



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, MAY 7, 1891.

NUMBER 19.

## The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

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

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. MCKEE.

TAXES come from all the people; taxes should be used for all the people and can be properly used no other way. The use of taxes, therefore, to impart religious instruction, that is, their use to turn the sentiments of one part of the people against the sentiments of another part, is unlawful and unjust.—*Independent Patriot.*

IN his opening address at the State University, at Cheyenne, Wyoming, D. A. A. Johnson, the Methodist minister lately placed at the head of that institution, said he recognized the fact that State and Church were widely separated and was glad it was so. He understood the genius of public institutions and believed they should be administered in the interests of the entire people without regard to creeds or dogmas. He believed in the Christian religion, and that all its churches were necessary to meet the needs of the people; yet during his administration no sectarian teaching should be allowed in the University. Dr. Johnson's platform is heartily approved by the people of the State.—*Denver Weekly Times.*

THE important lesson of this hour is, that as the common school instruction, in the ideal American State, must be entirely secular, the Church must supplement and reinforce the public school instruction by more vigorous religious teaching at home, and through the varied agencies of the Church. The spiritual energies of the Church must be summoned here, as else-

where, to supply the deficiencies of the State or rather do what the State can not do in the very nature of the case. In the inevitable separation of the Church and State (a separation so complete, that religion is ruled out of our popular education) the Sunday-school rises into an importance of which the founders of that institution had no conception. It becomes the great agent for leavening the minds of the youth of the land, with those religious truths, which are essential to moral conduct as well as to spiritual vigor, the hope and bulwark of modern society. Heavy as is the burden thus laid on the broad shoulders of the Church she is able to bear it, and to gloriously accomplish the work that of right belongs to her.—*Rev. T. D. Peake.*

### The New American Revolution.

LAST week we showed that which is open and clear to every reader of the Declaration of Independence, namely, that the American principle of government is that the Government is simply a piece of machinery which the people set up in order more fully to make themselves secure in the enjoyment of their rights. This principle of the Declaration is carried out in the Constitutions of all the States of the American Union, and of the national Constitution of this Union. These Constitutions, State and national, are simply the expression of the people as to the form of government which they will have, defining the powers and limitations upon the Government which they have thus established. This doctrine of the complete subordination and impersonality of the Government, is one of the two grand elements that formed the American Revolution.

As long as this principle shall be maintained in its integrity, so long the beneficent fruits of the Revolution may remain to bless the American people, and through them other nations; but if this principle shall be lost sight of and it shall come to that place where the Government shall be personified and exalted above the people,

then the design of the Revolution will be frustrated or indeed undone. There will, in fact, be a revolution *backwards* and the re-establishment of the principle of European Governments and of the despotism which it was the design of the revolutionary fathers for themselves and their posterity forever to escape. It may be news to the American people when we state that this revolution backwards has already been accomplished for the Government of the United States. It may be news to the American people to be informed that the American principle and system of government has been supplanted by the British and the Roman. Such, however, is the fact. All this has already been done. This reversal of the American Revolution has been already accomplished. Now to the proofs, and we sincerely ask the reader's careful attention.

May 19, 1890, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its decision in the case of the confiscation of the Mormon Church property appealed from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Utah. The case arose in consequence of the enforcement of what is known as the "Edmunds Law or Act of Congress, February 19, 1887," forfeiting and escheating "to the United States the property of corporations obtained or held in violation of section three, of the Act of Congress, approved the first day of July, eighteen hundred and sixty-two." By the Act of 1862 "any corporation for religious or charitable purposes was forbidden to acquire or hold real estate in any Territory, during the existence of the territorial government, of greater value than \$50,000." By the year 1887, the Mormon Church corporation had become possessed of real estate to the amount of about two millions of dollars, and personal property to the value of about one million. All of this property, above \$50,000 worth of real estate, was declared forfeited to the United States.

The Mormon Church claimed that this property was held in trust by the corporation for the individual members of the

church who by donations, bequests, etc., had placed their property in the hands of the corporation to be held in trust. The United States disputed this claim. The case was tried in the territorial court, and the whole sum was declared confiscated to the United States. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the decision of the territorial Court, confiscating the property, was confirmed.

It is not necessary here to enter upon any discussion as to whether the Mormon Church had violated the law of 1862, first, because the Supreme Court of the United States decided that it was not necessary that that law should be violated in order that the corporation might be dissolved, but that "Congress for good and sufficient reasons of its own, independent of that limitation, and of any violation of it, had a full and perfect right to repeal its charter and abrogate its corporate existence, which of course depended upon its charter;" and second, because the merit of the question as between the Mormon Church and the United States is not material for the purpose of this article. The principle upon which the Supreme Court acted is all that is necessary to be discussed here; and that principle is discernible without any examination or discussion as to the merit of the controversy.

The argument of the Court proceeds as follows:—

When a business corporation, instituted for the purpose of gain or private interest, is dissolved, the modern doctrine is that its property, after the payment of its debts, equitably belongs to its stockholders. But this doctrine has never been extended to public corporations. As to this, the *ancient* and established rule prevails, that when a corporation is dissolved, its personal property, like that of a man dying without heirs, becomes subject to the disposal of the sovereign authority.

Now with all due respect to the honorable Court, it may be inquired, why should not the modern doctrine be applied to public corporations as well as to private? Why should the ancient doctrine be adopted in such cases, when, to do it, it is necessary to proceed in the face of the principles and institutions of the Government of which the court is but a part. When the ancient doctrine is adopted the principles of the ancient governments must likewise be adopted, because the ancient doctrine is but the expression of the principles of the ancient governments. And the principles of all those governments were directly the reverse of the principles of this Government. This will be seen more fully as we proceed. It is in fact seen in the above expression that personal property, in such cases as this under consideration, becomes subject to "the sovereign authority."

