



Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 20, 1890.

NUMBER 8.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

EDITORS,
E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

THE Merrick County (Nebraska) *Republican*, of February 7, has the following item:—

“On Sunday evening Rev. Mitchlemore, of the Central Baptist Church, preached on the subject, ‘Why prohibition does not prohibit?’ As a chief reason he found that the Church had failed in its duty of reforming men by the power of Christian teaching. The Church has crippled its efficacy in moral and religious work by seeking an alliance with civil power. In other words Mr. Mitchelmore holds that the religion of Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation to all men, whether slaves to appetite, or money, or in whatever condition of immorality or sin. He believes the Church admits the inefficacy of Christianity when it converts itself into a political engine to accomplish the reformation of man. This view is logical and worthy of more consideration than is given it in Central City. It is certain that either Christianity has lost its saving power or many priests of God are woefully misled in their ministrations.”

THE *Christian Statesman* remarks of Colonel Ingersoll’s recent article on “God in the Constitution” that “the bold Atheism which it inculcates, and on which the writer rests his opposition to religious acknowledgment in political constitutions, will create a powerful revulsion of feeling in favor of the National Reform movement.” It ought to do nothing of the kind. It is true that Mr. Ingersoll’s hatred of Christianity is plainly shown in everything which he says, but it does not follow that because he is unreasonable and intolerant that Christians should be so too.

Proper opposition to so-called National Reform rests not upon any real or supposed demerit in Christianity, but upon the fact that National Reform would, if carried out, set up men in the place of God, and thus overthrow the very religion which it is designed to maintain. The truth or falsity of the Christian religion cuts no figure whatever in the case, and the sooner both Christians and infidels come to see this fact the better, and the more hope there will be of maintaining the religious liberty enjoyed under the national Constitution as it is.

The Kind of a Religion.

IN view of the demand that the State shall teach religion in the public schools, it is a pertinent question to ask, What kind of a religion? This question is not always fairly answered by those who make the proposition. It is generally answered in a vague indeterminate way that leaves the question as much unanswered as before. It is sometimes answered “The Christian Religion.” But then the question still recurs, What kind of Christian religion? Shall it be the Presbyterian Christian religion? or the Methodist Christian religion? or the Lutheran Christian religion? or the Roman Catholic Christian religion? Which of these is it that shall be taught in the public schools?

Occasionally, however, there are those who undertake to define what they mean by religion, and what kind of religion it is that shall be adopted and inculcated by the State. Joseph Cook is one of these. His course of Monday Lectures last year dealt largely with this question, especially antagonizing the Roman Catholic view of religion and the public schools. In Lecture III, course of 1889, he said:—

It is very generally conceded that common morals, natural religion, the principles of ordinary utilitarian prudence may be taught without sectarianism in the public schools.

Here are three distinct phrases used to define what kind of religion it is which shall be taught in the public

schools. To understand these phrases is to understand what is proposed to be taught as religion to the children of the United States.

1. “*Common morals.*” Common morals can be nothing else than that grade of morals which is common to the general mass of the people of the United States. And to teach that in the public schools, as the standard of right doing, would be only to teach the children that it is right to do as the mass of the people do. This is very properly defined by Mr. Cook as

2. “*Natural religion.*” Natural religion, in the abstract, is that which is discoverable from nature. With respect to individual character, natural religion is that which it is natural for each one to manifest—his natural disposition. With regard to the general mass of the people therefore, natural religion is the sum of those natural traits which are most manifest in the general character of a given people, or of all mankind; and is therefore synonymous with “common morals.”

But what in the world is the use of teaching such things as these in the public schools or anywhere else? It is easy enough for any person that ever was born to do without any particular instruction, that which it is natural for him to do. It is easy enough for the general mass of the people to manifest in character that which is natural to them. In other words, it is easy enough for every man to be just what he is. And to make such strenuous efforts as these men do, to have the State make of special moment this line of instruction, will hardly pay those who make the demand that it shall be done; and it is certain it would never pay the people of the United States.

Nevertheless Mr. Joseph Cook, and, if we may judge from the frequency of the “applause” that is carefully interspersed throughout the printed lecture, a large number of “the usual great audience” of Boston people who attend this lecture-course, actually propose that this shall be the “religion” that shall be taught in the public schools of this nation. In all

teaching touching upon religion or morals, it is essential that a *motive* be presented. In all instruction some *principle* or principles must be recognized, morals must have a sanction: religion, an incentive. What then are the principles which are to sustain, and what the motive which is to re-enforce this teaching of common morals, this teaching of natural religion? The distinguished lecturer leaves us not in the dark upon this important question. He declares it to be

3. "*The principles of ordinary utilitarian prudence.*" The briefest and easiest understood definition of utilitarianism is selfishness. In making this the sanction of common morals, and the incentive to natural religion, it must be confessed that Mr. Cook is strictly logical. As we have seen, common morals is that standard of morality which is common to the great mass of the people: and it being easier to do that which it is natural to do, the great mass of people will always be found to be doing thus. Therefore, it is perfectly proper to present the principles of ordinary selfishness as the sanction of common morals and the incentive to natural religion. For that is precisely what selfishness is. It is the root and the offspring of every grade of common morals or natural religion.

And all this Mr. Cook and his "usual great" and applauding Boston audience, would have taught in the public schools! And to make sure that it shall be forever taught they demand that an amendment to the United States Constitution shall be adopted making it an essential part of the curriculum of the public schools throughout the Nation. This they insist must be a part of the public school system of the United States. At the same time they loudly complain of the Roman Catholic opposition to the public school system, and severely condemn them for not sending their children to the public schools! We do not assent to any Roman Catholic doctrine, nor do we agree with the Roman Catholic view of the public school question; but we are perfectly free to say that if the doctrine set forth by Joseph Cook on this question were a part of the public school system in any State, then not only the Roman Catholic but everybody else who has any respect for true religion or any care for his child, would not only be justified in keeping his child away from such schools, but would be also justified in denouncing the system everywhere as essentially evil and utterly unworthy of any recognition whatever. The only effect such teaching could ever have upon youth would be only for worse and worse. Whatever may be said of the Roman Catholic system, or the Roman Catholic practice, Roman Catholicism certainly has yet this to its credit, that at least in the theory it holds to a higher idea of morals and religion than

that which is so confidently set forth by the Boston Monday lectureship.

