



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, MAY 5, 1892.

NUMBER 18.

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.

THE *Christian Statesman* has not yet explained how it can consistently advertise Sunday trains while denouncing and boycotting Sunday papers. There are a good many people who would like to understand the niceties of this question.

WE are reminded by a recent article in *Our Country*, of the story of the man who determined to whip his wife: If, on reaching home, he found her up, he would whip her for not being in bed; but if he found her in bed, he would whip her for not being up. This is about the attitude of our Boston contemporary toward the Roman Catholic Church.

IN the past, Protestants have justly complained of Rome because she refused to recognize the validity of Protestant marriages. Now, *Our Country*, which, if not truly Protestant, is, at least, intensely anti-Roman Catholic, complains bitterly because the College of the Propaganda at Rome has decided in a certain case that a marriage performed by a Methodist minister was valid.

THE facts which constitute the ground of our Boston contemporary's complaint are stated by that paper substantially as follows:—

Years ago a Mr. William Grant, of Connecticut, before he was a Catholic, was married to a Roman Catholic woman by a Methodist clergyman. Subsequently Mr. Grant joined the Roman Catholic Church, and still later, under the laws, and in accordance with the laws of Connecticut, he secured a divorce, and afterward was legally married. This divorce the Roman Catholic Church of

Bridgeport would not recognize, and Mr. Grant applied for an ecclesiastical divorce, on the ground that a Methodist marriage was not recognized by the Catholic Church. For four years the case dragged along in the courts of the church, when last summer the case was decided by the Hartford diocese against Mr. Grant. The latter appealed to the arch-episcopal tribunal in Boston, which reversed the Hartford decision. The question was then taken to Rome, and the decision is that the first marriage, solemnized by the Methodist minister, was valid.

ON the strength of these facts, *Our Country* says:—

How long do the American people mean to stand such high-handed interference with their civil institutions? If the American people do not propose to surrender to the papal church their sovereignty, their honor, and their rights, and undo what their fathers secured through the sacrifices of the Revolution, then something will have to be done, and that speedily.

This is unspeakably foolish under the circumstances. To us it seems that this was a very proper decision. The marriage contract was entered into in good faith, and was for years recognized by both the State and the Church; by Protestants and by Catholics; and how could the authorities at Rome decide that the marriage never was valid? Evidently they could not; but that was the only question before them; and the decision does *not*, as *Our Country* insists, “furnish another proof of the Pope's claim of supremacy over the State.” It is true that the Pope makes that claim, but there is absolutely nothing in *this* case to show it.

THE decision in this case says nothing of the civil status of the marriage at all; it is simply to the effect that according to the faith, rules, and usages of the Roman Catholic Church, Mr. Grant was married to the woman from whom he was divorced by the civil law; and that, as the Catholic Church does not sanction divorce, the woman to whom Mr. Grant was first married is still his wife in the eyes of the Church; and consequently, that he is now living with his second wife, not in holy wedlock, but in adultery; and that so long as he continues in that relation he is not

entitled to receive from Catholic priests the sacraments of the Catholic Church. The decision is one that can not be properly assailed on the ground that it is in opposition to the laws of the State. The church can not in such things be governed by State laws, any more than the State can be governed by church laws.

TO make this matter more plain, let us suppose that a member of the Methodist Church wishes to sell intoxicating liquors. He knows that it is contrary to the rules of the Methodist Church; but he is very anxious to engage in the business; and so secures a license under the laws of the State. He then says to the church: The State grants me this privilege and you dare not disfellowship me, for that would be to array the authority of the church against that of the State. The church would very properly say: We can not take our rules of discipline from the State; we have nothing to do with the State, except as individuals to share with other citizens the burdens and benefits incident to civil government. As a church we recognize no authority but the great Head of the Church, Jesus Christ; his law alone is our rule; and as we believe that liquor selling is in violation of that law, we can not fellowship you if you engage in it, even if you have a license from the State.

THIS hypothetical case is exactly parallel to the case of a man who gets a divorce in accordance with the laws of the State, and then marries again in violation of the laws of the church of which he is a member. A church, whether Catholic or Protestant, has a perfect right to enforce its rules by withholding the sacraments; or as we Protestants put it, by withdrawing the hand of fellowship; and this is often done by both Protestants and Catholics for acts, which, according to the civil law, are perfectly proper. *Our Country* ought to temper its zeal with discretion. Such unreasonable attacks only injure the cause they are designed to

aid. Mr. Grant can withdraw from the Catholic Church; but he has no right to insist that the church shall change her rules to suit his convenience. No more has he, or anybody in his behalf, the right to insist that the church shall take her law and practice from the State. A church dominated by the State would be no better than a State controlled by the church. In this country we want neither. It would be well if anti-Roman editors would confine their warfare against the Pope to legitimate protests against papal interference in civil affairs, and not make themselves ridiculous by demanding that the authorities of the church in Rome shall meekly bow to the decision of a Connecticut divorce court.

C. P. B.

Pittsburg Preachers and the World's Fair Commission.

FOR unlimited impudence the series of resolutions adopted by the United Presbyterian Preachers' meeting of Pittsburg, on April 11th, exceeds any official utterance of the promoters of enforced Sunday closing of the World's Fair, yet made public. This expression of the views of the Pittsburg preachers has long before this received as wide a circulation as they could give it, for the last resolution provides that the series "be sent through the Reform Bureau to the religious press of the country and as far as possible to the secular papers." That any body of intelligent men should be willing to publish to the world such an embodiment of their arrogance as is contained in those resolutions is marvellous. The absurd insolence of the manner of address of these Pittsburg preachers to the business management of the World's Fair, if it comes under their eyes, can only do one of two things—rouse their anger or excite their contempt. The men who hold the business control of the Illinois corporation entitled "The World's Exposition of 1892," are men of practical affairs, well known, and in most instances widely known, for their ability and integrity; were it not so they could not hold such a relation to this great enterprise as they do. These men are possessed of as keen and active a moral sense as the preachers of Pittsburg. The stockholders who have invested their money in the World's Fair have without question full as much confidence in their sound business sense and reliability, and as complete assurance of their honesty and worth, as they would have in that of the preachers who have adopted and sent broadcast these resolutions. In fact it is doubtful if these preachers could have secured the confidence of so many investors who are looking for safe men with whom they may entrust their money for the furtherance of this Exposition in which their credit and financial interests are involved to such large amounts. How absurdly the title "minister"—which being translated is "servant,"—fits men who speak thus as having authority, as men accustomed to say to others, "go," and they go, "come," and they come; and who are filled with such indignation at the suspected possibility that their expressed wishes, as to the management of this World's Fair, in which they do not own a share, may not be followed. At the very expectation of such an event, even, they burst forth into denunciatory rhetoric. Is this the language of servants of God, or rulers of the State and kings of finance? What madness possesses the

