

"IF ANY MAN HEAR MY WORDS, AND BELIEVE NOT, I JUDGE HIM NOT: FOR I CAME NOT TO JUDGE THE WORLD, BUT TO SAVE THE WORLD."

Vol. 10. No. 44.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 7, 1895.

Price, 3 cents.

## American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE  
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.  
CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, }  
LEON A. SMITH, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

### GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY AND THE "POWERS THAT BE."

A CORRESPONDENT writes that he is unable to harmonize the idea of God's sovereignty in earthly affairs, with the statement made recently in the SENTINEL that the power and glory of the kingdoms of this earth are delivered into the hands of Satan.

As we have said before, the condition expressed by the latter statement arose from the fact that Satan overcame Adam, the father of the race, in the garden of Eden. We know that "of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage." 2 Peter 2: 19. Thus Adam was brought into bondage to Satan, and this bondage is the bondage of sin. Sin is the will of Satan, being the opposite of righteousness, which is the will of God. That which holds an individual in this bondage is called the "law of sin and death." Rom. 8: 2.

From this law, which works in the natural heart of every man, there is no escape but by "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus;" in other words, by the provisions of God's grace as revealed in the gospel. And as "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3: 23), all are in bondage to sin, subject to the law of sin and death, save such as have been "born again" by the Spirit and Word of God.

These latter, sad to say, are but a small minority among the multitudes that people the earth; and as it is to-day, so it has been in all ages of the world. Multitudes have ever thronged the broad, smooth road that leads to perdition, while only the few have traversed the narrow, rugged way that leads to life.

Hence, in all ages of the world, the multitudes have been on the side of Satan. They have been sinners, doing his will in every sin that they committed. And such have been

by far the greater number of those who have sat upon the thrones and stood in the high places of earthly kingdoms.

We cannot trace the history of earthly kingdoms and arrive at any other conclusions. Their power and splendor have not been used for the glory of God, but for the glorification of man, and through man, for the glorification of him whom every sinful man serves, that is, Satan. This is why they have fallen, one after the other, and gone down in ruin.

Yet God has never vacated the throne of universal sovereignty. There can be no *rightful* rule that is contrary to his, but this does not alter the fact that such rule does exist. We see it on every side of us. We see the reign of sin, in the low places and in the high, producing all that is evil and contrary to the will of God. God could blot this out in a moment and assert his rightful rule; but he does not do so, since he will demonstrate to every being in the universe that his ways are just, and that his kingdom is not based upon the principle that "might makes right." Thus sin, though without a shadow of right in God's universe, must be permitted, until the work of God for men shall be finished, and his purpose in man's creation carried out.

God has ordained "the powers that be," since there must be government on the earth. He is the rightful ruler, but he will rule only where he has the willing consent of his subjects; he will rule only where obedience springs from love. This is the highest, the best obedience, and he will accept no other. He will not be the ruler of automatons nor of slaves. The obedience of every one of his subjects must be consistent with their perfect freedom.

Hence, another rule is instituted by him among men, in their sinful state, but instituted to supply the place of God's direct rule only so far as concerns the securing of public order and peace. These are necessary conditions to human progress and to the realization of his own purposes in the earth. This is the rule of those who exercise "the powers that be." And because their rule, as ordained by Him, is thus limited, it is not necessary that they should themselves be righteous.

The case of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, furnishes a good illustration. His rule

was ordained of God. In the prophecy of Jeremiah we read that God said: "I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beast of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him; . . . and it shall come to pass that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord." Jer. 27: 5-8.

Here Nebuchadnezzar is called the servant of God; yet he was not a righteous man. He was a heathen king, and a worshiper of idols. He set up a great idol in the plains of Dura, as we read in the prophecy of Daniel, and commanded all his subjects to worship it, and cast the three Hebrew worthies into the fiery furnace because of their refusal to do so. In all this he was the servant of Satan. And the power and glory of his kingdom, wielded as these were by the king and the heathen men of his court, Daniel and his fellows excepted, were in the hands of Satan, for he controlled them as his servants. Yet God overruled in certain things, and made the king an instrument in his hands to serve him, though ignorant of God, in the accomplishment of his divine purpose.

The power of King Pharaoh, who refused to let the Israelites depart from Egypt, was also ordained of God, for we are plainly told that God raised him up to his high station that he might be an instrument through which would be manifested God's greatness and power. And Pharaoh faithfully served the devil in his cruelty and wicked obstinacy, yet God overruled events so that the purpose he had in view was accomplished. Thus Pharaoh was in a sense the servant of God, and his power and station were ordained of God; but no one will question that the power and glory of his court, with its magicians, soothsayers, and idolators, were under Satan's control.

The "powers that be" to-day are ordained of God, and we are commanded to be subject unto them in things pertaining to the exercise

of their legitimate authority. Yet the present kingdoms of this world are not kingdoms of righteousness, but are full of every kind of iniquity. When Christ takes the kingdoms he will "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel," and they will be utterly swept away, as described in Dan. 2:35. Yet under their rule we have order and peace and the security afforded by laws which are in the main intended for the restraint of evil-doers. But the full and perfect sovereignty of God which is his right cannot be established here so long as there remain those who will not render to him willing, loving obedience in all things. When the time shall come that his will is to be done here as it is in heaven, there will be no further need of the powers that be.

#### AN ITEM FOR TENNESSEE, GEORGIA, ET AL.

OCTOBER 10, 1895, two Americans, of whom the writer was one, and six Armenians, *all Seventh-day Adventists*, were starting from Constantinople to go out to the head of the bay of Nicomedia. As the time was in the midst of the late uprising of the Armenians in Constantinople, naturally enough all Armenians were held under suspicion, and were subject to search for arms or correspondence. And as we Americans were in company with Armenians our valises were also searched. In the valise of one were a number of letters, etc., in English. This of course was not understood by the Turkish officers, and consequently the whole party was arrested and put under an armed guard to be kept until we could be taken to the chief of police for examination.

A few minutes after we had been arrested, another officer with a squad of soldiers was passing, and seeing us guarded by a squad of soldiers also, he turned aside to see why it was. When he came up he recognized one or two of the Armenians, and knew them to be Seventh-day Adventists. He at once said to the other officers: "Oh, these men are Sabbatharians; you need not be afraid of them; they are all right." The other officers not knowing what the standing of the "Sabbatarians"—the title given to the Seventh-day Adventists by the Turks—is, could not let us go without authority. They immediately treated us with marked respect however, moved the guard back a considerable distance and gave us seats, while the two chief officers jumped into a carriage and drove rapidly away to the headquarters of the Imperial Police to see further about it. In about half an hour, or perhaps less, they were back again with the word from headquarters that the "Sabbatarians" were all right, and were not to be suspected, and with orders to let us go at once. Immediately, therefore, with such respectful and repeated bows and salutes as to amount almost to an apology, we were conducted by one of the officers aboard the ship; and the officer who had first recognized us came aboard, shook hands with us, and wished us a pleasant journey.

