



"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 8, 1894.

NUMBER 10.

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, GALVIN P. BOJLMAN,
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is Christian.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is Protestant.

AND the AMERICAN SENTINEL is American.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is therefore everlastingly and uncompromisingly opposed to every element and every principle of the papacy wherever, and in whatever guise, it may appear.

AND being Christian, Protestant, and American, the opposition of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to the papacy, whether in the guise of a professed Protestantism or in her own proper dress, always has been, and always will be, conducted upon strictly Christian, Protestant and American principles.

THIS subject of opposition to the papacy in the United States needs to be very carefully studied, lest it be done in such a way as to really help her instead of hindering her. The papacy needs to be opposed and must be opposed in her designs upon the United States and the world as well as in every other thing. But this opposition, to avail anything, must be made upon right principles and must be conducted in the right way.

IF opposition to the papacy be conducted upon unchristian principles, it will only increase her antichristian power and influence. If this opposition be conducted upon unprotestant principles the only effect will be to make more widespread the influence of Catholicism. The papacy is un-American, it is true, but if opposition to her is conducted on un-American principles her un-American power and influence is only increased, her hold upon the country is more confirmed, and her taking possession of the country is only hastened.

THEREFORE it is that this question of

opposing the papacy requires the most careful thought upon the part of all who would engage in it, lest they be found really aiding her while professedly opposing her, and while really intending to oppose her. This is true in the case at any time, because of the exceeding subtlety of her workings; but now it is doubly true, because, in addition to the subtlety of her workings, she has, as we showed last week, such a clear field and such an immense advantage in every way, for the carrying forward of her avowed purpose to possess America for herself.

It has been seriously proposed to disfranchise Catholics in the United States who will not renounce allegiance to the pope. *But this could never be done on any American principle.* The Catholic's allegiance to the pope is a religious matter—it is a spiritual thing. And to deny or curtail political right on account of religious profession is clearly and entirely un-American. It is a fundamental principle, as well as a constitutional provision, of the Government of the United States, that religious profession shall never have any bearing upon civil rights or political qualifications. To the Catholic the pope is in the place of God, and is the representative of God: he *believes* that allegiance to the pope is allegiance to God. And it is in this sense that the Catholic professes and holds allegiance to the pope. This cannot fairly be denied. His allegiance to the pope is therefore a religious thing, it is a religious profession, and is to him an essential part of his worship as to God. And to propose to abridge his political rights on account of his allegiance to the pope, is therefore plainly to deny civil or political right *on account of religious profession*, and is therefore just as clearly unconstitutional and un-American.

It will not do to say in answer to this, although it be perfectly true, that the pope's claims to be the representative of God, or to *be* God, are a fraud and an imposture, and therefore the Catholic's belief in the pope and his allegiance to him are a fallacy and are indeed really *nothing* religiously. This is all true, but that does not touch the point here. The Catholic *believes* and *religiously* believes

that the pope's claims are genuine, and that his prerogatives are divine: that is the Catholic's religious profession. And the point is that he has the inalienable right to *believe thus* and to hold this religious profession, without question or molestation from any source or for any cause. It is a fundamental American principle and sound American doctrine, that for "each one to believe for himself and to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience is an inalienable right." And that "our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, more than on our opinions in physics or geometry; that therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to the offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow-citizens, he has a natural right." This, we say, is sound and fundamental American principle and doctrine. And therefore it is clear that any proposition to make the Catholic's allegiance to the pope a test or impediment against any civil or political right is decidedly un-American. Consequently, any such method as that of opposing the papacy in the United States not only will not succeed but will actually aid her, in that it subverts fundamental principles and breaks down constitutional safeguards. And when these are subverted and broken down for *any cause whatever*, they are subverted and broken down for every cause—they are indeed no more, and the nation becomes but the prey of the violent and the most violent take it by force. Such procedure can only hasten the success and supremacy of the papacy. And therefore the AMERICAN SENTINEL, being American, and opposed to the papacy, can never indorse, nor engage in, any such method of "opposition."

BISHOP COXE proposed another method of "opposition" to the papacy, which is worth notice, not only because it is an example of how *not* to do it, but because it has been quite widely indorsed. We have given in these columns the bishop's clear statement of the situation as regards

the papacy in the United States, and have given him credit for it. And we also give him credit for good intentions regarding opposition to the papacy. But as his raising the alarm is robbed of its force by the fact of his having helped to create the alarming situation, so his proposed opposition is robbed of all its force by the method which he proposes. Here is his proposition as made in his second open letter to Satolli:—

When Buddhists shall have 500,000 votes from this country, we shall find out how to prohibit the Grand Llama from sending his "ablegate" here to control them. You may force us to make a general law applicable to the pope and the Grand Llama alike.

But how such a law could be made in accordance with any American principle the bishop does not attempt to say, even if he ever took time to think on that phase of the subject. Such a law as Bishop Coxe suggests could not possibly be anything else than a law respecting an establishment of religion and prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Such a law therefore would be in direct violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution, which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And that the bishop means just such a law, as indeed there could be no other, is made certain by his own words in the sentences immediately following the one above quoted. Here are his words to Satolli:—

Now, look at the French law, established by the First Consul and accepted by the pope himself. Here it is textually translated:—

No individual calling himself nuncio, legate, vicar or commissary apostolic, or availing himself of any other denomination, shall, without the authorization of the Government, exercise any function relative to the affairs of the Gallican Church upon the soil or anywhere else.

Any such law as that would be at once to make the Government the head of all religion, which would be but the papacy under another form and under another head. The enactment of any such law, either in word or in principle, would be, at that one stroke, to sweep away every principle of the Government as established by those who made the Government. It would be, at that one stroke, to destroy the Government as it was founded upon American, Protestant, and Christian principles, and to set up in its place a government committed to and actuated by papal principles only. That it would be done by professed Protestants would alter neither the principle nor the prospect. Professed Protestants have done such things before. And in all such instances the only thing that ever kept them from being, in all respects, like the papacy itself, was only the limitations upon their power. The only thing that ever kept John Calvin from being to the fullest extent like Innocent the Third, was that he did not have the power of Innocent the Third. The only thing that ever kept either the Puritans of England or of New England, or the Episcopalians of England or Maryland, from being, in all respects, like the papacy, as they were in so many respects, was that they did not have the power of the papacy. And if the principles here announced by Bishop Coxe should prevail in the United States, we have no assurance that the people would be any better off under the superintendence of Bishop Coxe than they would be under Archbishop O'Flannagan or Cardinal O'Mulligan. And we positively know that with the principles of the Government, maintained as they were originally established, the people would be far better off with ten

thousand "ablegates" here, than they could be without one, under the procedure proposed by Bishop Coxe; for this procedure would open wide the door for every bigot—political, religious, or other kind—in the land, to make himself an "ablegate" over everybody else. And the event would prove that they would all make themselves such too. Bishop Coxe's proposed remedy is far worse than is the real disease, which we dread equally with him.

