upon the necessity of repressing heretics, but the weapon—secular sovereignty—which she had hitherto employed for the purpose, seemed to be breaking in her hands. The time was come when she was to forge a weapon of her

own; to establish a tribunal the incorruptness and fidelity of which she could trust; which, in the task of detecting and punishing those who misled their brethren, should employ all the minor forms of penal repression, while still remitting to the secular arm the case of obstinate and incorrigible offenders. Thus arose the Inquisition. St. Dominic is said by some to have first proposed the erection of such a tribunal to Innocent III., and to have been appointed by him the first inquisitor.<sup>923</sup> Other writers trace the origin of the tribunal to a synod held at Toulouse by Gregory IX. in 1229, after the Albigensian crusade, which ordered that in every parish a priest and several respectable laymen should be appointed to search out heretics and bring them before the bishops.<sup>934</sup> The task of dealing with the culprits was difficult and invidious, and the bishops ere long made over their responsibility in the matter to the Dominican order. Gregory IX. appointed none but Dominican inquisitors; Innocent IV. nominated Franciscans also, and Clement VII. sent as inquisitor into Portugal a friar of the order of Minime. But the majority of the inquisitors employed have always been Dominicans, and the commissary of the holy office at Rome belongs *ex officio* to this order.

Of the powers of inquisitors, the same books says (page 60):—

The duties and powers of inquisitors are minutely laid down in the canon law, it being always assumed that the civil power will favor, or can be compelled to favor, their proceedings. Thus it is laid down, that they "have power to constrain all magistrates, even secular magistrates, to cause the statute against heretics to be observed," and to require them to swear to do so; also that they can "compel all magistrates and judges to execute their sentences, and these must obey on pain of excommunication;" also that inquisitors in causes of heresy "can use the secular arm," and that "all temporal rulers are bound to obey inquisitors in causes of faith."<sup>945</sup> No such state of things as that here assumed now exists in any part of Europe; nowhere does the State assist the church in putting down heresy; it is therefore superfluous to describe regulations controlling jurisdiction which has lost the medium in which it could work and live.

This paragraph tells why "the church" does not now persecute, why "her only weapons are those pointed out by St. Paul;" it is because the weapon of her own which she "forged," the Inquisition, the "tribunal the incorruptness and fidelity of which she could trust," "has lost the medium in which it could work and live." And that is the only reason. "Rome never changes," and the Roman Catholic Church to whose fold Leo XIII. invites "the princes and peoples of the universe," "the Roman Catholic Church of to-day," upon which

"Protestants," so-called, are invoking the divine blessing, is unchanged in spirit and purpose, and would persecute to-day as she persecuted in the past if she had the power. Her denial of persecution is as disingenuous as we have in the past shown her professions of love for the Scriptures of truth and the Constitution of the United States to be.

But let not any lose faith in religion because of the unchristian course of a professed church of Christ. The Word of God foretold the great apostasy which resulted in the setting up of the papacy and warned his people, and through them the world, against it long before there was any such system claiming to be Christian; and through all the long dark night of papal supremacy God preserved to himself witnessess [*sic.*] for his trust, faithful men and women who counted not their lives dear unto themselves, if only they might glorify their Lord. Moreover, since the Roman Catholic Church has become hopelessly corrupt, and, as a church, irretrievably estranged from Christ, the same divine word which eighteen hundred years ago warned the world against the falling away and the "man of sin," which was to follow it, now raises a standard against this system of iniquity and calls to the remnant people of God, not only in the Roman Catholic Church, but in her fallen and apostate daughters, saying, "Come out of her my people." There is hope in this invitation; God has "set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people," and this gathering will be final, for its consummation will be the coming of the Lord to take his people to himself. Let as many as are dissatisfied with Roman Catholicism, and with papacy, whether in the Roman Catholic Church or in any other, turn to the Lord and be saved by him from sin now, and from the penalty of sin at his coming.

**"Evicted Tenants" *American Sentinel* 9, 42 , p. 332.**

THE city of Montreal, Canada, is under the control of the Roman Catholic Church. Here, the church, though influenced to some extent by the presence of Protestants in the city, has matters somewhat to her liking. Of course, she cannot punish heretics with civil pains and penalties as of old, since an appeal to the higher courts of the Dominion which are under English influence have been fined for refusing to remove the hat at the passing of a Catholic procession, and for crossing a street occupied by a church parade.

While the church is limited in the use of one of her two potent weapons—the civil law—she uses the other, the ecclesiastical boycott, for all it is worth. And it is worth millions.

It is quite generally understood that the Roman Catholic Church does make merchandise of the souls of men in collecting millions upon millions of dollars annually from her deluded votaries for the hastening of the souls of men through the terrible flames of purgatory. While this trading in the souls of men brings in this enormous revenue, the church does not let the body escape untaxed, as appears from an investigation of her burial laws now in force in Montreal.

In order to appreciate the situation there it must be borne in mind that the church teaches that the bodies of Roman Catholics must be buried in ground consecrated by the church, from which are excluded the contaminating bones of heretics. To be buried outside of this consecrated ground is regarded by the faithful as the greatest of calamities. With this idea in mind, the reader will understand how it is possible for the Roman Catholic Church to impose on the people in the manner indicated by the following facts:—

The church authorities in charge of the Catholic cemetery of Montreal, like the authorities of non-Catholic burial grounds, sell burial plots. But here the likeness ends. Not satisfied with the revenue collected by chasing the soul through purgatory, so long as there are living friends to pay for the chasing, the church now starts in pursuit of the body and levies on it as long as there are living friends to pay the tax, after which the bones are chased out of the cemetery and dumped with others in a nameless grave. Notwithstanding relatives have paid from four to twenty dollars for a resting place for the body of the deceased, still, at the end of every five years, they are taxed an amount equal to the first cost of the plot; and if for any reason the relatives fail to raise the amount, they must bear the shame and endure the sorrow of having the body of a loving father or mother, the remains of a companion sister or brother, or the sacred dust of an angel-faced child, distinterred and mingled with the bones of hundreds of other "evicted tenants" in a potter's field,—a nameless grave. A wanderer in a foreign land, on returning home and paying a visit to a mother's grave, would find the marble slab gone, and in its place another, marking the grave of a stranger.

But, says the non-Catholic, let the Catholic bury his relatives where the mercenary hand of Rome will not disturb their dust. But the

church has taught them that this is to exchange a life in paradise for the pains of hell. There is no escape from this tyranny, but separation from the "holy mother church," which means to the Catholic the loss of everything.

Thus it is seen that the church corrals the souls of men in purgatory and taxes them until the day of judgment, and in like manner corrals their bodies in "consecrated" ground and taxes them until exhumed by the sexton's pick, or "the trump of God." Verily, the Roman Catholic Church, at least in Montreal, literally fulfills the description of Revelation 18, and makes merchandise of the "slaves, [Greek, bodies] and souls of men."

Oh, that the deluded victims of the papacy would flee this tyranny and refuse longer to permit "the church" to make merchandise of both body and soul! Let them trust in Him who said, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live" (John 11:25), and who has promised that even the unconsecrated sea shall give up her dead. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, . . . and they were judged [not according to their burial place, but] according to their works." Rev. 20:13.

**November 1, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 43 , p. 337.**

"RENDER therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." This is the Christian and Protestant principle of separation of Church and State, after which the champions of religious freedom modeled the Constitution of the United States.

WHEN Jefferson, Madison, the Baptists, and certain Presbyterians labored for separation of Church and State in Virginia, and afterwards in the national Government, they understood they were making an image, in America, to the great Christian and Protestant principle of separation of Church and State; and that this separation and its concomitant, freedom of conscience, was in its every feature unlike the papal principle of union of Church and State and its concomitant, religious oppression.

TO show they believed all this we quote their words: "It is at least impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects which profess the Christian faith, without

erecting a claim to infallibility, which would *lead us back to the Church of Rome.*" Again, "To judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an inalienable right, which, upon the *principles on which the gospel was first propagated*, and the *Reformation from papacy* carried on, cannot be transferred to another."

THUS it is seen that the framers of the American Constitution modeled our national Government upon the Protestant principle of separation of Church and State. It was made in the image of the Protestant, and not the papal, principle. The builders said it would continue to image the Protestant principle so long as it refused to legislate on the religious disputes between sects, and protected all in the right to judge for themselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of conscience. But should our lawmakers ever legislate, said they, on religious questions, by that act they would lead the nation back to the Church of Rome,—they would mold it into an image of the papacy. And now of the act of Congress closing the World's Fair on Sunday, and the imprisonment of conscientious Sabbath-keepers in the several States under sanction of federal courts, we ask, whose image and superscription do they bear, Protestant or papal?

AND now shall Christians obey ("Obedience is the highest form of worship." "To obey is better than sacrifice.") these Sunday-law enactments which are imaged after the papal principle, both in dogma and practice, or shall they worship God by obeying him and keeping his Sabbath, they are of his power? Shall they worship the beast and his image by observing the papal Sunday enforced by laws which are made in the image of papal policy? "If any man worship the beast or his image or 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.

**"White With Fear and Wrath" *American Sentinel* 9, 43 , pp. 337, 338.**

A RECENT editorial in the *Christian Statesman* headed, "A Glimpse at the Catholic Question," closes with the following paragraph:—

It becomes us Americans to look at once into the secret plottings of this political church. They are striving with mighty energy to gain control of the whole Government of America, national and State, as well as municipal. The assertion is ventured, without much fear of mistake, that they have already succeeded to

an extent that, if known to the people, would turn our faces white with fear and wrath.

The assertion may be ventured without *any* fear of mistake. Another assertion is ventured without any fear of mistake, and that assertion is that the *Christian Statesman* and the National Reform Association, of which it is the organ, and the American Sabbath Union, and the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association, with which the *Statesman* is allied, is responsible in large measure for the success of "the secret plotting" of the Roman Catholic Church to gain control of the whole Government of America, national, State, and municipal. And let it be said before forgetting it, that it illy becomes the *Christian Statesman* and the political churches and associations which are behind it to speak of the Roman Catholic Church as a "political church," and of its efforts to secure favorable legislation as "secret plottings" "to gain control of the whole Government." This is just what the *Christian Statesman* and its allies have been doing for over a quarter of a century. The only difference is that the Roman Catholic Church has been plotting to gain control of the whole Government in the interests of Roman Catholicism; while the *Christian Statesman* and its allies have been plotting to gain control of the whole Government in the interests of a system the perfect image of Roman Catholicism. The first by order of the pope has been plotting "to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled in the principles of the true church." The second has been plotting to "place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." So similar have been the objects of these plotters that they have found it profitable to play into each others hands. Now that the faces of the editors of the *Christian Statesman* turn white with fear and wrath at the successful plottings of their "mother," it is proper to make them fear a chapter in the history of *their* plotting to gain control of the whole Government of America.

Aug. 31:1881 the *Christian Statesman* published the following:—

This common interest ["of all religious people in the Sabbath,"—Sunday] ought both to strengthen our determination to work, and our readiness to co-operate in every way with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept

co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is *one* of the *necessities* of the situation.

As the result of this request for co-operation Cardinal Gibbons in 1888 indorsed by letter the petition for a national law enforcing the observance of the Roman Catholic Sunday. The next year, Nov. 12, 1889, the Congress of Catholic Laymen passed,

338

"with the greatest demonstrations" of enthusiasm, the following:—

There are many Christian . . . to which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics, and shape civil legislation for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice and overlooking rivalry, we should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday.

Commenting on their success, one branch of this political church combination spoke thus:—

The National Lay Congress of Roman Catholics, *after correspondence and compliance with the American Sabbath Union*, passed its famous resolution in favor of *co-operation* with Protestants in Sabbath reform. . . . This *does not* mean that the millennium is to be built in a day. This is only a proposal of courtship; and the parties thus far have approached each other shyly.

The *Christian Statesman* and the National Reform Association continued to circulate literature among legislative and judicial heads of the Government until finally the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision asserting that "this is a Christian nation," and in evidence citing the Sunday laws of the several States, "in a document that reads as if largely gathered from the National Reform manual" (*Christian Statesman*, June 25, 1892). With this decision in their hands the *Christian Statesman* editors and their allied political churches continued their plotting to gain control of the whole Government of America. They urged upon congressmen that since this country had been declared a Christian nation, since Sunday was the Christian Sabbath, it was the duty of a Christian nation to protect the Christian Sabbath. At the same time they continued to solicit the aid of that other political church, the papacy, and to present the names of her archbishops and bishops in favor of their scheme. To all this was added the political boycott, and congressmen were threatened with political death if they refused to vote for a Sunday law closing the World's Fair on Sunday. The plotting succeeded. The Government surrendered to these political churches. A Sunday law

was enacted. Something the Congress of the United States had, up to this time, utterly refused to do. Not only refused, but declared if it were ever done it would result in the ruin of the American Republic. Here are the words of the United States Senate report on Sunday mails, adopted Jan. 19, 1829, in response to petitions for a Sunday law:—

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 that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World.

*Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. This first effort [to secure a national Sunday law] of the kind calls for the establishment of a principle which, in the opinion of the committee, would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizens. If admitted, it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence.*

And now that the *Christian Statesman* and its allied political church have, with the aid of that other political church, been successful in their plottings, that other political church proceeds immediately to tell the *Christian Statesman* and its "Protestant" allies that Sunday is solely a Roman Catholic institution, and in the matter of the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws "the Government assumes the right to enforce a religious dogma of the Catholic Church."

And now after they have made the "proposal of courtship" and the papacy has responded to their adulterous advances, they rise up and with an assumption of immaculate chastity profess to be shocked with the undue liberties taken by that other political church, and assert that they are about to "turn pale with fear and wrath."

While this political church combination was plotting to gain control of the whole Government of America, and courting that political church, the papacy; the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and the Seventh-day Adventist Church were protesting by voice and pen and telling them

that they would one day stand aghast at the ruin they had wrought. While they were picking away at that magnificent break-water, the American Constitution, we exhorted them in the name of American liberty, in the name of humanity, and in the name of Christianity to desist, telling them they were but making a breach through which would flow the angry seas of papal domination and intolerance. But they heeded us not. Now they are turning pale with fear and wrath at the ruin that follows.

And now we continue to stand as faithful watchmen, warning the people of approaching ruin, and calling to them and all men with God's message of mercy: "Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins and receive not of her plagues." Come out of Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. Come out of her daughters, the plotting political churches who have "become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird."

**"A Presbyterian Paper Against God and Against Itself" *American Sentinel* 9, 43 , p. 338.**

ACCORDING to the *Cleveland Leader* of October 5, J. F. Andrews, a Presbyterian minister, was expelled recently from the Ohio Synod for preaching that "Saturday is the true Sabbath." Commenting on the case, the *Herald and Presbyter*, of Cincinnati, in its issue of October 10, says:—

It is reported that the Presbytery of Muskingum, of the United Presbyterian Church, recently suspended one of its members from the ministry for persistently preaching and teaching that Saturday is the true Sabbath. He took an appeal to the synod meeting last week at Wheeling, W. Va. Of course, the Presbytery was sustained. He then gave notice of an appeal to the General Assembly. If the facts are as reported, it is hard to find words sufficiently condemnatory of such a man. The position of the United Presbyterian Church as to the Sabbath is so well known that any one seeking to agitate it on this line is a mere disturber of the peace. We shall expect to hear of some one denying the existence of God and appealing to some General Assembly, and then crying out that his liberty has been abridged because he is not sustained.

The full significance of this utterance will appear when it is remembered that the Word of God—the Bible—says plainly and in so many words, that "the seventh day is the Sabbath." The ridicule of [*sic.*] the *Herald and Presbyter* falls not upon the offending minister

but upon the Word of God and upon Him who will one day say: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

But the *Herald and Presbyter* is not consistent even with itself. On another page of the same issue containing the paragraph to which we refer, we find these words:—

Thus we see that the pope, in this matter acted arbitrarily, imperiously, and in utter disregard of the opinions and wishes of the priests and bishops in this country. But they have to submit, for the pope is vicar of Christ, the infallible head of the church. People who believe in and submit to ecclesiastical despotism are unfit for civil freedom.

We have no fault to find with this utterance in itself. But the *Herald and Presbyter* condemns itself in saying it. The matter to which it refers is the sending of a papal delegate to this country. This, it is asserted, the pope did contrary to the wishes of the American priests and bishops; and because they thus submit in a mere matter of discipline, the *Herald and Presbyter* thinks them unfit for civil freedom, while insisting that in a matter of faith, a question of conscience, a man ought to unquestioningly submit to the Presbyterian Church, even when the decision of the courts of that church is directly contrary to the Bible—the Protestants' professed rule of faith.

But a thousand times rather would we stand with the poor deposed preacher than to occupy the highest place in a church which makes void the law of God by human tradition, or sit in the seat of the editor who hurls his shaft of ridicule against the humblest man who dares to obey God rather than man. The Judgment draws on apace.

**"Only on an Equality With Romanism" *American Sentinel* 9, 43 , pp. 338, 339.**

DECEMBER 12, Sweden will celebrate the three hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gustavus Adolphus, "The Lion of the North." "Every Protestant nation," it is stated, "has been invited to take part in the celebration, and whether officially or not, will be represented."

And announcement of the coming celebration recently sent out from Stockholm, says:—

Up to the time that the great Swede marched into Germany there had not been a strong arm raised for the Protestant cause.

Always their leaders had been weak men and their soldiers divided into small bodies by petty jealousies. Then came a soldier whose reputation lives to this day as superior to that of any man of his century. He picked up the defeat-stained banner of Protestantism and bore it steadily forward, achieving even in his death a victory which for all time established the Protestant religion on a basis of equality with that of Roman Catholicism.

The last sentence, especially the last clause, is literally true: that victory did establish "the Protestant religion on a basis of equality with that of Roman Catholicism," and it has never in those countries risen above it from that day to this.

"The spirit of Luther," says the writer which we quote, "was abroad in the North, and the man and the time had come to demonstrate that the men of the North would no longer be held in bondage by Austria and the Church of Rome." But was it the "spirit of Luther"?

Luther's only weapon was the "sword of the Spirit, the Word of God." By that he conquered, and he would have no other. "The pope and the emperor," said he, "combined against me; but the more they blustered the more did the gospel gain ground. . . . And why was this? Because I never drew the sword or called

339

for vengeance; because I never had recourse to tumult or insurrection: I relied wholly upon God, and placed everything in his almighty hands. Christians fight not with swords and muskets, but with sufferings and with the cross. Christ, their captain, handled not the sword; . . . he hung upon the tree."

But the Reformation did not remain true to its own principles. Faith in God gave place to faith in kings, and the "sword of the Spirit" was exchanged for carnal weapons; and the Church of Christ in Switzerland, in Germany, in Norway, in Sweden, in Denmark and in Scotland, became the Church of the State. Says D'AubignÉ:—

If the Reformation, having attained a certain point, because untrue to its nature, began to parley and temporize with the world, and ceased thus to follow up the spiritual principle that it had so loudly proclaimed, it was faithless to God and to itself.

Henceforth its decline was at hand.

It is impossible for a society to prosper if it be unfaithful to the principles it lays down. Having abandoned what constituted its life, it can find naught but death. . . .

One portion of the reform was to seek the alliance of the world, and in this alliance find a destruction full of desolation.

Another portion, looking up to God, was haughtily [unhesitatingly] to reject the arm of the flesh, and by this very act of faith secure a noble victory.

If three centuries have gone astray, it is because they were unable to comprehend so holy and so solemn a lesson. <sup>951</sup>

As a man and a soldier Gustavus Adolphus is to be honored. From the human standpoint his was a noble service to the cause of freedom. But he rendered no service to true Protestantism. The State churches of Sweden and Norway, of Denmark and of Germany, are little better and scarcely less intolerant than the Roman Catholic Church of Portugal and Belgium, or even of Spain. Protestants may honor Gustavus Adolphus for his human bravery, but they must weep for the lack of living faith in God which made his career possible and substituted for the papacy other human systems instead of the pure gospel of the Son of God.

**"Sunday and the Reformation" <sup>961</sup> *American Sentinel* 9, 43 , p. 339.**

THE blighting influence of the Sunday institution upon the Reformation has never been thoroughly appreciated. Beginning with an appeal to the Word of God as against tradition, the Reformation soon encountered the traditional Sunday Sabbath. Some of the reformers, notably Carlstadt, who was professor of theology in the university of Wittenberg, and "during Luther's confinement at the Wartburg, had almost sole control of the reform movement at Wittenberg, and was supreme in the university," <sup>97 2</sup> was a strong advocate of the seventh-day Sabbath. Of his position on this point Luther wrote as follows:—

Indeed, if Carlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath—that is to say Saturday—must be kept holy. <sup>983</sup>

In 1519 occurred the notable discussion between Luther and Eck, in which the chief point of controversy was, whether the Bible, or the church and the pope, were the higher authority. Dr. Eck made the following claims:—

*Concerning the authority of the church*, the Scriptures teach, Remember to keep Saturday holy; six days you are to labor and do all your work; but on the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God, etc.; and yet the church has transferred the celebration of the Sabbath to Sunday, solely by her own power, without the Scriptures,

and we doubt by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.—*Dr. Eck's Little Hanbook ("Enchicution"), 1435, p. 78.*

The Sabbath has been manifoldly commanded in the Scripture. And as neither the gospels, nor St. Paul, nor yet the Bible itself states that the Sabbath has been abandoned, and Sunday instituted, it follows that it has been done by the apostolic church, without Scripture for it.

But if the church has had the power to set aside the Sabbath of the Bible, and enjoin the observance of Sunday,—why should she not have power to do the same with other days? If you do not observe them and leave the church, to go back to the Scriptures alone, you must, with the Jews, keep the Sabbath, which has been kept from the beginning of the world.—*Id. p. 79.*

Luther, prejudiced, no doubt, by the extreme contempt in which the Jews were held at that time, swerved from the principle upon which the Reformation had been launched, and rejected the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, but was not so inconsistent as to claim divine authority for Sunday observance; but on the contrary, asserted—as in the twenty-eighth article of the Augsburg Confession, which was drawn up by his approval—that "there is no divine authority for it."

The dilemma in which this position placed him is illustrated in his "Smaller Catechism," published in 1529, in the preface of which Luther arraigns the church of Rome in the following words:—

O ye bishops! How will ye ever render account to Christ for having so shamefully neglected the people, and having never for a moment exercised your office! May the Judgment not overtake you! You command communion in one kind, and urge your human ordinances; but never ask in the meantime, whether the people know the Lord's prayer, the *ten commandments*, or any part of God's Word. Woe, woe unto you everlastingly! <sup>994</sup>

In the same connection he instructs his ministers "first of all to teach the *text* of the *ten commandments*," <sup>1005</sup> and yet in the same book he violates his own instruction, and instead of teaching the text of the Sabbath commandment, he followed in the footsteps of Rome and supplanted it with the meaningless, indefinite, evasive, human makeshift, "Thou shalt sanctify the holy day." <sup>1016</sup>

One feels like condoning this mistake when it is remembered what a herculean task was undertaken by him. Luther doubtless unearthed from their covering of human tradition, more precious gems of truth, than any other one man since the time of Christ, but he was not without his mistakes,—mistakes which instead of being rectified by those who profess to be his legitimate successors, have in the matter

of Sabbath, been intensified. They now declare that there have been "transferred to it [Sunday] all the honors of the Jewish Sabbath;" <sup>1027</sup> and although asserting in this same connection that "Christians are at liberty to appoint any day for worship," <sup>1038</sup> immediately pronounce the death sentence upon the one who violates their unscriptural, man-made Sabbath.

What is the particular threat and penalty annexed to this commandment? [The commandment they have made.]

Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you; every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death. Ex. 31:13. <sup>1049</sup>

Having abolished the Sabbath of the Lord under pretext of Christian liberty, and having put in its place a human ordinance in conflict with it, which, for want of scripture they are unable to enforce, they next attempt to re-enact the penalty for the transgression of that law under the theocracy, and apply it to the transgression of a man-made institution. All this is done in the face of the statement from the same book that the Holy Scriptures are a "perfectly sure and sufficient standard, according to which all other says, writings, and doctrines are to be judged, so that *what accords with them must be received, what is in conflict with them must be rejected.*" <sup>10510</sup> Does the command, "Thou shalt sanctify the holy day" (the first day of the week) accord with the Holy Scriptures which command, "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," etc.?