That such views should be set forth as representing the Christian religion, is not by any means the least of the evils of Mr. Cook's theory. Let it become generally understood, as Mr. Cook distinctly teaches, that the Christian religion is a "natural" production; that Christian morals is "purely natural;" that "the character of Christ" "contains the organizing principles" only of a "scheme of natural morals;" and nature worship and naturalism will come in, in such a flood as to sweep away the last vestige of genuine morals and true religion.

No avowed enemy of Christianity ever attributed to it a baser character than that which the Boston Monday lecturer gives it in the lectures of 1889.

Yet, says Mr. Cook, "it is very generally conceded," that this view of morals and religion may be taught in the public schools. It is probably true that this is conceded to a much greater extent than is generally supposed; but that it is "very generally" so outside of Boston, is more than we are yet prepared to believe. However, to whatever extent it is conceded, it is only a startling evidence of the low level to which the popular idea of religion is descending.

It is but natural that those who hold such views of religion should expect to propagate it by the natural power—the State.

A. T. J.

Queer Christians.

The *Mail and Express* insists that the late political campaign, in Salt Lake City, for the power of the city government, was a contest between Mormons and Christians. It calls the successful ticket "the Christian ticket." The result it magnifies as a "Christian victory." And in its pen, it says:—

It is as remarkable as creditable that the disturbances of the peace were so few and slight; but the leaders on both sides were determined to control their own forces and keep them from violence, and on the side of the Christians there was ample provision of deputy marshals, detectives and special police for the prevention of any considerable amount of either fraud or disturbance.

That doesn't look as though these "Christians" were much better than other people. When it comes about that "provision of deputy marshals, detectives, and special police" must be made to prevent Christians from committing "any considerable amount of either fraud or disturbance," then the fewer of such Christians as that there are in the world the better. And even then, it seems that the intention was only to prevent any *considerable amount* of fraud or disturbance! as though small or an inconsiderable amount of either were perfectly compatible with the Christian profession!

We do not for a moment suppose that those who ran the anti-Mormon Cam-

paign considered that they were doing so as Christians or that Christianity entered to any extent into the contest. We only notice the facility with which Col. Elliot F. Shepard manufactures Christians. This is perfectly consistent with the theory and methods of the American Sunday Law Union, of which he is president. It is another strong reminder of the times of the fourth century when fraud and violence were commendable if only committed in defence of orthodoxy.

The Puritan Idea.

In Dr. Herrick Johnson's address on "Sunday newspapers," which has been circulated widely as a campaign document by the abettors of religious legislation, occurred the words, "Oh, for a breath of the old Puritan," meaning that what the speaker wanted was a return to Puritan habits and customs. In the recent annual meeting of the Iowa Sabbath Convention, Mr. Gault said that what was wanted in Iowa was a wave of Puritanism. From these and other expressions we learn that the Puritan idea of government is the model for National Reformers of whatever stripe. A few quotations from a standard work may enable those who are interested to know just what kind of government a Puritan government would be. In a late work by Professor Fisk, of Harvard College, entitled, "The Beginnings of New England," is the following in connection with the account of the exodus of the Puritans from Holland:—

All persons who came to Holland and led decorous lives there, were protected in their opinions and customs. By contemporary writers in other countries this eccentric behavior of the Dutch Government was treated with unspeakable scorn. "All strange religions flock thither," says one: "It is a common harbor of all heresies, a cage of unclean birds," says another; "The great mangle of all religions," says a third. In spite of the relief from persecution, however, the Pilgrims were not fully satisfied with their new home. The expiration of the truce with Spain might prove that this relief was only temporary, and, at any rate, complete toleration did not fill the measure of their wants. Had they come to Holland as scattered bands of refugees, they might have been absorbed into the Dutch population, as Huguenot refugees have been absorbed in Germany, England, and America. But they had come as an organized community, and absorption into a foreign nation was something to be dreaded. They wished to preserve their English speech and English traditions, keep up their organization and find some favored spot where they could lay the corner-stone of a great Christian State.

This language is not written in any spirit of captious criticism. The author manifests a spirit of fairness, and writes in an impartial manner, simply giving historical facts. That he did not charge the Puritans with inconsistency is seen from the following, which very clearly sets forth the Puritan idea:—

It is worth while to inquire what were the real aims of the settlers of New England. What was the common purpose which brought these men together in their resolve to create for themselves a new home in the wilderness? This is a point con-

cerning which there has been a great deal of popular misapprehension, and there has been no end of nonsense talked about it. It has been customary first to assume that the Puritan migration was undertaken in the interests of religious liberty, and then to upbraid the Puritans for forgetting all about religious liberty as soon as people came among them who disagreed with their opinions. But this view of the case is not supported by history. It is quite true that the Puritans were chargeable with gross intolerance, but it is not true that in this they were guilty of inconsistency. The notion that they came to New England for the purpose of establishing religious liberty, in any sense in which we should understand such a phrase, is entirely incorrect. It is neither more nor less than a bit of popular legend. If we mean by the phrase "religious liberty" a state of things in which opposite or contradictory opinions on questions of religion shall exist side by side in the same community, and in which everybody shall decide for himself how far he will conform to the customary religious observances, nothing could have been farther from their thoughts. There is nothing they would have regarded with more genuine abhorrence. If they could have been forewarned by a prophetic voice of the general freedom—or as they would have termed it, license—of thought and behavior which prevails in this country to-day, they would very likely have abandoned their enterprise in despair. The philosophic student of history often has occasion to see how God is wiser than man. In other words, he is often brought to realize how fortunate it is that the leaders in great historic events cannot foresee the remote results of the labors to which they have zealously consecrated their lives. It is a part of the irony of human destiny that the end we really accomplish by striving with might and main is apt to be something quite different from the end we dreamed of as we started on our arduous labor. It was so with the Puritan settlers of New England. The religious liberty that we enjoy to-day is largely the consequence of their work, but it is a consequence that was unforeseen, while the direct and conscious aim of their labors was something that has never been realized, and probably never will be.

