



Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political.—Thomas Jefferson.

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 29, 1892.

NUMBER 38.

## The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 48 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, . . . ALONZO T. JONES,

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. MCKEE.

THE Government of the United States as our fathers made it, as they intended, and as they by the Constitution established it, is now a thing of the past. It is gone. Both by the Supreme Court and by Congress the intention of the fathers has been disregarded, the principles of the Government have been subverted, and the Constitution has been over-ridden.

THE action of the Supreme Court has been reviewed, and the words in which the Court did its part have been given in these columns. The action of Congress in which it did its part in this thing has also been referred to and largely discussed in THE SENTINEL. We are asked however to give more fully the actual words and proceedings in which Congress did this thing. With this request we gladly comply, for the evidence is not only important but conclusive, and should be placed before all the people.

ALTHOUGH Congress is forbidden by the Constitution to make any law on the subject of religion, yet this matter was discussed, and the law was enacted, solely from the standpoint of religion. Senator Hawley, who had the principal part in carrying this thing through the Senate, said plainly:—

Everybody knows what the foundation is. It is founded in religious belief.

And so entirely was the discussion a religious one that Senator Peffer said of it:—

To-day we are engaged in a theological discussion concerning the observance of the first day of the week.

And the chaplain of the United States

Senate, in reporting the matter to the *New York Independent*, July 28, 1892, said of it these words:—

While there were differences of opinion as to how the Sabbath should be honored, every man who spoke protested against any purpose to dishonor the fourth commandment. During this debate you might have imagined yourself in a general council or assembly or synod or conference, so pronounced was one senator after another.

SUCH is the impression received by an official onlooker. And that the impression is not at all strained is evident from the speeches that were made, as any one may see who will read the *Congressional Record* of July 12 and 13, 1892. The three principal advocates of the Sunday closing bill were Senators Colquitt, Hawley and Hiscock. As Senator Colquitt is a National Reformer nothing else was to be expected of him, and he fully sustained this character in his speech, about half of which was made up from extracts from a sermon by Father Hyacinthe, Old Roman Catholic of France. The rest of his speech was National Reform sentiment of his own manufacture. Altogether it was of such a sort that he himself began to see how incongruous it was in that place, and halted with these words:—

But I shall continue this no further, Mr. President, for it may to some sound like cant, like preaching, as though we were undertaking to clothe ourselves in overrighteous habiliments and pretend to be better than other men.—*Congressional Record*, 52d Cong., p. 6755.

SENATOR HISCOCK both preceded and followed Colquitt; and the aim and the sum of all his speech is contained in the words of surrender and servitude to the churches, to which we have before referred, as follows:—

If I had charge of this amendment in the interest of the Columbian Exposition I would write the provision for the closure in any form that the religious sentiment of the country demands and not stand here hesitating and quibbling about it. Rather than let the public sentiment against the Exposition being opened on Sunday be re-enforced by the opposition in the other House against any legislation of this kind in the interest of the Exposition, I say to the junior senator from Illinois

[Mr. Palmer] he had better yield to this sentiment and not let it go out to the country that there is the slightest doubt that if this money shall be appropriated, the Exposition will be closed on Sunday.

If I were interested in this measure, as I might be interested if it were to be located in my own State, I should make this closure provision satisfactory to those petitioners who have memorialized us against the desecration of the Lord's day.

I would not have it uncertain whether the Government might engage in business or not upon the Sabbath day. In my judgment, doubt upon this question carries with it more peril to your appropriation than it can encounter from any other cause whatever. I have nothing more to say.—*Id.*, p. 6755.

SENATOR HAWLEY both preceded and followed, both Colquitt and Hiscock. And as his speeches were longer than the others, so also were they more rabidly religious and more cringing and cowardly. Yet for all this he was not able to reach that height of religious enthusiasm and eloquence to which for this particular occasion his longing soul aspired, and so he very pertinently exclaimed:—

I wish, Mr. President, that I were the most eloquent clergyman, the most eloquent of those stanch old sturdy divines who have honored American citizenship as well as American Christianity, that I might give something more than this feeble expression of my belief in the serious importance of this vote.—*Id.*, p. 6700.

But as he could not have all his wish, as he could not be one of "those stanch old sturdy divines," such as John Cotton or John Davenport, or Cotton Mather, he made up this lack by presenting the views of Archbishop Ireland, Archbishop Gross, and Archbishop Riordan, of the Catholic Church, and followed this in order with the views of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church both North and South.

BUT although Senator Hawley could not have his wish to be one of "those stanch old sturdy divines," he could be a demagogue—and that seemingly without any particular effort. By the census of 1890 he estimated 13,000,000 members of churches in the United States. Then by

adding to this number "the people who are also attendants, associates, and sympathizers, who go to church and send their wives and children and subscribe for it, and have a profound respect for it whether they believe in it or not,"—by this method of counting he got up "from forty-five to fifty millions of the people of this country who have more or less of religious profession or sympathy." Then upon this calculation he argues thus:—

There is no use in endeavoring to escape the responsibility. If the Senate to-day decides that it will not close that Exhibition on Sunday, the Exhibition will be opened on that day, and you will have offended more than 40,000,000 of people—seriously and solemnly offended them. No wise statesman or monarch of modern times, no satrap of Rome would have thought it wise to fly in the face of a profound conviction of the people he governed, no matter if he thought it was a profound error. It is not wise statesmanship to do it.

Now, if gentlemen repudiate this, if they desire to reject it, if they deny that this is in the true sense of the word a religious Nation, I should like to see the disclaimer put in white and black and proposed by the Congress of the United States. Write it. How would you write it? How would you deny that from the foundation of the country, through every fiber of their being this people has been a religious people. Word it, if you dare; advocate it, if you dare. *How many who voted for it would ever come back here again?* None, I hope. —*Id.* p. 6759.

So, then, the chief duty of a United States senator, or member of Congress, is to "come back here again." The height of the ambition of such is to "come back here again." And now it is the perfection of "wise statesmanship" so to play into the hands of threatening, boycotting, and unprincipled religious partisans, as to be sure that they can "come back here again." No matter though the thing demanded be subversive of every principle of the Government, we must yield to it, or we can't "come back here again." No matter though the thing demanded be positively forbidden by the Constitution it must be granted or else we can't "come back here again." No matter, though to yield to the demand we must violate the solemn oath which we took to maintain the Constitution of the United States—that oath is nothing, the Constitution is nothing, the principles of the Government are nothing, in the presence of the awful alternative, conveyed in the threats of religious bigots, that we can't "come back here again."

Was there ever on earth a more cowardly or more contemptible surrender than this of the Senate of the United States, as proclaimed by its representatives—Senators Frank S. Hiscock, of New York, and Joseph R. Hawley, of Connecticut?

And the Church managers know that it is a surrender to them. The chaplain of the Senate in the article before referred to says:—

Say not that the former days were better than these, for the Congress of the United States never numbered abler, truer, nobler men than fill the chambers to-day! And never more surely than now would avowed hostility to God, his day and word and house and kingdom, remand a public servant to private life.

This is just what these senators told the churches that they were afraid of. And this is now a public notice that henceforth a religious test will be required as a qualification for office under the United States. H. H. George, who labored for months to secure this legislation, said:—

I have learned that we hold the United States Senate in our hands.