Upon this the question at once arises, Who or what is the sovereign authority in this Government? And to this question we have an answer that is certainly plainly expressed, and certainly true, if

not absolutely authoritative. Bancroft is the historian of the *Constitution* not less than of the country, and upon this very point he has the following plain statement. "Is it asked who is the sovereign of the United States? The words sovereign and subjects are unknown to the Constitution."—*History of Constitution, Book V, chap. 1, par. 20.*

By this it is evident that the Supreme Court steps upon foreign ground when it suggests the existence, in this country, of a sovereign authority. It is true that the people are sovereign; but the people do not exercise their sovereignty authoritatively as such directly, nor of themselves. "The people of the United States have declared in their Constitution that *the law alone is supreme*; and have defined that *supremelaw*." *Id. par. 21.* In the foregoing quotation from the opinion of the Court it is made manifest that the existence of a sovereign authority was necessary to sustain a decision confirming the judgment already pronounced by the territorial Court. And as, according to the quotations given from Bancroft, there is no such thing known to American principles or institutions, the Court was necessarily driven beyond this Government and its institutions to find a basis for this sovereign authority. Accordingly the decision proceeds:—

The principles of the law of charities are not confined to a particular people or nation, but prevail in all civilized countries pervaded by the spirit of Christianity. They are found imbedded in the civil law of Rome, in the laws of the European nations, and especially in the laws of that nation, from which our institutions are derived.

But the principle of the government of Rome and all the European nations, and especially that nation from which the Court says our institutions are derived—the British—have always been directly the reverse of this. In those governments there were sovereign authorities. They were not governments of the people, but governments of the sovereign, and the people were subjects. That of Rome was absolutism solely. The Emperor was supreme in everything. He was *parens patrie*, that is, father of the country, and father of the people in the complete and fullest sense. He fed the people, he gave them money and whatever else they demanded, or whatever some political demagogue demanded, and took from them whatever he himself was pleased to demand. It was so also in England, at the period of the Revolution, though there the sovereign had not the absolute character that attached to the Roman; yet, what the king lacked in this respect, Parliament possessed, so that the system of absolutism and of paternalism prevailed there, as formerly in the Roman Government.

Nor is it correct to say, as did the Court, that our institutions are derived from England. Our governmental institutions are as far as possible the opposite of those of England and were intended to be so

when they were established. The Government itself, as we have seen, is directly the reverse of that which existed in England when this Government was established. When the institutions of the United States Government were established the governments of Europe were ruled by sovereigns who held their powers by "divine right." In the Government of the United States that system was revolutionized and governments were declared to derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

At that time the governments of Europe were all paternal. The Government of the United States is of, and from, *the individual*. For "the distinctive character of the new people as a whole, *their nationality*, so to say, *was the principle of individuality* which prevailed among them *as it had nowhere* done before. . . . The Constitution establishes nothing that interferes with equality and individuality. . . . It leaves the individual alongside of the individual. No nationality of character could take form except on the principle of individuality, so that the mind might be free, and every faculty have the unlimited opportunity for its development and culture. . . . The *institutions and laws* of the country rise out of the masses of individual thought, which, like the waters of the ocean, are rolling evermore."—*Bancroft, Id. par. 7, 9.*

In England, and all other European Governments, religion was held to be an essential element of civil government; but when this Government was formed it was entirely separate from religion, and disavowed not only any connection, but any right to any connection with religion.

The Supreme Court itself is an institution which so far from having been derived from any of the institutions of England or any other European nation, was a new creation entirely. The very form of government, that is, the distribution of its power into legislative, executive, and judicial, so far from being from England or any other European nation, was also a new creation. "The tripartite division of government into legislative, executive, and judicial, enforced in theory by the illustrious Montesquieu, and practiced in the home government of every one of the American States, became a part of the Constitution of the United States, which *derived their mode of instituting it from their own happy experience*. It was established by the Federal convention with a rigid consistency that *went beyond the example of Britain* where one branch of the Legislature still remains a court of appeal. Each one of the three departments *proceeded from the people*."—*Bancroft, Id. par. 13.*

The decision of the Court proceeds:—

The manner in which the due administration and application of charitable estates is secured, depends upon the judicial institution and machinery of the particular government to which they are subject.

This statement is certainly clear enough;

and in view of it, it is proper to inquire, Why then should the Court find it necessary to go to the judicial institutions and machinery of the governments of Europe, and even to that of Rome which has been dead more than twelve hundred years? However, instead of adhering to the judicial institutions and machinery of our own Government, the Court in the very same paragraph proceeds as follows:—

In England, the Court of Chancery is the ordinary tribunal to which this class of cases is delegated, and there are comparatively few which it is not competent to administer. . . . There are some cases, however, which are beyond its jurisdiction; as where, by statute, a gift to certain uses is declared void, and the property goes to the king. . . . In such case the king as *parens patriæ* [parent of the country or father of the people], under his sign manual, disposes of the fund to such uses, analogous to those intended, as seems to him expedient and wise.

Now in this country there is no king; nor is there anything anywhere among the institutions of this country that can fill the place, or exercise the office, of *parens patriæ*. Here, instead of the Government or any part of it being the parent of the country or father of the people, the case stands just the reverse. The *people* are the parent of the Government and everything in connection with it. To secure the inalienable rights of men this Government was established, deriving its just power from the consent of the governed, and whenever the form of Government which was established by the revolutionary fathers becomes destructive of the ends for which it was created, "it is the right of the *people* to alter or abolish it and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." So that in this Government, and according to American doctrine, there is no such thing as *parens patriæ* and there is no place for such a thing even if the thing should be proposed.

Therefore, as there is in this Government, neither king nor *parens patriæ* to which the property in this case might go, it follows logically from the previous statement of the Court (that the administration and application of the estate involved, depends upon the judicial institution and machinery of the particular government to which they are subject), that the decision of the territorial Court should have been reversed and the money involved restored to the individuals to whom it belonged. Such is the logic of the case, according to the principles and institutions of the Government of the United States. But this logic was not followed. Instead of it, the Court proceeded to create and establish a sovereign power, and clothe it with the office of the parent of the country and the father of the people.

The Court first quoted a number of decisions, Roman, Spanish, and English, to

sustain the principles which it had adopted from Rome and England, every one of which is of course strictly in accord with the character of sovereignty and paternalism which is part and parcel of all those governments; but not one of which is applicable under American institutions, nor can be sustained according to American principles. Then the decision says:—

The authority thus exercised, arises in part from the ordinary power of the Court of Chancery over trusts, and in part from the right of the government or sovereign as *parens patriæ*. . . . If it should be conceded that a case like the present transcends the ordinary jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery, and requires for its determination the interposition of the *parens patriæ* of the State, it may then be contended that, in this country, there is no royal person to act as *parens patriæ*, and to give direction for the application of charities which can not be administered by the court. It is true we have no such chief magistrate. But here the Legislature is the *parens patriæ*, and unless restrained by constitutional limitations, the Legislature possesses all the powers in this regard which the sovereign possesses in England.

