

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 3.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER, 1888.

NUMBER 9.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
OAKLAND, CAL.

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS,

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS.

J. H. WAGGONER, E. W. FARNSWORTH, DAN T. JONES.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

What Constitutes a Catholic School?

THE question is, What do Catholics include in the doctrine of faith and morals? And we are at no difficulty to answer that that church teaches, among other things, that Church and State are not to be separated, and that the church is rightfully superior to the government of all States. This is one department of Catholic faith, as expounded by an infallible church. It is not to be supposed that all the minutiae of faith are imparted to children in the parochial schools, but let them be fully indoctrinated with the idea of the infallibility of the church in their youth, and then let the application of the doctrine to their conduct as citizens be made at some later period of life, and there can be no doubt that, if they are good Catholics, they will decide that their first allegiance is due to the Catholic Church rather than to their country.

There is no difficulty about a good Catholic being also a good patriot so long as no question of the supremacy of the Church or State is involved; but let that question arise, let the issue be fairly made whether in these United States the Government shall control the Catholic Church or the Catholic Church shall control the Government, and every good Catholic is bound to do his best to bring the Government under the control of the church. These and similar consequences flow logically and irresistibly from the doctrine of the infallibility of the church, in connection with the Catholic theory of "faith and morals," and we must understand that a Catholic school is an institution where the seed is sown that will infallibly produce this fruit.

It becomes a matter of interest to us to have a clear understanding of these matters, in view of the fact that the demand is persistently made for the maintenance of these schools by the public, and the public have a right to the fullest information on this point, that they may intelligently determine whether they wish to pay taxes for the support of such instructions.—J. Rockwell, in *Christian Union*,

The American Sentinel and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

THE SENTINEL has had occasion frequently to criticise some of the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Upon the part of those who favor the establishment of a *religious* instead of a *civil* government here, this fact has been made the means of an attempt to create prejudice at the expense of the SENTINEL. They try to make it appear that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is opposed to temperance. We propose to make plain our attitude toward temperance in general and toward the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in particular.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL is thoroughly and consistently devoted to the genuine principles of temperance. And what the SENTINEL considers to be the genuine principles of temperance can be stated in this single sentence, viz.: *Total abstinence from all stimulants and narcotics of whatever kind or nature or degree.* More than this, it is out of allegiance to Christian principle that the SENTINEL is devoted to this principle of temperance. It is thoroughgoing Christian temperance in which the SENTINEL thoroughly believes. It is because allegiance to Christ demands that we shall be temperate in all things, that we advocate the principle of temperance. Both of the editors of the SENTINEL are doing their very best to act strictly in accordance with this principle of temperance. It must therefore be manifest to every soul that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is decidedly in favor of temperance, and *Christian* temperance at that. And in this it must likewise be manifest to everybody that whatever criticisms we have ever made, or shall ever make, upon the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, are not in any sense in opposition to the purest principles of Christian temperance.

Although we are decidedly in favor of Christian temperance, and endeavor personally to practice it, and to persuade others to practice it, we are *not* in favor of using the civil power to compel anybody either to favor or to practice it. And when the Woman's Christian Temperance Union attempts, as it does, to use the civil power to compel people to conform to the principles of Christian temperance, it goes beyond its legitimate province, it acts contrary both to civil polity and Christian principle, and *therefore* we oppose it. Christian principle knows no such thing as outward force; it never seeks either the support or the control of the civil power. Chris-

tian principle knows only the force of conscientious conviction, aroused to action by persuasive reason, under the blessed influence of the Spirit of God. Christian principle knows no power but the power of God as manifested in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Believing this with all our heart, although we are decidedly in favor of *temperance*, of *Christian* temperance, of *woman's* Christian temperance, and even of *woman's* Christian temperance *union*, we are just as decidedly opposed to the *political aspirations* of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish a theocracy in this country, and to that end demands that the ballot shall be put into the hands of women. Proof:—

"A true theocracy is yet to come; . . . hence I pray devoutly, as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause."—*W. C. T. U. Monthly Reading for September, 1886.*

Now the establishment of a man-made, or a woman-made, theocracy will be but a repetition of the establishment and working of the hideous principles of the Papacy, if not the establishment of the Papacy itself, in this country. The Papacy is a theocracy. Its workings throughout history have been but the practice of the principles of a man-made theocracy—such a theocracy as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish here by the ballot. The rule of such a theocracy is the wickedest rule that the world has known or can know.