No! Upon American, Protestant, and Christian principles, the Grand Llama has as much right to send an "ablegate" here to control 500,000 Buddhists as he has to send a priest to control five, or as any individual has to be a Buddhist at all: that is, a full, complete and untrammelled right. And under these principles the pope has just as much right to send an ablegate here to control 7,000,000 Catholics, as he has to create a cardinal here, or to appoint a priest here, or as any individual here has to be a Catholic at all: and that is, a perfect right. And no restriction can be put upon that right without, at the same time and in the same act, sweeping away the safeguards of all the rights of all the people. And, surely, every person who will take the time to think must readily decide that it is far better to maintain the principles and the safeguards of all the rights of himself and all the people, and bear the presence of an "ablegate," than to sweep away all the safeguards of all the rights of himself and all the people in an attempt to get rid of the "ablegate."

BUT it may be said, and truly, that the papacy with its ablegate, and in its whole system, is not only religious but political, and interferes in politics and manipulates votes, and thus herself violates the principles of the Government and the Constitution. Yes, that is true. The papacy is nothing if not political as well as religious. "The help of the law and State authority" is an essential element in the work of the papacy. She does interfere in politics and does manipulate votes, and does, thus and otherwise, violate the principles of the Government and the provisions of the Constitution. And there are many professed Protestant church-managers, who have set for her the pernicious example by repeatedly doing the same things. And this is where they are just like the papacy. But even though this were not so, and there were no such example set, it is manifestly vain to attempt or expect to defeat the wrong-doing of the papacy, by doing the same things, and the same way that she does. No person nor anything can be right by being like the papacy. We can be right only by being entirely unlike the papacy in all things. When the papacy violates the principles, or the Constitution, of the Government, it will not help the matter for us also to violate these principles or the Constitution. Violation of American principles by Catholics cannot be stopped by the violation of these principles by people who are not Catholics. One breach of American principles is not cured, but is increased by a good deal more than double, by the committal of another. Such is not the way to oppose the papacy in the United States. And as the AMERICAN SENTINEL is American indeed, we can never join in or indorse any such "opposition" to the papacy.

THE reader may be ready to ask, "Do

you propose to surrender to Rome altogether?"—Oh, no, never! We propose to have the victory over Rome altogether. It may be inquired then, "How do you propose to do it?" Well, we shall tell that later. But in the meantime we beg leave to remark that the present position and work of the papacy in the United States presents a much greater question than the American people realize, and a question which requires much more careful and critical thought than many people have ever yet given to it.

A. T. J.

Trial of Seventh-day Adventists in Gainesville, Georgia.

THE cases of Elder W. A. McCutchen and Professor E. C. Keck, Seventh-day Adventists, of Gainesville, Ga., were reached in the City Court of Gainesville during the forenoon of Thursday, February 22. The cases were heard together, and occupied nearly the entire day. The trial was before Judge Marshall L. Smith and a jury.

The following morning the Atlanta Constitution contained this special correspondence in reference to the matter:—

GAINESVILLE, GA., February 22.—(Special.)—Rich in sensation and replete in novelty was the case of the State vs. Elder W. A. McCutchen and Professor E. C. Keck, of the Seventh-day Adventist sect, which came up for trial in the City Court of Hall County to-day. The defendants were indicted for working on Sunday.

The State was represented by Solicitor-General Howard Thompson and W. F. Findley, and the defendants appeared in their own defense. Four witnesses were introduced in behalf of the State, who testified that they saw the defendants at work in the Seventh-day Adventists' Church here on Sunday of November 19, 1893. They were sawing, scribing and jointing lumber. The defendants made their statements and admitted doing the work, but claimed that they observed Saturday the seventh day, and therefore had no remorse of conscience. Elder McCutchen made a very clever argument in his own defense, lasting one hour and a half. He was followed by Professor Keck, who spoke less than five minutes. Colonel W. F. Findley then closed for the State, consuming an hour, and his honor, Marshall L. Smith, gave a clear and impartial charge to the jury which retired.

During the trial the courtroom was crowded. The ministers of the city were on hand in full force to hear the law and gospel both propounded in the courtroom. The jury retired at 4:15 o'clock in the afternoon, and, it being announced at 5:40 that the jury had not agreed and that the same was not likely to agree, by consent it was agreed that should the jury reach a verdict during the night the foreman should hold it until court reconvenes in the morning at 9 o'clock.

The case resulted in a mistrial. On the reconvening of court the next morning the jury was still out, and being called in, the foreman declared that there was no likelihood of an agreement being reached. The jury was therefore discharged, and the case will come up for trial again at the next term of the same court which opens the third Monday in May.

There has been, very naturally and properly, a deep and wide-spread interest in this case. It could not be otherwise, when it is considered what the principle is which is at stake, and in jeopardy of what, under its penal code and system, the State of Georgia has placed these men. The citizens of the city of Gainesville and the country surrounding have been in a measure aroused to the importance of the case. That the trial resulted as it did is a partial evidence of this. It is not to be supposed that the people of the State of Georgia will allow a case of religious persecution, worthy of the last century, to be carried on among them without, at least, informing themselves as to its merits and developing very decided opinions as to its propriety or impropriety. Those who

have charge of this prosecution and its continuance are placed in a very delicate position in the eyes of the people of their State and the country. There is on the statute books of Georgia a law which is a survival of the Middle Ages, and breathing the religious intolerance from which it sprung. Will they enforce this law? Will they gladly accept the odium which must attach to those who are party to the enforcement of such a relic of semi-barbarism? They certainly are in a difficult position. Those who bring complaint and indict and prosecute, are in a place of much greater difficulty than the men whom they bring to the bar of the court. There is no doubt or uncertainty or shadow of turning in their minds. They are right. The law of the State of Georgia is wrong. There will be no question in the minds of all men of sincere religious conviction throughout the world as to which stand in the nobler and worthier position, the victims of the iniquitous law, or those who put it into operation and execute its injustice. It is not these two men who are on trial in this matter, in reality; but this law of the State of Georgia and the people, as to whether they are willing that it should be enforced, or no.

A full statement of the arguments presented before the court will be given hereafter.

W. H. M.

Gainesville, Ga., Feb. 25.

Did the Church of Rome Ever Persecute?

It is most emphatically denied by the priests and bishops of Rome that "the church" ever persecuted. In "The Faith of Our Fathers," Cardinal Gibbons gives this version of the establishment of the Inquisition:—

The Spanish Inquisition was erected by King Ferdinand, less from motives of religious zeal than from those of human policy. It was established, not so much with the view of preserving the Catholic faith, as of perpetuating the integrity of his kingdom. The Moors and Jews were looked upon not only as enemies of the altar, but chiefly as enemies of the throne. Catholics were upheld not for their faith alone, but because they united faith to loyalty. The baptized Moors and Israelites were oppressed for their heresy because their heresy was allied to sedition.

It must be remembered that in those days heresy, especially if outspoken, was regarded not only as an offense against religion, but also as a crime against the State, and was punished accordingly. This condition of things was not confined to Catholic Spain, but prevailed across the sea in Protestant England. We find Henry VIII. and his successors pursuing the same policy in Great Britain towards their Catholic subjects, and punishing Catholicism as a crime against the State, just as Islamism and Judaism were proscribed in Spain.