This at once creates a sovereign power and clothes it with paternal authority. And if this doctrine shall be maintained, so that it becomes a principle of American law, and shall become established as a principle of Government here, then the revolution backwards is complete; government of the people is gone; and that of a sovereign parent of the people is put in its place. Then the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States is subverted and the doctrine of sovereignty, absolutism, and paternalism, is established in its stead. Then also Bancroft's history in the place above cited, will need to be revised so that it shall read as follows: "Is it asked who is the sovereign of the United States? The Legislature is the sovereign and the *people* are subjects."

To prove the correctness of its position the Court quoted from Chief Justice Marshall, in the Dartmouth College cases, the statement that "By the Revolution, the duties, as well as the powers of government devolved upon the people." This is true enough, but it is particularly to be noticed that the Court has made these devolve upon the Legislature. It is a singular piece of logic that would prove that certain powers devolve upon the Legislature, by citing a passage which declares that those powers have devolved upon the *people*. Again, the Court quoted a statement from Chancellor Kent, that "in this country the Legislature or government of the State as *parens patriæ* has the right," etc., and further from Justice McLean, that "when this country achieved its independence, the prerogatives of the crown devolved upon the *people* of the States." Justice McLean's statement, like that of Chief Justice Marshall's is strictly correct in saying that these powers devolved upon the people. But that of Chancellor Kent, like some other legal expressions of his, is utterly false and

contrary to American principles. Among American institutions there is no king, and aside from the people there is nothing that corresponds to a king. And even in the people all that corresponds to a king is in the *individual*; for each individual American citizen is sovereign and king in his own right.

Again, the Court says:—

This prerogative of *parens patriæ* is inherent in the supreme power of every State, whether that power is lodged in a royal person or in the Legislature.

But in this country the supreme power is lodged neither in a royal person nor in the Legislature; but as stated by Bancroft, in the law alone, and in the Constitution that supremacy is defined.

It is true that the decision of the Court is qualified by the expression, that "unless restrained by constitutional limitations, the Legislature possesses all the powers in this regard which the sovereign possesses in England." But this is another instance of the reversal of the principles of our Government. This argues that the Legislature is already in possession of power, and can exercise that power to the full, unless it is *restrained* by constitutional limitations. Whereas, the truth is that the Legislature has no power at all, is possessed of no authority at all, and can exercise none except as it is *granted*. The Constitution plainly declares "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The express doctrine of the Constitution is, that the powers not delegated are reserved. The doctrine of this decision implied, if not expressed is, that the powers not prohibited are possessed. This in itself would be sufficient ground upon which seriously to question the correctness of the decision but there is laid against it, by the Chief Justice, the additional evidence that the Legislature is restrained by the very constitutional limitations suggested by the Court.

The Chief Justice, with Justice Field and Lamar concurring, dissented from the decision. In his dissenting opinion he speaks as follows:—

In my opinion, Congress is restrained, not merely by the limitations expressed in the Constitution, but also by the absence of any grant of power, expressed or implied in that instrument. And no such power as that involved in the act of Congress under consideration is conferred by the Constitution, nor is any clause pointed out as its legitimate source. I regard it of vital consequence, that absolute power should never be conceded as belonging under our system of government to any one of its departments. The legislative power of Congress is delegated and not inherent, and is therefore limited. I agree that the power to make beneficial rules and regulations for the Territories necessarily comprehends the power to suppress crime; and it is immaterial even though that crime assumes the form of a religious belief or creed. Congress has the power to extirpate polygamy in any of the Territories, by the enactment of a criminal code directed to that end; but it is not authorized under the cover of that power to seize and confiscate the property of persons, individuals, or corporations, without office found, because they may have been guilty of criminal practices.

The doctrine of *cy-pres* is one of construction and not of administration. By it a fund devoted to a particular charity is applied to a cognate purpose, and if the purpose for which this property was accumulated was such as has been depicted, it can not be brought within the rule of application to a purpose as nearly as possible resembling that denounced. *Nor is there here any counterpart in Congressional power to the exercise of the royal prerogative* in the disposition of a charity. If this property was accumulated for purposes declared illegal, that does not justify its arbitrary disposition by judicial legislation. In my judgment its diversion under this act of Congress is in contravention of specific limitations in the Constitution; unauthorized, expressly or by implication, by any of its provisions; and in disregard of the fundamental principle that the legislative power of the United States as exercised by the agents of the people of this Republic is delegated and not inherent.

There can be no doubt whatever that the Chief Justice expressed the truth in this matter according to American principles. It therefore as certainly follows that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in this case, is not true American law; that it enunciates principles which, if they become established, do actually create a revolution backwards; and that such a thing has, in fact, been done so far as it is possible for the Supreme Court to go in the matter.

A. T. J.

#### A Few Observations.

THE following paragraph under caption "The Sabbath Question," appears in the *Christian Statesman*, of April 23, 1891:—

A petition has just been received from the hands of T. C. Maughlin, of Stafford, Kansas, addressed to the Commissioners of the Columbian Exposition, and praying that the gates of the Exposition be closed every Lord's day during its progress. The petition bears three hundred and eighteen signatures. Mr. Maughlin writes that not one-fourth of the inhabitants of the country have had opportunity to sign; that all classes give their names willingly except infidels and the Seventh-day Adventists. These last, though Christians, are prevented by their peculiar views of the Sabbath, and by their opposition to all moral and religious elements in civil government, from co-operating with other Christian people in this effort.

This is about as fair a statement of the case as respects the position of the Seventh-day Adventists, as we have ever seen in the *Statesman*. It admits that they are Christians; that because of their peculiar views of the Sabbath (which peculiarity, by the way, consists simply in taking the Sabbath commandment as it reads) they can not lend their influence toward Sunday-keeping; and that on account of their opposition to the introduction of religious questions into civil government, they are unwilling to unite in an effort to secure the recognition and enforcement of the Sunday Sabbath, or any other Sabbath or religious institution, by law.