It puts man in the place of God, and deifies human passions; and such a *régime* is but one remove from that of Satan himself. Therefore, as such a theocracy is such a wicked thing, as it is such an utter perversion of every principle of government, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to it. And as the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is pledged to the establishment of such a theocracy, and rejoices that it has so long championed such a cause, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to *that part* of the aims and workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. And why should we be blamed for it?

In order to the establishment of this theocracy here, they "pray devoutly for the ballot in the hands of women." But whenever the ballot is put into the hands of women, for any such purpose as that, then the ballot will be the worst thing that was ever put into the hands of a woman.

Again; the SENTINEL is first, last, and all the time, opposed to the aims of the National Reform Association. That association likewise proposes to turn this Government into a theocracy, ruled by "the leaders and teachers in the churches." It declares that dissenters from National Reform opinions "cannot dwell together on the same continent" with the National Reformed Christianity; and that "there is nothing out of hell" that should not be "tolerated" as soon as these. In Senator Blair's proposed National Sunday law and constitutional amendment, both of which are now pending in the United States Senate, the National Reformers see taken the first steps toward making effective their "tolerant" intentions. Now the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the closest ally, and the most powerful support, that the National Reform Association has in this Nation to-day. Many of the officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union are also vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. It was the Woman's Christian Temperance Union that first started the petitions for this National Sunday law, which pleases the National Reformers so well, and which so fitly plays into their hands; and the Union went before the Senate Committee with the names of one and a half million petitioners, and more to follow, in favor of that law which, in more than one of its provisions, is subversive of liberty, and which savors all over of tyranny. (See the judicial decision, in another part of this paper.) It is perfectly safe to say that from the position which she occupies, the present president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, herself alone, is doing more to spread National Reform ideas and principles than are all the National Reform "District Secretaries" put together. And there are other leaders of the Union who are not much behind her in this bad accomplishment.

Therefore, as we are totally opposed to the aims of the National Reform Association, and as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the most powerful support of that association, we are, consequently, totally opposed to *that part* of the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. And why should we not be?

Nor is this all. We view with grave apprehensions the encroachments of the Papal power, on its own part, upon the civil institutions of this Government. Everybody knows that the Papacy has never wearied of condemning our public schools because they are not made the medium of religious instruction. The National Reform Association and its allies now echo the Papal condemnation, and seek to remove the cause of it, by the pending amendment to the National Constitution, in which the National power is pledged to see that every State "shall establish and maintain" a system of religious public schools. Now to secure this and the co-operation of the Papacy at the same time, the National Reform Association agrees that the Catholic Bible, and Catholic instruction, shall be established in the public schools wherever "Roman Catholics are in the majority." And also in secur-

ing and enforcing the pending National Sunday law, the National Reformers pledge themselves to "gladly join hands" with the Roman Catholics, and to make repeated advances to secure the co-operation of the Roman Catholics "in *any form* in which *they* may be willing to exhibit it." Therefore the two points,—the National Sunday law, and religion in the public schools,—upon which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is diligently working to secure National religious legislation, are the very points upon which the National Reform Association stands pledged to unite with the Papacy.

Now the Woman's Christian Temperance Union supports the National Reform Association. The National Reform Association is pledged to Rome. Rome stands pledged forever to the subversion of every principle of liberty. Therefore, as we are forever opposed to the encroachments of Rome, so we are forever opposed to *that part* of the working of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union which supports the National Reform Association, which is pledged to Rome. And why should we not be opposed to it? And why should not everybody else be opposed to it?

We know that there are many of the women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union who do not favor the political, nor the theocratical, nor the National Reform, aspirations of the leaders of the Union. We know a number of women who have separated themselves from the workings of the Union because of the very things which we have here pointed out. They joined the Union to work for Christian temperance upon Christian principles, and to secure the practice of Christian temperance by Christian means. But when they saw that by the leadership of the Union, political efforts and means were supplanting the Christian principles, efforts, and means, they left it. They did well to leave it. And so will every other woman do well to leave it, who does not want to be sold into the hands of Rome through the political, theocratical, and National Reform aspirations of the present leadership of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

We only pray that the whole body of the Union, leadership and all, may awake to the danger of their position before they shall have delivered the civil power, and themselves and us all with it, into the hands of a religious despotism. A. T. J.