The aim of Winthrop and his friends in coming to Massachusetts was a construction of a theocratic State which should be to Christians, under the New Testament dispensation, all that the theocracy of Moses, and Joshua, and Samuel had been to the Jews in Old Testament days. They should be to all intents and purposes freed from the jurisdiction of the Stuart king, and so far as possible the texts of the Holy Scriptures should be their guide, both in weighty matters of general legislation, and in the shaping of the smallest details of daily life. In such a scheme there was no room for religious liberty, as we understand it. No doubt the text of the Scriptures may be interpreted in many ways, but among these men there was a substantial agreement as to the important points, and nothing could have been farther from their thoughts than to found a colony which should afford a field for new experiments in the art of right living. The State they were to found was to consist of a united body of believers; citizenship itself was to be co-extensive with church membership; and in such a State there was apparently no more room for heretics than there was in Rome or Madrid. This was the idea which drew Winthrop and his followers from England at a time when—as events were soon to show—they might have staid there and defied persecution with less trouble than it cost them to cross the ocean and found a new State.

The Puritans simply followed the customs of their time. Religious liberty was a thing unknown. Roman Catholicism and intolerance have been synonymous from the beginning. The Church of England was as intolerant as the Roman Church. The Puritans had not advanced

far enough to perceive the error of the principle of religious intolerance, only they did not want the intolerance extended to themselves. They did not think that the Church of England ought to be intolerant, because they could see her errors, but, feeling sure that they themselves were right, they were equally sure that their opinions ought to prevail, and ought to be imposed upon others. In all New England, in the days of the Puritans, there was only one man who was far enough ahead to perceive that religion was a matter that rests with the individual, and not with the civil government, and that man was Roger Williams.

Although the Puritans were intolerant, and persecuted others even as they themselves had been persecuted, they are not to be stigmatized as bad men. They thought they were right. They were but little removed from the darkest period of Roman superstition and oppression, and they had before them no example of perfect religious freedom. In consideration of their circumstances we can make allowance for the ideas of government which they had, and honor them for that spirit of independence which was perpetuated in their children, and which resulted in the complete religious liberty which was finally established in this country. But while we may make allowance for those men, considering their time, what allowance can be made for men who have before them the history of one hundred years of religious liberty in the United States? and who can compare its glorious work with the work of the religious despotism of the Old World? Those who in this age would institute the Puritan idea of government, must be either deplorably blind or else wickedly selfish.

E. J. W.

"Justice."

THIS was the subject of a lecture in the Jewish synagogue of Oakland, Sunday evening, January 12, by Justice Charles N. Fox, of the supreme court. The peculiarity of the appearance of this lecturer before a Jewish audience, with such a subject, is emphasized by the fact that the judge is an ardent Sunday-law advocate; and when that subject was a campaign issue before the people a few years ago, he was one of the prominent orators opposed to the repeal of the California Sunday law.

The lecturer said, "The law of all civilized countries is but an elaboration of that given to the children of Israel, amid the thunders of Sinai," and then he repeated the ten commandments. The hard part of it is, reverting to his perorations of seven years ago, to see how a Sunday law could be an elaboration of the ten commandments, which very plainly indicate that the first day of the week is one of secular labor.

Speaking of the injustice to which the Israelites have been subjected in various ages, the judge remarked that "even today in some countries they are feeling bitter injustice." But he did not allude, as he might have done, to the injustice awaiting them in the United States when the Sunday law scheme, which he and his National Reform American Sabbath Union *confreeres* are endeavoring to fasten upon the country, shall have been accomplished.

Again, the lecturer, "Possibly in the name of religion, alone, more injustice has been done than in any other name known among the children of men." But he did not refer to the fact that the entailing of intolerant Sunday laws on the country is the opening wedge for a return to the injustice of the Dark Ages. Nor did he seem to realize the fact that when the gates to civil and religious liberty are closed in this great country whose boast is liberty of conscience, that would be the precursor of more intolerance in other countries, which have been impelled to a degree of liberality because of our asylum for their refugees from oppression.

Another sentiment which, coming from a Sunday-law enthusiast, may be considered as an admission, was this: "Nations at times are not moved by the final judgment of the aggregate of men; they are moved by emotion, and not awaiting the final judgment. Hence, injustice often occurs." If the judge fully appreciated the truth he uttered in that expression, he would never again raise his voice in favor of a Sunday law. All religious legislation is the result of emotion, and it begets its kind with terrible rapidity and in excessive degree, rushing on to fanaticism, intolerance, persecution.

Said the lecturer: "Tolerance, however, is constantly growing, so that we may expect the adoption of the eleventh commandment, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them.' *Tolerance* has no legitimate place in the vocabulary of a free people. The person or principle that is merely *tolerated*, is always at the mercy of the power that tolerates. Equality of rights leaves tolerance in the background. Tolerance will never admit the principle of "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them." If *tolerance* is growing, good-by to liberty of conscience.

On the theory that "we cannot hope to live to see pure, unadulterated justice administered by man, one toward another, or under men's laws," the lecturer indulged the hope that progress "may so develop the intellects of our children that they will attain nearer and nearer that justice that sits enthroned at the feet of God." On the strength of this hope, the lecturer closed with the following picture:—

When the church of the Christian and the synagogue of the Hebrew will be alike the place for the

worship of the one God, Father of men—then a man may enter either and make his devotions, knowing he is in a tabernacle of the one ever-living God. Then peace will wave her wand over the world.

Shall we suppose that he was contemplating the benign effects of a national Sunday law, or a National Reformed Constitution, when he portrayed that beautiful image of the unanimity of Hebrew and Christian worship under the progress of "men's laws?" It used to be a settled theory on the Western plains that the rattlesnake and the prairie-dog dwelt harmoniously in the same burrow; but when the writer killed a rattler with a whole prairie dog inside of it, the cause of the harmony was explained. It was a clear case of coercion. Just so it will be when the Hebrew worship, as such, will so perfectly assimilate to the then "Christian" that there will be no perceptible difference.

W. N. GLENN.

Oakland, California.

An Example to the World.

WITHOUT doubt the government of the United States has stood as a beacon-light to the whole world. It has done more for civil and religious liberty than any other nation. At one time it stood alone in representing the right relation of civil government and religion. This grand example has not been without fruit. Its influence has been felt throughout the world. One by one the other colonies of Great Britain have slowly followed in its wake.

The following proclamation of Queen Victoria, issued in 1858, to the natives of India, shows on the face of it the gentle influence of the United States Constitution:—

Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects. We declare it to be our Royal will and pleasure that none be in any wise favored, none molested or disquieted by reason of their religious faith or observances, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us, that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects, on pain of our highest displeasure.

And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge.