brains of these preachers? Is it that madness which marks the preliminary attack of the destroyer? and is it the expression of that pride which goes before a fall? The humility and calm-minded simplicity of him who faithfully serves and waits, knowing that the fruition of his labor is in the hand of the Master, is not to be found in these resolutions. The "whereas" with which they open reads thus:—

WHEREAS, The Columbian Commission, as we are informed, has, for a third time, postponed the decision of the question of Sunday opening, in this case to the very eve of the Fair, with the self-evident purpose, avowed privately by some of the Commissioners, of making it impossible, as buildings must be begun in May, for either friends or foes to express their disapproval of the final decision by withdrawing from the Exhibition: therefore, etc.,

What means such a tone as this? Have they no right to postpone the consideration of this question three times, or as many times as they see fit? And if they have postponed their decision of this matter to the very eve of the Fair with a purpose, and that "self-evident purpose" should be attained, these preachers, if in their right mind, would feel thankful that they and their followers had been saved from disregarding the laws of the land and entering into an unchristian conspiracy to diminish the property rights, and civil privileges of their fellow-citizens.

But the resolutions characterize this postponement as an "attempt to deceive" and a "political evasion of plain and present duty;" a "serious trifling" with the petitions of themselves and others like them; and ask "a reconsideration of the postponement and an immediate and unequivocal decision of the question." This is equivalent to a special session of the World's Fair Commission called by order of the preachers of Pittsburg. The Commissioners will take notice! The resolutions continue, however, that if this call is not obeyed or the "postponement is persisted in" it should be construed as "the forecast of an adverse decision in the form of a cowardly compromise or otherwise," and as an evidence of "lack of moral courage" to such an extent as to necessitate the withdrawal of the patronage of the preachers and their friends from the Fair. Again the "moral cowardice" of the World's Fair management is held up on the gall-poisoned tip of the clerical pen and Congress asked to preserve its morals with a money bribe.

The longest two of the eight resolutions are occupied with the details of a systematic conspiracy, the organization of which is urged upon all general assemblies, general conferences, Christian exhibitors, religious organizations, the religious "Congress," and all connected with it, religious conventions and churches, to the end that they may "solemnly covenant with each other not to aid or abet such a foe of the Sabbath by exhibition or attendance."

To their unmitigated insolence towards the World's Fair management the Pittsburg preachers have added conspiracy.

W. H. M.

RELIGION is a matter of faith, law a matter of reason; religion is between man and his God, law is between man and man; religion is purely spiritual, and belongs to the individual, law is actual and belongs to the community; religion looks to the preservation of man's happiness in the next world, law looks to the protection of his rights in this world. —Mrs. Susan Bullitt Dixon.

Sunday-Closing Sentiment in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

THE *Washtenaw Times*, the only daily of Ann Arbor, Mich., has the following in an article on the Sunday closing of the World's Fair:—

"There are some questions of right and wrong which are universally admitted by intelligent beings. That it is wrong to steal is easy of comprehension because it is easy to make a personal application and by that discover that you wish your own property protected. Murder would be wrong because if it was right for you to murder John it would be right for John to murder you. The social crimes can be proved wrong to any one by bringing the application to his own home, which he would be zealous to protect. All those parts of our jurisprudence which relate to the protection of men in their personal and property rights are capable of easy demonstration on the most easy basis, that of selfish interests, for a man can not expect a community to protect him from the encroachments of his neighbors unless he is at the same time compelled to respect the rights of others.

"Right and wrong as applied to government are purely relative terms and have arisen entirely from the relations which men bear to each other in communities.

"The object of all laws should be the protection of the liberties of the individual to which he would be entitled if he were absolutely alone from the encroachment of others when he is associated with them in communities. No liberty should be denied the individual which would be his natural right, unless it encroaches upon the liberties of others. This will not be denied by any intelligent man, nor will any intelligent man deny that the personal liberty of the individual should be curtailed the moment it encroaches upon the liberties of another or a community.

"For this reason no matters of abstract right and wrong should be touched upon by law, further than to guarantee liberty of belief to each and every individual, and further, guarantee him the right to the practice of that belief, so long as it does not interfere with the liberties of others. An abstract right or wrong is one which can not be demonstrated in a material manner, or one which exists entirely in the mind. All religions are such. They are simply beliefs, and as long as there is no absolute material evidence, they must always remain such. There are many millions of intelligent men and women to-day to whom the evidences have been sufficient to prove the truth of the Christian religion. There are also many millions of intelligent men and women to-day to whom the evidences have not been sufficiently strong to induce such a belief. There is no absolute proof of its truth, and its strongest point is faith, which is the best argument which can be produced to show that its proofs are not absolute. The Christian church is itself divided into a number of minor beliefs which conflict with each other on points of vital importance. The follower of each sect believes fully in the interpretation of his particular branch, and yet the proofs are not absolute or there would be no such division.

"The difference between the Protestant and the agnostic is no more marked than the difference between the Protestant and Catholic, and yet while the Protestant

would consider it an abridgment of his liberties which he would defend with his life, should the Catholic attempt to make him conform to all the fast days and other peculiar rites of the Catholic Church, still he would attempt the same abridgment of the liberties of the agnostic or the believer in some other faith by making him conform to the peculiar observance of the church, to whose creed he is a subscriber.