THE *Christian Statesman* has sent us a circular giving reasons why that paper is to be commended. One of these reasons is:—

"Because it advocates a *civil* as well as a church Sabbath."

But there is no such thing as a civil Sabbath. The original, supreme, and only Sabbath law—the fourth commandment—says explicitly of the Sabbath, that it is "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." It is not the Sabbath of any civil government, it is the Sabbath of the Lord. He calls it, "*My* holy day." Christ has commanded us to render to God that which is God's, while we render

to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's. The Sabbath being the Lord's day, it is to be rendered to him and not to Cæsar. Civil government can never of right have anything to do with directing the observance of the Sabbath. Whenever it undertakes to do so, it puts itself in the place of God, and usurps the authority of God, both in such legislation, and by invading the sacred precincts of the conscience. The Lord alone "is the Author and Lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to stand between God and the conscience. A violation of this divine law written in the heart is an assault upon the majesty of God and the image of God in man."

Religious Wickedness.

WHILE so many professed Protestants are courting the favor of the Catholic Church, it is timely to consider the logical conclusion to be drawn from such a course, and the true nature of National religion, as represented by the Papacy, and advocated by the National Reformers of the United States.

One of two things is truth, beyond the possibility of contradiction, namely: Either the Roman Church is a great apostasy from genuine Christianity, and utterly antichristian, or, otherwise, the Reformation under Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle, Calvin, etc., was a schism, an apostasy from the true church, and entirely inexcusable. To advance the idea that the Catholic Church is a truly Christian body, is to openly condemn the work of Luther and his co-laborers.

The words of a certain Christian writer of Switzerland, recently uttered, are true: "Protestants there are, but Protestantism is dead." As a system, representing a distinct profession of faith, and represented by nations or large religious bodies, Protestantism has passed away. Fifty years ago Protestants could not have been persuaded that such a change in the religious world could possibly take place in a single generation. But the change has come, and those peoples who have been most determined in their Protestantism, are now most forward to show their zeal in defending the standing of the Pope and *his church*.

The motto of the SENTINEL is: "Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves." Akin to this sentiment we may declare the following: "Perverted Christianity is the worst form of error." The fact has often been noticed that religious wars are the most cruel and sanguinary; religious persecution is the most bitter and relentless. If we trace the history of the Romish Church, its Inquisition, its *auto da fe*, its ingenuity of tortures, we shall find a parallel to its barbarities only amongst the savages of the forests. Rome, in its purely civil form, was marked by its cruelty and thirst for human blood; but under its nationalized Christian form it was still more iron-hearted.

But it is not our purpose at present to trace the history of the Papacy, or to repeat the indictment presented by Luther and others of his time. We only call attention to the fact, and ask all to candidly examine

it, that either the Papal system is a gross apostasy, or the Reformation of the sixteenth century was an inexcusable schism. We are compelled to affirm the first part of the proposition; they who are petting the Papacy, as the leading men of the large denominations in America are doing to-day, are in effect denouncing the work of Luther and Melancthon.

But we do not indict the individuals composing that church as being, in the aggregate, sinners above the rest of mankind. The indictment lies against the system under which they acted. Under a similar system, others have followed their example; and under like circumstances others would yet do the same.

National Christianity is a perversion of Christianity, and as such it carries in its bosom, inherent in its nature, all the evils that have cropped out in the history of the Papacy. The principle was incorporated into the early religious systems of New England, and the cruelties of Salem were the result. The complacency with which religious bigots look upon and speak of the sufferings of those who hold a belief differing from their own, is enough to shock the sensibilities of the heathen.

A book published in London, in 1661, entitled "Heresiography," furnishes a notable example. It was written by "Ephraim Pagitt, late minister of St. Edmonds, Lombard Street." What must be the heart of a professed minister of the gospel who can write in the following strain?

OF ANABAPTISTS.

"7. *How Christian princes have suppressed these sectaries, and especially how they have been punished in England.*

"As you have heard of their detestable and blasphemous errors, so I propose to speak a word or two of the severe punishments inflicted upon those wicked sectaries.

