

"If any Man Hear My Words, and Believe not, I Judge him not: for I Came not to Judge the World, but to Save the World."

VOLUME 9.

NEW YORK, MARCH 22, 1894.

NUMBER 12.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
Entered at the New York Post-Office.

EDITOR, ALONZO T. JONES.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

WE have been asked what objection we have against the proposed Sixteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution?

WE have also been asked what we think of the so-called League for the Protection of American Institutions, which is the originator and promoter of this proposed Sixteenth Amendment?

WE are perfectly willing to answer both of these questions. Indeed, we answered them four years ago in these columns; but are ready to answer them again, not only because we are asked, but because this subject comes naturally in the line of our studies and discussion of methods of opposing the encroachments of Rome.

THIS proposed Sixteenth Amendment is framed as follows:—

No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly, or in part, under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.

THERE are two objections to this proposed amendment. *First*, it does not go far enough; and *second*, it is not honest as far as it does go. It does not go far enough because it only forbids "any State" to use its property or credit or money for the purposes named, while it leaves the *United States*—the national Government—free to keep on doing it, as it has been doing, to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars ever since 1885. Again, it does not go far enough, in that it only forbids any State to aid, "by appropriation," "any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly, or in part, under sectarian or ecclesiastical control," while it does not forbid any State even to make appropriations in aid of religious institutions, societies, or undertakings, under State control. So that there is nothing in this proposed amendment to prevent any State or the national Government from making all the appropriations of property, credit and money that can be obtained, for the support of religion or for religious purposes, so long as the institution or society, or even the church to which the appropriation may be made, is under State or national control, and not "under sectarian or ecclesiastical control."

THIS is not only so, but is intended to be so, by the chief organizers of the league and the originators of the proposed amendment. And this is where the thing is not honest as far as it does go. And here we begin to tell not what we think of this league, but what we know of it. The chief, if not the sole originators of the league, were James M. King, D. D., of this city, who has always been and is now its secretary; and Hon. John Jay, who was the first president of the league, and continued its president for several years, until his death. And it is a plain and distinct matter of record that both James M. King and John Jay were all this time actively committed to the support of religion by the State. Of this there is abundant and undeniable proof, some of which we shall now give.

It is well known, and a matter of public record, that in 1888 Henry W. Blair, then United States Senator from New Hampshire, introduced a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States, which provided in so many words for the enforcement, by the national power, of the teaching of "the principles of the Christian religion" in all the public schools in the land. February 15, 1889, James M. King, D. D., then the representative of the Evangelical Alliance and now secretary of this league, appeared before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and argued in favor of the adoption of that proposed Blair amendment. He argued earnestly for that "Christianity" which is "a part of American law," and further said:—

The Christianity which has from the beginning char-

acterized our public schools, and which properly belongs to the schools of Christian people, is thus alluded to by the Evangelical Alliance in a recent circular to the American people:—

"Touching the management of our common schools, on the purity of whose teaching depends the character of the nation, this Alliance would earnestly and respectfully entreat all who would maintain in their purity and beneficence our American institutions to have eye to the schools in their own immediate neighborhood; to cherish them with affectionate and jealous care; to guard them from partisan and sectarian manipulation; to see that the teachers are fitted for their work, morally as well as intellectually, and that they worthily appreciate the grandeur of their task in training children for their high duties as American citizens. They should clearly understand that while those duties are based upon the broad, tolerant Christianity which our country holds to be, in a modified sense, a part of the American law—the Christianity revealed in the Bible, and whose divine origin and birth are judicially recognized—a Christianity not founded upon any particular tenets, but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men—the Christian ethics and influence thus authorized and demanded in our State institutions, and least of all in our public schools, by the admission of denominational dogmas or doctrines, or of decrees or maxims at variance with American rights, American principles, or American law, or inconsistent with the fundamental American principle of a complete separation of Church and State."

AGAIN: In the winter of 1889-90 the Supreme Court of Wisconsin decided against the use of the King James version of the Bible in the public schools. The court decided thus upon the strength of the clause in the State constitution forbidding sectarian instruction in the public schools, and which forbids the State to make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. In short, the Supreme Court of Wisconsin decided against the use of the Bible in the public schools, under constitutional provisions which in substance and on their face are identical with this amendment which is proposed by the National League for the Protection of American Institutions; yet, on the eighth day of April, 1890, in the New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Dr. King, at the time general secretary of this league, as chairman of the Conference Committee on Religion and Public Education, presented a report, in which are the following statements of what the committee called "principles":—

2. That the separation of Church and State cannot

mean, under our form of government, the separation of Christian morality and the State.

3. Historically, and by the highest legal and judicial precedent, we are a Christian nation.

4. It is well settled by decisions in leading States of the Union that Christianity is a part of the common law of the State; "the American States adopted these principles from the common law of England."

5. Education consists in the symmetrical development of the whole man for the purpose of his creation. This purpose is admitted to be moral. Purely secular education is impossible in a land whose literature, history and laws are a product of a Christian civilization.

12. We repudiate as un-American and pagan, and as a menace to the perpetuity of our free institutions, the recent Supreme Court decision in the State of Wisconsin, a decision dictated and defended by the enemies of the public schools, that the reading of the Bible, without comment, is "sectarian instruction of the pupils, in view of the fact that the Bible contains numerous passages, upon some of which the peculiar creed of almost every religious sect is based. And that such passages may be reasonably understood to inculcate the doctrines predicated upon them." The enemies of the common school declare that "exclusion of the Bible would not help the matter. This would only make the schools purely secular, which were worse than making them purely Protestant." For as it regards the State, society, morality, all the interests of this world, Protestantism we hold to be far better than no religion."

In the present state of the controversy, we hold it to be the duty of the citizens of a commonwealth, Christian in its history and in the character of its laws, to deny that the Bible is a sectarian book, and to claim for it a place whenever the State attempts to educate youth for the duties of citizenship.

THE New York Times criticised this report upon the basis of the fundamental principles of the Government of the United States, which maintain the total separation of the State from religion. Thereupon, April 16, 1890, in a long letter to the Times, Hon. John Jay, then president of this league, took the Times severely to task for its criticism upon Dr. King's report.

The sole object of this letter is to prove that "Christianity is a part of American law," and that therefore Christianity and its interests must be respected and enforced by the law; and he distinctly defends the right of the State "to teach morality," "to approve the ten commandments," and "to instruct children in the law of God and the sermon on the mount." And he assumes the task of "defending American law from the charge of ignoring Christianity," which he declares "is not difficult for even a layman."

By these evidences it is plain enough that this so-called League for the Protection of American Institutions is a deceitful thing. It does not really intend to protect American institutions. It does not really intend to protect the American public school. For, while proposing that this amendment shall prohibit the State from devoting any money to any church school or institution, the league does intend that the State shall teach the Christian religion in the public school, and such other educational institutions as can be put under State control, and shall use the money of the State for that purpose. The league gives to the word "sectarian" a meaning of its own, a meaning which the word cannot fairly be made to bear, and it intends that under that interpretation, the league's views of the Christian religion shall be forced upon the people in the public schools and other places, by the State, at the public expense.