This is the way that Turkey treats the Seventh-day Adventists when they are known. Instead of putting them into prison or the chain-gang, she sets them free when by mistake they are taken prisoners. Instead of hunting them with suspicion, cruelty, and persecution, she orders that they are not to be molested. From this fact it is plain that Tennessee, Georgia, Illinois, and other States of the boasted "Christian nation" of the United States could very well learn some lessons in justice and government from the abhorred Turk whose government is held by Christian(?) nations as hardly fit to be on the earth.

It will not do to say that here we had broken no law, while in those States the Seventh-day Adventists break the law; *first*, because here as soon as it was stated that we were Seventh-day Adventists *there was no sort of inquiry* as to whether we were breaking any law—that fact alone settled all such questions; and *secondly*, when such a government as Turkey can hold Seventh-day Adventists above suspicion, just *because* of their known character as Seventh-day Adventists, then any law of any other government, and above all any law of such government as that of the States or the United States, that makes them subject to constant surveillance, arrest, prosecution, imprisonment, and chain-gangs, is an unjust, illegal, and barbarous law. Such law shows that the *government*, and not the people, is wrong.

It is a queer comment on Western civilization and religion that harmless people are safer in Constantinople than in Chicago, and safer under the government of Turkey than under the government of the American States. But such is the living fact in the experience of Seventh-day Adventists, who by the testimony of both American and Turkish judges, are harmless people. All this too was done by the Turkish power altogether on its own part, without any petition or communication from the Seventh-day Adventists.

A. T. J.

Constantinople, Oct. 17.

#### FIGHTING THE ENEMIES OF CHRIST.

"THE National Citizenship League," says the *Union Signal*, of Oct. 24, "has issued a call 'To the People of God Everywhere,' setting forth the method and purpose of that organization and summoning the followers of Christ to unite against his enemies. It is signed by a long list of men and women, thinkers and philanthropists, among them Frances E. Willard and Lady Henry Somerset, and appended are letters of indorsement from well-known ministers and educators. The league is non-partisan and non-sectarian, its three-fold object being:

'1. To reveal Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the nation as well as of the individual.

'2. To make Christian principles operative in public affairs.

'3. To unite the followers of Christ in consistent, harmonious and aggressive action, not as church members, but as Christian citizens for the following purposes:

'(1) To prevent by personal effort the nomination and election of corrupt candidates and the enactment of corrupt laws in city, State and nation.

'(2) To secure fidelity on the part of officers intrusted with the execution of the laws.

'(3) To exterminate the saloon as the greatest enemy of Christ and humanity.

'(4) To preserve the sabbath.

'(5) To purify and elevate the elective franchise.

'(6) To promote the study of social wrongs and the application of effective remedies.

'(7) In general to seek the reign of whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely and of good report.'

Without questioning the motives of those who have issued this summons to all the followers of Christ, it must still be said that this "call" has a sound not in harmony with the accents of the voice of Christ himself. In the first place, Christ never called his followers to be united *against* his enemies; for all sinners are the enemies of Christ, yet he himself

was never against them, but gave even his life for them.

True, it is political opposition that is here contemplated; but it is no part of the work of Christianity to array the followers of Christ in political parties against his enemies. There is nothing in such antagonism that tends in the direction of love for those enemies or that seeks the salvation of their souls. Its tendency is rather the opposite, as must be evident to every person who takes note of the things said and done by the opposing parties in any political campaign.

It cannot be supposed that the provisions of the gospel itself do not place all Christians in antagonism to all that can properly be antagonized in the pursuance of Christian work. Hence a call to such union at the present time is as superfluous as it is belated.

True Christian antagonism to this world's evil is that antagonism which was manifested in the life of Christ; for he only is a Christian in whom Christ dwells (Gal. 2:20), and Christ is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." He lives in each of his followers now the same life that he lived in the flesh when he walked and taught in Judea.

If political methods constitute the proper means whereby Christ's followers are to oppose the forces of evil, it is strange indeed that he should not have given his followers a single word of instruction upon this point.

If the ballot,—the instrument chosen by the National Christian Citizenship League for the accomplishment of its aims, is a proper weapon of Christian warfare, St. Paul made a great mistake when he wrote to the Corinthian church, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal."

The weapons of the Christian's warfare are "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10:4, 5. Why abandon these weapons for one that is immeasurably inferior to them in power,—one which cannot touch the thoughts and imaginations of the heart at all?

Why abandon "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God" (Eph. 6:17),—that word which "is quick [living] and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12), in the work of subduing all that is opposed to righteousness, for one of the weapons of ungodliness itself? Is not the sword of the Spirit the most powerful weapon in the universe for this very purpose?

Undoubtedly one great reason for such a fatal error on the part of so many persons of undoubted loyalty of purpose to the cause of Christ, is a failure to discern a great truth of fundamental importance in its relation to the subject of Christian warfare; namely, that the real enemies against whom the Christian wars are not those that he sees around him. In other words, and as the Scripture states it, "We wrestle not against flesh and blood." Eph. 6:12. To make the warfare a battle against flesh and blood, using a carnal weapon, is therefore simply to make sure of utter failures in the real conflict which is being waged with the forces of evil.

The weapon of Christ's warfare was the word of God. "It is written," were his words as he withstood and conquered the great foe that manipulates the evil forces of this world. "We wrestle," says the apostle, "not against flesh and blood, but against principal-

ities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Eph. 6:12. Then with what weapons shall we fight? Shall we use one which has a place in the armory of the ungodly? Shall we attempt to fight the devil with fire? Or shall we make Christ our example, and employ the weapon that he used?

Every real and permanent reform must touch the heart, the fountain head of the good or evil that is seen in the life. And therefore there can be no reasonable hope of accomplishing any such reform without the instrumentality of that which alone can reach and change the heart,—the word of the living God.

If the time, the effort, and the means now being expended by hundreds of thousands of Christians in the impossible scheme of converting this world and overcoming its confederacy of evil by the use of political weapons, were used to proclaim the "living and powerful" word of God, the result would be immeasurably better for the world, for themselves, and for the cause of Christ.

### RELIGION IN POLITICS.

THE various religious organizations which are working to "elevate" politics in our land by consolidating and directing the Christian vote, are nearly always careful to explain in setting forth their purpose and plans, that they seek no union of Church and State. They seem to think, and doubtless with good reason, that without this disclaimer the natural conclusion of their hearers would be that such a union was directly intended.

They do not mean that any person shall vote as a church member, but only as a Christian; hence, they say, no union of Church and State can be the result.

But what constitutes a union of Church and State? As at present commonly understood, and as defined by the societies and leagues for the promotion of "Christian citizenship," it means a union of the State with some one or more church denominations, to the exclusion of others. But if this be the true definition, then there was no union of Church and State in the Dark Ages; for then Rome was the one supreme church, so far as political interests were concerned, and it was all the same whether she instructed her adherents to use their political power and influence as Roman Catholics, or merely as Christians.

The scheme of Christian citizenship which is being elaborated to-day, will present similar conditions. The merely "Christian" vote will be directed by these representatives of the churches as a whole, just as if no divisions in the church had taken place. Thus it will be precisely similar to the state of things that prevailed in Rome's palmy days, before these divisions arose.