It was, therefore, rather a royal and political than an ecclesiastical institution. The king nominated the inquisitors, who were equally composed of lay and clerical officials. He dismissed them at will. From the king, and not from the pope, they derived their jurisdiction, and into the king's coffers, and not into the pope's, went all the emoluments accruing from fines and confiscations. In a word, the authority of the Inquisition began and ended with the crown.

The massacre of St. Bartholomew is explained by the cardinal in about the same way. He says:—

In the reign of Charles IX. of France, the Huguenots were a formidable power and a seditious element in that country. They were under the leadership of Admiral Coligny, who was plotting the overthrow of the ruling monarch. The French king, instigated by his mother, Catherine de Medicis, and fearing the influence of Coligny, whom he regarded as an aspirant to the throne, compassed his assassination, as well as that of his followers in Paris, August 24th, 1572. This deed of violence was followed by an indiscriminate massacre in the French capital, and other cities of France, by an incendiary populace, who are easily aroused but not easily appeased.

Religion had nothing to do with the massacre. Coligny and his fellow Huguenots were slain not on

account of their creed, but exclusively on account of their alleged treasonable designs. If they had nothing but their Protestant faith to render them odious to King Charles, they would never have been molested; for, neither did Charles nor his mother ever manifest any special zeal for the Catholic Church, nor any special aversion to Protestantism, unless when it threatened the throne.

The true attitude of the papacy toward the Inquisition is thus stated by Ranke, in his "History of the Popes," page 58:—

When it was perceived that no conclusion was come to with the Protestants of Germany, and that at the same time, even in Italy, controversies respecting the sacraments, doubts concerning purgatory, and other speculations of great moment, as regarded the Romish ritual, were gaining ground, the pope one day asked Cardinal Caraffa "what means he could devise against these evils." The cardinal declared that the only one was "a thorough searching inquisition." John Alvarez de Toledo, Cardinal of Burgos, joined with him in this opinion.

The old Dominican Inquisition had long ago fallen into decay. The choice of inquisitors was committed to the monastic orders, and it frequently happened that these partook of the opinions which it was sought to put down. In Spain, the earlier form of the institution had been so far departed from, that a supreme tribunal of the Inquisition for that country had been erected there. Caraffa and Burgos, old Dominicans, both of them, both men of harsh and gloomy views of rectitude, zealots for the purity of Catholicism, austere in life, and intractable in their opinions, counselled the pope to found in Rome, on the model of that of Spain, a general supreme tribunal of the Inquisition, on which all others should be dependent. "As St. Peter," said Caraffa, "vanquished the first heresiarchs on no other spot than Rome, so must the successor of St. Peter overcome all the heresies of the world in Rome." The Jesuits reckon it to their honor, that their founder, Loyola, supported this proposal by a special memorial. On the 21st of July, 1542, the bull was issued.

It names six cardinals, among whom Caraffa and Toledo stood first, to be commissioners of the apostolic see, general and universal inquisitors on this side the Alps, and beyond them. It bestows on them the right to delegate ecclesiastics with similar power, to all such places as it shall seem good to them, to determine absolutely all appeals against the acts of the latter, and even to proceed without the participation of the ordinary spiritual courts. Every man, without a single exception, without any regard whatever to station or dignity, shall be subject to their jurisdiction; the suspected shall be thrown into prison, the guilty shall be punished even capitally, and their property confiscated. One restriction is imposed on the court. To punish shall be its function: the pope reserves to himself the right of pardoning the guilty who become converted. Thus shall everything be done, ordered, and accomplished, to suppress and uproot the errors that have broken out among the Christian community. Caraffa lost not a moment in putting this bull into execution.

But even as Cardinal Gibbons states it, it is only shifting the responsibility; it is saying, just as religious persecutors say now, "The State did it." It was, indeed, the civil power that executed the death penalty, but it was the church that defined heresy and excommunicated the heretics, delivering them up to the civil power. It was, in any event, the religious sentiment engendered by Rome that made the Inquisition not only possible but inevitable. And by no possibility can that corrupt church escape the odium. The position of the Catholic Church upon this question is thus defined by Archbishop Kenrick:—

Heresy and unbelief are crimes; that is the whole of the matter, and in Christian countries, where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the laws of the land, they will be punished as other crimes.

In the light of this utterance all that any denial of persecution by Rome means is simply that the papal church did not actually inflict the death penalty. The same defense exactly is made in behalf of Calvin who accused Servetus and prosecuted him before the civil courts. Now the disciples of Calvin declare that it was the civil authorities that put Servetus to death. So it was; but who caused the civil authorities to do it?—John Calvin. And who, in Roman Catholic countries, causes the Catholic religion to be made a

part of the law of the land?—Rome. And who invokes the civil law against "heretics"?—Rome. Who then persecutes?—Rome, most assuredly.

But it is not Rome alone that seeks to shield herself from the charge of religious persecution, behind the civil law. It is denied that there has been persecution in Tennessee and Maryland; it is simply enforcing the civil law, say the modern "Protestant" apologists for modern religious persecution. Speaking of the Jude-fund case in Maryland, the so-called *Christian Reformer* recently said:—

Of course it will seem to Adventists a most unfair and unjust comparison, but the fact is that the violators of Sabbath law are to be dealt with as the violators of other laws on the statute books of our States.

This is strikingly similar to Archbishop Kenrick's utterance, which we quote again, in order that the reader may have the two side by side. Here it is:—

Heresy and unbelief are crimes; that is the whole of the matter, and in Christian countries, where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the laws of the land, they will be punished as other crimes.

What a contemptible attitude is this! "Christian" sentiment demands laws which, in effect, define heresy in the interests of the religious dogma, and then the same "Christian" sentiment disclaims the responsibility and says, "The State did it."

Now let us put alongside this National Reform utterance (from the *Christian(?) Reformer*) and papal utterance (from Archbishop Kenrick) the following from Judge Hammond's dictum in the King case in Tennessee:—

The courts cannot change that which has been done, however done, by the civil law in favor of the Sunday observers. The religion of Jesus Christ is so interwoven with the texture of our civilization and every one of its institutions, that it is impossible for any man or set of men to live among us and find exemption from its influences and restraints. Sunday observance is so essentially a part of that religion that it is impossible to rid our laws of it. . . . So civil or religious freedom may stop short of its logic in this matter of Sunday observance. It is idle to expect in government perfect action or harmony of essential principles, and whoever administers, whoever makes, and whoever executes the laws, must take into account the imperfections, the passions, the prejudices, religious or other, and the errings of men because of these. We cannot have in individual cases a perfect observance of Sunday, according to the rules of religion; and, indeed, the sects are at war with each other as to the modes of observance. And yet no wise man will say that there shall be, therefore, no observance at all. Government leaves the warring sects to observe as they will, so they do not disturb each other; and as to the non-observer, he cannot be allowed his fullest personal freedom in all respects; largely he is allowed to do as he pleases, and generally there is no pursuit of him, in these days, as a mere matter of disciplining his conscience; but only when he defiantly sets up his non-observance by ostentatious display of his disrespect for the feelings or prejudices of others.

