



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, MAY 14, 1891.

NUMBER 20.

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 religious teaching of the children must be left in the hands of parents, friends, Christians. Were the State to undertake to teach religion, in this country, as the majority are Christians, she would teach Christianity. Then the State would have to require every teacher to be an active and earnest Christian. If this were not done, there would be many schools in charge of persons having no interest in religion, and no power to awaken interest in it. But who would go so far toward the union of Church and State, as to have the latter sit in judgment on the religious character of a large number of its servants? Surely the result of such inquisition and patronage would, in the end, be evil to all concerned. Let us have no State religion in our public schools; there is a better and safer way.—*Rev. T. D. Peake.*

BEFORE there is any Chicago Fair open, the demand is made that it close on the Sabbath. As there are two days recognized as the day of religious rest, each by good Christian bodies, which is to have the preference? The seventh-day people have as many rights as the first-day, and the Government has just as much right to protect the conscientious scruples of the one as the other. As a matter of history and of fact the seventh-day folks have the best of the argument, though the great mass of indifferent people are not particular which day is kept, so that there is a day kept. In all other countries there is no harm taken by keeping such an ex-

hibit open on Sunday. On the continent of Europe, Sunday is election day. In Ireland, at present, Sunday is the day of campaign speeches, and priests think it no evil, after their clerical duties, to do a bit of work on the stump.—*San Francisco Alta.*

The Original Parens Patriæ in its Practical Workings.

THE principles of sovereignty and paternalism announced for the United States Government by the Supreme Court in the decision which was discussed last week, are of more consequence to the American people at this time than appears in the mere enunciation of the principles; though in that, as we have seen, there is accomplished, as far as the Court can go, a total revolution in the principles of government which were established by the makers of the American Union. This can be more clearly illustrated by following the lead suggested by the Court. It will be remembered that the Court cited Rome as one of the authorities for the position which was taken in the decision; and by a brief examination of the Roman governmental system, in its principle and in its workings, in connection with certain claims and movements which are becoming quite popular in this country, the full meaning of that decision can be more clearly discerned.

In the Roman system the government was supreme, absolute, paternal, and divine. "The idea of the State was the highest idea of ethics; and within that was included all actual realization of the highest good; hence the development of all other goods pertaining to humanity was made dependent on this."—*Neander.* Man with all that he had was subordinated to the State; he must have no higher aim than to be a servant of the State; he must seek no higher good than that which the State could bestow. "The first principles of their law was the paramount right of the State over the citizen. Whether as head of a family, or as proprietor, he had

no natural rights of his own; his privileges were created by the law as well as defined by it. The State, in the plenitude of her power, delegated a portion of her own irresponsibility to the citizen, who satisfied the conditions she required, in order to become the parent of her children; but at the same time she demanded of him the sacrifice of his free agency to her own rude idea of political expediency."—*Merville.*

It is very evident that in such a system there was no place for individuality. The individual was a part of the State. There was no such thing as the rights of the people. The right of the State only was to be considered and that was to be considered absolute. "The more distinguished a Roman became, the less was he a free man. The omnipotence of the law, the despotism of the rule drove him into a narrow circle of thought and action, and his credit and influence depended on the sad austerity of his life. The whole duty of man, with the humblest and greatest of the Romans, was to keep his house in order, and be the obedient servant of the State."—*Mommsen.*

Thus every Roman citizen was a subject and every Roman subject was a slave. It would be difficult to conceive of a system of government whose principles were more radically opposed to those of the United States, than were these.

As the State was paternal the Emperor was father of the people; and as such he gave to the people land, he fed them, he gave them money, in short he dealt with them as a father with his children. But even before there was an emperor this principle was the principle of the government. The only change from the times before the emperors, to the times of the emperors, was that in the imperial authority there was merged in one man that which before pertained to the government composed of the senate, consulate, and tribunate.

In the days of Tiberius Gracchus, B. C. 133, the public lands were leased by the government to capitalists. And although

there was a law which forbade any single holding of more than three hundred and thirty-three acres, the law was of ancient standing and had been gradually disregarded until practically it was forgotten, and the capitalists had entirely monopolized the public land which they cultivated by slave labor, and the citizens without capital being unable to compete with capital in control of slave labor, were virtually crowded off the land. Tiberius determined that the monopolies should be broken and that the public lands should be restored to the citizens. It was done, and within two years the commissioners appointed to distribute the land had settled forty thousand families upon public lands which the monopolists had been obliged to surrender. But the commissioners soon became unpopular. Those who were compelled to resign their lands were exasperated, of course. On the other hand, those to whom the land was given were not in all cases satisfied. It was certain that some would be given better pieces of land than others, and that of itself created jealousy and discontent.

But the greatest trouble was, that in the great majority of cases it was not land that they wanted, in fact it was *money* that they wanted first of all; and although the land was virtually given to them and well improved at that, they could not get money out of it without work. It had to be personal work, too, because to hire slaves was against the very law, by virtue of which they had received the land; and to hire freemen was impossible; (1) because no freeman would work for a slave's wages—that in his estimate would be to count himself no better than a slave—and (2) the new landed proprietor could not afford to pay the wages demanded by free labor, because he had to meet the competition of the wealthy land owners who worked their land with slave labor.

The only alternative was for the new landholders to work their land themselves, and do the best they could at it. But as the money did not come as fast as they wished, and as what did come was only by hard work and economical living, many of them heartily wished themselves back amid the stir and bustle of the busy towns working for daily wages, though the wages might be small. The discontented cries soon grew loud enough to give the Senate its desired excuse to suspend the commissioners and then quietly to repeal the law.