"Anabaptism continued in Germany in its vigor, not much above ten years, they were destroyed and suppressed by the Christian magistrates; at Frankbus there were slain about five thousand of them, and three hundred executed with Muncer; at Nuremburg also a great number was slain; at Zurich they drowned them that were rebaptized; at Vienne they did the like; at Passow many were burned and drowned; in the Low Countries at Amsterdam, Leyden, Harlem, and in all other places else, they were severely punished. Pontanus writeth of the destruction of 150,000 persons.

"The Christian princes and magistrates never left off burning, drowning, and destroying them, till their remainder was contemptible. A remnant of them came to England in two ships, where they have been lurking. They came hither about the year 1535. In the year 1538 we read of them in our Chronicles, viz., upon the 24 day of Novem., in the said year, four Dutch Anabaptists bare fagots at Paul's Cross; and again of the burning of two Dutch Anabaptists in Smithfield the 27 of Novembar.

"Again of two Dutch Anabaptists burnt, in the highway beyond Southwark, leading to Newington, Anno 1539. Again upon Easter day, 1575, of a congregation of Dutch Anabaptists discovered in a house, without the bars at Algate, of whom twenty-seven were taken of them, four recanted at Paul's Cross, the 25 day of May, in form following:—

"WHEREAS, I, T. R. H., being seduced by the devil, the spirit of error, and by false teachers, have fallen into most damnable and detestable errors, namely,

"1. That Christ took not flesh of the substance of the Virgin Mary.

"2. That the infants of the faithful ought not to be baptized.

"3. That a Christian man may not be a magistrate, or bear the sword or office of authority.

"4. That it is not lawful for a Christian man to take an oath."

Here follows the form of recantation, and the profession they were compelled to make, and the record continues:—

"Anno 1575, in the seventeenth year of Queen Elizabeth, of blessed memory, one man and ten women, Dutch Anabaptists, were in the consistory of Paul's, condemned to be burnt in Smithfield, but after great pains taken with them, only one woman was converted, and the other banished the land.

"The 22 of July in the same year, two Dutchmen, Anabaptists, were burnt in Smithfield, who died in great horror, crying and roaring: this was the entertainment that these sectaries had in times past."

Go where you will, look through all history, and you will find that this spirit always accompanies the enforcement of religion. And we need not wait for a National religion to be set up to have this spirit generated; it is the presence of this spirit that calls for and establishes National religion. Where the Spirit of Christ is; where the meek and tender spirit of genuine Christianity exists; where men pity the erring, and strive to fulfill the divine requirement to love their neighbors as themselves, there can be no enforcement of religion, no lording it over the consciences of others.

This spirit of persecution for differences of religious belief is strongly manifesting itself in the utterances of the self-styled National Reformers. Already they complacently declare what shall be the fate of those who "interfere with my faith," or dare to have a faith and practice not in all things consistent with their views of State religion. They talk of disfranchising non-conformists, with all the coolness of inquisitors who already had their victims in their power. And, strange to say, but few of the people take the alarm, though they can see the spirit of persecution spreading, and the idea of a State-enforced religion everywhere being received with favor.

Mr. Robert Robinson, the able Baptist historian, of Cambridge, England, in his "Ecclesiastical Researches," speaking of the action of Leo III., and of the Papacy as a system, said:—

"Dominion over conscience is antichrist anywhere. At Rome antichrist is of age, a sovereign, and wears a crown; at the meanest meeting-house if the same kind of tyranny be, antichrist is a beggar's baby at the breast, but as conscience everywhere is a throne of God, so an usurper of his throne is antichrist anywhere."—Pp. 172, 173.

And again he used the following most truthful and forcible language:—

"Religion neither is, nor can be, forced; and there is no danger in allowing it to be free. Happy are the States which provide for a free exercise of religion! Happier still are they that confine the civil magistrate to civil affairs, and let religion wholly alone."—P. 176.

But a little over a century ago there was a

terrible struggle in North America to establish civil liberty. The struggle for religious liberty in the United States is yet before us. People imagine that it was established with civil liberty; but signs and events are proving that it yet stands on a very slender footing.

J. H. W.

The Savor of Tyranny.

SENATOR BLAIR'S National Sunday Bill declares that no person shall "engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord's day, or during any part thereof." Some of the States already have the same sort of Sunday laws as this. California has no Sunday law, much less one of this kind. But not long ago the city of San Francisco had, on another subject, an ordinance of the same nature as this passage in the National Sunday Bill. San Francisco has no such ordinance now, however; the merit of the ordinance came up before the Superior Court, and the whole thing was treated with the contempt which all such statutes only deserve.