WE are not alone in the view that by interpretation this proposed amendment is to be made to enforce what it does not say. The same day on which Dr. King spoke before the Senate Committee in be-

half of the Blair amendment, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association, spoke immediately preceding Dr. King, and presented a memorial, of which the following resolution is a part:—

Resolved, That while our schools are and should be Christian no preference or advantage should be given to any one sect or denomination in connection with the public schools. Above all, no sect can justly or fairly claim any share of the public money for the support of its own sectarian schools.

This expresses the same principles precisely as those held by Dr. King and Mr. John Jay. And of this amendment that is framed and proposed by the league, the *Christian Statesman*, of which Mr. Stevenson was then editor, said:—

It ought to receive the immediate and serious support of all loyal Americans.

Then it said:—

Rightly interpreted, the foregoing amendment could not be used in any way as a lever to overthrow the Christian elements in our public schools.

By these evidences it is plain enough that if that amendment were adopted and were a part of the United States Constitution, and the United States Supreme Court should by it decide against the use of the King James version of the Bible in the public schools, as the Supreme Court of Wisconsin did, then that court would be denounced by this league as an aider and abettor of "the enemies of the common schools," and such decision would be denounced by this league as "un-American and pagan."

THE ideas of Christianity held by this league, and the King James version of the Bible, according to the views of the president and secretary of the league, are *not sectarian*. These are held to be not sectarian, because the leading Protestant denominations all agree that this is proper. With this meaning given to the word "sectarian," these denominations might establish what they would call a national university, say at Washington City. They could put it under State control and then could draw from the public treasury all the money that by any influence they could secure in support of that school, and so teach their views of Christianity in the school, just as they are now doing with the Indian church schools. All this, even though that amendment were a part of the national Constitution: because the school would not be under *ecclesiastical* control, but *State* control; and, according to their interpretation, the teaching of their views of Christianity and the Bible would not be *sectarian*.

Or, on the other hand, the United States itself might be persuaded, as Senator Edmunds' bill proposed to establish a national university, and these denominations, according to their interpretation of the word "sectarian," could have taught there, at the national expense, their views of Christianity and the Bible. And if these things were not so taught in such an institution, then, according to the "principles" of these originators and officers of this league, and these originators and promoters of this amendment, the league would repudiate the action, and even the institution, as "un-American and pagan, and a menace to the perpetuity of our free institutions."

ACCORDING to their ideas, Christianity and the Bible are not sectarian, therefore they should be taught in the public schools.

But if the question be left to the States, there will be a disagreement between them, as has already appeared in Supreme Court decisions. But if this proposed amendment should be adopted, the whole question would at once be removed from State jurisdiction and made national only. Then if a decision of the United States Supreme Court should be secured sustaining the ideas of the league, that Christianity and the Bible are not sectarian, a national religion would thus be established at one stroke. And as the Supreme Court of the United States has already unanimously declared that "this is a Christian nation," and that "we are a religious people," there is not the least room for doubt that this court would readily enough sustain the views of the league that Christianity and the Bible are not sectarian, and can therefore be taught and supported by appropriations of public money. And thus the far-reaching and dishonest purposes of this league would be accomplished. Therefore, as the ultimate object of this proposed Sixteenth Amendment is to support religion by the State, and is therefore to be used only to establish so-called Protestant or *non-sectarian* Christianity as the national religion, we have all the objection to it that we have to any other effort to establish any other form of Christianity or any other religion as the national or State religion.

So much for this proposed amendment, but we are not done with this league. There is another piece of its wickedness to be exposed. In the New York legislature of 1890, James M. King, D. D., the general secretary of this league, acting in his official capacity as such, had introduced a bill written by himself, upon the subject of public schools and compulsory education. That bill provided that even a parent could not teach his own child in his own home without first passing a successful examination "by a superintendent of schools." The bill was discussed by the Union League Club of New York City, and was referred to a committee of eight members, who were to draw up a report for the action of the club. The committee made a lengthy report, which so ably exposes the mischiefs of the bill, and the mischievous spirit of the league which framed the bill, that we reprint the main points of it. It is worthy of the most careful consideration of every person in the United States, and especially so in this connection, as the editor of the SENTINEL himself heard the author of the bill—Dr. King—declare that he would never cease his effort to secure the enactment of such a law. The report of the committee of the Union League Club, which was unanimously adopted, runs as follows:—

The Committee on Political Reform have had under consideration Assembly Bill No. 106, entitled "An Act to secure to children the benefits of an elementary education, and making an appropriation therefor," and submit the following report and resolution, and recommend their adoption:—

"This bill purports to be in favor of compulsory education and in support of the common schools. Nothing is more important or desirable to the preservation of our institutions than the universal dissemination of knowledge, and, as a means to that end, the most vigorous support of the public schools is needed, consistent with individual liberty. It is believed that every member of this club is a staunch supporter of the common school system, in common with the great body of the citizens, and would do nothing to weaken their hold upon public affection, or impair in any way their usefulness.

"The proposed bill is so extraordinary in its provisions as to require a careful and critical examination. It incorporates within it certain principles and methods

of action that are entirely inconsistent with individual liberty and the sacred rights of the family. The bill seems to be, in some measure, a substitute for the act passed in 1874, but with additional powers and limitations that make it a dangerous and vicious bill."

After describing a number of sections of the bill, the report continues:—

The bill invades the privacy of the domestic circle and supersedes the authority of the parent in the education of children of tender age, and substitutes therefor persons authorized by act of the legislature to discharge these delicate and important duties.

Although section three tolerates education in the family circle, it does not leave that to the choice and discretion of the parent, but provides that that teaching shall be under the supervision and control of a "school commissioner or a superintendent of schools, by whatever name known in the city or the State." The same section also graciously provides that in case a child is taught at home, the instruction in the branches specified in the bill shall be at least equivalent to that given in the public schools.

There is also a provision that, in case of the physical or mental condition of a child being such as to render its attendance at school inexpedient or impracticable, a physician's certificate may remit the penalty.

The general effect of the bill is to bring all matters of education, whether in the family circle or in public or private schools, under the supervision of school superintendents or school commissioners. The neglect of the duty of educating children according to these public officials is made a misdemeanor.

This bill proceeds upon the theory that the artificial and intangible body known as "the government" is a better guardian of children than those to whom they owe their existence, and that the most ignorant and incompetent public school teacher in the State is qualified to train any young child, while the most refined, intelligent, virtuous, and loving mother of that child, if for any reason she fails to obtain the consent of the school authorities, is not competent for that purpose. It calls for interference between parent and child at precisely that tender age when the character of the latter is unformed, and when it is in the most need of parental guidance and teaching. An attempt to enforce the provisions of this bill will be likely to lead to violence and breaches of the peace.

However desirable general education may be, it never can be desirable to invade the rights of parents and the sanctity of the family in the manner proposed by this act, under the guise of public instruction.

The bill specifies certain fundamental subjects of education as essential to fit a child as a member of the State. True education consists in the harmonious and symmetrical development of mind and character, and both should proceed together as far as practicable. In most cases no one is as likely to know the character of children as well as parents, and only in exceptional cases should be taken from them the absolute right to determine what and what kind of education they shall receive. The object of the public school system is to aid parents in the education of their children and not to override the parental control or usurp its place. The bill reduces parents to the humiliating position of being obliged to obtain the consent of the school authorities before they can teach their own children, or select a teacher for them at home, and to the risk of fine and imprisonment if they act without such consent. Such legislation as this tends to destroy individuality and substitutes therefor State control in matters that should always belong to the individual. It is a long step in the direction of Socialism, where all property and all individuals are placed under the direction of government.