Ten years afterward the same thing had to be done over again. This time it was accomplished under the leadership of Caius Gracchus brother of Tiberius; but it was not enough that he should restore the land law that had been secured by his brother. That law, even while it was being worked at its best, was satisfactory to but few of its beneficiaries. The law was restored, it is true, but the prospect of leaving Rome, and going perhaps to some distant part of

Italy to engage in hard work, was not much of a temptation to men who had spent any length of time in Rome, involved in its political strifes, and whose principal desire was to obtain money and the means of subsistence with as little work as possible. It required something more than the restoration of the land law to satisfy these, and Caius granted it.

With the "enthusiastic clapping" of every pair of poor hands in Rome, he secured the passage of a law decreeing that there should be established in Rome, public granaries to be filled and maintained at the cost of the State, and that from these the wheat should be sold to the poor citizens, at a merely nominal price. This law applied only to Rome, because in Rome the elections were held. "The effect was to gather into the city a mob of needy, unemployed voters, living on the charity of the State, to crowd the circus and to clamor at the elections, available no doubt immediately to strengthen the hands of the popular tribune, but certain in the long run to sell themselves to those who could bid highest for their voices."—*Froude*.

This same thing was repeated over and over before the government became merged in an emperor. In fact it became necessary to repeat it; because, although it was easy enough to distribute the land, it was not so easy to keep it distributed. Those to whom the land was given lived far beyond their means and as the public granaries were open and the poor citizen could get the main part of his living for nothing those who received the land for nothing were not likely to cultivate habits of economy. Their lands were soon mortgaged and at last forfeited, falling back into the hands of the capitalists who, in the nature of things, at each successive turn became monopolists.

Thus at last the distribution of the land became an old story, the distribution of grain still remained a fixture, and as money had to be paid by the government in order to give to the citizen either land or grain, there next naturally grew up the demand that the money should be given direct to the citizen, and in the eyes of demagogy, political necessity justified this step. Cæsar gave to each soldier about one thousand dollars, and to each citizen about twenty dollars with house rent free for a year. In addition to this he provided a magnificent feast for the citizens who were supported by the public grants of grain. Twenty-two thousand tables were spread with the richest viands from which the two hundred thousand State paupers feasted, while from hogsheads the finest wine flowed freely.

Then came Augustus, the Emperor in whom was merged all that pertained to the State and the people. He was *parens patriæ*. So long as Rome was in the full tide of conquest subduing populous and wealthy countries, levying upon them enormous tributes, robbing their treas-

uries, and rifling their temples, there was always money in the Roman treasury to furnish the lands, the grain, or even the ready money, which occasion might demand. But when the era of conquest ceased, as it did with Augustus, then also ceased the abundant supply of money. So far from the demands ceasing, however, they went on as before. As the demands were imperative, the money had to be secured from some source, and as now it could no longer be secured by conquest, it had to be secured by other means and other means were employed.

During the reign of Augustus there was need of money by many classes. The regular and legal system of taxation did not furnish enough, and logically enough *confiscation* was the next step. And why not? Was not the Emperor the father of the people? And may not the father divide up the patrimony amongst the children? If some of the children have abundance and others have little or none, may not the father see that there is an equitable distribution? It is the father's office to care for the children. The Emperor in the exercise of his office of *parens patriæ*, did just this thing. Accordingly says Suetonius, "as often as large sums of money came into his possession, by means of *confiscations*, he would lend it free of interest, for a fixed term to such as could give security for double of what was borrowed." Tiberius continued the same practice, for says the same author, "after the example of Augustus and to satisfy the clamors of the people, he loaned money without interest for three years to all who wanted to borrow."

But the *parens patriæ* had not enough money to supply all who wanted to borrow; accordingly, "he first compelled all money-lenders to advance two-thirds of their capital on land; and the debtors to pay off at once the same proportion of their debts. And still there were many who wanted to borrow. Five million dollars was yet required, and in order to obtain it he turned his mind to sheer robbery. It is certain that Cneius Lentulus, the augur, a man of vast estate, was so terrified by his threats and importunities that he was obliged to make him his heir. . . . Several persons, likewise, of the first distinction in Gaul, Spain, Syria, and Greece, had their estates confiscated upon such despicably trifling and shameless pretensions, that against some of them no other charge was preferred than that they held large sums of ready money as part of their property."

This was Rome. Such was the system of government to which the Supreme Court of the United States appealed for guidance in the decision which we have considered. And such was the exercise of the dignity of *parens patriæ* by the government which originated it, and from which, through the British copy, the dignity has now

been adopted as a distinct feature of the Government of the United States.

We have stated, however, that there is involved in this matter, that which is of greater importance than simply its adoption by the Supreme Court. These very principles are being advocated by certain classes in this country. Some there are who demand that all the land shall be possessed, or rather held in trust, by the Government for the people and distributed for their good. Senator Stanford has already introduced a bill in Congress which proposes to oblige the Government after the manner of Augustus, to lend money—not exactly free of interest but—at two per cent. for thirty years to all who can give security to double the amount borrowed. In the same line with this the Farmers' Alliance demands that the Government shall build granaries throughout the land and advance money upon the farmers' crops as well as to loan money upon their land, and upon whatever other kind of security may be offered.

In these schemes there is involved the whole Roman system in its practical workings. If these things were done the Government would inevitably become possessed of a vast amount of land and of grain; and with the Government in possession of such commodities and having obtained possession of it by such means, the next thing, and according to those principles reasonable enough too, would be a demand that the Government should supply grain at a favorable if not a nominal price, to the poorer citizens. But back of all these enterprises, in which it is proposed the Government shall embark, there lies the important question, Where shall the Government obtain the money to lend to all who want to borrow, and to advance upon the crops of those who want to sell? This Government is not engaged in wars of conquest as Rome was, nor has it the opportunity to become so.