The observations we would make on this are these: (1.) If opposition to moral and religious elements in civil government leads to a refusal to help along a movement for the recognition and enforcement of Sunday by law, what can the favoring of Sunday laws be but an effort to introduce moral

and religious elements in civil government? In other words, what are Sunday laws but religious laws? and what the enforcement of them but the enforcement of religion? And what is the enforcement of religion but a union of Church and State? (2.) If the observance of the Sabbath commandment, as it reads, leads men to oppose a union of Church and State, is not the effect of such observance good? (3.) And if the Christianity of a certain class leads them to take God at his word, and this leads them to oppose a union of Church and State, is not that a good sort of Christianity to have? W. A. COLCORD.

#### Evil Effects of Puritanism.

EVERY question of the day, generally speaking, has both a popular and an unpopular side; for the majority of mankind, if they think at all, are apt to think as others think, depending more upon the judgment of those whom they esteem as scholars and men of deep thought, than upon personal investigation. But often time has proved that the unpopular view of a subject was the right one.

There is no idea more prevalent at the present time than that all we have and are we owe to our "Pilgrim Fathers," and there is no idea more erroneous. The place given them in history has been given too freely, not but that they have wielded a powerful influence in our Nation, but that that influence is not in its effects entirely good.

The desire for freedom from religious tyranny was the motive which induced them to flee from England to the New World. With wonderful beauty of expression has Mrs. Hemans said:—

They left unstained what there they found—  
Freedom to worship God.

But is it true? Read their old "Blue Laws." Attendance at religious worship was made compulsory; and any violation of this was punished by imprisonment and fine; a second offense by stripes; and should the offender protest, he was likely to have a red hot iron thrust through his tongue.

Do you remember the persecution of Roger Williams, who was compelled to flee from them because they were attempting to found a theocracy, and because he maintained that to God, and to God alone, was he responsible for the convictions of his conscience, or the practice of any form of religion? Can you listen to the story of the "Salem Witchcraft"? can you read that black page in the history of our country, when innocent men and women by the score were executed merely to gratify the zeal of a superstitious and fanatical religious body, and still justify the Puritans?

But you say: "Their zeal, their fear of God, prompted them to all this." Granted! But was their conception of Jehovah the conception of a Christian? "There is

no fear in love," and "God is love." And that charity, the greatest thing in the world, could never prompt to deeds like this. They who sought in the literal interpretation of the Scriptures, guidance for every matter of every-day life, must have forgotten the commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Many outgrowths of puritanism exist at the present time, which from long custom we have ceased to question whether or not they be in accordance with perfect liberty. The observance of any form of religious worship in our public schools is another outgrowth of puritanism. Religion should be taught in the home; for as soon as we refer the violation of right to the law of God, we are sure to interpret that law according to sectarian views and principles, and this interferes with freedom.

The employment of chaplains in the army and in Congress are other traces of the old force which sought so completely to effect the total union of Church and State, though Jesus had once and forever severed them by that clean-cut statement: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

We point to our glorious Republic, and refer all honor to the Puritans, but do we not know that the very principles on which our Constitution was founded, were in direct opposition to all puritanic ideas? Freedom of conscience no less in religious than in civil matters was to be preserved, and no religious test was to be made as a qualification for office.

But puritanic forces are working to-day, and they are all the more dangerous to our Government from the fact that they are in the hands of those who are regarded as our best people. When a New England senator introduces into Congress a bill which provides for the compulsory observance of Sunday as the American Sabbath in a manner consistent with the demands of a Christian Nation, and when he is supported by the National Reform Association, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and orders of a like nature—when this is done, and thousands of American people sign a petition to Congress to make that bill a law, is it not time for us to stop and think? Is this the freedom of conscience secured us by the Constitution? Is this the freedom of conscience which is ours as a divine gift? Is this perfect liberty? A thousand times—No. It is tyranny, religious tyranny, no less to-day than of old. It is only a step toward the establishment of a national religion—the union of Church and State. The observance of any day of the week as Sabbath is purely a personal matter which lies between man and God; then how, while liberty exists, can we consent to such a measure?—A measure that binds us in an ecclesiastical servitude, which is of all subjection the most galling.

Consistency of creed and daily works

can, of course, never be fully realized, however much we aim at that quality; but can we not at least note the rocks on which other ships have been stranded and steer clear of them? Can we not preserve the freedom of our Government?

Finally, when we sum up the good and evil effects of puritanism, and while conceding the existence of the former, we look behind them for the motives which actuated their causes, and see selfishness, self-righteousness, lack of charity, persecution of countrymen, do we not fear that judgment from on high, "Weighed in the balance and found wanting"? for "by their fruits ye shall know them."

JESSIE O. BARBER.

*Ann Arbor, Mich.*

### Compulsion.

AN infidel once said, "It is hard for a Christian to be tolerant;" and why should he have said it but for the fact that so many so-called Christians have been, and are now intolerant? And so learned and eminent a man and historian as Macaulay, has said, "the doctrine of all sects, when condensed into a few words, is simply this, 'I am in the right and you in the wrong. When you are the stronger, you ought to tolerate me, for it is your duty to tolerate the truth; but when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you, for it is my duty to persecute error.'" Macaulay judged as the infidel did; he judged all Christians by the tendencies and acts of the most numerous, wealthy, learned and influential bodies of so-called Christian men, and hence his conclusion; and it will be the conclusion of all thinking men. But the truth is that no real Christian can be intolerant, because it is a fundamental principle of Christianity "that all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," (Matt. vii.) and "as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." Luke vi. And Christ said, also, "Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves." Matt. x.

What Primitive Baptist would persecute any man for his religion, however erroneous he might know it to be? There is not one that would. There is not a Primitive Baptist church anywhere that would hold a member in fellowship who would join in burning or destroying the property or otherwise injuring a Roman Catholic on account of his religion. Not one would; though knowing, at the same time, that the Catholics have in the past, hanged, drawn, and quartered many of our brethren. Stephen called down the blessing of God upon those who stoned him to death, and Christ prayed for those who crucified him. Surely the religion of Christ is not of this world.