The next step in this beaten path of error, is the attempt to secure the observance of this unscriptural, man-made Sabbath by means of the strong arm of civil law. This step the professed followers of Luther are now beginning to take. Rev. F. W. Conrad, D.D., of Philadelphia, editor of the *Lutheran Observer*, appeared Dec. 13, 1888, before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, at a hearing given the friends of the Blair Sunday bill, and represented that the German Lutherans were in favor of compelling the observance of Sunday by civil law. The following are his words as reported and published by the Government:—

I desire to speak for the evangelical portion of the German emigrants who are Lutherans and also reformed evangelical Christians, as we call them. In regard to their position on the Sabbath, while they differ relatively as to the basis on which the Christian Sabbath now rests, and also in regard to the manner of observing the Sabbath, they are, I should say, universally in favor of maintaining the Sabbath laws that exist in America. <sup>10611</sup>

We know of individual Lutheran ministers who are *not* "in favor of maintaining the Sabbath laws that exist in America," but we fear that Dr. Conrad's representation is true of the majority.

**November 8, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 44 , p. 345.**

IN a recent sermon in this city, Rev. Charles H. Eaton said:—

The Roman Catholic Church has produced some of the finest examples of humanitarians in the history of the world, and it should not be forgotten that the preservation of literature was due to the church, while she had produced her quota of scientists as well. The lives of Newman and Manning and Richard B. Froude are worthy of the highest admiration.

And this utterance is called by the paper from which it is taken, "A plea for religious toleration"!

IT is true that "some of the finest examples of humanitarians in the history of the world" have been Roman Catholics; but they were such in spite of the system, not because of it. Heathendom, too, has given the world some noble characters.

BUT what is meant in such a connection by "religious toleration?" Simply religious equality; and this not in the sense of equality before the law, but equality in the estimation of the people. Rome and her apologists want the history of the Dark Ages obliterated and the past forgotten [*sic.*]; and refusal to do this is religious intolerance! It is for this reason that Rev. Walter Elliott, a Roman Catholic missionary writings to the *Catholic World*, brands the Seventh-day Adventist Church as the "most venomous enemy of Catholicity in these parts;" "Puritans of the worst sort," etc.

THE "venom" of the Adventists is their uncompromising hostility to the errors of Roman Catholicism, and their persistent insistence that the papacy is the "man is sin," and the papal system "the mystery of iniquity;" the papal church the harlot mother of the harlot daughters of the Apocalypse.

FOR centuries Rome dominated the civilized world, and brooked no rival. "Heresy," and "heretics," were alike destroyed. Not only was open schism a crime to be punished by death, but secret dissent was likewise sought out and visited with the most severe penalties.

ACCORDING to her own confession, the Roman Catholic Church forged <sup>107</sup> 1 her own weapons for the extirpation of "heresy" in the

13th century. Prior to that time she had used the secular powers, for they had been willing tools, but civil rulers were becoming indifferent, and the Inquisition was called into being.

"ROME never changes;" this is her boast to-day. Therefore, what Rome did in the Middle Ages Rome would do now had she the power. And yet Rome regards it as the height of intolerance of her history and to warn the people against the errors of Romish doctrines, and expose the corruption of the Romish Church and priesthood.

THE Lord says: "Cry aloud; spare not;" but Rome says, "Be tolerant." Yes, be tolerant, but tolerance does not mean indifference to truth. It does not mean giving the right hand of fellowship to error. It does not mean disloyalty to the word of God. It properly means, equality before the law; perfect freedom to profess and practice any religion or no religion, just as the individual shall elect, limited only by due regard for the equal rights of others. It means the perfect equality before the law of every individual and every sect with every other individual and with every other sect in all things. It means perfect liberty of conscience, guaranteed and defended by the State and restricted only by the equal rights of others. This Rome demands for herself and her votaries in America, and this Rome ought to have, not only here but everywhere; but this Rome denies to others wherever she as the power. Verily, "Rome never changes"!

**"Roman Catholic Saints and Miracles" *American Sentinel* 9, 44 , pp. 345, 346.**

THE Roman Catholic Church claims a catalogue of saints numbering hundreds of thousands. Every one of these hundreds of thousands of saints is *dead*. In fact, the very first qualification of a Roman Catholic saint is that he be dead, and, second, that he be dead at least fifty years.

Another all-important qualification is that he work miracles *after* his death. Though his conduct while living be declared saintly, and though he is believed to have performed countless miracles while living, nevertheless, before he can be a full-fledged Roman Catholic saint he must perform miracles *while dead*.

Butler's "Lives of the Saints" contains the names of one thousand five hundred and fourteen saints, but this work is but a vest-pocket edition, as it were, of the lives of the saints. Although the saint-ologists of the church have been compiling the lives of the saints for

three hundred years, and although the catalogue now comprises twenty-four large volumes, the end of the undertaking is not yet in sight. One or more of these innumerable dead saints is worshiped by the members of that church on every day of the year, not excepting the 29th day of February. It is believed that these dead men and women saints are in heaven praising the Lord, and that they know all about the ups and downs of humanity, and are thinking how they can help the living who invoke them.

All this is a terrible mistake. Jesus said, "Whither I go ye cannot come." <sup>108</sup>1 Not until he comes the second time and raises the dead can the righteous be with him. Hear him again, "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also." <sup>109</sup>2 "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." <sup>110</sup>3 Again, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go

344

down into silence." <sup>111</sup>4 "His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." <sup>112</sup>5 "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." <sup>113</sup>6

Therefore the painfully sad and awfully solemn truth is that two hundred millions of Roman Catholics are praying for temporal help and eternal salvation to myriads of dead men and dead women, who instead of being in heaven praising the Lord and interceding for sinners, are down in the silence of the grave; whose forms have moldered back to earth; whose thoughts have perished,—who are *dead*; and who will *stay dead* until that "coming" hour "in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." <sup>114</sup>7

Though the question does not involve character, since all are dead, yet it is not unprofitable to digress for a moment and examine the character of a Roman Catholic "saint." Dominic, the founder of the order of "Dominicans," is a prominent "saint" whose name appears in the Roman breviary as one who overthrew heretics, and whose

miracles "extended even to the raising of the dead." Now the plain truth is that this man was anything but a saint. According to Roman Catholic historians he was the inventor of that satanic engine of cruelty, the Inquisition. They also declare that he marched in front of the Roman Catholic army and encouraged the soldiers as they laid waste the beautiful Albigensian valleys and tortured and massacred the innocent inhabitants. And when the captives were tried for heresy he sat as inquisitor-general and "by words and miracles," says the historian, "convicted a hundred and eight Albigenses, who were at one time committed to the flames." And this is the inhuman monster of cruelty whom we are asked to believe is now a saint in heaven associating with our Lord who said, "The son of man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them." And it is to this murderer of the saints of God that men pray for temporal and spiritual blessings!

At this point the Roman Catholic arises and asks in anticipated triumph, How about the countless miracles, which have been, and are now, wrought by the saints in all lands? He points to the pyramids on either side of the entrance to the church of St. Anne of BeauprÈ, Canada, composed of crutches, canes, surgical appliances, and other artificial supports; and to the grotto at Lourdes, France, thatched with similar evidences of the miraculous. He points to the army of pilgrims, six hundred thousand strong, which marches annually to these two shrines alone, and asks, Can this great army of people which is annually increasing, be the victims of imagination and priestcraft?

But, with this host of pilgrims in view, with churches and grottoes festooned, and thatched with crutches and canes before our eyes, we persistently reply, The "grandmother of Jesus" and Mary the blessed mother of our Lord, and all the other "saints" in the calendar are *dead*; and "the dead know not anything." <sup>115</sup>8 "Put not your trust in princes neither 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."

How then do we account for the signs of power, the miraculous wonders wrought through the intercession of the saints? We will not reply with the answer given by many that they are wholly the result of human trickery and priestly artifice. We will deal with them as supernatural, for if there are not some of these strange cures which are beyond the power of human science to fathom, then there soon will be those which are. With a view to discovering the power behind

these vaunted miracles, we ask by what power or by what name are the miracles of the Christian religion wrought? Peter said to the cripple at the beautiful gate of the temple, "*In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth* rise up and walk." And when the people who saw or heard of the miracle ran with wonder and amazement to the place where Peter stood, he said, "Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk? The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers hath glorified his son Jesus whom ye delivered up, and denied in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of Life whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses. And *his name, through faith in his name*, hath made this man strong, whom ye see and know: yea, *the faith which is by him* hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all."

While Peter was thus addressing the people the captains of the temple and the Sadducees came upon, being grieved that he taught the people, and preached through Christ the resurrection of the dead. When they had arrested the apostles and brought them before the council they asked them, "*By what power, or by what name* have ye done this? Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them, Ye rulers of the people, and elders of Israel, if we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that *by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth*, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even *by him* doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. *Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved.*"

It is, therefore, by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, "through faith in his name" that men receive "perfect soundness." Yea, more, when the rulers demanded of Peter, "by what name have ye done this," his answer was "by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth;" and then in order to shut out once and forever the mother of Jesus, and "St. Anne, the grandmother of Jesus," and all the rest of the untold thousands of dead saints from any part in the salvation of both physical and moral cripples, he adds, "Neither is there salvation in

any other; for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved." <sup>1169</sup>

Further examination of this subject must be postponed until next week.

**"The Pennsylvania 'Sabbath' Association Against Religious Liberty"**  
***American Sentinel* 9, 44 , pp. 346, 347.**

LAMST week, Williamsport, Pa., was the storm center of the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association. A few weeks previous to this time a law and order league was formed through the influence of the secretary of the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association. As a result of the influence of this league the following ordinance was passed:—

SECTION 1. *Be it ordained by the select and common councils of the city of Williamsport*, That from and after the passage of this ordinance it shall not be lawful for any person to expose for sale within the limits of said city any wares or merchandise on Sunday; nor shall any grocery, shop, store or other place of business be kept open on that day for the sale of any commodity whatever: nor shall any owner or occupant of such store, shop or other place of business permit persons to congregate therein, under a penalty of \$10 for each offense, and for each of the foregoing offenses; *Provided*, That the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to drug stores kept open for the sale of medicines only, nor shall it apply to the sale of bread or milk.

This law, it will be noticed, is more severe both in prohibition and penalty than the Pennsylvania Sunday law of 1794. This new law forbids the sale of all eatables except "bread or milk," while the law of 1794 declares that its provisions are not to be construed "to prohibit the delivery of milk or of the necessities of life, before nine of the clock in the forenoon, nor after five of the clock in the afternoon of the same day." The Williamsport ordinance also forbids shop-keepers to allow their friends to congregate in their places of business though nothing is sold. However, the people of Williamsport are permitted to congregate in the churches on Sunday and drop their coin into the collection-box for the payment of the preacher. The penalty attached to the law of 1794 is four dollars, while the penalty of the new Williamsport ordinance is ten dollars.

Sunday and Monday evenings preceding the opening of the convention of the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association, the writer delivered two addresses in the court house, to what the local papers termed "large" and "good-sized" audiences. The subject of the first

address was "The National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association and the Constitution of the United States." It was shown that the first attacks on the religious liberty provisions of the Constitution of the United States came from the "Synod of Pittsburg in Pennsylvania" as early as January 4, 1811, when the Presbyterian element of that section of the State petitioned Congress to prohibit the transportation and distribution of mails on Sunday. The history of the movement to secure congressional recognition was traced from 1811 to the final victory in 1892.

The subject of the second lecture was "Jesus of Nazareth and the Sabbath Association of Jerusalem." It was shown that at the first advent of Jesus the Jews had lost sight of the true Sabbath and were attempting to save the "sanctity of their Sabbath" and thereby preserve the

347

nation from the judgment of God by methods exactly similar to the methods of the Sabbath Association and law and order leagues of the present day. It was shown that as Jesus, the true Sabbath-keeper, was persecuted for his faithfulness in Sabbath-keeping, by the Sabbath-breakers of Jerusalem, so the true Sabbath-keepers in our time are being persecuted by the Sabbath-breakers (Sunday-keepers) for their faithfulness in keeping the same Sabbath day which Jesus kept.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church in Williamsport manifested a commendable zeal in circulating religious liberty literature. On the Monday preceding the Sabbath Association meeting they circulated fifty-two thousand pages of this literature, and later one thousand copies of the SENTINEL. Even the mothers and children engaged heartily in this work. The people of this country will not appreciate the herculean struggle in which Seventh-day Adventists are engaged for the preservation of religious freedom until it is too late.

At the first session of the Sabbath observance meeting held in the Pine Street Methodist Church, Tuesday morning at 11:30, the subject, "Sunday Mails" was discussed. The burden of the speeches was the laxity of Christians in the matter of sending and receiving mail on Sunday, and the necessity of a combine of the Christian people to force from Congress,—which was likened to the unjust judge,—a law forbidding the transportation and distribution of mail on Sunday. It was urged that this was a Christian nation on the authority of the

Supreme Court of the United States, and therefore the Christian people of the country would be heard and heeded in their demands for the enforcement of Christian institutions and usages. One speaker became so enthused with the prospects of the Sabbath which they hoped to secure by the aid of civil law, that he declared that it would make "devils on horseback holiness unto the Lord."

The greater part of the afternoon session was devoted to the discussion and adoption of resolutions regarding the maintenance of the Pennsylvania Sunday law of 1794. After much discussion it was decided to demand an increase of the present penalty of four dollars to twenty-five dollars. Some feared that this demand for an increased penalty might furnish the opposition with a weapon they would use to destroy the entire law. But the prevailing sentiment was that the time had come for aggressive work, and if the demand for a \$25 penalty invited an attack on the whole law it would be met with the thunders of the combined church. Many advocated, demanding a fine of one hundred dollars, and others imprisonment for the third offense. The atmosphere of this meeting reminded one of historical descriptions of the heresy tribunals of the Dark Ages.

In the evening a Williamsport attorney delivered an address of welcome to the delegates of the convention. Knowing the sentiments that would be most welcome to the ears of the delegates he devoted his entire time to reading decisions of the supreme court of Pennsylvania sustaining the Sunday law of 1794 and arguing that Seventh-day observers could find no shelter in the constitution of the State which says: "All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their consciences; and . . . 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 establishments or modes of worship."

The president of the Cumberland Valley Sabbath Association responded by narrating how he had intimidated the last legislature and helped to prevent the repeal of the Sunday law of 1794 by appearing before the committee with the names of 30,000 church members which had been gathered in the Cumberland Valley. All were exhorted to rally for the maintenance of the Pennsylvania Sunday law against the "conspiracy," and "treason," and "anarchy" which was looking to its repeal this winter.

The prevailing sentiment of the meeting was that with the fall of the Sunday law would go all civility, morality, and religion, and, in their places, would come anarchy with temporal and eternal ruin. It is evident that these men believe this, and hence their earnestness in its enforcement, even though as one member of the convention said to the writer, "Seventh-day Adventists must be arrested and prosecuted."

At the forenoon session of the second day's convention resolutions were passed condemning Sunday newspapers, Sunday street cars, Sunday mails, and calling for the organization of law and order leagues in every city and town in the State, and the boycotting of every candidate for public office favorable to the repeal of the present Sunday law or opposed to increasing the penalty to \$25. One resolution asked professed Christians to be consistent and keep the Sabbath (Sunday) themselves. Many pertinent things were said along this line. It was stated that the violation of the Sunday by professed christians [*sic.*] lay at the very foundation of the present disregard for the day. It was also stated ministers dared not rebuke this disregard of Sunday for fear of losing their hearers. Hence the safest and easiest way out of the dilemma was the strong arm of the State.

Preparations were made for a great struggle this winter, not merely for the preservation of the present law, but for an increased penalty. Petitions will be circulated in every part of the State, and a combined effort be made to force from the legislature the desired legislation.

Throughout the entire convention there was manifest an intense earnestness which bespeaks an honest conviction, but which is ominous of further encroachment on the liberties of the people.

**"Ignorance or Dishonesty—Which?" *American Sentinel* 9, 44 , p. 347.**

IN its issue of October 25, the *Christian Work* has notes on the International S. S. lesson for November 4, the title of which is, "Jesus Lord of the Sabbath." These notes are by "Rev. Joseph Newton Hallock," the editor of the paper in which they appear.

The lesson recounts the circumstances of the plucking of the ears of corn on the Sabbath by the disciples and of the charge of Sabbath-breaking brought against them by the Pharisees; also the healing of the withered hand on the following Sabbath.

Mr. Hallock comments upon the first even, namely, the plucking of the ears of corn, and then says:—

Our Lord had silenced his accusers once, but on the following Sunday they were at the synagogue watching him again with malicious hearts, hoping that perchance they might pervert even his works of gracious healing into a just cause of accusation. When they saw the man with the withered hand they were exultant, for they were sure that Christ would heal him, and thus, in their estimation, break the Sabbath. First they had attacked the man who had carried his bed upon the Sabbath, then they had accused the disciples, and now with evil malevolence they were about to pounce upon Christ himself, and accuse the Lord of the Sabbath of breaking it.

It is concerning this that we inquire, Is it ignorance or dishonesty—which? That the Pharisees did not accuse Christ of breaking the Sabbath on Sunday need not be asserted. Sunday was to the Jews just what Monday is to most people now—namely, the first of the six working days. Moreover, the Pharisees did not resort to the synagogue to watch Christ on Sunday, for he was not at the synagogue on that day. Sunday was not the day when the Jews resorted to the synagogue. The Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, the day just before Sunday, was the day upon which the people resorted to the synagogue and upon which the Pharisees watched Jesus to see whether he would heal "on the Sabbath day."

Only the words of Holy Writ can adequately describe this confounding of the holy and the profane, this effort to make Sunday and Sabbath synonymous: "There is a conspiracy of her prophets in the midst thereof, like a roaring lion ravening the prey: they have devoured souls; they have taken the treasure and precious things; they have made her many widows; in the midst thereof. Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them." Ezek. 22:25, 26.

**"Sunday and the Reformation" <sup>1171</sup> *American Sentinel* 9, 44 , pp. 348, 349.**

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, but which it violated in joining with other churches in petitioning Congress for a law closing the World's Fair on Sunday:—

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 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 along 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 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 Publishing Society, 1420 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

Many earnest appeals were made by Baptist ministers against the denomination's leaving these principles and participating in the Sunday-law crusade. The following from the pen of Rev. G. W. Ballenger, of Chicago, of South Chicago, March 7 and 15, 1892, will furnish a sample of these courageous protests:—

Since I am left free to remain away from the Fair

350

on Sunday, I do not consider that my rights are invaded, and I shall not invade the rights of others by asking that Congress, State Legislatures, or national commissioners compel them to act in harmony with my view of Sabbath sacredness.

Personally, I wish that all men were consistent Christians, and that the Sabbath were universally observed; but all are not

Christians, and all do not observe the Sabbath. Under these circumstances it is the duty of the Church to use the God-appointed means to accomplish these reforms. When these fail, the responsibility rests with the individual transgressor. Christians have no right to appeal to civil law to compel men to conform to their ideas of worship.

I am opposed to securing compulsory Sabbath observance, either by laws avowedly in the interest of such observance, or under cover of purely civil enactment. I simply want the Sabbath institution to stand on its own eternal foundation, unaided by laws impelled by political strife, embittered by partisan feeling, as one of the blessed gifts of an all-wise and loving Creator to humanity for humanity's good. The blessings of the Sabbath will be realized by all who observe it, but when an institution of the loving Creator is made by any man or set of men, a means to coerce or render less happy the lives of others, then the Creator is dishonored, religion is injured, and the individual is farther from the kingdom of God than though he had been left free to be won by the power of the gospel. . . . When we attempt by the power of the civil law to compel the observance of our ideas by others, an unseen hand will write, "Ichabod" over our portals, and our glory will have departed forever.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 44 , p. 352.**

THE *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, for October, contains an official translation of Leo XIII.'s invitation to "the nations and peoples of the universe" to return to the fold of the so-called "Catholic" Church.

WITH becoming modesty, Cardinal Gibbons has written a long introduction to the official translation of the pope's encyclical which may be understood as explaining just what the "holy father" meant. The cardinal says:—

But what is the great Leo's principle of union; what his remedy for existing dissensions? What the nature of the invitation addressed to all princes and people? He advises reconciliation and union with the Church of Rome; not such a union that would be brought about "by a certain kind of agreement in the tenets of belief and an intercourse of fraternal love. The true union between Christians in that which Jesus Christ, the Author of the church, instituted and desired, and which consists in a unity of faith and a unity of government." In his view, which is the only true view, the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, the supreme jurisdiction of St. Peter and his successors, can alone unite us in the fellowship with our Redeemer. That has been the claim of the Catholic Church from

the beginning. She has repeated and insisted on the necessity of submission to the center of Christian truth and the bond of external union. The fathers and doctors have invariably taught that "where Peter is, there is the church," and that on account of its superior power and primacy every particular church must adhere and be united to the Church of Rome where blessed Peter erected his see forever.

It is thus that we are brought face to face, as it were, with that wonderful seat, or see, from which the pope derives his "infallibility;" and it is to faith in that that [*sic.*] the pope has invited all "princes and peoples." "Where Peter is there is the church," and where Peter is, there is his seat to which attaches infallibility! Profound thought! Christ is out, Peter is in; God is dethroned and "the man of sin" sits "in the temple of God showing himself that he is God."

BUT it is only when we realize that Peter is *dead* that the stupendous folly of the whole thing dawns upon the mind. The papal system is built upon men, and upon *dead* men at that, as shown in our first page article. Read, and ponder it well.

AMONG our significant paragraphs are two printed side by side showing the attitude of the Church of Rome toward religious liberty in Europe and in America. In Europe Rome opposes every concession to God-given human rights; but in America the same power poses as the champion of religious freedom! Only recently the hierarchy in Spain protested against the ordination of an Anglican bishop in Madrid; and now, while the Roman Catholic press of this country is waxing loud in its plaudits of religious liberty, "the church" in Hungary is doing its utmost to maintain the Church and State statutes by which it has so long held in cruel bondage the Hungarian people. "Rome never changes."

**November 15, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 45 , p. 353.**

THIS number of the SENTINEL tells of Seventh-day Adventists imprisoned in Switzerland, and in this country, for doing bodily labor on Sunday.

WHY do Seventh-day Adventists suffer imprisonment rather than keep Sunday? Why do they not obey the civil laws which require them, in common with others, to refrain from the ordinary vocations of life on the first day of the week?

THE answer to the question raised in the preceding paragraph is that Adventists regard Sunday as a rival of the Sabbath of the Lord, and to honor it would be, with them, a denial of the Lord of the Sabbath. Sabbath-keeping is not with Adventists what it is with very many people, a mere matter of convenience, a simple choice of days, but it is a question of loyalty to God.

COURTS have denied that it is a matter of conscience with Adventists to work on Sunday, and have branded their devotion to their principles as obstinacy; but so did the Roman emperors the refusal of the early Christians to offer incense to Cesar. The Christians, they argued, were not forbidden to worship Jehovah; they were only required to honor the gods of Rome. It is the same to-day with the Seventh-day Adventists: they are not forbidden, say the courts "to keep their Sabbath; they are only required not to work on 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." <sup>118</sup>1 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 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," <sup>119</sup>2 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." <sup>120</sup>3

ADVENTISTS can go to prison, or to death, if need be, but they cannot even seem to keep Sunday.

**"Roman Catholic Saints and Miracles" *American Sentinel* 9, 45 , pp. 353, 354.**

IN our examination of the subject last week, it was shown that notwithstanding the inspired declaration that in Christ only is there salvation, because "there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved," <sup>121</sup>1 notwithstanding this

fact, we say, it was shown that Roman Catholics all over the world are praying for temporal help and eternal salvation to myriads of dead men and dead women, whom the Scriptures declare are dead, but whom the Roman Catholic Church teaches its votaries to believe are in heaven making intercession for those who invoke them.