"If the church, as a whole, has a right to enforce the observance of Sunday, the Catholic Church has the right to ask for the enforced observance of Lent and other of its fast days, and the most hot-headed advocate of enforced Sunday observance will deny that. But, gentlemen, when you deny that, you admit that in absolute justice you have no right to enforce the strict observance of Sunday, and your only remaining argument is strength, which, when used against you, you are pleased to call persecution.

"These facts are commended to the careful perusal of all. They are not written in an argumentative vein, but are simply statements of facts which can be gainsaid by no one. They are written from the standpoint of a church member, but one who believes in protecting his liberties by protecting those of others."

What It Means.

THE *Catholic Universe* says:—

Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, the senior editor of the *Christian Statesman*, Pittsburg, evidently does all within his power to establish lines of common action in which Catholics and Protestants as Christians and Americans can join. It is a worthy programme, and our best wishes to our good friend in it.

Mr. Crafts quotes this in his paper evidently as a compliment. He may so consider it, but we ask, Is it? He professes to be a Protestant; but a true Protestant is one who *protests* against the errors, corruptions, and false doctrines of the Papal Church. Such was the origin of the term. The term grew out of the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, when the Christian princes of Germany at the diet of Spire, drew up a protest against the persistent efforts of the Romanists to stop the further progress of the Reformation, re-establish the papal hierarchy, and deny to all the freedom of speech and liberty of conscience in religious matters. They declared their adherence to the holy Scriptures as "the sure rule of all doctrine and life," and this "without anything added thereto." This protest gave the reformers the name of Protestants, and its principles are the very essence of Protestantism.

But Mr. Crafts, with not a few others, is doing his utmost to establish lines of common action between the two bodies. The adherents to the Papacy evidently have an eye on him, approve his "worthy (?) programme," and to all appearances consider him a very dutiful (grand) son. But what does this mean, that Catholicism can call a professed Protestant "our good friend," and extend to him its "best wishes"? It must mean one of two things; either that Catholicism has changed, or that the Protestant has ceased to protest and is a Protestant only in name. Which is it?

All know that Roman Catholicism has not changed. It still clings to tradition as tenaciously as ever. Its desire for supremacy is as great as ever. It still believes in persecuting and punishing heretics, and in dictating the religious belief

and controlling the consciences of men. Everywhere it seeks to establish itself in government, and only where it lacks the power does it fail to assert its sway and enforce upon the people the ceremonies of its ritual and the support of its clergy.

The conclusion is therefore inevitable that it is the Protestant who has changed. The only line of common action which a professed Protestant could establish for himself and Catholics, as Christians, to join in, would be one common to Catholicism, and foreign and destructive to true Protestantism. And such is the fact in the case in hand. Mr. Crafts has not only indorsed the papal theory of government, but, as the *Catholic Universe* says, is doing all in his power to establish that which can be nothing more nor less than this very thing. That theory is the theocratic theory, or one in which God is declared to be the ruler. But the declaration is a lie, for God is simply said to be the ruler, while men do all the legislating, and not only tell what God wants done and what not done, but take it upon themselves to arm themselves with the vengeance which belongs only to him, and mete out punishment to whomsoever they declare has offended the Most High. This is the papal theory of government. It is simply the putting of man in the place of God, and is well described in 2 Thessalonians, second chapter, where the apostle, speaking of the man of sin, says: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

The papal theory maintains that the "true faith" should be established, protected and enforced by law. Mr. Crafts and the National Reform Association hold the same. That theory claims the right of the Church to say what men shall believe, and to dictate to the State what punishment shall be meted out to those who refuse to conform to the faith prescribed. Mr. Crafts and National Reformers advocate the same theory. They hold that all men should be compelled under pains and penalties of law to be religious enough to keep Sunday, the badge of their religion, at least. The papal theory denies the right of the freedom of speech and the press. Mr. Crafts upbraids certain religious people with whom he differs, for exercising this right. (See his "Sabbath for Man," page 262, edition 1885). This theory justifies religious persecution. Mr. Crafts holds that in enacting religious laws, which conflict (as all such laws are bound to do) with the faith and practice of some, "the only constitutional or sensible" policy is to "let the insignificantly small minority . . . suffer the loss" of certain of their inalienable rights.—*Id.* The papal theory is that Church and State should join hands to enforce the law of God as interpreted by the Church. So, in the *Christian Statesman*, of April 2, 1892, Mr. Crafts says: "The Nation and patriotism should strike hands with religion in securing obedience to the fourth commandment," which he interprets as teaching Sunday keeping, as does also the Papacy.

This is sufficient. We need not further extend the list of parallels. The likeness must be apparent to all. That line of work to which Mr. Crafts is devoting his best energies is but a programme for the making in this country of a veritable image to the Papacy of the Old World. And as Paul foresaw the rise of the one, so the

Apostle John on the Isle of Patmos foresaw the formation of the other. (Rev. 13: 11-18) Carried down past the time when the Papacy was to receive its deadly wound (the taking of the Pope prisoner by the French army in 1798), he heard certain ones "saying to them that dwell upon the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by the sword, and did live." To him it was future. To us it is a living reality. But no true Protestant can join in any such movement, nor bow the knee to any such image when it is made. Like the German princes they will still *protest*, and like the loyal captives of Judah before the image which Nebuchadnezzar erected in the plain of Dura, they will not bow down though death stare them in the face. There is still need for the spirit of true Protestantism to be aroused, and that its voice should be heard in the land. The forces of evil are abroad, spying out the liberties of the people; the conflict between truth and error is not yet ended; there are still wolves in sheep's clothing. Loyalty to God and the right only will meet divine approval and win an immortal crown.

W. A. COLCORD.

Beware of the First Step!

COMPULSORY compliance to a church dogma does not and can not make converts to that dogma. Human nature is such that the effect would be the reverse. Conviction does not grow out of compulsory observances. That is a truth many people can not grasp. Even if such were the case, the principle is wrong. Religions are given all the liberty conceivable. They are free to practice and preach any doctrine they please, so long as their practice and preaching are not in conflict with the laws of the land.

The theory of this Government, carried out to the letter, is that all shall have perfect liberty, within the laws, but that no law shall be enacted establishing any religious doctrine or practice. The idea is that religion and government shall be entirely separate—that neither shall encroach upon the rights of the other.

