



"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. 38.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 26, 1895.

Price, 3 cents.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY.

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

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

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN MARYLAND.

THERE are two facts that conspire to make the history of religious toleration in Maryland of surpassing interest to the student of American history. One is that the lord proprietary was a Roman Catholic; the other is that Maryland, it is claimed, was the first of the original thirteen colonies to establish religious toleration by statute.¹

Confronted by the history of centuries of intolerance in other countries, Roman Catholics turn with satisfaction to the history of Maryland, and point to it with pride, as an evidence of the tolerant character of "the church."

After exhausting the very meager materials found in the Old World with which to support the papal claim that "the church" is tolerant, Cardinal Gibbons says:—

Turning to our own country, it is with no small degree of satisfaction that I point to the State of Maryland as the cradle of civil and religious liberty, and the "land of the sanctuary." Of the thirteen original American colonies, Maryland was the only one that was settled by Catholics. She was also the only one that spread aloft over her fair lands the banner of liberty of conscience, and that invited the oppressed of other colonies to seek an asylum beneath its shadow.²

There are, at least, two fatal errors in this paragraph: first, *Maryland was not settled exclusively, nor even principally, by Roman Catholics*; and second, *religious liberty*

was never established in that colony, either by Catholics or by Protestants. The act of April 21, 1649, was an act of toleration merely, providing that "no person within this province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall be in any ways troubled, molested, or discountenanced, for his or her religion, or in the free exercise thereof."³

The same act provided that "whatsoever person shall . . . deny the Holy Trinity, or any of the persons thereof, shall be pun-

proprietary the sum of five pounds sterling or the value thereof. . . . And every such offender or offenders for every second offense shall forfeit ten pounds sterling or the value thereof. . . . And every person or persons before mentioned offending herein the third time, shall for such third offense forfeit all his lands and goods, and be forever banished and expelled out of this province."⁴

It will be readily conceded that this was very far short of religious liberty; it was simply toleration for believers in the

Christian religion. It is true it was far in advance of any other colony at that time except Rhode Island,⁵ but it was not religious liberty. In practice it did not secure even toleration to *all* believers in Jesus Christ. "The Quakers were persecuted in Maryland as badly as in Virginia and Massachusetts." For example: "In 1658, Joseph Coale and Thomas Thurston, preachers belonging to that body, were treated with great severity by the authorities and compelled to flee the country."⁶

But let us consider briefly the question as to whom the credit belongs for a measure of religious toleration in Maryland.

As before stated, Maryland was not settled by Roman Catholics but very largely by Protestants. The charter was issued on the twentieth day of June, 1632, to Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore. The following November, Leonard Calvert, brother of the proprietary, sailed from the Isle of Wight with two hundred colonists to effect a settlement in Maryland.

The vessels, the *Ark* and the *Dove*, sailed by way of Fortune Island, Barbados, and St. Christopher's, and did not reach Maryland until March, 1634. After cruising about in



CECIL CALVERT, SECOND LORD BALTIMORE.

It was quite out of the question for Lord Baltimore to establish the Catholic religion in Maryland; he did the only thing that was possible for him to do under the circumstances, to secure even toleration for those of his own faith.

ished with death." And that "whatsoever person or persons shall from henceforth use or utter any reproachful words or speeches concerning the blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of our Saviour, or the holy apostles or evangelists, or any of them, shall in such case for the first offense forfeit to the lord pro-

⁴ "Archives of Maryland Assembly," Vol. I, p. 244. See also Bancroft's "History of the United States," Vol. 1, part 1, chap. 10, pp. 168, 169.

⁵ Roger Williams was expelled from Massachusetts in January, 1636. "Within two years," says Bancroft, "others fled to his asylum. The land which he occupied was within the

¹ The statute to which reference is here made was passed by the Maryland assembly in 1649, thirteen years after Roger Williams and others who had suffered persecution in Massachusetts, had established, at Providence, as Arnold says, "a pure democracy, which for the first time guarded jealously the rights of conscience by ignoring any power in the body politic to interfere with those matters that alone concern man and his Maker." It was not, however, until March 14, 1643, six years before the act of toleration was passed in Maryland, that the "Patent for Providence Plantations" was issued, prior to which time the legislation of the colony was without royal sanction.—See "Patent for Providence Plantations," and foot note to the same, in "Charters and Constitutions," Vol. 2, p. 1594.

² "Faith of Our Fathers," p. 272; edition of 1893.

³ "History of the United States," by Bancroft, Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10, p. 168.

the Chesapeake Bay and the Potomac River, they dropped anchor in St. Mary's River.

Leonard Calvert gained the good-will of the natives who were preparing to abandon that particular locality, and purchased from them for some cloth and a few axes, their right to the soil. Bancroft says:—

Upon the 27th [of March, 1634], the emigrants, of whom at least three parts of four were Protestants, took quiet possession of the land which the governor had bought.¹

It is probable that the relative proportion of Catholics and Protestants in Maryland remained about the same, and though the government was in the hands of the lord proprietary, who was a Catholic, it would have been quite impossible for him, even had he desired to do so, to have denied toleration to so large a majority of his subjects. Bancroft says:—

In the mixed population of Maryland, where the administration was in the hands of Catholics, and the great majority of the people were Protestants, there was no unanimity of sentiment out of which a domestic constitution could have harmoniously risen.²

This was about the time of the conflict in England between the Parliament and Charles I., and Lord Baltimore had to look well to his rights in order to retain any authority at all. Leonard Calvert, the proprietary's deputy, went to England in 1643 to consult with his brother, Lord Baltimore, about affairs of the colony. Claybourne was still claiming Kent Island, and the Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Puritans, who formed a large proportion of Lord Baltimore's subjects, were restless under the authority of a Catholic, and were desirous of establishing Protestantism, so-called, as the religion of the colony.

In 1645, a petition was presented to the House of Lords, asking that the government of Maryland might be settled in the hands of Protestants. For some reason this petition was not acted upon, and "the politic Lord Baltimore," says Bancroft, "had ample time to prepare his own remedies. To appease the Parliament, he removed Greene [the Roman Catholic Governor], and in August, 1648, appointed in his place Wm. Stone, a Protestant of the Church of England."³ A very significant fact in this connection is that Lord Baltimore required Governor Stone to take and subscribe the following oath:—

I do further swear I will not by myself, nor any other person, directly trouble, molest, or discountenance any person whatsoever in the said province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ; and, in particular, no Roman Catholic, for or in respect of his or her religion, nor his or her free exercise thereof within said province, so as they be not unfaithful to his said lordship, or molest or conspire against the civil government established under him.⁴

This shows very clearly that instead of being in a position to dictate to others in matters of faith, had he been so disposed, Lord Baltimore was apprehensive lest religious toleration might be denied to his co-religionists; as, indeed, there was a manifest disposition in the colony to do, and as the charter would have

warranted, for at that time popery was outlawed in England.

It was in April of the following year that the act, already referred to, establishing religious toleration, was passed. Bancroft says: "To quiet and unite the colony, all the offenses of the late rebellion were effaced by a general amnesty; and, at the instance of the Catholic proprietary, the Protestant governor, Stone, and his council of six, composed equally of Catholics and Protestants, and the representatives of the people of Maryland, of whom [only] five were Catholics, at a general session of the assembly held in April, 1649, placed upon their statute books"⁵ this act of toleration.