No body of Christians can, in Christ's spirit, seek by law or force to harm any

class of men, whether believers or unbelievers either in person or property. But all denominations of Christians in this country, so far as I know, except the Primitive Baptist, seek to mix, to some extent, Church and State. They all favor chaplains in the Federal and State Legislatures, men who are paid to pray by the civil Government—paid by taxing Jews and unbelievers as well as believers. It is superfluous to ask if that is according to Christian principle, for it is too plain that it is not. They also favor the exemption of all church property from taxation, which is just, as far as religious people are concerned, but it is not just to citizens professing no religion. Christ did not design that his religion should be a burden to any man, nor can Christians in his spirit make it so.

The Ohio Supreme Court held (*American Law Register*), "that there is no such thing as 'religion of State.'" "When Christianity," continues the Court, "asks the aid of Government beyond a mere *impartial protection*, it disowns itself. Its laws are divine, not human; its essential interests lie beyond the reach and range of human governments. United with government, religion never rises beyond the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows that the more widely and completely government and religion are separated, the better it is for both. If it be true that our law enjoins the teaching of the Christian religion in the public schools, surely all the teachers should be Christians. Were I such a teacher, while I should instruct the pupils that the Christian religion was true, and all other religions false, I should tell them that the law (the law requiring religion to be taught in the schools) itself was an unchristian law. One of my first lessons would be to show the pupils that it was unchristian, and that lesson would be, "whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." I could not look the veriest infidel or heathen in the face and say that such a law was just; I should have to tell them it was an outgrowth of false Christianity, and not one of the 'lights' which believers are to shed upon an unbelieving world."

How then can Christians ask, according to Christ's teachings, for their church property to be exempt from taxation? or, in other words, how can they ask that non-professing tax-payers be taxed to support their religion? That certainly is not Christian. . . . Now consider the value of all the church property of all the denominations in the United States, of the Episcopalians, Methodists, Catholics, Baptists, Presbyterians, and running up in value to hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars, exempt from taxation, and the deficiency, aggregating millions of dollars, that is forced out of the non-professing tax-payers to support the so-

called religion of Christ, and that in a Government boasting of religious liberty, and a complete separation of Church and State!

I confess that it may seem that these things are too trifling and unimportant to notice; but when we consider their tendency, they become matters of grave import to lovers of real Christianity and religious liberty, as well as lovers of free government, whether religious or irreligious. It was the beast that had two horns like a lamb that spake as a dragon. Rev. xiii.—*R. in Gospel Messenger, Primitive Baptist.*

### Going too Far.

REFERRING to a quotation from the editor of *Freethought* to the effect that "the Government of Mexico to-day is the most liberal Government on the face of the earth," Mr. Hugh O. Pentecost says:—

To substantiate this statement Mr. Putnam relates that a "vast amount of church property has been confiscated. . . . Convents are forbidden. The clericals are not allowed to wear the official garb on the streets. They must dress like other folks: They can not perform a legal marriage." I judge from this that if the Mexican officials should drive the church people out of the country, or make it a capital offense to be a Christian, the Mexican Government might be considered still more liberal. Is the kind of tyranny Mr. Putnam describes his idea of being liberal? On Mr. Putnam's own showing the Mexican Government is exceedingly illiberal toward the Catholic Church, quite as illiberal as that church is toward other people.

What right should a government have to confiscate church property, or forbid priests to dress as they please, or not recognize the legality of the marriage they solemnize? The Liberals of the United States would do well to regard Mexico as missionary ground, on which to teach the first principles of liberalism, rather than to regard it as the most liberal country in the world. Fie upon liberality that does not concede to the Church liberty to exist and work without governmental interference of any kind! There should be no statutes either favoring or oppressing the Church. It should be given a fair field in which to play its part in this world.

I regard the Church as an unmitigated evil, and, as an institution, have a cordial dislike to it, but as long as public opinion can sustain such an institution its right to exist should be recognized and contended for first of all by Liberals. While we have a Government, the utmost that a Liberal should ask of it with regard to the Church is that it should extend it no official aid. While other property is taxed church property should be taxed, but no legislative discrimination should be made against the Church. If the priests like to wear their absurd petticoats who should object? And if persons wish priests to marry them, whose affair is it but that of the contracting parties?

All of this, with the exception of Mr. Pentecost's expression of dislike for the Church, we regard as good sense. There is by far too much of the "liberalism" that smiles upon an opposition to religion. All should remember that it is no more the province of government to oppose religion than it is to foster it.

A THANKLESS task has he who tries  
To chip and model  
The world to just the form and size  
Of his own noddle.

—Trowbridge.

### What They Say about "The Sentinel."

FROM lawyers and magistrates in North Carolina who have received two numbers of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL:—

I like to read your paper very well. I like your cause, as I do not believe in a law religion. I want it as our forefathers handed it down to us, to worship God according to the dictates of our consciences. Whenever anything else comes it will cause blood to run. Let the Church and God make Christians. When we undertake to run over our Constitution and trample on it, we are a ruined Nation.

Your paper received and appreciated very highly. We fully indorse your cause in regard to religious rights. I am an old-school Baptist and a Democrat. My grandsires fought through the Revolutionary War for religious rights and liberty. I want to march under the same banner.

Yes, I'll gladly receive and read your paper. I am in hearty and prayerful sympathy with every work that looks to the preservation of our civil and religious rights in the United States of America. God bless your paper.

I have examined your paper called THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, and have a good opinion of its merits. I desire to make further examination of the paper.

From individuals who have had THE SENTINEL two or three months:—

I thank you for the copies of THE SENTINEL sent free, but am sorry to say I do not see my way clear to subscribe now. I think the great body of the people want Church and State forever apart, and that only "cranky" individuals and small sects desire a union.

Your paper, THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, has afforded me much light upon the National Reform movement of which it treats. The positions it has taken are to my mind eminently correct. All subjects that pertain to civil and religious liberty should be carefully studied, and all efforts, looking to a union of Church and State, uncompromisingly opposed. Such a thing would eventually lead to the worst results. Allow me also to say the reading of your paper has afforded me much pleasure.