The same desire for religious liberty is seen in the other colonies. In 1868 the union of Church and State was abolished in parts of the West Indies. In 1869 the Irish Church was disestablished. In 1870 the State Church was done away with in Jamaica and in Victoria. In 1871 civil government and religion were rent asunder in St. Kitts, Antigua, and Granada. In 1875 State aid was abolished in the Cape of Good Hope. In 1881 the same was done in Ceylon. In our own country (England) the tide towards religious equality is no less steadily setting. In 1812 the Convent-

icle and Five Mile Acts were repealed. In 1828 the Test and Corporation Acts likewise went. In 1855 an act for securing "Liberty of Religious Worship" was passed. In 1858 Jews were admitted into Parliament. In 1860 an act for opening of Grammar Schools for Dissenters passed. In 1867 all the Queen's subjects, without reference to their religious belief, were declared eligible for office as Lord Chancellor of Ireland. In 1870 the University Tests abolition acts passed. And at the present time strenuous efforts are being made to abolish the union of Church and State.

Yes, the influence of the Constitution still lives, and is to be seen outside of the United States. The eyes of Europe and of the world are fixed with intense interest on that country. The question to be solved is, are the people going to stay by the glorious principles set forth by the framers of the Constitution, or are they going to go back on them? Are they going to allow a few ambitious clerics to drag that country back to a mediæval standard? God forbid! And for the cause of religious liberty may the United States Constitution forever remain as it is.

FRANK HOPE.

London, England.

Government and the Sermon on the Mount.

SOME weeks ago we printed a brief speech by the Bishop of Peterborough, England, in which the Bishop took the ground that civil government could not enforce the Sermon on the Mount. The speech was quite brief, but yet it was of sufficient length to stir up a "hornets' nest," and the Bishop was attacked on many sides. This brought the Bishop again to the front with a good lengthy discussion of the question. The article was printed in the *Fortnightly Review*, and we are glad that we can reproduce it for our readers. It will make about three installments for the SENTINEL columns, the first of which is printed herewith. The Bishop makes one slip, however, which will be noticed in its place. With this exception the argument is sound, and is excellently stated. The argument is of interest in this country, as well as in England, because of the persistent effort being made to secure legislation committed to the principles of Christianity. The Bishop says:—

"In the course of a discussion on Christian Socialism, at a Diocesan Conference, in commenting on a recent definition of it, as being 'an attempt on the part of the State to compel all men to live according to the precepts of Christ,' I ventured to make two assertions.

"1. That it is not possible for the State to carry out, in all its relations, literally, all the precepts of Christ, and that a State which attempted this could not exist for a week.

"2. That if it were possible to do this

the result would be a perfectly intolerable tyranny.

"For saying this I have been assailed in language which proves nothing. Now I propose to discuss whether what I said is or is not true.

"Is it, then, possible for the State to carry out those precepts of his which inculcate non-resistance, inexhaustible forgiveness, and unlimited benevolence? Can the State, that is to say, disband its army, burn its ships of war, abolish its courts of justice, pull down its jails, dismiss its policemen, bestow its revenues upon all and sundry who ask for them, and yet still continue to exist as a State? If there really be any person who maintains this I cannot argue with him. His proper place is in a lunatic asylum.

"I am, however, taken to task by others of my critics on quite an opposite ground. Of course—these say—the State cannot literally obey all the precepts in the Sermon on the Mount; but neither can the individual. Those precepts can be obeyed by the individual in the spirit only, and not in the letter. Why may not the State do the same? I must confess to a firm belief that neither in the spirit nor in the letter can the entire of that sermon be carried out by the State, and that whenever it attempts to do this it is tending to its own destruction.

"What is a State? Speaking loosely this term is used as signifying the entire population of any country. The State, when we are speaking of its social or political obligations, can only mean that part of the nation which is empowered to speak and act on behalf of the rest. It is briefly, as it has been well defined to be, 'the sovereign body having supreme power.' The essential idea of a State always is that of sovereignty held on trust for the commonweal; and to this trust, for the sake of which it exists, it is morally bound to be faithful.

"It is clear, therefore, that a State, in order that it may be a faithful trustee, is bound—first, to preserve its own existence; and secondly, to resist, restrain, and even, if needs be, to destroy whatever and whomsoever assails its authority or attacks the interests committed to its charge. Self-preservation, therefore, and the preservation of all that is intrusted to it, are the moral obligations of every State.

TWO IRRECONCILABLE IDEAS.

"Now, is this idea of protection of interests, of maintenance of rights, and of resistance to all assaults on these, the idea of the Sermon on the Mount? Distinctly it is not. The idea, the spirit, of that discourse is the diametrically opposite one of sacrifice of rights, surrender of interests, and non-resistance to assaults on these. It is, in a word, from beginning to end the idea of self-sacrifice as opposed to that of self-preservation. Is it not clear, therefore, that the State, if it is to be true to its own idea, if it is not to abdicate or betray

its trust, cannot carry out, in spirit even, the directly antagonistic idea of the Sermon on the Mount? Nay, is it not true that under analogous circumstances—namely, when acting as a trustee for the rights and interests of others—the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount do not apply and were not intended to apply to the private individual? Take the case of A. B., who is trustee or guardian for C. D. and E. F. Is he morally justified in giving away or in allowing any one to take away their possessions? Assuredly he is not. So long as he continues to be their trustee he is morally bound to maintain and defend these against all comers. He may allow the taking away of his own cloak and his own coat, but he has no right to allow the taking away of theirs. He may bestow all his own goods to feed the poor, but he has no right thus to bestow their goods, simply because they are theirs and not his. Quite apart, therefore, from the question, yet to be considered, as to how the individual is required by the Sermon on the Mount to deal with his own rights and possessions, it is clear that it gives him no directions as to how he is to deal with the rights and possessions of others.

“A State is something else and something more than a collection of individuals; and a Christian State, whatever that may mean (and that is a very large question), though bound by all those precepts of Christ which may be addressed to it as a State, is not therefore bound to obey all those which are addressed to its members in their several and diverse relations and capacities. A State is not morally justified in refusing to resist or prevent invasion—*i. e.*, to wage defensive war—because it would thereby be betraying to destruction the lives and properties of its subjects; it is not morally justified in expending all its revenues in pure benevolence, because it would thereby be applying those revenues to purposes for which they were not intrusted to it; it would not be morally justified in forgiving out of mere compassion all or any of its criminals, because it would thereby be weakening or even destroying those sanctions of order and of law which it is its duty to maintain and to enforce. In all these respects—and they might be largely multiplied—the State, if it were to act in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount, would be failing to discharge functions which are given it, as we believe, of God himself, who, we Christians hold, has ‘ordained the powers that be,’ and so would be breaking a law which God assuredly has given it in the vain attempt at obeying laws which Christ has never given it. I venture, therefore, not only to repeat but to enlarge upon my first ‘odious’ and ‘immoral’ utterance, and to affirm not only that the State cannot but that it ought not to carry out in all its relations—either in the letter or in the spirit—all the precepts in the Sermon on the Mount, inasmuch as these were not all of them addressed to it by him who gave them.”