It is proposed, indeed, by those who advocate the scheme, that the Government shall issue treasury notes to supply all the demands. But the more of such notes that the Government issues, the less any of them will be worth. A promise of the Government to pay is worth no more than that of a private individual, if it has nothing with which to make the promise good. The Government may print on a piece of paper the promise to pay a dollar or even one thousand dollars; but the only thing that makes that piece of paper worth a dollar, or whatever sum is promised, is the certainty that the Government has that sum of real money with which to make the promise good. But if, without any such certainty, the Government issues a sufficient amount of such notes to supply the demands of all who want to borrow and to all who want to sell, as they demand it, it would be but a little while till none of it was worth anything; and those who invented the scheme would discover this

as soon as anybody else. Then they would be ready to demand real money and not mere promises to pay.

But the Government would not have real money sufficient to supply the demand, and even the Government can not make gold and silver. What then? Oh, the monopolists, the millionaires, the money-lenders, and the rich people generally, have vast sums of real money. The people need money, the Government is *parens patriæ*, let this father of the people cause an equitable division amongst the children. Will it be said that this would be confiscation? and that it can not be supposed that our Government would ever employ such means? It is a sufficient answer to say that the Government has already done it. The Edmunds law, by the decision of the Supreme Court of Utah, did confiscate three millions of dollars' worth of property belonging to the Mormons. The Supreme Court of the United States sustained the decision and confirmed the judgment.

And at the same time, the Court announced the doctrine, that it is not necessary for a corporation to violate its charter to justify the Legislature in dissolving the corporation; but that "Congress for good and sufficient reasons of its own independent of that limitation and of any violation of it, has a full, a perfect right to repeal its charter and abrogate its corporate existence, which of course depends upon its charter." Let that doctrine be adopted by the States as well as by the United States and what corporation can ever count itself secure? All that is necessary to its dissolution is that the Legislature may have good and sufficient reasons of its own, independent of limitations defined by law, to repeal any charter and abrogate the existence of any corporation. And if it be a public corporation the money is at once confiscated. By the very fact of the dissolution the property is forfeited and escheated to the Government as *parens patriæ*. And as this is accomplished by the application of the ancient instead of the modern doctrine, what is to hinder the adoption and the application likewise of the ancient doctrine in the case of private corporations? If it should be, then private property as well as public, would, upon the dissolution of the corporation, be confiscated to the Government as *parens patriæ*. And, indeed why should not the ancient doctrine be applied in these instances as well as in the other? If Roman and English governmental principles shall be followed in one set of cases, why not in the other?

Everybody knows that these demands from first to last are already being loudly made by different classes in this country. So long as the American principles of government shall prevail all such wild schemes will amount to nothing; but let the European and the Roman principles of government supplant the American, then what is to hinder the carrying into

full effect every item of the different schemes proposed and advocated? This is why we say that the Supreme Court decision, under consideration, means vastly more just at this time than the mere enunciation of the principle which it has adopted.

It is strange enough, indeed, that there should be any class of men who are capable of thinking to any purpose at all who would be so scatter-brained as to make such propositions as those of Senator Stanford, the Farmers' Alliance and others to the same purpose. But the strangest of all things is that the Supreme Court of the United States, should by decision rendered, announce and establish a principle of this Government, the very principle upon which alone any and all of these schemes could be made effective. And that the Supreme Court should cite in its decision that very government by which these things were done in the practical application of the doctrine of *parens patriæ*, which the decision makes a distinctive principle of this Government, is astonishing.

A. T. J.

Sunday and the Workingman.

THE *Independent* has the following, relative to the proposal to open the Metropolitan Museum of Art on Sunday:—

We learn that a petition is to be presented to the directors of the Metropolitan Museum, of this city, asking that the Museum be open Sunday afternoons. This petition, it appears, has been circulated by the efforts of a number of young people connected with one of our churches. It is most seriously to be hoped that the prayer of this petition will not be granted. If the question of opening art collections on Sunday afternoon stood by itself it might not be worth while seriously to oppose it; but it does not stand alone. If the Metropolitan Museum were opened at this demand there would be raised a clamor for the opening of theaters and concert halls, and all sorts of places of entertainment, without regard to their moral character or influence. These young people who are so zealous in behalf of the cause of the workingmen evidently do not understand the tendency of their efforts. We have, in all conscience, little enough of Sunday left; let us not fritter away what we have of it. The friends of the Sabbath must make a stand somewhere, and the best place to make that stand is against the opening of the Metropolitan Museum and all other institutions of like character. The very last wish that any friend of the workingman should have for him should be the introduction of the continental Sunday. That means not rest for him, but work. In this matter we are persuaded that a great deal is asked for in his name for which he is in no wise responsible, and which he does not and would not ask for himself. We do not know how thoroughly the mature Christian sentiment of the city will make itself heard when the petition we referred to comes before the directors of the Museum; but we are quite certain that the overwhelming Christian sentiment of this city is decidedly opposed to the opening of the Museum on Sunday.

This is interesting, first, because it shows that even the members of Sunday-keeping churches are not a unit in favor of using the power of the State to force rigid Sunday observance upon the public; and, second, because it reveals plainly the fact

that the fight against the Sunday opening of the Museum is made solely upon religious grounds.