But there was in those days a complete union of Church and State, as all Protestants will admit. Probably the reason they can see this so plainly while being unable to see that any such union is in prospect now, is that they look upon Rome's union with the State from the standpoint of opposition to the Church as a whole, which Rome then was; while now, they will themselves be the representatives of the universal "Christian" church, and hence in full harmony with it.

To be sure, there were a few who stood out against Rome even in her best days, standing upon the Word of God and maintaining their allegiance to him; but this fact did not invalidate Rome's claim that she was the universal Christian church *any more* than the fact that

there are now a few who, from the standpoint of God's Word, oppose popular church dogmas and institutions for which State support is sought, invalidates the assumption of the churches to-day to constitute, as a whole, the Christian church.

The truth is, that every attempt to manipulate the "Christian vote" or any other kind of vote so as to secure political support, and through that the sanction of municipal, State or national law to religious dogmas or institutions, is an effort to unite Church and State. And when that purpose is apparent in the work of any religious organization, that organization is really working to unite Church and State, however loudly it may disclaim the fact.

### WHAT ELSE COULD THEY EXPECT?

In a sermon in this city on Oct. 27, Rev. F. M. Foster, Reformed Presbyterian, said, as reported in the *Sun* of the following day:—

The political situation in this city is so corrupt that there is absolutely no hope of purifying it by the ballot box. Of the three parties worthy of notice not one of them has sufficient fear of God to stand for the fourth commandment. This witnesses to moral stagnation and death. All the saloon-keeper has to do is to hold on a little longer and he will sweep such anti-Christian, morally nil, forces from the field. It is believed that those who control politics, who make platforms, who name candidates, have already so dishonored the Sabbath, and the God of the Sabbath, as to make it impossible for them to lead to moral victory; and the Republicans are not a whit behind the Democrats in this respect.

Oct. 6, the Lord's day, was spent from before noon to late at night in a great discussion by committees from the Chamber of Commerce, the Good Government, the German-American Reform Union, and the Republican party, trying to get together on a platform and on candidates. A clearer, more unjustifiable, and reprehensible violation of divine law, as embodied in the fourth commandment, will not be seen when the saloons are thrown wide open on that day. If Tammany Hall is a law-breaker and should be cast out, such party leaders are law-breakers and deserve the same condemnation.

The God of heaven affirms, "Without me ye can do nothing." If this be true, and it is, these party leaders, having cast off the law of God, cannot expect his blessing to attend their efforts. They can't lead the people to victory. They have shown that their fear of God compares favorably with Fourteenth Street [Tammany Hall]. It is no worse, but it is questionable if it is any better. The God-fearing Christian should refuse to be marshalled under their banner, as they can hope for nothing but defeat.

The platforms adopted by the Fusion, the Good Government, and Tammany Hall parties each pledges more liberal excise laws; and furthermore, that those elected shall use their efforts to have the fourth commandment submitted to the desire and will of this metropolis—cast into the den of lions. With such platform it is believed that a Christian cannot stand for election to office; nor can he vote for those who, with "no fear of God before their eyes," are candidates. If he votes, he pledges the man for whom he votes to give a more liberal excise law—to open saloons on the Lord's day. If it was ever doubtful as to what the Christian's duty is, this is not that time.

As Christ warns judges and rulers to fear and serve him, and as our Constitution and Government reject him, all parties calling for the casting off of his law, loyalty to Christ requires of the God-fearing citizen that he refuse to participate in the godless affairs of the godless government until it repent and return to God.

We maintain that loyalty to Christ requires no less than this. If the government will not own that it is under the law of God, and parties put up that law as the price of votes, it is time for the Christian to step aside lest the vengeance of an offended judge engulf him also. If they will not have our God and his law, they cannot have us, for we stand with Christ. No, the Christian cannot vote under present conditions.

What better has Mr. Foster a right to expect? He and all the Sunday preachers have demanded that the government take cognizance of religious questions; and now that such a question has been made the football of contending parties, what right has he or any like him to complain? None whatever.

### SOUND POLITICAL PRINCIPLES.

In contrast with the platforms of the various political parties in this State, all of which favor religious legislation, it is worth while to note the following declaration of sound principles made by the committee on address of the Utah Democratic Convention, which assembled at Salt Lake City, Oct. 22, for the purpose of deciding on some plan of action in the matter of the interference of the Mormon Church in the political affairs of the Territory:—

We declare the truth to be, that man may worship his Maker as his conscience dictates; that no State or political party has the right to interfere with this great privilege; that man's first allegiance politically is to his country; that no church, ecclesiastical body, or spiritual adviser should encroach upon the political rights of the individual; that in a free country no man or body of men can with safety to the State use the name or the power of any religious sect or society to influence or control the elective franchise; that no citizen, by reason of his association with any church, can be absolved from his duty to the State, either in times of war or times of peace, without the consent of the State; that a trust is imposed upon such citizen in a free country to act politically upon his own judgment and absolutely free from control or dictation, ecclesiastical or otherwise.

We therefore, in solemn manner say that we will not be dictated to, interfered with, or hindered in our political duties by those selected to minister to us the consolations of the gospel.

From this it appears that in a situation where the people of a State or Territory feel called upon to oppose Church interference in political affairs, it is easy for them to see that such interference is altogether wrong, and that every citizen is bound "to act politically upon his own judgment and absolutely free from control or dictation, ecclesiastical or otherwise." But it seems to be quite a different matter where the church that is meddling in politics is one to which they themselves belong, or which they favor, or where the interference is by a combination of the churches capable of wielding vast political power, and having general respect and favor throughout the land.

It is a fact that there is ten times more danger threatening this country from the interference of the various Protestant churches or organizations, in political affairs, than from any action that can be taken by the Mormon Church, simply because the former are ten times more numerous and powerful than the latter, and are but little, if any, behind it in their determination to control politics, within the sphere of their influence, in the interests of church dogmas and institutions.

### SAVING THE NATION.

ONE of the aims of the Christian Citizenship League is "to reveal Christ as the Saviour of the nation as well as of the individual."

The terms of that salvation which Christ brought to mankind, stamp such an idea as utterly preposterous. He himself stated them, and said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Mark 16: 15, 16.

This shows that the securing of salvation through Christ is wholly an individual matter. No one ever heard of an act of faith that was not individual, or of baptism being administered to anything but individuals.

It shows also that any movement which aims at securing national salvation through Christ, proceeds either in total ignorance or total disregard of the teachings of the Word of God.

The idea is contrary to both revelation and

reason. If Christ could save the nation as well as the individual, then he could save sinners in their sins as well as from their sins; since the individual, while not the nation, is an inseparable part of the nation, and failing to secure salvation as an individual, because of his sins, he might secure it as a part of the nation, provided only that the nation secured it!

If there could be such a thing as a Christian nation, in a governmental sense, then that government, if it continued Christian, would be saved through Christ. Hence if this Government be Christian, or can become such, and does not fall from grace, it will be saved in the kingdom of God, and there will be in that kingdom, through all eternity, a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," founded on the Constitution of the United States!