But religions, it seems, will never be satisfied with the liberties they enjoy, but persistently continue to endeavor to encroach upon the province of government with the purpose of securing the reins and guiding the course of governmental affairs—that is, to make the government and church domination one, or, reduced to church mathematics, one and one make one, and that one to be the church. They do not expect to reach that desideratum at one jump, but little by little, so that the people will surrender their liberties in such small lots as to be almost imperceptible, and to call forth but little opposition at each step. They have labored incessantly for and accomplished in many States the first precedent. That is in the enactment of Sunday laws. These enactments, however, have not been secured on the plea of "religious observance," but simply as a physical necessity. But the religious idea, the idea that the laws shall force a religious observance, is at the bottom of it, and the motive of many advocates of Sunday laws is that there shall be a union of Church and State, however slight that union may be, and that a start is everything, and with that start a further and firmer welding together is the next step. A precedent results in won-

derful things, either for good or evil. One precedent in violation of law, although the law may be stretched but very little in order to establish it, gives an argument and a starting point for a further stretch of law, for another precedent still further on. A step in a certain direction is not much and a step from that step is not much, and so on to the end. The churches have succeeded in making the first step toward a union of Church and State, by presenting physical grounds for bringing Church and State nearer together, and keeping the real motive for such a step nicely hidden and wrapped up in the cloak of deception. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and "eternal vigilance" is something Americans must exercise or their liberties will go little by little until with a perfect union of Church and State history will repeat itself on American soil.—*Idaho World*.

In Favor of Sunday.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury, in recently presiding at the opening of the Fine Arts Exhibition in Whitechapel, a district of London mainly inhabited by the poorer classes, placed himself on record as favoring the opening of art galleries and museums to the public on Sunday under certain circumstances. The exhibition referred to is intended to exercise an influence in elevating and refining the dense population of a section in which few opportunities are afforded of an improving and educational kind. It is kept open especially on Sunday because the great majority of the people for whose benefit it has been instituted can attend on no other day. That the privilege thus extended is appreciated has been shown by the fact the number of daily visitors has been unexpectedly large, and that the attendance on Sunday is greater than that of all the other days of the week put together. So successfully indeed has the plan worked that the free opening of other institutions of a similar character is under consideration.

The Archbishop's present attitude is the more noteworthy because he formerly opposed the opening of the South Kensington Museum on Sunday, though even in that case he based his objections on the ground that the distance of the museum from the districts inhabited by the working people was too great to make it available for them without an immense and undesirable increase in travel, traffic, and labor. The English primate is so exalted an ecclesiastical authority that his action in this instance can not fail to be influential. It may even have the effect of lessening the opposition of Col. Elliott F. Shepard to the opening of the Columbian Exposition during some portion of Sunday, and of leading him to apprehend that everything which can be used to educate, refine, and elevate men, without neglecting the opportunities and duties of religious observance, has its proper place among the sanctities and privileges of the Sabbath.

The success of the Whitechapel experiment has been paralleled by the opening of the New York Metropolitan Art Museum to the public on Sunday afternoons. It has been found there that the class of persons who can visit the museum on other days very properly absent themselves on Sundays, while an orderly crowd of working people may be found examin-

ing the treasures on exhibition there on the only day which they can spare for that purpose. In view of these and other precedents of the same sort, it seems inevitable that when the time comes for finally determining the question as to whether or not the Exposition shall be open during some portion of Sunday—say in the afternoon—the interest and benefit of the great mass of the working people of Chicago and its vicinity will have to be duly considered.—*Washington Post*.

Appropriation of State Funds for Sectarian Schools.

It seems that New York is not the only State in which public funds are diverted from their legitimate channels and into the coffers of denominational institutions. The following facts, taken from a circular letter sent out by C. B. Waite, President of the American Secular Union, show that the evil has attained considerable proportions in Illinois:—

Section 3 of Article VIII. of the Constitution of Illinois reads as follows:—

"Neither the General Assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money, or other personal property ever be made by the State, or any such public corporation, to any church for any sectarian purpose."

In an act of the Legislature, which went into effect May 28th, 1879, provision was made for incorporating industrial schools for girls. This act provided for the commitment of dependent girls by the county court of any county to any industrial school for girls which might have been organized under that act, and authorizes and requires the county to pay the industrial school for the tuition, maintenance, and care of such dependent girls.

Under this act a school was organized called "The Chicago Industrial School for Girls." Various commitments were made to this institution. But the "Chicago Industrial School for Girls" had no buildings or any means for furnishing the girls either tuition, maintenance, or care. The institution existed only on paper.

It received, however, nominally, all the girls committed, but immediately sent them to two Catholic institutions, the "House of the Good Shepherd," and "St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum." In fact, the Chicago institution was a mere feeder for the other two, seven of the nine directors and incorporators being Sisters of the Good Shepherd.

In the spring and summer of 1886, the county of Cook paid to these two institutions \$2,314.34, it being admitted on the face of the bills rendered by the "Chicago Industrial School for Girls" that the tuition, etc., and clothing for which the money was paid, had been furnished entirely by the two Catholic institutions.

About this time some good Protestants, having some regard for the Constitution of the State, must have demurred; because the next bills of the kind which were presented, the county refused to pay. The "Chicago Industrial School for Girls" brought suit. The case was tried before Judge Tuthill, and judgment rendered for the Chicago School. The county took the case to the Supreme Court.

The decision of the Supreme Court of the State will be found at page 540 of the 125th volume of the Illinois Reports.

The Supreme Court reversed the decision, holding that the Constitution had been plainly violated in paying money to the two Catholic institutions; that it was the duty of the State to provide for the dependent girls, and the State had no right to turn them over to sectarian institutions. The court decided also that the fact that the doctrines of a particular church were taught, and that all exercises of a religious character were those of said church, would render the institution sectarian, within the meaning of the Constitution.

In the face of this decision, and in the face of the Constitution, the county is still appropriating money to sectarian institutions. And the Commissioners do not even beat about the bush, as they did before the decision was made, but in open and shameless disregard of the Constitution, and in open defiance of the authority of the Supreme

Court, they appropriate the money of the people directly to sectarian schools.