The editor of the "oldest German newspaper in the South" writes:—

The copy of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL you kindly sent us was received. After a careful perusal of the same, we entirely indorse the position you take by it, and shall be only too glad to give expression of our approval through the columns of the *Anzeiger*. At a period when fanaticism, sailing under the false flag of religion, is endeavoring to overthrow our sacred institutions, the publication of a journal like THE SENTINEL, which bravely breaks a lance with orthodoxy and hypocrisy is only to be hailed with pleasure, and every true American ought to make it his duty to spread it among the people, so that they might recognize the danger of the Republic becoming subjugated by the Church. Please place the *Anzeiger* on your mailing list, and oblige.

From gentlemen in Birmingham, Alabama:—

I heartily indorse your sentiments, as expressed in THE SENTINEL of January 22. Please send me a few copies in February and March; if pleased with them will subscribe.

I would be glad to read further on the subjects treated in your SENTINEL.

I will be pleased to receive your journal.

I have, I think, read every word in the copy of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, received this morning and am more than pleased with it. Wife and children will read to-night. *Send it on.*

## NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.



### DECLARATION of PRINCIPLES.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ. We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.

We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.

We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.

We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.

We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

#### OFFICES.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY;

225 A ST., N. E., WASHINGTON; 28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO.

C. ELDRIDGE, - - - - - President.  
W. A. COLCORD, - - - - - Secretary.

W. F. CRAFTS is now lecturing in the West, in the interest of a better observance of Sunday. Sunday, April 19, he spoke in Moberly, Mo., dwelling principally on whether or not the World's Fair should be closed on Sunday.

At a recent meeting of some of the most ardent advocates of Sunday laws, in Wisconsin, at which J. P. Mills was the chief speaker, it was decided that the present Sunday laws of that State are as good as they could desire. They will direct their efforts toward raising a sentiment to secure their enforcement. They will also hold a meeting in June to revive a nearly dead society, called the "Wisconsin Civil Sunday Association," organized at Milwaukee a year ago last December. They will then work to effect local organizations in every county, city, township, and voting precinct in the State, with a view to canvassing for names to a petition to close the World's Fair in 1893 on Sunday.

IN concluding a recent series of sermons Rev. W. E. Copeland, of Tacoma, Washington, said:—

I have preached these sermons and given these lectures to arouse men to see the danger which threatens religious freedom and civil freedom as well. The question has been recently discussed, Will the Republic endure another hundred years? I answer unhesitatingly, No. That is, if certain devout and earnest Christians can have their way. Our liberty, purchased at so dear a price, is in danger, and but few are alarmed. Most persons laugh at any danger, utterly forgetful of the lessons of history written in letters of blood.

As to the position of the Roman Catholic Church on this question of religious liberty no possible doubt can exist. The church stands where it has always stood, the uncompromising enemy of education and liberty. It only lacks the power to compel conformity; the desire is as great as ever. Evidence of this can be seen in the universal opposition of Roman Catholics to the public schools of the United States, in the establishment of parochial schools in every Roman Catholic parish, and in their allegiance to a foreign potentate whose commands are law. You all know this of Romanism.

But only few know that there is a rapidly growing sentiment among co-called Protestant Christians which prominent preachers and laymen give voice to, and which demands with ever increasing emphasis an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that shall recognize God, Jesus, the Bible, and the Sabbath; that shall declare this Nation to be by law a Christian Nation. In the interests of this party a bill was introduced into Congress which proposed a compulsory Christian education, and prominent members of this party declare that to attain their ends even a resort to arms would be justifiable. So anxious are these fanatics to have the first day of the week marked as God's day, which every one shall observe in a fashion to be prescribed by them; that Jesus should be recognized as supreme ruler, and the Bible as the supreme law of the land; that they are willing to go to almost any extremity to secure their ends.

Once this party and the Roman Church join hands and religious liberty is gone, and as history has always shown with religious goes civil liberty. Nor is the prospect of such union as remote as many suppose.

And in the indifference to which Mr. Copeland refers, lies the chief danger of the situation. Were the American people awake to the danger it would cease to exist.

JAMES P. MILLS, general and field Secretary of the sixth district of the American Sabbath Union, has been lecturing in the leading cities of Illinois in behalf of the better observance of Sunday. He spoke in Bloomington April 21, and on the Monday following organized a local union for the county. Those who have attended his lectures state that it is difficult to tell which he is working for the hardest; to secure a better observance of Sunday, or to fight the Seventh-day Adventists. Every place he goes he takes particular pains to tell how hard the Seventh-day Adventist people are working against Sunday laws. This people have evidently been reading history and know what it means to enforce any religious doctrine by civil law. Let all lovers of civil and religious freedom study the question carefully in the light of the record of the past, and the majority will see that it is their duty to oppose such legislation, no matter how highly they may regard Sunday.

*Public Opinion*, of London, says, that "Sir Henry James, M. P. addressing the members of the Liberal Union Club at their annual meeting in Westminster, said it had become a demonstrated fact that the Roman Catholic priesthood held the balance of power between all parties in Ireland, and that if the Government were ever given into the hands of the people it would, in fact, be handed over to priestly control." This is an evil by no means confined to Ireland; a desperate effort is being made to give the Protestant clergy the same power in this country that the priests exercise there.

THE insolence of the aggressor is usually proportioned to the tameness of the sufferer.—*Ames.*

# GOOD HEALTH,

The popular health journal conducted by  
**J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,**

Contains the following departments: **General Articles**, devoted to practical hygiene and popular medical papers; **The Home Gymnasium**, an illustrated department of physical culture; **Dress**, which opposes extreme notions, but advocates rational dress-reform; **Social Purity**, conducted in the interest of all that pertains to the moral purity of the individual, the home, and society; **Medical Frauds**, containing reports of the results of recent and original investigations of the nature and composition of secret nostrums, and the methods of secret systems of medical treatment. **Editorial**, and **A Doctor's Chats with His Patients**, combine a rich variety of hygienic tidbits representing latest scientific thought and racy discussions of live medical topics, new ideas in medical philosophy, new theories of disease, etc.; and **Household Science**, wherein Mrs. J. H. Kellogg gives the readers of **GOOD HEALTH** the benefit of her years of experience in **Hygienic Cookery**. The publishers offer the following premium to new subscribers:

## The Household Monitor of Health,

A new and valuable work of 400 pages. Price of **GOOD HEALTH**, \$1.00 a year. With Premium Book \$1.37. Address,

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

# Sacred Chronology.

BY SYLVESTER BLISS.