It is not our purpose to deny that Lord Baltimore himself was a liberal-minded man; and it is very probable that he entertained charitable feelings toward Protestants. But even had this not been the case, his environment and the circumstances under which he received and held his charter were such that he could not well have taken any other course than that which he did take in securing for his subjects religious toleration. England was at that time Protestant, so-called, and the



Roger Williams Fleeing from Massachusetts.

To escape transportation to England for his faith, Roger Williams fled from Salem, Mass., in January, 1636. He found a temporary shelter with the Indians, and within two years established at Providence, as Arnold says, "a pure democracy, which for the first time guarded jealously the rights of conscience by ignoring any power in the body politic to interfere with those matters that alone concern man and his Maker."⁶

charter granted Lord Baltimore by Charles I., established in effect the Anglican Church as the church of Maryland. It gave the lord proprietary authority to found "churches and chapels, and places of worship in convenient and suitable places within the premises; and of causing the same to be dedicated and consecrated, according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England."⁷

Speaking of this phase of the charter, Bancroft says: "Christianity, as professed by the

Church of England, was established [by the charter]; but the patronage and advowsons of churches were vested in the proprietary; and, as there was not an English statute on religion in which America was specially named, silence left room for the settlement of religious affairs by the colony."⁸ But it would have been in flagrant violation of the charter to have established Roman Catholicism, for an express provision of that instrument was that all acts concerning religious establishments were to be "according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England."

It will be seen at once that it was quite out of the question for Lord Baltimore to establish the Catholic religion in Maryland;⁹ he did the only thing that was possible for him to do under the circumstances to secure even toleration for those of his own faith: he established religious toleration for all who professed faith in Christ; and the fact that representative Catholics appeal to the history of Maryland, in proof of the tolerant spirit of Catholicism, demonstrates the paucity of such evidence.

But even if all that is claimed for Maryland were true, it would by no means establish the claim that is made in behalf of Rome. Cardinal Gibbons himself states the principle which dominates Rome everywhere. He says:—

Many Protestants seem to be very much disturbed by some such argument as this: Catholics are very ready now to proclaim freedom of conscience, because they are in the minority. When they once succeed in getting the upper hand in numbers and power, they will destroy this freedom, because their faith teaches them to tolerate no doctrine other than the Catholic. It is, then, a matter of absolute necessity for us that they should never be allowed to get this advantage.

Now, in all this, there is a great mistake, which comes from not knowing the Catholic doctrine in its fullness. I shall not lay it down myself, lest it seem to have been gotten up for the occasion. I shall quote the great theologian Becanus, who taught the doctrine of the schools of Catholic theology at the time when the struggle was hottest between Catholicity and Protestantism. He says that religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it. This is true Catholic teaching on this point, according to Becanus and all Catholic theologians.¹⁰

This is indeed, as the cardinal states, "the true Catholic teaching upon this point," and it ought to be universally recognized as such by Protestants. When Rome grants toleration she does not do it as a matter of principle, but as a matter of policy; and as a matter of policy, partial religious toleration was established in Maryland.

THE "CHRISTIAN STATESMAN'S" UNCHRISTIAN INTOLERANCE.

The *Christian Statesman*, as might be expected, is out with a defense of the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists. It has been moved to this by the stinging criticisms of intolerance made by such papers as the *New York Tribune* and the *Christian Intelligencer*.

The *Statesman* asserts that "not a single individual in any State of the Union has been prosecuted for keeping the seventh day as the Sabbath." We would like the *Statesman* to reconcile this assertion with the fact that in the neighborhoods where Adventists have

¹ "History of the United States," Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10, p. 158.

² The "American Cyclopædia," article "Calvert," says: "It does not appear that Lord Baltimore, or any of the settlers, had an intention on founding the colony of proclaiming absolute religious freedom, and one of the first acts of the assembly of 1639 was to make the Roman Catholic religion the creed of the State." We have not verified this statement, but the assembly of 1640 declared that the "holy church, within this province, shall have and enjoy all her rights, liberties, and franchises, wholly and without blemish." See Bancroft's "History of the United States," Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10.

³ "Faith of Our Fathers," pp. 268, 269.

⁴ "History of the United States," Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10, p. 168.

⁵ "Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, and other Organic Laws of the United States," compiled under the order of the United States Senate, by Ben: Perley Poore, p. 812. The original charter is in Latin, but an excellent translation of a portion of it may be found on page 72 of "The Relation of Religion to Civil Government," published by Putnam's Sons, New York.

⁶ "History of the United States," by Edmund Ollier, Vol. I, p. 77; published by the Cassell Publishing Co., New York.

⁷ "History of the United States," Vol. I, Part I, chap. 10, p. 161.

⁸ *Id.*, p. 166.

⁹ *Id.*, p. 167.

¹⁰ *Id.*, p. 168.

territory of the Narragansetts. In March, 1638, an Indian deed from Canonieus, and Miantonomoh made him the undisputed possessor of an extensive domain."—*History of the United States*, Vol. I, Part I, chap. 15, p. 254.

This, it should be remembered, was eleven years before the Maryland act of toleration. Moreover, Rhode Island had religious liberty from the first day of its settlement; and five years before the Maryland act of toleration, Williams published and defended in England his views of religious liberty. Bancroft says:

"The principles which he [Williams] first sustained amid the bickerings of a colonial parish, next in the general court of Massachusetts, and then introduced into the wilds on Narragansett Bay, he found occasion, in 1644, to publish in England, and to defend as the basis of the religious freedom of mankind."—*Id.*, p. 255.

been prosecuted, only Adventists have been interfered with. We have repeatedly published this statement and given the facts, stating what kinds of work were done, and just where done; and so far from being denied, these facts have been recognized by others, and have been published to the world by others; not from what we have said, but from their own personal knowledge. The *Republican*, of Dayton, Tenn., has published such facts. Ex-Senator Slaughter, of Tennessee, has published to the world in the *Nashville American*, over his own signature, the statement that "steamboats, railroads, street-car lines, hotels, livery-stables, hackmen, and other money-making concerns can continue their various vocations without the least fear of molestation by officers of the law, whilst another class of true and good citizens must be persecuted for doing what others are promiscuously allowed to do."

The *Statesman* also asserts that "no man's conscience requires him to work on Sunday." It would be difficult to make a more erroneous statement. The *Statesman* ought to know, for it has had opportunity to know, the position of Seventh-day Adventists upon this question. Seventh-day Adventists regard the Sunday institution as a rival of the true Sabbath; it is the badge or mark of pagan and papal apostasy, and rebellion against the Creator of the heavens and the earth. For this reason they cannot pay even outward regard to it. They look upon the demand that they shall keep Sunday as exactly parallel to the decree of King Nebuchadnezzar requiring the three Hebrews, Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, to bow down with the multitude before the great image set up in the plain of Dura.

It is argued, however, that "the Adventists are left free to observe the seventh day," and that "they are not required to keep Sunday religiously." Neither were the three Hebrews forbidden to worship the true God; nor were they required to pay more than outward and formal respect to the great image. They might have bowed before the image at the sound of the music and then prayed to the God of heaven; but to all beholders they would have appeared to worship the image, and God vindicated them in their refusal to even seem to countenance idolatry.