The decision was made in 1888, and published in the reports in 1889.

In 1890, the Board of County Commissioners appropriated \$40,000; in 1891, \$45,000; and in 1892, \$45,000.

This sum was distributed as follows:

To the St. Mary's Training School for Boys, at Feahanville, \$12,500; to the Illinois Training School for Boys, at Glenwood, \$12,500; to the Chicago Industrial School for Girls, \$8,000; and to the Illinois Industrial School for Girls, at Evanston, \$12,000.

Of these, the first and the third are well known to be Catholic institutions. The other two, though not under the ostensible control of any Protestant sect, are yet Protestant institutions to all intents and purposes. They have Protestant prayers, Protestant Sabbath schools and Protestant teachings.

Sufficient evidence that they are sectarian institutions of a Protestant character, is found in the fact that their managers consent so readily to the appropriations for the Catholic schools. How is it that there were no complaints and expostulations, such as there were in 1886 and 1887 against the misappropriation of the public funds, in violation of the Constitution?—Because they get a share of the public plunder. It is an unholy religious alliance for the purpose of robbing the people and depleting the public treasury in disregard of all the supposed safeguards of the Constitution.

Some two years ago, the Secular Union took the matter up, and had a bill in chancery filed for an injunction to prevent funds being paid to the Feahanville school. That case is now pending in the Supreme Court of Illinois.

All opposed to a union of Church and State—all opposed to pious frauds of every description, and especially all opposed to open violations of the Constitution, in the supposed interests of religion or of education, are called upon to assist in putting a stop to such practices.

A Presbyterian Minister on Religious Liberty.

THE Rochester (N. Y.) *Herald*, of April 11, prints the following synopsis of a sermon delivered on the previous Sunday, by Rev. Dr. Nelson Millard, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of that city:—

"Religious Liberty and the Civil Power" was the subject of the morning address and the preacher aptly chose his text from the twenty-first verse of the twenty-second chapter of Matthew: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." In the course of his sermon Dr. Millard said:

"We are living in the enjoyment of many privileges, the possession of which seems as natural and as much a matter of course to us as our use of the sunlight and the air. One of these privileges is the right to private judgment in religion, the right to worship according to the dictates of our own consciences without molestation or violence from others; that right to the average American seems like an axiom; but it is only a little while ago that this right of private judgment in religion was regarded as the very height of absurdity. It was then the universal opinion that governments had not only the right but were under the bounden duty to coerce their subjects into uniformity of belief and worship. The monarch was regarded as not only the temporal but the spiritual head of the State; and through a thousand mediæval years both State and Church repudiated the right of private judgment in religion and at once believed in and practiced persecution.

"This seems strange when we remember that Paul in the fourteenth chapter of Romans had laid down with a luminous-

ness like sunlight the doctrine of the right of private judgment. It seems strange, too, when one remembers that the early Church both taught and practiced entire religious toleration. To the immortal honor of the Church of the first three centuries be it said that they neither attempted to persecute nor so much as defend persecution, but repudiated it in the strongest terms. Tertullian, Lanctanctius, Hilary of Poitiers, all of them taught the doctrine of entire religious liberty as plainly and as forcibly as it is ever taught to-day. Yet the Church sank back from this high position and became for a thousand years, in connection with the State a persecuting power.

"During an unhappy millennium Church and State in unhallowed alliance shed a vast amount of blood and caused untold physical and mental suffering. The early Christians had been persecuted by the Roman Government, but now a spirit more fierce than that which inflamed the empire raged in the bosom of the Church. It is only in the last 250 years that there has been a gradual emergence from this low condition of persecution up to that condition of religious privilege which we enjoy in this land.

"The first step upward was from persecution to toleration; in this stage of toleration, while the State still has some one established form of worship which it favors and supports, it does not now molest or use violence toward other forms of worship, but allows them to be practiced without persecution. But this is all there is reached in the second stage, namely, toleration.

"But toleration is by no means the highest point. It is indeed common to hear toleration lauded as if it were a princely virtue, almost the acme of perfection in regard to men's religious rights. But it leaves much yet to be reached, for toleration carries the imputation that the immunity from persecution which it confers is a concession granted, not a right recognized. It implies that the State has the right to persecute, but at its pleasure and for such time as it may elect, waives that right. The word toleration in its very self and sense implies superiority and indicates condescension. 'We tolerate,' it has been justly said, 'what we dislike but can not prevent.' No one wants to be 'tolerated;' it's like being patronized. Therefore a yet higher stage before the true ground is reached is this: Liberty, full religious freedom, and equality. Only as without establishing or favoring any religion the State equally and impartially protects them all does it assume the correct attitude.

"Such is the condition of things in this country where the principle of full religious liberty is executed with now and then, however, some illogical and intolerant exceptions. Most of our people are in hearty accord with it, and are glad that our United States Constitution allows not the slightest union of Church and State. There are, however, some busybodies who either do not or will not understand that our Government is founded upon the absolute divorce of Church and State, and who desire to introduce into the Constitution a religious element, making our Government a distinctively 'Christian' one. This would logically be only an entering wedge for the whole doctrine and evil of the union of Church and State. Far better than this is the Sixteenth Amendment proposed by the present

House of Representatives, which calls upon the general Government to require every State to insert in its Constitution the principle of entire divorce of Government from any interference in religious affairs.

"In some of the States their Constitutions are such that Jews and Seventh-day Baptists, who keep Saturday as Sabbath, can be and have been prosecuted for not observing Sunday. This is religious persecution and is unjust.

"Ought legislatures to be provided with chaplains? If they do have them all sects ought to have equal rights and privileges in their appointment; and it is certainly an open question whether such chaplains should not be paid by the churches rather than from the public funds. Our legislatures need praying for bad enough; but I should say, let the churches do the work and pay the workmen.

"In short, total divorce of Church and State is the only true logic and the only course that can produce smooth sailing."

A Counterpart of Judge Hammond's Decision.