Dr. Kittridge, of this city, recently said: "The home is the grandest university in the world, and to its wise and religious education we owe, more than to any educating influence, the scholars and patriots and benefactors of our race." This we believe to be a true statement of the value of the home and home influence; and whatever evils may exist touching the education of certain classes of our citizens, those evils cannot by any possibility justify the subversion of the homes, and homo control of children, which serve to lay the foundation for all that is best and holiest in our lives and our country.

The tendency of this bill, if enforced, will be to weaken parental authority over the children, and divide responsibility between the parents and the State authorities for their education. It is in the line of the most vicious class of legislation with which we are afflicted—that of State interference and control in matters with which the State of right ought not to interfere. However paternal the government may be, in this field it should keep its hands off. Whatever may be said in favor of enforced education of those whose education is entirely and grossly neglected, nothing can justify the public scrutiny and control of family education as contemplated by this act.

We therefore submit the following:—

Resolved, That the Union League Club deems this bill in the particulars mentioned a menacing invasion of the sacred rights of the family, in the matter of the education of children, and we request the members of

the legislature so to vote as to defeat the passage of the bill.

Signed by E. B. Hinsdale, chairman; Edward H. Ammidown, R. M. Galloway, Cephas Brainerd, Clarence C. Buel, John Jay Knox, D. B. St. John Roosa.

M. M. BUDLONG, Secretary.

Union League Club House, January 23, 1890.

Such are the purposes, the objects, and the aims of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, John Jay, president, James M. King, D. D., general secretary. As the legislation which it proposes is dangerous and vicious legislation, so the league which proposes it is a dangerous and vicious league. Instead of its being for the "protection," it is rather for the destruction of American institutions. Therefore the best thing the American people can ever do is to protect American institutions themselves, by giving no place to the dangerous and vicious designs of this dangerous and vicious National League for the Protection of American Institutions. A. T. J.

A Plea Before a Georgia Jury.

IN the trial of Messrs McCutchen and Keck, in Gainesville, Ga., for Sunday labor, which resulted in the disagreement of the jury, and the setting of the case for retrial in May, no legal counsel was employed and Mr. McCutchen occupied nearly an hour and a half in an address to the jury. This address was an earnest and effective presentation of the truths and principles which apply in the case; only a condensed statement of the points made can be given here. The counsel for the State had previously cited the law and read the statutes upon which the action was brought. Taking advantage of the fact that the statutes use the three expressions "Sunday," "Sabbath," and "Lord's day," the defendant, in his plea before the jury, declared that the work in question was not done on the Sabbath, or Lord's day, and, that, as by the very language of the statute and the indictment the realm of the Lord's things had been entered, it was proper to go the Lord's Word—the only competent authority—to show what the Lord's day is. He contended that the labor in question had not been done on the Lord's day or the Sabbath. The Lord's day and Sabbath are synonymous. They are the seventh day. But Sunday is the first day, and statutory law cannot make them the same or decide that they are the same. Neither are statutes competent to decide the question as between Sunday and Sabbath. There is but one book competent to speak upon that subject. The speaker called for the court Bible and reminded the jury that it was the identical book upon which the witnesses had been sworn; from that book he read in the 20th chapter of Exodus, beginning at the eighth verse, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." This, the only competent authority, expressly states that the seventh day is the Sabbath day.

Sunday is the first day. This is the concurrent testimony of history. Pagan and Christian recognize Sunday to be the first day of the week. The seventh day and the first day are distinct days, the Sabbath is one, Sunday is the other, therefore, that Sabbath and Sunday are different days must be conceded. Sunday is a pagan institution. The fact that the day is called Sun day shows this to be so.

This work is charged to have been done

on the Sabbath, the Lord's day. What day is the Sabbath? The seventh day. Upon what day of the week did Nov. 19, 1893 fall, the day in which it is charged this violation of the statute of Georgia took place? The first day. The question then necessarily arises as to whether the seventh day is still the Sabbath day. When a law is once enacted it remains in force until repealed. The only authority competent to repeal the law is the one that made it. You are bound to admit that the seventh day of the week is still the Sabbath unless it has been abrogated, and by divine authority. If there has been no such repeal it is a fact that the same day is the Sabbath to-day that was the Sabbath in the days of Moses.

Here the speaker entered into a detailed consideration of the passages of scripture in the New Testament referring to the first day of the week, showing in each case, from the context, that it was not the Sabbath to which reference was made. Many texts were also quoted and analyzed which spoke of the Sabbath, and contained intrinsic evidence that reference was not intended to the first day of the week. Thus the Bible was shown to give reciprocal testimony that the first day of the week is not the Sabbath, and the Sabbath is not the first day of the week.

The speaker brought explicit evidence that Christ left no record of a repeal of the law of the Sabbath, and that he and his apostles and followers observed the same seventh day during the life of Christ upon earth and after his crucifixion. He showed it to be the unanimous testimony of Scripture that the day remained the same. The custom of the apostles as to the observance of the Sabbath as found in the Acts of the Apostles was stated in detail. Indeed, in one place Paul preached in the synagogue for seventy-eight consecutive Sabbaths. If Paul preached to the Jews in the synagogue and on the Sabbath, it was necessarily on the seventh day. That he also himself actually observed the day, Acts 28:17, is conclusive proof, when he says: "Men and brethren though I have committed nothing against the people, or customs of our fathers, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans." He was addressing the Jews. He was a Jew. It was the custom of themselves and their fathers to observe the seventh day. Then in declaring that he had committed nothing at all against their custom he made a positive statement that he observed the same day they did.

This is amply sufficient to show which day the Sabbath day is both formerly, latterly, and all the way along. He who dares to say that that everlasting and eternal code in which is inscribed the Sabbath law may be changed or altered takes away the standard of all morality religion and right. In Matthew 5:17 is direct testimony that this law has not been changed: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The law of God, therefore, remains inviolate. The Sabbath has not been changed. We have not violated it, but after keeping it in conformity with scriptural direction, have worked on the first day of the week.

"As another demonstration of the identity of the Lord's day and the seventh day of the week, take two other statements

of scripture. Mark 2:28 says, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Ex. 20:10 says the seventh day is the Sabbath. Here are two plain statements of scripture which may form the premises of a syllogism thus:

"The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath. The seventh day is the Sabbath. Therefore, the Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

"Forming another syllogism, of which the above conclusion shall be the minor, we have this:

"Whatever day it is of which the Son of man is Lord, is the Lord's day.

"The Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

"Therefore, the Lord's day is the seventh day."

But there is a claim that a change has been made since the first order of things. The Lord did not make the change. Who then has attempted it? W. H. M.

(To be continued.)

The Pope as Arbiter of the World.