The ordinance read as follows:—

"No person shall in any place indulge in conduct having a tendency to annoy persons passing or being upon the public highway or upon adjacent premises."

A man by the name of Ferdinand Pape was distributing some circulars on the street, which had "a tendency to annoy" somebody; he was arrested. He applied to the Superior Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*, claiming that the offense charged against him did not constitute a crime, and that the ordinance making such action an offense was invalid and void, because it was unreasonable and uncertain. The report of the case says:—

"The writ was made returnable before Judge Sullivan, and argued by Henry Hutton in behalf of the imprisoned offender. Disposing of the question, the Judge gave quite a lengthy written opinion, in which he passed a somewhat severe criticism upon the absurdity of the contested ordinance, and discharged Pape from custody. Said the Judge:—

"If the order be law, enforceable by fine and imprisonment, it is a crime to indulge in any conduct, however innocent and harmless in itself, and however unconsciously done, which has a tendency to annoy other persons. The rival tradesman who passes one's store with an observant eye as to the volume of business is guilty of a crime, because the very thought of rivalry and reduction of business has a tendency to annoy. The passing of the most lenient creditor has a tendency to annoy, because it is a reminder of obligations unfulfilled. The passing of a well-clad, industrious citizen, bearing about him the evidence of thrift, has a tendency to annoy the vagabond, whose laziness reduces him to a condition of poverty and discontent. The importunities of the newsboy who endeavors with such persistent energy to dispose of his stock, has a tendency to annoy the prominent citizen who has already read the papers, or who expects to find them at his door as he reaches home. He who has been foiled in an attempted wrong upon the person or property of another, finds a tendency to annoy in the very passing presence of the person whose honesty or ingenuity has circumvented him.

And so instances might be multiplied indefinitely in which the most harmless and inoffensive conduct has a tendency to annoy others. If the language of the ordinance defines a criminal offense, it sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.

"But it may be said that courts and juries will not use the instrumentality of this language to set the seal of condemnation on offending citizens, and to unjustly deprive them of their liberty and brand them as criminals. The law countenances no such dangerous doctrine, countenances no principle so subversive of liberty as that the life or liberty of a subject should be made to depend upon the whim or caprice of judge or jury, by exercising a discretion in determining that certain conduct does or does not come within the inhibition of a criminal action. The law should be engraved so plainly and distinctly on the legislative tablets that it can be discerned alike by all subjects of the commonwealth, whether judge upon the bench, juror in the box, or prisoner at the bar. Any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror savors of tyranny. The language employed is broad enough to cover conduct which is clearly within the constitutional rights of the citizen. It designates no border-line which divides the criminal from the non-criminal conduct. Its terms are too vague and uncertain to lay down a rule of conduct. In my judgment the portion of the ordinance here involved is uncertain and unreasonable."

This decision applies with full force to Senator Blair's proposed National Sunday law. Under that law all that would be necessary to subject any person to a criminal prosecution, would be for him to engage in any sort of play, or game, or amusement, or recreation, on Sunday, because there are many of those rigid National Reformers who would be very much "disturbed" by any such amusement or recreation, however innocent it might be in itself. And it is left entirely to the whim or the caprice of the "disturbed" one, or of the judge or jury, to say whether the action has really disturbed him or not.

The California decision is, that such a statute "sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality." California courts "countenance no such dangerous doctrine, countenance no principle so subversive of liberty," or which so "savors of tyranny." It is very likely that should Senator Blair's bill be enacted into a law, the United States courts would decide in the same way as did the Superior Court of California. But it is an exceedingly ominous sign, and one most startling in the danger which it displays, when a bill which so "savors of tyranny," and which embodies a principle so "subversive of liberty," can be introduced into the National Legislature, can be received and reported favorably, can pass two readings, can be spread broadcast throughout the land, and only one single voice—that of the AMERICAN SENTINEL—be raised against it.