A FOREIGN correspondent of the *New York Observer* gives in that paper of the 14th inst., the particulars of the persecution in Aveiro, Portugal, of Fernando Francisco Bichao, now undergoing imprisonment "for the crime of refusing to remove his cap to a naked cross carried at a funeral two years ago."

Two appeals were taken in the case. The first appeal was to the court at Oporto, which quashed the sentence on the ground that there was no evidence of any intention to insult the State religion. The other appeal was taken by the prosecutors from the decision of the Oporto court, to the Supreme Tribunal at Lisbon, and here the original sentence was affirmed.

The action of the Lisbon court was on the ground that the intent to insult the State religion was sufficiently proved by the fact that the prisoner knowingly refused to remove his cap. On this point the *Observer's* correspondent remarks: "So they deliberately ignored the article of the Constitution that provides that no one shall be persecuted on account of his religion."

THIS action of the Lisbon court is very similar to certain decisions by American courts in Sunday cases. The Lisbon court would of course say that Bichao is not persecuted, but prosecuted, not for his religion, but for his insult to the religion of others. It was thus that Judge Hammond held in the case of R. M. King, of Tennessee. The Judge said:—

Sectarian freedom of religious belief is guaranteed by the Constitution, not in the sense argued here, that King as a Seventh-day Adventist, or some other as a Jew, or yet another as a Seventh-day Baptist, might set at defiance the prejudices, if you please, of other sects having control of legislation in the matter of Sunday observances, but only in the sense that he should not himself be disturbed in the practices of his creed. . . . We do not say Sunday observance may be compelled upon this principle, as a religious act, but that the constitutional guaranty of religious freedom does not afford the measure of duty under such circumstances, nor does it any more, it seems to us, protect the citizen in refusing to conform to Sunday ordinances. . . . By a sort of factitious advantage, the observers of Sunday have secured the aid of the civil law, and adhere to that advantage with great tenacity, in spite of the clamor for religious freedom, and the progress that has been made in the absolute separation of Church and State. . . . Sunday observance is so essentially a part of that religion that it is im-

possible to rid our laws of it. . . . As to the non-observer, he can not be allowed his fullest personal freedom in all respects; largely he is allowed to do as he pleases, and generally there is no pursuit of him, in these days, as a mere matter of disciplining his conscience; but only when he defiantly sets up his non-observance by ostentatious display of his disrespect for the feelings or prejudices of others.

Judge Hammond's decision is an exact parallel to that of the Supreme Tribunal at Lisbon. But is such a decision any better in America than in Portugal? And if the Portugal decision violated the constitutional guarantee of religious liberty in that priest ridden country of the Old World, what shall we say of similar decisions by the courts of "free America"?

How to Quicken the Public Conscience.

THE "Pearl of Days," for April 9, contains answers from several ministers to the question, "What means should be relied upon in the present crisis to quicken the public conscience throughout our country in regard to the proper observance of the Sabbath?"

In reply to this query, Rev. Lee M. Heilman says:—

Conscience in its nature and functions has supreme reference to the great cause of all things, and hence to excite it to adequate sensibility means must be employed which will touch it from the side of that first cause, or God. That monitor must be quickened with facts and truth of divine authority, and of the inborn need of highest welfare. Any agencies that disseminate these strong and self-evident facts, as they meet human want, will awaken conscience. But the "public conscience" is reached by the ordained witness for God and truth, viz., the believer. In a Christian land, a land of churches, this becomes pre-eminently a duty. Our reliance, then, must be upon the word and Spirit of the God of prayer. The Church has the responsibility, but not the sense of it; the power, but not the motive and grace.

With this answer no reasonable fault can be found; and were not the essential elements mentioned in it entirely lacking, it would be the practically accepted and universal answer, and appeal to civil law would not be made.

In reply to the same query, Rev. R. C. Wylie, of the National Reform Association, says:—

1. We must convince the masses of the people that the Sabbath is of divine appointment and is a permanent institution. There will be no conscience in this matter at all if the idea of divine authority is omitted.

2. It must be made clear that the Sabbath law is binding in social, business, and political circles. It must be shown that the Sabbath has a civil, as well as an individual, a family, and an ecclesiastical side.

5. It must be shown that the Sabbath law can not be violated with impunity. The penalty may be delayed, but it is sure to come. It falls on the individual in the form of premature death; on business in a variety of forms; on the Nation in the form of public vice, divine judgments, national overthrow.

Mr. Wylie's first, is in effect the same as Mr. Heilman's answer. It is that to awaken the conscience appeal must be made to the law of God. Did he stop here his answer would be commendable; but seeing evidently the impossibility of connecting divine authority with Sunday, the Sabbath which Mr. Wylie had in mind, he departs from the real question and adroitly introduces another feature, namely, how can men be forced to keep Sunday? This he intimates can be accomplished by means of the "civil Sab-

bath," or as he puts it, by showing that "the Sabbath has a civil side;" by which he means, that men must be shown that by the civil law they can be required to treat Sunday as though it were the divinely ordained Sabbath.

BUT it is in his fifth that Mr. Wylie plainly implies that he would quicken the conscience by civil law. He says: "It must be shown that the Sabbath law can not be violated with impunity." True he does not directly refer to civil penalties, but as they are inseparable from a "civil Sabbath," they are strongly implied.

BUT it is left to Rev. Henry Ostrum, Methodist, of Milwaukee, to depart wholly from the question and appeal wholly to the civil power. His answer in full is:—

1. Enforce existing State laws. Slighted laws in factories, schools, and homes destroy regard and create anarchy. The Sabbath is in danger of passing into the hands of just such anarchy.

2. Organize. But organization without a body-guard of conviction will be a bird's egg without a nest; therefore, let the organizer thoroughly start the campaign. Church work must not be counted on as an organization in this enterprise. The foe is definitely organized.

3. Greatly increase the number of organizers in the field.

4. Multiply short selections of literature on the subject.

5. Introduce a strong hymn, to be sung to a widely known air, and thus get the thousands singing about the Sabbath. Let this be a specialty in many languages at the World's Fair.