This is only putting in legal phrase, clothing in judicial language, the same intolerant idea expressed by the so-called Protestant paper, the *Christian(?) Reformer* and the popish archbishop, Kenrick. The facts of history show that Rome has persecuted; her utterances show that had she the power she would persecute again, while "Protestant" utterances show that such Protestantism is no better than the papacy.

C. P. B.

"A CHRISTIAN man may believe that his church is far from perfect, and may yet consistently retain his membership in it; but in the very moment in which he reaches the conclusion that it is a thoroughly corrupt organization, he is bound to leave it and lift up his voice against it. If he hesitates, he shows that he is lacking in courage."

Christianity and the Roman Empire.

THE controversy between Christianity and Rome was not a dispute between individuals, or a contention between sects or parties; it was a contest between antagonistic principles. On the part of Christianity it was the assertion of the principle of the rights of conscience and of the individual; on the part of Rome it was the assertion of the principle of the absolute absorption of the individual, and his total enslavement to the State in all things; divine as well as human, religious as well as civil.

Jesus Christ came into the world to set men free, and to plant in their souls the genuine principle of liberty,—liberty actuated by love,—liberty too honorable to allow itself to be used as an occasion to the flesh, or for a cloak of maliciousness,—liberty led by a conscience enlightened by the Spirit of God,—liberty in which man may be free from all men, yet made so gentle by love that he would willingly become the servant of all, in order to bring them to the enjoyment of this same liberty. This is freedom indeed. This is the freedom which Christ gave to man; for, whom the Son makes free is free indeed. In giving to men this freedom, such an infinite gift could have no other result than that which Christ intended; namely, to bind them in everlasting, unquestioning, unswerving allegiance to him as the royal benefactor of the race. He thus reveals himself to men as the highest good, and brings them to himself as the manifestation of that highest good, and to obedience to his will as the perfection of conduct. Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh. Thus God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, that they might know him, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he sent. He gathered to himself disciples, instructed them in his heavenly doctrine, endued them with power from on high, sent them forth into all the world to preach this gospel of freedom to every creature, and to teach them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them.

The Roman Empire then filled the world,—“the sublimest incarnation of power, and a monument the mightiest of greatness built by human hands, which has, upon this planet, been suffered to appear.” That empire, proud of its conquests, and exceedingly jealous of its claims, asserted its right to rule in all things, human and divine. In the Roman view, the State took precedence of everything. It was entirely out of respect to the State and wholly to preserve the State, that either the emperors or the laws ever forbade the exercise of the Christian religion. According to Roman principles, the State was the highest idea of good. Neander says: “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.”

It will be seen at once that for any man to profess the principles and the name of Christ, was virtually to set himself against the Roman Empire; for him to recognize God as revealed in Jesus Christ as the highest good, was but treason against the Roman State. It was not looked upon by Rome as anything else than high treason; because as the Roman State represented to the Roman the highest idea of good, for any man to assert that there was a

higher good, was to make Rome itself subordinate. Consequently the Christians were not only called “atheists,” because they denied the gods, but the accusation against them before the tribunals was of the crime of “high treason,” because they denied the right of the State to interfere with men’s relations to God. The common accusation against them was that they were “irreverent to the Cæsars, and enemies of the Cæsars and of the Roman people.”

To the Christian, the Word of God asserted with absolute authority: “Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.” Eccl. 12:13. To him, obedience to this word through faith in Christ, was eternal life. This to him was the conduct which showed his allegiance to God as the highest good,—a good as much higher than that of the Roman State as the government of God is greater than was the government of Rome.

This idea of the State, was not merely the State as a civil institution, but as a divine institution, and the highest conception of divinity itself. The genius of Rome was the supreme deity. Thus the idea of the State as the highest good was the religious idea, and consequently, religion was inseparable from the State. Hence the maxim, *Vox populi, vox Dei*,—the voice of the people is the voice of God. As this voice gave expression to the will of the supreme deity, and consequently of the highest good; and as this will was expressed in the form of laws, hence again the Roman maxim, “What the law says is right.”

It is very evident that in such a system there was no place for individuality. The State was everything, and the majority was in fact the State. What the majority said should be, that was the voice of the State, that was the voice of God, that was the expression of the highest good, that was the expression of the highest conception of right;—and everybody must assent to that or be considered a traitor to the State. The individual was but a part of the State. There was therefore 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 first principle of their law was the paramount right of the State over the citizen.”

It is also evident that in such a system, there was no such thing as the rights of conscience; because, as the State was supreme also in the realm of religion, all things religious were to be subordinated to the will of the State, which was but the will of the majority. And where the majority presumes to decide in matters of religion, there is no such thing as rights of religion or conscience.

Christianity was directly opposed to this, as shown by the words of Christ, who, when asked by the Pharisees and the Herodians whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not, answered: “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.” In this Christ established a clear distinction between Cæsar and God, and between religion and the State. He separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to the State. Only that which was Cæsar’s was to be rendered to Cæsar, while that which is God’s was to be rendered to God, and with no reference whatever to Cæsar.

The State being divine and the Cæsar reflecting this divinity, whatever was

God’s was Cæsar’s. Therefore, when Christ made this distinction between God and Cæsar, separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to Cæsar, and commanded men to render to God that which is God’s, and to Cæsar only that which is Cæsar’s, he at once stripped Cæsar—the State—of every attribute of divinity. And in doing this he declared *the supremacy of the individual conscience*; because it is left with the individual to decide what things they are which pertain to God.

Thus Christianity proclaimed the *right* of the individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, while Rome asserted the *duty* of every man to worship according to the dictates of the State. Christianity asserted the supremacy of God; Rome asserted the supremacy of the State. Christianity set forth God as manifested in Jesus Christ as the chief good; Rome held the State to be the highest good. Christianity set forth the law of God as the expression of the highest conception of right; Rome held the law of the State to be the expression of the highest idea of right. Christianity taught that the fear of God and the keeping of his commandments is the whole duty of man; Rome taught that to be the obedient servant of the State is the whole duty of man. Christianity preached Christ as the sole possessor of power in heaven and in earth; Rome asserted the State to be the highest power. Christianity separated that which is God’s from that which is Cæsar’s; Rome maintained that that which is God’s is Cæsar’s.

This was the contest, and these were the reasons of it, between Christianity and the Roman Empire.

The Gospel Not Force.

REFERRING to the Lord’s work in the earth, Luther said: “It is not by the sword that he will have his gospel propagated.” Such were the words of the great reformer of the sixteenth century, and such is still the language of true Protestantism.

The sword is a carnal weapon; but the language of the true followers of Christ is, “The weapons of our warfare are not carnal:” the sword of the Spirit is our sword, and this, as Paul in Ephesians 6 says, is “the Word of God.” Upon one occasion, it will be remembered, one of the disciples of Christ attempted to defend him with the sword. The Master’s command was, “Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.”