So true is this that in the face of the inspired testimony by the Apostle Peter, Joachim Pecci, as Pope Leo XIII., claiming to be the successor of Peter, has pronounced the apostolic benediction, the blessing of Peter, upon the shrine of St. Anne in Canada, where thousands of deluded peasants ask for healing in the name of "St. Anne;" and upon Lourdes, France, where so many more thousands ask for perfect soundness in the name of "Our Lady of Lourdes," and where hundreds of letters are received daily addressed to "Our Lady of Lourdes," asking her to make the writers whole. And we are certain that should the Apostle Peter come forth from his grave and enter the church of St. Anne at BeauprÈ, or the grotto of Lourdes, France, and while the people, encouraged by the priests, were imploring "St. Anne" and "Our Lady" to heal them, should he repeat the sermon he preached in the temple he would be arrested again, not by captains sent by Jewish priests, but by captains solicited by the priests of the pretended Peter, Pope Leo XIII.

But, says the Roman Catholic, there *are* miracles wrought; if they are not performed by the saints in whose name they are implored, by what power are they performed?

Miracles in themselves are to-day the infallible evidence of but one thing, and that one thing is power. The next question is, what power? Bringing down fire from heaven was once the sign of the true God. It is not the sign to-day for "the revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him to show unto his servants," declares, in Rev. 13:12, that the time would come when a power would arise of which it is said, "He doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men." Again, miracles in the time of the Saviour were an evidence of his Messiahship, for when the messengers came from John asking, "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?" Jesus answered, "Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached." <sup>122</sup>2 Again Christ is referred to in the Scriptures of truth as "a man *approved* of God . . . *by miracles, and wonders, and signs.*" <sup>123</sup>3

But that miracles, and wonders, and signs are not to-day in themselves an infallible evidence of the truth of the cause in whose interests they are performed is shown from the following warning given by the Lord Jesus himself: "There shall arise false christs, and false

354

prophets, and shall show *great signs* and *wonders*; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." <sup>1244</sup> Again he says in that revelation which God gave to him (Rev. 1:1), speaking of a certain power that would arise,—he "deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those *miracles* which he had *power* to do." <sup>1255</sup> Thus it is seen that the three things, "miracles, wonders, and signs," which were a proof that Jesus was "approved of God," are by the same God and the same Jesus pointed out as signs of last-day antichristian powers.

But who perform these miracles, and signs, and wonders? Let the same revelation answer: "They are spirits of *devils* working *miracles*." <sup>1266</sup> Again the Lord by Paul warns of a falling away before the coming of the Lord, and in consequence, "the working of Satan with all *power*, and *signs*, and *lying wonders*." <sup>1277</sup>

If, then, miracles, and signs, and wonders are wrought when people invoke dead men,—instead of him whom God raised from the dead, and "who ever liveth to make intercession for us,"—they are miracles wrought by the spirit of "devils working miracles." It is the beginning of the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders. And this invoking dead men, instead of the living God, is itself one of the evidences of the second coming of Christ. At the time when some are waiting for the Lord, there is so remarkable a seeking unto the dead that the inspired prophet exclaims: "Should not a people seek unto their God? On behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?" <sup>1288</sup>

Thus it is seen that the Roman Catholic Church is honeycombed with the soul-destroying doctrines of Spiritualism, while at the same time claiming to be opposed to it. From all this it is seen that while claiming to be the true church of Christ, she is the habitation of devils. The miracles, and signs, and wonders to which she points as an evidence that she is the true church, instead of being wrought by her hundreds of thousands of dead "saints," are wrought by devils, and are the evidences of her apostasy.

Thus it is seen how well prepared the papacy is for the fulfillment of the part which Jesus Christ declared it would act in the closing scenes of earth's history. Here is the prophecy: "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon [paganism], out of the mouth of the beast [Roman Catholicism], and out of the mouth of the false prophet [fallen Protestantism]. 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. Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." <sup>1299</sup>

**"'Twould Be Well Were It True" *American Sentinel* 9, 45 , p. 354.**

THE everywhere continued intriguing of priests and nuns in Indian school work to secure legislation at Washington, and foster opposition among the Indians to Government Indian schools and their insidious persuading of Indian parents to withhold their children from Government schools is fast reaching a point where there is no escape from the gage of battle. We have always acted on the defensive, and hesitate to take the opposite, but there seems no escape. The overwhelming evidence of our daily experience indicates that there is to be no peace. All concessions on our part for harmony's sake are in vain. The Roman Catholic Church as such, works in unison with nobody.—*The Red Man*.

'Twould be well were the concluding sentence of this paragraph from the *Red Man* true. But it is not. The Baltimore Lay Congress of 1889, adopted this:—

There are many Christian issues to which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics *and shape civil legislation* for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice, and overlooking zealotry, we should seek an alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judaic Sabbath, we can bring the mass over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday.

It would also be well if others would not work with the Catholic Church; but such is not the case. Too many so-called Protestants stand ready to co-operate with Rome so far as her interest and theirs are the same; then they cry, halt! But Rome goes right on, and they "turn white with fear and wrath" because of papal aggression in America!

**"In a Maryland Jail for Conscience' Sake" *American Sentinel* 9, 45 ,  
pp. 354, 355.**

ROBERT R. WHALEY, a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church at Church Hill, Queen Anne's Co., Md., was committed to prison, Monday, Nov. 5, to serve a term of ninety days in the county jail at Centreville, for the crime of "Sabbath-breaking" and "doing bodily labor on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday."

There were three cases against him. The first for working Sunday, June 3, 1894, and the other two for laboring the two succeeding Sundays. In one of the warrants the offense charged was "Sabbath-breaking," and when Mr. Whaley was asked whether he would plead guilty or not guilty, he answered that he would plead, "not guilty" to the charge of Sabbath-breaking. Judge J. M. Robinson, the presiding judge, asked him if he worked on the day called Sunday, the first day of the week. Mr. Whaley answered that he had. To which the judge replied: "In this State they are the same. The Sabbath and Sunday are the same."

Five witnesses were called by the State, all of whom testified to having seen Mr. Whaley hoeing in his garden, chopping and sawing wood in his back yard. All the witnesses volunteered the information that the defendant did not deny that he worked on Sunday, but admitted it and said he had the right to do it. After the prosecuting witnesses were examined the judge asked the defendant if he had any explanation to offer.

Mr. Whaley replied that he had, and in a calm dignified manner and in a tone of voice firm and impressive, he said in substance:—

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 was never before the court until to-day. I have always endeavored to be a law-abiding citizen. But I am here in 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 can not 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.

The court room was crowded and this brief statement was listened to in marked silence.

Judge Robinson replied at some length to the effect that the law did not interfere with his rights to keep the seventh day, but only asked that he refrain from labor on Sunday, the first day of the week. He admitted that Sunday laws were enacted out of deference to the religious sentiment that regards the day as holy. He traced the present Sunday legislation back through the Church and State governments of modern Europe to Constantine's time. He made use of every opportunity to sitmatize the Sabbath of the Lord as the "Jewish Sabbath;" and repeatedly asserted that the defendant was not conscientious in the matter of working on Sunday. Mr. Whaley remarked that he was, but the judge said he did not wish to argue the question and did not give him an opportunity to explain why he was conscientious regarding the necessity of working on Sunday. The judge spoke in a kindly manner, and repeatedly offered to suspend fines in the second and third cases "if the defendant would show a disposition to obey the law." Of course Mr. Whaley could not compromise the matter and the judge fined him five dollars and costs in each of the three cases. At this writing the amount of the costs is not obtainable, but the amount does not affect the length of the term of imprisonment, as the time is limited by law to thirty days for each separate case.

Mr. Whaley is forty-two years old and has a wife and seven children dependent on him for support. Previous to his becoming a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church he was a probationary member of the Methodist Church, and it is a very significant fact in this connection that four of the five prosecuting witnesses were members of the Methodist Church, and Mr. Whaley's former brethren.

In the summer of 1893, Elders Robinson and Horton, Seventh-day Adventist ministers, came to Church Hill, a town of five hundred inhabitants, and held a series of meetings which resulted in the organization of a small church. The opposition was very bitter. Attempts were made, with partial success, to cut down the tent in which the meetings were held and at the same time the mob, with pious enthusiasm, came with tar and feathers with avowed intention of decorating Elder Horton and treating him to a free ride.

In the spring of 1894 work was commenced on a church building and Mr. Whaley, being a carpenter by trade, was engaged to build the church. Not wishing to give unnecessary offense and having work on

his own premises which must be done, he refrained from working on the church on Sunday, and devoted the day to hoeing in his garden and chopping firewood as his neighbors often did, and as one of them actually did at the same time as Mr. Whaley did part of the work for which he was arrested.

The other case, that of William G. Curlitt, another Seventh-day Adventist belonging to the same church, was called, but as one of the State's witnesses was absent the case was postponed until Wednesday.

Mr. Whaley's wife is in perfect sym-

356

pathy with her husband, and though loath to be separated from him for so long a time, yet she encouraged him to faithfulness, promising to care for the family of little ones as best she can.

**"President Cleveland's Thanksgiving Proclamation" *American Sentinel* 9, 45 , p. 355.**

THE President of the United States, following the example of every president, we believe, except Jefferson, has, in his assumed role of High Priest of the nation, the *American Pontifex Maximus*, as it were, has issued his proclamation, directing certain religious observances by all the people for the 29th day of the present month. This proclamation is as follows:—

The American people should gratefully render thanksgiving and praise to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, who has watched over them with kindness and fostering care during the year that has passed. They should also, with humility and faith, supplicate the Father of all Mercies for continued blessings according to their needs, and they should, by deeds of charity, seek the favor of the Giver of every good and perfect gift.

Therefore I, Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, do hereby appoint and set apart Thursday, the twenty-ninth day of November, instant, as a day of thanksgiving and prayer, to be kept and observed by all the people of the land.

On that day let our ordinary work and business be suspended, and let us meet in our accustomed places of worship and give thanks to Almighty God for our preservation as a nation, for our immunity from disease and pestilence, for the harvests that have rewarded our husbandry, for a renewal of national prosperity, and for every advance in virtue and intelligence that has marked our growth as a people.

And with our thanksgiving let us pray that these blessings may be multiplied unto us, that our national conscience may be quickened to a better recognition of the power and goodness of God, and that in our national life we may clearer see and closer follow the path of righteousness.

And in our places of worship and praise, as well as in the happy reunions of kindred and friends, on that day let us invoke Divine approval by generously remembering the poor and needy. Surely He who has given us comfort and plenty will look upon our relief of the destitute and our ministrations of charity as the work of hearts truly grateful and as proofs of the sincerity of our thanksgiving.

Witness my hand and the seal of the United States, which I have caused to be hereto affixed.

Done at the city of Washington on the first day of November, in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and ninety-four, and of the independence of the United States the 119th.

[Seal.] GROVER CLEVELAND.

By the President: W. Q. GRESHAM, *Secretary of State*.

The terms of this proclamation are mandatory, but of course there being no penalty for non-observance of the prescribed religious services, the people will do as they please on the 19th instant, so far as observing the day sacred to the American stomach is concerned. But we are constrained to agree with Jefferson, who thus stated his reasons for not issuing the customary proclamation:—

I consider the Government of the United States *as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline, or exercises*. . . . But it is only proposed that I should *recommend*, not prescribe, a day of fasting and prayer. That is, that I should *indirectly* assume to the United States an authority over religious exercises, *which the Constitution has directly precluded them from*. It must be meant, too, that this recommendation is to carry some authority, and to be sanctioned by some penalty on those who disregard it; not, indeed, of fine and imprisonment, but of some degree of proscription, perhaps in public opinion. And does the change in the nature of the penalty make the recommendation less a *law* of conduct for those to whom it is directed? I do not believe it is for the interest of religion to invite the civil magistrate to direct its exercises, its discipline, or its doctrines; nor of the religious societies, that the General Government should be invested with the power of effecting any uniformity of time or matter among them. Fasting and prayer are religious exercises; the enjoining them, an act of discipline. Every religious society has a right to determine for itself the times for these exercises, and the objects proper for them, according to their own particular tenets;

and this right can never be safer than in their own hands, *where the Constitution has deposited it.*

Jefferson, it will be remembered, was one of the framers of the Constitution, and probably knew its meanings as well as any man then living, and much better than any man now living.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 45 , p. 360.**

READ on pages 354 and 356 how Adventists are imprisoned in Switzerland, and in America for refusal to keep the papal Sabbath, the "wild solar holiday of all pagan times." Persecution of Sabbath-keepers is fast becoming world-wide. But it is only that which prophecy foretells, and Adventists have long expected; it is one of the "these things" to which our Lord referred when he said: "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Let the persecuted Adventists pray and sing praises in their prisons, even as Paul and Silas did in the Philippians jail, for though unseen by mortal eyes, He for whom they suffer, suffers with them and sustains them by his grace. It is a time to be "strong and very courageous."

THE New York *Sun* thinks that if the Seventh-day Adventist farmer "of Tennessee who was arrested and imprisoned for plowing his land on a Sunday, had been able to carry his case up to the highest court, he might have gained it, on the ground that his conviction was in violation of the constitutional provision of religious freedom." The *Sun* ought to know that the Supreme Court of the United States has, in effect, decided over and over again that the so-called constitutional guarantee of religious liberty in the Constitution of the United States is no guarantee at all, for it only inhibits *Congress* from making any "law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The constitutional guarantee that "no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury," has been repeatedly held to apply only to cases arising under the laws of the United States. The principle is the same. The moral is that the Constitution of the United States contains much less ample provisions of liberty, both civil and religious, than many have supposed.

ANOTHER provision of the Constitution of the United States is that "the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended, unless in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it." But the Alien Contract Labor law and the Chinese Exclusion act

both suspend the writ so far as it relates to those affected by the laws referred to. Persons accused of being contract laborers or of being in the country in violation of the exclusion act, have no recourse to the courts. The decision of the Treasury Department in such cases is final. This fact illustrates the truth that no constitutional guarantee is of any value except it is sustained by public sentiment. This country is now ruled less by constitutional law than by public clamor.

AMONG our significant paragraphs is one entitled, "Cardinal Gibbons on the Basis of Unity," which is worthy of note, not only because of the statements he makes regarding the desire among "Protestant" ministers for union, but because of his incidental admission that "the church" was corrupt in Luther's day. The point which he endeavors to make against Luther and Calvin is easily answered. The cardinal admits that abuses and iniquity in "the church." It is then enough to reply to his censure of the Reformers that the abuses and the iniquity were a necessary result of the system. Tetzal peddled indulgences in Germany under the authority of Leo X.

**November 22, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 46 , p. 361.**

WHEN Robert R. Whaley, the Seventh-day Adventist now serving a term of ninety days in the county jail at Centreville, Md., for hoeing in his garden on Sunday, was asked at his trial by Judge Robinson whether he would plead "guilty" or "not guilty," he replied that he would plead "not guilty" to that part of the warrant charging "Sabbath breaking," as he had not worked on the Sabbath.

THE judge then asked him if he had worked on Sunday, the first day of the week.

Mr. Whaley answered that he had. The judge then replied: "In this State they are the same. The Sabbath and Sunday are the same."

In the State of Maryland there is a contention between sects that profess the Christian faith as to which day, the first or the seventh, is commanded of God to be observed as the Sabbath. Judge Robinson has adjudged the right of the State of Maryland to manifest a preference for those holding that Sunday, the first day of the week, is the Sabbath, and to attempt to force those who believe that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord" to submit to laws "made in

deference" to the Sunday-Sabbath sentiment, and observe the first-day.

In 1776, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison indorsed and presented petitions to the Virginia legislature, signed by Presbyterians, Baptists, and Quakers, calling for separation of Church and State in the colony.

THE following is a quotation from the petition:—

It is . . . impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among various sects that profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to Rome.—*Baird's "Religion in America," Book 5, chap. 3, par. 11.*

And now according to the invincible logic of James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, the Virginia Presbyterians, Baptists, and Quakers of 1776, Judge Robinson and the State of Maryland in deciding that Sunday is the Sabbath, have erected a claim to infallibility which is leading back to Rome.

**"Roman Catholicism and Spiritualism" *American Sentinel* 9, 46 , pp. 361-363.**

IN the last issue of the SENTINEL we concluded an article on saints and miracles, in which it was clearly shown that the Roman Catholic Church is honeycombed with the fundamental doctrines of Spiritualism, and that in practice she is daily seeking unto a multitude of dead men and dead women for temporal help and eternal salvation, instead of seeking unto Jesus who ever *liveth* to make intercession for men. But notwithstanding, the Roman Catholic Church is, in fact, the largest organization of Spiritualists outside of the great pagan systems of the East; she has professed opposition to the Spiritualism outside the limits of her jurisdiction, and has actually hurled condemnatory edicts against it. She has not, however, condemned the practice of seeking to men and women who are dead, but only the seeking unto the dead men and women whom the church has not canonized. In other words, the church has attempted to "corner" this whole business of seeking unto dead men and women, by prohibiting the seeking unto any save her own dead. The obvious reason for this is that there are "millions in it." Those who are encouraged to seek unto these dead men and women, are encouraged to begin that seeking by making a liberal offering to the dead "saint," and the church very generously offers to accept such offerings as the agent of all her dead "saints."

This is one reason why the Roman Catholic Church has opposed what is termed modern Spiritualism. But it is becoming more evident to members of these two spiritualistic organizations that they have so much in common that the step from modern Spiritualism to Roman Catholic Spiritualism is short and easy to take.

Margaret Fox, one of the "Fox sisters," through whom modern Spiritualism was first manifested in 1848, in what was later known as the "Rochester knockings," realized this fact, and before her death, took this short step and united with the Roman Catholic Church. And now, 1894, a Roman Catholic publishing house <sup>130</sup> 1 in London publishes a pamphlet entitled, "A Convert Through Spiritualism." The work is prefaced by Richard F. Clarke, a Jesuit priest. The writer purchased the pamphlet of Benziger Brothers, "Printers to the Holy Apostolic See," who advertised it on their special advertising bulletin, at the entrance to their New York office.

The pamphlet narrates, in the language of the convert, her conversion to Roman Catholicism as a result of seeking unto the dead through the channel of modern Spiritualism.

The Jesuit priest, in his preface, enumerates several "rules that ought to guide us in forming our opinions as to what is lawful and what is unlawful in the method of intercourse with those who belong to the invisible world," and that "even with regard to Spiritualism, we must beware of indiscriminate condemnation of all who practice it." In justification of this position he says:—

It is quite possible that God may permit some soul from purgatory to answer the summons of one who is an honest seeker after truth, just as he permits the holy souls to go unsought on messages of mercy to those on earth. There are well authenticated stories without number of the appearance to the living of those in purgatory. Why should we regard it as impossible that they should be sent to warn, instruct, or advise one, who, amid the mists of ignorance, was longing and praying for more light, and who in all good faith sought to obtain it through their instrumentality? Such exceptional cases do not in any way derogate from the general law respecting the character of Spiritualism.

The following quotations are taken from the story of the "convert," who now speaks from the standpoint of a Roman Catholic, in a publication prefaced by a Jesuit priest, and published and sold by Roman Catholic publishing houses, and is a practical proof of the conclusion already reached by many infallible proofs that Roman

Catholicism and modern Spiritualism are closely affiliated in doctrine and practice:—

"Not very long after my husband died,

362

when I was hungering and thirsting for some sign of his presence, for some evidence that he still lived and loved me, I began to hear Spiritualism discussed, and I read eagerly and listened earnestly, so as to obtain all the information I could glean. . . . I became most anxious to find some medium, but had no idea how to accomplish it, when an unexpected way was opened to me under very pleasant and desirable circumstances. A lady I knew told me she would like to introduce me to an old friend of hers, who, together with her daughter, was investigating Spiritualism in a very serious and religious manner. Accordingly, the introduction was effected, and the old lady kindly begged me to go and pay them a visit.

"Mrs. R. (as I will call her) and her daughter Margaret, had been originally Unitarians, but at the time I made their acquaintance they were Christian dissenters, the spirits having declared to them the divinity of our Lord.

"I may here add that Margaret eventually became a Catholic under the same influences which helped me to become one, although some time after my reception, and she has remained a thoroughly good and faithful child of the church for now more than twelve years, having baptized her mother on her death-bed, and instructed many in the faith. I make a point of mentioning this, because I have seen it stated, not only that Spiritualists seldom become Catholics (which is probably true, though I think many would do so if they could be brought under Catholic influences), but, that in the rare instances of apparent conversion, they have always gone back. I can only say that this is distinctly contradicted by facts within my knowledge.

"The *sÉances* held at Mrs. R.—'s house were entirely private, and were attended by no professional medium, but several of the *habitats* possessed considerable magnetic force, which had been developed and increased by these frequent meetings. There was, in particular, a certain Mr. B—, a member of the congregation to which my friends belonged, who had very extraordinary powers. He used to fall into a sort of trance, appearing like one dead, pale and livid, and then would suddenly start up, gazing straight before him into space, with eyes that had in them no speculation, and would begin to speak in voices quite other than and distinct from his own, voices of men, of women, and of children, voices refined and cultured, and voices coarse and rough, he being all the time entirely unconscious of what was being spoken through him. Occasionally a voice would be recognized by friends of the departed individual from whom it professed to emanate, but often the voices were

those of strangers, coming, for the most part, to implore prayers. I afterwards saw this "trance-mediumship," as it is called, in several other instances, especially in that of a German lady, now dead—an interesting person, of sensitive temperament and religious aspiration, who had come out of Calvinism through the teachings of her disembodied friends, and who was gradually learning Catholic doctrines. . . .

"We were bidden always to make the sign of the cross before entering into these communications, and to request any spirit, wielding to spell a message, to move the indicator in the form of a cross, as they said that evil spirits were unable to make the holy sign. We found this a great protection, but still I think we were sometimes deluded, unless it might have been, that we perhaps did not always accurately obtain a message as it was intended. . . .

"All the *sÉances* at Mrs. R.—'s were begun by prayer and the singing of hymns, by the special desire of the spirits present. They invariably begged to be prayed for, as did nearly always all the spirits with whom I was brought into contact during my investigations, in other places, and through other mediums. This fact struck me very much, and was, indeed, the first ray of light which flashed across my path. 'Is not this the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory and of prayer for the dead?' I asked of a spirit. 'Yes, and it is true,' was the reply. The spirits literally beset us with entreaties for prayers. Some of them appeared very unhappy, greatly lamenting the selfish and useless or sinful lives they had led upon earth, and which they were not expiating. 'Are you in heaven?' we would sometimes inquire of one whose words were more hopeful, and whose 'influence' was sweet and peaceful. 'Oh, no, not yet—but I soon shall be, if you will pray,' was once the answer.

"And so we prayed for the dead for the first time in our lives! Gradually many other Catholic truths were taught to Margaret and to me, spelled out by the "Indicator," but we were so ignorant of the doctrines that we did not always understand them, or recognize their full import at the time, though we began to wonder whether, as the church of Rome was apparently considerably right, it might not be actually possible that she should be right in a good deal more. And what if she should be altogether right, and be the one true teacher!

"I have heard that Mr. B— also became a Catholic eventually, but my friends, the R—'s, lost sight of him when he left their neighborhood, I am not sure of the fact.

"Another old friend, at present a professed nun, who has been a Catholic more than twenty years, often joined me in my inquiries into Spiritualism at the period of which I am writing, chiefly by putting her hand with mine on the 'Indicator,' to obtain the spelling of messages. Quite recently I paid her a visit at her convent, and,

as we were talking over the 'Auld Lang Syne,' before the conversion of either of us, and wondering at our dreads and difficulties in those now dim and distant days, she replied to my mind an incident that had escaped my memory (though I now remember it perfectly), as to a communication we had received, in reply to a question of hers, as to whether the Church of England was preferable to other forms of religion, as she believed it then to be, meaning, of course, to Protestant sects, the Catholic Church being entirely outside her region of thought. 'All these churches fall short of the ideal,' was the reply; 'the Roman Catholic Church is the true religion.' Upon this, my friend immediately exclaimed: 'Now, I know that this is not a reliable message!' Yet she says she never forgot this testimony, and considers that it indirectly helped in her conversion.