6. The laboring men are hoodwinked by their leaders. Let us meet them on their own ground.

7. And, finally, the great multitude of Church people "reading up" on the subject, and praying the inwrought prayer, will electrify the whole movement.

"Enforce existing State laws." How in the name of common sense could that quicken the conscience? It might make more people profess regard for Sunday, that is, it might, and certainly would, make hypocrites, but to say that it could reach the conscience is to assert that civil law stands on a par with divine law, and "is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

MR. OSTRUM'S reply amounts to about this: Coerce people by civil law; secure convictions in the courts; get up an excitement; appeal to feeling; excite a frenzy; and finally the great multitude of church people will become alive to their duty, and, presto! the thing is done!

BUT Mr. Ostrum's "6" deserves special notice. If we are to believe Mr. Crafts and the American Sabbath Union, the laboring men are now very largely demanding the preservation of the "American Sabbath." Is this what Mr. Ostrum means by saying that they "are hoodwinked by their leaders"? Does he mean that they have been deceived into a support of Sunday observance? Probably not; he would hardly make such an admission. He must then wish to be understood as implying that the mass of the laboring men are opposed to Sunday laws, and that they have assumed this hostile attitude because they have been deceived by their leaders. But what then becomes of the gauzy structure reared upon the claim that the workingmen are demanding Sunday laws and Sunday-closing of about everything in order that they may not be forced to labor? It is thus that this Milwaukee preacher ruthlessly sweeps away some of Mr. Crafts' strongest reasons for the "civil Sabbath," namely, the demands of the "toiling masses," the cry of the tired

workingmen, the moan of the weary over-worked shop girl. The advocates of enforced Sunday observance should get together and agree upon their "indisputable facts" before they expect everybody to flock to their standard. C. P. B.

Sunday Closing.

THERE are very few broadminded people in Chicago who will not receive with pleasure Director General Palmer's statement that the World's Fair must be opened on Sunday. Of course it must. The World's Fair must be a world's fair, not a parochial enterprise. It is for Presbyterian and Catholic, high church and low church, Jew and Gentile, Mohammedan and fireworshiper, Buddhist and Parsee, orthodox and heterodox, and people without any doxes at all.

We narrow the great work at once when we permit any class in the community, no matter how numerous and respectable, to dictate their system of Sabbath observance to people just as numerous and quite as respectable who differ with them on the God-ordained manner in which the good people should pass "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday." It is not a question of who is right or who is wrong either in the interpretation of the Bible or in one's belief in the purpose of the God behind the Bible; but it is a question as to whether, when there is a difference of opinion among honest men, one side should dominate, control, and annoy the other.

Were it at issue that by holding the Fair open on Sundays the people who favored Sunday closing would be forced to attend the exhibition and thus do violence to their convictions, the *Mail* would demand Sunday closing. But there is no such necessity. It is open to every visitor to go or not to go, as seems best to him according to his private belief; but it is not open to him to say to another, "You must not go to the Fair to-day, because I do not approve of your going."

Those who think it wrong to open their exhibits or to look at the exhibits of others on Sunday are under no compulsion to commit what they deem sin; but neither are they to be permitted to interfere with him or her who does not think it sin to go to Jackson Park on Sunday.

It is a curious, almost a sad fact that a problem so simple and so self-evident should need serious discussion in these closing watches of the nineteenth century. Still it requires time and teaching to bring home the fact to the egotism of each of us that a man's mind must be a law unto himself. Still there should be one platform on which all could meet—let each visitor to the World's Fair be his own Sunday closer.—*Chicago Mail*.

THE gathering of petitions for laws with reference to Sunday with which the last two Congresses have been so incessantly besieged has been credited mainly to the Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. It seems that the Union has, until within the last few Sundays, made an object lesson of itself as to the necessity which it claims exists for these laws and their enforcement. It is said that work has been regularly prosecuted upon the Woman's Temple, in Chicago, on Sundays, but, in view of the public comment created, Sunday work has been discontinued. This destroys the force of the example that they might have made of the case; others may now think that they also can work or stop work as they choose without legal compulsion.

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 ST., NEW YORK CITY.
1225 T ST., N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.
28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO, ILL.
12TH AND CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.
267 WEST MAIN ST., BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

R. C. PORTER - - - - - PRESIDENT.
A. F. BALLENGER - - - - - SECRETARY.

At Nashville, Tennessee, Warren, Pennsylvania, and Findlay, Ohio, efforts have lately been made for compulsory Sunday observance.

FORT WAYNE, Indiana, has organized a Rest-day League and appointed its leading ministers as officers. The avowed intention is here, as elsewhere to secure the enforcement of Sunday laws.

IT is reported as an item of current news that Judge Clark, of Georgia, has declared Sunday advertising illegal.

In New York, a special enactment, in the year 1891, made Sunday advertising legal, and pay for such advertising by Sunday papers collectable.

A CONSIDERABLE number of petitions are now being presented daily, in both the Senate and the House, "remonstrating against the commitment of the United States Government to a union of religion and the State by the passage of any bill or resolution to close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation." It is quite time that intelligent and really patriotic citizens, who see the danger in this legislation which is being almost forced upon Congress, should be heard. As they more fully realize the situation they will continue to remonstrate in increasing numbers.

THE new broom of the New York police department seems to be devoting its attention almost entirely to sweeping out Sunday saloons. That is an evidence of insincerity to begin with. Sunday laws are themselves a hypocritical cloak, and their enforcement is everywhere made a false show of zeal in the interests of good order in a community. The *Sun* very truly says:—

Perhaps more liquor saloons than usual were really closed last Sunday, and the number of arrests for the violation of the Sunday-closing law was somewhat greater than the average. If such was the case, the experience of the past has simply been repeated. When Mr. Hewitt was Mayor the law was enforced for several successive Sundays with even more rigor, and under every municipal administration for a long time past there have been comparatively dry Sundays, when the station houses received many bar-keepers who had been caught in dispensing beer and whiskey, or decoyed by detectives into violation of the law. For years past the Grand Jury has spent a large part of its time in investigating these cases, and thousands of indictments have been brought against the accused. Meanwhile the business of Sunday liquor selling and liquor drinking has gone on the same as ever.