The American people have so long enjoyed the liberty, which has been justly their boast, that they seem, from appearances, to think that now they can lie down safely and hiber-

nate undisturbed for all time to come. We wonder what can ever awaken them. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty;" but "corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

A. T. J.

Bad Institutions and Good Men.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL has often called attention to the rapid spread of National Reform ideas, while the great majority of those who love real liberty seem to be asleep. The National Reform Association itself is a comparatively insignificant affair, and if the issue depended on its efforts alone, there would not be much to fear. Its organs, the *Christian Statesman* and the *Christian Nation*, have long ago ceased to publish distinctively National Reform articles, and seem to exist chiefly in order that the association's "secretaries," who sacrifice themselves in the cause of reform for one hundred dollars a month and expenses, may have a place in which to tell of their exploits. But the success of that which is misnamed National Reform does not depend on their efforts. There is just one thing that this so-called National Reform really stands for, and that is the passage and enforcement of strict Sunday laws, and for this many are working who are not known as National Reformers.

As an example of how the great object of the National Reform Association is gaining ground, take the Blair Sunday Bill. By request of certain influential persons in the church, Senator Blair introduced the bill, and it passed its second reading in the Senate almost before it had been heard of by anybody outside of the "ring" which had started it. Then the Rev. Dr. Crafts devoted his whole attention to it, and has already succeeded in working up large petitions in favor of it. He has got the churches, the Sunday-school Associations, and many trades-unions and Knights of Labor clubs to take hold of the matter, so that when the bill comes to its final passage, the legislators will be confronted with documents setting forth that the people of the country are almost unanimous in desiring the measure.

But besides all this, there is the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which is now married, as the *Statesman* claims, to the National Reform Association. A more correct statement would be that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has adopted the National Reform Association, and is nursing its principles into stalwart proportions. Whichever way it is put, however, the fact remains that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, with its vast influence, is wholly committed to the principles of the National Reform Association, and 1892 is set as the date for its triumph. Judging from the vast host of names of men and women both dead and alive that are arrayed in favor of the movement, we cannot see much presumption in the claim that it will succeed in four years. Think of it, you who have recently celebrated another anniversary of our country's independence, and are swelling with pride at the thought that this is the freest country on earth—only four

years to elapse before liberty in this country will be dead! only four years until laws shall be passed which will inaugurate a system of espionage upon those who think differently from the majority, and who have the courage of their convictions, which will be worse than any that ever existed in Russia! Is it a pleasant prospect? If not, what are you going to do about it? Do you say that if it is going to come it will come, and that you will not let it swerve you from the right when it does come? That will not do; for if through your indifference any who might have been warned of the danger, and put on their guard, are taken unawares and overcome by the speciousness or the force of the oppressor, their blood will be upon your head. It is time for somebody to be awake, for there is just before us a struggle between right and wrong such as the world has never yet seen. It will be a struggle between error entrenched in law, and having the cloak of righteousness, and truth under ban of law, and covered with reproach and stigmatized as blasphemy. He who stands firm for truth at that time will need much of the grace of God. There will yet be greater need for the martyr spirit than ever before in the history of the world.

Right here, however, we are met with the charge of inconsistency. "How can it be possible," it is asked, "that such evils should result from a movement that is in the hands of so many good people." Our friends of the opposition tell us that the very arguments which we bring forward to show the strength of the National Reform movement, are strong arguments to show its righteousness. Indeed, it often puzzles many people who are really opposed to the principles of the association, to know how any harm can come from anything which is introduced by the good folks of the churches and the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. We will explain by a brief reference to the history of the past. And we will quote first, as a text, a passage from the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, of May, 1844, written by Rev. Ralph Emerson, D. D., at that time Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Andover Theological Seminary. It is this:—

"Few things can be so pernicious to the church as a general belief that no very bad measure was ever introduced by good men or with a great and good purpose. Then will they look at the character of the men, and at the object proposed, instead of scrutinizing the means by which it is to be effected; and the work is done before its character is suspected. Nearly all the bad institutions in the church—Jesuitism among the rest—have been by apparently good men, and for a professedly good purpose."

This is a point that is given too little attention. When we portray the essential wickedness of the National Reform movement, we do not impugn the character nor the motives of its abettors. We are convinced that many of them are conscientious men; but we never yet saw a good man who could not make a mistake, nor one whose advocacy of a bad institution could make that institution good.

We will take, for example, the system of slavery as it existed years ago in this country.