"On leaving the R—'s, I went to London on a visit, and saw a great deal of Spiritualism, of all kinds, some of which was decidedly undesirable, and dangerous even from the point of view of a non-Catholic; but I was now determined to go fully and thoroughly into the subject. I also met and became intimately acquainted with some of the most enlightened and intellectual leaders of the movement, who were in reality rather mystics of the school of Böhmen, Jung Schilling, Oberlin, and others, than ordinary Spiritualists. By one of these earnest and thoughtful persons, I was lent an old Italian 'Life of St. Catherine of Siena,' which took a great hold upon me, so much so, that I began to invoke her, asking of her, instruction as well as intercession. And from this time I came gradually to see more clearly, and to accept Catholic doctrine in a way very wonderful, considering that I had never seen a priest, or read nay dogmatic Catholic book, or spoken to any Catholic in the flesh.

"One day I went to a *sÉance* with some friends, two of whom were High Church clergymen, at the house of a well-known medium. Answers to inquiries were spelled out by raps on the table, floor, and indeed, all over the room. Questions having been asked on theological matters by the two clergymen, especially concerning the real presence, and some confusion in the answers having arise, I said, 'May I tell you what has been told to me?' As I repeated what had been given me by 'impression,' I was accompanied by a perfect chorus of raps. 'Is she right?' asked one of the clergymen. 'Yes, yes, yes,' from all parts of the room. 'How does she know this?' 'Because a very high spirit, called Cathering, is teaching her.' 'Who is this Catherine?' said one of my friends to me. I replied, 'I have been reading the 'Life of St. Catherine of Siena.' 'Yes, yes, yes,' came again from the invisible chorus. The impressional message received by me concerning transubstantiation, was, as I afterwards found when more fully instructed, entirely in accordance with Catholic doctrine. . . .

"From this time I began to go to mass, and left off attending Anglican services, but I knew no Catholics, and had not the remotest idea of how to put myself in communication with a priest. . . . I was, however, received into the church, about six months after this episode, by a very experienced and remarkable priest, now dead, to whom I was made known by an American lady, herself a convert to Catholicism through the teachings of the spirits, a friend of the person who lent me the 'Life of St. Catherine.' Her occult experiences far transcend mine in interest, and she came into the church in a much more marvelous manner. She died a few years ago, after receiving the sacraments, an undoubted instance of the perseverance of a former Spiritualist. I should like to relate many of the wonderful things she told me about her conversion, but space fails, so I will only say in passing that it would seem to have been chiefly the work of Jesuit and Franciscan martyrs, who appeared to her and taught her, she being utterly ignorant not only of the Catholic religion, but of any form of Christianity, though very desirous of truth at any price, and from whatever quarter. Her husband and some friends, impressed by these extraordinary manifestations, followed in her footsteps, and were also received in America—I believe by a Jesuit father.

"I have only been able, in this sketch, to furnish a few broad outlines of strange facts, which to some may seem startling, but which I hold to be less unusual than

363

is ordinarily supposed, for God is very good to souls who seek him.  
A. E. W."

Thus it is seen that the transfer from intercourse with the dead of the Spiritualistic *sÉance* to intercourse with the dead of the Roman Catholic calendar of saints, and *vice versa*, is short and easy. And that the Roman Catholic Church, in leaving the "Prince of Life whom God raised from the dead," to invoke a multitude of dead "saints," who have not been raised from the dead, has departed from the faith and become the victim of "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." 1 Tim. 4:1.

**"What Is Modern Spiritualism?" *American Sentinel* 9, 46 , pp. 363, 364.**

MODERN SPIRITUALISM claims to be intercourse, or communion, with the spirits of the dead. In this it is identical with ancient witchcraft, which was likewise intercourse, or communion, with the dead.

That witchcraft was a real thing, and not simply a superstition, is evident from the fact that it was prohibited by the Lord under penalty of death. In Ex. 22:19, we find the express command: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live;" and again in Lev. 20:27, we have these words: "A man also or a woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death."

The latter text records, not only the sentence of death against those who had familiar spirits, but identifies witchcraft with spiritism, or with spirit possession; that is, one not merely pretending to have intercourse with familiar spirits, but one actually having a familiar spirit was a wizard or a witch, according to sex.

The Scriptures not only forbid, under penalty of death, intercourse with pretended spirits of the dead, but they declare that the dead take no interest in human affairs (Job 14:21), that they have no power to help those who invoke them (Ps. 146:3, 4), and that they "know not anything." Eccl. 9:5. This at once brands the whole system of witchcraft, ancestral worship, and Spiritualism as deceptive and soul-destroying.

That this intercourse with pretended spirits of the dead was for the purpose of obtaining revelations from them is evident; thus we find Saul seeking to a witch for information as to the future after the Lord had forsaken him (1 Sam. 23); and in Isa. 8:19 (R.V.), we read these words: "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto the 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?"

This spirit intercourse was universal among heathen peoples. The "Encyclopedia Britannica," Art. "Manes," says: "All nations have revered the spirits of their ancestors;" and again, "In all nations of antiquity, *and in many existing savage tribes*, these spirits [supposed spirits of the dead] were held in great awe and veneration, as being powerful for good or for harm." "Offerings of all kinds were placed in the tomb or burnt on the pyre, and the rites of burial were, with the lamentations of surviving friends, thought necessary for the repose of the ghost."

That the spirits referred to in Isa. 8:19, were *evil* spirits will scarcely be disputed; else why the prohibition of communion with them? Besides it cannot be supposed that spirits in harmony with "the Father of spirits" would hold intercourse with men contrary to the will of God. But we are not left in doubt as to the character of these

spirits. The apostle says, plainly: "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils." 1 Cor. 10:20. This, then, is the reason why witchcraft, or intercourse with evil spirits, is so hateful in the sight of God; it is devil worship.

It was into this debasing idolatry that the Israelites fell when "they joined themselves unto Baal-peor, *and ate the sacrifices of the dead.*" Ps. 106:28. "It was not," says Faber, "that they ever absolutely renounced the adoration of Jehovah; but, apparently deeming him far above out of their sight, while they distantly viewed him with a decent, ineffective reverence, they addicted themselves to the more palpable funeral orgies of Thammuz, or Adonis, or Baal, or Osiris." <sup>1311</sup>

The same writer continues: "Such also is the worship, into which, according to the sure word of prophetic revelation, certain members of the church catholic [general] would lapse in the latter times. 'The Spirit,' says St. Paul, 'speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall apostatize from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines concerning demon gods.'" <sup>1322</sup>

This interpretation of the prophecy was received by the early church "probably more than twelve centuries before the Reformation." <sup>1333</sup>

But, it may be asked, has not devil worship, or witchcraft, ceased?—By no means. Has human nature changed? have demons become less wicked than formerly? are human beings any less prone to seek to know the future independently of God? A single negative will suffice to answer all these questions. Then how could demonology cease so long as the conditions necessary to its existence are unchanged?

In an article in the *Arena* for November, that well-known Spiritualist, J. M. Peebles, A.M., M.D., gives explicit testimony as to the continuance of spiritual phenomena and its identity in all ages; he says:—

Evolution is everywhere manifest. The telegraph, the telephone, the phonograph, surrogony, mesmerism, clairvoyance, psychometry, in connection with other scientific discoveries and religious aspirations, seemingly constituted the befitting time for the rediscovery and propagation of Spiritualism. We say rediscovery, for to agnostic materialists and sectarian Christians, Spiritualism, demonstrating connections communications between mortals and the overarching, invisible world of immortals, was literally a discovery, a new revelation. And yet from remotest antiquity all races and tribes had addressed and echoed these phenomena in

some form. They were considered as different periods miracles, magic, possessions, apparitions, oracles, special providence, witchcraft, demons, and angels. Their persistence, surviving the decay of deities and empires, is, according to Herbert Spencer, a proof of their reality and their value.

When in Canton, China, the guest of Dr. Kerr, physician and missionary, we chanced to speak of the spirit manifestations in America, when he coolly exclaimed: "Why, sir, these manifestations are very old in this country. China is an empire of spiritists." And to prove it he took me out to temples, shrines, and booths, where I witnessed spirit-writing and other forms of mediumistic phenomena.

Thus, it is evident that intercourse with spirits has not ceased; and that these spirits are evil is also confessed by Spiritualists themselves. Said Judge Edmonds, in his Broadway Tabernacle lecture, in this city, Feb. 15, 1855:—

I assure you from my own experience and observation, that the fascination of this intercourse is so great that its tendency is to lead men away from their proper judgment, and instill a spirit of fanaticism most revolting to the calm and restored mind.

And in the *Banner of Light*, of Oct. 26, 1864, Dr. Child said:—

Nor can we doubt, I think, that there are a diverse host of badly misdirected spirits. The lower spirits seek to undo the good work of the higher, and to harass and to annoy and subject to suffering, medium and sitter. They will *deceive us for their amusement*. Where is the medium but what has either seen or felt this? I have both, but wise spirits, who are to be the revelators and executors of the divine will, *designedly deceive us for our good*.

The same paper, in its issue of March 26, 1869, quotes Swedenborg as follows:—

When spirits begin to speak with men, he must beware that he believe nothing that they say; for nearly everything they say is fabricated by them and they are; for if they are permitted to narrate anything, as what heaven is and how things in the heavens are to be understood, they will TELL SO MANY LIES that a man would be astonished.

According to these testimonies all these are lying spirits for all deceive; one class "for our good," the other, "for their own amusement"! Judged by the Saviour's rule, all are then of the devil, for his lusts they do.

That the spirits, from whom the communications come and by whom supernatural things are performed, are not the spirits of the dead is evident from the testimony of the apostle already quoted: "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils;" and also from the inspired declaration that "the dead know not anything."

<sup>1344</sup> Moreover, the manifestations of Spiritualism are by a host of spirits, whereas revelations and manifestations from God are by one Spirit. Says the apostle: "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; *but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit*, dividing to every man severally as he will." <sup>1355</sup>

As already shown in the quotation from Mr. Faber, special warning is given in the Bible against satanic delusions in the last days. In addition to the texts which he cites, our Lord himself says: "There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, *and shall show great signs and wonders*; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." <sup>1366</sup>

Again, we are told by the apostle, that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light," <sup>1377</sup> and St. John, in describing the closing scenes of this earth's history, 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

364

kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Behold, I come as a thief." <sup>1388</sup>

Thus it is seen that the great and overpowering delusions of the last days, that shall deceive and sweep down to everlasting destruction all who are not rooted and grounded in the truth of God,—all who do not stand firmly on the divine declaration, "The dead know not anything,"—will come through what is known as modern Spiritualism, which is nothing more and nothing less than ancient witchcraft or devil worship in a new garb, the better to deceive the people to their eternal ruin.

**"The Hebrew Republic" *American Sentinel* 9, 46 , p. 364.**

WE publish in this issue under "Significant Paragraphs" a quotation from a New Jersey editor who professes to speak for the People's Party. His views of the mission of the People's Party will delight National Reformers, who are working so earnestly and successfully for the establishment of a theocracy in America, modeled after the theocracy of Israel. He regards the People's Party as the agent in the creation of the government represented by the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, of Dan. 2:47. The "Ancient of Days," referred to in Dan. 7:13, is also interpreted to referred to a representative form of government such as the People's Party are to make out of the American Republic. Here is his argument:—

The name [Ancient of Days] alludes to the fact that it is to be a government modeled after the Hebrew republic in which the masses chose their rulers, and Moses instructed them to "choose men who fear God and hate covetousness."

Now there are about as many errors in the above statement as are to be found in the average National Reform Association utterance of the same length. The following are some of the mistakes:

1. The "Ancient of Days" does not refer to a form of government, but to God, the Father, who delivers to the "Son of man" a kingdom. Dan.7:9, 10, 13, 14. Rev. 11:15. Luke 1:31-35.

2. There never was such a thing as a "Hebrew republic." The government of Israel was a theocracy. 1 Sam. 8:6, 7, also 10:12. Moses was chosen of God. Ex. 3:15.

3. The "masses" did not choose their rulers in the theocracy of Israel. Ex. 18:25, 26.

4. Moses did not instruct them to choose rulers. Ex. 18:17, 21, 22.

5. Moses himself chose the seventy rulers. Ex. 18:25, 26.

6. The editor has misquoted the scripture he here misapplies.

7. The scripture is quoted as the words of Moses to the masses, when in fact the are (when properly quoted) the words of Jethro addressed to Moses. Ex. 18:17-23.

There are enough errors in this paragraph, and of a suitable kind, to recommend their author to a place among the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association.

Our excuse for noticing this matter is that the utterances of this professed spokesman of the People's Party are exactly in harmony with the views of that combination of churches, masking under the title of Sabbath Associations, and National Reform Association, which is attempting to force upon men a day not the Sabbath, and which

has worked, and is working to deform the nation, and establish a man-made theocracy in the image of the papacy.

**"Disciples Depart From Protestant Principles,"** <sup>1391</sup> *American Sentinel*  
**9, 46 , pp. 365, 366.**

ONE of the most striking examples of the fall of American Protestantism from the principles of complete separation of Church and State is to be found in the Christian or Disciple Church. Alexander Campbell, the founder of that church, as early as 1820, combated certain "moral societies" of Western Pennsylvania,—the ancestors of the National Reform Association,—whose principal object was the enforcement of Sunday laws, in the following forcible style:—

There is no precept or command in the New Testament to pay any regard to the Lord's day, any more than any other day.

Therefore to compel a man who is not a Christian to pay any regard to the Lord's day, more than any other day, is without authority of the Christian religion.

The gospel commands as duty which can be performed without faith in the Son of God. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

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

Therefore, to command unbelievers, or natural men, to observe in any sense the Lord's day, is anti-evangelical or contrary to the gospel. <sup>1402</sup>

Speaking of his motive in opposing these compulsory Sunday observance societies, he said:—

I wrote from principle; I had no object in view but one; viz., the suppression of an anti-rational, anti-scriptural, anti-constitutional confederation, that I conscientiously believe to be dangerous to the community and inimical to civil and religious liberty. And while I am able to wield a pen, I will oppose everything of the kind, from the same principles, that comes within the immediate sphere of my observation. <sup>1413</sup>

When the movement was inaugurated, by which the churches compelled Congress to enacted a law closing the World's Fair on Sunday, the denomination of Alexander Campbell repudiated the principles of its founder, and joined in the movement. A small minority vigorously protested, calling attention to the principles so persistently advocated by Mr. Campbell. These arguments were declared by Dr. D. R. Dungan, a leading light of the denomination, to be "streaked with insanity," and one of the organs of the denomination

characterised those who maintained these views as "evangelical preachers out of color."

The following from the pen of one of the dissenting minority, Dr. J. I. Parsons, pastor of the First Christian Church of

366

St. Louis, published in the *Christian Oracle* of Chicago, July 13, 1893, is worthy a place by the side of the noble utterances of Mr. Campbell:—

I am opposed to Sunday legislation. It is contrary to our Constitution and to the New Testament. On the same principles I am opposed to the American Sabbath Association (Union). It is itself anti-American and anti-evangelical. It is the same thing in principle that Mr. Campbell opposed in the moral societies of Washington County, Pennsylvania, seventy-five years ago. I stand by the principles of this great man on this question. In respect to seeking the aid of the State in maintaining its pet notions and institutions, Protestants are scarcely a whit better than Catholics. In seeking the aid of the national legislature to prevent worldly men from "desecrating the Sabbath," *Protestants are doing the same thing they condemn in Catholics*. Both Protestants and Catholics are wrong in this regard, and if either party succeeds, *it will bring ruin to both our civil and religious liberties*. May God defeat them both. Let us fight out the question of religion and of observing holy days, and especially the Sunday question, with the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," and not with the sword of Cesar.

Another Christian minister, Dr. James A. De Moss, writing in the *Christian Standard*, of Aug. 12, 1893, offers the following courageous protest against the part his denomination took in securing the law closing the World's Fair on Sunday:

What have we done?

Our plea for apostolic Christianity, our plea for Christian union, our work and labors throughout the whole . . . for Christianity pure and unalloyed, our fights upon all things that bear the marks of Romanism, are marred by our notion in the Sunday question that has been under agitation, and will be agitated for a few years yet to be.

It seems now that we list to the misapplied Sabbath-day,—misapplied by the "infallible pope," and received as righteousness by the sectarian world. We excuse this action by differential statement, designating it the "civil Sabbath."

What has constructed or made a "civil Sabbath"?—Law. What makes law?—Man. Who made the Sabbath?—God. For whom did he make it?—For man. Can man make it for himself?—No. Then we bow before the force which takes the affairs of God into its own hands.

Who is "above all that is called God?—The papacy. To whom and to what do we bow in this question of the "civil Sabbath"?—To the pope and to Romanism.

There can be no doubt that this legislation upon the Sunday (Sabbath) question is a "mark of the beast." As a people who have vied in the creation and enforcement of this "Sabbath law," we have received upon our foreheads and upon our hands the "mark of the beast." We have not too much evidence that the first day of the week is the Lord's day: while we have conclusive evidence that the first day of the week is not the Sabbath day.

If, as we infer, the first day be the Lord's day, then what authority have we to enforce the Lord's day upon the world, or expect its recognition by legal force? Or by what authority do we assume to exact from other brethren by legal force the rights of *honest, conscientious* worship on the only day embodied in the divine law? Church and State should not be combined. Our glorious brotherhood must not assist in combining them.

If we engraft (it has been engrafted) in law the first day "Sabbath," then, indeed, as all law, it must be enforced. Besides injustice to very good and honorable people, we should know we have no right to enforce God's law upon the people that dwell in the earth, presuming it to be the Sabbath day, which we all know quite well it is not. As well might we exact a law to compel all men to be baptized, or fix in law what may constitute a Christian, or by law *create* Christians.

A person out of Christ is no better by respecting, or being compelled to respect, a day of worship; for he is not spiritually or otherwise in the realm of worship, and therefore beyond the reach (jurisdiction) of God and the Church; still this carnal law, when enforced (and enforced it will be sooner or later), has gotten higher than God.

What now is "higher than all that is called God"?—Why, it is papal authority, *unmistakable* and *certain*. And the "saddest of all sad things" is that the Church of Christ has stultified itself in its actions in this matter, and taken one step backward toward Romanism.

We have brethren who thoroughly understand this question, and this line of prophecy now under fulfillment, and know well these are facts we must confront.

For shame! May not the general convention further compromise our position upon these questions, by indorsing our national legislation upon the subject, or giving support by resolution or otherwise to a "national Sabbath"—the beginning of the union of Church and State in America.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 46 , p. 368.**

"THE Catholic Church has been made to appear in a false light to those not of her communion," says Cardinal Gibbons. Nothing could be more true; and nobody has contributed more to this result than has the cardinal himself. The mask should be once more torn aside, even as it was in Luther's days, and Rome be made to stand forth in her true character. "Rome never changes."

ANOTHER evidence that religious persecution is "without natural affection" is to be found in the treatment of Mrs. Whaley, the wife of Robert R. Whaley who is now serving a sentence of ninety days in jail for doing common labor on Sunday. Mrs. Whaley is a dressmaker, and devotes the time not occupied in the care of her large family, to this occupation by which she was able to materially aid her husband in supporting the family. But when she began the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, she became the victim of what is in effect a church boycott. Not only has an influence been brought to bear to prevent her from obtaining work, but a lady member of the Methodist Church, for whom Mrs. Whaley had made a dress, perceiving an opportunity of escaping payment and at the same time punishing a hated heretic, tendered the amount of the debt (\$5) on the seventh day. Mrs. Whaley explained to the woman, what she well knew, that she did not transact business on that day, and asked her to hand it to her later. And now this professed follower of Jesus refuses to pay the debt, alleging that her duty has been performed in tendering the money.

THE gospel of National Reform, the gospel of force, is being carried into the newly-opened portions of Africa by the missionaries that have followed closely upon the heels of the troops of the British South African Company, to which was committed the conquest of Matabeleland and Mashonaland. First, the so-called company, which is in fact the colonial government of that part of Africa, despoiled the natives of their territory by force and fraud, and then doled out grants of land to the missionaries as a speculative investment, the returns to be made in "infloence" in civilizing the natives. How the missionaries who have thus sold themselves for a mess of African pottage will succeed in serving two masters, remains to be seen; though, in view of our Lord's declaration that it cannot be done, the issue can scarcely be considered doubtful.

THE two articles in this paper, "Roman Catholicism and Spiritualism," and "What Is Modern Spiritualism?" will be found to be of more than usual interest. It has long been understood by many that prophecy teaches that in the last great conflict between truth and error, Spiritualism and Roman Catholicism, like Herod and Pilate, would be "made friends" in fighting against the truth of God; but how these two systems were ever to be united in a common cause has not been clearly seen. Now, however, light is breaking in, and it is apparent that the gulf that separates them is neither as wide or as deep as many have supposed; and that Rome, while opposing certain forms of Spiritualism all these years, is, and has been, a gigantic organization of Spiritualists. And it is now becoming apparent to both bodies that they hold enough in common to make the transfer from "*sÈance*" to saint worship, and *vice versa*, short and easy. By her saintology Rome inculcates Spiritualism, though under another name, and it is not strange that in turn the spirits testify that Rome is "the true religion." Satan is not divided against himself.

**November 29, 1894**

**"The 'Modern Inquisition'" *American Sentinel* 9, 47 , pp. 369, 370.**

NOT a week passes but brings new evidence that the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and its auxiliary State organizations, such as the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association, etc., are modeled after the papacy of the 16th century, both in spirit and methods.

At a meeting held at Williamsport, Pa., October 30th and 31st, under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association, to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the Pennsylvania Sunday law of 1794, the secretary of the association distributed a circular, headed, "Suggestions to Sabbath Defense Committees." These "Sabbath Defense Committees" are the "law and order league" arms of the Sabbath Association octopus.

And now, to show how closely these "Sabbath Defense Committees" or law and order leagues are constructed on the model of the papal Inquisition, we print, first, a cardinal-indorsed description of the origin, object and methods of that terrible tribunal. The quotation is from a Roman Catholic work, entitled, "Half Hours With the Servants of God, With a Complete History of the Catholic

Church," "Approved by His eminence Cardinal Gibbons, and Their Eminences Cardinals Manning and Newman, the Most Reverend the Archbishops of New York, Philadelphia, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, and Many Bishops," and published by Murphy & McCarthy, New York. On pages 58, 59, and 60, of this work, is found the following description of

### THE INQUISITION

For many ages after the conversion of Constantine it was easier for the church to repress heresy by invoking the secular arms than by organizing tribunals of her own for the purpose. Reference to ecclesiastical history and the codes of Justinian and Theodosius shows that the emperors generally held as decided views on the pestilent nature of heresy, and the necessity of extirpating it in the germ before it reached its hideous maturity, as the popes themselves. They were willing to repress it; they took from the church the definition of what it was; and they had old established tribunals armed with all the terrors of the law. The bishops, as a rule, had but to notify the appearance of heretics to the lay power, and the latter hastened to make inquiry, and, if necessary, to repress and punish. But in the thirteenth century a new race of temporal rulers arose to power. The Emperor Frederic II. perhaps had no Christian faith at all: John of England meditated, sooner than yield to the pope, openly to apostatize to Islam; and Philip Augustus was refractory towards the church in various ways. The church was as clear as ever upon the necessity of repressing heretics, but the weapon—secular sovereignty—which she had hitherto employed for the purpose, seemed to be breaking in her hands. The time was come when she was to forge a weapon of her own, to establish a tribunal the incorruptness and fidelity of which she could trust; which, in the task of detecting and punishing those who misled their brethren, should employ all the minor forms of penal repression, while still remitting to the secular arm the cases of obstinate and incorrigible offenders. Thus arose the Inquisition.

The duties and powers of inquisitors are minutely laid down in the canon law, it being always assumed that the civil power will favor, or can be compelled to favor, their proceedings. Thus it is laid down, that they "have power to constrain all magistrates, even secular magistrates, to cause the statutes against heretics to be observed," and to require them to swear to do so; also that they can "compel all magistrates and judges to execute their sentences, and these must obey on pain of excommunication;" also that inquisitors in causes of heresy "can use the secular arm," and that "all temporal rulers are bound to obey inquisitors in causes of faith." No

such state of thing as that here assumed now exists in any part of Europe, nowhere does the State assist the church in putting down heresy; it is therefore superfluous to describe regulations controlling jurisdiction which has lost the *medium* in which it could work and live.