NEW YORK, MAY 5, 1892.

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

FRIENDS sending us newspaper clippings are requested to invariably note on the clippings themselves the name and date of the paper, also where published. Clippings are of little value without this information.

THE *Mail and Express* thinks that "Michael Walsh, Ph.D., is in a position of more usefulness as treasurer of the ministerial fund for the Grant monument than as editor of a Sunday paper." The *Mail and Express* is an evening paper, and evening papers do not publish Sunday editions. It would not pay.

SEVERAL Russian Hebrew boys, all under sixteen years of age, were arrested in Central Park, on a recent Sunday, for selling lozenges. They spent the night in cells, and were arraigned in a police court the next day for violation of the Sunday law. Louis Sevatchman, thirteen years old, spoke for the crowd. He said he was the oldest of seven children. He had attended school eight years. The boys were all discharged with a caution not to again offend against the majesty of the law and the sacredness of Sunday.

RELIGIOUS persecution and bigotry are the worst in the world. They are without consideration or pity.—A. D. Vail, D. D.

"True enough," remarks a country paper, "but that need not trouble the United States of America." No, it need not trouble the United States were it not that, as Judge Hammond puts it, "by a sort of factitious advantage, the observers of Sunday have secured the aid of the civil law, and adhere to that advantage with great tenacity, in spite of the clamor for religious freedom, and in the progress that has been made in the absolute separation of Church and State."

And what is the result of this tenacious adherence to this "sort of factitious advantage," which the Sunday observers have secured by the aid of the civil law? Go for answer to the graves of R. M. King and W. Parker, hounded to death by the minions of an iniquitous Sunday law; inquire of the women and children left to be supported by charity while their natural protectors were suffering im-

prisonment for the "crime" of differing with their neighbors as to the particular day to be observed as the Sabbath; read the indictments even now hanging over the heads of honest, God-fearing men for daring to assert their God-given rights; and then say no more that the question of religious bigotry and persecution need not trouble the United States of America. True, this probably does not trouble those miserably pinched and pusillanimous souls who feel secure because they are on the popular side; but it will trouble the large hearted lover of liberty, whatever may be his religion.

THE dailies of the 27th ult. published the following dispatch:—

Chestertown, Md., April 26.—William E. Hubbard, son of John E. Hubbard, of Tolchester, is in jail here for contempt of court in refusing to testify on Saturday in a case brought by his father against another man. When called to the stand he said:—

"Judge, it is no use to swear me; I will not testify. To-day is my Sabbath day, and although I know the Bible says, 'obey those in authority over you,' Peter says, 'obey God rather than man,' and as this is my Sabbath I refuse to be sworn."

"Well," said the Judge, "I have been on the bench twenty-four years and I have never had a case of this kind, and, however true your quotation of Peter may be, the law says that we shall observe but one day as the Sabbath, and that is the day commonly called Sunday, and sir, you must either testify or go to jail."

The young man still refused, and went to jail. He is a Seventh-day Adventist.

It is very generally claimed in defense of Sunday laws that they do not prevent the keeping of another day by those who wish to do so. But according to this Judge, the law of Maryland "says that we shall observe but one day as the Sabbath, and that is the day commonly called Sunday." It is true that the law of Maryland does not say this in so many words, but that is about what Sunday laws mean whether in Maryland or anywhere else.

The young man did right in adhering to the principle stated in Acts 5:29. The Judge showed himself a fit administrator of an intolerant law.

SOME weeks ago we published the fact that five of the leading members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, at Springville, Tennessee, had been indicted for Sunday work, and that they were liable to be arrested at any time. The following letter which we reprint from the *Review and Herald*, the Seventh-day Adventist Church paper, published at Battle Creek, Michigan, explains the situation as it is at present; also the probabilities in the case:

Springville, Tenn., April 13, 1892.

A. O. Tait, Battle Creek, Mich.

DEAR BROTHER: Yours of March 27, was received some time ago, and you requested that I should let you know all of the particulars in regard to the arrests made here for Sunday labor. Since my last writing, other facts have come to light. One of our neighbors was at the county-seat on business, and the State's attorney came in and asked him if he lived in the Advent community. He replied that he did. The attorney asked, "Do they

keep up their Sunday work?" He answered, "Yes, and none of the Adventists will deny it."

Then the attorney requested him to give him the names of five of the leading church-members, which he did. The State's attorney said he had heard the circuit judge, Judge Swiggart, say he was going to put a stop to that Sunday desecration.

So the five warrants were issued, and are in the sheriff's hands. But it seems that he has understood that we will not give bonds, and so will wait until court sits, which will be the fourth Monday in May. These are the facts in the case. I will write again as soon as there are further developments.

Your brother in the one faith,
J. MOON.

The place, where the work complained of is done, is in a retired country neighborhood, about two miles from the village of Springville.

THE *Christian Statesman* accuses Drs. Stevenson and McAllister of retaining and making an improper use of the mailing list of that paper after it had been sold to the present management. Dr. Stevenson mildly asks "a brief withdrawal of the accusation," but virtually confesses its truth. Upon this the *Statesman* says:—

It is curious that so soon after the general condemnation of the abstracting of the *Voice* mailing list, any one should lack commercial sense (not to say moral sense) as to seriously defend such a course as here described. Surely the honored National Reform Association needs to meet and begin anew its reform work in its own official ranks.

This is most cruel! Only think of the National Reform Association having to be instructed in morals by as accomplished a trickster as the present editor of the *Christian Statesman*! Surely this is the irony of fate!

ONE of the worst features of the "Reform" scheme advocated by the *Christian Statesman* is that it involves the employment of secret spies. Article V. of the Constitution of the so-called "Reform Leagues," which Mr. Crafts has been, and is, organizing wherever he goes, provides that "the Secretary shall appoint an investigating committee of four, known only to himself, the first of whom shall on the first week of every month, the second on the second, and so following, ascertain personally what violations—first, of the civil law, second, of the higher laws of God—are in progress, and report fully in writing to the Secretary, who shall in turn inform the public authorities," etc. A fine blackmailing scheme truly! Its possibilities in that direction are limitless.

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 City