That it was a wicked institution few will now have the hardihood to deny. Even the people where it flourished, and who reaped all the benefit that was to be reaped from it, are glad that it is abolished. And yet thousands of good men upheld the institution, and held slaves. It cannot be denied that there were people who held slaves, who were personally as upright, and as conscientious Christians, as any who opposed the institution. It is no doubt true that very many slaves were actually in better circumstances than many colored people are now in a state of freedom. But these are not the things by which we judge slavery. Even if the vast majority of slave-holders had been humane men, that would not have made the system right. The fact is that under that system which was upheld by so many good men, a bad man could expend upon his slaves all the hellish brutality of his nature, and the law would uphold him in it. The principle of the system was, in the first place, opposed to the golden rule, and all the good men in the world could not, by their advocacy of it, make it right. The system must be judged by the injustice which it allowed men to do.

So must we judge of the National Reform system. When a universal rigid Sunday law is once passed, all the good intentions of the men who are working to secure it, and the humane feelings of the good women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, cannot prevent the law from being used as an instrument of cruelty upon persons who conscientiously differ with the majority.

The methods which are used to advance the movement should convince anybody that there is something essentially wrong about it. We have already spoken of the great lists of names which Rev. Mr. Crafts is securing to petitions in favor of the Blair Sunday Bill. But it would take too long, and would involve too much labor, to circulate these petitions throughout all the country, for individual signatures. So a scheme has been devised by which a great deal more influence can be secured for it, with much less trouble. The matter is to be presented, not to individuals, but to churches, and a vote taken on it. If the vote is favorable, as it will usually be, then the entire membership of the church will be counted as favorable. Let us illustrate. Here is a church of five hundred members. At one of its meetings, when there is an average attendance of perhaps three hundred members, a vote is taken on the Sunday bill, and no one votes against it. Then by the vote of less than three hundred people, the influence of five hundred is secured in favor of the bill, although many of the five hundred may be opposed to the bill. Even though a few of the three hundred present vote against the bill, their votes are not counted out, and so opposition is by this ledgerdmain turned into advocacy. Anything which uses such methods must be inherently wrong.

Before we close we must refer to a little circumstance that happened years ago, for the express benefit of those who think that no harm can come from a movement that is

in the hands of such good women as the leaders of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Some men named Paul and Barnabas were preaching the doctrines of a sect that was everywhere spoken against. They were doing this, notwithstanding the fact that their preaching had been condemned by the established church, and was utterly out of harmony with the belief of the majority of church-members. At Antioch, in Pisidia, they had been so active that "the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region," much to the disgust of the general public. So the record says:—

"But the Jews stirred up the devout and honorable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts." Acts 13:50.

Here is something for our friends to consider. If it had not been for the influence of the "devout and honorable women," Paul and Barnabas might have continued preaching in Antioch. The heathen did not persecute them, but on the contrary rejoiced to hear the word; it was the good people of the church, "the chief men of the city," and the "devout and honorable women,"—the eminently respectable and moral people,—that persecuted Paul and Barnabas, and drove them from the country. And who shall say that a similar thing may not happen again? We bring no charges against the worthy women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. We are willing to grant that they are all "devout and honorable," but we remember that just such women once persecuted the preachers of the gospel, and were no less "devout and honorable" when they got through than when they began. When error is upheld by law, then the law-abiding people must prosecute those who stand for truth and against error; and in such a case prosecution becomes persecution.

E. J. W.

The National Establishment of the Christian Religion.

THAT amendment to the National Constitution that has been offered by Senator Blair, and which is now pending in Congress, is a singular sort of a document, though hardly any more so than was to be expected in the promotion of the scheme which underlies it, *i. e.*, the establishment of a National religion. The proposed amendment is just about as flatly self-contradictory as any proposition could be. Section 1 reads as follows:—

"No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The first sentence of section 2 reads as follows:—

"Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate to the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality and the principles of Christian religion."

That is to say, No State shall ever make or maintain a law respecting an establishment

of religion; but every State in this Union shall make and maintain laws establishing the principles of the Christian religion. And to make assurance doubly sure, section 3 declares that—

"The United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided."

And that is to say that the United States Government pledges itself that every State shall establish and maintain the principles of the Christian religion. "This proposed amendment therefore, at one stroke, establishes Christianity as the National religion, because it declares that every State shall maintain the principles of the Christian religion in the public schools, and the Nation is pledged to see that this is done. Therefore there must be a National decision of some kind declaring just what are the principles of the Christian religion. Then when that decision shall have been made, every State will have to receive from the Nation just those principles of religion which the Nation shall have declared to be the principles of the Christian religion, and which the Nation will have pledged itself shall be taught in the public schools of every State. In other words, the people of the United States will then have to receive their religion from the Government of the United States. Therefore, if Senator Blair's proposed amendment to the National Constitution does not provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National religion, then no religion was ever established or maintained in this world.