D’Aubigne, in the “History of the Reformation,” speaking of the fallen condition into which the Church had lapsed by resorting to worldly power, says: “She had, from false policy, had recourse to earthly instruments and vulgar weapons. When once the Church had begun to handle these weapons, her spiritual essence was lost. Her arm could not become carnal without her heart becoming the same.” This is a solemn truth, and the principle herein involved is as true to-day as it ever was. The Church can no sooner call upon the State for aid and assistance than she loses her spiritual power. In this act she denies the gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation, rejects her lawful husband, the Lord, and unites herself, in adulterous connection, to Cæsar. This worldliness and worldly connection

is the "wine of her fornication" referred to in the Scriptures, with which Babylon, the Romish Church, has made all nations drunk. And, sad to say, the harlot daughters, the apostate Protestant churches, are now seeking the same illicit union, as is manifest in their appeal to the State to enforce Sunday observance.

God constrains no one by means of force. He never forces nor attempts to force any one to believe. His moral government is not one in which he exercises force. To the creatures he has made he says, "Come, let us reason together." He invites them all to come and take of the water of life freely, to come and be saved; but he compels no one. Neither will those who are godlike seek thus to constrain any one. Said Luthér, "I am ready to preach, argue, write; but I will not constrain any one, for faith is a voluntary act." But in all ages those who have assumed to take the place of God, and by law prescribe to men their religious duties, have acted very ungodlike. Because men would not believe and act in religious matters as they dictated, they have threatened them with the infliction of civil penalties, thrown them into dungeons, placed them upon the rack, and kindled around them the fires of persecution. Thus blindly and without reason have they sought to force their opinions and practices upon their fellow-men. But the men who do such things are not Christians, whatever their profession; neither is the church which upholds such actions and pursues such a course the Christian church, however much it may claim to be.

W. A. COLCORD.

Rome Claims Supremacy Over the State.

[Everybody ought to know the real position of Rome touching the relations of Church and State. A standard Catholic work, "Familiar Explanations of Christian Doctrine No. IV.," published by Benziger Brothers, "Publishers to the Holy Apostolic See," New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago (pages 195-198), gives this information definitely and explicitly:—]

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS asks the question: "Can the pope deprive a sovereign of his temporal power if he become an apostate from the faith?" and he replies to this question as follows: When a sentence of excommunication is juridically pronounced against a sovereign for apostasy, his subjects are by the very fact free from all allegiance. Charged to preserve in all their integrity the fundamental truths of faith, and to watch over the spiritual welfare of the members of the Catholic Church, the pope as her head can take all necessary measures to secure her children from the danger of perversion. "With a wicked heart the apostate deviseth evil and at all times he soweth discord." Prov. 6:14. It is clear that the faith of a nation is in imminent danger under the power of an apostate ruler. As the church has a right to punish one of her members for willful murder or adultery, so has she also a right to punish a Catholic sovereign for abandoning the faith; she can dispossess him of his States if she judges this punishment useful for the spiritual good of her children.

It may be said that Julian, the apostate, had Christian soldiers in his army and commanded them to march for the defense of the empire and that they were not disengaged from their allegiance, as they obeyed his orders. We must never confound right with fact. For certain reasons it may not be advisable for you to

use your rights; but for that your right is not less certain. In the time of that apostate it was not advisable nor possible for the church to use all her rights. She therefore allowed her children to obey that apostate emperor in all that was not contrary to faith, in order to avoid a greater evil, but her moderation and prudence did not destroy or lessen in the least any of her imprescriptible rights.

When States were wholly Catholic, as they were for a good many centuries, when all men believed, with the saints and martyrs, that it was to the pope that the Almighty said, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven;" when the supreme authority of the Holy See was at once the bulwark of thrones, and part of the public law of Europe; when Cæsar said to the council, presided over by the papal legates, as Constantine, the master of the world, said to the Fathers at Nice, "*Nos a vobis recte judicamur*,"—nobody disputed that, as members of the Christian commonwealth, kings and princes were subject, by the law of God, to the authority of the Roman pontiff. It was his office to restrain, by all the means which the decree of God and the faith of Christians gave him, any abuse of their power by which either the interests of religion or the just rights of Christian people were prejudiced. He was at once the guardian of the faith, and the only invincible enemy of tyrants. The most eminent non-Catholic writers have confessed that Christianity was preserved from what Guizot calls "the tyranny of brute force," mainly by that vigilant and fearless intervention of the Holy See, for which, as some of them sorrowfully admit, no substitute can now be found. But it is evident that the extreme penalty of deposition, the application of which is now transferred from the pope to the mob, could only be enforced in a state of society which has long since passed away, and is never likely to return.

But, if popes no longer depose bad princes, "by the authority of Peter," there are others who depose good ones without any authority at all. In order to depose them more effectually, they have taken to cutting off their heads. Cromwell and his fellows did it in England; Mirabeau and his friends in France. These energetic anti-popes did not object at all to deposition, provided it was inflicted by themselves. They object to it still less now; it has become a habit. Englishmen deposed James II. after murdering his father, and put a Dutchman in his place. In other lands they are always deposing somebody. The earth is strewn with deposed sovereigns. Some times they depose one another, in order to steal what does not belong to them. One of them has deposed the pope himself, at least for a time, and all the rest clap their hands. They do not see that by this last felony they have undermined every throne in Europe. Perhaps in a few years there will not be a king left to be deposed. Since the secular was substituted everywhere for the spiritual authority, kings have fared badly. The popes only rebuked them when they did evil; the mob is less discriminating. And the difference between the deposing power of the popes and that of a mob is this: that the first used it like fathers, for the benefit of religion and society; the second, like wild beasts, for the destruction of both.

There is, therefore, among all true Catholics, but one unanimous voice as to the

supreme authority of the head of the Roman Church, *viz.*: that Jesus, the Son of God, and of man, gave to Peter and his successors that fullness of jurisdiction and power which will keep the church in safety till he comes back in the day of Judgment; and to deny that supreme authority is to be at sea, drifting about with the currents of opinion, and tossed on the troubled waves of Protestantism, Calvinism, Quakerism, Mormonism, Spiritualism, Socialism, and all the other isms and sophisms.

Shame on Maryland.

THE State of Maryland does not mean to be beaten by Tennessee. The latter commonwealth punished an otherwise inoffensive citizen for ploughing in his fields on Sunday, and Maryland has now inflicted the statutory pains and penalties on another farmer for husking corn on Sunday. We congratulate both of these Christian commonwealths on this signal vindication of the majesty of the law. To be sure, in both States thousands of saloons and brothels and gambling-houses are open every Sunday, making everyone one who enters them tenfold more a child of hell than he was before, but the courts have punished two Christian men for the much worse offenses of quietly ploughing in the fields or husking corn in a barn. *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum.*

We wonder that the very stones do not cry out against such travesties of justice; that Christian men do not lift up their voices in protest against this wicked perversion of religion, this insult to the name of Christ. And, in particular, why do not Baptists, whose fathers stood against the world for soul liberty, make themselves heard when these relics of mediæval bigotry and persecuting intolerance are found in our free country? Sunday laws like those in Tennessee and Maryland are a disgrace to a Christian commonwealth in this nineteenth century, and should be repealed at the earliest possible moment.