The *Independent* truly says of the workman "that a great deal is asked for in his behalf for which he is not responsible." This is true; and of nothing is it more true than of the demand for Sunday laws made in the name of the workmen. It will be remembered that in the city of Washington, February 18, 1890, Mr. Crafts produced before the Committee on the District of Columbia, a Mr. Schulteis who said that he represented Local Assembly, No. 2,672, of the Knights of Labor, and that that Assembly had indorsed the Breckinridge Sunday bill. But unfortunately for this claim Mr. Millard F. Hobbs, master workman of the whole federation of the Knights of Labor in the District of Columbia, was present, and presented the matter in quite another light. He said:—

No one has been authorized by the Knights of Labor to speak in favor of this bill. Mr. Schulteis is not authorized to speak for the Knights of Labor. It is true Mr. Schulteis is a member of a committee having charge of certain matters, but that committee has nothing to do with this question. The Knights of Labor are virtually opposed to this bill. Some are in favor of some parts of it; some are in favor of all of it; and some are entirely opposed to all of it. For this reason the Knights of Labor of the District, as an organization, have refused to have anything to do with it. We are all in favor of a day of rest, some of two days; but we are afraid of the religious side of this question. What benefits the Knights of Labor wish to obtain, we think can be better secured by our own efforts through our own organizations than by the efforts of others, through the Church.

One who was present and heard Mr. Hobbs speak, says:—

This speech, coming as it did, was more or less of a surprise to all; but to Mr. Crafts and his party it was "a stunner." It instantly crushed to atoms the whole pet theory which they had so nicely framed and so pathetically presented in behalf of "the poor workmen who are so cruelly oppressed by being forced to labor on Sunday;" and of the Church's gallant effort to liberate them from "the Egyptian bondage of Sunday slavery." Nothing could have happened that would more clearly expose the perfect hollowness of the plea that is made by the American Sabbath Union, that this Sunday movement is in the interests of the workmen, than did this unpremeditated and wholly unsolicited speech.

The idea that workmen are, as a class, so devoted to Sunday that they want art museums closed against them upon the only day that they can as a rule spend time to visit them, is absurd. Such a claim never would be made were it not that the friends of a State-bolstered Sunday sacredness feel that they must make a stand somewhere. What they want to secure is general recognition of the principle, that the State is the proper guardian of the Sunday institution. In discussing this very matter, the *Catholic Review*, of May 9, says:—

Where the Christian Sunday is a fact in the national life the observance of it in one fashion or another, provided its sanctity be kept, is of no moment.

This is the Catholic view of the matter, and it is rapidly coming to be the Protestant view; that is, the observance of Sunday in any particular way is not important if only its sacred character be recognized; but that is just what the State has no right to do; yet it is the very thing that Protestants and Catholics alike demand that the State and all acting under State authority shall do.

This accounts for the everlasting ringing of the changes upon the so-called demand of the workmen for Sunday laws, and for the Sunday slamming of the doors of the art museums in their faces. The State is a political concern; it turns this way or that way in obedience to votes; the workmen have votes, hence the anxiety of the Sunday-law, Sunday-museum-closing advocates to make the impression general that the workmen are exceedingly desirous of being excluded from museums upon the only day when they have time to visit them. C. P. B.

Problems for National Reformers.

THE self-styled National Reformers have several rather difficult problems on their hands for solution; but they are not disposed to give them up.

1. How to procure a "religious amendment" of a Constitution which has nothing of religion in it to amend, except this: that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The question is, how to get Congress to legislate in favor of certain religious tenets without annulling this prohibition.

2. How to enforce religious institutions by civil law without a union of Church and State.

3. How to make use of the Roman Catholics to procure religious legislation, and then exclude them from an equal share in the Government.

4. How to legislate non-sectarian religion into the schools of the Nation, which shall be Christian and not Jewish, Protestant and not Catholic.

5. How to build a civil Sabbath upon a purely religious foundation.

6. How to compel a part of the people to keep Sunday civilly, to make it easier for others to keep it religiously; and this without any religious discrimination.

7. How to enforce the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath by a commandment which says nothing of that day, except as a day on which God worked, and also says that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." R. F. COTTRELL.

"Whose Ox," etc.

THERE are a very few preachers and religious thinkers in our country who have not the natural ability, or training, to define the difference between tweedle-

dee and tweedle-dum. Our pulpit and platform ability can evolve a discourse from an adverb, a conjunction, or preposition; can divide into longitudinal sections the finest specimen of capillary matter that was ever found in a second growth on any theological pate, however shiny; it can eisegete into scriptural texts ideas God and the angels would fail to find therein; can beat out moral questions into a thinness in comparison to which tissue paper is like China's wall; while of moral principles, however subtle in themselves, it can make such fine-spun applications as to necessitate, for the ordinary intelligence, a Lick mental telescope to discover, and many other feats of intellectual jugglery is it able to perform; but when it comes to a consideration of a certain phase of religious matters, the support religion receives, directly or indirectly, from the State—a support that is inconsistent, unjust, unfair, and therefore unchristian and un-American—the average theologian's sensibilities seem suddenly seared as with a hot iron.

There is a failure to detect the dishonesty and unfairness in the exemption of church property from taxation, which exemption besides is so palpably inconsistent with our theory of the union of Church and State, that it surprises one that there should ever be any claims made that we have here no such union.

Sabbath legislation, under the disguise of civil, sanitary, and other pretensions, is an insult to the ordinary intelligence, and "it gives one a pain" to think that the "Sabbath" reformers can not see it in that light, and since they do not, what hope is there that they will ever see that such legislation is alike subversive of Christian as well as American principles?

Strong is the spell that error weaves,
In midnight madness for mankind;
And deep the trace that error leaves
Impressed upon the human mind.
Bright must the rays of God's light break,
And strong the power of truth must be,
Ere men from error's trance awake
And think, and act, and dare be free.

H. B. MAURER.

The World's Fair on Sunday.

THE *Independent* has obtained the views of ninety-seven Roman Catholic and Protestant archbishops and bishops as to the question of opening or closing the coming World's Fair at Chicago on Sunday.