They would be very dull indeed not to have learned it, when the Senate openly

told them so. Of course they hold it in their hands, and they will use it, too. For did not that other preacher, J. D. Sands, in Pittsburg, declare that as the Senate had listened to the voice of the Church, This grand, good fact suggests to the Christian's mind that if this may be done, so may other equally needful measures. The Church is gaining power continually and its voice will be heard in the future much oftener than in the past.

Thus the evidence is complete and the proof conclusive, that the Government of the United States as it was established and as it was intended to remain is no more. It has been given into the hands of the combined churches, and is there now only a tool to be used by them to enforce upon all the decrees of the Church at her arbitrary will. And thus there stands in the United States to-day the living image of the Papacy, instead of the glorious Government which our fathers established and hoped would remain.

The "new order of things" to which this Nation stands pledged by the Great Seal of the United States is reversed; and the old order of things which has always been a curse to the world is restored.

A. T. J.

#### Chicago Asks for a Repeal of the Sunday Closing Proviso.

A PETITION, starting from Chicago, is being industriously circulated, asking for the repeal of the congressional action closing the World's Fair on Sunday. The *Chicago Herald* has announced that it will circulate the petition throughout the entire United States. After citing the paragraphs which it is asked should be repealed, the memorial gives, as reasons why Congress should reverse its previous action in this matter, the educational advantages of the Fair which should be denied to none; and that Sunday closing would inevitably flood the city on that day with an idle crowd which would tend to multiply crime beyond the capacity of the police to meet the situation. The last two clauses of the memorial read thus:—

That the largest opportunity should be given for admission to the grounds and buildings of the Fair on this day, and that some marked distinction should be made so as to have Sunday stand apart as a special day, such as stopping all machinery and labor connected with exhibits and allowing exhibitors who so desired to cover their displays.

That the entire matter of a Sunday as well as a week day Fair should be left by Congress in the hands of the regular World's Fair authorities.

This petition and memorial is nothing but a very superficial plea for the reversal of the Sunday closing action. While it makes that plea, it takes at the same time the position that "some marked distinction should be made so as to have Sunday stand apart as a special day," ignoring the true position that no one has a right in reality to make any distinction in this matter for anyone outside of himself and his own personal exhibit.

If it were possible that this petition could be brought before all those in this country who sympathize with it, and signed by them, it is very certain that on its presentation Congress would repeal the Sunday closing proviso. It is not likely, however, that enough interest will be taken in it to accomplish any such thing. But even if this should be done, on a petition so worded, and for the reasons there related, with the acknowledgment there made, the legislative attitude as regards religion which the central

Government has taken would remain unchanged.

The actual and valid reasons upon which this memorial should have been based have been entirely ignored. Has it become a settled conviction, already, in the minds of the people that the First Amendment to the Constitution has been interpreted out of existence by the Supreme Court, and that now it is perfectly proper for Congress to pass laws respecting the establishing of religion? How long since Congress has been constitutionally endowed with the power to pass legislation impairing the obligation of contracts previously entered into, that no mention should be made of such a plea in this memorial? When has Congress purchased the World's Fair site, of the State of Illinois, by the consent of the Legislature of the State, that it should assume to legislate either directly or indirectly as to its municipal control? Why does not this memorial ask these questions and make these pleas? Is it because constitutional government in this country is a thing of the past, and already we are under the rule of an oligarchy? Do these petitioners mean to acknowledge this? or do they wish to protest against it? If this is a protest, why do they not protest? Why not place themselves frankly and intelligently upon the righteous principle, and not tamely yield to the unrighteous enactment, only asking that it be remitted in their individual case to serve their selfish interests?

The *Mail and Express* reports Mr. Edward F. Crogin, of Chicago, as saying:

No attempt has been made to answer the argument that no opening on Sunday is in accordance with the unanimous opinion of the United States Supreme Court that this is a Christian Nation.

Is this statement true?—It is. Outside of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL and a few of its supporters scarcely a voice has been raised in all this Nation to expose the specious fallacies of that decision. Are there no learned lawyers or judges in the city of Chicago competent to realize the lack of law, of logic, and of Christianity which are the distinguishing features of this decision? If there are, why do they not speak?

Emboldened by their failure to speak in any of these particulars the *Mail and Express* makes the friends of Sunday closing say that "the Fair will be under the control of the United States Government, and not under the control of the local board, and no judge in Cook County would have any jurisdiction whatever." Do the judges and lawyers of Cook County acknowledge any such oligarchy? If not, why not speak? W. H. M.

#### A Fine Scheme, Truly!

SOME eight years ago an organization known as the "Boys' Brigade" was formed in Scotland, its object being "to promote Christ's kingdom among the boys and train them in habits of reverence, self-respect, and Christian manliness."

Three years ago the organization was introduced into this country by way of San Francisco; and now a brigade has been organized at Willimantic, Conn. In a sermon in that city on the 18th inst., Rev. C. A. Dinsmore thus explains the scheme for keeping the boys under church influence and interested in church work:—

The boys are equipped in the uniform and drilled in the tactics of the United States Army. They have breech loading Springfield rifles and are

as well furnished as the State militia. Every Sunday they march into their Bible class to receive religious instruction, and are under strict military discipline. Every boy pledges himself to attend the weekly drill and Bible class. If he is willfully absent two consecutive weeks without reasonable excuse, he is dishonorably discharged from the company. Boys are appointed to the offices for proficiency in drill and in Bible lessons. Each boy furnishes his own uniform, costing about five dollars. If a boy is unable to do this, the church will provide him one. The guns are owned by the church. Only boys who attend this church or who have no other church connection are admitted. Great care will be taken not to encroach upon other denominations. With these qualifications the company is open to any boy between the ages of twelve and twenty-one.

To buy the guns and provide for incidental expenses we shall need two hundred and fifty dollars. Next Sunday we shall take a collection for this purpose, and we are confident you will contribute the amount needed. This is not a new experiment and can not fail, if wisely managed, because it is founded on the ineradicable instincts of a boy's nature.

Certainly it can not fail in stimulating and developing the natural instincts of the human heart. It is an easy matter to teach boys to love applause and to labor for it; but it is quite another thing to teach them to "be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honor preferring one another." Nevertheless that is the lesson that Christ would have all both old and young to learn; and it is the lesson that the Church should teach. As a means of cultivating pride, the Boys' Brigade is doubtless a marked success; as a means of grace, it must ever be a dismal failure.

#### Limits of Obedience to Civil Government.

OBEDIENCE is to be rendered to all human governments, in subordination to the will of God. These governments are a recognized necessity in the nature of the case, and their existence is manifestly in accordance with the divine will. Hence the presumption is always in favor of the authority of civil law; and any refusal to obey, must be based on the moral proof that obedience will be sin. The one who proposes to disregard human law, must be persuaded in his own mind that, in that course, he will meet the approval of God. It is too obvious to need discussion, that the law of God, the great principle of benevolence, is supreme, and that, "we ought to obey God, rather than men," in any case of conflict between human law and the divine.

There are cases so clear that no one can question the duty to refuse obedience. In all times and in all lands such cases have arisen. In a case of this kind, either of two courses is possible; to disobey the law, and resist the government in its attempt to execute it, or to disobey and quietly suffer the penalty. The first is revolutionary, and can be justified only when the case is flagrant, and affects such numbers that a revolutionary movement will be sustained. Sometimes a decided attitude, on the part of a large number, in opposition to a wicked law, will set the law aside, and make it inoperative. Such a movement is as justifiable as any revolution. But these cases are rare. 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.