And, now, with this authentic description of the Inquisition of medieval days before the reader, we submit an authentic description of an organization made in the image of the original,—the

## "MODERN INQUISITION"

### *Suggestions to Sabbath Defense Committees*

Civil government is a divine institution. Rom. 13:1-7.

Therefore—

1st. Realize that your duties are a department of that work to which your Lord and Master has called you.

2nd. Undertake the work in His name and in the spirit of His gospel.

3rd. When an offense against the law is known to you, in the spirit of Matthew 18:15-20, <sup>142</sup> 1 send one of your members, wisely selected, to talk with him (or her); whose duty it shall be to show the offender wherein he is violating the law and try to persuade him to desist, giving him reasonable time to consider the matter, if necessary. If reformation does not

370

follow this effort within a reasonable time send a committee of two of your members that they may make another and similar effort. Success will often crown the first or second effort, but if not, and you are convinced that other and more effective measures must be resorted to, make formal and definite complaint to the proper civil officer, requesting him to perform his duty as prescribed in the law and in his oath of office.

4th. If the said official refuse or fail to perform his duty, make complaint in writing to his superior in office.

5th. If all this results in disappointment and failure, one of two things remains, either secure the impeachment of the delinquent official and his consequent removal, or institute process in law against the violator, if he still continues the offense; remembering that information must be made within seventy-two hours after the offense is committed.

6th. Through the pastors of the churches secure the appointment of one Lord's day annually, when a sermon on the question of the Sabbath shall be preached from every pulpit.

7th. See to it that a representative delegation attend every County or State Sabbath Convention.

#### PENNSYLVANIA SABBATH ASSOCIATION.

J. H. LEIPER, *Field Secretary*.

There are at least seven fundamental points of similarity between the two inquisitions.

1. The papal Inquisition claimed the right to decide who were heretics. This modern Inquisition claims the same right. They declare the church dogma, "the first day is the Sabbath," to be orthodoxy, and the Bible doctrine, "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," to be heresy. They declare that the old puritanic method of Sunday-keeping is orthodox, and that visiting parks, and excursions into the country, on Sunday are heterodox.

2. The medieval Inquisition believed civil government to be a "divine institution" for the punishing of those whom the church pronounced heretics. This modern Inquisition makes the same claim.

3. The old inquisitors believed that heresy hunting was a department of that work to whom their Lord and Master had called them. These new inquisitors make the same declaration in their "Suggestions to Sabbath Defense Committees."

4. The old inquisitors imprisoned, tortured, and burned heretics "in his name," and in their interpretation of "the spirit of his gospel." These "Sabbath Association" inquisitors are instructed to "undertake the work" of fining and imprisoning little hungry newsboys and old confectionary women who have been pronounced heretics because they follow their ordinary means of obtaining a livelihood on Sunday, "in his name" and in their interpretation of the spirit of his gospel. But this interpretation of the spirit of his gospel, is satanic, and is identical with the interpretation given to the gospel of Christ by James and John when they wanted to punish the heretical Samaritans with fire. Jesus said to the would-be inquisitors of his day, and to their successors, both medieval and modern, "Ye know [sic.] not *what manner of spirit ye are of*. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." <sup>1432</sup>

5. The papal Inquisition was organized for the purpose of enforcing laws against heretics. This Protestant Inquisition was organized for the same purpose. That Sunday laws in general, and the Pennsylvania Sunday law in particular, are laws against heresy is admitted by these modern inquisitors. The following is an extract from a "Sabbath Association" history <sup>1443</sup> of the Pennsylvania Sunday law,

copies of which were distributed at the Williamsport convention at the same time as the "Suggestions to Sabbath Defense Committees:"—

When our ancestors [Presbyterians] came to Pennsylvania there was then in existence the statute of 29 Charles II., enacted in 1676, "forbidding worldly labor on the Lord's day or any part thereof." The provincial assembly of Pennsylvania, at different times, enacted laws to the same effect as that of Charles II. After the Revolution, acts were passed for the observance of the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, and the one now in force was passed the 22nd of April, 1794.

And now that the reader may see that the statute of 29 Charles II.—which the "Sabbath Association" admits is the grandfather of the Sunday law of 1794,—is a statute against heresy enacted at a time when Church and State were united and when heretics were compelled to attend church, we print the statute below:—

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. <sup>1454</sup>

Thus it is seen that the law of 1794, which is an admitted grandson of the law of Charles II., is a relic of the laws against heresy, enacted by a government in which Church and State were united and where heretics were forced by law to attend the services of the State Church. And these modern inquisitors, in attempting to enforce the Sunday law of 1794, are attempting to enforce a heresy suppressing relic of the State Church period of more than two centuries ago.

6. The medieval Inquisition was made necessary because the civil authorities were more Christian than the ecclesiastics and desired to repeal the laws against heretics or allow them by disuse to become a dead letter. This modern Inquisition is made necessary because the civil authorities are more humane than these inquisitors, and desire to repeal the Sunday law relics of State Church intolerance, or desire to permit them to remain a dead letter.

.7. The Inquisition of the 16th century attempted to compel civil magistrates to enforce the laws against heresy, and inflicted the terrible penalty of "excommunication" in case of failure. The Inquisition of the 19th century attempts to compel civil officials to enforce the Sunday law against heretics, and when they refuse the inquisitors are instructed to inflict their penalty, the "impeachment of the delinquent official and his consequent removal." And if this fails, when the offending official is again a candidate for office, an attempt is made to "knife him at the polls" by the organization of a political church boycott, as was done in the case of Senator Lyon, of Pennsylvania, in the recent campaign which resulted in his election to the office of lieutenant-governor. <sup>1465</sup>

Other points of similarity between the papal Inquisition and this modern image of it might be mentioned, but they are not necessary. The one is so complete an image of the other that the *Pennsylvania Grit*, a paper of large circulation and influence, published at Williamsport, Pa., under liberal Roman Catholic management, contained, in its issue following the Sunday-law convention, the cartoon which appears on our first page. It would be expected that a well-read Roman Catholic would be able to discern in this "gospel of force" movement a counterpart of the Inquisition of medieval days. This the editor does, and labels the movement, represented in the cartoon by its secretary, as the "modern Inquisition." This is just what it is. It is an image of that engine of tyranny by which the papacy persecuted and put to death thousands of martyrs who refused to worship that beast of cruelty by obeying its laws against heresy, and who chose to obey God rather than man.

And now that this modern Inquisition, made in the image of that cruel power, attempts to compel all men to worship it and its prototype the papacy, by compelling obedience to its laws enforcing the observance of Sunday, the mark of papal power, let all men refuse to submit to its intolerant decrees. Let no man think that in thus refusing he is fighting against either God or good government. For

that God who says the "seventh day is the Sabbath," says also, "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;" <sup>1476</sup> and of those who refuse to submit and wear the badge of Rome, and who choose to keep the Sabbath of the Lord and suffer as the martyrs of old, he says in the same connection: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." <sup>1487</sup> Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.

**"The Puritan Sabbath For "Physical Rest" <sup>1491</sup>" *American Sentinel* 9, 47 , pp. 370-372.**

IN the agitation in behalf of Sunday laws that is now being carried on all over the land, the religious character of Sunday and of the legislation is sought to be covered up by the plea that "one seventh part of time—that is, one whole day in seven, which must be Sunday—is necessary *for physical rest*" in order that men may "recuperate their wasted energies"

371

and be better prepared to successfully to prosecute the vocations of life. This is the ground also upon which courts attempt to sustain the rightfulness of Sunday laws. It is well to examine this plea and see what is its basis, and what its origin, that we may know what it is worth.

The theory of "one-seventh part of time" for rest originated in the controversy between the Puritans and the Episcopalians in the latter part of the sixteenth century, and the authority for the theory was the Rev. Nicolas Bownde, or Bound, D.D., "of Norton, in the county of Suffolk," England. Dr. Bownde was a Puritan and promulgated this theory for the first time in a book which he published in 1594, entitled "The Doctrine of the Sabbath."

The way it came about was this: It was in the height of the controversy between the Church of England and the Puritans about "habits and ceremonies, and church discipline," that the Church of England maintained,—

"That though the holy Scriptures are a perfect standard of doctrine, they are not a rule of discipline and government: nor is the practice of the apostles an invariable rule or law to the church in succeeding ages, because they acted according to the circumstances of the church in its infant and persecuted state; neither are the Scriptures a rule of human actions, so far as that

whatsoever we do in matters of religion without their express direction or warrant is sin, but many things are left indifferent. The church is a society like others, invested with powers to make what laws she apprehends reasonable, decent, or necessary for her well-being and government, provided they do not interfere with or contradict the laws and commandments of holy Scripture: Where the Scripture is silent, human authority may interpose; we must then have recourse to the reason of things and the rights of society. It follows from thence that the church is at liberty to appoint ceremonies, and establish order within the limits above mentioned; and her authority ought to determine what is fit and convenient."—*Neal's "History of the Puritans," Part I, chap. chap. viii, par. 112.*

All this the Puritans denied, and asserted that the Scriptures are a rule of discipline and government as well as a perfect standard of doctrine. The position of the Church of England, summarily stated, was, that, whatever the Scriptures do not forbid, in matters of church discipline and church government, may be done without sin. While the Puritan position was, that, whatever is not commanded in the Scriptures, in these things, cannot be done without sin. The Puritans therefore dropped all church festivals and feast days, surplices, habits, and ceremonies, and charged the Episcopalians with "popish leaven and superstition, and subjection to the ordinances of men" because they retained these. As proof which, they thought, ought to convince the Puritans that the church had liberty in such things as these, the Episcopalians produced the fact that the observance of Sunday is only an ordinance of the church and rests only upon the authority of the church; and that the Puritans therefore contradicted themselves in observing Sunday while denouncing the authority of the church, the only authority upon which that observance rests.

This put the Puritans in a box; and they had to cast about for some way to get themselves out. They would not admit the authority of the church; because, if they did, that would involve the obligation to observe all the other festivals. Directions of Scripture to observe Sunday they found none; because the only authority for a day of weekly rest is the fourth commandment, which commands the observance of the seventh day, not the first day of the week. The Puritans therefore found themselves keeping a day for which there was no authority but church authority; church authority they would not recognize; and yet they would not give up Sunday observance. But to observe it without any authority, while insisting against the Episcopalians that there must be a commandment of God for

everything that was to be done, was to condemn themselves in the eyes of all.

There was great perplexity. What could be done? Then it was that the inventive genius of Dr. Bownde found play. He committed a deliberate fraud upon the commandment of God, and came to the rescue with the theory that, It is not the definite seventh day, but "a seventh part of time" that is required by the fourth commandment to be kept for the Sabbath: that it is "not the seventh day from creation; but the day of Christ's resurrection, and the seventh day from that:" that "the seventh day is *genus*" in the fourth commandment, so that "the seventh day from creation, and the day of Christ's resurrection and the seventh from that" are "both of them at several times comprehended in the commandment, even as genus comprehendeth both his species." Thus the fourth commandment was made to enforce the seventh day from creation until the resurrection of Christ and then the first day from that time onward!

This brought joy to the Puritans, for it relieved them from the dilemma into which the answer of the Episcopalians had cast them. "This book had a wonderful spread among the people." "All the Puritans fell in with this doctrine, and distinguished themselves by spending that part of sacred time in public, family, and private acts of devotion." Says Heylin:—

"This doctrine, carrying such a fair show of piety, at least in the opinion of the common people, and such as did not examine the true grounds of it, induced many to embrace and defend it; and in a very little time it became the most bewitching error and the most popular infatuation that ever was embraced by the people of England."

But for what purpose was this "seventh part of time" appointed? for what was it to be used when it had been discovered?

"This year [1594] Dr. Bownde published his treatise on the Sabbath, wherein he maintains the morality of the seventh part of time *for the worship of God.*"—Neal, *Id.*, par. 120.

Doctor Bownde's own statement of the matter is this:—

"Wherefore being bound by his calling (Gen. 2:15) to dress and keep the garden, and yet charged (verse 3) to keep holy the seventh day, meditating upon the wisdom and mercy of God appearing, as in all the creatures, so especially in himself, and thus (Rom. 1:20) beholding the invisible things of God in them, giving thanks to God for them, praying for the continuance of them, teaching them to his posterity, etc., it was needful that the seventh day should be unto him (as it was indeed) a Sabbath day, that is, a

day of rest, resting from all his other necessary business *that so he might with his whole heart and mind attend upon these, as the worship of God requireth.*"—Book I, under 4.

There was not in it the remotest idea that this time was for physical rest. It was solely for worship and religious exercises. The suggestion of such a thought as that this time was intended or might be devoted to physical rest would have been spurned by the founder of the theory and by every other Puritan that ever lived in Puritan times, as only the suggestion of the arch enemy of righteousness. The theory therefore that a seventh part of time is necessary *for physical rest* is a positive fraud upon the original.

And that the original invention that a seventh part of time is what is commanded and required, by the fourth commandment, is a positive fraud, is clearly proved not only by the circumstances of its invention but also by every test of scripture and every rule of law.

But this theory of a seventh part of time for *physical* rest is not only a fraud upon the original Puritan theory of a seventh part of time for the worship of God, it is also a fraud upon the commandment of God which enjoins the day of rest. 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, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, 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."

Here are the reasons: First, he rested on the seventh day; second, he blessed it and made it holy. That you may become tired is not given as a reason for doing no work on the seventh day. God does not say that on the seventh day you shall do no work because if you should you would overdo or break down your physical system. Nothing of the kind. Man's physical wants are not referred to in the commandment. <sup>150</sup>2 It says, Work six days because *the Lord* worked six days; rest on the seventh because *the Lord* rested on the seventh day; keep that day holy, because the Lord blessed it and made it holy. It is the Lord who is to be held in view. It is the Lord who is to be exalted. Therefore the fourth commandment and its obligations have solely to do with man's relationship to God. It is not man's *physical* but his *spiritual* needs that are held in view in the Sabbath commandment.

This is further proved by referring again to the reason given in the commandment for the resting. It is to rest the seventh day because *the Lord rested* that day. Now did the Lord rest because he was weary from what he had done on the six days? Did he rest because if he should work longer there was danger of overdoing or breaking down his physical system? Did he rest in order to "recuperate his wasted energies?"—Not at all. "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?" Isa. 40:28. This is what the Scripture says of it; and what one of the chief Sunday-law workers says of it is this:—

"If he is never weary, how can we say of him that he rests? . . . God is a spirit, and the only rest which he can know is the supreme repose which only the Spirit can know—in the fulfillment of his purpose and the completeness as well as the completion of his work. Just as in the solemn pauses between the creative days, he pronounced his creatures, 'good,' so did he rejoice over the finishing of his work, resting in perfect satisfaction of an accomplished plan; not to restore his wasted energy."—*Rev. Geo. Elliott, "Abiding Sabbath," chap. I.*

The rest with which the Lord rested was spiritual rest, spiritual refreshing, and delight in the accomplished work of the creation. As the Lord's Sabbath rest was spiritual; and as his so resting is the reason for man's Sabbath rest, so man's Sabbath

372

is likewise to be one of spiritual rest, spiritual refreshing, and delight in the works and ways of God. This is proved by that psalm for the Sabbath day, "Thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands." Ps. 92:4. And by another scripture, "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 shall thou delight thyself in the Lord." Isa. 58:13, 14.

This is yet further shown by the fact that the Sabbath was instituted and given to man while he was yet in the garden of Eden; before he had sinned; before the word had been spoken, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread;"—before toil had become a part of man's lot; and while as yet there was no possible necessity or opportunity for an waste of energy and therefore no place for physical rest to recuperate wasted energy.

It is likewise shown in the additional fact that after men are redeemed, the earth made new, and Eden restored, the redeemed will keep the Sabbath. For it is written: "As the new heavens and the new earth which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass that, from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come *to worship before me*, saith the Lord." Isa. 66:12, 23.

A day of weekly rest is *in itself* an institution of God. Its basis is the rest of God, which was wholly spiritual. Its purpose is to cultivate the spiritual in man. Its authority is the commandment of God which is spiritual and religious, and which must be religiously and spiritually observed to be observed at all. As says the seer of Patmos, "I was *in the Spirit* on the Lord's day." The whole subject, therefore, in all its bearings, is entirely beyond the jurisdiction and even the reach of the power of civil government or of man. It rests wholly in the power and jurisdiction of God, and remains solely between the individual and God.

Thus, we repeat, it is not man's physical, but his spiritual needs that are to be held in view in the Sabbath commandment. The Sabbath is intended to be a day in which to worship God—a day of holy remembrance of him and of meditation upon his works. The day is to be kept *holy*, not civilly nor physically. If it is not kept holy, it is not kept at all in the purview of the commandment and the intention of the Author of the day of the weekly rest.

The evidences which we have here presented positively demonstrate, to the utter exclusion of every other theory, that the object of the Sabbath, the object of the weekly rest, is THE WORSHIP OF GOD.

The sum of this whole matter therefore is this:—

1. The Puritan theory of one seventh part of time for the Sabbath is, and in its inception was a fraud upon the commandment of God.

2. The theory of one seventh part of time *for physical rest* is a fraud upon the original Puritan theory.

3. The seventh part of time for physical rest is therefore *a fraud upon a fraud*.

4. In addition to its being a fraud upon the Puritan theory, the seventh part of time for physical rest is also a fraud upon the commandment of God.

5. And the Puritan theory of a seventh part of time for the Sabbath is itself a fraud upon the commandment of God.

6. The two together therefore—the Puritan Sabbath and the weekly physical rest day—interlocked as they are, form a HEAPED UP FRAUD.

That is just what the theory of one seventh part of time for physical rest is: and all the sophistry of all the preachers, and all the decisions of all the courts on earth, can never make it anything else.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 47 , p. 376.**

THE *Mail and Express*, commenting on the recent outrages committed by the Turks upon Christian Armenians, says:

Mohammedanism is bent on the extermination of Christianity in Armenia. We have been felicitating ourselves on the fact that the age of religious persecutions has passed away.

Mohammedanism has always made use of the sword in propagating itself, and in this instance is but true to its animating spirit. We ought not to be surprised therefore to hear that the Mohammedan is conducting himself naturally. It is when professed Protestant Christians in the United States, and other enlightened countries, contrary to the animating spirit of true Protestant Christianity, begin such a war of extermination on their dissenting brethren, as is now in progress in Maryland, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Manitoba, Switzerland, New South Wales and elsewhere, that men are surprised. And the *Mail and Express* is now, and has been for several years, by giving aid and comfort to the American Sabbath Union, fostering this modern crusade in America, while denouncing Mohammedan persecutions in semi-barbarous Turkey.

**December 6, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 48 , p. 377.**

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

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

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

A CARDINAL'S oath reads thus: "I,—, cardinal of the holy Roman Church, do promise and swear that . . . I will never knowingly and advisedly, to their injury or disgrace, make public the counsels intrusted [*sic.*] to me by themselves [the popes], or by messengers, or letters" <sup>151</sup> 1 [from them]. A bishop promises that "the counsels which they [the popes] shall intrust [*sic.*] me withal by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice." <sup>152</sup> 2

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

**"Did the Roman Catholic Church Ever Persecute?" *American Sentinel* 9, 48 , pp. 377, 378.**

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

I here assert the proposition. . . . that the Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty; and

that whenever any encroachments on these sacred rights of men were perpetrated by professing members of the Catholic faith, these wrongs, far from being sanctioned by the church, were committed in palpable violation of her authority.

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

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

The quotation given in this paper last week from a cardinal-indorsed Roman Catholic work, entitled, "Half Hours With the Servants of God," shows that the Inquisition was a creation of the Roman Catholic Church. Nor was this all; according to her own confession, Rome not only "forged" that diabolical weapon, but she appointed her own agents to use it, and compelled the civil power to inflict the penalties and execute the sentences of that most dreadful of all human tribunals.

But even before the creation of the tribunal known as the Inquisition, the Roman Catholic Church persecuted. According to "A Catholic Dictionary,"<sup>153</sup> 1 article, "Albigenses," Innocent III., in 1208, "proclaimed a crusade or holy war with indulgences against the Albigensean heretics, and requested Philip II., the king of France, to put himself at its head." The Catholic historian continues:—

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

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

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

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

378

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

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

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

The death of the princes referred to ended the bishop's mission, and he turned his attention to combating heresy. The pope strongly approved of the object, but refused to allow the bishop to be absent from his diocese beyond two years. The result was that Dominic was

finally left alone in the work of converting "heretics." It was thus that he was brought into contact with "heresy," and his zeal from the "true church" and the "true faith" fired to that extent that his life was given to the extirpation of "heresy," first, by the proscribing of what he probably supposed was truth; second, by the so-called "holy war;" and third, by torture inflicted under the forces of civil law. On this point Rev. Samuel Edgar says:—

The holy office as well as the holy see showed Dominic's cruelty. The Inquisition, indeed, during his superintendence, had no legal tribunal; and the engines of torment were not brought to the perfection exhibited in modern days of Spanish inquisitorial glory. But Dominic, notwithstanding, could, even with this bungling machinery and without a chartered establishment, gratify his feelings of benevolence in all their refinement and delicacy. Dislocating the joints of the refractory Albigensian, as practiced in the Tolosan Inquisition, afforded the saint a classical and Christian amusement. The kind operation he performed by "suspending his victim by a cord, affixed to his arms that were brought behind his back, which, being raised by a wheel, lifted off the ground the suspected Waldensian, man or woman who refused to confess, till forced by the violence of torture." Innocent commissioned Dominic to punish, not only by confiscation and banishment, but also with death; and, in the execution of his task, he stimulated the magistracy and populace to massacre the harmless professors of Waldensianism. "His saintship, by words and MIRACLES, convicted a hundred and eighty Albigenses, who were at one time committed to the flames." <sup>154</sup>2—*The Variations of Popery*, p. 267.

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

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

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

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

The period of the Crusades marks a turning point in the history of indulgences, for they were given more and more freely from that time onwards. In the first place it is to be noted that indulgences were given for wars analogous to the Crusades. For example, at the Council of Siena, in 1425, a plenary indulgence was offered to those who took arms against the Hussites; while wars against the

Waldenses, Albigenses, Moors and Turks were stimulated by the same means.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This was only putting into slightly different phase the papal "argument" of the thirteenth century in justification of the Albigensean Crusade and the Inquisition. It is neither better nor worse now than it was then. Then the Roman Catholic faith was regarded as the

bulwark of social order, and so to be protected by civil law; now the Sunday institution is declared to be essential to good government and so, to be jealously guarded by the State. In these Sunday law persecutions, history is simply repeating itself.

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

**"Obey the Law Until Repealed" *American Sentinel* 9, 48 , pp. 378, 379.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Ans.*—I am not.

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

*Ans.*—I certainly would.

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

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

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

379

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

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

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

God, who is the searcher of hearts, is my witness, that I am ready most earnestly to obey your majesty, in honor or in dishonor, in life or in death, and with no exception save the Word of God, by which man lives. In all the affairs of this present life, my fidelity shall be unshaken, for here to lost or gain is of no consequence to salvation. But when eternal interests are concerned, God wills not that man shall submit unto man. For *such submission in spiritual matters is real worship, and ought to be rendered solely to the Creator.* <sup>1551</sup>

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

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

We are resolved, with the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of his only word, such as is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testaments, without adding anything thereto that is contrary to it. . . . For these reasons most dear lords, uncles, cousins and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we PROTEST by these presents, before God, our

only Creator, Preserver, and Redeemer, and who will one day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people, *neither consent nor adhere in any measure whatsoever to the proposed decree* in any thing that is contrary to God, to his holy word, to our right conscience [and], to the salvation of our souls. <sup>1562</sup>

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

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

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

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

Our own day is no exception to this rule. The sectarian press of the popular religious denominations of the country, with a single

exception, indorse the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists for Sunday labor, and, like all the persecutors of the past, deny that they are the victims of persecution, or that there is any conscientious principle involved. To this point we will address ourselves in our next issue.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 48 , p. 384.**

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

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

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

convicted and sentenced to pay fine and costs or go to jail. He appealed his case, and we hope to give our readers the results of the appeal in our next issue.