(To be continued.)

Religious Liberty in Rhode Island, 1636.

UNLIKE the other American Colonies, Rhode Island enjoyed the privileges of entire liberty of conscience from the time of the foundation of the commonwealth. Roger Williams, its founder, believed that God alone had to do with the heart of man, and that it was “unlawful for the magistrate to meddle with the breaches of the first table” (*i. e.*, with violations of the four first commandments, which have only to do with our relation to God). Accordingly, he founded the first commonwealth the world had ever known on the principles of individual right of conscience; and may be justly called The First American, which title does him more honor than if he had held the highest office the Colonies could afford.

From the publications of the Narragansett Historical Society, I take the following:—

Roger Williams, says Professor Gervinus, in his recent “Introduction to the History of the Nineteenth Century,”* founded, in 1636, a small new society in Rhode Island, upon the principles of entire liberty of conscience, and the uncontrolled power of the majority in secular concerns. The theories of freedom in Church and State taught in the schools of philosophy in Europe, were here brought into practice in the government of a small community. It was prophesied that the democratic attempts to obtain universal suffrage, a general elective franchise, annual parliaments, entire religious freedom, and the Miltonian right of schism, would be of short duration. But these institutions have not only maintained themselves here, but have spread over the whole Union. They have superseded the aristocratic commencements of Carolina and New York, the high-church party in Virginia, the theocracy in Massachusetts, and the monarchy throughout America; they have given laws to one quarter of the globe; and, dreaded for their moral influence, they stand in the background of every democratic struggle in Europe.

The founder of Rhode Island not only believed in every individual having the right of conscience, but he believed in every individual (the Indian as well as the white man) having *all* his inalienable rights. Consequently, he contended that the patent from the king, depriving the Indian of his land without his consent thereto, was sinful; and hence, like Penn, he purchased his land from the native inhabitants. His study of the teachings of Christ (for he was a devoted Christian and close Bible student) gave him a clear understanding of the inherent rights of mankind and the proper sphere of government. It was Christ himself who said, “My kingdom is not of this world”; and “Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.”

George Bancroft, justly meriting the eminence which he has gained for his critical and diligent research, as well as graphical description, truly says:—

The annals of Rhode Island, if written in the spirit of philosophy, would exhibit the forms of society under a peculiar aspect. Had the territory of the State corresponded to the importance and sim-

* Translated from the German. H. G. Bohn, London, 1853, page 65.

gularity of the principles of its early existence, the world would have been filled with wonder at the phenomena of its history.†

Again, the historian says:—

The land which was now [1636] occupied by Williams, was within the territory of the Narragansett Indians; it was not long before an Indian deed [dated March 24, 1638] made him the undisputed possessor of an extensive domain. Nothing displays more clearly the character of Roger Williams than the use which he made of his acquisition of territory. The soil he could claim as his own, as truly as any man’s coat upon his back; and he reserved to himself not one foot of land, not one tittle of political power, more than he granted to servants and strangers. He gave away his lands and other estate to them that he thought were most in want, until he gave away all.‡ He chose to found a commonwealth in the unmixed forms of a pure democracy, where the will of the majority should govern the State, yet “only in civil things.” God alone was respected as the ruler of conscience.

Thus it was that the grand institutions of the great American Republic had their birth. These principles were afterward fostered and encouraged by various commonwealths, and by such men as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and their fellow-statesmen; and, finally found a place in the Constitution of the United States of America.

Well may the American people feel proud of their country. And every freeman should watch with a jealous eye, lest these principles, which have raised this nation above any other nation on the face of the globe, should be set aside, and our national Government, even yet, legislate upon the subject of religion.

W. A. BLAKELY.

Poor California—No Sunday Law.

REV. ASELM H. BROWN, writing from San Francisco to the *Christian Intelligencer*, on the “Moral Conflicts on the Pacific Coast,” says of the Sunday:—

From careful observation and study of the churches, I believe the Sabbath [Sunday] is observed here by the resident Americans as faithfully as it is observed in other States by the same class of people. California has no Sabbath law, but such a law where it exists is not generally enforced. Christian people would like to have one, and mean to secure it and enforce it. But, although without it, the Sabbath [Sunday] is by no means obliterated as a day of rest,—tourists from the East, among whom are many professing Christians, are not as careful as they should be in observing it.

And then he mentions the example set by a distinguished clergyman and minister who was connected with a board of missions. Of the latter, one person said that “Mr. Ingersoll would not probably have set a worse example in breaking the Sabbath day.”

With reference to this testimony, we would note the following points: 1. It is in harmony with others which have been borne (Mr. Crafts to the contrary, notwithstanding) that Sunday is as well observed by Americans in no-Sunday-law California as other Sunday-law States.

† Bancroft’s “History of the United States,” vol. i., pp. 380, 381.

‡ From a letter of Daniel Williams.

2. The worst influences as regards Sunday violation come from professed Christians, some of these being ministers in the Church. 3. Christians want laws to compel Sunday observance, evidently to compel these church members to live as they believe.

What a travesty is all this on the religion of Christ, when Sunday-keeping has so little support from the Scriptures, when church members set the worst example as regards its observance, then for Christians to clamor for a civil law to compel recreant brethren among others to observe it! It is a confession that it has no basis in God's word, and that they have no faith in the power of Christ to impress it upon the conscience. Sunday is a papal institution, and it takes papal means to "induce" the people, some of whom are Sunday Christians, to observe it. May it be long before California greets the Dark Ages in another Sunday law.

But our genial townsman, N. R. Johnston, member of the State Executive Committee of the California branch of the American Sabbath Association, is becoming discouraged over the prospects of a Sunday law, at least his letter of December 3, to the *Christian Statesman* so indicates. He says:—

At my last writing I hoped to be able ere this to communicate something very encouraging as to the progress of our Sabbath cause in this State, but in common with others I have been disappointed. Even since the State convention, held while Dr. Wilbur Crafts was here, when a large Executive Committee was appointed, the interest in the cause has seemed to be growing less.