It is true that Adventists are not forbidden to rest upon the seventh day, neither are they required to perform upon the first day any act which is of itself religious; but rest is itself a religious act in such a case, just as bowing before the image, under the circumstances, would have been a religious act on the part of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. Actions speak louder than words, and by working upon the seventh day, and resting upon Sunday, the Sunday-keeper testifies more loudly than he could by words that the seventh day is not the Sabbath, and that Sunday is the sabbath. In like manner by resting upon the seventh day and working upon the first day, the Sabbatarian testifies that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and that the first day is not. This the *Christian Statesman* would prohibit by statute, thus curtailing the liberty of the Sabbath-keeper to teach by his example that which he believes is the truth; so that not only do Sunday "laws" require of the Sabbatarian a service which he cannot conscientiously render, but they forbid him to render a service, in the way of testifying to the truth, which he feels in conscience bound to render.

It does not follow from this that the Sabbatarian should be unnecessarily offensive in his Sunday work; but he should treat the day as a secular day, doing quietly and in an orderly manner his accustomed work, just as

Daniel, being accustomed to pray three times a day with his window open toward Jerusalem, continued that practice when he knew that the writing had been signed forbidding any man to ask any petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of the king only. His act was not uncivil, nor was it anything that could possibly be styled a disturbance of the peace before the king's decree was issued; neither was it anything that ought to have disturbed anyone after the decree was issued; and yet, as a matter of fact, it did very seriously disturb Daniel's enemies; not because it was uncivil or because it injured them in any way, but because their intolerant feelings could not brook such violation of the king's decree, when in conflict with their ideas of propriety. And it is for the same reason that Sunday work by Sabbatarians so powerfully disturbs Sunday-keepers; it is because it is obnoxious to their intolerant feelings. They cannot brook it because they feel that it is improper, and because fortified by the knowledge that there is a statute against it, they cultivate that feeling until it becomes a passion with them.

SCRIPTURAL PRECEDENT FOR IT.

THE *Outlook* gives an account of a communion service in Japan at which neither bread nor wine were used; sponge cake taking the place of the bread, and tea being substituted for wine; but those who partook felt that "they obeyed the command of our Lord." The *Outlook* remarks:—

This is parallel to the question which might arise in an arctic region. For ourselves, we have no doubt that Jesus baptized by immersion, but that would be manifestly impossible in a frigid zone. Do not these facts indicate that the virtue is not in the thing used, or in the form in which a rite is administered, but in the fact that it brings to mind the person and teaching of the Saviour himself? We think few would presume to say that the cake and tea were not as holy and acceptable as the bread and the wine, and a no larger number would require baptism by immersion in the frigid zone. Not on the rite, but on the truth symbolized, the Master would have the emphasis placed.

The *Examiner* (Baptist) takes exception to this view of the case, and shows very conclusively that there is nothing to prevent immersion even in the coldest countries inhabited by man. It also goes further and shows that both bread and wine are easily obtainable in Japan, and that hence there was no occasion for substituting sponge cake and tea, as was done in the instance referred to by the *Outlook*.

But is there any greater impropriety in substituting sponge cake and tea for bread and wine in the celebration of the Lord's supper, or in substituting sprinkling for immersion in baptism, than there is in substituting the first day of the week for the seventh in the matter of Sabbath observance? The fact is that the practice of substituting something that the Lord has not commanded for that which he has commanded, is altogether wrong. However, the practice is very ancient, and is regarded by some as even venerable.

The first one so far as we know to offer a substitute, was Cain, who, instead of bringing a lamb as an offering, as required by the Lord, substituted the fruits of the ground. Another case of substitution is recorded in the 10th chapter of Leviticus, where we read that "Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not."

Thus it is seen that there is precedent even in the Scriptures for offering to the Lord

something that he has not commanded instead of that which he has commanded. These cases are not likely to be appealed to, however, in support of the practice, as it is very evident that such substitution was not pleasing to the Lord then; and there is no reason to believe that it is any more pleasing to him now.

JAILED FOR "OBSTRUCTING THE STREETS."

THE *Sabbath Recorder*, of the 19th inst., has the following relative to the imprisonment of members of the Salvation Army:—

While the persecutions for conscience' sake are going on in Georgia and Tennessee against Seventh-day Adventists, Pontiac, Mich., has thrown eleven Salvationists into jail on a charge of "obstructing the streets."

These prisoners say they also are persecuted for conscience' sake. But there is a wide difference between their alleged offense and that of the Seventh-day Adventists. The latter consider it a sin to work on the day which Jehovah has set apart, blessed and sanctified and commanded all men to observe as his Sabbath; while no Scriptural law would be violated by refraining from obstructing the streets which the city ordinance forbids. There may be and probably is a spirit of persecution exhibited in the former case, but the victims stand on very different grounds from those who are persecuted for Sabbath observance. To obey the law of the land, in one case is a sin against God; in the other case it is right and honorable. In one case it "renders unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's;" and in the other case "unto God the things that are God's."

Being ignorant of the facts in this Michigan case, we cannot of course say that the authorities acted arbitrarily in the matter; but we are convinced that in most instances the offense of the Salvationists is only technical. We have seen a good many Salvation Army street meetings, and never yet saw a street seriously obstructed. There certainly is the difference pointed out by the *Recorder*, and yet it is safe to say that if the "obstruction" were occasioned by some political club no arrests would be made.

ARE METHODISTS CONSISTENT?

THE Methodist missionaries, expelled from the Caroline Islands some years ago by the Spanish authorities, are demanding, through the State Department at Washington, the privilege of returning to the Islands. It is stated that the Secretary of State will shortly demand that the missionaries be permitted to return. Whether this will be granted or not remains to be seen; but if they are not permitted to return, it is stated definitely that Secretary Olney will take "most vigorous measures to bring about obedience."

Our sympathies in this matter are wholly with the Methodist missionaries. There ought to be no part of the world where any man who conducts himself civilly, could not go and teach whatever religious views he might wish to teach, in a quiet and civil manner, to as many as would listen to him, without molestation; neither ought there to be any portion of the world in which every man could not practice freely in accordance with his faith, as long as in so doing he did not interfere with the equal rights of his fellow-men.

But we fail to see how Methodists can consistently demand that they shall be permitted to teach and to practice contrary to the law of the Caroline Islands. We believe that the Methodists in this country advocate the idea that Seventh-day Adventists "should obey the civil law until it is repealed, whether right or wrong;" and that they should not array themselves against the "laws" which require the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath. This being their position here, what right have they to demand that they shall be

permitted to teach and practice contrary to the statute-intrenched religion of the Caroline Islands?

The fact is, however, that neither Methodists nor any other denomination obey the civil statutes which are contrary to their religious faith and practice. Methodists are right in insisting upon their right to return to the Caroline Islands, but they are wrong in insisting that Adventists ought to obey Sunday laws until they are repealed. The enforcement of Sunday laws in this country is exactly the same in principle as the enforcement of the laws of the Caroline Islands against the teaching and practice of the Methodists. It is just as legitimate and just as much the province of government to require Methodists to take off their hats to the host (a piece of bread), as it is borne through the streets, as it is to require all men to render homage to the Sunday institution by refraining from work upon that day.