THE agitation having for its object the selection of the pope as arbiter of the world gains strength with passing time. The suggestion has been repeatedly and openly made by papists and very many items looking in that direction, and designed no doubt to further the movement, appear from time to time in leading periodicals. The *Review of Reviews*, for March has the following significant article:—

There are not a few signs of the moral desperation which, rightly guided, goads into a new and auspicious career. What seems to be the crying need of the hour is a great European leader, a truly international man, whom kings and statesmen and the common people in every land could trust, who, passing from court to court, from cabinet to cabinet, from one Bourse to another, could negotiate the general desire for peace into a permanent organization, who could charm national pride and sensitive national honor into loyal submission to a tribunal of international justice and international force. In default of such a modern edition of Peter the Hermit preaching the union of the nations in a crusade against war, Europe may have to wait the authoritative summons of the leagued English-speaking peoples, or the spontaneous resolve of the continental proletariat, or the cruel dictate of mutual helplessness following on devastating war. But whatever be the occasion, the one condition of settled peace remains the same: The establishment of a central court, with power to enforce its sentence. Disarmament by mutual arrangement seems scarcely possible or wise, unless accompanied or preceded by this condition. Until a man knows that the law is strong enough to protect him from injury, he can hardly be expected to give up carrying arms; and until nations know that behind the high court of international justice there is material strength enough to prevent or punish the international aggressor, they are not likely in any fit of amiable enthusiasm to disband their armies and dismantle their fortresses. That condition observed, the difficulty ought not to be insoluble. Are the powers willing to develop the concert of Europe, or such relies of it as survive, into a properly constituted judicial tribunal? If they are not willing, then there seems to be nothing for it but to let them burn in the hottest purgatory of militarism until such time as they shall be willing. A strange glint of coming possibilities showed itself last month in the Bavarian Diet. Two Ultramontane members, while denouncing the acceptance of the Army Bills, "proposed the institution of an international court of arbitration for the settlement of European quarrels, under the presidency of the pope." His holiness is said to be preparing an encyclical on the general question.

The final and everlasting judgment of the papacy is certain. But before that time comes we may expect to see that wicked power exalted to the tops of the mountains. "For God hath put in their hearts [the hearts of the rulers of Europe] to fulfill his will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the [papal] beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled." Then shall that wicked power boast her-

self, saying, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire; for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."

A Flatterer, a Deceiver, a Perverter; Such Is the Papacy.

"AND such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he pervert by flatteries." Dan. 11:32, R. V.

"To pervert is to turn from the truth; to distort the truth from its true use and end; to pervert the laws by misinterpreting and misapplying them; to pervert the meaning of an author."—*Webster*.

This is exactly that kind of work described by the prophet of God in the text quoted; and it is very far from being honorable work. Indeed it is quite the reverse. It is a work of the most disreputable kind. To turn from and twist the truth; to misinterpret and misapply law; and to turn the true meaning of an author, or a document of merit, and so deceive the people is dishonorable, contemptible and misleading.

But this is precisely what is expressed in the text; and by whom? What is represented by the pronoun "he," in this verse? In the preceding verse two desolating powers are described as the "daily" desolation, and the "abomination that maketh desolate," which for a long period were to desolate the Church of God. The two great desolating powers, which have been the scourge of the Church and of the world, are pagan and papal rule. The first was supplanted by the latter in A. D. 538; and since that time it has been the perverter of the principles of righteousness as proclaimed by that voice in Judea, which declared the utter separation of Church and State (Luke 20:25); and the rights of conscience of the individual. John 12:47. Never was this more apparent than at this present time.

How is it possible, in the light of the history of the past, that this dissolute power, the papacy, shall be able to so pervert the truth and the law—the fundamental law of the land—and as a result, pervert the people to its own perverted methods? Mark the law: "Pervert by flatteries." But notice another thing also. Those who are affected by these "flatteries," are those "who do wickedly against the covenant;" evidently those who think more of tradition—the false doctrines of the mother church, called "the wine of the wrath of her fornication;" of which all nations have drunk (Rev. 18:3);—than they do of "the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." 1st Peter 1:23. And the prophet says, "But the people that do know their God [not know about God, but know their God;] shall be strong and do. Dan. 11:32. Being assured by this that those who "know their God," shall not be perverted by these "flatteries," turn now, for a moment to the work of the flatterer.

A flatterer is "one who flatters; a fawner, a wheedler, one who praises another to accomplish some purpose." To flatter is "to raise false hopes by representations not well founded. 'How many young and careless persons are flattered out of their innocence and their property by seducing arts.'"—*Webster*.

Is not this a most faithful picture of the situation of this youthful nation and

the papacy to-day? This gigantic religious-political organization calling herself the church of Jesus Christ, and recognized by many a so-called Protestant as, at least, a branch of that church, now comes before us as the "author of religious liberty," the "protecting cordon" of "this their Republic," as the only "power" suitable "to hold up your Constitution above the storms of human passions;" none "more congenial to the spirit of your Republic;" none "more conducive to its stability than the" Roman Catholic Church. She comes as "the foe to lawlessness," the champion of law and order," and "the saviour of society." She comes before us as the friend of education, assuring us that "Catholic education is the surest safeguard of permanence" to the Constitution, and "the best guide of the Republic in civil progress," and that "every Catholic school is a safe guardian of youth," and that "she is the fostering mother of the arts and sciences," and that Pope Leo "encourages scholarship by the establishment of universities or by giving them his blessing."

This "flatterer" would fain make us believe that she is the workingman's friend and protector; for "Leo XIII. has shown his love for the workingman." She comes saying: "We love liberty"!! for the church "grows and expands like the rose under the genial sun and air of liberty." And she professes "remarkable friendship for the republican system of government." All this is but a fulfillment of the words of the Spirit of God spoken through his prophet centuries ago. These are the words of a flatterer, words uttered for a purpose, and that, the purpose of the subjugation of this Government. And under this stupefying potion the sensibilities of professed Protestants are fast being benumbed. They have perverted the supreme law of the land, so that, to them it no longer means what it says; and so it stands, as misinterpreted, but a hollow mockery of those principles of which it has been regarded as the champion and safeguard. Yes, they have adopted the methods of the mother church in seeking and securing legislative recognition of a dogma of the mother, a religious institution—the Sunday—which is Church and State union, and spiritual adultery. They have set up the very image of the papacy, and now they talk just like her, manifesting the same spirit of egotism and presumption, and do not hesitate to claim to be the most law-abiding people of the land, the most loyal, the most patriotic.

H. F. PHELPS.

St. Paul, Minn.

Rome vs. History.

A VIGOROUS, and probably successful, protest has been filed with the Board of Education in San Francisco, against the use of "Myers' Outlines of Mediæval and Modern History," as a text book in the high schools of that city. While the Catholics deny having anything to do with the filing of the protest, the history is objected to solely on the ground that it is extremely offensive to Catholics. No objection is made that the history is not a correct and truthful delineation of the events which actually transpired, but simply that the position which the Roman Church occupies is not pleasing to contemplate. Appeal is made to the fact that the book, in so far as it refers to the Catholic Church, comes within the purview of the State constitution, which

provides that no sectarian book shall be used in the public schools. The author of the protest admits that it is impossible to give a complete history of those times without referring to the Roman Church, and displays extreme sensitiveness that nothing but what is creditable to the Catholic Church be published. Any departure from this is looked upon as treading upon forbidden ground, and an infringement of rights. A comparison of the difference between countries in which the Roman Church for a long time has had full and undisputed sway, and those where the masses of the people have belonged to the Protestant persuasion, is particularly objectionable. The statements in the book that "the church through popes and councils, had committed itself to the doctrine that the earth is flat and denounced as irreverent and heretical any view differing from this," are branded as "flat-footed falsehoods."