THIS work treats of the Elements of Chronology, the different systems, and the various eras, and gives the chronology of the principal events recorded in Sacred History from the Creation till the death of St. John. It also contains a vindication of the numbers of the Hebrew Scriptures. As an aid to investigation it is invaluable. The book has been thoroughly revised, and an entire chapter added, on the

## PEOPLING OF THE EARTH.

This chapter is an exposition of the tenth chapter of Genesis, and gives an **outline of the beginning of History** and

## THE ORIGIN OF NATIONS.

New and valuable notes have been added to the original text of the book, making it the most valuable work on the subject of sacred chronology extant. No student of history can well do without it. It contains **a vast amount of information in small space**, and so far from being dry it is as interesting as a story, which it really is. **300 pages**, cloth binding, with side stamp, **\$1.00.**

Address,  
**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**  
 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.  
 OR, 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 attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

### PRICES.

No. 1	Russia leather, for 2 pens	10c.
No. 2	" " " " " "	15c.
No. 3	" " metal back, 2 pens,	15c.
No. 4	" " " " " " " "	20c.
No. 5	Sealskin, for 2 pens,	15c.
No. 6	" " " " " " " "	25c.
No. 7	Russia Leather, for 4 pens	25c.
No. 8	Sealskin, " " " " " "	40c.

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

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

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

# Evening Line by the Picturesque Hudson.

STEAMERS BALDWIN AND ROMER.

To Kingston, and the Catskill Mountains, leaving New York daily, except Sundays, at 4:00 p. m., from pier 46, foot of West 10th street; and Rondout, daily, except Saturday, at 6:00 p. m. Saturday steamer leaves New York at 1:00 p. m. These Steamers are under the management of, and sailed by, their owners. Comfort and safety assured, comfortable staterooms, excellent meals, and an opportunity to view the grandest river scenery in the world, in the setting sun, and by moonlight.

## Illustrated Curiosity List

With box of Ornamental Minerals, Indian Relics Curiosities, 10c. "Companion," Illustrated, describing curiosities, 25c. year; Advertisements, 1c. a word. [Mention this paper.]  
 E. A. BROWNE, FLORENCE, ARIZONA.

# CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

In English, German, Danish, and Swedish.

BY A. T. JONES,  
 Editor of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

## Scriptural, Logical, Plain, and Forcible.

This Important Work Shows Clearly the Relation that Should Exist Between Church and State at the Present Time, as Proven by the Bible, and the History of the Past Twenty-five Centuries.

CHAP. I Outlines vividly the relation that existed between "Christianity and the Roman Empire."  
 CHAP. II Distinguishes between "What is due to God and what to Cæsar."  
 CHAP. III Shows for what purpose the "Powers that Be" are ordained."  
 CHAP. IV Aply discusses "The Religious Attack upon the United States Constitution."  
 CHAP. V Unmasks "Religious Legislation."  
 CHAP. VI Is devoted to the "Sunday-Law Movement in the Fourth Century, and its Parallel in the Nineteenth."  
 CHAP. VII Shows the workings of Sunday laws when they are enforced.

# CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

Is a Pamphlet of 182 Large Octavo Pages, in English, Price, 25 cents; and in German, Danish, and Swedish, over 200 pages, Price, 35 cents, (Illustrated).

THOUSANDS OF COPIES

Should be placed in the hands of thinking people at once. It clearly defines what position American citizens should sustain toward the efforts now on foot to secure Religious Legislation. Address,

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

OR, 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 condition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, briefly states the principles of ancient heathen philosophy, and shows how the adoption of these principles by prominent men in the church, and

## The Incautious Lowering of the Standard of Pure Christianity, Developed the PAPACY,

which was simply a new 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.

OR, OAKLAND, CAL.

# The Nonsuch Professor, IN HIS MERIDIAN SPLENDOR.

By WILLIAM SECKER (Puritan).

With an introduction by THEO. L. CUYLER, D. D. Price, post-paid, **\$1.00.**

### TESTIMONIALS.

"It is a mine of sparkling gems."—*Presbyterian Observer*.  
 "A sheaf of golden grain, ripened by grace, and sweet with the flavor of rare simplicity and holy wisdom."—*New York Observer*.  
 "It is a searching book."—*Christian Intelligencer*.  
 "This is a wonderful book. At whatever page you open it, your eye lights upon pithy aphorisms that combine the sententiousness of Benjamin Franklin, with the sweet, holy savor of Samuel Rutherford. It contains hundreds of bright seed thoughts."—*Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D. D.*

Address, **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**  
 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

# DO YOU USE A FOUNTAIN PEN?

Then you need the **COMBINED INK BOTTLE AND PEN FILLER**, consisting of a bottle holding ink sufficient to fill a pen 8 or 10 times, with a Patent Rubber Cork and Filler, all inclosed in a neat wooden case with a screw top, making the safest, most complete, compact, and convenient article for the use of traveling men and others now extant. Weighs when filled with ink less than three ounces.

Imitation Rose-wood case, 25c.  
 Real Box-wood, " 50c.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price.

Address,  
**PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,**  
 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.  
 OR OAKLAND, CAL.

# THE NEW WEBSTER.

Just Published.



Cost \$300,000.

**SUCCESSOR OF THE UNABRIDGED.**  
 Re-edited and Reset from Cover to Cover. Sold by all Booksellers. Illustrated pamphlet free. **Caution!**—Cheap books called "Webster's Big Dictionary," "Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary," etc., are being advertised. The body of these from A to Z is printed from plates made by photographing the antiquated 1847 edition. The authentic "Unabridged" (still copyrighted) and the new "International" both bear the imprint of **G. & C. MERRIAM & CO., Pub'rs, Springfield, Mass.**

# IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

BY THE

**Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,**  
 Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

The above is the title of a treatise written by the author at the request of the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, California. It grew out of a discussion upon the present aspect and aims of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, the author taking the ground that the rise, progress, present and future condition of the temporal power known as the Papacy, or Vaticanism, is outlined in the prophecies of Holy Scriptures with sufficient accuracy to determine what the "Papacy" is, and what is to be its future development and ultimate end.