**December 13, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 49 , p. 385.**

IT always costs something to consistently adhere to principle.

THE time-server and faint-hearted will always find times when it would seem to be easier, and even better, to compromise principle and lower the standard.

THIS is emphatically true in the advocacy of the separation of Church and State. The logic of one's position often leads him beyond what he saw in the beginning, and the tendency is to falter. But to falter is to suffer defeat.

THE principles of religious liberty apply not only to the Christian, but to the unbeliever as well. If God ordained freedom to believe, he just as truly ordained freedom not to believe. If he reserved to himself judgment in spiritual things in heathen lands, he did the same in so-called Christian countries; for the words, "The powers that be are ordained of God," were spoken when Rome ruled the world. Whatever legitimate authority any civil government has now, Rome had then.

BUT we find the disciples of Christ ignoring the laws of Rome that were designed to control men in matters of religious faith and practice. They fearlessly preached the gospel even when directly forbidden by the magistrates to do so. They were, therefore, violators of the civil law of a God-ordained government.

BUT neither Rome nor any other human civil government was ever ordained of God to control men in religious matters. The key to the whole apparent difficulty is found in the words of our Lord: "Render unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." This forever separates between civil and spiritual things, and marks clearly the limits of civil authority. Within this sphere civil government is God-ordained; beyond it, any human government is only usurpation. Therefore the Christian who claims freedom of conscience for himself, must unhesitatingly award the same to every other man, however much his feelings may be hurt, or his religious prejudices outraged.

BUT it costs in more ways than one to adhere to principle in the matter of the separation of Church and State. Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists have put themselves on record as desiring to be consistent in the matter of paying taxes on their church property. And the Baptists were among the first to protect against the appropriation of public money for the support of sectarian Indian schools. It is true that in one instance in Indian territory Baptists did violate the principle, but they dissolved the iniquitous partnership of their own volition before public attention was called to the fact that it existed, and have since consistently held themselves aloof from such entanglements. Adventists have never transgressed in this matter.

IN the matter of Sunday laws, Baptists have not been consistent, but Adventists have. The latter have opposed such laws not only for themselves but for all men. They have refused to accept exemption clauses on the ground that they could not consent to the right of the State to require anybody to keep Sunday. Had they compromised in this matter they might have accomplished much in the modification of Sunday statutes, but would have done nothing for real soul-liberty. They might have kept out of prisons and chain-gangs but they could not have been the means of delivering souls from the bondage of Satan. They might even now go into partnership with civil governments, but in so doing they would deny their principles. And in the words of the historian of the Reformation: "It is impossible for a society to prosper, if it be unfaithful to the principles it lays down. Having abandoned what constitutes its life, it can find naught but death."

DOUBTLESS, every temptation possible will be thrown in the way of consistent defenders of religious liberty to get them to prove untrue to their principles. Satan leaves no stone unturned to accomplish his purposes. He will frighten the timid, cajole whom he can, and retreat only when he must. It is a time for every lover of soul-liberty, every consistent defender of total separation of Church and State, to be alert. Let Seventh-day Adventists especially, who know what it is to suffer for the truth's sake, set their faces like a flint against everything "tending toward a union of Church and State *either in name or in fact.*" It is a time to "be strong and very courageous."

**"Obey the Law Until Repealed" *American Sentinel* 9, 49 , pp. 385, 386.**

LAMST week, under the above heading, it was shown that the advice given to Seventh-day Adventists—that they ought to obey Sunday laws until they could secure their repeal—by justices of the peace and judges of superior courts, as well as by those who are responsible for Sunday law prosecutions, was advice which, had it been followed in the past, would have stifled every great religious reform from the days of Daniel in Babylon to Roger Williams in America. It was shown that Daniel, the three Hebrews, the Lord Jesus, the apostles, the early Christians, Wycliffe, Huss, Jerome, Luther, the Protestant princes, Tyndale, Latimer, Ridley, Knox, Bunyan, Wesley and Roger Williams, all came in conflict with civil law in carrying forward the reforms of their day. It was also shown that they did not submit to the law until they could secure its repeal, but were true to conscience and suffered the consequences. It was also shown that the Protestant world to-day applauds the faithfulness of these violators of human law, and attributes to their faithfulness the liberty of conscience so long enjoyed.

But it is denied that there is any conscience involved in obeying a law enforcing idleness on Sunday, the first day of the week, and to this question we address ourselves in this article. However, this charge is not new. It has been made against every Reformer in every age. The conscientious scruples of the persecuted have always been denounced by the persecutor as fanatical stubbornness. The Roman rulers denounced the refusal of the early Christians to offer a few grains

386

of incense on the altar of the gods, in order to save their lives, as unreasonable and unpardonable obstinacy. Cotton Mather and the Puritan defenders of the cruel imprisonment and barbarous whipping of Elder Holmes, the Baptist minister, in replying to the criticisms of their Puritan brethren in England, answered that Elder Holmes was not "compelled" by conscience to "come into this jurisdiction" and take upon him to baptize."

But it is objected that all the reformers of old were forbidden to preach or practice their faith, while Seventh-day Adventists are not prohibited by Sunday laws from doing either. But they *are* so forbidden, and there is a principle of conscience involved.

The following conversation between an editor of the SENTINEL and a Sunday law champion will aid in making this manifest:—

*Ques.*—When you labor on Saturday, the seventh day, don't you, by that labor, preach to the world that you do not believe that Saturday, *the seventh day, if the Sabbath?*

*Ans.*—I do.

*Ques.*—Ought not Seventh-day Adventist to have the right, then, in a free country, in a land which boasts of granting equal religious liberty to all men,—ought they not to have the right to labor on Sunday, the first day of the week, and by that labor preach to the world that Sunday, *the first day of the week, is not the Sabbath?*

*Ans.*—No.

The same questions were asked the secretary of the Pennsylvania Sabbath (Sunday) Association, at its recent meeting in Williamsport. To the first question the secretary answered in the affirmative; but in the midst of the second question, he said, "Stop! I see the point you are making. No; Seventh-day Adventists do not have the right to work on the first day of the week, and teach thereby that it is not the Sabbath. We can't permit you people to desecrate the Sabbath [Sunday], and set a bad example before our children. We are in the majority, and the minority must submit." This is the situation frankly stated. "Actions speak louder than words," and in obeying the command of God to rest the seventh day, and following their usual vocations on the "six working days" (which includes Sunday, the first day), Seventh-day Adventists are preaching that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and that the first day is not, so loudly that their enemies, who have no divine command for Sunday observance, undertake to stop their preaching by the State churchman's old weapon, civil law. Yes, verily, this Sunday law crusade against Seventh-day Adventists is as certainly an attempt to stop their preaching as was the enforcement of the law which imprisoned John Bunyan an attempt to stop his preaching. And now, if there is any conscientious principle involved in a law forbidding preaching, then there is a conscientious principle involved in the law compelling Seventh-day Adventists to rest on the first day, a day which their enemies proclaim to be the Sabbath by resting upon it.

To eliminate the conscientious element from the Sunday law dispute, an effort is made by a large class to show that Sunday laws are purely secular enactments, and have nothing to do with religion. No phase of the Sunday law controversy is so manifestly weak, erroneous and wicked, as this. Even Judge Hammond, of the United States Circuit Court, felt called upon, in the King case, though deciding against the defendant, to rebuke this plea by applying to it

the term "disingenuous;" and we heartily agree with his honor in applying this term, which, being interpreted by Webster, means that the claim that Sunday laws are not religious laws, is "wanting in noble candor or frankness," "uncandid," "mean." Nothing can be more clearly demonstrated than that Sunday laws are religious. Sunday laws originated in a union of Church and State; they are clothed in religious terms, and are perpetuated by the religious element. On this point Mr. Crafts, the Sunday law champion of the United States, says: "During nearly all our American history, the churches have influenced the States to make and improve Sabbath [Sunday] laws."

The Sunday laws of the United States are descendants from the Sunday law of Charles II. of England. This fact is acknowledged by their advocates. And no one will deny that the Sunday law of Charles II. is religious, because it honestly states that its object is to secure the "keeping holy the Lord's day" "and repairing to the church thereon," and the exercise of the "duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately." The Sunday law of Maryland, under which two Seventh-day Adventists are now imprisoned in the county jail at Centreville, is nearly as honest in avowing its religious character as is its ancestor the Sunday law of Charles II.; for the section under which they are imprisoned is entitled, "Sabbath-breaking," and three times uses the religious term, "Lord's day." It also punishes persons who "*profane* the Lord's day." Webster defines "profane" as "to violate anything sacred." Thus the Sunday law of Maryland, like its antecedent the law of Charles II., attempts to compel men to keep sacred or holy the Lord's day on the first day of the week, when God commands men to keep holy the Lord's day on the seventh day of the week. He says, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but *the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord.*" The seventh day is therefore the Lord's day, and must be kept sacred on that day and not on "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday."

And now, we ask again, is there not a question of conscience involved, when the law attempts to make Seventh-day Adventists keep sacred the "Lord's day" on a day which is not the Lord's day, but one of what the Lord himself calls the "six working days."

At this point an attempt is made by judges and prosecuting attorneys, and by Sunday-law apologists in general, to parry the force of this argument, by asserting that while the law does compel the Seventh-day Adventist to recognize the sacredness of the "Lord's day commonly called Sunday," it does not forbid him to hallow the day he

regards as the Lord's day, the seventh day, commonly called Saturday. And so long as he is left free to observe the day of his choice, there is no infringement upon his rights of conscience when he is compelled to observe the "Lord's day" of the majority.

The decree of Nebuchadnezzar, calling upon Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, to fall down and worship the golden image on the day of its dedication, did not prohibit these three Hebrews from worshiping Jehovah on the seventh day, the day dedicated to his worship, and yet they refused to bow down, and the "Judge of all the earth" sanctioned their refusal and rewarded their "anarchy" with a marvelous deliverance from the fiery furnace.

But it is here objected that the cases are not parallel, because the golden image stood as the sign of an apostate and idolatrous worship, which was a rival of the worship of the true God, who had given explicit command against worshiping idols. This point will be treated in our next.

**"Compel Them to Respect Our Religious Prejudices" *American Sentinel* 9, 49 , pp. 386, 387.**

REV. H. BEER, an Episcopal minister, of Redwood, Minn., makes a vigorous protest in the *Redwood Gazette* against Sunday work, in the following arrogant language:—

MR. EDITOR:—Will you kindly give me space in your valuable paper to call attention to the fact that the mechanics were working on the jail on Sunday last. If these people have no decency enough to have some regard for our religious sentiment, then it will become our duty to compel them to respect our religious prejudices. We have a right to be considered as well as they. We do not want any work done in our town on the Lord's day, and since the jail is our own building, we consider we have something to say in the matter. We remind the offenders that there is a State law against work on the first day of the week, so if they have lost all respect for the law of God, we can compel them to pay respect to the law of the land; though we confess we should be very reluctant to do so.

While we are writing, it may not be amiss to state, for the benefit of those who haul hay, wood, etc., on Sunday, and those who engage in ball play and such sports on that day, that they render themselves liable to a fine of from one to ten dollars.

Of course the jail builders will have the usual clap-trap excuse, that they are trying to rush the building so as to have it inclosed [sic.] before winter, but we can put them on a better way of rushing it, than by working on Sunday. Let the contractor employ a half

dozen of those unemployed men who are said to be looking for work, let him work them for all they are worth on the six days, and then there will be no need to break the law of God and man, and insult the religious sentiments of our community by desecrating the Lord's day.

It would be quite a joke on them if they rushed the building by working on Sunday, and got it finished just in time for their own accommodation. H .

BEER.

Besides calling attention to the over-bearing, dictatorial tone of this letter, we wish to ask the writer how men "break the law of God" by working on Sunday, the first day of the week?

The law of God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work."

Having shown that Mr. Beer is in conflict with the law of God, it is now proper to show that he is also in conflict with the creed of his own church. Here is the position of his church as printed in the catechism:—

Is there any command in the New Testament to change the day of weekly rest from Saturday to Sunday?

None.

What, then, does this universal custom in the church seem to show?

It shows that the change of day was one of those "things pertaining to the kingdom of God" (like infant baptism, confirmation, liturgic worship, etc.), concerning which Christ gave "commandment" to his apostles after he rose from the dead. Acts 1:2, 3. <sup>157</sup>1

And here is another statement of the case from a standard Protestant Episcopal work which will show that labor on the first day of the week does not violate the

387

law of God, but only the traditions of the church:—

There are some points of great difficulty respecting the fourth commandment.

In the first place we are commanded to keep holy the seventh day; but yet we do not think it necessary to keep the seventh day holy; for the seventh day is Saturday. It may be said that we keep the first day instead; but surely this is not the same thing; the first day cannot be the seventh day; and where are we told in Scriptures that we are to keep the first day at all? We are commanded to keep the seventh; but we are nowhere commanded to keep the first day. There is another difficulty on this subject: We Christians, in considering each of the ten commandments, turn to what our Lord

says in explanation of them; for in the sermon on the mount he says, that "not one jot or tittle" of the law shall fail; that he has come "not to destroy but to fulfill" the law; and then he shows in the instance of the sixth, seventh, and third commandments, how he will require them to be fulfilled by Christians, not in the letter only, but in the spirit, the heart, and thought. . . .

The reason why we keep the first day of the week holy instead of the seventh is for the same reason that we observe many other things, not because the Bible, but because the church, has enjoined it. <sup>1582</sup>

And now we counsel Mr. Beer to read the fourth commandment and his church catechism before he writes another letter threatening to have men fined and imprisoned for breaking the law of God by working on Sunday.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 49 , p. 392.**

THE two Seventh-day Adventists recently imprisoned in Centreville, Md., for Sunday work, have been released. R. R. Whaley was convicted on three charges, and committed to jail for thirty days on each charge. But it seems that the judge determined, before adjourning court, that he should be imprisoned for only thirty days. He was released on the 3rd inst. W. G. Curlett was convicted on two charges, and was likewise committed to jail for thirty days on each. But he, too, was released in thirty days. The judge was, it seems, more merciful than the law and the complaining witnesses. This action reflects credit on Judge Robinson. It must be exceedingly distasteful to such men to be compelled by an unjust law to lend themselves to what is evidently religious persecution. The remedy is to repeal the law which makes such things possible.

WE wish to call special attention to the article on our first page, entitled, "Obey the Law Until Repealed." It answers clearly, and we trust, convincingly, a criticism often passed upon those who refuse obedience to Sunday laws.

It is strange that Christian men,—men with an open Bible in their hands,—cannot see the vital principle involved in this question of yielding obedience to laws requiring a measure of worship; for "obedience is the highest form of worship."

It is said that Sunday laws are civil, not religious; and that they require a civil and not a religious service. But assertion is not proof. The fact is, and it has been admitted by a very large majority of courts and judges, that Sunday laws are religious in this that they rest upon

the religious convictions and prejudices of the people, and are designed to guard a religious institution as such; and thus indirectly, at least, to guard religion itself. Indeed no other view was ever taken of such laws until under our scheme of complete separation of Church and State it became necessary to find a "civil" basis for such legislation.

Judge Allen, of New York, holds that the Sunday statute merely recognizes an attribute of holiness already bestowed by a higher law. His exact language is, "It does not detract from the moral or legal sanction of a law of the State, that it conforms to the *law of God*, as that law is recognized by the great majority of the people." A Pennsylvania judge in like manner declares, "Sabbath-breaking is a violation of a *divine* as well as a human law." In Arkansas, some Sunday card players were informed by the judge that the day "is set apart by *divine* appointment" "for other and better engagements." While in Maryland, it has been plainly said, "Ours is a Christian community, and the day set apart as the day of rest is the day *consecrated by the resurrection of our Saviour.*" <sup>1591</sup>

But it would not matter if every court in the world declared the legally enforced Sunday to be purely civil; the consistent Seventh-day Adventist still could not keep it. It is, the Bible teaches, a rival of God's Sabbath, and as such the man who so believes, must refuse to show it any honor no matter what the consequences to himself may be; prison, the chain-gang, or even death, may await him, but he cannot falter; he must "obey God rather than men."

A WELL-AUTHENTICATED story of the barbarous treatment of a Seventh-day Adventist colporter comes to us from Lewisville, the county seat of La Fayette County, Arkansas.

This colporter, who is employed by the Arkansas Tract Society of Seventh-day Adventists, with headquarters at Van Buren, went to Lewisville and began selling an Adventist book. He called on a Methodist minister, who said to him in substance: "That is the book, is it not, that the *Arkansas Methodist* condemned recently?"

Upon learning that it was the same book, an effort was made to have the colporter arrested, but the town clerk said he had a right to sell the book, which he continued to do. About 4 o'clock in the afternoon this Seventh-day Adventist colporter was met on the street by a number of men, headed by what proved to be the marshal of the town, who immediately ordered the colporter to leave the town.

The officer showed no badge and did not declare himself as an officer. Finally, he caught the poor Seventh-day Adventist by the shoulder, and, turning him around, ordered him to leave, and began to assist by kicking him! This was continued for some blocks, when, finally, he grew tired, and, drawing a revolver, he gave the abused colporter fifteen minutes to leave the place.

The Adventist went directly to his lodging-place and went to bed, for he had been badly used. About 8 P.M., the marshal came to the room where the victim of his abuse lay, accompanied by a man with a shot-gun. The colporter was again ordered to leave the place, but he refused to go, saying that he was a citizen of the State and had a perfectd right to remain there as long as he conducted himself properly.

The next day the affair was the talk of the town, and the valiant marshal, fearing that he would be prosecuted by the colporter, went to a justice of the peace and pleaded guilty to assault, and was fined. He was in no danger, however, so far as the poor Seventh-day Adventist was concerned, for the colporter did not intend to make complaint, preferring to leave his case in the hands of the Lord.

If this had happened to a Methodist colporter in a Roman Catholic country, it would have been religious persecution. But what is it since the victim is an Adventist, and the assailants so-called Protestants?

**December 20, 1894**

**"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 9, 50 , p. 393.**

THAT which distinguishes Christianity from every other religion is its spirituality.

WHEN Christianity ceases to be spiritual it ceases to be Christianity; for it has lost its distinguishing feature.

CHRISTIANITY is not of this world, even as its Author is not of this world; and being spiritual, and not of this world, it can be advanced only by means not of this world; hence the words of our Lord: "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." <sup>160</sup>1

THE sword stands not alone for the weapon bearing that name, but for civil power, for the authority of the State, and for all carnal force in spiritual things. Christ's kingdom is not of this world, hence its interests cannot be advanced by the use of carnal weapons. "For the

weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." 1612

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL has, from the first day of its publication until the present time, adhered consistently to this principle. It has insisted that as the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ is wholly spiritual, it not only cannot be enforced upon any person whatever, but that its promulgation cannot be either helped or hindered by worldly means; that as it cannot be promulgated by the sword, so it cannot be assisted by gifts from civil powers.

STATE support in any degree, whether in exemption from taxation or in direct gifts of land or money, means, at least, a measure of State control. But how can a spiritual church, teaching a spiritual truth, and dependent upon spiritual power, submit in any degree to be controlled by any power except her divine and spiritual Lord?

BUT, as before stated, State aid means State control, either in whole or in part. A State grants a charter to a railroad, giving it the right of eminent domain; and in return the railroad must submit to have its business regulated by the State, to an extent and in a manner beyond the control exercised over other kinds of business.

A NUMBER of citizens contribute freely in work and money to build a grist mill. The mill is built as a custom mill. Later, the owners desire to run it as a merchant mill; but they must first repay every penny donated to assist in building it, because neighborhood aid means a measure of neighborhood control.

THIS principle is clearly stated by Dr. A. P. M'Diarmid, pastor of the Tabernacle Baptist Church, Brooklyn, in his pamphlet, "Should Church Property Be Taxed?" He says: "Accepting the support of the State, we must logically accept the authority of the State over the Church. It is, practically, the argument by which the State-church has always been defended." This is sound; State aid necessarily involves State control, either directly, in legal enactments binding the Church, or in undue influence exerted by the State, and which the Church dare not resist for fear of forfeiting the favor of the State.

LOBBYING, wire-pulling, and compromise are inseparably connected with the acceptance of public lands or public funds. If the civil government, by whatever name it may be called, or whatever may be its form, gives anything to a church, it is in expectation of receiving a return in influence. The church is then expected to support the government, to indorse its laws; in short, to give its moral support in return for the bounty granted by the government. But this

no church can engage to do and remain loyal to God. It is sometimes necessary for a church to oppose the policy of a government and disobey its laws, even as did the apostles, and, like them, return to civil rulers this answer: "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." "We ought to obey God rather than men." Therefore, as the chaste woman will not accept presents from a man not her husband, and to whom she is not betrothed, so no pure church should accept bounties from any civil government under heaven.

**"Obey the Law Until Repealed" *American Sentinel* 9, 50 , pp. 393-395.**

THE Lord says, "The seventh day is the *Sabbath of the Lord*." <sup>162</sup>1 Again, speaking of the seventh day, the Lord calls it "my holy day." <sup>163</sup>2 Again the Lord says of the seventh day, "The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." <sup>164</sup>3

Besides declaring that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," the Lord of the Sabbath says, "Six days shalt thou labor," <sup>165</sup>4 and calls these six days, "The six working days." <sup>166</sup>5

Seventh-day Adventists believe the Lord. More, they obey him. They keep holy the seventh day, and commencing on the first day, they work on "the six working days."

While thus obeying the Lord, the government, instigated by representatives of opposing religions, lays its heavy hand on them and says, You are guilty of "Sabbath-breaking," <sup>167</sup>6 you "profane the Lord's day" <sup>168</sup>7 contrary to law. Seventh-day Adventists protest that they have not profaned the Lord's day, and read the words of the Lord, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord." But the law of Tennessee <sup>169</sup> 8 replies, "The Sabbath day" is "Sunday." <sup>170</sup> 9 Montana, <sup>171</sup> 10 Vermont, <sup>172</sup> 11 New Hampshire, <sup>173</sup> 12 and Pennsylvania <sup>174</sup> 13 agree with Tennessee, and say, "The Lord's day" is "the first day of the week."

394

Arkansas <sup>175</sup> 14 and New Jersey <sup>176</sup> 15 join the controversy and remark, "The Christian Sabbath" is "the first day of the week." Colorado <sup>177</sup> 16 puts it a little differently and asserts that "the Sabbath or Lord's day" is "the first day of the week." Florida, <sup>178</sup> 17 Illinois, <sup>179</sup> 18 Indiana, <sup>180</sup> 19 Iowa, <sup>181</sup> 20 Kansas, <sup>182</sup> 21 and Wisconsin <sup>183</sup> 22 in . . . , "The Sabbath day" is "the first day of the week." Maine <sup>184</sup> 23 is very definite, and says, "The Lord's day" is "the first day of the

week," and "includes the time between twelve o'clock on Saturday night and twelve o'clock on Sunday night." Massachusetts <sup>185</sup>24 does not say which day is the "Lord's day," but cheerily infers that it . . . "the seventh day," and Virginia, <sup>186</sup>25 and West Virginia <sup>187</sup>26 in like manner infer that "the Sabbath day" is not "the seventh day."

Minnesota <sup>188</sup>27 in explaining her position, . . . "The first day of the week being by general consent set apart for rest and religious uses, the law prohibits the living on that day of certain oaths. . . . A violation of the foregoing prohibitions is Sabbath-breaking."

Missouri <sup>189</sup>28 agrees with Minnesota, and states that "no labor or perform any work;" "on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is "Sabbath-breaking." Nebraska <sup>190</sup>29 agrees with Missouri. Georgia, <sup>191</sup>30 Mississippi, <sup>192</sup>31 and South Carolina, <sup>193</sup>32 all agree that "the Sabbath day" is "Sunday," and Tennessee adds that the seventh day is one of the "week days."

Vermont <sup>194</sup>33 asserts that "any persons who, between twelve o'clock Saturday night and sunset on the following Sunday, exercises any business or employment" is guilty of "Sabbath-breaking."

North Dakota and South Dakota <sup>195</sup>34 are still more emphatic, and say, "Doing servile labor on the first day of the week" is "Sabbath-breaking," and one of the "crimes against religion."