It is often urged that the right of private judgment, as now maintained, in reference to obedience to the laws of the

land, will subvert government, and introduce confusion and anarchy. . . . The danger, however, is greatly over-estimated. Government is never the gainer in the execution of a law that is manifestly unjust. . . . Conscientious men are not the enemies, but the friends, of any government but a tyranny. They are its strength, and not its weakness. Daniel, in Babylon, praying, contrary to the law, was the true friend and supporter of the government; while those who, in their pretended zeal for the law and the constitution, would strike down the good man, were its real enemies. It is only when government transcends its sphere, that it comes in conflict with the consciences of men.

But it is objected that the example is corrupting, that a bad man will violate a good law, because the good man refuses to obey a wicked law. The cases are just as unlike as right and wrong, and any attempt to justify the one by the other, is gross dishonesty. Unquestionably, the principle can be abused by the wicked, and so can any truth, whatever, but the principle of unquestioning obedience to human law, is false, and needs no perversion to make it mischievous. Practically, the cases are few, in well-established governments, where the law encroaches upon the rights of conscience; but if the principle be surrendered, the cases will multiply. . . . The most grievous of all imperfections in government, is the failure to secure the just and good result. Injustice and oppression are not made tolerable, by being in strict accordance with the law. Nothing is surer, in the end, than the reaction of such wrong to break down the most perfectly constituted government.—*Fairchild's Moral Philosophy*, pp. 178-186.

#### The Sunday Question—An Historical Survey.

[The following article from the *Christliche Welt*, Leipzig, for which we are, however, indebted to the *Literary Digest*, shows plainly that the claim that Sunday is the Sabbath by divine authority, is fraudulent. It is for this reason that we publish it. We are not in sympathy with the idea that the original Sabbath was ever abrogated by its Author.]

As far as we can now learn, the Sunday is a creation of Gentile Christianity. . . . Certain it is, however, that the Jewish observance of the Sabbath exercised a material influence on the introduction of the first day of the week in the Christian Church. This is all the more certain because there existed few, if any, congregations composed entirely of Gentile Christians. But of a transference to Sunday of the ideas associated with the Jewish Sabbath, no mention or hint is given in the entire Christian literature of the times. . . . Accordingly, too, there are no signs to show that the early Christians modeled their Sunday observance after the methods and manners of the Jewish Sabbath observance. The conception of Sunday was not so much as a day of rest, but rather as a joyful remembrance of the resurrection of the Lord, as a sacred day of worship and praise (*Kultustag*), as a day for the assembling of the congregation.

In early post-apostolic times, and in the age of the old Catholic Church, no material changes were made in this regard. Nearly all the Christian authors of this age emphasize the difference and distinction between the Christian Sunday

and the Jewish Sabbath. In all the first five centuries of the Christian Church there is not a single Christian author who regards the Christian Sunday as a continuation of the Jewish Sabbath, or declares the former to be a divine ordinance. The data on this point are found in Zahn's *Geschichte des Sonntags vornehmlich in der alten Kirche*, Hanover, 1878. Occasionally, the writers of this period contrast the two days, but this is always done only to emphasize the difference between them. In the Old Testament command to observe the Sabbath, which in its literal application referred to the Jews as a nation, the Patristic writers recognized a deeper principle of eternal application, namely, the withdrawal from self-work and from sin, for the purpose of serving the Lord in his sanctuary. This moral behest, however, was accepted as applicable not only to one time or place, but as valid for the entire life. Understood in this sense, the Sabbath command finds its fulfillment neither in the Jewish Sabbath nor in the Christian Sunday. The moral principle in the Sabbath command was thus recognized by the early Christians, but not its legal features. As the true motives for the observance of the Lord's day they assign, not the Sabbath of the Jews, but the resurrection of the Lord. It is this great event that gives this day its joyful sanctity.

When Christianity became the State Church in the days of Constantine the Great, a material change took place in motives of Sunday observance. As now organized the Church became also a great political power. This made it all the more natural for the Jewish hierarchical system to look to Old Testament models and methods, especially in exercising its power. In the doctrine of Sunday there was indeed little or no change for three centuries, yet the practice of the Church began to degenerate to a legalistic stage. The famous edict of Constantine on the Sunday question was issued on March 7th, 321. By this document the Christian Sunday became the legal holiday of the empire; at any rate its observance as a day of rest is made obligatory. But nothing is more noteworthy in this respect than the fact that Constantine in this writing does not with a single word appeal to the Old Testament Sabbath law. It is true that in this innovation of the Emperor, the prime motive was of a political character; but the character and contents of the document are significant as to the idea of the Sunday then current. From this time on, Emperor and Synods began to issue legal ordinances for the observance of Sunday, but never because of the Sabbath command of the Old Testament. Political interests and public morals were the controlling factors in these measures.

The legal observance of the Sunday on the basis of the Decalogue first begins to appear in the Western Church in the times of Gregory II. In connection with this is the other phenomenon that the emphasis in the observance of the Lord's day is no longer sought in the worship and praise of the Christian people, but in strict and stringent abstinence from manual labor. The great dogmatician of the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas, gave the scientifico-theological formula to the dogma in this view. The law became an edict of the Church as well as of God, and a test of the obedience of the Christians, which obedience was their prime

virtue. The Church commands attendance at church and mass, promising rich reward for such obedience. *Opera servilia* are prohibited; *opera liberalia* are allowed.

The German Reformation proceeded from the doctrine that we must first seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and again established the observance of the Sunday on the basis, not of law, but of the joyful and free worship of God. The Reformers rejected the transfer theory, according to which the legal demands of the Decalogue were regarded as applicable to the Christian Sunday, although recognizing the moral principle underlying the Sabbath observance. Just as little did the Reformers base this observance on any direct command of Jesus Christ. According to the 28th article of the Augsburg Confession, Sunday is an ecclesiastical custom, a venerable traditional rite. Its basis is found chiefly in the words of Christ which promise blessings to those who worship in common, as also in the fact of need of order and system in church work and worship, and in social and political respect to the welfare of neighbors.

This last mentioned item was of leading importance in this connection for the Geneva Reformer. Calvin most emphatically demanded a day of rest, but he bases this demand upon Sabbath law as little as Luther does. He regards it as a fact that the observance of the Lord's day is a human ordinance, no matter how emphatically he insisted upon this period of rest, as an absolute necessity for man and beast. How deeply the Reformers were imbued with this doctrine, can be seen from the fact that they claim for the Church the rights of controlling Sunday. Luther from the beginning made this a prominent point. The Church, he says, "could make Friday her Sunday." For the individual, the Reformers emphasize the duty of not departing from the usages and customs of the Church in this regard.

### "Is God In It?"

UNDER the heading, "Exposition Poetry," the *Christian Cynosure* has the following:—

The closing stanza of Prof. John K. Paine's "Columbian March and Chorus," to be performed at the dedication of the Exposition buildings at Jackson Park, next month, is as follows:—

All hail and welcome nations of the earth!  
Columbia's greeting comes from every State,  
Proclaim to all mankind the world's new birth  
Of freedom, age on age shall consecrate.  
Let war and enmity forever cease,  
Let glorious art and commerce banish wrong,  
The universal brotherhood of peace  
Shall be Columbia's high, inspiring song.