It needs only this slight elaboration of the idea to show its utter absurdity. How intelligent Christian people can believe in it and work for its realization, is something that passes comprehension.

Salvation through Christ is for individuals only, and any measure which aims at securing that salvation, can be effective only as it applies to individuals. And there will be just that proportion of the nation saved, which is comprised by the aggregate of those individual citizens of it who are truly Christian. But no government now existing upon earth, or that ever has existed since the fall, will be perpetuated in the earth made new.

### ROME REBUKES PROTESTANTS.

BY ALLEN MOON.

ON Thursday, Oct. 24, the clergy of Baltimore, Maryland, held a meeting for the purpose of discussing their Law and Order crusade, and especially the enforcement of the old Puritan Sunday law, enacted in 1794. The Catholic clergy of the city were invited to attend the meeting. Rev. Father O'Keefe, pastor of St. Francis Catholic church, is reported in the *Baltimore American* to have replied by letter that "he was not in sympathy with meetings of ministers who undertook to manage civil affairs, as the civil officers were selected for that purpose, and that he believed more good could be accomplished by attending to their spiritual duties." It is a sad comment on the spirit of the times, when the followers of Wesley receive such merited rebuke from a priest of Rome.

It may not come with very good grace from the clergy of a church that has always meddled in civil affairs; for them to reprove the ministers of the Methodist Church for following the example of Rome; but in this country of boasted freedom in religion, as well as freedom from the domination of the Church, it would seem that the Catholic clergy are becoming ashamed to be found in company with ministers who so far forget their sacred calling as to neglect the work of the ministry for the salvation of men, and engage in a crusade for the enforcement of unjust civil enactments.

Every Catholic priest knows from whence the Sunday institution came. He knows that his church, the author of Sunday, is able to secure just the kind of observance in the church that she decrees. And believing that there is no salvation outside the church, he has no confidence in the plan of saving men by a crusade to compel men outside the church to obey one precept of the church, while living in violation of others.

Consistency is on the side of the Catholic priest, who believing in the power of the

church to ordain feasts and holy days, devotes his time and energies to convincing men of the divine mission of his church, and leaves the administration of civil affairs to those who are selected for that work.

Would it not be well for Protestant ministers to take this matter home to themselves, and instead of degrading their sacred office by descending to the control of civil legislation, devote every energy to the cause of the Author of our salvation, who said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel," and "Whoever believeth shall be saved." The Author of the commission under which these men claim to be laboring, wants preaching preachers, instead of law-enforcing preachers. The Lord could have ordained that men should be saved by law if he in his wisdom had seen best.

If these law-enforcing preachers would abandon their crusade and go over to the Catholic Church, they would have congenial company among those who believe in the Sunday institution; and those that do not so believe might have liberty to serve the cause of their Master, the Saviour of men.

### CUSTOM AGAINST PRECEPT.

BY E. J. WAGGONER.

"REMEMBER the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11.

Thus reads the fourth commandment. In thousands of churches it is read every Sunday, and all the congregation unite in saying at its close, "Lord . . . incline our hearts to keep this law." And yet it is not kept, because the day which the commandment says must be observed is the seventh day, while people in general keep the first day of the week, a day not mentioned in the commandment, except as included in the "six days" in which work may be done.

It is a fact that the seventh day of the week is the day commonly called Saturday.

It is a fact that the people who heard the words of the law spoken directly to them from Mount Sinai, did observe the seventh day of the week in obedience to that commandment, and to this day still hold that it is the Sabbath, whether they keep it or not.

It is a fact that the Jews in the wilderness, and for centuries thereafter, were under the direct leadership of the Lord himself, the Lord manifesting himself to them, and talking with them and their leaders as he has never done with any other people.

It is also a fact that when they were the most closely connected with the Lord, and his presence among them the most marked, they were the most faithful in their observance of the seventh day.

The fact that the Jews kept the seventh day of the week while the Lord who spoke the fourth commandment was personally conducting them, shows that God meant just what he said, and that the fourth commandment does require the observance of the seventh day of the week, which alone is the true Sabbath of the Lord.

Further, it is a fact that the commandment cannot mean two different things. The words, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of

the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," cannot mean both the seventh day and the first. Neither can they refer to either one of them indifferently. Neither can they mean anything different now from what they did when first spoken and written. If they apply to the first day of the week now, then they must always have meant the same day, and in that case the ancient Jews must have been wrong in their practice, and the Lord must have encouraged them in that wrong.

But such a supposition is impossible. The fact that God specified by daily miracles for forty years, just which day they should observe, shows, as before stated, that the seventh day of the week—Saturday—and that only, is the day which the commandment enjoins.

This being the case, those who hear the commandment read every Sunday should either cease responding, "Lord . . . incline our hearts to keep this law," or else should begin to keep it; for it is certain that the fourth commandment can no more be obeyed by resting on Sunday, than the first commandment can be kept by worshiping Jupiter.

But some one will ask, "Has not the commandment been changed?" We do not find in the Bible any record of a change. If the commandment has been changed, so as to warrant Sunday observance, why is it that the revised law is not read in any of the churches? If people really thought that the commandment had been changed, it would be very strange for them to keep on for years reading the old commandment, which enjoins another day from that which they keep. No; the commandment has not been changed, and nobody really thinks that it has been.

"But surely the day has been changed." Nothing can show the weakness of this position any better than the statements of those who hold to it. Read what the Vicar of Burgh, Lincolnshire, in a tract intended to show the necessity of Sunday observance, says about the matter:—

When Christ's life on earth was ended, and he had ascended to heaven, a change was made as to the day which was to be kept holy. . . . Before Christ's coming, the seventh day was kept holy in remembrance of the finished work of creation. After his ascension, the first day was sanctified in remembrance of the completed work of redemption. This change was made by the apostles in obedience to the will of Christ. We are not told of any words of his in which he gave this direction.

Just think of it. It is said that the apostles made the change in obedience to the will of Christ, and yet we nowhere find the words in which he gave the direction, nor even any words of the apostles, in which they intimate that such a direction ever was given! How then do men know that it was given? They do not, and never can know that it was. For no one can know that a thing is so when it is not so; and the fact that there is no record of any such change, is evidence that no such change was ever made. Christ ascended to heaven without saying anything about a change in the day. The apostles all died without ever saying anything about it, or even intimating that Christ ever said a word about it. But some men say that the change was made by the disciples in obedience to the will of the Lord. Let them produce the inspired record before they try to make people believe it.

No; the day remains the same, and will remain unchanged throughout eternity. But the people have changed. The great apostasy began, and the people insensibly drifted away from the standard of Christ and his apostles, under the influence of surrounding paganism. Then the apostasy culminated in the papacy, which thought to change the times and the

laws, so that the customs of the people were taken as the standard of right, instead of the Bible. And that is how people now keep Sunday instead of the Sabbath.

But custom cannot make a thing any different from what God has established it. "The customs of the people are vain." Jer. 10:3. The traditions of men are the transgression of the commandments of God. This matter of custom against the word of the Lord is strikingly set forth in the following from John Bunyan's famous "dream." Christian was on his journey, when—

He espied two men come tumbling over the wall on the left hand of the narrow way; and they made up apace to him. The name of one was Formalist, and the name of the other was Hypocrisy. So, as I said, they drew up to him, who thus entered with them into discourse.