Seventh-day Adventists again look at their Bibles and notwithstanding all this testimony from human law, the law of God still reads, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord."

They appeal to the United States Circuit Court, but that court says it cannot interfere. And before they can get their case before the Supreme Court of the United States this tribunal of last resort decides unanimously that "this is a Christian nation," and as one proof cites the very "Sabbath laws" <sup>196</sup>35 which oppress them and which declare that the first day of the week is the Sabbath day or the Lord's day.

Closely following this decision the Congress of the United States, in violation of the Constitution, takes sides with the States and joins in declaring that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday" <sup>197</sup>36 is the Sabbath; a thing it had for a hundred years refused to do and which the United States Senate said if done would constitute "a legal decision of a religious controversy" <sup>198</sup>37 and lay the foundation for "that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World."

When in 1829 the Senate of the United States was petitioned to enact a law enforcing the observance of the "Sabbath or first day of the week," the Senate answered by committee report: "With these different religious views ["the seventh day is the Sabbath" and "the first day is the Sabbath"], the committee are of the opinion that Congress cannot interfere. It is not the legitimate province of the legislature to determine what religion is true and what is false." Notwithstanding these solemn warnings the Congress of the United States in 1892 took sides with the several States and with the Supreme Court in deciding that the claim that the first day of the week is the Sabbath is true and that the claim that the seventh day is the Sabbath is false.

After all this has been done the demand is made that Seventh-day Adventists, *by the act of resting on the first day of the week*, shall assent to, and thereby teach, the doctrine that the "first day is the Sabbath." But with the States of the Union, with the Supreme Court of the United States, and with the Congress of the United States, declaring that the first day is the Sabbath, Seventh-day Adventists find that the commandment still reads, "*Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord.*"

For their faithfulness to the law of God and their refusal to bow to the image—a counterfeit—of that law which men have set up, they are fined and imprisoned, and when let go are admonished in future to obey the laws of the State which declare that the first day of the week is the Sabbath. Seventh-day Adventists answer, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."<sup>200</sup><sup>39</sup> When let go, they continue to labor on the first day of the week in harmony with the law of God and in violation of the law of the State.

They are again arrested, fined, and imprisoned, and told by judges that the ought as good citizens to obey the laws of the State until they could secure their repeal. Prosecuting attorneys, prosecuting witnesses, the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, State Sabbath Associations, popular churches, law and order leagues, and young people's societies assume an air of patriotic loyalty to law, and in a chorus respond, Amen. But the Seventh-day Adventists answer, "We ought to obey God rather than men."<sup>201</sup><sup>40</sup> And then the judge, whose province it is to judge according to the civil laws, leaves this judgment-seat and climbs to the throne of the Infinite, and usurps the "divine prerogative," and judges the

consciences of the accused, and tells them that there is no element of conscience involved in the question, that the law does not forbid them to keep the seventh day, but only requires them to observe the Lord's day on the first day of the week, and that there is no element of conscience involved in refraining from labor on the first day of the week, and to contend that there is but a manifestation of fanatical stubbornness.

The charge of fanaticism and stubbornness is as old as religious persecution, and has been met by the reformers of all ages. There is a conscientious principle involved, and Seventh-day Adventists will continue to maintain their loyalty to God and give a reason for the hope that is within them with meekness and fear.

The observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, or the Lord's day, is an act of religion, an act of worship. The Sabbath, or Lord's day, is commanded by the law of God which Paul declares is "spiritual" and "holy." When the State therefore attempts to compel men to observe the Sabbath, or Lord's day, it undertakes to enforce obedience in spiritual matters. And as obedience in spiritual matters is worship, so to obey the Sabbath laws of the State is to *worship* the State. And the Seventh-day Adventist says to the State, in the words of Martin Luther to the Emperor Charles V.:—

God, who is the searcher of hearts, is my witness, that I am read most earnestly to obey your majesty, in honor or in dishonor, in life or in death, and with no exception save the Word of God, by which man lives. In all the affairs of this present life, my fidelity shall be unshaken, for here to lose or gain is of no consequence to salvation. But when eternal interests are concerned, God wills not that man shall submit unto man. For *such submission in spiritual matters is real worship, and ought to be rendered solely to the Creator.* <sup>202</sup>41

But what has the Government done in presuming to decide this religious controversy regarding the Sabbath and demanding obedience to its decision under penalty of fine and imprisonment? It has done just what the Baptists, Presbyterians, and Quakers, with Jefferson and Madison, said in their memorial to the Virginia legislature in 1776, denying the rightfulness of "the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith,"—it has erected "a claim to infallibility" which is papal in principle and can but "lead us back to the church of Rome."<sup>203</sup>42 In deciding that the first day is the Sabbath, in favor of certain sects that profess the Christian religion, and against the position of

another Christian body which holds that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," it violates the great Protestant principle after which it was imaged by the hands of its founders, and is moulded in the image of the papacy which has always claimed the right to infallibly decide questions of faith and to enforce the decision by fines and imprisonment.

It is plain, therefore, that in attempting to compel Seventh-day Adventists to obey the government in the spiritual matter of Sabbath-keeping, which obedience is real worship, the attempt is made to compel Seventh-day Adventists to worship the image of the papacy.

But this is not all. The first day rival of the Sabbath of the Lord was not originated by the Government of the United States. As a so-called Christian institution the first-day Sabbath originated with the papacy, that power which Daniel said

395

would "think to change times and laws,"<sup>204</sup> 43 and which Paul prophesied would "exalt himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped."<sup>205</sup>44 The papacy claims to be able to change the time of the Sabbath of the Most High in the face of the plain command of God.

On this point Cardinal Gibbons says:—

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.<sup>206</sup>45

A standard catechism of the Roman Catholic Church speaks thus plainly on the same subject:—

*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 . . . *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 Scripture authority.*<sup>207</sup>46

Thus the church of Rome confesses that "the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week," is the Sabbath, instead of the "seventh day," originated with her. This is denied by some professed Protestants on the ground that Sunday was kept before the Roman Catholic Church was recognized as a distinct body. This does not

alter the matter. "The mystery of iniquity," which now assumes the name Roman Catholic Church, was at work in Paul's day.

But it devolves on those who keep the first day as the Sabbath and who deny the claim of Rome as the author of Sunday observance, and who accept the Bible as infallible rule of faith, to find where the great Law-giver has abrogated the command to observe "the seventh day" and enacted a law enjoining the observance of the "first day." But this they confess they cannot do. Here are some of their confessions.

The Protestant Episcopal Church says:

Is there any command in the New Testament to change the day of weekly rest from Saturday to Sunday?

None. <sup>208</sup>47

The Church of England says:—

There are some points of great difficulty respecting the fourth commandment. . . .

In the first place we are commanded to keep holy the seventh day; but yet we do not think it necessary to keep the seventh day holy; for the seventh day is Saturday. It may be said that we keep the first day instead; but surely this is not the same thing; the first day cannot be the seventh day; and where are we told in Scripture that we are to keep the first day at all? We are commanded to keep the seventh; but we are nowhere commanded to keep the first day. . . .

The reason why we keep the first day of the week holy instead of the seventh is for the same reason that we observe many other things, not because the Bible, but because the Church, has enjoined it. <sup>209</sup>48

The Methodist Episcopal Church publishes this:—

This seventh-day Sabbath was strictly observed by Christ and his apostles previous to his crucifixion. Mark 6:2; Luke 4:16, 31; 13:10; Acts 1:12-14; 13:14, 42, 44; 17:2; 18:4. . . .

Jesus, after his resurrection, changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. . . .

When Jesus gave instruction for this change we are not told, but very likely during the time when he spake to his apostles of the things pertaining to his kingdom. <sup>210</sup>49

Says Rev. Edward T. Hixcox, a Baptist minister, author of the "Baptist Manual," in a recent address before a Baptist ministers meeting of New York City:—

There was and is a commandment to "keep holy the Sabbath day," but that Sabbath-day was not Sunday. It will however be readily said, and with some show of triumph, that the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, with all its

duties, privileges and sanctions. Earnestly desiring information on this subject, which I have studied for many years, I ask, where can the record of such a transaction be found? Not in the New Testament,—absolutely not. There is no Scriptural evidence of the change of the Sabbath institution from the seventh to the first day of the week. I wish to say that this Sabbath question, in this aspect of it, is in my judgment the gravest and most perplexing question connected with Christian institutions which at present claims attention from Christian people.

Space will not admit the introduction of a great mass of similar confessions from other professedly Protestant denominations.

And now, we ask, when a civil government transforms itself into an image of the papacy and commands men to obey its decrees in the spiritual matter of Sabbath-keeping, and attempts to compel men to observe the first day as the Sabbath, when God says, "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and since the first day Sabbath is the Roman Catholic Sabbath, and since "such submission in spiritual things is real worship," it follows that to obey such laws is to *worship*, not only the image of the papacy but *the papacy itself*, and this is just the view which Roman Catholics take of the question in the following quotation:—

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. <sup>211</sup>50

But this is not all. Not only does the papacy claim the power to change the law of God; not only does it claim to *have changed* the Sabbath, the seventh day, to Sunday, the first day, but it puts forth this very change as a mark or sign of its power to command the obedience of men under penalty of sin. Here is the claim:—

*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*.

<sup>212</sup>51

And now from all this it is clearly seen that when Seventh-day Adventists refuse to obey laws made to compel the observance of the first day as the Sabbath of the Lord, they refuse to obey or worship a power which by the very act of deciding which day is the Sabbath,

and enforcing that decision upon them, transforms itself into an image of the papacy. They refuse also to obey or worship the papacy itself, which originated the Sunday rival of the Sabbath of the Lord. And, lastly, they refuse to receive, either with a willing mind or under the hand of compulsion, the Sunday institution which the papacy itself claims as the mark of its power.

And in thus refusing they are acting in harmony with the warning found in "The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him to show unto his servants," which says: "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.

This is the reason why Seventh-day Adventists cannot obey Sunday laws until they are repealed. To the statement that this position will bring them in conflict with every civilized government in the world, they answer that the Lord has predicted that the "kings of the earth and their armies" would rally to the support of this papal apostasy against those "who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" would rally to the support of this papal apostasy against those "who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." But blessed be his name, the "King of Kings and Lord of Lords" <sup>213</sup>52 marshals the "armies in heaven" for the defense of the faithful few who keep the commandments of God, and joins in battle with "the beast and the kings of the earth and their armies," <sup>214</sup>53 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 worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." <sup>215</sup>54 "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

the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." <sup>216</sup>55

And the great controversy between truth and error, the battle of the ages, is ended.

**"Still Troubled by Adventists" *American Sentinel* 9, 50 , pp. 395, 396.**

"FATHER" WALTER ELLIOTT, a Catholic priest of the order of the Paulist Fathers, in writing from Michigan, some months since, said of Seventh-day Adventists: "The sect is the most . . . of Catholicity in these parts." Mr. Ellison is still proscribed by the Adventists, who attend his meetings in Ohio, as they did in Michigan, and fill his question box with queries that seem to almost upset the equanimity of the doughty priest.

In the *Catholic World* for December, Priest Elliott says:—

In the question box our only abundant matter was furnished by the Seventh-day Adventists, for their propoganda had won over a little band of fanatics. They seemed to be surprised that I took the Protestant side of the controversy on the question of Sunday observance, and then they deluged us with angry interrogatories. I maintained that, first, a "Bible Christian," one who holds to the private interpretation of the Scriptures as the only rule of faith, can and must believe that the entire ceremonial law of the Jews is totally abolished by Christ, including all liturgical observances whatever, no less the Jewish Sabbath than the Jewish sacrifice. Second, I maintained with the catechism of the Council of Trent that there is

396

evidence is the New Testament of the selection by the apostles of the Sunday as a substitute for the Mosaic Sabbath, and if the texts are not conclusive of an obligation, they are still plainly indicative of the apostolic origin of the new custom. That gave me ample opportunity to demonstrate the need of church authority in such matters, but the two points above stated compel us, I am sure, to take sides against the Adventists. I dread their fanaticism. If they ever grow strong, the Sunday is gone from public courts and legislatures, from the industrial and domestic life of the people—an incalculable loss to religion. These new sectarians are making converts in many places, full of deadly hatred of the Catholic Church, some of whose opponents have, unhappily, supplied them with their most effective weapons to unsettle Protestant belief and practice on the question of Sunday observance.

It will be noted that "Father" Elliott acknowledges that he took "the Protestant side of the controversy on the question of Sunday

observance." It is clear therefore that he did not take the Roman Catholic position. In other words, pressed by the questions of Seventh-day Adventists he abandoned the position of his church, and took a position that the *Catholic Mirror*, the organ of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Baltimore, branded only a few months since as "groundless, self-contradictory and suicidal."

But it is not strange that a Romish priest takes a "Protestant position" when occasion demands; for, "The end justifies the means" is a time honored motto with the papacy. But it is too late in the history of the world for the priests of Rome to deny the position of their church upon the change of the Sabbath. "Father" Elliott only stultifies himself and his cause when he abandons the claim that the Roman Catholic Church changed the Sabbath, and tries to make it appear that it was done by the apostles. The catechisms and publications of the Catholic Church are against him. Every Seventh-day Adventist in the United States ought to have several copies of the *Catholic Mirror* pamphlet, <sup>2171</sup> "The Christian Sabbath," to use against this virulent priest wherever he goes. Loan them to your neighbors, and ask them to read them; and when Mr. Elliott denies the claim of his own church as put forth by the official organ of the American Cardinal-Archbishop, the people will readily see in his devious course the trail of the Romish serpent, and will judge him by the rule, *Falsus in uno, Falsus in omnibus*.

**"Is It Religious Persecution?" *American Sentinel* 9, 50 , pp. 396, 397.**

THIS question was raised by the New York *Independent*, in its issue of November 29, in an article devoted to the discussion of the recent imprisonment of two Seventh-day Adventists in Centreville, Md., for "doing bodily labor on the Lord's day."

The *Independent* has several times in the past spoken in no uncertain terms concerning the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists, for failure to observe Sunday in obedience to civil laws, and the opening paragraph of the present article has some of the old-time ring. Our contemporary says:—

In the progress of the spirit of independence and liberty persecution has become a hateful thing, an intolerance which the right-minded refuse to tolerate. It is with a feeling of humiliation, if not with positive horror, that we look back to the time in our own history, not so far away as we could wish, when the members of certain sects were proscribed and persecuted; when imprisonment

and fines were meted out to those who did not fall in with prevalent religious practices. We are not sure that we have not still among us a vestige of that species of persecution by which the civil authorities used to punish men and women for their neglect or refusal to comply with religious observances enforced by law.

This is good. We certainly still have among us very considerable "vestige of that species of persecution by which the civil authorities used to punish men and women for their neglect or refusal to comply with religious observances enforced by law." But the *Independent* grows timid as it progresses, and after giving expression to the sentiments we have quoted, begins to hedge in this fashion:—

Strictly speaking, the courts do not enforce this civil law because of the divine sanction or because of the religious observances of the day. The law is based on the idea that a periodical rest-day is for the good of men and that its enforcement is a matter of police regulation, for which it is perfectly proper that the State should make provision. This is the main ground, as we take it, but connected with it is also the principle that those who desire to observe it as a day of religious exercise are entitled to do so in quietness and peace without the disturbance which characterizes an ordinary day of labor.

Of course *all* the courts do not necessarily enforce this "civil law because of the divine sanction or because of the religious observance of the day," but because the law directs them to enforce it. That does not, however, touch the real question at all: Why are such laws enacted? Let the *Christian Statesman*, of November 3, answer:—

The State is bound to keep the Sabbath as a *witness* for God before the eyes of the people. This witness must be *kept on the witness stand* that men may profit by its testimony. The Sabbath is a witness to the Lordship of the Almighty. God designed that men should not be permitted to forget his authority. He, therefore, so orders it by means of the institutions of the Sabbath, that every seventh day there should be before their eyes a reminder of his supremacy. And so it is that all over this wide world, wherever by human authority, men are required to cease from toil on the Sabbath God has a witness on the stand testifying to his supremacy. This is why wicked men desire to annul the legislation that requires the cessation from usual labor on the Lord's day—*they want to get rid of its testimony to the authority of GOD*. . . . Next to the cross of Calvary, the ordinance of the Sabbath witnesses most eloquently to the benevolence of God.

This is a bold avowal of the real purpose of Sunday laws. *Their design is to honor a religious institution as such;* and they are

enacted in obedience to the demand of the churches. In the *Christian Statesman*, of July 3, 1890, Rev. W. F. Crafts, the great Sunday law champion, said:—

During nearly all our American history the churches have influenced the States to make and improve Sabbath laws.

In like manner, United States District Judge Hammond, in his *dictum* in the well-known King case, in western Tennessee, said:—

Sectarian freedom of religious belief is guaranteed by the constitution [of Tennessee]; 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 observance, 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. . . . he might disregard laws made in aid, if you choose to say so, of the religion of other sects.

Again, in the same connection, Judge Hammond, though deciding against King, says:—

It is a somewhat humiliating spectacle to see the Sunday advocates trying to justify the continuance of Sunday legislation . . . upon the argument that it is not in conflict with the civic dogma of religious freedom. It surely is. . . . The bare fact that the mass [of the people] desires Sunday as the public day of rest, is enough to justify its civic sanction, and the potentiality of *the fact that it is in aid of the religion* of that mass might be frankly confessed and not denied.

This is a plain statement of the fact which the *Independent* seeks to explain away, namely, that Sunday laws rest not upon civil but upon religious grounds, and hence are religious laws, *i.e.*, laws designed to control, to some extent, the people in religious things. They rest confessedly upon religious prejudices and not upon civic reasons. The *Independent* would better get off the fence. It is impossible to serve two masters. The imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists for working on Sunday is either right or it is not right. If right, let the *Independent* fearlessly defend it; if wrong, let it as fearlessly say so, as it has done in the past, and not try to carry water on both shoulders.

It is evident that the *Independent* is in a great strait betwixt a desire to please the people who demand Sunday laws, and an innate sense of justice which revolts at evident injustice. The third paragraph of the article in question runs thus:—

So far as the courts are concerned we have no reason for holding that the imprisonment of seventh day observers for laboring on the first day is in the nature of religious persecution. The courts must consider such cases as are legally brought before them, and must decide according to the law. The element of persecution may appear, however, in connection with the complaint. It is quite possible that some, whose zeal for the Christian Sabbath is warmer than their love for their Christian brethren, are led to secure the enforcement of law on account of a feeling of prejudice. However this may be, it is a painful thing to see men who conscientiously observe the seventh day, arraigned and imprisoned for refusing to observe also the first day. It looks like religious persecution; it looks like intolerance toward those who cannot conscientiously accept the views of the majority as to the Sabbath. Making all allowance for the charge that some of the seventh day people in the penalties of the law by ostentatiously violating it, it does seem to me that such cases as those in Maryland and Tennessee are an anachronism. It is perfectly easy so to nullify the law as to permit those who observe the seventh day regularly to have the privilege of working on the first day, provided they do not infringe, in their laboring, the rights of the majority. There is such a provision in the laws of this State and in those of other States, and we wish it were universal.

It may be, as before remarked, that so far as the courts in general are concerned, the motive is not religious. Indeed, we have personally known of judges who were very reluctant to try these Sunday cases, and State attorneys who were loth to prosecute them; but there are very many judges who are in hearty sympathy with just such legislation. A number of judges of various courts have been, and are, identified with the National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union, thus giving their influence to the enactment of civil laws for the enforcement of religious dogmas.

Moreover, in some cases courts have, by construction, actually made laws of just this character. For instance, the statutes of Tennessee provide a fine of three dollars for violation of the Sunday law, to be recovered before any justice of the peace. But the courts of that State have, by construction, made a law that a repetition of such acts becomes a nuisance, an indictable offense, punishable by a fine in any sum over fifty dollars, at the discretion of the jury, and under that sum at the discretion of the judge. This decision was rendered, and this law made by the Supreme Court of Tennessee in a case where an Adventist was the defendant. And this decision was made in the face of a prior decision by the same court in a similar case, but

where no religious issue was involved, to the effect that "to hold that it [ordinary labor] becomes a nuisance when carried on on Sunday, is a pervers-

397

sion of the term 'nuisance.'" Certainly, in view of this clearly expressed opinion of the same tribunal, there was no legal obligation binding the judges to decide that Sunday work was a nuisance; and this is but one of many cases that might be cited to show that judges as well as prosecuting witnesses have shown unmistakably that they were influenced not by a zeal for the maintenance of civil order, but by religious bigotry worthy of the Dark Ages.

And so it is not without reason that the *Independent* says, "It looks like religious persecution; it looks like intolerance toward those who cannot conscientiously accept the views of the majority as to the Sabbath." Yes, it certainly does look "like religious persecution;" in fact, that is just what it is; dressed, it is true, in modern garb, but the same nevertheless, though still masquerading under another name; for religious persecution has never been willing to use its proper designation. Touching this "civil" disguise of religious laws, the church historian, Robert Baird, has this pungent paragraph:—

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 as it is; wherever there is 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. 34.

This effectually disposes of the "civil law" argument. Of course, in one sense such laws are "civil," *i.e.*, in the sense that they are enacted and enforced by the civil power; but they are religious in this that they rest upon the religious prejudices of the people and are designed for the protection of religious institutions.

But the *Independent* takes another tack. It admits that the Adventists are conscientious, but thinks the matter of scarcely sufficient importance to make so much stir about. It says:—

Of course, as it seems to us, our seventh-day brethren of various Christian names make entirely too much of a particular day. It has always seemed to us that the difference as to day is a very narrow basis on which to build up separate denominations of

Christians; but it is a matter of conscience with several thousand of our brethren, and we cannot ask them to violate their consciences by working on the seventh day and observing the first. It is impossible, of course, for them to avoid prosecution by observing the first day as well as the seventh, and this is what most of them do. There is in Plainfield, N.J., a very attractive church building, recently erected by the Seventh-day Baptists. When they made their contracts with the builders it was stipulated that no work should be done on the seventh day. As most of the workmen were in the habit of observing the first day of the week, work on the building could go on only five days in the week. Of course such a peculiar contract could not be made on the most favorable terms for the church. The contractors had to take the enforced idleness of two days in the week into account, and doubtless the church had to pay a larger amount because of it.

Now, the first part of this is quite aside from the real issue. It matters not how absurd the faith of any people may be, nor how few that people, they have a natural and inalienable right to practice that faith so long as in so doing they do not infringe the equal rights of others. But the *Independent* mistakes in supposing that it is possible for Seventh-day Adventists "to avoid prosecution by observing the first day as well as the seventh." The seventh day is the badge or sign of the true God: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Eze. 20:12. In like manner the Sunday is a counterfeit of the Sabbath, the badge of an apostate power the mark of the papal power, the sign of the usurped authority of the "man of sin" "to appoint feasts and holy days, and to command men under sin." No Seventh-day Adventist can observe it and remain loyal to God. Therefore, to keep Sunday is with the Adventist to apostatize from God. But the Adventist does not deem it necessary to needlessly offend their neighbors by "ostentatiously" violating Sunday. Adventists are a quiet, well-behaved people on all days of the week; but they insist that they have, from a proper civil standpoint, as much right to follow on Sunday their usual callings as their neighbors have to follow theirs on the seventh day.

The *Independent* concludes its article by this paragraph:—

It is very often an inconvenience and a matter of hardship to these people to be faithful to their own conscientious convictions and also to obey the civil law. Of course they cannot be compelled to work on the seventh day; but, on the other hand, does their conscience impel them to work on the first day? Hardly, one would say. If there were no alternative it would be better that they should

suffer some inconvenience and loss in observing two days in the week than that the one rest day in which the great majority are united should be overthrown. When Mr. Whaley writes from jail to say that he is "thrust into prison for the sake of God's eternal truth," he does not truly represent the case. He was not imprisoned for observing the seventh day, but for working on the first day. But the number of seventh-day observers, including the Jews, is not numerous, and the law can be modified to suit their case without overthrowing the foundations of the general rest-day. It is a great deal better to be tolerant in this matter than to engage in what looks like religious persecution.