We only hope that it is true, and wish Mr. Crafts would come again and a committee twice as large be appointed. The cause, in part, of this decline our friend thinks is because of the agreement to leave out of view the divine authority and the religious feature of the reform—to work only for a "civil Sunday law, . . . to ignore the claims of the moral law of God." And Mr. Johnston concludes that "unless there can be awakened more earnestness and a heartier cooperation on the part of church members, it will be a long time before California will have any Sabbath law or any better Sabbath observance." He "thinks it doubtful whether they will ever again have any kind of a law in favor of any kind of a Sabbath."

It is a mournful wail. If we may be allowed to suggest to these preachers, we would say, turn from man and put your trust in God. If Sunday is supported by the Bible, preach it, practice it, press it home by the aid of the Spirit of truth upon the conscience of men, and observance of the day will improve. You will not need the support of the civil arm. But if Sunday is not supported by the Bible, it is not worthy of this effort. If these ministers would only preach the

gospel, what a blessing it would be. They ought to be discouraged.—*Signs of the Times, Oakland, California.*

An Opinion on the Blair Bill.

Truths of Nature, a monthly journal of natural science, published in Boston, has the following concerning the Blair Sunday Bill and its supporters:—

"He has a very powerful, but a very unchristian minority in the sponsors of his bill, seeking in this way to strengthen their waning power. The bill may be passed, for the American people are patient and long-suffering in such cases; but there is such a thing as the 'last feather,' and when the reaction takes place in the minds of the American people the tribe of Blairs will be swept into obscurity, and the religious freedom of the people of the United States will be doubly assured. The very fact that Senator Blair, in his 'Sunday Rest bill' invokes the aid of statute law to compel the people to rest according to his programme robs the Sabbath of its holiness. . . . Each man should be allowed to spend the day according to the 'dictates of his own conscience,' so long as he does not interfere with the natural rights of others. If the churches are not filled there is something wrong in the churches. When Senator Blair's followers are prepared to discard purple and fine linen, distribute the proceeds among the poor, and then preach as did the lowly Nazarene, without price; when they are willing to follow those they desire to save, as did Jesus, they will rob their present action of its selfish aspect. The time has gone by when we could take a club and compel men to go down on their knees and pray. We can no longer put a man in the stocks for being an absentee from church on Sunday. The very power that Senator Blair seeks in his 'Sunday Rest bill,' if granted, would defeat the object sought."

A Pointed Item.

A religious paper of Oakland, California, has the following pointed item:—

"The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, who has so much to say about the unfortunate and fearful condition of California with no Sunday law, says of his investigation in New York City on the first Sunday 'of the year, and since,' 'I started to write down a list of the places open, but found it would be much easier to make a record of the places closed.' Dear Mr. Crafts, San Francisco and Oakland are not so bad as that, with no Sunday law. And if there had been such a law as you desire, how would you have escaped arrest? Under which head, 'mercy' or 'necessity,' would *your work* have come?"

Pertinent Questions.

In the Sunday issue of the *Tribune* of this city there is a department entitled "In the Church Porch," in which much sound doctrine is dispensed,—the following, for instance, which we commend to Joseph Cook and others who in the attempt to justify their demand that the State shall teach religion, so innocently exclaim that so many of the people "never see the inside of a church":—

"Did Jesus preach his gospel in a big and well-appointed church in High Street, Jerusalem? Did he announce that those who desired to hear him must go there; or did he rather go where the sinners were and there preach to them? Preach to them? I recall the word. He did better than preach; he entered into the lives of sinners; he learned what their burden of sorrow or trouble was and tried to lighten it. He came to them not as a professional preacher, but as a friend and brother. And if the modern church would succeed it must go and do likewise.

"Take an illustration. Here is a great physician, and here are a multitude of sick folk needing his skill. But instead of going to the homes of these sick folk and trying to cure them by suggesting remedies appropriate to their special cases, he erects a big hall, and gives a course of learned and brilliant weekly lectures on the importance of believing in, and supporting the State Medical Society. Do you think the sick people would go to these lectures to be cured of their sickness? But maybe the physician would describe in his lectures the true nature of disease and the manifold resources of medical science. Maybe he would show how frequently people brought sickness on themselves by their vices or their ignorance. Would that help the sick people? Not at all. No matter how comfortable his lecture-hall might be, no matter how beautiful the music of his choir might be, no matter how eloquent his lecture might be, those who were sick in their wretched homes, or on the streets, would still remain sick, until he went to them individually, and gave them medicine to heal their sickness.

"What say you to this, brother preachers, who expect sin-sick souls to be cured by listening to your eloquent sermons on the importance of joining the church, or on some abstruse scheme of theology? Would it not be wiser to go to these men and women and personally give them the medicine which will cure their special sickness? Not that preaching is to be ignored. Oh, no. It is one of the greatest functions of Christianity. But it cannot take the place of sympathetic ministration to individual souls, which, more than anything else, is needed to-day in our great cities. To vast multitudes of men and women, parochialism, with its cast-iron methods, is an utter and complete failure. Would it not, therefore, be wiser for the Church to try some other more simple and direct plan?"

THE BEST DUPLICATING INKS

FOR USE WITH
"CYCLOSTYLE," "MIMEOGRAPH,"
"COPYGRAPH."

Or any Duplicating Process in which a Stencil
is used, are the

Celebrated "Redding Inks."

They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog the stencil,
Dry or Harden on Roller or Pallet, and are in
every way

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done
with these Inks.

REDDING INK CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

ROMANISM AND CIVIL LIBERTY

BY HON. WILLIAM JACKSON ARMSTRONG.

The above is the title of a recent issue
of the *Sentinel Library* which contains a
verbatim report of a powerful
lecture delivered by this well-known
speaker, in Oakland, California. Price,
4 cents. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OF OAKLAND, CAL.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Published weekly, at Oakland, Cal., for the

International Tract and Mis-
sionary Society.

A sixteen-page Religious Family Paper, devoted to
a discussion of the Prophecies, Signs of the
Times, Second Coming of Christ, Harmony of the
Law and Gospel; with Departments devoted to
Health and Temperance, the Home Circle, the
Missionary Work, and the Sabbath-school.