What we would like to know, Is God in it? If not, we prefer the older couplet,—

Praise God from whom all blessings flow;  
Praise him, all creatures here below.

Really, we would like to know what is meant by "the world's new birth of freedom," and what is the use of trying to unite all nations in "the brotherhood of peace" without the aid of Christianity? Will some one, not a pagan, tell us.

It is not our purpose to explain the meaning of the expression, "The world's new birth." Mr. Paine could probably do that better than any one else. Neither do we purpose answering any question; but rather to ask one. The *Cynosure* implies that God is not in the "Columbian March and Chorus;" would he be in it any more if it contained the couplet,—

Praise God from whom all blessings flow;  
Praise him, all creatures here below.

To be more explicit, would a formal

recognition of God by a godless poet and a godless choir be pleasing to the Creator? Must not all acceptable service be inspired by faith? Is it not still true as it was eighteen hundred years ago that "he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him"? Would God be in the familiar words,—

Praise God from whom all blessings flow,  
if they did not come welling up from hearts full of praise to him, any more than he was in the same words sung by the thoughtless reporters when Congress adjourned?—Certainly not. Then why does the *Cynosure* insist upon hypocrisy?

### Some Scraps of New England History.\*

#### THE SUFFERINGS OF THE QUAKERS.

THE last article closed with the statement that the laws against the Quakers were not allowed to become a dead letter but were enforced in the regular Puritan way. Just what that way was will appear from the following order issued in 1657 by Governor Endicott:—

To the marshal general or his deputy: You are to take with you the executioner, and repair to the house of correction, and there see him cut off the right ears of John Copeland, Christopher Holder, and John Rouse, Quakers, in execution of the sentence of the court of assistants for the breach of the law instituted, "Quakers."

In the latter part of the same year the following order was issued by the court:—

Whereas Daniel Southwick and Provided Southwick, son and daughter of Lawrence Southwick, *absenting themselves from the public ordinances*, have been fined by the courts of Salem and Ipswich, pretending they have no assistance, and resolving not to work, the court, upon perusal of the law, which was made upon account of the dates, in answer to what should be done for the satisfaction of the fines, resolves that the treasurers of the several counties are and shall be fully empowered to sell said persons to any of the English nation at Virginia or Barbadoes, to answer the said fines.

With this latter sentence there is connected an important series of events. As stated in this order, these two persons were son and daughter of Lawrence Southwick. Lawrence Southwick and his wife Cassandra, were an aged couple who had been members of the Salem church until about the close of 1656. They had three children, Joseph, who was a man grown, and the two mentioned above, who were but mere youth. The old gentleman and his wife were arrested at the beginning of the year 1657, upon a charge of harboring Quakers. The old gentleman was released, but as a Quaker tract was found upon his wife, she was imprisoned seven weeks, and fined forty shillings. If they were not Quakers before, this made them such, and likewise some of their friends. A number of them now withdrew from the Salem church, and worshiped by themselves. All were arrested. Lawrence and Cassandra Southwick and their son Joseph, were taken to Boston to be dealt with. Upon their arrival there, February 3, without even the form of a trial they were whipped and imprisoned eleven days, the weather being extremely cold. In addition to this, they were fined four pounds and thirteen shillings, for six weeks' absence from church on Sunday, and their cattle were seized and sold to pay this fine.

The following summer two Quakers, William Leddra and William Brend, went

to Salem. They, with five others, among whom were the Southwicks who before had suffered, were arrested for meeting together. They were all taken to Boston, and put all together in a room in the prison, of which the windows were boarded up close. Food was denied them, unless they would work to pay for it. "To work when wrongfully confined, was against the Quakers' conscience." They therefore went five days without anything to eat. This, however, was only a part of their sufferings, for on the second day of their imprisonment, they all were severely whipped, and then with raw wounds were thrown back into the close dark room, in the July heat, with nothing to lie upon but the bare boards. On the second day afterwards they were informed that they could go if they would pay the constable's and jail fees. They refused to pay anything. The next day the jailer, in order to force them to yield, took Brend, and with irons bound his neck and heels together, and kept him that way for sixteen hours, from five o'clock in the morning till nine o'clock at night.

The next day Brend was put to the mill and ordered to work. He could not have worked if he would, as he could scarcely move; but he would not have worked if he could, and so he refused. Then in a rage "the gaoler took a pitched rope, about an inch thick, and gave him twenty blows over his back and arms with all his strength, till the rope untwisted; then he fetched another rope, thicker and stronger, and told Brend that he would cause him to bow to the law of the country, and make him work. Brend thought this in the highest degree unreasonable, since he had committed no evil, and was wholly unable to work, having been kept five days without eating, and whipped also, and now thus unmercifully beaten. Yet in the morning the gaoler relented not, but began to beat again with his pitched rope on the poor man's bruised body, and foaming at the mouth like a madman, with violence laid four score and seventeen more blows upon him, as other prisoners, who beheld this cruelty with grief and passion, reported. And if his strength and his rope had not failed him, he would have laid on more. He thought also to give him the next morning as many blows more. . . . To what condition these blows must have brought the body of Brend, who had nothing on but a serge cossack over-shirt, may be easily conceived. His back and arms were bruised and bleeding, and the blood hanging, as it were, in bags under his arms, and so into one was his flesh beaten that the sign of a particular blow could not be seen. His body being thus cruelly tortured, he lay down upon the boards so extremely weakened that the natural parts decaying, and his strength failing, his body turned cold; there seemed, as it were, a struggle between life and death; his senses were stopped, and he had for some time neither seeing, feeling, nor hearing; till at length a divine power prevailing, life broke through death, and the breath of the Lord was breathed in his nostrils."

The people now, horrified at the outrage, would bear no more. A cry was raised, they rushed to the jail, and rescued the tortured prisoner. This rather frightened the government. Endicott sent his own family doctor to succor Brend, but the surgeon pronounced the case hopeless—that the flesh would "rot from off his bones," and he must die. The cry of

\* Condensed from "Two Republics."

the people grew louder, and their indignation more fierce. They demanded that the barbarous jailer should be brought to justice. The magistrate posted up on the church door a promise that he should be brought to trial, but here the "Rev." John Norton stepped forth declaring: "Brend endeavored to beat our gospel ordinances black and blue; if he then be beaten black and blue, it is but just upon him, and I will appear in his behalf that did so." He rebuked the magistrates for their faintness of heart, and commanded them to take down the notice from the church door. They obeyed, and the cruel jailer was not only justified, but was commanded to whip the Quakers who were yet in prison "twice a week if they refused to work, and the first time to add five stripes to the former ten, and each time to add three to them."

The other prisoners now presented a petition to the court praying to be released. Their petition was dated, "From the House of Bondage in Boston, wherein we are made captives by the wills of men, although made free by the Son (John 8: 36), in which we quietly rest, this sixteenth of the fifth month, 1658." They were brought into court for examination. They made so strong a defense that there appeared some prospect of their acquittal; but the preachers rallied in force. The "Rev." Charles Chauncy, in "the Thursday lecture," preached as follows:—

Suppose you should catch six wolves in a trap [there were six Salem Quakers], . . . and ye can not prove that they killed either sheep or lambs: and now ye have them, they will neither bark nor bite; yet they have the plain mark of wolves. Now I leave it to your consideration whether ye will let them go alive; yea or nay?