The canvass shows that an overwhelming majority of the Protestant prelates are strongly opposed to the Sunday opening, and that of the twenty-two Roman ecclesiastics fourteen would only admit the public during the afternoon at best. Two only out of twenty-five bishops of the Episcopal Church declare themselves for Sunday afternoon opening. The Methodist bishops, white and colored, with a single exception, and he colored, are for closing the Exhibition altogether on that day.

The remainder, representing the Moravians and the Evangelical Association, are all against Sunday opening.

The grounds for the Roman Catholic negative are expressed by Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul. They are that Sunday "is already too seriously attacked, whether from the greed of capital or the aggressiveness of irreligion," for us "to yield, even in a lesser degree, to its adversaries during solemn national occurrences." The interests of labor also, in his opinion, require that the day be kept for rest; and whatever tends to diminish its inviolability tends to the injury of the workingman. "Our accustomed observance of Sunday," he adds, "is the glory of America."

Bishop Clark, of Rhode Island, represents the Episcopal opposition to Sunday opening when he says that the Exposition can not be opened on Sunday "without shocking the religious sensibilities of the great majority of our people," and without setting an example which "might be very disastrous and lead to the throwing open of all sorts of popular amusements on Sunday." That is substantially the view of the Methodist and other Protestant bishops who are against Sunday opening.

The other side is represented by Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia, who can see "no violation of the Sabbath in permitting the public to walk through the grounds and admire the products of human industry and the fine arts, which tend to improve and refine the mind." Therefore he would open the gates on Sunday afternoons. So also Archbishop Janssens, of New Orleans, thinks that "if a Christian gives a reasonable time in the morning to religious devotions, he may be allowed to indulge in an innocent and useful recreation in the afternoon." Bishop Grafton, of the Episcopal Church, regards it as "Pharisaical hypocrisy" to censure "some poor laborer who goes into a picture gallery or listens to a band of music" on Sunday. He would open the departments devoted to art after twelve o'clock on Sunday, believing that shutting the gates entirely "would only be in the interests of the saloons and theaters." The single colored Methodist bishop who is in favor of Sunday opening is Bishop Turner. He thinks that desecration of the day would be prevented rather than encouraged by such a course. "With a hundred thousand or more visitors all the time in the city, if they are shut out from the Exposition, they will naturally gravitate to every centre of vice and corruption." He would open the gates in the afternoon at a reduction of the price of admission, but would stop the machinery and everything calling for special labor, allow no buying or selling except of substantial food, give sacred concerts, temperance and moral lectures, and have preaching by "ministers of the gospel, all without regard to

race and color." The managers, he says, "could procure colored singers enough alone to have two or three concerts in operation at the same time," and hundreds of ministers among the visitors would be glad to take turns at the preaching.

If the question were put to the vote of the people of the Union, would not the great majority agree with the small minority of the bishops who argue for Sunday opening? We have no doubt that that would be the result, for Sunday is the day when this great majority can best enjoy such a display. As to the comparatively small amount of labor involved in the opening, there would be no trouble. Multitudes of people would welcome the opportunity to perform it, as multitudes are glad to run Sunday cars and trains for the accommodation of church-goers. If it would be wrong to go to the Chicago Exposition on Sunday, is it not also wrong that the Central Park here in New York should be most often crowded on that day? Where is the moral distinction between enjoying the beauty and the recreations of that pleasure ground and enjoying and profiting by the magnificent display of a World's Fair? As for ourselves, we can not see it.

At this very time a petition to the trustees of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, asking that that building be opened on Sunday, is receiving great numbers of signatures, and they are the names of religious people in great part. If it is profitable for the people to visit that display of the treasures of art and industry on Sunday, it would be of far greater profit for them to observe and study the vastly more comprehensive museum which a World's Fair is.

What are the people to do on Sunday? Even when they go to church more than nine-tenths of the day still remains. They must do something, for mere idleness is the devil's opportunity. They must have means of recreation, and what could be better for that purpose than a grand display of the world's achievements in art and industry, showing the progress of mankind in civilization and refinement?—*The Sun*.

Army Chaplains.

UPON the subject of chaplains in the army, General Schofield says:—

Under the conditions now existing a corps of chaplains belonging to many diverse denominations would be like a medical corps, or an engineer corps, composed of the adherents to as many diverse theories on the science of medicine or of engineering. In all other things the War Department prescribes an exact code by which all in the army are to be instructed and governed; but in religion and in morals it must allow to all in the army the freedom guaranteed by the fundamental principles of our Government. There is, therefore, very little field for the performance of official religious services in the army, and great danger of doing more harm than good by any attempt to exercise military control or influence over religious matters. My impression is that the

best policy would be to leave the various garrisons in the army free to select religious ministers of their choice, as other communities in this country do, the action of Congress to be limited to supplying the necessary money to pay for their services, and that of the War Department to regulating the mode of their election. In this manner a large proportion of the troops, if not all, could have the services of their own faith at least a part of the time, which they do not now.

From personal experience we know, not only that there is very little field for the performance of official religious services in the army, but that there is a good deal less performance in this than the size of the field allows; but the General's proposal to have Congress pay for the services of those whom the army might choose, and the War Department to regulate the mode of their election, would leave the question just about as it is now. It certainly would not better the matter any. The only right thing to do is for Congress to abolish all chaplaincies. If this were done the army and the navy would receive much better attention religiously than they possibly can under any system of chaplaincies. The chaplains that are there do the men no good, and they prevent others from doing them any good. If this system were abolished, as it ought to be, then the soldiers and the marines would be visited by those who are really interested in their religious welfare, and who would do this work because they were interested in it. In this way many times more good would come to the army and navy than can ever possibly come from any system of chaplaincies that could be arranged.