SIGNIFICANT!

We have often remarked that the demand for the Sunday-closing of saloons was less in the interests of temperance than of Sunday sacredness. The following from the September 19 issue of the *Examiner* (Baptist), of this city, shows clearly that this is so:—

Do the liquor-dealers and their friends fully understand what they are doing in their efforts to keep saloon doors open on the Lord's day? Do they not see that they are forcing the issue—a clean sabbath or entire prohibition? There are thousands of men who do not profess to be prohibitionists, but who, when that issue is made, will take their stand. If it is the sabbath or the saloon, they will demand the suppression of the saloon. It may be that God is allowing the liquor traffic to trample on the sabbath day that the Christian heart may be fired with holy indignation against a trade that is willing to sacrifice everything sacred for its own benefit. Open doors on the Lord's day will do more to consolidate Christian sentiment against the saloon, unify the decent elements of society, and array everything that is good against the dram-shop, than anything else. The cupidity and madness of the liquor traffic are forcing the issue—a clean sabbath or entire prohibition. Open doors on Sunday will help to bring over to us thousands of men who are now halting.

This is, in effect, saying to the liquor dealers, "Close your saloons on Sunday, or else we will close them on all days." In other words it is saying, "We have power to prohibit the liquor traffic on all days, but we will not do it if the saloons will assist in giving us a 'clean sabbath.'"

We expect to see the saloons accept the compromise.

HE WROTE THE SUNDAY MAIL REPORTS.

The *Mail and Express* recently printed the following concerning Hon. Richard M. Johnson:—

He Killed Chief Tecumseh.

The Senate Chamber in Washington is about to be decorated with the bust of one of the most able and popular men who have presided over that body, Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, who was vice-president of the United States, during the presidency of Martin Van Buren.

Richard M. Johnson was one of those early statesmen who fought their way to popularity in the forests of the New World. Like Jackson, Harrison, Sam Houston, Davy Crockett and others who were familiar figures in public life during that era, Colonel Johnson had smelt gunpowder on the frontier, and knew well the ring of the savages' war whoops.

Johnson's most famous exploit was during the war of 1812. As Garfield did many years later, the bold Kentuckian resigned a seat in Congress in order to take the field. He was in command of a regiment under William Henry Harrison, and in the battle of the Thames, Oct. 5, 1813, it is believed that Johnson slew with his own hand the famous and hitherto unconquered chief, Tecumseh.

In this battle the British and the Indians were combined. The English forces were posted between the river and the marsh, while the Indians were on a high ground in the swampy land. Colonel Johnson ordered his men forward, and the English let them get within a few yards before the command to fire was given. A desperate battle took place, the Americans being victorious. Tecumseh was found on the field dead, and it was asserted that Johnson was the one who shot him, as he was killed by a man on horseback, and Johnson was the only one mounted, his command being infantry. It was also known that Johnson had been engaged in a hand-to-hand fight with one of the most desperate of the chiefs, who answered to the description of Tecumseh. Johnson himself was badly wounded.

When Colonel Johnson returned to Congress he was still too sick to walk, and was received with a triumphal procession, and a joint resolution of thanks was passed by both houses of Congress.

The *Mail and Express* has failed to mention the service which most of all endeared Mr. Johnson to the hearts of the people of his generation, namely, the writing of the Sunday mail reports of January, 19, 1829, and March 4 and 5, 1830. Of all Mr. Johnson's public services, the writing of these reports was singled out by his fellow-citizens in Kentucky for mention upon the tombstone which they erected in his memory.

VERY TRUE!

[The *Examiner* (Baptist).]

GREAT zeal in religious matters does not always indicate religious principles or religious motives. Demetrius was very zealous for the worship of "Diana of the Ephesians." He was very clearly influenced by the business profit resulting from the making of "silver shrines of the goddess." His appeal to the workmen was, "By this means we have our wealth." "There is danger that this our trade come into disrepute." He cunningly appealed also to the feelings of the populace who did care for the worship of Diana, and admired her "magnificence." He was an astute manager in this matter, and as unprincipled as have been many other managers since his day, where money making is concerned. Many a bad business is advocated for the same reasons which influenced Demetrius. It is not unusual for men in many occupations to consider alone the profit of them. Liquor men are not pursuing their business from benevolent, or moral, or philanthropic motives. It is solely for the money which is in it, even though the money be stained with tears and blood, that they follow the business. The interests of architects and builders in the erection of temples of worship, is not a guarantee of their devotion or piety. Real estate men have been known to offer liberally for churches because of their influence in promoting the value or ready sale of lands. Noah's carpenters possibly were interested in the ark, but perished in the flood in spite of ark and interest.

WORSHIPED THE IMAGE.

BY W. S. CHAPMAN.

In ancient times King Nebuchadnezzar, of Babylon, erected a golden image in the plains of Dura, and issued the following command to the people:—

O people, nations and languages, That at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up. Dan. 3:4, 5.

In the exercises, "Children's Day," at Cheswold, Md., in the Methodist Episcopal churches of that place, occurred a most remarkable and startling reproduction of the

enforced worship of an image, which we find recorded by Daniel the prophet. In these churches the pulpits were removed out of the way, and in place of a pulpit a representation of a golden gate arranged—typifying the entrance to the city of God in heaven. Beside the gate stood a female (Virgin Mary) having a key which unlocked the gate (key of Peter). From among the audience young girls were selected to personate the Christian graces. These, in turn, approached the gate, each being met at its entrance by the female guard (Mary), who presented the key by which alone entrance through the gate could be obtained. The pastor of the church (as high priest) superintended the whole performance, issuing directions and offering explanations. As each of the young women went forward and received the key, strains of music issued from the organ, and the command came from the pastor—"At the sound of music let everyone in the audience bow down before the image of the 'Heavenly Gate,' and all the audience did so bow down.

Of the organization from which such exhibitions emanate, and are promulgated, and which is striving for unity of action between Catholics and Protestants, Rev. W. H. McMillan, in his speech at the convention in Boston, said, speaking of the Catholic views of the body he represented:—

They suggested that the spirit of love and brotherhood was in harmony with that through which Pope Leo hoped to operate in bringing about the Christian unity for which his recent encyclical letter prays.

There was but one hopeful thing connected with these exhibitions, and that was that afterwards, upon reflection, many of the more sober-minded realized the enormity of the offense which had been committed.

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF COURTS.

[San Francisco *Examiner*, July 28.]

THE criticisms that have been made on the decision of Judge Ross that overthrew the Irrigation Act have brought to the front the same dear old defenders of the courts, who protest against the dissent as a piece of sacrilege against the divine institution of the bench. A suggestion that a judge's decision is against public policy, a danger to the commonwealth, a reversal of settled principles of law, or in opposition to the intentions of the law-making body, can be depended on to bring out the solemn asses who ground their faith on the infallibility of courts, and insist that a judgment from the bench should be taken as the final settlement of any question.

It would be unfortunate for the public rights if the press took this view of the matter. No question of public policy is settled in this country until it is settled right. No declaration of a court that "this is the law" can be regarded as final unless it is a law for the benefit of the public. Courts are not omnipotent or infallible. They have not succeeded to the divine rights that went down with the Stuarts and the Bourbons. The courts are a part of the machinery of government established to secure certain public purposes. When they fail in serving these purposes; when they lay down principles that place the people in the power of corporations or confer upon wealth privileges that do not belong to it, or deny to government the powers demanded for the public welfare, it is not the public, but the courts, that must yield.