The whole book is characterized as a skillful attempt to prejudice the minds of the young against Catholicism, and, in the words of the protest, "is in reality adapted for a fifth rate Protestant college, or an anti-popery Sunday school."

About six years ago the use of "Swinton's History" was so violently opposed by the Catholic clergy for similar reasons, that its use in the schools was discontinued.

E. E. PARLIN.

A Christian(?) Lobbyist at Work.

THE real spirit of the promoters of the religious amendment is shown by the fact that they are endeavoring to prevent the committee from hearing the objections to the proposed amendment. The methods adopted are worthy of ward politicians, and yet they are unblushingly told in the *Christian Reformer* of March 3, by H. H. George, who is engineering the iniquitous business. Not having the paper of that date at hand, we borrow from an exchange a synopsis of Mr. George's boastful confession.

He begins his report of a day's labor with, "Well, I have gotten in some splendid work to-day." What this preacher calls "splendid" work an ordinary politician would designate wire-pulling, and the world would add that it was wire-pulling of the most unscrupulous sort. He says that he first met Judge Culberson, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, who said he would do all he could to secure the Reformers a prompt and full meeting of the committee. Then he saw Representative Stone, of Pennsylvania, who "is most cordial and hearty, and says he will do everything he can to get the committee together, and will help us in every way he can." Mr. Stone is surprised that some members of the committee are opposed to the amendment; he does "not see how they can be, for it is right." Mr. Wolverton, of Pennsylvania, is seen; he is "quite as cordial and hearty," "will help all he can," and "volunteered to gather the committee."

Then Mr. George went over to the other end of the capitol. He saw Judge Pugh, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and found that gentleman "most cordial." Mr. George asked him if he would appoint his sub-committee for Wednesday. Why, certainly, he would; "glad to accommodate us." Rev. Mr. George continues his charmingly frank narrative. "And after a little very pleasant conversation, I said, 'Judge, would it

be improper, as I am acquainted with Senator Wilson, of Iowa, to suggest that he be one of the sub-committee?'" Instead of telling the clerical lobbyist that such a request was highly improper, and that he could not for a moment think of packing the sub-committee in the interest of any combination, chairman Pugh responded with alacrity, "He shall be so appointed, at your request." We do not believe that Senator Pugh will thank Mr. George for telling the whole country about this little game. The most hardened Tammanyite would blush to make such a confession. Packing a jury is morally and legally a crime, and packing a committee is the same morally, even if it is not legally. Is this a sample of the "purification of politics" that the "reign of Christ over the nation" is to give us?

Mr. George went from Senator Pugh to Senator Wilson, whom he apprised of his assignment to the sub-committee. The Iowa Senator "accepted it kindly; will be very willing to serve, and his heart is right on all such questions." Mr. Elijah Morse, of Massachusetts, was the next friend of the amendment seen, and was found "brimful of interest." He at once called his stenographer, and dictated a letter to each member of the committee, insisting (*he is not a member of the committee*) that each one should be there on Tuesday morning.

He also sent word to Culberson saying that the two hours of that day would be for the friends of the cause; and if there should be opponents present, they might look out for another time. [Does Mr. Morse run all the committees in that way?—Ed.] I said: "Would it not be better for us to divide the time with them and meet them?" "No," he said, "you have the grip on the subject; hold to it, and put in all your force. If they should get another time, we can perhaps be heard again. You must come that week prepared to stay all week."

Our contemporary to which we are indebted for this synopsis of Mr. George's remarkable confession, concludes with this pertinent question: "What do you think of all this, Freethinkers and honest Christians who love religious liberty and believe in fair play in politics?"

Church Taxation and Sunday Cars.

Two or three years since a congregation of Baptists in Toronto, Canada, refused to accept exemption from taxation for their church property, and now a movement is on foot in that city to tax all such property. The following editorial from one of the Toronto papers states the main facts:—

THE CLERGY AND EXEMPTIONS.

Some of the clergymen who took such an active part last summer in preventing half the citizens of Toronto from exercising their personal freedom on Sundays have now made a descent upon the legislature to protest against the proposal to rescind the section of the Municipal Act under which churches are exempted from municipal taxation. We can understand a benighted individual becoming conscientiously possessed of the idea that it is a sin to use the street cars on Sunday, for some very queer ideas are begotten of religious enthusiasm. But we fail to conceive how any man professing Christianity can argue in favor of a law that compels the poor man who attends no church to contribute towards the support of the churches of the wealthy. The Church should be the very fountain of justice. Instead of that we see its priests dishonoring their high calling by petitioning Caesar to make others help to pay the taxes that justly are chargeable to themselves. The Founder of the Church himself would never have dragged his holy cause through the mire like this. In fact, he issued a distinct pronouncement to the contrary. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's" are his own words, and the barefaced way in which the ministers of this city come forward and publicly counsel disobedience to that command tends to cast discredit on their profession.

In the case of the Sunday car movement they handicapped Christianity with inconsistency and inhumanity. To-day they are weighing it down with a further handicap in the shape of injustice, as indefensible as it is petty.

It is evident that the Toronto ministers are looking out for their own interests. No Sunday cars means larger congregations and larger collections, while no taxes means more money for the Sunday preachers. Has not the prophet Isaiah well described such ministers in these words? "They are greedy dogs which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, every one for his own gain, from his quarter."

Now for Purer(?) Politics in Indiana.

THE Indianapolis *News* of March 8, gives an account of a religious movement, designed to influence political parties in the interests of moral reform, that has now reached that place. The movement comes from the young people's societies of the various churches, without regard to denomination. These include the Christian Endeavor Society, the Young People's Society, the Epworth League, the Baptist Young People's Union, and the St. Andrew's Brotherhood. These societies, massed together, are called the Christian Alliance. It is stated that a chief object of this alliance is to influence political nominating conventions and that it will endeavor to make itself felt before the time set for the State convention to be held in Indianapolis. Arrangements have been made to have a mass meeting with revival services, to be held for a week just before the political conventions. All the churches in the city will be asked to help support the movement.

The Christian Endeavor Society has circulated a paper which is called a roll of honor, and to which it gets all the signers possible. The pledge is as follows:—

Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for direction, we promise him that we will never indulge in any intoxicants or tobacco, nor use profane or impure language, nor violate the obligations of social purity or the Sabbath; and when we vote it shall be as we think Christ would have us vote; and we will pray each day for God to help us to keep this pledge, and that the saloon, gambling room, and other places of evil resort shall be banished from the land.

It is stated that this pledge and the work is undenominational and that "the Knights of Father Matthew of the Catholic Church, and other organizations interested in good citizenship, will meet together and act in unity." The largest hall in the city has been rented and a mass meeting will be held, lasting from April 15 to the 21st, which is just a few days before the Republican convention to be held there. On the Sunday evening that the revival opens, all the churches in the city will be asked to dispense with their regular services, so that the congregations may attend the mass meeting. The *News* states that "it is probable that the alliance will make some definite expression concerning political conventions, and warning them that they cannot expect the support of the alliance unless certain demands of good citizenship are complied with."