By their diligence the preachers not only prevented any acquittal, but succeeded through the law of 1658 in inflicting capital punishment upon all the Quakers who remained or who returned after sentence of banishment.

### Sunday and the World's Fair.

THERE is strong evidence of a constantly growing reaction throughout the country against the wave of extreme sabbatarianism which resulted in a congressional provision that the World's Columbian Exposition should be closed on Sunday.

A notable instance of breadth of view in this particular is furnished by the recent action of the New York State Board of Women managers of the World's Fair. This board, with the good sense and liberal minds that were to be looked for, enthusiastically adopted resolutions recommending that the great Exposition be opened on Sunday, thus enabling the people of all nations to profit on that day by the unparalleled educational and generally elevating facilities which it will offer.

We are, perhaps, not strictly accurate in terming this action of the New York women a symptom of "reaction." More strictly speaking, it is but one of many evidences that the great mass of the people of the country, instead of changing their opinions, are merely awakening to the fact that by their early indifference a relatively small body of well meaning persons were enabled to force upon the citizens of the United States, and of other countries as well, a piece of religious legislation of a paternal, sectarian order, by no means in keeping with the idea that a

man should be permitted to observe the Sabbath as his own conscience dictated, and not as others directed.

It is to be hoped that the next session of Congress will repeal the Sunday closing provision referred to, and leave attendance or non-attendance at the World's Fair on the Lord's day to be decided by the individual for himself. Those who consider it a sinful desecration to be enlightened and educated on that day should stay away by all means. Those who do not should not be forced to accept the intolerant views of the sabbatarians.—*Boston Herald.*

### Cruelty in Clerical Dress.

To the person who imagines that the spirit of religious persecution no longer survives in this country, we submit the following conversation which recently passed, in substance, between Rev. McLean, Secretary of the Chicago Branch of the American Sabbath Union, and A. F. Ballenger, Secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association:—

*Mr. McLean.*—The Seventh-day Adventists are under the protection of the other churches, and yet they oppose us in securing Sunday laws.

*Mr. Ballenger.*—Under the protection of the churches? Yes, in Henry County, Tenn., they are protected by some of the churches, but the protection consists in working them as criminals on the streets in the chain gang.

*Mr. M.*—They have violated a law of the State.

*Mr. B.*—The law is wrong.

*Mr. M.*—Christians should obey the laws.

*Mr. B.*—Daniel disobeyed the law forbidding him to pray; the three Hebrews disobeyed the law requiring them to bow down to the image in the plains of Dura. Would you consider the law just that would compel you to rest the seventh day of the week and thus allow you but five days in which to labor in support of your family?

*Mr. M.*—No, I would not regard such a law as just but would secure its repeal.

*Mr. B.*—That is just what Seventh-day Adventists are trying to do, and you and your Association are doing all you can to prevent them from accomplishing it.

*Mr. M.*—Yes we are, and will continue to oppose them.

*Mr. B.*—Then you are opposed to repealing laws in Tennessee which put Christian men in the chain gang and work them on the streets with common criminals for working on their farms on Sunday?

*Mr. M.*—Yes sir, we are.

*Mr. B.*—I am glad I called. I will use your statement. (Starts to leave the office.)

*Mr. M.*—(Angrily) Come back! I will make it stronger! I will "rub it in"!

But he was too angry to command words with which to make it stronger, and the conversation ended.

### "O, Consistency, Thou Art a Jewel!"

THE utter inconsistency of a union of religion and the State has just received a very forcible illustration. The Supreme Court of the United States, in its already famous decision of the 29th of last February, embodied as a part of that decision the following words from Chancellor Kent, of New York, the "famous commentator on American law":—

The people of the State . . . profess the general doctrines of Christianity as the rule of their faith and practice; and to scandalize the author of these doctrines is not only, in a religious point of view, extremely impious, but even in respect to obligations due to society, it is a gross violation of decency and good order. . . . The free, equal, and undisturbed enjoyment of religious opinion, whatever it may be, and free and equal discussions on any religious subjects, is granted and secured; but to revile with malicious, blasphemous contempt, the religion professed by almost the whole community, is an abuse of that right. Nor are we bound by any expression of the Constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish

at all, or to punish indiscriminately, the like attacks upon the religion of Mahomet or the Grand Lama; and for this plain reason, that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of this country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of these impostors.

In thus speaking the Supreme Court declares that Christianity (the religion of Jesus Christ) is the true, or orthodox religion, and that all others are impostures; for these two false religions that are named must be considered as representing all false religions as distinguished from Christianity. But further, the Court also gives fair warning that if the worshipers of any of these systems shall be attacked because of their faith, they are not entitled to protection, for their religion is an imposture.

Now it so happened that, not far from the time that our Christian (?) Nation was thus declaring through its highest judicial authority that Mahometanism was heretical and not entitled to protection, some zealous Mahometans became imbued with the very same sentiment concerning Christianity.

In Turkey the Church and the State are united, and Mahometanism is the national religion, just as Christianity has been declared to be the religion of our Nation, and "to scandalize the author of these doctrines (their prophet, Mahomet), is not only, in a religious point of view, extremely impious, but even in respect to obligations due society, it is a gross violation of decency and good order." Yet Christian missionaries from the United States of America are there, telling those worshipers of Mahomet that they have been deceived, that Mahomet was no prophet but only a pretender, and, in short, scandalizing the author of their religion. We believe that these statements are true, in fact, and recognize Mahomet only as a false prophet; but it does not look that way to his followers, but must appear as a reviling "with malicious, blasphemous contempt, the religion professed by almost the whole community." So it was perfectly natural, and perfectly legal also, for them to arise in righteous indignation and suppress this "gross violation of decency and good order." This they proceeded to do, and they went at it in a very energetic manner; that is, they plundered and burned the houses and schools of the missionaries, and grossly assaulted the persons of the missionaries themselves.

The poor missionaries appealed to the Turkish Government for protection. But they were met with the indifference that comes from the idea that *we are not bound by any expression of the Constitution, as some have strangely supposed, to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Jesus Christ or the Grand Lama; and for this plain reason, that the case assumes that we are a Mahometan people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Mahometanism and not upon the doctrines of these impostors.*

Of course the missionaries next appealed to the United States for a redress of their grievances; and our Christian (?) Government is now demanding an indemnity for these outrages.

This demand will probably be acceded to, because the United States is a powerful nation and Turkey is very weak. But there is no justice in such a demand by our Government, for the Turks were only doing what our Supreme Court had just declared to be proper and right. Nor

can the churches of our land call it persecution, for the majority of them have rejoiced in the judicial decision herein cited; and, according to that, those missionaries were certainly guilty of scandalizing the author of the Turkish religion, and so were guilty of "a gross violation of the decency and good order" of the community in which they lived.