*Chris.* Gentlemen, whence came you, and whither go you?

*Form. and Hyp.* We were born in the land of Vain-glory, and we are going for praise to Mount Zion.

*Chris.* Why came you not in at the gate which standeth at the beginning of the way? Know ye not that it is written, "He that cometh not in by the door, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber?"

*F. and A.* They said that to go to the gate for entrance was, by all their countrymen, counted too far about; and that therefore their usual way was to make a short cut of it, and to climb over the wall as they had done.

*Chris.* But will it not be counted a trespass against the Lord of the city whither we are bound, thus to violate his revealed will?

*F. and H.* They told him that as for that he need not trouble his head thereabout; for what they did they had custom for, and could produce, if need were, testimony that could witness it for more than a thousand years.

*Chris.* "But," said Christian, "will it stand a trial at law?"

*F. and H.* They told that custom, it being of so long standing as above a thousand years, would doubtless now be admitted as a thing legal by an impartial judge. "And besides," said they, "if we get into the way, what matter is it which way we may get in? If we are in, we are in: thou art but in the way, who, as we perceive, came in at the gate; and we are also in the way, that came tumbling over the wall; wherein now is thy condition better than ours?"

*Chris.* I walk by the rule of my Master; you walk by the rude working of your own fancies. You are counted thieves already by the Lord of the way. You came in by yourselves without his directions, and shall go out by yourselves without his mercy.

To those who plead "custom" as a sufficient reason for keeping Sunday instead of the Sabbath, let me ask, "Will it stand a trial at law?"

### OUR UNWRITTEN CONSTITUTION.

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

THE written constitution is a political growth. For centuries of early political history constitutional law was merely a matter of tradition and memory; but repeated struggles for freedom emphasized the value of the pen and ink sketch of what the law was. So we have in history the Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the Petition of Right, the Declaration of Independence—all foreshadowing the Federal and State Constitutions of to-day. These fundamental principles of government are what constituted the unwritten constitution of the past, and in accordance with the modern idea of supremacy of fundamental law these old constitutional principles were declared to be of paramount authority.

Magna Charta had scarce been given to the English nation when it was redeclared and the provision added that any decree contrary to the rights therein secured, was *void and of no effect*. This appears to have been the first great statutory declaration of the nullity

of any legal act contrary to fundamental law; it was, however, merely the statutory recognition of an already established constitutional doctrine.

This unwritten constitution was known as the common law,—as distinguished from custom law and statute law,—of the English peoples. It was called common law because it concerned and was common to the whole people. This common law was brought over from England with the colonists and forms the basis of the constitutional rights and liberties of the American people.

"The common law of England," says Judge Cooley, in his "Constitutional Limitations," "consisted of those maxims of freedom, order, enterprise and thrift which had prevailed in the conduct of public affairs, the management of private business, the regulation of the domestic institutions, and the acquisition, control and transfer of property from time immemorial. It was the outgrowth of the habits of thought and action of the people, and was modified gradually and insensibly, from time to time, as those habits became modified, and as civilization advanced, and new inventions introduced new wants and conveniences and new modes of business. Springing from the very nature of the people themselves, and developed in their own experience, it was obviously the body of laws best adapted to their needs, and as they took with them their nature, so also they would take with them these laws wherever they should transfer their domiciles from one country to another.

"To enlodge the common law is no part of our present purpose," continues the jurist. "But, on the whole, the system was the best foundation on which to erect an enduring structure of civil liberty which the world has ever known. It was the peculiar excellence of the common law of England that it recognized the worth, and sought especially to protect the rights and privileges of the individual man. Its maxims were those of a sturdy and independent race, accustomed, in an unusual degree, to freedom of thought and action and to a share in the administration of public affairs; and arbitrary power and uncontrolled authority were not recognized in its principles. Awe surrounded and majesty clothed the king, but the humblest subject might shut the door of his cottage against him, and defend, from intrusion, that privacy which was as sacred as the kingly prerogatives. The system was the opposite of servile; its features implied boldness and independent self-reliance on the part of the people."

American law is full of praise for this great body of law on which our own Constitution is based. "No one who is familiar with the common law of England," declares Justice Miller, of the United States Supreme Court, in his lectures on the Constitution, "can read the Constitution of the United States without observing the great desire of the convention which framed that instrument to make it conform, as far as possible with that law."

And from this ancient source it was that we get the barrier that forever seals with disapproval and illegality any law interfering with religious freedom. The great Justice Mansfield, in stating this principle of law, declared: "Persecution for a sincere, though erroneous conscience, is not to be deduced from reason or the fitness of things [the test of what constitutes the common law]."

Early in the reign of George III., this constitutional principle was asserted in a judicial decision of the House of Lords, as follows: "There is nothing certainly more unreasonable, more inconsistent with the rights of human nature, more contrary to the spirit and

precepts of the Christian religion, more iniquitous and unjust, more impolitic, than persecution. It is against natural religion, revealed religion, and sound policy."\*

It was already a maxim of the common law five hundred years ago when Europe was deluged with the blood of martyrs. And it is this same constitution now, written and unwritten, that will be the sole protection of the statute-persecuted Christians of Tennessee and elsewhere. When legislatures, public sentiment and officers have no longer any sympathy for the persecuted, the followers of Jesus of Nazareth will have only what protection the Constitution can give. To the Charters of Justice alone can they cling, for all else fails when friends have failed.

### RELIGIOUS LIBERTY—CHURCH AND STATE.

[Chas. Foley, in Patriot Phalanx.]

THE word "religion" has such a world-wide meaning, and is used by people to express so great a variety of sentiment and things, that to understand its use in a given instance by any one, it is indispensably necessary to look and enquire outside of the word itself, and to study the person using it, and the circumstances under which used. I doubt whether there is another word in our language in as common use, that requires so much care to get at the meaning of the person using it. When the word religion is used to express a man's highest and noblest conceptions of duty and obligation, then I think we will all agree that all men should carry such religion with them into the shop, the field, into politics, in short, with them wherever they go, and in all they do, whether as private citizens or public servants.

A man's religion, whatever it is, whether exalted or low in conception, is purely an individual matter and can never be otherwise. A State can have no religion, any more than a bank or a railroad can. The maxim of the law books that "a corporation has no soul," is true. A State cannot propagate religion, or oppose its propagation, but it can use its police and military power to propagate and oppose the views and opinions of individuals as to what constitutes religion, its origin, its use and the office it performs in this life, and any life hereafter. A man should not, no man has the right, to carry his religious views into a public office and use political power to advance the ends of his creed or church, or enforce his religious views on others. No one wants the State to assist in the dissemination of religious views with which he is not in harmony, or to oppose his own.