PAPER COVERS, . . . . . 25 CENTS.  
 CLOTH COVERS, . . . . . 60 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address,  
**Pacific Press Publishing Co.,**  
 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK;  
 12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.,  
 Or, LOS ANGELES CHURCHMAN, 35 California  
 Bank Building, Los Angeles, Cal.





NEW YORK, MAY 7, 1861.

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL with-  
having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some  
friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invari-  
able 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 Portuguese Ambassador has left Rome for Lisbon in order to receive the instructions of his government with reference to the proposed submission of the dispute with Belgium to the arbitration of the Pope. The dispute is in regard to the southern portion of the Congo State.

CARDINAL TASCHEREAU and his suffragan prelates of Quebec have protested in joint letter against the act of the Manitoba Legislature abolishing separate schools in that province. The bishops declare that the Church, as the representative of her divine Founder, not only has the right, but the duty to direct through her ministers the moral education of her children.

THE *Mail and Express* says:—

We hope and believe that the end is near, and that the civilized nations of the earth will demand at the hands of the Russian Government that freedom of action, occupation, and residence for the Jews which is enjoyed by all the citizens of free countries.

At the same time the *Mail and Express* is in the van of those influences which are at work in this country to impose similar disabilities upon those in this country who do not conform to the religion of the majority.

THE Cincinnati *Post* remarks that "an Indianapolis church member who subscribed to a church building fund attempted to wriggle out of it by claiming that the contract was illegal as it was made on Sunday, but the Court has decided that he must pay up." It is true that the law of the State makes void Sunday contracts, but as it is also true that Sunday laws are in the interests of the Church, it is only natural that the courts should construe them in that interest. Of course the whole thing is contrary to the spirit of our institutions, but nowadays that don't count.

THE Sunday-law advocates in Hong-Kong are terribly in earnest in demanding Sunday legislation for that Colony. In answer to the objection that it would deprive the poor coolies of a considerable part of their already slender income, a correspondent of the *China Mail* says:—

This cry about the poor coolie losing a day is all "cry and no wool." The business man of Hong-Kong

cares for the coolies about as much as he does for a cockroach. He may not go out of his way to crush a cockroach, but the roach must not run across his foot. And so with the coolies. . . . It might entail a little more night work (but I doubt it), and as that costs the ships no extra expense, I do not see their reason for refusal.

It seems a little strange that Sunday rest is so important that these poor heathen must be compelled to rest upon that day even if they do earn less wages and have to work nights to do it. We suppose that it is, however, for their health in some way.

It is stated that there is under consideration a plan for a grand South American Roman Catholic Council on the model of the one recently held in Baltimore. When it will be held is not yet decided, but the majority of the bishops indorse the project. The aim of the Council will be the entire reorganization of the American churches.

GEN. B. F. BUTLER thinks that the Constitution of the United States ought to be studied in the public schools. He says:—

Would it do any harm if I should suggest that such study might be taken up in the public schools instead of the study of the Scriptures, the prosecution of which, more or less compulsory, has worked great harm in our schools? . . . That there should be no governmental teaching of any religion, or recognition of any religious faith, was fundamental in our Constitution; and after powerful and thorough debate there was no recognition of any religion in that instrument. The first chapter of the first Act of Congress struck out the word "God" from the obligation of an official oath, and the calling upon the Supreme Being in an official oath never obtained until the ironclad oaths of the Rebellion. I feel sure that pure religion will not lose but gain by being withdrawn from contestation among the pupils of the schools, as I trust it will always gain when kept out of controversy.

Well, no; we do not think that the suggestion will do any harm; and we are very certain that the practice would not. The Bible ought to be read and studied by everybody, but the public school is not the place for such study.

THE "Pearl of Days" argues thus in favor of Sunday laws:—

There are now not a few things to alarm the friends of good order, of moral and spiritual prosperity, in our land. Glaring crimes are too frequent. Too many of our sons and daughters are not trained into habits of industry and honesty. We have Sunday concerts, theaters, and many kinds of demoralizing amusement. We have frequent Sunday excursions by railroad and steamboat, baseball, beer gardens and gaming in a thousand forms. We have regular Sunday railroad trains and Sunday newspapers, and consequently Sunday labor to an amazing extent. Our post-offices are open on Sunday, which alone deprives many thousand men and women of a needed day of rest.

It is evidently the thought of the editor of the "Pearl" that it is the duty of the State to remove all these adverse influences; to see to it that our sons and daughters are all properly trained, and

that every evil influence is banished. But something of this kind has been upon trial in Germany for about one hundred years, and the result is that no country in the world can show as large a per cent. of infidels. Faith is a plant of sturdy growth that will not bear potting, and the atmosphere of the hot-house kills it.

"YESTERDAY," says the *Mail and Express*, of April 27, "was a day of days, and a stroll through the park or in the upper part of the city was attended with delights unnumbered. The air in the vicinity of Washington Heights and Fort George was redolent with the perfume of cherry and apple blossoms, the trees on some of the old estates being huge bouquets of beauty. The breeze was just strong enough to temper the sun's rays, and from points where a good view of the noble Hudson could be had, so clear was the atmosphere that one could distinguish houses on the river bank as far north as Tarrytown." This perfect day, this "day of days," was a Sunday, and doubtless thousands enjoyed its beauties to the full; but if the *Mail and Express* had its way only those who live in those delightful quarters of the city and those who own carriages, could enjoy the fragrance of apple blossoms, and the beauty of the suburban landscape, for there would be no Sunday street-cars to take them out of the more crowded portions of the city.

ONE of the neatest things that has come under our notice in the advertising line is a pamphlet descriptive of the new South, issued by the Staunton Development Company, of Staunton, Virginia. The pamphlet will be of interest to both pleasure-seekers and money-getters, as it describes one of the most attractive parts of the South.

#### Dialogue on a Wagner Buffet Car.

PASSENGER.—Say, Porter, can I get anything to eat on this car?

Porter.—No, sah. It's Sunday, an' its 'gainst de law to sarve victuals on Sunday.

Another Passenger.—Say, Porter, can I get anything to drink on this car?

Porter.—Yas sah, anything yqu likes; its 'gainst de law, but we has to do it to 'commodate passengers.—*The Voice*.

#### 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.

It 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, post-paid, \$1.00

In clubs of 2 to 100 copies, per year, each, - - - - 90c.

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

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

Address AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
43 Bond Street, New York.