The final appeal is not to the Supreme Court. The last word has not been said when four justices in California or five gentlemen on the supreme bench at Washington have given their opinion. Their opinions are enti-

tled to due consideration and respect, and their statement of the law must for the time be obeyed.

But there is another appeal, and that is to the power that makes courts and constitutions and molds governments and forms of society. The final appeal is to the great tribunal of the people, and on the decision of the people finally must all principles of law and government rest.

It is thus proper that the press should criticize or approve the acts and opinions of judges, so long as it does so in honesty and fairness of purpose to secure the right. The press may err, and when discussing the technical rules of securing justice and the precedents of courts is more likely to be mistaken than is a judge who has given his life to examining these rules. But when it comes to discussing the fundamental principles of government, to pronouncing on questions of public policy; to declaring that this law is good because it operates for the public interest, and that a decision is bad because it injures the people, the press is at least on even ground with the courts. Clearness of vision in regard to matters of public policy is probably more frequent in the press than among the judges on the bench.

It is thus not sacrilege, but in the public interest, that the press should protest against a decision which it believes to be wrong, and appeal from the court to the people, from the agent to the principal. If the court is right it will be sustained. If it is wrong it will be reversed in the long, slow process through which the popular will makes itself known and felt.

SENSIBLE.

[*Truth Seeker, September 14.*]

THE mischievous notion that certain men, by reason of their vocation, are either too good or too bad to exercise the ordinary functions of citizens is quite prevalent in the South, where the constitutions of some of the States forbid a minister to hold any civil office. In other words, the idea of equal citizenship is lost in that of class distinctions based on occupation. By a curious coincidence, the Church is stronger in the South than elsewhere in the country, and laws against freedom on Sunday and discrimination against infidels are more numerous and stringent, and generally more rigorously enforced.

A disfranchised or disbarred class can dominate legislation in spite of its disabilities if it is accepted by the voters and law-makers as the teaching class. This is precisely the position that the clergy occupy. In view of this fact, the demand of the *Press and Banner*, of Abbeville, South Carolina, that the legislature "forever prevent any minister of the gospel from holding office or dabbling in politics" is foolish in the extreme. Such a law would vastly augment the influence of the clergy, for whatever savors of persecution redounds to the benefit of the persecuted.

But there is a vital principle as well as a question of expediency involved in this proposition. The State can rightfully discriminate neither for nor against the Church. If it debars clergymen from office on the ground that they are too good to make and administer laws, it discriminates ostensibly in favor of the Church. If it debars them on the ground that they are too bad, it discriminates ostensibly against the Church. If it forbids them to take part in political discussions it denies free speech to a class because they are religious teachers. The State has nothing whatever to do with ministers as ministers; it can recognize them only

as inhabitants of the State, subject to the same laws as and no other laws than those which regulate the relations of the other inhabitants.

DIVINE LAW VS. HUMAN LAW.

MRS. E. G. WHITE.

THE law of God is the only rule of rectitude. Those who are loyal to that law will not be found transgressors of the law of their country, unless the lawmakers exceed their rights, and enact laws in opposition to the law of God; then God must be obeyed. "If ye love me," says Christ, "keep my commandments." The world may set up its standards and maxims, and governments may enact laws; but if they are counter to the law of Jehovah, the Christian must necessarily be loyal to God, whatever may be the consequences.

The Christian is in the world, but not of the world. He is to represent the character of God in obedience to his holy, just, and good law. Daniel was a noble statesman; but his best service to Babylon was his unswerving integrity in the worship of God. In spite of the king's decree, he prayed three times a day with his window open towards Jerusalem, and made no compromise with an idolatrous nation.

Great is the responsibility of the Christian world. All heaven is looking down upon those who claim to be Christians, and have the Bible, and yet are not searching the word that they may find out what is truth. By precept and example they are teaching the world to transgress God's holy law, and to ignore the seventh-day Sabbath, which he has blessed and hallowed, and declared to be his holy day. Oh that the vast army of professed Christians would teach men to shun the example of Adam, who, by transgression, opened the floodgates of woe on our world. But with this example before them, and all its dreadful consequences, they continue to transgress. They have set the world on the wrong track; they lead sinners away from the path of obedience to God's word into false paths. They might have been a power for good; but what a responsibility will they have to meet in that day when every man shall receive as his works have been.

THE PRINCIPLE OF PERSECUTION.

[*Southern Sentinel, Melbourne, Australia.*]

SAYS Canon Potter, referring to the late controversy arising from the church union question:—

If the present discussion were to win from Rome an authoritative repudiation of the principle of religious persecution, something real would be done to pave the way for the reunion of Christendom.—*Melbourne Argus, May 13, 1895.*

Yes; anything that would win from Rome a repudiation of the principle of religious persecution would accomplish a great thing indeed. But nothing will ever do it; for the Roman Church is built upon this very principle, and it would cease to be the Roman Church the moment it repudiated it. The principle of religious persecution is the principle that the church has the right to use the power of the State, that the church has a right to be established and supported, and have its doctrines and dogmas supported, by law; and this even the Church of England, Canon Potter's own church, has not yet repudiated. It still holds on tenaciously to its establishment and its Sunday laws. We only

wish that every soul on earth would refuse to unite with any church until it would repudiate this principle of religious persecution. A grand stride, indeed, would this be for the right, should they do it. There would still be one church left they could join,—the church of Jesus Christ. That never persecutes.

TESTING THE SUNDAY LAW.

[*New York World, Sept. 20.*]

EX-JUDGE A. J. DITTENHOEFER appeared in the Court of Special Sessions yesterday as counsel for Anton Koeber, a waiter at Sulzer's Harlem River Park, who was on trial on a charge of sabbath-breaking. The offense alleged was selling a glass of soda water within the gates on Sunday. Mr. Dittenhoefer announced that if the decision of the court should be against his client he would carry the case to the Court of Appeals. There are about twenty-five similar cases pending against Sulzer's waiters, and he wished to make this a test case.

The case alleged by Koeber was admitted, and the ex-judge raised these points: That all sales on Sunday are not prohibited but only public selling; that a sale in an inclosure such as Sulzer's Park is not public selling; that such sale is no interruption of the repose of the community as contemplated in the statute; that soda water is a necessity; that drinking it is not prohibited, and selling it is a labor needful for the comfort of the community; that liquids are foods as well as solids; that never until very recently has the sale of soda water on Sunday been interfered with, and that the construction of the statute by which such sales are now stopped is erroneous.

The court took the matter under advisement.

MORE PRESS COMMENTS CONCERNING RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

[*The Odd Fellow, Owosso, Mich., July 23.*]

WE read with unfeigned surprise that seven men have recently been tried, convicted and imprisoned, and placed in the chain-gang at Dayton, Tenn., for quietly working on their farms on Sunday, they being Seventh-day Baptists or Adventists. Such an act is a disgrace to the people of Tennessee, an infringement on the right of religious freedom, that demands and should receive the most emphatic condemnation of all classes of Americans.

An Effort to Stifle Conscience.