A LAWYER in North Carolina, who has read THE SENTINEL three months, writes:

I have been reading with pleasure and decided approval the numbers of THE SENTINEL you have kindly sent me. About two years ago, I wrote for the local paper an article on the origin and sanctity of the Christian Sabbath, commonly called Sunday, and respecting its nature and obligation, to correct what I consider general ignorance and misconception on the subject; and it was highly approved by many persons of piety and learning, including churchmen; but it stirred up such a bitter feeling and controversy on the part of a Presbyterian clergyman and his followers, that after a few replies and rejoinders I quit the subject, with good grace, however. I have no time to write at length and refer to much of the ground covered by THE SENTINEL. I will only sum up briefly my politics on the whole subject. I believe that the Saviour intended that his gospel should be propagated by simple preaching without the aid of the State; that it does not require any outside help, and that the whole world can not suppress it. It can accomplish nothing except through its effect on the hearts and consciences of men, and it can do this only when presented to them gently and lovingly, and it must be accepted voluntarily, without force, constraint, or interference of law. Whilst the Christian's life is a warfare, the fight must be between the man and himself, and his evil passions and appetites, and not between him and some one else who wants to make him good by force, if need be, whether he will or no. This puts the devil in any one, and makes him hate religion, if such be religion. The Church and its ministry should not strive with men, except by earnest plea and entreaty, and when it goes out into the world and interferes by law, or personal opposition, with the business or pleasures of men, it abandons its field of duty, and surrenders all its power and its influence. You have a herculean task before you to set the country straight on this subject.

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.

49 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY;

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

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

A RECENT Sunday-law meeting in Edinboro, Pennsylvania, passed, among others, the following resolution relative to this paper:—

That we warn the people of our community against the insidious attacks of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL and other secularist publications, and all those who aim to defeat or antagonize legislation designed to perpetuate to all our people the preservation of the Christian Sabbath.

The same meeting heartily indorsed the ironclad Sunday law of Pennsylvania, in these words:—

We utter our indignant protest against the proposal to modify, nullify, repeal, or in any way impair the efficiency of our Sunday law of 1794. Laws which for nearly one hundred years have stood as a bulwark in defense of our Christian Sabbath.

They should have added: A law which for nearly one hundred years has made it possible for any religious bigot who wished to do so to persecute those who differed from him in the matter of Sunday observance. Possibly the Rev. J. L. McCartney, under whose directions these resolutions were drawn and adopted, does not know that under that same law of 1794 Seventh-day Baptists have been repeatedly fined and imprisoned for doing common labor on Sunday, after having conscientiously observed the seventh day according to the fourth commandment. But Mr. McCartney is an officer of the American Sabbath Union, and the works of the Union he will do.

THE *Riverside* (California) *Daily Press*, of April 23, publishes an article "by request of the Pastor's Association," in advocacy of the exemption of church property from taxation. Church property is now taxed in California, but the arrangement is not pleasing to many of the ministers. The writer of the article in question says that a tax upon church property is a tax upon religion, and declares that

as a matter of true statesmanship and economy, the State had better do all in its power to aid the

churches, even to build them such houses and exempt them from all kinds of taxation.

In conclusion the writer says:—

I take the ground that to tax a house of worship, the most co-efficient factor and element in good government, is inconsistent and wrong; wrong in principle, and wrong in practice also. But, if challenged on the point of the vast sums invested in church buildings, I would willingly concede that beyond a fixed and reasonable sum so invested, in our houses for worship exclusively, the State may rightfully levy a tax. I make the same plea for a primary or district school-house, but no other school or college. California, I believe, has the distinction among all the States of the Union, of abolishing the civil and religious Sunday, and also of taxing church houses. It is to be hoped that this distinction may soon be lost; and that soon this heaven-favored and sun-blessed land may stand up among the sisterhood of States, with no blush on her fair brow.

That is, he would favor a system that would put a premium upon fraud, and constitute the State the judge of what is worship to God!

It would be interesting to hear the gentleman explain how California abolished the religious Sunday. California simply abolished what we have been assured again and again by the Sunday-law orators, from Mr. Crafts to Joseph Cook, was simply a civil Sunday law; how then can it be true that California abolished the religious Sunday? Is Sunday as a religious day dependent in any measure upon State legislatures? So it seems. But what then becomes of the claim that Sunday laws are civil only?

THE *Observer* notes that

the Select Committee on Public Petitions has reported two hundred and twenty-six petitions forwarded to Parliament against the recent bill for the removal of Catholic disabilities, but not one in its favor. Liberalism in reference to church matters has made considerable progress, but a revulsion of feeling is quite possible. Mr. Spurgeon expresses the feeling that the Society for the Liberation of the Church from State Control, has gone too far along political lines, and he refuses the use of the Tabernacle for the Society's annual meeting. The two movements have, of course, drawn their support from Nonconformists, but all Nonconformists are evidently not ready to wipe out all religious distinctions.

These "two movements" referred to are the attempt to remove Catholic disabilities, and to free the Church from the control of the State, or separate Church and State. Every example of the advocacy of religious freedom which is not based on the pure principle of liberty as it is found in Christ will experience a "revulsion of feeling," and finally prove its complete inadequacy, becoming at last, instead of a defender of the faith, an efficient aid to the enemies of religious freedom.

These movements are in this instance inspired by selfish or mixed motives, for if they were introduced, advocated, and supported, solely on the gospel ground of "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them," it would not be possible to "go too far," and no one, while yet a Christian, would feel any "revulsion" from such a course in the affairs of either Church or State.

Subtly Dangerous.