The farmer who has been so sternly dealt with by the State of Maryland belongs to that denomination known as "Seventh-day Adventists." He observes Saturday as a day of worship, and consequently is absolved by his conscience from the observance of Sunday. To him the first day of the week has no more sacredness than the third, and we are exhorted by the Apostle Paul to have due regard for such scruples on the part of our brethren. (Rom. 4:4-6). He disturbed nobody by his labor, and he should not have been molested. We have known cases in which Seventh-day Christians deserved the penalties of the civil law. In one case, a Seventh-day Baptist kept a blacksmith shop just across the village street from a Baptist Church, and he always managed to have a job of hard pounding on his anvil at the hour of divine service in the Baptist Church. He deserved to be punished, not for working on Sunday, but for malicious disturbance of the worship of other Christians. He was persecuting those who differed from him in faith and practice. Had he been inoffensive about his work, and had the Baptists procured his prosecution for Sunday labor, they would have been persecuting him for a difference of faith and practice.

Baptists ought always to keep their minds clear on this one point: no laws relating to the observance of Sunday are valid that are founded on any belief as to

the sanctity of the day, or that seek to punish men for the offense of "Sabbath-breaking." Such laws, where they exist, are a relic of the union of Church and State against which Baptists should set their faces as a flint. Sunday laws designed and adapted to secure for every man a day of rest, and to protect him from molestation if he choose to make it also a day of worship, are all that can be justified by the principles that Baptists maintain. We are bound by our centuries of protest against religious persecution to oppose everything else.

In this, and many other States, it is a bar against prosecution for Sunday labor, if the accused plead that he keeps any other day as "holy time." This is the least recognition that the civil law can give to the rights of conscience. Maryland, Tennessee, and other States that still have persecuting Sunday laws on their statute books, cannot too soon follow the just and liberal example of New York. The Empire State has many defects, but we are proud to be citizens of a commonwealth where legal persecution of one denomination of Christians by others long ago ceased to be a possibility.—*New York Examiner*.

The Church Union on Sunday Observance.

"THERE was a singularly interesting debate last night," says the *Westminster* (Eng.) *Gazette*, of February 10, "at a meeting of various guilds at the rooms of the English Church Union on the question of the observance of Sunday. Mr. Stewart Headlam, who came late from the School Board meeting with Mr. Ridgeway, *more suo* expressed his conviction that every one was in favor of any amount of recreation after attendance at the Holy Communion, an assertion which was loudly challenged; but there was a general consensus of opinion that, while the Sunday was a day of rest, worship, and recreation, it was very wrong for the leisure classes to make so many other people work to minister to their pleasure. In fact, the majority of those present recognized that the sons of toil had a right to an amount of liberty on Sundays which would have shocked a former generation. An extremely interesting and effective speech was made by a laborer in the building trade, who advocated the opening of museums on Sundays, as did Mr. Ridgeway very strongly."

The "Non-Sectarian" Delusion.

"NON-SECTARIAN" is a much used term. It catches the ear. It is attractive and seductive. It seems to soften down the bitterness of old-time bigotry. It seems to give expression to the idea of religious freedom that many have who are inclined to be liberal-minded. It is also the watchword of religious partisans suspicious of their rivals. It is used in manifold combinations. In short, it is a word to conjure with. But what does it mean? Are the applications of it legitimate, or do they convey more often an impression contrary to the truth?

According to the "International" the word "sect" comes from the Latin *secta*, from *sequi*, to follow. It is often confused, says the same authority, with the Latin *secare*, to cut. A sect is defined as "those following a particular leader, or authority, or attached to a certain opinion." This definition is illustrated by

a reference to the followers of Mahomet as a sect, and by a quotation from the Book of Acts, in which the Christians are spoken of as a sect.

Now in the common use of the word one of the sub-divisions of the people who accept Christ as their leader in religious matters, is called a sect. Two or more of these sub-divisions combined become non-sectarian. It is in this sense the term is used almost exclusively in discussing the schools, public appropriations, and matters pertaining to the government. It matters not how small a percentage of the whole people are represented in the combinations of sectional divisions, if they agree to work together for certain ends, it becomes a non-sectarian movement. What would be wrong for one faction alone to do, becomes right if several factions are united! To use the public schools to teach the particular belief of one part of a sect, is condemned. To use the public schools to teach the particular beliefs that several parts of the same sect can agree upon, is approved. To take a part of the funds of the people to promote the interests of one denomination can not be allowed; to use it for the advancement of several denominations who can agree to work together, is another thing.

What an absurd position! Yet is not this practically the aim of the non-sectarian cry? Do not most of the religious papers stand on this platform? Does the National League seek to go beyond this? They propose a reformation that will cut off appropriations for a Catholic, a Baptist, or a Presbyterian, specifically; but supposing the Catholic, the Baptist, and the Presbyterian agree to use the public institutions to propagate some dogmas on which they unite, what then? That will fill the non-sectarian idea, yet, all of them together are only a part of one of the great sects.

The fallacy of this non-sectarian position is well illustrated in the recent use of the university at Ann Arbor for the revival meetings conducted by Rev. B. Fay Mills, in defiance of the constitution of Michigan, which says the property of the State shall not be used for the benefit of any religious sect. The churches of nine denominations and the Students' Christian Association united in the meetings. They were largely advertised for weeks beforehand. The use of the university for part of them was clearly to bring to bear the influence and power of a State institution in promoting their success. Not even all the divisions of the Christian sect in the city took part in them. Not all of them were invited to join with them. Four denominations who hold Christ as their leader, the Episcopalian, the Unitarian, the Zion, and the Catholic, were left out, or refused to join with them. The four denominations out of the combination represent more people of the Christian sect in the nation than the nine denominations who were represented in the so-called non-sectarian combine. The Students' Christian Association, on whose invitation the meetings were taken to the university, is a sectarian institution so strong that no one is admitted to membership unless he belongs to the Christian sect; and no student is allowed to have a share in its government unless he holds to the divinity of the founder of the sect. What a cry would have gone out from the nine denominations if the Catholics had gotten possession of the State university hall and used it to propagate their religious

doctrines? What would Rev. Dr. MacArthur say if they should take the bones of Saint Anne, or the relic of Saint Paul into the hall of a State university, instead of a "reformed drunkard and gambler," as Mr. Mills was advertised, and use the property of the people to make proselytes to their faith?

Too much praise can not be given to the timely, able and unanswerable sermon in condemnation of this use of State property, preached and since published by the pastor of the Unitarian Church, Rev. J. T. Sunderland.

What is wrong in principle can not be made right by a multitude participating in it. Some of the "non-sectarian" movements do not commend themselves. Closely examined they reveal the same limitations to intellectual and spiritual liberty.

The public schools can only be made truly non-sectarian by ceasing to use them for teaching any religious creeds.

L. D. BURDICK.

The New "Standard Dictionary."

WE remarked some months since, after examining sample pages of Funk & Wagnalls' new dictionary, that when the "Century Dictionary" was published, and immediately thereafter the "International," we thought that little or nothing more was to be expected, or even desired, in the way of dictionaries, for years to come; but that the "Standard" promised to be superior in several respects to all others. This promise has been realized. The first volume of the "Standard" is now completed, and is even better than the sample pages led us to expect.