[*White River Journal, Washington, Aug. 24.*]

THE secular press of the country has taken a decided stand against the persecution of the Seventh-day Adventists of the South. It is time a halt was called upon this cruel and unjust effort of a few zealots to stifle the conscience of these people who will suffer all manner of persecution before they will deny what they believe to be the direct command of God. We would have thought that the persecution of King in Tennessee would have cooled the ardor of these fanatics, but it only stimulated them to further efforts.

"Outrageous."

[*Pawnee County (Nebr.) Times, July 19.*]

THE persecution of the Seventh-day Adventists, now being indulged in by professed Christians down in Tennessee and other States, is not only a disgrace to the perse-

cutors, but is a shameful commentary on our free, American way of doing things. Our Constitution grants to every one the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and yet a large number of Adventists have been arrested, fined and imprisoned for not keeping Sunday as a holy day, while religiously believing that the seventh day, or Sabbath, is the proper day to observe. This outrageous work has been going on a long time, and if allowed to continue, will ultimately overthrow our free American institutions and place us altogether under the dictation and control of the particular church or denomination having the greatest number of voters. We believe in freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and particularly in the right to live according to the teachings of the Bible as we understand it. The sooner Church and State are eternally divorced, the better for all concerned.

Not What our Forefathers Intended.

[*Kingston (N. Y.) Daily Freeman, July 17.*]

IN Rhea County, Tenn., eight leading members of the Seventh-day Adventists are in a chain-gang because they labored in the fields on Sunday, in violation of the law of the State. All of these persons are devoutly religious, but they observe Saturday instead of Sunday as a holy day, and are persecuted by other Christians in consequence. It was the intention of the founders of this nation to guarantee perfect religious liberty and to make certain that no persons, in however small a minority, should be persecuted on account of their theological views, but for some reason the plan has miscarried.

"Glaring Injustice."

[*Mystic (Conn.) Press, July 26.*]

LARGE numbers of newspapers throughout the country, both secular and religious, have commented upon and condemned the glaring injustice of this persecution of honest and conscientious Christian men for the sole offense of laboring on Sundays, while they have conscientiously and religiously obeyed the strict letter of God's law and remembered and kept the seventh day as the Sabbath, and at the same time allowing men, and whole classes of men, of any or of no religious belief, to work on Sunday without reproof or prosecution.

On the other hand, a few newspapers, including five Baptist religious weeklies, have defended the action of the Tennessee authorities. Shame on such laws; on the men who take advantage of them to persecute their brethren; and on those co-religionists of Roger Williams, who have so far degenerated as to defend such persecution, thus repudiating the soul-liberty of which he was the distinguished apostle.

Our Liberty Threatened.

[*Lamar (Col.) Sparks, July 25.*]

THE *California Voice* approves of the imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee because they observe Saturday instead of Sunday as the Sabbath. . . .

The editor of this paper is very far from being an Adventist, but we do believe that their imprisonment for conscience' sake is in direct conflict with the fundamental law of this Republic, which guarantees to all men the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. It would

seem that, according to the *Voice's* logic, minorities should be compelled to surrender their religious convictions at the demand of the majority. Such a doctrine enforced would prevent all reform. It would have suppressed Luther, and Knox, and Wesley, and Phillips, and Garrison, and Sumner. It was the effort to enforce this rule that drove the Pilgrims to this country, imprisoned and hanged Quakers, and filled the past with cruelty, persecution and blood.

When majorities arrogate to themselves the right to say to minorities, "You have misguided consciences in religion, and if you don't worship God in the manner we prescribe, we will put a ball and chain about your ankles and shut you up in prison," then is the very foundation of religious liberty attacked, and the crowning glory of this Republic threatened.

Governmental Tyranny.

[*Laurensville (S. C.) Herald, July 26.*]

IF we are to allow ourselves to believe that it is religion to take up and convict and sentence to the chain-gang the members of that religious sect known as Seventh-day Adventists, simply because, in their belief, they are not commanded by God's Word to keep the sabbath day holy, we certainly have a very narrow conception of what is commanded of us. There is something so utterly deceptive in such thought that the solitary fact that these people can cite Bible authority in justification for their keeping holy the seventh day of the week instead of the first day, ought at least to protect them from governmental tyranny. Much stress has been laid upon the fact that our republican form of government is so liberal that from its foundation it was decreed that there should be no established form of religion, the object being to forever prevent the union of Church and State. . . . Notwithstanding this mandate of our Constitution, the signs of the times betray a disposition to consummate this union of Church and State; but when such degeneracy does take place, the Church, which should be the bride of Christ, becomes the harlot of king, priest and politician. In fact, this union is already consummated in United States Court decisions, thus placing Christ upon a civil throne, contrary to his declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world."

So now we see religious laws that came down from the Church and State polity of England, stringently enforced, and godly men fined, imprisoned, worked alongside of negroes in the chain-gang—and all for dissenting from popular opinion. Shall the ruling party or the majority intrude their religious beliefs into the realm of civil affairs? Many will say no; but the thing is being attempted all the same. We don't want to see any religious law incorporated into the new Constitution. Those Seventh-day Adventists are just as much entitled to their religious belief as were the Huguenots or the Scotch Dissenters, and the spirit of the Constitution never intended that the Seventh-day Adventists or any other religious sect should be persecuted for enjoying their religion.

Send Missionaries to Tennessee.

[*Brooklyn Eagle, August 28.*]

IF missionaries are needed anywhere in this wide world at the present moment, they are needed in Tennessee. Certain good Christians in that State have decided that the religious doctrines held by the Seventh-day Adventists are wrong, particularly that feature of their

creed which recognizes the dictum of the Bible as to resting on the seventh day. The Adventists rest on Saturday, like the Jews, and work on the other days. That displeases the very pious people, for . . . the people of Tennessee are pious and can make as much noise at their protracted meetings as if they were operating a boiler factory.

So they have indicted the men who reserve Saturday for their worship, and have sent them to jail and put them in the chain-gang to work on the roads. Tennessee roads need working on, and need it badly, but not by men and women whose offense is that of recognizing the Jewish Sabbath—the Sabbath prescribed in the Bible. Nothing has been charged against the Adventists other than that they worked on the day their fellow-citizens, who are Methodists and Presbyterians and Baptists, went to church. The persecuted families are non-combatants; they have founded a school that far surpasses the average and infrequent public school of the State, and they neither preach nor practice anything that the sternest moralist might disapprove.

Divested of its legal flummery, the charge that has made them prisoners at hard labor is that their religious belief differs from that of their neighbors. This is a direct defiance of the Constitution of this country. It is a defiance of the spirit of the age. It is an outrage on the rights of the individual. It is setting up a religious hierarchy in a land that has jealously preserved its liberties from that sort of encroachment. It is commanding obedience to forms of faith that are not confessed by millions of residents of our country, and that will presently fall into disrespect if they have to be championed by such people as the community in Tennessee that has sent the Adventists to jail.