UNDER the heading "The Pittsburg Law and Order Society," the *Christian Statesman*, of a late date, says:—

Pittsburg is one of the quietest cities in the United States on the Sabbath. For this it thanks its Law and Order Society, under the management of the efficient and zealous Captain Wishart. But the Society has gained the undying hatred of the lawless classes, and the most unscrupulous assaults are constantly made upon it. It has just now been attacked in the Legislature—in what manner it may be inferred from the spirited reply which it has forwarded, by mail, to every member of that body:—

Inasmuch as the enemies of the Sunday law are circulating at Harrisburg false and malicious statements alleging gross abuses in the enforcement of said law in Allegheny County, with intent to render the Sunday law odious and to influence the Legislature to legalize certain kinds of business, we make the following statement:—

First.—No person has ever been prosecuted for the sale, on Sunday, of any medicine of any kind whatsoever, or of any appliances designed for the relief of pain or sickness.

Second.—No person has ever been prosecuted for the delivery, on Sunday, of bread, or fresh milk, or ice, or of fresh meats kept in butchers refrigerators over Saturday night.

Third.—No person has ever been coerced or induced to violate the law by any agent or employe of the league.

Fourth.—The league has not made a specialty of prosecuting "widows and cripples." On the contrary, as the records will show, it began with the big offenders and prosecuted them vigorously and successfully. The league, however, has never regarded physical or financial disability as a sufficient justification for the persistent violation of law.

Fifth.—Not one dollar of the fines collected for worldly employment has ever been received either directly or indirectly by the league or by any agent or employe of the league; nor has the fines.

The above points cover the stereotyped charges which constitute the stock in trade of the law-breakers and their sympathizers. We challenge proof of any of these alleged abuses. The cases are all matters of record. We invite the fullest investigation, and will cheerfully meet our accusers face to face before a legislative committee, or any other tribunal. We call attention to a single fact which should show the utter fimsiness of all such charges: defendants have the right of appeal to the Judges.

We desire to emphasize the fact that the work of the league is done under the careful supervision of a committee. Our agent, Captain Wishart, is paid a fixed salary, and makes weekly reports to the committee.

Our motto is, "We ask only obedience to law." To this reasonable demand good citizens will not object. Others must not. The league will continue to prosecute law-breakers without fear, favor, or affection, as it has done from the beginning.

There is no factor of this whole National Reform movement more subtly dangerous than the Law and Order League. A careful study of the above manifesto will develop many of the points wherein this organization is really inimical to the safety of the commonwealth which it so earnestly professes to protect.

In the first place, its main burden is the support and enforcement of religious laws, more especially of Sunday observance at present, as is shown in this letter to legislators. In the next place it assumes to itself, with the utmost arrogance, a complete incapacity to do wrong so long as it does not overstep, in its prosecutions, the limits of technical law. It flaunts in the face of any who are, or may be, its victims the fact that "defendants have the right of appeal." All that they ask is "obedience to law," to this good citizens will not object, "others must not."

These are principles no whit different from those upon which the inquisitorial prosecutions were carried on, and upon which the infliction of civil penalties, for the infraction of religion and ecclesiastical canons, were justified.

These phrases have a fine rhetorical ring but not all good citizens will accept it as an established ethical principle that they should acquiesce in the enforcement of unjust and unchristian laws simply because they have been enacted and are on the statute books.

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.

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 grand est river scenery in the world, in the setting sun, and by moonlight.

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.

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.



GENERAL AGENT WANTED

AGENTS are making FROM \$75 to \$150 PER MONTH.

FARMERS MAKE \$200 to \$500 DURING THE WINTER

LADIES have great success selling this Washer. Retail price only \$5. Sample to those desiring an agency \$2. Also the Celebrated KEYSTONE WRINGERS at manufacturers' lowest prices. We invite the strictest investigation. Send your address on a postal card for further particulars.

LOVELL WASHING CO., 251 Huron St., ERIE, PA.

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 Caesar."
CHAP. III Shows for what purpose the "Powers that Be" are ordained."
CHAP. IV Ably 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.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

A Semi-monthly Publication

Devoted to the defense of

AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

And the Preservation of the

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

AS IT IS.

TERMS, 75 CENTS PER YEAR.

The following numbers are now ready, and will be sent to any address post-paid on receipt of price:—

- No. 1 *The National Reformed Constitution.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 2 *Religious Liberty.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 3 *Evils of Religious Legislation.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 4 *The Blair Sunday Rest Bill.* Price, 7 cents.
- No. 5 *The Blair Educational Amendment.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 6 *Purity of National Religion.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 7 *National Reform and Rights of Conscience.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 8 *The American Papacy.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 9 *The Salem Witchcraft.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 10 *National Reform is Church and State.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 11 *What Think Ye of Christ?* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 12 *Bold and Base Avowal.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 13 *The National Reform Movement an Absurdity.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 14 *The Republic of Israel.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 15 *National Reformed Presbyterianism.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 16 *A Lutheran View of the National Reform Movement.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 17 *Religion and the Public Schools.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 18 *The National Sunday Law.* Price, 25 cents.
- No. 19 *Rev. W. F. Crafts Against the Editors of The American Sentinel.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 20 *Romanism and Civil Liberty.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 21 *Why We Oppose Religious Legislation.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 22 *The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 23 *A Civil Sunday Holiday.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 24 *Blair's Sunday Rest Bill and Joint Resolution, introduced December 3, 1889.* (Exact copies, with notes). Price, 1 cent.
- No. 25 *Civil Government and the Decalogue.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 26 *National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 28 *A Religious Political Movement.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 29 *Arguments on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill. The Object and Price of Exemption Clauses.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 30 *A Civil Sabbath. What It Amounts to.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 31 *Union of Church and State. What Constitutes Such a Union?* Price, 1c.

Address: Pacific Press Publishing Co., OAKLAND, CAL. Or, Atlantic Tract Society, 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

PENSIONS

The Disability Bill is a Law.