Many Christians claim that Christianity itself is repugnant to all attempts on the part of the State to propagate it, and earnestly oppose the exercise of such power. I have just read a production of Dr. E. T. Hiscox, author, with other works, of the "Baptist Church Directory," a standard work among Baptists. He says:—

The "Baptist position" in respect to the relation of religious and secular affairs, is this: There should be no union of Church and State, but an entire separation between them in all matters pertaining to the administration of religious affairs. They represent two kingdoms, with distinct spheres and diverse functions, which cannot be united without injury to both. The State has no right of authority or of dictation in matters of faith or worship, which are questions of conscience and principle that lie between the individual soul and God. The State is bound to protect its citizens in the free exercise of their religious faith, without harm or hindrance, so long as they do not interfere with the rights of others. Christians should be good citizens, supporting the government which protects them, honoring the rulers and obeying

\* See Cobbett's Parliamentary History, Vol. XVI., pp. 313-327

the laws under which they live, so long as such laws are not contrary to the Word of God. The Church should sustain no organic relation to the State, and receive no patronage or support from it, since to do that would imply the right of supervision and dictation by the State. The support of religion belongs to those who profess it, and to allow fellowship and accept patronage from the State never fails to secularize the spirit and to corrupt the purity of the Church. The civil authorities have no right to enforce or demand any form of faith, any manner of worship, nor yet to establish by law or compel the observance of a sabbath, or any religious institution. It has no right to force conformity, or to punish dissent. Baptists to-day are loyal to their traditions through all the past. What they have demanded, labored for, and suffered to secure, is not *toleration*, but *liberty*; liberty in all concerns of conscience and of faith. The enactment of civil laws for the control or the curtailment of religious liberty, or for the infliction of civil penalties for nonconformity and the exercise of religious liberty, is wrong, unjust, contrary to the spirit of the gospel and to the genius of Christianity.

Let it be remembered that history teaches that the religious system that is espoused by any State, is always the system of the strongest and most aggressive religious party in that State, without regard to whether it is right or wrong.

### DANGER SIGNALS.

[Midland (Mich.) Republican, April 19, 1895.]

A WRITER who has not sufficiently the courage of his convictions to call himself anything else but "M," takes exception to the remarks of the *Republican* in regard to the danger of putting in the Constitution of the United States a clause naming "Christ as the nation's Sovereign, Lord, and King," and says: "We do not see the 'great world's council' assembled to elect the representative of Christ." This simply proves that "M" does not look into the past, nor open his eyes to the facts of to-day. It places him in the ranks of those who "having eyes see not." Can he be oblivious to the fact that there is to-day, on earth, a representative—elected to his office—for whom it is claimed that he should be recognized by all nations as a supreme arbiter? But "M" says:—

Intolerance and persecution in the past had their stronghold, not in belief in Christ or acknowledgment of him, but in the ignorance of the masses. The spread of education renders such bloody scenes as the world has witnessed in the name of religion highly improbable if not quite impossible in this day.

It is because of the value of information and acquaintance with the warnings of history and the signs of the times, and because of the good that an enlightened press may do in sounding these warnings that we have hope. We trust that before the proposition referred to is put to a vote of the States, the intelligence of the people and the "campaign of education" will insure its defeat. Mind that we have not said a word against belief in Christ, nor against trust in God. The proposition does not touch these. These pertain to the individual; but when any man or set of men undertake to rule others in the name of Christ, and invoke the civil law to help them, there will be persecution.

Men are lying in jail to-day in this "land of the free," simply for obeying the dictates of their own consciences in a matter of religious (Sabbath) observance. They are persecuted in the name and by the authority of the civil law. Referring to these things, no less a person than Dr. Lyman Abbot, in the *Outlook*, says:—

Let these abuses be ventilated. The sooner we understand whether this is actually a free country, the better it will be for all concerned.

The *Examiner and National Baptist*, of New York, says:—

In not a few of our States religious liberty is grossly,

wickedly, infamously violated through the abuse of what are called the Sunday laws.

The *Church Bulletin* (Baptist), of Chicago, says:—

Let us be careful how we let in the camel's nose of religious legislation.

The *Louisville Courier Journal* says:—

People are asking if we are returning to the days of Cotton Mather or the Spanish Inquisition.

But "M" says there is no danger. Let's sleep on while the choir sings. Yet at the very moment a determined and persistent effort is being made to wipe out what constitutional guarantees there are against this dangerous tendency.

The *New York World* says: "It [the State] has no more right to prescribe the religious observance of sabbaths and holy days, than to order sacraments and ordain creeds." Yet the convention referred to demanded that the "religious observance" mentioned be put in the Constitution, and further demanded the very thing that would lead to the ordaining of creeds,—in fact, demanded that a creed should be put in the Constitution itself!

### SECULARISTS BECOMING CONSISTENT.

At the fourteenth annual congress of the American Secular Union in 1890, a resolution was adopted demanding the "repeal of all laws enforcing the observance of Sunday as a religious institution rather than an economic one, justified by physiological and other secular reasons."

In commenting upon this demand of the American Secular Union, in the *SENTINEL* of Oct. 9, 1890, we said: "Sunday is, and always was, a religious institution. It was such in the old pagan world, and it is such now in the 'Christian' world, and we deny the right of the State to require its observance upon any grounds whatever. True, it is regarded as a holiday by many who have no religious regard for it, or indeed for anything else, and they have a perfect right to so use that or any other day, so far as their fellowmen are concerned; but we deny the right of one portion of the community or State to fasten upon the other portion, that is, upon the minority, no matter how small a minority it may be, the observance of Sunday or of any other day, for any reason *either religious or otherwise*. We do not deny the right of the State to make any day or any number of days *legal holidays*, leaving the individual citizen free to observe or not to observe such days just as he sees fit, as is now the case with the Fourth of July and other holidays; but to require the observance of such days, or to forbid upon one day, acts which are freely permitted upon other days, is an abuse of the power of the State. The American Secular Union should lay the ax to the root of the tree and demand that all laws 'directly or indirectly enforcing the observance of Sunday' upon any pretext, be repealed.

This advice has been followed more than once by the body to which it was given; and its adoption of and adherence to correct principles in this matter gives us ground to hope that some at least of its numbers may yet be led to discriminate fully between the Christianity of Christ and the "Christianity" of the creeds. The *SENTINEL* labors not to destroy but to build. We would not take from any man the faith that he has without at the same time giving him ground for a better, a nobler, a truer faith.

### DOES CONSCIENCE REQUIRE IT?

BY F. D. STARR.

IN its issue of Sept. 7, the *Christian Statesman* makes an editorial comment on the prosecution of Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists for violating the Sunday law. It says that the idea that there is any persecution about these arrests and imprisonments is an entire misapprehension of the facts in the case. Concerning labor on the first day of the week, the *Statesman* says: "No man's conscience requires him to work on that day." Upon this basis it argues that there can be no persecution whatever in a man's being forced by law to refrain from labor on the first day of the week.

The *Statesman* has undertaken a very grave task in attempting to decide what other men's consciences demand of them to do. It also states that "if anyone chooses to observe every day as a sabbath, the law will not interfere." It is readily admitted by all that some people's consciences require them to observe the seventh day of the week; but most people have consciences that take in other matters than the mere observance of any certain day in the week. Every Scripture requirement becomes to the true disciple of Christ a matter of conscience, and when he reads in 1 Tim. 5:8, "But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel," he feels in conscience bound to perform his duty. If he should neglect it, his conscience would condemn him, and properly, too.