There are persons in Indianapolis who cannot give their support to this movement, and cannot sign the "roll of honor," who will very likely be accused of not being "interested in good citizenship" when they do not join in this movement.

This movement is much the same as that

going on in other States, as, for example, where the Young People's Christian Endeavor Society in Illinois has entered politics, one of its chief objects being the "preservation of the American Sabbath" by that means.

These young people's endeavors to Christianize society will fall quite short of their aims as long as their weapons are those of the world, such as coöperation with or threats against scheming politicians who will or will not yield to their demands.

It is quite significant to see what means have to be adopted to secure the "preservation of the American Sabbath." Surely a thing that has never been sound enough to stand alone would need a pretty strong preservative with which to preserve it.

L. A. HANSEN.

More Sunday Legislation in Massachusetts.

THE effort to tone up our Massachusetts Sunday laws, because part of the community who think those whose views differ from them as to the sacred character of the day, are having altogether too much religious liberty, found expression in the following bill, a hearing on which was given, before the joint judiciary committee, Feb. 28:—

Whoever in any way manages, performs, or takes part in any entertainment, musicale, show or performance of any kind, nature, or description in any theater, museum or hall on the Lord's day, except sacred concerts under the auspices and for the benefit of any church or religious society, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$200.

The intolerant spirit back of this bill is worthy of the Dark Ages. Every one must be denied the privilege of any entertainment in any theater, hall or museum, upon Sunday, except such as are approved by the churches and are for their benefit. Such monstrous infringements upon the rights of others, in these times of gospel light, as this bill presented and advocated in the Massachusetts legislature is, is certainly a marked evidence of the decadence of the spirit of both civil and religious liberty. Elders R. C. Porter, Geo. E. Field, and others, remonstrated against the bill.

GEO. B. WHEELER.

Steadying the Ark by Preamble.

JUST now there is another of the periodical spasms of anxiety about the name and being of God, in congressional circles, and Massachusetts leads the would-be pious campaign. Senator Frye and Representative Morse have introduced resolutions looking towards the introduction of God into the Constitution of the United States. These people would like to make of us a Christian nation by an act of Congress; legislate piety into our people. Granting for argument's sake that there is cause for this religious nervousness, the remedy proposed is childish. What imbecility of spirit is that that would undertake to stay the throne of the Eternal by a preamble? Chemistry cannot be made theistic by inscribing on the laboratory walls, "In God we trust," nor can astronomy be made devout by engraving a hymn upon the tube of the telescope. A pious creed does not necessarily make a pious church. The word "God" in the Constitution, or a Christian amendment to the same, will not change the prayerless hearts in the nation. The Government cannot be made theistic upon the adoption of a

resolution by godless senators and the approval of the same perhaps by a profane president. Let Massachusetts lead in some better way.—*Unity (Unitarian).*

Like Priest, Like People.

THE following dispatch from Algona, Iowa, under date of March 13, published in the *New York Sun* of the 14th, is a pertinent commentary on the boastful claim of Rome that she is best promoter of Christian civilization:—

Father Eckert, the German Catholic priest at Wesley, indicted for keeping a nuisance and selling liquor contrary to law, pleaded guilty to-day and was fined \$300 and costs, the smallest fine that could be made by the court. The priest built a large church sometime ago, and being heavily in debt, a number of festivals and fairs were given and a barroom was arranged in the basement, where the priest dispensed intoxicating liquors to his thirsty parishioners and others. The citizens of Wesley have circulated a petition asking Governor Jackson to have the priest's fine revoked.

Remember the priest was not fined for his religion, nor for doing anything that was in any way connected with his religion, but for violating the excise law. If the governor remits the fine how can he refuse to remit all fines imposed for similar offenses, unless indeed the State of Iowa proposes to establish the precedent of permitting Rome to ride roughshod over the statutes of the State for the purpose of increasing her revenues.

The Traitor Political Church.

[This correct statement of the work and purposes of the political church is from the *Truth Seeker*. Its words are true and they are none too earnest. Why should not one who sees unrighteousness so clearly be able eventually to fathom the mystery of righteousness?]

WHAT is being done by the theocrats to push the Christian amendment? Meetings in furtherance of the movement have been held in a number of cities and towns, especially in Pennsylvania; at one meeting \$225 was raised for the work in Washington, and \$180 more for the same work was reported in one issue of the *Christian Reformer*, besides more than \$400 for the general work of the National Reform Association; a mass meeting was held in Pittsburg on March 2nd, and it was expected that a large delegation would go to Washington from that meeting and be present as a moral backing at the hearing on the 6th inst. So many are going that special railway fares and hotel rates in Washington were secured; while the amendment is pending, a monthly, the *Constitutional Amendment*, will be issued and also a new weekly series of National Reform documents (the "Christian Amendment Series"); subscriptions are being solicited to send these documents to all the ministers and other influential persons throughout the Union; the association wishes to send out each week one hundred thousand copies of the smaller document and the same number each month of the larger one; petitions are being widely circulated; all friends of the treasonable scheme are urged to write letters to their representative and senators, and it is expected that hundreds of telegrams will be received by the members of the House Judiciary Committee from March 5th to 7th. These are some of the measures being taken to "arouse the public conscience" in order to intimidate Congress and so secure a favorable report from the Judiciary Committee. The enemy is splendidly organized, is under perfect discipline, is fanatically enthusiastic, and

in the final struggle at the polls or elsewhere can depend upon the dormant yet powerful superstitions of millions of Christian men and women who may now think that they are opposed to the demands of the National Reform Association, but who will find it impossible to resist the Christian appeal to their early teachings and their fears—"He that is not for me is against me."

Now we know what is before us—a long and stubbornly contested fight to preserve the most important parts of the national Constitution and with them our dearest rights as American citizens and free students in the great world-school of thought. All that our ancestors wrested by the force of brain and the might of the strong right arm from noble and priest and king is at stake. The traitor political church has once more flung herself at the white throat of liberty. Her murderous hand must be wrenched away at whatever cost. She must be thrust back into her place and taught to respect the rights of the people. She says government is from God, by which euphemism she means herself. We say all just government is of the people, and when she attempts to usurp their authority she does so at her peril.

Depew and Leo.

It will be remembered that some months since, Chauncey M. Depew visited Rome and was accorded an audience by the pope. Mr. Depew seems to be very proud of his "gracious" reception by "his holiness," and has apparently improved every opportunity to tell of it. The most recent of these was an entertainment given Monday evening, March 12, by the Catholic Club of this city, at which Mr. Depew was not only an honored guest, but the principal orator. The *Sun* thus tells the story:—

Dr. Depew began speaking at 8:30 o'clock, and he kept his hearers laughing and applauding for two hours. On the platform where he stood sat Archbishop Satolli, Archbishop Corrigan, Bishop Gabriels of Ogdensburg, Vicar-General Mooney, John D. Crimmins, President Fornes of the club, Judge Daly, Judge O'Brien, Joseph Thoron, Mgr. Farley, and R. L. Hoguet. In the audience were almost all the pastors of the city.