This is not written in defense of those outrages, for the writer has the most hearty sympathy for those earnest, godly missionaries who have taken their lives in their hands to carry the glad tidings to those who sit in darkness. But he has just as much respect, and no more, for Church and State in Turkey as in the United States of America. If it is right for a civil court in the United States to declare what is the true religion and what the false, it is right for the Turkish Government to make a like decision for Turkey. If it is "a gross violation of decency and good order" in the United States to scandalize the author of the national religion of the United States, then it is a gross violation of decency and good order to so revile the author of the Turkish religion in Turkey. If we are not bound to punish attacks upon Mahometanism in a Christian nation, they are not bound to punish attacks upon Christianity in a Mahometan nation. The principle is that the majority have a right to declare that the religion of the minority is heretical, and that is a part and parcel of the mystery of iniquity that fostered the Inquisition in Europe during the Dark Ages, and expects some day to bring to an end—by the same means, of course—religious liberty in the United States of America. J. O. BEARD.

### They Are Right Who Obey God.

A GENTLEMAN in Nebraska sends us the following, evidently for publication:—

WHICH IS IT?

WITH respect to what are called *denominations of religion*, if every one is left free to judge of his own religion, there is no such a thing as a religion that is wrong. But if they are to judge of each other's religion, there is no such a thing as a religion that is right. These principles being admitted, it will follow as a matter of fact all the world is right or all the world is wrong. Which is it?  
J. L. WAGNER.

Waco, Neb.

But "these principles" will not be admitted by any one who gives the matter serious thought. Man is a moral being, and consequently has a moral responsibility. So far as his fellow man is concerned, every man is the judge of his own religion; but this instead of militating in the least degree against his accountability to God for the choice which he makes in religion, only emphasizes it; for being absolutely free to choose the right he is the more responsible for choosing the wrong. Those who choose the service of God, ordered according to his revealed will, are right. All others are wrong. But they are accountable only to God for being wrong. Man is not the judge of his fellow man in religious things.

### What Constitutes a Molestation?

THE following quotation from the *Ashley (Mich.) News* shows how easily people may be disturbed in an enlightened land:—

A number of the good citizens of Bannister, Mich., who have been molested for the past two months with the Seventh-day Adventists' doctrine, and es-

pecially the Jewish Sabbath, felt it their duty to send for help, etc.

They, of course, need help; but what has caused this "molestation"? Simply this. Two young men came there with a tent and invited the people to investigate the teachings of the Bible, and many responded to the invitation. The respective merits of the so-called "Jewish Sabbath" and the "American Sabbath" received its share of attention, and a number decided in favor of the Bible Sabbath. This so disturbed some that they attempted to remove the tent and drive the "impostors" from town, thus demonstrating the fact that the spirit of persecution is at the bottom of the whole thing, and is only waiting for a chance to use the strong arm of the law in defense of religious bigotry.

W. G. KNEELAND.

### Note This and Pass It Around.

IN a recent speech, in Topeka, Kan., Rev. W. F. Crafts, said: "The Christian people of this land can have what they will of their legislatures if they will only ask for it;" and, "The legislators are but the servants of the people, and when the people demand laws their servants must enact them: so if we want Sunday laws, all we have to do is to ask for them."

He doubtless was encouraged to make this statement by the action of Congress in its last session, passing the bill requiring that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday at the imperious demand of the churches.

In all the life and teachings of the Man of Nazareth, we find nothing to indicate that it would ever be right for his followers to "demand" that laws be made in favor of the Christian religion. Is it possible that any man who has read the history of those long, dark ages of religious persecution, when it was possible for so-called Christians to secure by their "demand" whatever laws they desired, would ask that the same scenes be enacted over again in the nineteenth century? In itself alone there is power in Christianity to lead men to Christ; but when it is coupled with civil law, it ceases to be Christianity, and has no power for real good. A. O. TAIT.

OF the saving clause, "Except works of necessity and mercy," usually found in Sunday laws, the Baptist *Examiner* says:

There has been of late a notable expansion of men's ideas of what constitute works of necessity and mercy. Great cities and modern conditions of living have made some things necessary that were not so formerly. In a rural community families may easily provide themselves with food beforehand, and can ride to church in their own carriages. It would be a cruelty to the poor in our cities, unable to buy ice or provide proper storage, to forbid them to buy food early Sunday mornings, especially milk, and if any but the rich ride to church it must be in public cars.

This paragraph is worthy of more than passing notice, because while it is seemingly very liberal, it is in fact extremely narrow. The idea of the writer clearly is to restrict all travel on Sunday to church going. It is for that purpose that the cars must run; that is the "necessity" which exists for public conveyances upon the first day of the week. People may be permitted in mercy to buy food on Sunday to prevent them from starving; from "necessity" to ride to church. The poor man who wants to go elsewhere may possibly be permitted to walk, provided he does it reverently.

## NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

THE Grand Jury at Fort Worth, Texas, has instructed the officials in regard to the Sunday law, and as a consequence it is being rigidly enforced, at that place.

A CORRESPONDENT from New Port, Benton Co., Oreg., reports that the Sunday law has lately been enforced at that place, closing all places of business on Sunday, with the exception of hotels and restaurants.

It is reported that the Supreme Court of North Carolina will not sit hereafter on Mondays. The purpose of this regulation is that the lawyers may not travel on Sundays to be present at the call of their cases on Monday.

THE Congregational Church at Antigo, Wis., recently passed some resolutions calling on the mayor of the town to stop the violation of the Sunday laws there. The pastor of the church and the editor of the local paper have indulged in a little discussion over the merits of such resolutions, and the editor seems to be ahead in the argument.

AT Chicago the Trades and Labor Assembly has, by a vote of 119 to 40, declined the invitation of the World's Fair directors to take part in the parade during the dedication exercises next month. Several hot speeches were made for and against the acceptance of the invitation. It was finally declined on the ground that workingmen could not indorse the Fair as long as its gates were closed on Sunday.

THIS department acknowledges with much satisfaction the receipt of marked copies of newspapers containing local matter in reference to the enforcement of religious laws in different parts of the country. All matter of this description together with accounts of public meetings held to favor or oppose religious legislation, as well as newspaper discussions of the question, and the utterances from the pulpit in regard to it, are of much interest and value, and gladly received.

A CORRESPONDENT from Selma, Cal., details an interesting conversation with a chance acquaintance, who proved to be a Roman Catholic in belief, upon the union of Church and State now so evident in legal and legislative proceedings. At the close of the conversation the Roman Catholic said, "Well, I will not pretend to say how it will be done, but our priests tell us that the Government of the United States will soon be in the hands of the Catholic Church, for nearly all the higher courts are controlled by them now; and I guess they know pretty well what they are talking about." Such instances as this have their significance.

"THE Rev. W. W. Boyd, Pastor of the Peddie Memorial Baptist Church, of Newark, N. J.," says the *New York Sun*, "has resigned from the Law and Order League of that city. It is said that the league is on the verge of disruption. A year ago the league brought Captain Wishart, from Pittsburg, Pa., to assume the office of general director of its affairs. Great things were expected of the Captain. When he arrived he visited the different churches and told the spellbound congregations how he had redeemed Pittsburg from the lowest depths of vice. The Captain and the league laid elaborate plans for the redemption of Newark. Sunday was to be made a day of puritanical severity. Somehow their plans went astray. There was any amount of speech making and planning; but the Sunday beer gardens and Sunday sacred concerts went on without hindrance, and saloon keepers laughed at Captain Wishart. The Rev. W. W.