In point of material and workmanship the "Standard" is far superior to all other works of its kind. The book is one that any publishing house may well be proud of; and while for purposes of orthography and pronunciation but little fault can be found with any dictionary in common use in this country, the "Standard" has several new features which will certainly commend it to the general public.

It is impossible, in the space at our command, to mention all the good points in this dictionary. One very commendable feature is that it gives not only synonyms but antonyms, and also the proper prepositions. For instance:—

Antidote, n. 1. Anything that will counteract or remove the effects of poison, or disease, or the like.

2. Anything that will correct or counteract evil of any kind, physical or mental, or its effects.

Synonyms: Corrective, cure, remedy, specific.—Antonyms: Bane, poison, venom, virus.—Prepositions: *To, for, or against.*

Another very satisfactory feature of the "Standard" is that the definitions are given first and the derivation of the word last. It is strange that lexicographers have not thought of this order before. Probably a dictionary is consulted a hundred times for spelling, pronunciation, and definition to one time for derivation.

We note with satisfaction also that the literary quotations made to illustrate the use of words are not the stock quotations given in other dictionaries, but are almost entirely new. This does not, of course, add to the "Standard" where it is used alone, for its literary illustrations are not superior to those used in other dictionaries, but it does add to its value for comparison.

The "Standard" has reduced the compounding of words to something approach-

ing a logical system. This fact alone ought to endear it to printers and proof-readers, especially.

The illustrations in the "Standard" are both numerous and exceedingly good. Besides small illustrations on almost every page, Vol. I. is embellished with eight beautifully colored full-page lithographic plates. These are (1) Examples of Architecture, (2) Birds, (3) Coins, (4 and 5) Decorations of Honor, (6) Flags of America, Hawaii and Samoa, (7) Flags of Europe, Asia and Africa, (8) Gems and Precious Stones. Besides the lithographic plates there are full-page plates showing dogs, cattle, fowls, and horses. These illustrations add both to the beauty and utility of the "Standard." In addition to the colored plate of ancient coins, there is a very full table of modern coins giving the value of each in English and American money.

The more conservative will find many things to criticise in the new dictionary. Preference is given to the so-called reformed spelling in many cases; and as with the "Century" authority can be found in the "Standard" for very many things not recognized by such authors as Webster and Worcester. But language is the result of growth, and usage makes law. Lexicographers do not make languages; they simply record them as they find them. The more refined and expressive slang of to-day will continue to become the perfect English of to-morrow, until time ends or progress ceases.

Full particulars and sample pages of the "Standard" can be secured by addressing the publishers, Funk & Wagnalls' Company, New York City.

"The Sovereign Pontiff."

AN article in the February number of the *North American Review* on "Territorial Sovereignty and the Papacy," by Mgr. O'Reilly should set American readers to doing some very earnest thinking. The purpose of it is to try to show that the pope ought to have a territory of his own, in which he should be absolutely independent of all civil authority. The idea appears to be that the pope should be situated so as to be a sort of father and arbiter for all mankind, and that he will not be looked up to as such by all the nations if he is in any manner subject to the government of any one nation. After referring to the complications with Italy growing out of the killing of Italians at New Orleans two years ago, Mgr. O'Reilly makes this startling proposition:—

The day may come when to avoid war between this country and Italy, a worse thing might be done than to invoke the peaceful mediation or arbitration of the sovereign pontiff.

It is difficult to imagine what "worse thing might be done" than to relinquish our own sovereignty as an independent nation, and give to the pope or to any other hierarch the power to meddle with our affairs, a power which once acquired would not be given up. The very term "sovereign pontiff," used by Mgr. O'Reilly, a man who is very near the pope, is a pretty clear indication of the disposition to get and hold authority and power which has lodgment in the papal breast. It is a very human ambition, but it is one that develops vigorously in ecclesiastical circles and the American people cannot afford to subordinate the civil authority of the whole people as vested in their regularly chosen official representa-

tives, to any ecclesiastical domination from any source, even to the extent of an "arbitration." This is true if the ecclesiastical authority were part of ourselves; it is overwhelmingly true when such authority is outside of ourselves. The total separation of the State and the Church, any Church, in any form, or under any guise, is absolutely essential, and it is right along this line at the present time that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Even now efforts are being made in the United States to enforce religious observances by national law and constitutional amendments, and persecution of non-conformists has already begun in some quarters under State laws now in existence.—*Midland (Mich.) Republican, Feb. 23, 1894.*

What the National Reformers Propose to Do.

SECRETARY WYLIE of the National Reform Association thus outlines the work to be accomplished by the association to secure the adoption of the proposed "Christian" amendment to the Constitution of the United States:—

1. At least two agents must be kept at Washington to watch the progress of events, to arrange for hearing, and to form the connecting link between the people and the Congress.
2. When the time comes for hearing arguments by the judiciary committee we must send to Washington the best talent in the land to present the strongest pleas possible for the submission of the proposed amendment.
3. When the bill is reported to the two houses we must flood Congress with petitions urging the passage of the bill. Letters and telegrams by the ten thousand should also be sent to individuals, Congressmen and Senators, urging them to vote for the measure.
4. When it is submitted to the conventions in the States for ratification Christian citizens without regard to sect or party should labor to secure the election of good men, who are sure to vote for ratification, as members of the ratifying conventions.
5. Meetings must be held in every city, town, village, hamlet, and country district, to quicken and concentrate the Christian sentiment of our country in favor of this amendment. Petitions must be circulated and signers obtained by the hundred thousand. Every one who can devote a little time, if only a few days or hours, should circulate the petitions for signatures.
6. Literature treating of this measure must be scattered all over the land, East, West, North, and South, so that the whole people may be awakened and enlightened on this the most important measure ever brought before this nation.

It matters little what the National Reformers do. The Supreme Court and Congress have already practically amended (?) the Constitution; but it is of the utmost importance that the people shall be made acquainted everywhere with the real nature of the National Reform movement and the National Reform combination, so that they may refuse to worship the papal beast and his image.

DO YOU USE A FOUNTAIN PEN?

THEN YOU NEED THE

COMBINED INK-BOTTLE AND PEN FILLER,

Consisting of a bottle holding ink sufficient to fill a pen eight or ten times, with a patent rubber cork and filler, all inclosed in a neat wooden case with a screw top, making the safest, most complete, compact, and convenient article for the use of traveling men and others now extant. When filled with ink it weighs less than three ounces.

Imitation Rosewood case, 25 cents; real Box wood case, 50 cents. Sent post-paid on receipt of price. Pacific Press, 43 Bond St., New York.



Waterman's Ideal Fountain Pen

"I find the most satisfactory pen of its kind," says Chauncey M. Depew, President of the New York Central R.R., and thousands of others are ready to bear a similar testimony. This pen is simple and yet highly philosophical in its construction. It rarely gets out of order and seldom needs repairs.

The pen-points are fine, medium or coarse, and of all grades of flexibility from soft to very stiff. Any hand can be suited. A full guarantee goes with each and every pen. The cut shows a No. 4 pen (gentleman's size) reduced about one half in size.