SOLDIERS DISABLED SINCE THE WAR ARE ENTITLED. Dependent widows and parents now dependent whose sons died from effects of army service are included. If you wish your claim speedily and successfully prosecuted, address JAMES TANNER, Late Commissioner of Pensions, WASHINGTON D. C.

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



NEW YORK, MAY 14, 1891.

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.

It is stated that those who cause arrest of persons for having their places of business open on Sunday, in Tacoma, have learned that they must themselves pay the costs. Under the direction of Mr. Crafts an ordinance had been drawn up making the city responsible for the costs in all such cases, but it failed to pass.

THE Reformed Presbyterians are having a warm time among themselves over the suspension of the seven ministers who, some months since, took the position that voting under the United States Constitution as it is, is not sin. The *Christian Nation*, the New York organ of the denomination, is full of the controversy, and it seems that the end is not yet.

THE *Christian Advocate*, of May 7, remarks that

some persons become wonderfully interested in working people when they wish to crowd a measure through and can find no good argument in its favor. Let us look after the interests of working people by all means, but let us not invade the laws of God and nature under pretext of providing for any class.

That is just what we have always said.

PRESIDENT SHEPARD, of the American Sabbath Union, is profoundly concerned because of the refusal of the World's Fair Commission to decide definitely and at once to close the great Fair on the first day of the week. On a recent Sunday he told the congregation of the Asbury Methodist Church, that the reason why Chicago has of late been in the clutches of the grip was that the directors of the coming World's Fair in that city have not yet decided whether or not the Fair shall be closed on Sunday. Upon this the *Recorder* remarks that "it would perhaps be interesting to know what, in Colonel Shepard's opinion, is the cause of the grip in New York, and whether there is such a thing as a sin bacillus."

The readiness with which those who are engineering this Sunday business constitute themselves interpreters of God's dealing with men, is amazing, or would be, did we not remember that oftentimes "the wish is father of the thought." These men covet the power to punish those who believe and practice differently from them-

selves, but not possessing that power they imagine that the misfortunes common to all men are special judgments from God upon those whom they deem great sinners while they themselves are saints. In all such cases the words of Christ recorded in Luke 13:1-5 are to the point. The President of the American Sabbath Union may suppose that the grip in Chicago is an evidence of the special displeasure of God against that city, but the conclusion is altogether gratuitous and only shows that some people would love to have it so, and would, if they could, add to the supposed divine judgment, tangible evidences of their own displeasure.

THE National Temperance Congress has been called to meet August 18 and 19, 1891, in the Auditorium of the National Prohibition Park, Staten Island, New York. "We ask," says the call, "all local, State and national temperance societies (regardless of sex or politics), and all churches and Sunday schools, and other associations which hate the saloon, to send representatives to the National Temperance Congress."

IN Russia the Russian who deserts the national religion for a purer form is a traitor to the State, and will be punished promptly as such. In this country the American Sabbath Union is doing all in its power to place all who do not keep Sunday under a like ban, to disgrace them in the eyes of their fellows, and to punish them by law. The principle in either case is the same, and it is no better in America than in Russia.

A ST. PETERSBURG dispatch, of April 30, says:—

The priests and pastors of Moscow are overwhelmed with requests from Jews for baptism in order to avoid expulsion. The law prevents such conversions, except in the case of Lutherans and Catholics, and then permits conversions only in limited numbers.

The reasons for these requests for baptism is that the Russian Government is expelling the Jews; the dispatch continues:—

The expelled Jews are cruelly treated, being marched out of the city afoot chained in bands by the wrists. The Russians afterward pillage the deserted shops and houses.

And this is practical National Reform by a "Christian Government" that rules by "divine right"!

IN opposing the Sunday opening of the Museum of Art in Central Park, the *Christian at Work* says:—

The Museum is already open two evenings of the week; and it is the testimony of the officers of the Museum that the attendance does not show that the laboring or artisan class avail themselves of the opportunity to any notable extent. There is no reason to suppose that Sunday opening would be justified by the attendance.

There is no force to this objection. The fact that workingmen do not rush to the Museum in the evening is no evidence that they would not go on Sunday. The only reasonable presumption is that the Sunday attendance would be large, and largely of those who can not well spare the time to go on other days.

THE *Mail and Express* is also troubled over the agitation in favor of opening the Metropolitan Museum of Art on Sunday. It asserts that

the whole movement for opening museums on Sunday is backed by the enemies of the American Sabbath, and by the liquor dealers and others who are constantly trying to introduce European license into this country. As for the anticipated benefits to the workingmen of opening the Museum, experience shows that they would not follow. The Paris art galleries are visited by very few workingmen on Sunday, and the galleries in London were closed in pursuance of a petition signed by the workingmen themselves.

The charge that this movement is backed by the liquor dealers is simply silly, and is as false as it is foolish; nobody but Editor Shepard would ever suggest such a thing. We would beg to suggest to the *Mail and Express* that there is some difference between the workingmen of Paris and those of New York, and the difference is altogether in favor of the workingmen of New York; many of whom are quite as capable of appreciating the beautiful as are the members of the "Four Hundred." We also rise to remark that the action of the workingmen in London, wheedled as they doubtless were by Sunday-law advocates, should not be considered as binding American workingmen. The *Mail and Express* should infuse a little honesty and common sense into its advocacy of Sunday closing of museums.

WE have received from the author, Rev. A. P. McDiarmid, pastor of the Tabernacle Baptist Church, Brooklyn, a copy of an excellent pamphlet entitled, "Should Church Property Be Taxed?" Mr. McDiarmid answers in the affirmative and supports that answer by irrefutable arguments. The pamphlet is the best thing on the subject that we have seen, and should be read by everybody. The publisher is E. Scott, 134 West 23d Street, New York. We do not know the price, but think that 10 cents sent to the publisher would secure a copy.

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,
48 Bond Street, New York.