Boyd was one of the enthusiasts in the beginning. He said, 'I believe the majority of people are willing to let the Sunday question rest as it is. I got tired of fighting a dead issue. My time and strength were wasted in the league. Hereafter I will give my entire time and attention to the educational lines marked out in the church of which I am pastor.'

THE New York World has opened a column to women for the expression of their views of the Sunday closing of the World's Fair. At the head of the column it says:—

Twelve out of thirteen of the Board of Women Managers of the exhibit of the State of New York for the World's Fair, have protested against the action of the General Manager in deciding to close the Fair on Sunday. It would be interesting to know how women generally regard this matter. Are the twelve women of the board alone in their opinion or do all the women in the country stand as twelve to one in favor of opening the Fair every day of the week? These columns are open to a discussion of the question. Every woman is invited to cast her vote for or against the closing of the Fair on Sunday and to state her reasons. No vote will be recorded unless accompanied by the voter's name and address. These will be published or not, according to the voter's wish.

In its issue of Sept. 22, the World records the vote as five to one in favor of Sunday opening. A Brooklyn woman in the course of a pungently forcible expression of her views says most emphatically, "No force bill methods will avail in church matters." Certainly they will not avail to enforce true religion.

THE following is from a private letter written by a Seventh-day Adventist living in Atlanta, Ga.:—

Monday last, two policemen visited the writer and Brother —, to talk to us about working on the Sabbath, meaning Sunday. I will not state all they said. Among other things, they said that if Jews and others did not like the laws here, let them go to some other country. Again, they often used the expression, "We can't have the Sabbath desecrated." They referred to saloons and stores, and asked "how it would look to have them open on the Sabbath." We told them we were in favor of closing the saloons every day in the week.

When they were about to leave, we invited them to come back and see us again. They said, "We will, and you will change your doctrine;" but we think not.

These expressions show the Atlanta police to be apt students of National Reform doctrine. Heretofore the authorities of Atlanta have given their attention largely to stopping railroad traffic on Sunday, and the closing of saloons, but it seems that is becoming uninteresting, if not unprofitable; so now they begin to attack those who have a principle to defend in the matter, and who are foemen more worthy of their steel.

THE Washington Post after telling in its leading editorial of the issue of September 9, on the new movement started in Chicago to have the Fair opened Sunday, reprints President Higinbotham's reasons for signing the petition, and adds:—

Those propositions fairly state the case as viewed from a moral and sympathetic standpoint, but, of course, they fail to answer the strictly doctrinal objections to Sunday opening. Between these two views are difficulties of reconciliation interposed that seem apparently insuperable, and there is grave doubt whether Congress can be induced to recede from the position it has taken. Yet the dominant sentiment of the American people, if it could be ascertained, would doubtless favor the opening of the major portion of the Exposition on Sundays as an object lesson to the people the most valuable of its kind in all their lives, and calculated to make of them better and more intelligent citizens. This feeling has just been expressed in a resolution adopted by the Women's Board of Managers of the State of New York to the effect that the Exposition be opened on Sundays "for the benefit of all classes."

Besides failing to answer the strictly doctrinal objections they also fail most utterly to answer the fundamental objection that the civil law by right has no authority over a religious observance, either to enforce or to abrogate.

**HISTORY OF THE WALDENSES,**

By J. A. Wylie, LL.D.

ILLUSTRATED BY 20 FULL-PAGE ENGRAVINGS.

This work describes the conflicts waged by the Waldenses, and the martyrdoms they endured in defense of their faith and their liberty. Recent events have brought the Waldenses to notice, and thrown a new light upon the grandeur of their struggle and the important issues which have flowed from it. In their mountain fastnesses they maintained the faith of the early Christians, and by their untiring missionary labors, this faith was diffused to all the nations of Europe, thus preparing the way for the great Reformation. This history is well calculated to strengthen our faith in the power of the gospel to sustain the soul of the believer under the most bitter and cruel persecution, and to incite to perseverance in the cause of the Master. 212 pages. Price 90c.

**CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE.**

BY MRS. E. G. WHITE.

This new work from the pen of this well-known author is one of the most important of her works, and presents her views upon the vital subjects of health and temperance more fully than any of her previous writings. It is a volume of great interest and practical importance. No Seventh-day Adventist family can afford to be without it. Price, cloth, \$1.25; cloth, gilt edges, \$1.50.

**Abiding Sabbath And Lord's Day.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES.

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

**SOCIAL PURITY.**

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

Just from the press, a new and attractive edition of this popular little work, carefully revised, and with much fresh, excellent matter added.

This is not a dry, dull homily, which will be thrown down by the reader before the middle of the first page is reached, but a live, vigorous, and "telling" little work, written in the interests of pure morals and worthy citizenship.

Nothing more chaste, concise, and effective in the line of social purity literature has ever been written. The special attention of all social purity organizations throughout the country is called to this work. Between one and two hundred thousand copies are already sold. Order largely and scatter widely, if you would preach to the people the gospel of clean living. 82 pages; single copy, 25 cents. Write for special terms per 100 on large orders.

**POLISHED STONES**

AND

**SHARPENED ARROWS,**

BY C. W. BIBB.

SCRIPTURE TEXTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN WORKER AND THE HOME.

This volume was prepared to serve as a hand-book of illustrations for the preacher, the teacher, and the Christian worker, that they may abound more and more in every good word and work. An apt illustration will often touch the secret spring of the heart so that its door will swing open to receive the truth. The book is divided into twenty-three chapters, and contains an index to scripture texts to which the reader can quickly refer and find the illustration which accompanies the Bible text. The book contains 374 pages, bound in brown cloth, price \$1.25.

**Complete Dictionary**

OF

**SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS.**

BY RIGHT REV. SAMUEL FALLOWS, A. M., D. D.

With an appendix, embracing a dictionary of Britishisms, Americanisms, colloquial phrases, etc., in current use; the grammatical uses of prepositions and prepositions discriminated; a list of homonyms and homophonous words; a collection of foreign phrases, and a complete list of abbreviations and contractions used in writing and printing. 512 pages. cloth, \$1.00.

The above named books will be sent post-paid on receipt of price.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY.

12th & Castro Streets, OAKLAND, CAL.

43 Bond Street, NEW YORK.

**GOOD HEALTH,**

A monthly illustrated journal devoted to health, temperance, and sanitary science, teaches both physical and mental hygiene, and embodies the results of the latest scientific investigation in the direction of the prevention and cure of disease. First class in every respect, it stands at the head of the journals of its kind throughout the world. It has been established twenty years, and is an acknowledged authority upon all subjects that come within its province, being now more popular than ever before, as its large and increasing subscription list shows. Price \$1.00 per year. The fine premium offer begun last year will be continued through 1892. To new subscribers with copy of premium book, "Household Monitor of Health," \$1.37; to old subscribers, copy of journal one year and book, \$1.62. Address Good Health Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

**SIBERIA AND THE NIHILISTS.—Why**

Kennan went to Siberia. By William Jackson Armstrong. This is one of the most intensely interesting and thoroughly reliable contributions to literature on Russia and the Nihilists ever published. Everybody should read this book, because no one can be intelligent upon the subject of which it treats without familiarity with its contents. 160 pages, paper covers, 25 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY, 12TH & CASTRO STREETS, OAKLAND, CAL. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

**USEFUL AND INTERESTING BOOKS FOR BOTH OLD AND NEW SUBSCRIBERS.**

We will send the Signs of the Times one year, with your choice of either one of the following books, post-paid, for \$2.00:

**PROPHETIC LIGHTS**, by E. J. WAGGONER, Prophecies of the Old and New Testaments, interpreted by the Bible and history. Paper bound, 180 pages, handsomely illustrated.

**HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF FOREIGN MISSIONS** of Seventh-day Adventists, with maps showing location of churches, etc., 294 pages, paper binding.

**LIFE AND WORDS OF CHRIST**, by C. GEIKIE, D. D. This is a cheap edition, contains over 800 pages, and is bound in cloth.

Every library ought to contain these interesting and instructive books.

The Signs of the Times

is a 16-page weekly religious journal, and will be furnished at the following prices of subscription:

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Single copy, one year, post-paid,       | \$1.50.   |
| In clubs of 10 and over to one address, | 1.25.     |
| To foreign countries in Postal Union,   | (\$2) 8s. |

Address **SIGNS OF THE TIMES**, 12th and Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal. U. S. A.

**The Grand Trunk Railway OF CANADA**

AND THE

**Chicago & Grand Trunk Railway**

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

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

**THE ST. CLAIR TUNNEL,**

"THE LINK THAT BINDS TWO GREAT NATIONS."

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

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

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

N. J. POWER, G. P. A. Grand Trunk Ry., G. P. & T. A. C. & G. T. Ry., MONTREAL, CANADA. W. E. DAVIS, CHICAGO, ILL.

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



NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 29, 1892.

NOTE.—Any one receiving THE AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered THE SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

"ACTIVE and powerful agencies," says the "Pearl of Days," "are constantly at work in Great Britain, as well as in America, to break down the Sabbath." However this may be in England, it is certainly true in this country. And among these agencies none are more active or more powerful than is the so-called American Sabbath Union whose sole mission is to exalt a pagan holiday at the expense of the Sabbath of the Lord.

BUT it is urged that the essence of Sabbath observance is not in the particular day observed, but in observing by rest and worship one seventh part of time in regular succession; and that the particular day is a matter of indifference. This is the theory; the practice is that it is a matter of indifference as to the particular day—*provided always that Sunday is observed.* But that the particular day is an essential element of Sabbath observance is seen when we come to examine the institution itself, and to understand its significance.

THE Sabbath is a memorial of the finished creation: "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." This can never be true of any other day; and it must always be true of the seventh day. Says Rev. Mr. Elliott, in his prize essay, "The Abiding Sabbath," published by the American Tract Society, "While the reason remains, the law remains. The reason of the Sabbath is to be found in the fact of creation; it is God's one monument set in human history to that great event; and so long as the truth of creation and the knowledge of a Creator have any value to human thought, any authority over the human conscience, or make any appeal to human affections, so long the law and the institution of the Sabbath will abide with lasting instruction and undiminished obligation."

It follows from the statement made by Mr. Elliott, that to change the day necessarily involves a change of reason for observing the day; in short, it is to change the institution; and so we see in the Sabbath and the Sunday, not two phases of

the same institution, but two rival institutions. The one commemorating creation, the other, it is claimed, the resurrection; the one sacred to Jehovah, the other, it is claimed, equally sacred to his Son; the one stigmatized as "Jewish," the other called "Christian;" the one clearly of divine origin, the other set apart confessedly by the Church, and that in an age when corruptions had already perverted the gospel of Christ.

To illustrate this matter, let us suppose that the Irish people were in a majority in this country, and that instead of celebrating the Fourth of July they were to substitute the Seventeenth of March; and suppose further that they were to call it "Independence day," and celebrate it much as we now do the Fourth of July; and further suppose that their influence was such that they should cause their day to almost entirely take the place of our national holiday; could it ever become the same institution? Could it ever be truthfully said that the American Independence day had been transferred to the Seventeenth of March? and could the laws which now make the Fourth of July a legal holiday ever be made to apply without change to the day which had been introduced in opposition to the Fourth of July? In short, under such conditions would not everybody say that the American Independence day had been supplanted by the Irish Saint Patrick's day? Certainly they would. And this is exactly the case of the Sabbath of the Lord; it has been supplanted by a rival institution. Not indeed as is claimed by a day set apart by the Son of God, but by a heathen festival brought into the Church with other pagan corruptions, and foisted upon it by a foreign influence hostile to the spirit and intent of the Sabbath institution, and bent on its destruction.

AT a recent Sunday School Association meeting at Meridian, Mich., it became necessary because of lack of time to omit one topic which was to have been discussed. The choice lay between two, "Christ's Method of Teaching the Example for Sunday-school Teachers," and "Sunday-schools the Hope of the Nation." The latter topic was selected as being the more important theme, and a paper was read on it by Rev. G. H. Hudson (Baptist), who took the position that inasmuch as this is a Christian Nation only a Christian is competent to stand at its head; and as Christians are developed largely in the Sunday-school, therefore the Sunday-school is the hope of the Nation. That is, upon the Sunday-school devolves the work of training the future presidents of the United States! Truly the preachers of this country are getting ahead of the bishops of Constantine's time. The bishops only sought to make politics a branch of religion; the preachers

are seeking to make religion and politics identical. It matters little about the example of Christ if only the Sunday-school can train the presidents!

ABOUT as disingenuous a plea for Sunday laws as we have seen for some time, appeared a week or two since in the Baptist *Examiner*:—

The prohibition for one day in the week of all labor save works of necessity and mercy is on the one hand no infringement of any man's liberty, nor on the other is it a recognition of the Church by the State. Nor does the State undertake to say how the day of rest shall be spent.

But what reason has the *Examiner* for thinking, or rather for saying, that "the prohibition for one day of the week of all labor, save works of necessity and mercy, is on the one hand no infringement of any man's liberty"? This city is strongly Roman Catholic, and tens of thousands of people in it observe Saint Patrick's day by refraining from labor and business. Suppose the aldermen were to pass an ordinance requiring all to rest on Saint Patrick's day, except those who conscientiously and regularly celebrate the battle of the Boyne, what would the *Examiner* think? and what would it say? Would it not say that the liberty of every Protestant in the city was infringed by the ordinance? It certainly would, and justly so too. But if the civil law may rightly require the observance of Sunday, why may it not do the same thing for other religious festivals? For while the *Examiner* denies that Sunday laws are a recognition of the Church by the State, the fact remains that Sunday laws exist solely for the reason that Sunday is a religious institution. Were it not so there would be no such thing as a Sunday law.

BUT the sophistry of the *Examiner* is more apparent when we place side by side two statements which appeared in the same article in its columns, but separated by several paragraphs:—

The State does not undertake to say how the day of rest shall be spent.

When the Sunday holiday begins to nullify the Sunday rest day, the State should interfere.

That is, the State does not pretend to say how the day shall be spent, but it does say that it shall be spent neither as a working day nor as a holiday. The State leaves every man perfectly free to do just as he pleases on Sunday, provided he neither works nor plays! Wonderful freedom, which out of a possible three excludes two and leave the subject "free" to "choose" the third! But such is the freedom enjoyed under Sunday laws.

## THE AMERICAN SENTINEL,

A WEEKLY PAPER

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single copy, per year, post-paid, \$1.00.

In clubs of less than 100 copies, per year, each, - 90c.

In clubs of 100 or more copies, per year, each, - 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 5s.

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