No. 1, \$2.50	No. 4, \$4.00
" 2, 3.00	" 5, 5.00
" 3, .3.50	" 6, 6.00

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.

THE STORY OF JESUS.

BY MRS. G. E. MORTON.

A successful attempt to adapt the life of Christ to the comprehension of children of four years old and under. The charm of the story and the simplicity of the telling make this one of the very best books that can be given to a child.—*New York Observer.*

12mo, 316 pages, cloth, printed in colors, \$1.00



THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE PLAN OF SALVATION

By "an American Citizen"

Is something that every Christian ought to read. It is a valuable book, though not entirely free from remarks which indicate wrong ideas. But as these occur only incidentally, and are in no sense essential to the author's course of reasoning, they are unimportant. The book can be safely put into the hands of any one, and would be especially valuable in dealing with the candid skeptic.

Nearly 200 pages, Bound in Cloth. —Price 25 cents.—

ROBERT MORRISON, the Pioneer of Chinese Missions—By Wm. J. Townsend, Sec. Methodist New Connexion Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JOHN WILLIAMS, the Martyr of Erromanga—By Rev. J. J. Ellis. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

Order of PACIFIC PRESS,

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



NEW YORK, MARCH 8, 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.

LEGISLATION seems to be running mad. The latest freak is a bill at Albany "to prohibit the tolling of any bell in any cemetery in Brooklyn." The *Sun* pertinently enquires: "Will the meddlers with everything, and every custom, and every right of the living and of the dead, even with funerals, burial ceremonies, and immemorial usages, never cease their meddling?"

THE *Catholic Review* does not like the idea of taxing church property, but thinks that in the event of such a policy being adopted, "it is not the Catholics but the Protestants who will have the most reason to wince." And that is just the reason church property will not be taxed. "Protestants" there are in abundance who would like to tax Romish Church property, but the Protestants who are willing to pay taxes on their own church property are few.

A DISPATCH from Toledo, under date of February 21, published in the *Sun* of this city, on the 22nd, states that a judgment was rendered against one W. J. Ostrander, on a suit brought to recover a balance of \$138.40 on a contract for a lot of rifles sent to Council No. 2 of the American Protective Association. Ostrander was, it seems, the agent of the council in the purchase of the rifles. With the American Protective Association and the Roman Catholics both arming, the results are scarcely a matter of doubt. Open conflict must ensue.

The American Protective Association is opposed to the papacy, and this is right. But this way of opposing the papacy is not right. Rome and her methods are all wrong. And opposition to Rome or her methods cannot be made in the right way, nor can it ever succeed, by doing as she does. That only helps her along, instead of being any real opposition to her.

"THE garb of the Sisters of Charity was conspicuous in the Thirty-fourth Ward public school to-day," says a Pittsburg dispatch of the 26th ult. The reason given is that four nuns who had been previously employed in the parochial school of the ward begun teaching in the public school. The priest in charge of the parish states that this was necessary because of lack of accommodations for the parochial school children in his building. Instead of erecting an edition to the parochial school he installed nuns as teachers in the public school. "The nuns passed the school-

teachers' examinations with high percentages." The school board is composed of Catholics, and they readily agreed to the proposition. It is said that there will be no religious instruction given in the school hours, and that the nuns will not wear their rosaries, but will wear their religious garb. Commenting on the facts stated, the *Independent*, of this city, says: "Of course a nun should not be excluded from qualifying as a teacher if she can. But we should draw the line at her wearing any specially religious garb: and if we are not mistaken, General Draper, who was superintendent of schools for this State, decided that such a dress could not be allowed in public schools." If General Draper ever made such a ruling he was clearly right. Distinctively religious garbs must be excluded from the public school rooms unless the schools are to be completely Romanized.

A CORRESPONDENT wants to know our objections to the proposed 16th Amendment. We have no objection to it except that it does not go far enough. It prohibits simply appropriations for "sectarian" purposes. In the proper sense of the word that is all right, but in the sense in which it is intended by the promoters of the amendment it would still leave the Government or any State free to make appropriations for that colorless thing known as "unsectarian religious instruction." The amendment does not touch the root of the evil and is not designed to.

TOPEKA, Kansas, is moving in the matter of Sunday closing. The Ways and Means Committee met recently, says the *Topeka Capital*, to discuss the Sunday closing ordinance. A delegation from the Ministerial Union, consisting of Revs. Alderson, Dill, and Owens, was present to discuss the matter with the members of the committee.

"The points of discussion took a very wide course, which involved Sunday labor in nearly all its phases. This dealt with the butcher, milkman, Sunday paper question, and even the street railway company, and ran so far into the ridiculous that the ministers were compelled to draw the line and confine the discussion to a representative case, that of the butcher.

"The ordinance relating to Sunday closing states that it shall be unlawful to expose to sale fermented liquors, any goods, wares or merchandise excepting drugs, provisions and articles of immediate necessity on Sunday. It was over the expression 'immediate necessity' that the widest opinion existed among the committeemen. Messrs. Holman and Fulton thought it unnecessary to get meat on Sunday, as it could easily be kept if bought on Saturday. Colonel Burgess thought it no worse to buy meat on Sunday than to have his wife wring a chicken's neck and clean it before going to church, while

General Bradford thought the butcher shop ought to be kept open for several hours, but not later than 9 o'clock. The latter opinion met with favor and it was finally left to Mr. Bradford to draw up an amendment to ordinance 68, which should specify that butcher shops be kept open for three hours, until 9 o'clock on Sundays, and also naming a \$5 minimum fine, which is not contained in the present ordinance."

A FRIEND in Missouri writes us as follows:—

Publishers AMERICAN SENTINEL:

Not being very busy to-day I canvassed a little for the SENTINEL, and the first five men I showed the paper to subscribed; and I herewith send you \$4.50, for which you will please send the paper to the following names: [Here are given five names and addresses.]

Our friend need have sent us only four dollars on five new subscriptions, and is therefore entitled to fifty cents credit on his own subscription under our special offer recently made. Other readers of the SENTINEL have been doing the same kind of work, and there is opportunity for still others. Let the good work go on.

S. S. Lessons on the Book of Luke.

THE Sabbath-school lessons on the Book of Luke for the second quarter of 1894 are now ready and orders for them should be sent in at once so that they may be on hand in good time. The lesson pamphlet in question is the usual size and price; forty pages; price five cents. The Pacific Press, 43 Bond Street, New York City, has on hand a large supply and can fill orders promptly for any number required. Do not neglect to order early.

IF you are going to do anything this year in either the vegetable or flower garden wouldn't it be a good idea to send ten cents to James Vick's Sons, Rochester, N. Y., for a copy of "Vick's Floral Guide" for 1894? The "Guide" is one of the neatest things of the kind that we have ever seen, and if you purchase seeds, it costs nothing since the ten cents can be deducted from the first order for seeds. Vick's seeds cost no more than do others, and they are always good. Besides, the "Guide" is very attractive, and if you see it you will be pretty sure to want some of the choice novelties advertised this season. Every family that can possibly do so, ought to have, in addition to the common vegetables, at least a few choice flowers for their refining influence. They will repay the little care they require.

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,			
	43 Bond Street, New York City.			