Price Per Year, post-paid, \$2.00

In clubs of five or more copies to one
name and address, to be used in Mis-
sionary work, each, \$1.50

To foreign countries, single subscrip-
tion, post-paid, 10s

SIGNS OF THE TIMES,
OAKLAND, CAL.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

A Semi-monthly Publication

Devoted to the defence of

AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

And the Preservation of the

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
AS IT IS.

TERMS 75 CENTS PER YEAR.

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

GOOD HEALTH

Is a popular health magazine, published at Battle
Creek, Mich., and conducted by

J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Assisted by an able editorial staff.

It contains, each month, general articles on practical
hygiene, and medical papers, besides a rich
variety of other matter, pithy and practical, on
popular questions, also representing the latest
scientific thought, in combination with Dr. Kellogg's
wide professional experience.

Established on Four Continents. No journal
devoted to health or kindred topics has ever enjoyed
so great a popularity as this journal has earned by
its devotion to the interests of the people in the de-
velopment and popularization of knowledge on all
sanitary topics. It has been introduced into nearly
every part of the civilized world, and enjoys a large
circulation, not only in America, but in England,
upon the continent of Europe, in South Africa, and
in Australia. Among the

SPECIAL ATTRACTIONS

For 1890, the managers of this journal propose
during the year to devote considerable space to the
Exposure of Medical Frauds. They have, there-
fore, established a chemical laboratory, in
charge of a competent chemist, for the purpose of
carrying on a series of thorough-going investiga-
tions, the results of which will be published in the
columns of this journal. Price, \$1.25 a Year.
Single numbers, 15 Cents. Send for specimen copy,
and terms to agents.

GOOD HEALTH PUB. CO., Battle Creek, Mich.

ENGLISH AND GERMAN FAMILY BIBLES PARALLEL EDITION!

2,200 Pages, with 2,000 Illustrations, of which 60 are
Full-page Steel Engravings.

It contains a large Marriage Certificate, in black and gold; a Family Record;
Illuminated Temperance Pledge; a complete Concordance; and a great amount
of other things of great value. It is a beautiful book and is an ornament to
any home.

AGENTS WANTED.

Address,

SEND FOR CIRCULARS.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

THE GRANDEST BOOK ON THE GRANDEST SUBJECT! AND WITHIN THE REACH OF ALL.

We have just issued a special "TOUSIST'S EDITION" of our grand book entitled,

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS

THE YO SEMITE VALLEY

AND BIG TREES OF CALIFORNIA.

The most authentic and most intensely interesting description of this wonderful
region ever written. It is the same size page and contains everything that our
elegant Subscription edition does, except the artotype plates. It is printed on a fine
quality of thinner paper, bound in flexible cloth binding, and makes a beautiful
book. It contains nearly 500 pages of text and

OVER ONE HUNDRED ILLUSTRATIONS.

and portrays by aid of the artist's genius and the author's facile pen the lofty
mountains and charming valleys, the placid lakes and thundering cataracts, of
the world-renowned Yo Semite. The mission of this work is to make the best
possible representation of the marvelous scenery and sublime natural wonders of
this unique region.

PRICE, \$1.50 PER COPY.

Read what others say of it:—

"Many books have been written about the glorious and wondrous story of the Sierras. But it
seems to me that this scholarly and venerable pioneer, who was publishing an illustrated magazine
devoted largely to the themes he celebrates, when many of the younger authors were still at their
nurse's knee, is the one man who is entitled, by his culture, his fine tastes, and above all, his long
and wonderful experience, to write the one great and responsible authority about the Heart of the
Sierras."—*JOAQUIN MILLER.*

"The illustrations, the text, the whole atmosphere of the volume, are worthy of their great
subject, the Yo Semite—and what could I say more?"—*REV. JOSEPH COOK.*

"It is a truthful, interesting, and instructive work."—*GALEN CLARK, Yo Semite Valley.*
(For sixteen years the Valley's Guardian.)

"As might have been expected, Mr. Hutchings' story of the Valley that he knows and loves so
well, is no cold description, but read with all the charms of a romance."—*San Francisco Hotel
Gazette.*

"Those who have not seen Yo Semite cannot do better, short of going to the Valley, than by
purchasing Mr. Hutchings' handsome volume."—*The Sacramento Record-Union.*

In order to place this valuable book—the only one of the kind—within the
reach of everybody, we offer this edition at the exceedingly low price of \$1.50 per
copy, post-paid. Send on your orders quick, while the edition lasts.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OF OAKLAND, CAL.

TEN LECTURES

ON

NASAL CATARRH

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention, and Cure, and Diseases of the
Throat, Eye, and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh;
with a chapter of

CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical
Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontis-
piece and SIX BEAUTIFULLY COLORED PLATES, besides many
illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little
work costs only 30 cents, and is in great demand.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OF OAKLAND, CAL.

DIPHTHERIA!

Causes, Prevention, and Cure.

By J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

The increasing prevalence of this devastating
disease, and its alarming fatality in so many
cases, renders the subject of its Nature and Treat-
ment one of the greatest importance.

This work gives a concise account of the Nature,
Cause, and Modes of Prevention, and also the
Most Successful Methods of Treatment of this
prevalent and fatal malady. It should be in every
household, as its instructions, if faithfully carried
out, will save many a precious life. Price in
board covers, 25 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS,

43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

WATERMAN'S IDEAL

FOUNTAIN PEN.

HAS THE MOST RELIABLE arrangement for feed-
ing the ink from the reservoir to the pen.

It has the same sure principle of operation
(capillary attraction) and simple construction (a
split) that have been used by the ordinary dip
pen for 5,000 years to carry the ink to the paper.

Remember it is a combination of the BEST ma-
terial, workmanship, and principle of operation.
Don't waste your time or shorten your life with
any other. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OF OAKLAND, CAL.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

Neat, cheap, serviceable. They perfectly secure
pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it cannot fall
out when stooping. Can be easily and safely at-
tached to any part of the clothing. A small invest-
ment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or
pencil.

PRICES.

No. 1. Russia leather, for 2 pens 10c.
No. 2. Russia leather for, 3 pens 15c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee
these pockets superior in every particular to sim-
ilar styles formerly sold and still offered at much
higher prices. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OF OAKLAND, CAL.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL

AND

TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, devoted
to the dissemination of true temperance prin-
ciples, and instruction in the art of preserving
health. It is emphatically

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE,

Containing what everybody wants to know, and
is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is
unlimited, embracing everything that in any way
affects the health. Its articles being short and
pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, me-
chanics, and housekeepers, who have but little
leisure for reading. It is just the journal that
every family needs, and may be read with profit
by all. Price, \$1.00 per year, or with the 300-page
premium book—"Practical Manual of Hygiene
and Temperance," containing household and cook-
ing recipes—post-paid for \$1.40. Address,

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL,

OAKLAND, CAL.