Dr. Depew spoke mainly of his visit to Italy. He told of what he had seen of Rome, and he invoked the shade of Baedeker as he described the many monuments and churches. Then he told of Pompeii and of the home life of that town as he had seen it, and he rehearsed many Pompeian jokes, which the audience greeted heartily.

"And when I got back to Rome," continued Dr. Depew, "I found that I had a strong desire to see the pope. I was told that this was impossible as the pope was a very busy man. A friendly bishop explained to me that delegations who came to Rome to see his holiness on important clerical matters frequently waited months before they could secure an audience. But I persisted and wrote a letter, which my friend, the bishop, said he would have delivered to the proper person. He added that I need not expect any answer, as private audiences had been discontinued. Two hours later, however, the bishop returned, saying that the pope would receive me the following day at noon.

"We arrived at the Vatican some time before the appointed hour, and as we ascended the many broad staircases of the palace we were saluted by the gorgeously uniformed Swiss guard, and finally we were met by servants in crimson livery, who conducted us further. We passed through a number of audience chambers, and finally stopped in a room near where the pope would see me. A monsignor came out and talked with me. He was a young man who spoke several languages, and he was one of the most interesting men I ever met. Being an American and a Protestant I asked him what the ceremony would be when I entered the papal presence. He said that it was customary for the visitor to fall upon his knees and kiss the pope's ring and receive the papal blessing, but he added that he would find out how this would be in my case. He returned shortly and announced that the pope's desire was that the interview should be ex-

actly as if I were being received by the President of the United States.

"I wondered how the pope knew what the ceremony of the White House was, as he had never been out of Rome, but in a few moments I was ushered in. His holiness arose and offered me his hand, then he told me to sit down, and sat down himself beside me. I was somewhat embarrassed as to what I should say, but I started in by thanking him for receiving me, and I told him how the many thousand men who are employed by the corporation I represented, two-thirds of whom were Catholics, would be pleased to hear of this audience on my return to America. This suggested the subject of capital and labor, and the pope started in to speak on that subject. It was the most eloquent speech I have ever heard. I would not do justice to it if I tried to repeat it to you. The soul of it was that all men should follow the Golden Rule, and remember that, being born of one Father, they must in the end stand before the same Father in judgment."

After the address supper was served to the distinguished guests in one of the dining rooms, and the other guests found seats in the many rooms of the club house and enjoyed cake and champagne.

It is not stated how many of the "pastors" of the city partook of the champagne, but the presence of so many "Protestant" ministers at such an entertainment is sufficiently significant in itself. It is certainly an omen of the fulfillment of that prophecy which says of the papal beast: "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

No Distinctively Religious Garb in the Pittsburg Schools.

At the meeting of the Municipal Board of Education of the city of Pittsburg, Pa., March 13, the subject of the dress of the nuns who teach in the Riverside public school came up. After a short discussion the following was passed by a vote of twenty-nine to three:—

Resolved, That the wearing by any of the teachers in the schools of this city during school hours in the school rooms of any garb or dress distinctive of and indicating any religious order, or any attachments or adornment on their person symbolic of any such order, or of any of the teachings of any particular religion or creed, is sectarian within the spirit and meaning of section 2, article 10, of the constitution of this State. viz: "No money raised for the support of the public schools in the commonwealth shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school."


This action is right. The fact that an individual is a member of a religious order should not be a bar to becoming a teacher, but to permit the wearing, in public schools, of distinctive garbs and symbols, which have, and are designed to have, a distinctively religious and sectarian influence, is clearly contrary to the spirit of American institutions.

Romanists After the Regency.

THERE promises to be an interesting fight over the election of a Regent of the University to succeed the late Bishop McNierny, of this city. Among the candidates are Rev. Mr. Malone, of Brooklyn; Bishop Gabriels, of Ogdensburg, and Bishop McQuade, of Rochester, all Roman Catholics. The argument is made that as the deceased regent was a Romanist his successor should be of that faith.

Rowland Blennerhassett Mahony, of Buffalo, ex-Minister to Ecuador, was here yesterday lobbying against the candidacy of Bishop McQuade. He is supposed to be representing Bishop Ryan, of the Buffalo diocese. Bishop McQuade is an enemy of the public school system, while Bishop Ryan stands for the liberal and Americanized element in the church.—*Mail and Express, February 28.*

THE PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS.



This work is complete in one large octavo volume, and is a careful compilation of all of the proceedings—at once a fascinating story and a book of universal value. The book gives the origin of the Parliament of Religions; proceedings of every meeting of the Parliament; speeches delivered and papers read at every session of the noted gathering; the beliefs of the various religious denominations; opinions of eminent divines in regard to the Parliament; influence of the Parliament upon the religious thought of the world. Published by F. T. Neely, Chicago.

1000 pages. Price: Cloth, \$2.50.

We have made arrangements with the publisher so that we can offer this book to our subscribers, together


WITH THE AMERICAN SENTINEL FOR \$2.75,

only 25 cents more than the price of the book alone. This offer applies to either new subscriptions or to renewals. We will supply this book alone at the regular price, \$2.50.

This book is not offered because we approve the Parliament of Religions, but because it is a history of one of the most remarkable and significant religious gatherings ever held.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, 43 Bond Street, New York, N. Y.

THE COMPLETE VEST-POCKET LIBRARY



STANDS PRE-EMINENT,

In that while it is no larger than the average of such books, and of convenient size to carry in the vest-pocket, it gives, besides other useful information, THE CORRECT SPELLING AND PRONUNCIATION OF 45,863 WORDS, OR ABOUT TWICE AS MANY AS ANY SIMILAR WORK.

As its name indicates, it is much more than a dictionary. It contains:—

1. THE COLUMBIAN WORD BUILDER, a very simple and yet exceedingly useful device which more than doubles the capacity of the dictionary.
2. GUIDE TO PRONUNCIATION.
3. A VERY FULL LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.
4. THE COLUMBIAN PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY AND SPELLER (135 pages).
5. THE COLUMBIAN PRONOUNCING AND STATISTICAL GAZETTEER OF THE WORLD.
6. THE COLUMBIAN DIGEST OF PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE.
7. THE COLUMBIAN RAPID CALCULATOR, AND COMPEND OF BUSINESS AND SOCIAL FORMS.
8. THE COLUMBIAN PERPETUAL MEMORANDUM, STAMP BOOK AND THREE YEARS' Calendar.
9. TABLES OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The whole forms a book only 5 1/4 by 2 3/4 inches and only three-eighths of an inch thick.

In Leather, 50c; Cloth, 25c.


Address Pacific Press, 43 Bond Street, New York City.

SMITH'S DICTIONARY of the BIBLE.

EDITED BY WM. SMITH, L.L.D.

COMPRISING ITS ANTIQUITIES, BIOGRAPHY, GEOGRAPHY, AND NATURAL HISTORY.

Price, \$2.00.



This work contains every name in the Bible respecting which anything can be said; over 500 engravings, and is a complete guide to the pronunciation and signification of scriptural names; the solution of difficulties of interpretation, authority and harmony; also a history and description of Biblical customs, manners, events, places, persons, animals, plants, minerals, etc., and comprises a most complete encyclopedia of Biblical information.

FATHERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY 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. " 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 for \$1.00.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET.