We infer from the statement of the *Statesman* that no man's conscience requires him to work on the first day of the week, that no man's conscience requires him to work on any day of the week, and logically that a man's conscience would not be violated if he should not work three days or even seven days in the week. But what sort of a Christian would he be who had such a conscience? Conscience requires a man to provide for himself and for his own family, as well as to observe a certain day of the week.

The same God who gave the commandment to observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath gave just as explicit a command for laboring six days, so as to provide for our temporal necessities. With the close times and increasing poverty among the laboring classes, it does not require any argument to show that a man actually needs the entire six days for laboring in which to support his family. If he takes off fifteen or twenty per cent. of his time, as he would have to do in observing an extra day, as a day of enforced idleness, we cannot conceive how his conscience could leave him at ease in the matter. It seems that the *Statesman* has not well considered this point, for its position that no man's conscience requires him to work six days in the week would certainly indicate an extremely low idea of what a conscientious Christian must be. With a dependent family upon his hands to support, imagine, if you can, his conscience leaving him entirely unmolested on that day that he devotes to idleness, earning nothing whatever, but rather consuming the earnings of the other five days.

It seems remarkable that in an age of Christian enlightenment, any professed follower of the Master, who was ever diligent Himself, and who left ample instruction upon the point of diligence in business and frugal use of every moment of time, could advocate the absurd idea that a man can be a follower of Christ, and his conscience give him no trouble in so grave a matter as wasting quite a considerable portion of time every week, when he

needs that very time to support the family dependent upon him. Who can say that this is not a matter of conscience? No wonder the apostle has told us that he that is oblivious to this duty has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel, no matter what his Christian profession may be.

Man's first duty is to love God and thus keep the first four precepts of the Decalogue, but the command to love and care for fellow-beings is second only to this first command, and conscience requires it.

**HAVE CHANGED THEIR MINDS.**

The following from the Chicago Tribune, of October 28, illustrates some of the beauties of enforced Sunday rest:—

John Williams, No. 245 Sixty-third street, engaged a friend to move his household effects, and at 9 o'clock yesterday morning the work began. When the wagon was partly loaded an Englewood man going to church saw it and made complaint at the police station.

An officer was sent to the house with instructions to the family not to move. When the officer went away the work of loading the wagon continued, and again the police were requested to stop it. The man who owns the wagon said if they would not let him move the family because it was wrong to move on Sunday or do any work, he could not see his way towards unloading the wagon.

The police did not want the street obstructed all night, and the men who wanted to stop the moving did not want to be held responsible for any damage that might fall on the goods if they were left on Sixty-third street until Monday.

That was the status of the case when Police Sergeant Lillis told the man he might move, and at four o'clock in the afternoon, after wrangling all day, the teamster drove off with the goods.

The "law" of Illinois provides that the section prohibiting ordinary labor on Sunday, "shall not be construed to prevent ferrymen from carrying over the water travelers and persons moving their families on the first day of the week." It does not in so many words provide that persons shall be permitted to travel, or that it is lawful for families to move upon that day, but the presumption is that both things may be done, else why permit ferrymen to transport them over the water? It seems that this is the view that is taken of it by the police authorities of Chicago, for they only objected to the loading of the goods. It is simply another illustration of the absurdity of Sunday laws.

The purpose of human government being to preserve human rights, it cannot go beyond that. And that this is the sole purpose for which God ordained civil government among men is evident from the fact that had he ordained it for any other purpose, he would thereby have abdicated the throne of moral sovereignty. Had God permitted men to define and enforce duty toward him, he would by that very act have committed to men not only the custody but the modeling of his law, and moral duty, would then have been whatever government declared it to be; and the varying moral codes adopted by men must in such a case have been not only the rule of human conduct, but the divine rule of the divine judgment.

The Sabbath is not merely one-seventh part of time devoted to rest because of man's physical necessities, but it is a specific portion of time set apart by the Lord himself to keep him in mind as the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and as a sanctifier of his people.

**BOOKS FOR THE CHILDREN.**

We offer the following three books as the best of their kind we have been able to find. They are profusely illustrated, and the stories are told in a very simple yet highly entertaining manner. The books cannot fail to be exceedingly helpful to children in an educational way, and should be found in every home:—

**LITTLE FOLKS' BIBLE GALLERY**

Has nearly 100 pages, and contains 43 Bible stories, each illustrated with a full-page picture. Size, 7x9 inches, bound in board lithograph covers. Price, by mail, post-paid, \$1.00

**BIBLE PICTURES AND STORIES**

Has 45 full-page illustrations and an equal number of well-told Bible stories. Same style and size as "LITTLE FOLKS' BIBLE GALLERY," and is really a companion volume to it. Price, post-paid, \$1.00

A mother, than whom none can be more careful and particular as to what her children have to read and study, speaking of these two little books, says: "Really it is a pity that any little child should not have the privilege of seeing these beautiful full-page pictures and hearing the well-told stories."

Both "LITTLE FOLKS' BIBLE GALLERY" and "BIBLE PICTURES AND STORIES" will be sent to one address, post-paid, for \$1.75

**The Good Shepherd :**

The Life of the Saviour for Children.

Beautifully Illuminated Covers!  
Fifty-three Illustrations!  
Interesting Reading!




Ninety-six pages,  
Large print,  
Good paper,  
Strong binding.

This book, which is 8x10 1/2 inches and 1/2 inch in thickness, tells the story of the life of Christ in a way that cannot fail to interest the little folks. It is exceptionally free from doctrinal errors, and should be in every family where there are children to be taught a Saviour's love. The illustrations add very much to its educational value. Price, only 50 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 BOND STREET,  
NEW YORK CITY

**BIBLES :: - ::**



A LARGE AND VARIED STOCK.

Send for Catalogue to  
PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street,  
Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo. New York City.

**STEPS TO CHRIST,**

By Mrs. E. G. White.

We take pleasure in announcing an important and exceedingly helpful work, under the title of STEPS TO CHRIST. The rare ability of the author in the presentation of Scripture truth has never been used to better advantage than in this little work. STEPS TO CHRIST is not alone suitable as a guide to the inquirer and young convert, but is rich in thought and suggestion for the most mature Christian. Some idea of its scope and practical character may be gathered from the following table of contents:—

- THE SINNER'S NEED OF CHRIST.
- CONFESION. CONSECRATION. FAITH AND ACCEPTANCE.
- THE TEST OF DISCIPLESHIP. GROWING UP INTO CHRIST.
- THE WORK AND THE LIFE. KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.
- THE PRIVILEGE OF PRAYER. WHAT TO DO WITH DOUBT. REJOICING IN THE LORD.

The book is issued in a rich, neat cloth binding, embossed in silver, at 75 cents per copy; in white vellum cloth, silver edges, \$1.00. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address Pacific Press,  
43 Bond Street, New York City.  
or Oakland, Cal.

**FATHERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.**  
BY E. J. WAGGONER.

History repeats itself, because human nature is the same in all ages of the world. Hence, he who would know

**HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE**

must know how errors have developed in the past. The "Fathers of the Catholic Church" shows the condition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, briefly states the principles of ancient heathen philosophy, and shows how the adoption of these principles by prominent men in the Church, and the incautious lowering of the standard of pure Christianity, developed the papacy, which was simply a new form of paganism. The chapter on

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY is alone worth the price of the book.  
Fine English Cloth, Substantially Bound,  
CONTAINS ABOUT 400 PAGES,  
Will be Sent Post-paid for \$1.00  
PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street,  
New York City.  
Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo

**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, W. E. DAVIS,  
G. P. & A. Grand Trunk Ry., G. P. & T. A. C. & G. T. Ry.,  
MONTREAL, CANADA. CHICAGO, ILL.  
**FRANK P. DWYER,**  
Eastern Passenger Agent, G. T. Ry.,  
271 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY.



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 7, 1895.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

As this paper goes to press at least two Seventh-day Adventists, one in Tennessee, the other in Maryland, are about to answer before civil courts for failure to observe, as prescribed by law, the first day of the week, the "Christian sabbath."

IN considering our relation to "the powers that be," we must distinguish between the "powers" and the rulers who represent the powers. The "powers" that are "ordained of God" are always right and good; but the rulers are very often decidedly bad. We are always to be subject to the powers, but not to the rulers in the sense of obeying them, when they step outside the limits of the powers. God has not ordained that we should ever be thus subject to that which is evil.

WE have just learned through ex-Senator Wm. P. Tolley, of Rucker, Tenn., of the death, on the 19th ult., of Elder J. G. Woods, of Fayetteville, Tenn. Elder Woods, a Primitive Baptist minister, was a firm friend to the AMERICAN SENTINEL and a fearless advocate of the principles which it advocates. Elder Woods was not known to us personally, but his lifelong friend, Senator Tolley, describes him as "one of the Lord's most faithful followers and a good man in the full sense of the term." He was about seventy-two years of age. Death came suddenly but it had no terrors for such a man.

THE *Monitor* (Roman Catholic), of San Francisco, ridicules the application of Rev. 13:18 to the papacy, and gives an exhibition of cheap wit by manipulating the name of one of the editors of this paper and then figuring out of it the mystic number 666. But this is too serious a matter for sport. The stubborn fact remains that without manipulation the numerical value of the letters in the chief title of the popes is just 666—the "number six hundred three score and six," of Rev. 13:18. The blasphemous title, "Vicarius Filii Dei," so proudly worn by the pope, is in reality the brand of Cain upon the brow of the papacy.

ACCORDING to the *Chicago Tribune*, of the 28th ult., the Barbers' Mutual Protective Association of that city, is endeavoring to secure the repeal of the ordinance of July 15, closing barber shops on Sunday. The barbers are willing to risk arrest under the State "law," if the city authorities will repeal the ordinance.

A committee first waited upon the mayor, but he informed them that he was powerless

to act, as the ordinance made it obligatory upon him to enforce it; he referred them to the Board of Aldermen, to whom they must now look for relief from an oppressive municipal regulation. If we understand the matter correctly, the barbers were the prime movers only a few months since in securing the passage of the ordinance which they now wish repealed.

THE *Herald and Presbyterian*, of October 9, says of Seventh-day Adventists:—

In more than one quiet community they have courted martyrdom, not by observing Saturday as the Sabbath, as they have a right to do, nor by working quietly on Sunday, but by doing this as noisily and ostentatiously as possible and interfering with the peace and quiet to which the community has a right.

A more grossly false statement could scarcely be made. In not one of the scores of cases of the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists, tried in more than half a dozen different States, has anything of this kind been true.

The writer has personally heard the evidence in more than a score of such cases, and in not one of them has there been one particle of evidence to sustain the charge made by the *Herald and Presbyterian*.

In a letter to Governor Turney, of Tennessee, under date of April 8, 1895, Judge Jas. G. Parks, before whom probably twenty such cases have been tried, said: "There was no aggravation shown in a single case. It is true they did some work on Sunday, but it was done in a quiet way, and without any studied effort on their part to attract public attention. In fact, the proof rather tended to show that they tried to do their work in such a way as not to attract public attention."

It is possible that there have been isolated cases in which Seventh-day Adventists have forgotten the Golden Rule in the matter of Sunday work, but we know of no such case.

In view of all the facts we feel that it is incumbent upon the *Herald and Presbyterian* either to retract its bitter and sweeping charge or else to cite facts and circumstances in support of it.

ELDER J. O. CORLISS, well known to many of our readers as a former contributor to the columns of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, sends us a letter from New South Wales, Australia, in which he says:—

We have not yet in this country felt the rigors of persecution as our brethren in the southern States of America have been experiencing it. Two or three arrests have been made here for Sunday work among our brethren, but nothing more has come of these than to make our work a little more prominent. It has served, however, as a reminder to us that the same spirit which goes to such extremes in America, is not dead in this country, and will under certain conditions follow the same course that is being followed there. Already, there is a good deal of quiet work being done by ministers and others to cultivate a Sunday-law sentiment, and little incidents arise here and there to show that this sentiment is being strengthened from week to week. It does not require a very great stretch of the imagination to believe that very soon we shall feel the rod of oppression also in Australia. But I have noticed one thing, that when persecution sets in in any part of the world, the truth prospers more in that place than it ever has before. I expect that the same results will follow the enforcement of Sunday laws in this country.

Elder Corliss certainly does not state the

matter any too strongly when he says that "it does not require a very great stretch of the imagination to believe that very soon" they "shall feel the rod of oppression in Australia." The Word of God plainly says that "all the world shall worship the beast;" and it is by keeping Sunday that all the world pays homage to Rome.

EUROPE continues to be greatly agitated over the affairs of the Ottoman empire.

Ever since August 11, 1840, at which time the Turkish Sultan surrendered to the great powers of Europe his independence, Turkey has existed as the "sick man of the East." Scores of times it has seemed that the final demise of the Ottoman empire was but a question of days or at most of months.

Not its own vitality but the jealousy of other nations has kept Turkey alive as a political power for more than half a century; but the end has all the while been regarded as inevitable by statesmen everywhere. Sooner or later the Turkish power will be driven from Europe; and it seems as though the Armenian troubles, which have recently startled the world, would certainly be the occasion of the dismemberment of the empire of the Sultan.

That the Turk will be driven from Europe is not only the deliberate judgment of statesmen, but it is a plain prediction of prophecy. Daniel 11:45 says plainly of this power: "He shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him."

Driven from Europe, the Turk will make Jerusalem his capitol, but only temporarily; "he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." But what then? Again, let the Scriptures answer. "At that time shall Michael [Christ] stand up [reign], the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, everyone that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." Dan. 12:1-3.

The departure of the Turk from Europe will be one of the last acts in the drama of this world's history.

WORD received from London as we are going to press states that the manager of the International Tract Society at 451 Holloway Road, was on October 24 served with fourteen summonses for violations of the factory law in not compelling certain of his employes to cease work on Sunday.

#### AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

48 Bond Street, New York City.