FATHERS

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY ELDER 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 con-
dition 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 phase of paganism. It shows that
by the time of Constantine every phase of the
Papacy was fully developed, and was only waiting
for supreme power. The chapter on

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

is alone worth the price of the book. Fine English
cloth, substantially bound, contains about 400
pages, and will be sent post-paid at the nominal
price of \$1.00.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 20, 1890.

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

THE *Pearl of Days*, in giving "Reasons for Sabbath Laws," says:—

"The powers that be are ordained of God." If "of God," why not for God?

The answer is, Because God has forbidden it by his word.

In the Washington City Sunday Law Convention, it was again stated, and the statement was let go without a sign of contradiction, that Rev. W. F. Crafts "is the American Sabbath Union." This same statement was officially made last summer by one of the District Secretaries of the Union. We knew it before, but it is well to have authoritative statements in confirmation of the fact.

WE have before explained in these columns that Colonel Elliott F. Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Union, owns the *Mail and Express*, a daily evening newspaper of this city; and that that paper, through its "Pearl of Days" columns, is the official organ of the American Sabbath Union. Colonel Shepard is quite a pious man. So pious is he, indeed, that he prints a verse of Scripture every day at the head of the editorial columns of his newspaper; and occasionally, perhaps as evidence of an extra quantity, he embellishes this by printing an advertisement of an intoxicating drink at the foot of the same columns, to say nothing of the same thing in other parts of the paper. For instance, in the issue of February 10 (and this is not the first time that it has been done), at the head of the editorial columns, he printed this text:—

For he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth through the power of God. For we also are weak in him, but we shall live with him through the power of God toward you.

And the same day, at the foot of the editorial columns, stood this other thing thus:—

Piper Heidsieck Sec—The favorite everywhere.—Adv.

Now "Piper Heidsieck Sec" is a popular brand of champagne, possessing all the intoxicating qualities of champagne generally.

The *Christian Advocate* suggested, a short time ago, that the printing of texts of Scripture at the head of a daily newspaper "is a matter of taste." Yes, no doubt. And it is altogether likely that

the printing of "Piper Heidsieck Sec—the favorite everywhere"—at the foot of the same columns is also a matter of taste.

Since this was put in type we have received the *Mail and Express* of February 12. 1 Peter 2: 7, 8, is printed at the head, and "A popular sparkling wine—Piper Heidsieck Sec," at the foot of the editorial columns.

SPEAKING of the Chinese, the *Mail and Express* says:—

Those who are willing to become American citizens, adopting our ways, customs, religion, and language, ought to be admitted to all the rights of American citizenship.

Is "our religion," then, to be made a test of citizenship? By the way, Mr. Shepard, what is "our religion"? Is it the religion of the New Testament or of the saloon? Is it expressed in 2 Corinthians, 13:4, or in "Piper Heidsieck Sec"? The president of the American Sabbath Union ought to be able to tell, and we hope he will.

A CONVENTION of the liberal thought women of the country will be held in Willard Hall, Washington, D. C., February 24 and 25, 1890. The object of the Convention is to form a national organization for the purpose of opposing the demands for religious legislation that are already so loud, so frequent, and so persistent. The call for the Convention says: "In order to help preserve the very life of the Republic by rousing public attention to the constantly increased danger of a union of Church and State, it is necessary that liberal thought women should unite in a national society for combined work."

This is a worthy object by whomsoever it may be desired, therefore we wish the coming Convention abundant success both in the organization and in the work proposed.

All persons in harmony with this are invited to correspond with Matilda Joslyn Gage, Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., Willard Hotel will be the headquarters of the Convention; and speakers, delegates, and visitors are requested to report there, to Mrs. Gage, on their arrival in the city.

It is not alone on the question of Sunday observance that Congress is being asked to legislate in matters pertaining to religion. Representative Compton, of Maryland, has introduced a bill—Fifty-first Congress, H. R. 423—authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury "to refund the duties paid upon a clock and a chime of bells, imported into the port of Baltimore for the use of Saint Timothy's Episcopal church, of Catonsville, in Baltimore County, Maryland." Why should the duty on this clock and those bells be refunded any more than on every other clock and every other bell or bells? The answer,

of course is, that these are for a church. Then upon what principle is it that this money shall be given from the public treasury to this church, and not an equal amount of money be paid from the same source to every other church in the land? And if the national treasury is to pay for the support of the playing of the tunes and the keeping of the time, of the church, why shall it not also help support the singing and the preaching carried on by the church? If this can be granted, why should not the whole of the public funds be placed at once at the service of the church? That bill is a sneaking, unprincipled thing. Let it be killed so dead that it may never be heard of again.

THE *Christian at Work* notices the fact that Pittsburg, like Boston, is stirred up over the proposition made by the Catholics that they be given a proportionate share of public taxes for the support of parochial schools, and says:—

At a public meeting just held in that city a series of resolutions was adopted protesting against any concessions to Roman Catholics by the public school authorities, and against appropriation of any money to schools which advocated principles so directly in opposition to the fundamental ideas of American Government. This is the right ground. The public schools for all, and no public moneys devoted to sectarian purposes should be the American war-cry the country over.

But if this is to be the war cry of Americans, what will become of the Blair Educational Amendment? The only way to keep sectarianism out of the public schools is to keep religion out; but that is just what both Catholics and Protestants are determined shall not be done. They both want religious instruction, the only question between them being what religion shall be taught. Religious instruction belongs not to the State, nor to State schools, but to the home, the Church and the Church school.

MRS. MARY H. HUNT may be regarded as a leading authority in temperance matters, and she speaks from experience, and puts a good deal of wisdom in a small space when she says: "The recent unsuccessful prohibitory temperance campaigns have been attempts to focalize into law against alcohol a popular sentiment that does not exist. If we will seek first the temperance education of the people, all other temperance blessings will, in due time, be added unto us."—*New York Observer*.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

Is will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single Copy, Per Year, ~~paid~~, \$1.00

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, paid, 58c.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL

43 Bond Street, New York