Far better that we have no religion than that its professors shall assume the temporal power which the world flung off in the Middle Ages, and shall use that power to torture, to distress, to malign and unjustly entreat a class of their fellow-men who are merely trying to live their lives in usefulness and peace. If such outrages as this are to be perpetrated in the name of a Christian sabbath, then away with the sabbath and all its observances. Tennessee needs schools, it needs newspapers, it needs less law, it needs missionaries who will instruct in the difference between the Christian religion as it was practiced and promulgated by its Founder—a religion all tolerance and love and practical goodness, and that religion as it is enforced by fanatics who are backed by outworn, injurious and unconstitutional laws. Do not send missionaries to China while these poor creatures with darkened minds are seeking the injury of their fellow-beings for a quibbling and inconsequent difference in belief.

THE SENTINEL has always insisted that the laws against the sale of liquors on Sunday were designed, not so much for protection of the people against the evils of the liquor traffic, as for the protection of the so-called Christian sabbath. That we are correct in this is shown by a remark in the *Christian Statesman* of the 31st ult.: "Sabbath laws need enforcement against the excursion as well as against the saloon." The fact is that if the Sunday-law advocates had their way it would be impossible for the masses of the people to go anywhere on Sunday except to bed or to church. The thousands who see the country only on Sunday would see it no more. And the hundreds of thousands to whom the cheap Sunday excursions is a real boon, and who are for six days of the week confined in hot, crowded offices, shops and factories, would be

compelled to spend Sunday on the streets or in the narrow quarters afforded by city tenements—that is, unless they spent an hour or two at church—and this latter is really what the Sunday preachers want—they propose to gain by indirection that which every American constitution forbids, namely, compulsory attendance at church.

Let no one misunderstand the position of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. We are radical in our temperance principles, and for this reason we insist that the real issue should not be made secondary to Sunday sacredness. Let all laws for the regulation or prohibition of the liquor traffic be enacted and enforced for the protection of the rights of the people and not for the protection of a day held by some to be sacred. The conservation of human rights is the only proper object of human law.

UNDER the heading, "Broke up a Sunday Show," the New York Sun, of Sept. 17, prints the following:—

ST. JOSEPH, Mo., Sept. 16.—Wild scenes of rioting occurred last night when the Ministers' Alliance and the police of the city broke up a performance of Pain's "China and Japan." About 4,000 persons paid to see the show, and when the preachers and policemen made their appearance they were hooted, cursed, and threatened by the crowd. Mayor Shepherd appealed to the commissioners to relent and let the performance go on, but to no purpose. The management announced that checks would be given, good for to-night's performance, but hundreds of laboring people who could not attend to-night made a rush on the box office and demanded a return of their money. When this demand was refused the police had to use their clubs in beating back the mob.

There were several broken heads, and the women and children suffered most in the jam. Several were trampled upon and badly hurt. One of the gates was forced open and hundreds rushed out to escape personal injury, not waiting for another admission ticket. Manager Burkholder was arrested on the charge of violating a State law.

It is evident that the clericals who are pushing the Sunday-law crusade are determined to have peace on Sunday if they have to fight for it, and to compel other people to keep Sunday if they themselves have to break it to make them do so.

AN illustration is not an argument. But this fact is overlooked by certain ones who are trying to demonstrate the necessity for Sunday-rest laws by a diagram showing the human system in a continuous physical and mental decline through the week from Monday morning to Saturday night, and recovering its lost force at a single bound by keeping Sunday. The thing works so nicely by diagram that it seems quite unnecessary to cite actual experience, past or present, for further proof. But what about the traditional "blue Monday" with which the housewife is so commonly afflicted? It is quite a common impression, also, that more business is transacted on Saturday than any other day of the week, which does not quite harmonize with the supposed state of things as represented by the little diagram. We would suggest that if the diagram be changed so as to represent a downward plunge of the physical and mental faculties on Sunday, with a gradual rise throughout the week, it would accord much more nearly with the facts.

BOOK NOTICE.

"A GUIDE TO SYSTEMATIC READINGS IN THE ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA." By James Baldwin, Ph. D., author of "The Book Lover," "The Famous Allegories," "The Book of Elegies," etc. Published by the Werner Company, New York and Chicago.

The name of this book is descriptive of its character and purpose. "Unless we know

how to use our 'Encyclopædia,' says the author, "we shall fail to get from it as much benefit as we ought."

Dr. Baldwin regards the "Britannica" as much more than a mere book of reference. He says: "The 'Encyclopædia Britannica' is a great deal more than a dictionary, and is capable of imparting more knowledge and more enjoyment than all the dictionaries in the world."

The author of the "Guide" then tells, in fifty-four chapters divided into three parts, how to extract from the "Britannica" this knowledge and enjoyment.

The first five chapters treat of the subjects of special interest to the young.

The next fourteen chapters are designed to assist students and specialists in the prosecution of their studies.

Thirty chapters are then devoted to showing tradesmen, farmers, teachers, and others how to derive the greatest good from the "Britannica."

Chapter 19 contains hints for the "family reading circle," and the whole book is replete with valuable helps to the use of a most valuable work.

Anyone who has the "Britannica" has within his reach a thorough education, and the "Guide" will tell him how to obtain it.

BISHOP PATTERSON, the Martyr of Melanesia—By Jesse Page. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

MISSIONARY LADIES IN FOREIGN LANDS—By Mrs. E. R. Pilman, author of "Heroines of the Mission fields," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

ROBERT MORRISON, the Pioneer of Chinese Missions—By Wm. J. Townsend, Sec. Methodist New Connexion Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

FAVORITE BIBLE STORIES FOR THE YOUNG—With numerous illustrations. 16mo, handsomely illuminated board covers, 50 cents.; cloth extra, 75 cents.

HENRY M. STANLEY, the African Explorer—By Arther Montefiore, F. R. G. S. Brought down to 1889. 12mo. 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

ROBERT MOFFAT, the Missionary Hero of Kuruman—By David J. Deane, author of "Martin Luther, the Reformer," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JOHN GRIFFITH, Founder of the Hankow Mission, Central China—By William Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

MEMOIRS OF EDWIN BAINBRIDGE.—The subject of this memoir is the young English tourist who met his death at the dreadful volcanic eruption of Tarawera, New Zealand, on the 10th of June, 1886. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

PACIFIC PRESS, 43 Bond Street,
New York City.
Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

JOHN WILLIAMS, the Martyr of Erromanga—By Rev. J. J. Ellis. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JOHN BRIGHT, the Man of the People—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson," "Samuel Crowther," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

GINN'S CLASSICAL ATLAS—4to, cloth, \$2. 50. This work contains 23 colored maps, which were projected and executed by the late A. Keith Johnson, with a complete index.

WILLIAM CAREY, the Shoemaker who became a Missionary—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

SAMUEL CROWTHER, the Slave Boy who became Bishop of the Niger—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson." 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JAMES CHALMERS, Missionary and Explorer of Raratonga and New Guinea—By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

THE POCKET ATLAS OF THE WORLD—A comprehensive and popular series of maps, illustrating physical and political geography, with geographical statistical notes, 54 double maps, cloth, \$1. 00.

THOMAS J. COMBER, Missionary Pioneer to the Congo—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, price, 75 cents.

THE NEW BIBLE ATLAS AND GAZETTEER, with 16 colored maps by W. and A. Keith Johnson, and a very elaborate gazetteer, giving information about nearly every place which is marked upon the maps, with scripture references. 4to, cloth, \$1. 50.

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.