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

It perfectly secures pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it can not 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.	Sealskin, " 2 "	15c.
No. 4.	" " " 3 "	25c.
No. 5.	Russia leather, for 4 "	25c.
No. 6.	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.

CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE—A dictionary, and alphabetical index to the Bible. Cloth, \$1.25. Sheep, \$2.50.

Order of PACIFIC PRESS,

Or Oakland, Cal. 43 Bond Street, New York City

Health, Pleasure and Business.

Travel on the Famous Trunk Line and Picturesque

WEST SHORE RAILROAD.

Wagner Buffet Sleeping Cars on fast express trains between New York, Kingston, Albany, Utica, Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Toronto, Detroit, Cleveland and Chicago.

Address for rates, time tables and other information:

C. E. LAMBERT, General Passenger Agent, 5 Vanderbilt Ave., New York City.



NEW YORK, MARCH 22, 1894.

ANY ONE receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

HENRY W. BLAIR, will, it is said, soon introduce into the House a bill for a national Sunday law.

THE *Christian Patriot* says that Catholic priests and "Protestant" pastors are working together in Wisconsin for a better observance of Sunday.

WILL the person who sent us the article entitled, "Rome in Ireland, and as She Will Be in America," please send his name. The article is without signature, and we have forgotten, if we ever knew, who sent it.

THE American Sabbath Union, so-called, has issued a circular suggesting that on the first day of April next the observance of Sunday be made the subject of special instruction and prayer, as has been the custom for several years past.

OUT of nineteen items in the column of "Secular News," in a late issue of the *Christian Standard*, ten have reference to the legal enforcement of Sunday closing. This is indicative of the proportionate stress laid upon the "secular" religion.

THE Judiciary Committee of the Senate and House will not hear anything further upon the proposition to insert a religious amendment into the preamble of the Constitution, at present. It is understood, however, that no action will be taken without giving a full opportunity to those who oppose the amendment to state the grounds of their opposition before the committees.

THE question of Sunday street cars in Toronto will not down, and so the friends of a puritanic Sunday are appealing to the legislature to interfere in the matter and enact a law to prevent repeated submissions of the question to the people. This is characteristic of the Sunday movement throughout. The Sunday leaders are willing that the people should rule only when that rule is in favor of Sunday.

REPRESENTATIVE MEIKLEJOHN, of Nebraska, has reported from the House Committee on Public Lands a bill authorizing the issue of a patent to the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions for certain lands on the Omaha Indian Reservation. Meiklejohn's report was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union. Commenting upon this statement, for which the *Congressional Record* is authority, an exchange remarks:—

The union between Church and State, we presume, is the "union" to which reference is made; at least, that would be a fair inference from the nature of the report. The bestowal of public lands upon the Church is no new thing. Just here the question arises: Has Congress authority to give to a church any portion of an Indian reservation without the formal consent of the tribe to which the land belongs? But if the land in question is United States property, there is no question about the illegality of such action as that recommended in Mr. Meiklejohn's report.

We understood that the Presbyterians had decided not to accept any more appropriations from the Government. It is true that good resolve referred to money, but is not the same principle involved? Is there any essential difference between accepting money and demanding land?

MARCH 11, an attempt was made in Indianapolis, Ind., to blow up the office of the *Ironclad Age*, about the wickedest paper in the United States. The office is heated by natural gas, which was turned on and a single jet left burning so that an explosion must have occurred but for the timely arrival of the editor. It is to be regretted exceedingly that any one calling himself a Christian would imagine for a moment that there is any possible justification for such an act. The outrage was the conception of a dastard, not of a Christian.

REGARDING the progress of Roman Catholicism in the great metropolis of the central United States, *Donahoe's Magazine* says:—

Chicago's Catholic population comprised in 1833 only two hundred souls; to-day it is more than half a million. This phenomenal progress of Catholicity within such a comparatively short space of time is without parallel in the history of any church. . . . The onward march of the Catholic Church, within its limits, has been proportionately swifter and steadier than that of the city itself.

The boast contained in this last sentence is not without foundation; the same thing is as true of other growing centers of population in this country as it is of Chicago.

THE *Catholic Mirror* gives this startling evidence of its comprehension of prophecy and understanding of the lessons of history:—

Yes, there will be revolts, insurrections and rebellions at the sound of the tocsin of anarchy, the torch of the incendiary will be applied to the capitalist's property as well as the dynamiter's bomb to his life; they will seek revenge and will find it; but neither in that ignoble satisfaction nor in compliance with the other desire of their heart, will they have the liberty for which they pant. . . . They will do a bloody work, to their own destruction; but they will also do God's work, for they will purify the elect, and separate the wheat from the chaff. . . . Meanwhile let society awaken; . . . The approaching deluge can be averted as little as the persecution of the Christians during the first ages, or the French Revolution could be prevented. It will come. For it seems to belong to the designs of Providence and the plan of history.

Now let the *Mirror* look as clearly into

the prophetic part that the great religious organization, of which it is a mouthpiece, is to play in this approaching deluge of violence.

"SPIRITUALISM," says the *Catholic Review*, "is rapidly developing into a recognized religion and will shortly put on all the trappings of separate congregations. In Baltimore, Mrs. Rachel Wolcott has been installed as pastor of the First Spiritualistic Church of that city, and has already a fairly large body of parishioners. Indeed, that devilish deceit is making progress in the Monumental City and has led astray a number of persons who ought to be well-instructed Catholics. They have been misled by the genuine revelations made at seances to take the fallen angels for what they claimed to be—the spirits of the dead—and once admit that they are what they claim and that they are trustworthy in their statements and the end is abandonment of Christianity, the denial of the divinity of Christ, rejection of belief in the orthodox heaven and hell, and the acceptance of all the inventions of those children of the father of lies."

Spiritualism is certainly all that the *Catholic Review* claims that it is, namely, intercourse with fallen angels; but Rome has no right to take issue with Spiritualism. With her doctrine of natural, inherent immortality, conscious state of the dead, prayers to saints, patron saints, etc., how can Rome successfully meet Spiritualism? She cannot, and will ere-long practically unite with that delusion for the purpose of receiving from her "saints" confirmation of her unscriptural dogmas. Only those who believe as the Scriptures declare, "that the dead know not anything," can successfully withstand the assaults of this modern devil worship.

APRIL 5, we shall commence the publication of a series of articles, which will be devoted to the examination of some of the fundamental errors of the Roman Catholic Church. Among the subjects discussed will be, Justification by faith or penance, which? Infallibility, where is it found? The real presence, in what does it consist? etc. Everybody, both Protestant and papist, ought to read these articles; certainly, no Sabbath-keeper can afford to miss them; and there can be no better missionary work among Catholics than supplying them with the papers containing these articles.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single copy, per year, - - - \$1.00.

In clubs of	5 to 24 copies to one address, per year.	- - - 90c
"	25 to 99 " " " " " "	- - - 80c
"	100 to 249 " " " " " "	- - - 75c
"	250 to 499 " " " " " "	- - - 70c
"	500 to 999 " " " " " "	- - - 65c
"	1000 or more " " " " " "	- - - 60c
To foreign countries in Postal Union,		5 shillings
Address,	AMERICAN SENTINEL,	
	49 Bond Street, New York City.	