This is undertaking to say what is conscience and what is not. Mr. Whaley says he suffered for conscience' sake; the *Independent* says not. How could the *Independent* possibly know what Mr. Whaley's conscience is except by what he says it is? Resort was formerly had to torture to compel men to reveal the secrets of their hearts; and this is the logic of denying that a man's conscience is just what he says it is. But inasmuch as Mr. Whaley is an Adventist, and as we know of our personal knowledge that Adventists regard Sunday-keeping in the light in which we have presented it, namely, as a denial of the sovereignty of God, we are morally certain that Mr. Whaley's conscience is just what he says it is, notwithstanding the *Independent's* denial. The *Independent's* tortuous logic is simply indicative of the course that the remnant of the religious press will take. It is aptly expressed by a slight adaptation of the words of Pope:—

Persecution is a creature of such hideous valen  
That to be hated needs but to be seen;  
But seen too oft, familiar with his face;  
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

The Scriptures tell us that persecution is to be the lot of the last church upon earth; and that for which the *Independent* so weakly apologizes is only the beginning of the end.

**"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 9, 50 , p. 398.**

A READER, writing from Elgin, Nebr., frankly commends the course of the SENTINEL in general, but says:—

I don't think you are justified in your persistent hostility to the Catholic portion of the population of this country. There is nothing in the past history of our country to prove that they are enemies of free government or opposed to a republican form of government.

Our correspondent mistakes opposition to the doctrines of the Catholic Church for opposition to Catholics themselves. We would not injure a Catholic in any way if we could. We would not deny them a single right enjoyed by others; but we would, if we could, induce them to exchange the errors of popery for the truths of the gospel, the bondage of priestcraft for the glorious liberty of the children of God.

We have never intimated that Catholics were opposed to a republican form of government. Individual Catholics no doubt love liberty just as well as do Protestants, and they are no doubt just as ardently attached to republican institutions; but the Roman hierarchy is opposed to all liberty outside the Catholic Church, and to all government not controlled by the church. A republic denominated by "the church" would doubtless suit Rome just as well as any other form of government. Indeed, Leo XIII. seems to be rather partial to republics, doubtless because he finds it easier to dominate the people than to control the princes.

But any government dominated by Rome, or Romish principles, could be nothing but a despotism; and a despotism of the many is not less galling than a despotism of the few or of one. Republican government is a guarantee of civil and religious liberty only so long as the people know what liberty is and prize it as they ought. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," not less in a republic than under any other form of government.

It is superficial reading and thinking that makes people indifferent to encroachments on their liberties, and cause them to rest in fancied security when the very foundation principles of liberty are being assailed. "Rome never changes." And she has promised to do for this country what she has done for other countries. Rome never gave freedom to any country, but she has fettered the mind; stifled conscience; clogged the wheels of mental, moral, and spiritual progress; degraded the debauched whole peoples; murdered millions who dared to think for themselves; enshrouded the world in darkness; and she would do the same again. Verily, "Rome never changes."

- <sup>1</sup> The emphasis in this quotation is ours.—ED. SENTINEL.
- <sup>2</sup> Bower's "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 14.
- <sup>3</sup> Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," vol. 3, sec. 23, par. 2.
- <sup>4</sup> Salvian, quoted by Schaff, *Idem*. Sec. 12, par. 3.
- <sup>5</sup> Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap ii, par. 21; Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book vii, chap, xxx.
- <sup>6</sup> *Idem*, book iii, chap. ii, par. 27.
- <sup>7</sup> Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxviii, par. 8.
- <sup>8</sup> *Idem*, par. 11.
- <sup>9</sup> *Idem*, par. 12, and Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Book iii, chap. ii, par. 29.
- <sup>10</sup> Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," *Idem*, par. 29.
- <sup>11</sup> *Idem*, pars. 33, 34.
- <sup>12</sup> Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxix, par. 14; and Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. 31, par. 5.
- <sup>13</sup> Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iii, par. 8, from the end.
- <sup>14</sup> *Id.*, par. 11.
- <sup>15</sup> *Id.*, par. 14.
- <sup>16</sup> Bower's "History of the Popes," Symmachus, pars. 9, 10.
- <sup>17</sup> Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. 1, par. 5.
- <sup>18</sup> *Id.* Some writers call him Timothy the Cat; but whether "weasel" or "cat," the distinction is not material, as either fitly describes his disposition, though both would not exaggerate it.
- <sup>19</sup> *Id.*, par. 31.
- <sup>20</sup> *Id.*, pars. 21, 22.
- <sup>21</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>22</sup> Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book ii., chap. I, par. 8.
- <sup>23</sup> Bower's "History of the Popes," Celestine, par. 15.

- <sup>24</sup> Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iv., par. 2.
- <sup>25</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>26</sup> Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical History," Century ii, part ii, chap. iv, par. 1, Murdock's translation.
- <sup>27</sup> *Id.*, par. 3.
- <sup>28</sup> *Id.*, par. 5.
- <sup>29</sup> *Id.*, par. 7. Maclaine's translation.
- <sup>30</sup> Tertullian's "Apology," chap. xvi.
- <sup>31</sup> *Id.*, "Ad Nationes," book I, chap. xiii.
- <sup>32</sup> Bower's "History of the Popes," under "Pius" and "Anicetus."
- <sup>33</sup> Neander's "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. 1, Section Second, part I, div. 1, A, par. 5.
- <sup>34</sup> Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical History," Century ii, part ii, chap. ii, par. , Maclaine's translation.
- <sup>35</sup> "Epistle to the Ephesians," chap. vi, and "To the Smyrnens," chap. ix.
- <sup>36</sup> Ireneus "Against Heresies," book iv, chap. xxvi, par. 2; book iii, chap. iii, par. 2; and book iii, chap. iv., par. 1.
- <sup>37</sup> "On the Lapsed," chap. vi.
- <sup>38</sup> Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical History," Century iii, part ii, chap. ii, par. 4.
- <sup>39</sup> Epistle xxvi, chap. i. Epistle lxviii, chap. viii.
- <sup>40</sup> Epistle lxiv, chap. iii.
- <sup>41</sup> Epistle liv, chap. v.
- <sup>42</sup> "Ecclesiastical History," book viii, chap. i.
- <sup>43</sup> Draper's "Intellectual Development of Europe," chap. ix, par. 22.
- <sup>44</sup> "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii, Section Second, part I, div. I, par. 2.
- <sup>45</sup> "Life of Constantine," book I, chap. xii.
- <sup>46</sup> *Id.*, chap. xx.
- <sup>47</sup> *Id.*, chap. xxiv.

<sup>48</sup> *Id.*, chap. xxxviii.

<sup>49</sup> *Id.*, chap. xiii.

<sup>50</sup> "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. II, Section First, part I, div. A, par. 26.

<sup>51</sup> *Id.*, Section First, part I, div. A, par. 27.

<sup>52</sup> "Ecclesiastical History," book I, chap. viii.

<sup>53</sup> *Id.*, book III, chap. x.

<sup>54</sup> "Ecclesiastical History," book I, chap. xi.

<sup>55</sup> Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church," Lecture v, par. 34.

<sup>56</sup> This was actually done in the winter of 1893-94, in this city.

<sup>57</sup> Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book x, chap. v.

<sup>58</sup> *Id.*

<sup>59</sup> *Id.*, chap. vii.

<sup>60</sup> *Dark Day, The*, May 19, 1780, so called on account of a remarkable darkness on that day, extending over all New England. In some places persons could not see to read common print in the open air for several hours together. The true cause of this remarkable phenomenon *in not known*.—*Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, in Explanatory and Pronouncing Vocabulary, art., Dark Day*. The night succeeding that day (May 19, 1780) was of such pitchy darkness that in some instances horses could not be compelled to leave the stable when wanted for service.—*Stone's History of Beverly (Mass.)*.

<sup>61</sup> But the most sublime phenomenon of shooting stars, of which the world has furnished any record, was witnessed throughout the United States on the morning of the 13th of November 1833. The entire extent of this astonishing exhibition has not been precisely ascertained; but it covered no inconsiderable portion of the earth's surface.—*Burritt's Geography of the Heavens, p. 163, ed., 1854*.

<sup>62</sup> Since this was written, Mr. Debs has said in an interview at Terra Haute, Ind., July 29, that "the United States regulars came, and it was a strike against the Government."

<sup>63</sup> The "Lives of the Saints by Rev. A. Butler," a standard Roman Catholic work, indorsed by 29 bishops and archbishops, says (p. 212, Vol. 3): "Her body was brought from Palestine to Constantinople in 710, whence some portions of her relics have been dispersed in the West." The Roman Emperor Trajan reigned between the years 98 and 117. Therefore the body brought over to France during his reign was not "the hallowed body of St. Anne" at all, for "her body was brought from Palestine to Constantinople in 710," about six hundred years later. Twenty-nine bishops and archbishops against one cardinal! The chances are then 29 to 1. according to Catholic authority, that the "notable fragment of the finger bone of St. Anne," and the half of the "hand bone," before which hundreds of thousands of devout Roman Catholics are prostrating themselves and offering such prayers as, "St. Anne, obtain for me the love of Jesus crucified," were portions of some other "grandmother" or something.

<sup>64</sup> Allocution "Averbissimus," Sept. 27, 1852.

<sup>65</sup> Letter Apostolic "Ad Apostolicae," Aug. 22, 1851.

<sup>66</sup> Allocution "Acerbissimus" Sept. 27, 1852, and Nunquam fore, Dec. 15, 1856.

<sup>67</sup> Allocution "Neuo vestrum," July 26, 1865.

<sup>68</sup> Allocution "Acerbissimus," Sept. 27, 1852. Encyclical of Pope Pius IX. Dec. 8, 1854.

<sup>69</sup> "Manual of Devotion to Good St. Anne, by a Redemptorist Father." General Printing Office. A. Cot  & Co., 1891. Imprimatur E. A. Cardinal Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec. Page 283.

<sup>70</sup> *Id.* p. 372.

<sup>71</sup> "Encyclopedia Britannica," art. "Immaculate Conception."

<sup>72</sup> "Catholic Belief," p. 45.

<sup>73</sup> "Manual of Devotion to Good St. Anne," p. 5.

<sup>74</sup> *Id.* p. 110.

<sup>75</sup> *Id.* p. 119.

<sup>76</sup> *Id.* p. 158.

<sup>77</sup> *Id.* p. 102.

<sup>78</sup> *Id.* p. 71.

<sup>79</sup> *Id.* p. 72.

<sup>80</sup> *Id.* p. 150.

<sup>81</sup> *Id.* p. 153.

<sup>82</sup> *Id.* p. 153.

<sup>83</sup> Eph. 2:8, 9, 10.

<sup>84</sup> "Good St. Anne," pp. 72, 73.

<sup>85</sup> Heb. 2:16.

<sup>86</sup> Heb. 2:14.

<sup>87</sup> Rom. 8:3.

<sup>88</sup> Heb. 4:15, 16.

<sup>89</sup> Matt. 11:28, 29, 30.

<sup>90</sup> 2 Tim. 4:2.

<sup>91</sup> "Half Hours With the Servants of God."

<sup>92</sup> Ferraris, "Inquisitionis S. Officium."

<sup>93</sup> M<sup>h</sup>ler, *Kircheneschechte*, ii. 631.

<sup>94</sup> Ferraris, *loc. cit.* pp. 33-37.

<sup>95</sup> D'AubignÉ History of the Reformation, book 20, chap. 10.

<sup>96</sup> Appendix 1. Revised edition of "Protestantism True and False;" No. 19. Religious Liberty Library. Price 4 cents.

<sup>97</sup> M<sup>C</sup>lintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol. li, p. 122.

<sup>98</sup> "The Book Against the Celestial Prophets," by Martin Luther. Quoted in the "Life of Martin Luther in Pictures," p. 147; J. W. Moore, 138 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.

<sup>99</sup> Dr. Martin Luther's "Smaller Catechism." Explained in Questions and Answers, by Dr. J. C. Dietrich, p. 2. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1853.

<sup>100</sup> *Id.* p. 4.

<sup>101</sup> *Id.* p. 7.

<sup>102</sup> *Id.* p. 43.

<sup>103</sup> *Id.*

<sup>104</sup> *Id.* p. 52.

<sup>105</sup> *Ib.* p. 117.

<sup>106</sup> Senate Miscellaneous Documents, No. 50, 50th Congress. 2nd Section, p. 40.

<sup>107</sup> "Half Hours with the Saints of God," approved by Cardinal Gibbons, says of the 13th century: "The church was as clear as ever upon the necessity of repressing heretics, but the weapon—secular sovereignty—which she had hitherto employed for the purpose, seemed to be breaking in her hands. The time was come when she was to forge a weapon of her own; to establish a tribunal the incorruptness and fidelity of which she could trust; which, in the task of detecting the punishing those who misled their brethren, should employ all the minor forms of penal repression, while still remitting to the secular arm the case of obstinate and incorrigible offenders. Thus arose the Inquisition." Page 59.

<sup>108</sup> John 8:21.

<sup>109</sup> John 14:3.

<sup>110</sup> 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.

<sup>111</sup> Ps. 115:17.

<sup>112</sup> Job 14:21.

<sup>113</sup> Ps. 146:3, 4.

<sup>114</sup> John 5:28, 29.

<sup>115</sup> Eccl. 9:5.

<sup>116</sup> Acts 4:12.

<sup>117</sup> Appendix 2. Revised edition of "Protestantism True and False;" No. 19, Religious Liberty Library. Price 4 cents.

<sup>118</sup> Ezek. 20:12.

<sup>119</sup> "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, 1833, page 58.

<sup>120</sup> "Plain Talk About the Protestantism of To-day," by Mgr. Segur: Imprimature, Joannes Josephus Episcopus, Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co., Boston, 1868, page 213.

<sup>121</sup> Acts 4:12.

<sup>122</sup> Luke 7:19, 22.

<sup>123</sup> Acts 2:22.

<sup>124</sup> Matt. 24:24.

<sup>125</sup> Rev. 13:14.

<sup>126</sup> Rev. 16:14.

<sup>127</sup> 2 Thess. 2:9.

<sup>128</sup> Isa. 8:19, R.V.

<sup>129</sup> Rev. 16:13-15.

<sup>130</sup> Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, & Co., Lt., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London.

<sup>131</sup> "The Difficulties of Romanism," by George Stanley Faber, E.D., p. 186.

<sup>132</sup> *Id.*, p. 190.

<sup>133</sup> *Ib.*

<sup>134</sup> Eccl. 9:5, 6. Cf. also Job 14:20, 21; Ps. 146:1-3.

<sup>135</sup> 1 Cor. 11:4-11.

<sup>136</sup> Matt. 24:24.

<sup>137</sup> 2 Cor. 11:14.

<sup>138</sup> Rev. 16:13-15.

<sup>139</sup> Appendix 3. Revised edition of "Protestantism True and False" No. 19, Religious Liberty Library. Price 4 cents.

<sup>140</sup> "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," by Robert Richardson, p. 58. J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia. See also the *Washington Reporter* of Washington, Pa., Sept. 17, 1891.

<sup>141</sup> *Washington, (Pa.) Reporter*, July 4, 1891.

<sup>142</sup> The scripture here referred to is both in letter and spirit a positive condemnation of the whole movement in whose . . . it is cited. Note it, "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, shew him his fault between thee and him alone, if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church; and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican." Matt. 18:15-17. (R.V.)

The church is here forbidden to follow an offending member beyond the jurisdiction of church fellowship. When he refuses to listen to the admonitions of the church, the church is positively commanded to let him alone. But these modern inquisitors, like their medieval brethren, have interpreted this scripture to mean that if he will not hear the church, he is to be run down by heresy busters, brought before the civil courts, fined, imprisoned, and despoiled of his goods.

<sup>143</sup> Luke 9:55, 56.

<sup>144</sup> "Legislative and Judicial Opinions on the Observance of the Lord's Day, Commonly Called Sunday." (Leaflet.) Philadelphia Sabbath Association, 1224 Chestnut Street.

<sup>145</sup> "Revised Statutes of England from 1235-1685, A. D." (London, 1870.) Pages 779, 780.

<sup>146</sup> Lieutenant-Governor elect Walter Lyons by his opposition to the Allegheny County (Pa.) Sunday law which has a special penalty of \$25—while the Sunday law of the other counties of the State have a \$4 penalty—incur the wrath of this modern Inquisition and a church boycott was organized to defeat his election.

The following are quotations from a circular issued for that purpose:—

"TO THE VOTERS OF PENNSYLVANIA.  
"SENATOR LYON'S RECORD ON THE SABBATH LAW.

"We wish to call attention of the voters of this State to the fact that Walter Lyon, of Allegheny County, who is now a candidate on the Republican ticket of Pennsylvania for the office of lieutenant-governor, is the same Mr. Lyon who took such active part in the last legislature to have the Sunday law of Allegheny County repealed. . . .

"Mr. Lyon's actions and votes on the Sabbath question are an admonition to all law-abiding citizens and friends of good government that he is not the proper man to be elevated to the office he aspires to fill. November 6th will be an opportune time for the friends of the American Sabbath in this State to show their disapproval of his conduct by dropping his name from the ballot, even if they do not substitute another name in its place.

"It would be well for the friends of the American Sabbath in this State to have this paper circulated through the medium of the local press and otherwise.

"PENN'A SABBATH ASSOCIATION."

<sup>147</sup> Rev. 14:9, 10.

<sup>148</sup> Rev. 14:12.

<sup>149</sup> **Religious Liberty Library. No. 26, by A. T. Jones. 12pp. Price 1? cents.**

<sup>150</sup> It is not denied that physical rest is *obtained*, in the observance of the commandment; but it comes as the *consequence* of the spiritual rest which is the real meaning and object of the commandment. The observance of the Sabbath in spiritual rest is true Sabbath observance. While to attempt to observe it for physical rest is to miss it wholly and not to observe it at all.

<sup>151</sup> The Papacy by Dr. J. A. Wylie, p. 122.

<sup>152</sup> *Id.*, p. 135.

<sup>153</sup> Published in this city in 1893, by Bensinger Brothers, "printers to the body apostolic see."

<sup>154</sup> Fuerunt eliquando simul exusti CLXXX heretici ADagenses, cum antea et virtute et miraquilla eco H. Dominicus convicimet, Beil. De laic. III. 22. Veily, 5, 435. *Giannon XV. 4.*

<sup>155</sup> D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, Book VII, Chap. 11.

<sup>156</sup> *Id*, Book XIII, chap. 6.

<sup>157</sup> "Manual of Christian Doctrine," p. 127; published by James Pott & Co., 12 Astor Place. N.Y.

<sup>158</sup> "Plain Sermons on the Catechism," vol. I, pp. 334-336; by Rev. Isaac Williams, B.D., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford: Longmans, Greer & Co., 15 E. 16th St. N.Y., and 20 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; also James Pott and Co., N.Y.

<sup>159</sup> Kilgour vs. Mills, 6, G. & J. 268 (1894).

<sup>160</sup> Matt. 26:52.

<sup>161</sup> 2 Cor. 10:4.

<sup>162</sup> Ex. 20:9, 10.

<sup>163</sup> Isa. 58:13.

<sup>164</sup> Matt. 12:8.

<sup>165</sup> Ex. 20:6.

<sup>166</sup> Ezek. 46:1.

<sup>167</sup> Maryland Code of Public and General Laws, Vol. 1, Art. 27, sec. 247.

<sup>168</sup> *Id.*

<sup>169</sup> Code of Tennessee, 1884, chap. 11, sections 2015 and 2089.

<sup>170</sup> In Tennessee law, "Sabbath day" and "Sunday" are used interchangeably, as in the laws of other States the "Lord's day," the "Sabbath day" and "Christian Sabbath" are used interchangeably with "the first day of the week," or definitely designated by the term, "commonly called Sunday."

<sup>171</sup> Compiled Statutes of Montana, 1887, sec. 1408.

<sup>172</sup> Revised Laws of Vermont, 1881, chap. 201, sec. 4315.

<sup>173</sup> General Laws of New Hampshire, 1878, chap. 278, sec. 3 and chap. 5, sec. 1, of Acts of June Session 1887.

<sup>174</sup> Laws of Pennsylvania, 1883, Vol. 2, p. 1517, *et sep.* 835, sec. 3, 5.

- <sup>175</sup> Acts and resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, 1887, p. 12, sec. 1.
- <sup>176</sup> Revision of the Statutes of New Jersey, 1877, p. 1227, sec. 1.
- <sup>177</sup> Criminal code of Colorado, 1843, chap. 25, sec. 189; and chap. 64, sec. 18.
- <sup>178</sup> Laws of Florida, 1881, chap. 79, sec. 2.
- <sup>179</sup> Revised statutes of Indiana, 1888, sec. 2,000.
- <sup>180</sup> McLain's "Annotated Code and Statutes," 1888, vol. 2, chap. 12, sec. 5,438.
- <sup>181</sup> General statutes, vol. 1, 1889, sections 2,395 and 2,396.
- <sup>182</sup> Annotated statutes of Wisconsin, 1889, chap. 2, 310, sec. 4,593.
- <sup>183</sup> Revised statutes of Maine, 1882, chap. 134, sections 22 and 23.
- <sup>184</sup> General statutes of Massachusetts, chap. 28, sections 2 and 13.
- <sup>185</sup> General statutes of Massachusetts, chap. 58, sections 2 and 13.
- <sup>186</sup> Code of Virginia, 1887, p. 900, sections 3,799 3,800.
- <sup>187</sup> Code of West Virginia, second edition, 1887, chap. 142, sections 16 and 17.
- <sup>188</sup> General statutes of Minnesota, 1888, vol. 2, chap. 1, sections 221, 225.
- <sup>189</sup> Revised statutes of Missouri, 1889, vol. 1, chap. 47, sec. 3,852.
- <sup>190</sup> Compiled statutes of Nebraska, 1885, chap. 23, sec. 241.
- <sup>191</sup> Code of the State of Georgia, 1892, p. 1196, sec. 4,478.
- <sup>192</sup> Revised code of Mississippi, 1880, chap. 77, sec. 2,549.
- <sup>193</sup> Code of South Carolina, vol. 2, chap. 61, sec. 3,782.
- <sup>194</sup> Revised code of Vermont, 1881, chap. 201, sec. 4,315.
- <sup>195</sup> Compiled laws of Dakota, 1887. Under crimes against religion, sec. 6,341.
- <sup>196</sup> United States Supreme Court decision, Trinity Church case, Feb. 29, 1892.
- <sup>197</sup> Act closing the World's Fair on Sunday, signed Aug. 5, 1892.
- <sup>198</sup> "American State Papers," class 7, p. 225.
- <sup>199</sup> *Ib.*
- <sup>200</sup> Acts 4:12.

<sup>201</sup> Acts 5:29.

<sup>202</sup> D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, Book VII, chap. 11.

<sup>203</sup> Baird's "Religion in America," book 3, chap. 3, par. 11.

<sup>204</sup> Dan. 7:25.

<sup>205</sup> 2 Thess. 2:4.

<sup>206</sup> "Faith of Our Fathers," p. 111.

<sup>207</sup> "Doctrinal Catechism," by Rev. Stephen Keenan, Imprimatur, John Cardinal McCloskey: Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 5 Barclay Street, New York, 1876, p. 174.

<sup>208</sup> "Manual of Christian Doctrine," p. 127; published by James Pott & Co., 12 Astor Place, N.Y.

<sup>209</sup> "Plain Sermons on the Catechism," vol. 1, pp. 334-336; by Rev. Isaac Williams, B.D., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford: Longmans, Green & Co., 15 E. 16th St., N.Y., and 39 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; also James Pott & Co., N.Y.

<sup>210</sup> Binney's "Theological Compend, Improved," by Rev. Amos Binney and Rev. Daniel Steele, D.D.; Hunt and Eaton, New York; pp. 170, 171.

<sup>211</sup> "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," by Mgr. Segur: Imprimatur, Joannes Josephus Episcopus, Boston: Thomas H. Noonan & Co., Boston, 1868, p. 213.

<sup>212</sup> "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, p. 58.

<sup>213</sup> Rev. 19:16.

<sup>214</sup> Rev. 19:19.

<sup>215</sup> Rev. 19:20.

<sup>216</sup> Rev. 15:2, 3.

<sup>217</sup> Will be sent from this office; price single copy, ten cents; six for fifty cents.