NEW HISTORICAL ATLAS AND GENERAL HISTORY—By Robert H. Labberton. This is the only atlas that has a map for every period. A map for any particular date can instantly be found by any one. It contains, now made for the first time, maps of the Chaldean, Elamitic, Egyptian, Kossean, Armenian, Hittite, and Assyrian Empires. It contains 198 maps, printed in colors, 30 genealogical charts, and is complete in one volume. 4to, 312 pages. Sent by mail or express, post-paid. Half law sheep, \$2. 75; half morocco, \$3. 00.

PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
43 Bond St., New York.
Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

CYCLONE WASHER! We Have Struck It! The Champion of All Machines.

It washes in the most satisfactory manner the clothes of farmers, machinists, engineers, and bricklayers, cleaning the dirty collars and cuffs without rubbing. The work is effected by the compressed air forcing the water through the fabric, and therefore without wear to the material washed. The washing done cleaner, quicker, better, and in half the time. No tired feeling. A child of ten can operate it. Satisfaction guaranteed. Agents Wanted in every county. For particulars and circulars address,
COON BROS., 131-137 So. Washington St., Battle Creek, Mich.





NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 26, 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.

A CHICAGO grand jury has refused to indict a Seventh-day Adventist for Sunday work.

A LETTER from Rome by a correspondent of the *New York World*, dated Aug. 20, states that the pope is desirous of transforming the papal delegation at Washington into a nunciature, with diplomatic functions. A papal delegation modeled after that at Washington, is now being established in the city of Mexico, which the pope regards as the first step towards the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Mexican government.

THE following was introduced by bill at the session of the Constitutional Convention at Columbia, S. C., by Mr. Taylor, as a proposed section of the new constitution: "No person who denies the being of God, or a future state of reward and punishment, shall hold any office in the civil department of this State." Whether this or other measures of intolerance shall find their way into the new constitution of that State, will be known shortly.

The Medical Missionary, in noticing what the *Independent* calls "the infamous Sheats 'law,'" says: "An act prohibiting white and colored youth from attending school together under penalty of a fine of not less than \$150 and not over \$500, or imprisonment from three to six months, has recently been passed in Florida. Either patron or teacher violating this 'law' is subject to the penalty, and this 'law' applies to any school, public or private. This is not an item of history from the Dark Ages, but the 'law' goes into effect Sept. 1, 1895."

ACCORDING to a circular which the London *Daily Telegraph* says it has received "through a source amply guaranteeing its serious inspiration and practical purpose," leading Catholics of Europe have proposed a scheme for restoring the temporal power of the pope, by raising the sum of one billion dollars from Catholics throughout the world, with which to buy the city of Rome and such surrounding territory as may be needed, from the Italian government. As the latter is in very sore financial straits, it is not unlikely that such a proposition if made to it would be favorably received.

THE Spanish bull-fight is now bidding strongly for a place among the sports and pastimes of this "Christian nation." The recent exhibition of this kind in Colorado was, it is true, not very successful; but it is now proposed to have one or more in connection with the Atlanta Exhibition, and accord-

ing to the *New York World*, of Sept. 17, preparations for the fight are now in active progress. The Atlanta Exhibition was opened by President Cleveland, and is an affair of national character and importance. If the proposed bull-fight is held, Georgia will have to depend for its reputation for morality, upon the fact that it has a Sunday law which is exceedingly severe in its penalties upon such as desecrate that day by common work.

AND now it is in Montana that the dragon of religious persecution rears one of his hydra heads. August 3, in Butte, a Hebrew was arrested for selling goods without a license, and being too poor to pay his fine, was put into the chain-gang to work it out. Refusing to work on the Sabbath (Saturday), he was put into a dungeon, into which water was pumped so that he could not sit down. Two Seventh-day Adventists called on the mayor to learn the reasons for such treatment, and were told that it did not matter whether a man kept the seventh day or not, if he was in the chain-gang and refused to work on Saturday, he would have to take the consequences. This only shows very clearly that religious intolerance in this country is not sectional, and will be just as bad in those parts supposed to be possessed of a liberal spirit, as in any others.

ONE of the Baptist ministers of this city, Thomas Dixon, jr., preached a sermon on the 8th inst., in which, according to the *Examiner*, "he declared 'New York is without exception the most godless city on the American continent.' He dwelt upon the fact that 'in the eighty-six Methodist churches there was a gain of only two hundred and forty members during the year,' and that it is much the same with the Baptists and Presbyterians. He grew very dramatic when he shouted 'the pews dominate the pulpit,' and 'the collar is so tightly fastened to the pulpit that when you pass by the churches you can only hear a wheeze.'"

The *Examiner* does not agree with Mr. Dixon, but there is nevertheless much truth in what he said. The fact is, the time foretold in 2 Tim. 4:3, 4, has come. "They will not endure sound doctrine; but, having itching ears," they "heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts." Mr. Dixon is sensational, but has told the truth this time.

ONE of the great political parties of this State has adopted this as one plank of its platform: "We favor the maintenance of the Sunday law in the interests of labor and morality."

That which gave rise to the adoption of this plank, was the effort to close the saloons in this city upon Sunday. It will be observed, however, that nothing is said in the plank about the saloons, or about the liquor traffic in any way; but the party adopting it is pledged by it to the maintenance of the Sunday law. This shows that the plank is a bid

for the church vote rather than a pledge that the party adopting it favors the restriction of the liquor traffic. If it had been intended as a temperance measure it would have been easy to say, "We favor the maintenance and enforcement of the excise law."

This Sunday law to which the party adopting this plank stands pledged, forbids, it is true, the sale of liquor upon Sunday, but it likewise forbids the sale of ice upon that day; it also forbids fishing even on one's private premises. It permits the sale of manufactured tobacco, but prohibits the sale of soda-water or vichy. A dealer may sell cigars, or snuff, or chewing tobacco, but not a sheet of paper, a postage-stamp, or an envelope. It is to the maintenance of such a law as this that this great party stands pledged by the adoption of this plank, and that "in the interests of labor and morality"!

ACCORDING to recent advices, Turkish atrocities still continue in Armenia. The purpose of this modern persecution is thus stated by a correspondent of the *New York World*:—

Ask yourselves if the Christian world is to sit idly by and witness this crusade of persecution which will not end until 2,000,000 Armenian Christians have been wiped out—wiped out because they will not abandon Christianity and worship in the Moslem mosques of the Turks.

It is impossible to describe the outrages committed by the Kurds and Turkish soldiers. To robbery, arson, torture and murder in the most fiendish forms is added still more revolting crimes against girls and women. Not one is safe, and but few have escaped insult and violence at the hands of Turkish hirelings.

The Armenian persecution is due to the same spirit of bigotry and intolerance that in the Dark Ages manifested itself in the horrors of the Inquisition and the Albigensean and Waldensean crusades; and it is the same spirit that is to-day manifesting itself in the persecution of Sabbatarians by means of Sunday statutes. The Armenians are slaughtered because they will not "worship in the Moslem mosques of the Turks." The seventh-day Christians of the world are fined, imprisoned, and driven in chain-gangs because they will not honor the false sabbath of their "Protestant" neighbors. The difference between persecuting to the death and persecuting to the chain-gang, is in degree only; the principle is the same.

A LIMITED number of extra copies of this paper can be had at the usual rates—one cent per copy.

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,
49 Bond Street, New York City.