But how shall this National decision be made as to what are the principles of the Christian religion? It would seem that the second sentence of section 2 makes provision for this. It declares that no "instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools."

As therefore no religious tenets, doctrines, or beliefs can be taught in the schools, except such as are common to all denominations of the Christian religion, it will follow inevitably that there shall be officially called, a National council of the churches to decide what are the principles common to all, and to establish a National creed, which shall be enforced and inculcated by National power in all the public schools in the United States. And that will be but the establishment of a National religion. And that is exactly what Senator Blair's constitutional amendment assures, so surely as it or anything similar to it shall ever be adopted. And that is what the National Reformers intend shall be.

It was in this way precisely that the thing was worked in the fourth century. Constantine made Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman Empire. Then it became at once necessary that there should be an imperial decision as to what form of Christianity

should be the imperial religion. To effect this an imperial council was necessary to formulate that phase of Christianity which was common to all. The Council of Nice was convened by imperial command, and an imperial creed was established, which was enforced by imperial power. That establishment of an imperial religion ended only in the imperious despotism of the Papacy.

As surely as the complete establishment of the Papacy followed, and grew out of, that imperial recognition of Christianity in the fourth century, just so surely will the complete establishment of a religious despotism after the living likeness of the Papacy, follow, and grow out of, this National recognition of Christianity provided for in the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Blair, and which is now pending in Congress. A. T. J.

The Political Value of Religion.

JUDGE HAGANS,* of the Supreme Court of Cincinnati, in delivering his opinion in the case of *Minor and others vs. the Board of Education of Cincinnati and others*, said: "In a word, it is the *political value* of religion, morality, and knowledge which the State proposes to secure for its varied purposes, and that only." This utterance was preceded by an extended quotation from an article by Dr. Seelye, which appeared in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. XIII, No. 52. In this article Dr. Seelye says that "the State has its own end," and that it "uses religion as a means to this end; but religion itself is never an end with the State. Everything relating to the moral and religious life of its subjects is of interest to the State only so far as the State can use it to its own ends." Again he says: "With the State religion is a means." He says again: "There are temporal and earthly interests for the individual, and it is to subserve these that there is a State, a community, among men. These interests are undoubtedly more perfectly secured through the agency of some religion, and hence the proper and necessary connection of religion with the State. But in this connection religion is ever the servant, never the sovereign. It is to be used to secure some end"—namely, some temporal end, that comes within the province of the State. On this ground we understand Dr. Seelye to hold to a legitimate "connection of the State with religion, and the duty of the State to maintain its religion," while he disclaims any right on its part to resort to persecution.

The substance of this theory, as adopted by Judge Hagans, and more fully explained by Dr. Seelye, seems to be this: The State may and should incorporate religion into its own being as a part of its public law; not as an end, or on account of what religion is in itself, considered as a spiritual system, but solely on account of what the State can do with it as the means of promoting the civilization, improvement, and good earthly order of the body politic. The State can make use of it as a "servant," and hence, in this character,

should maintain it. Its "political value" brings it within the purview of civil government.

This theory is as old as the efforts of human thought to vindicate the establishment and maintenance of religion by the civil power. There is nothing in it which limits it to Christianity in either the Catholic or the Protestant form, and it has not been so limited. It applies to any religious system, whether pagan or Christian, true or false. Any such system, which, in the judgment of the State, can be made useful for the attainment of its temporal ends, may, as the means thereof, be legalized, adopted, and supported by the State. Almost any religion is, in its social effects, better than blank atheism; and, hence, it might be used by the State as a means, rather than have a nation of pure atheists, especially as no religion has ever been so bad as not to contain at least some rays of truth. Of course, it would be better for the State to adopt the true system; but, in its absence, it will be better to put its stamp on any system, and use it for State purposes, rather than be wholly without religion.

Now, in order to give this theory the benefit of the most favorable application, let us understand the term religion to mean Christianity. The case will then stand thus: The State may and should establish a connection between itself and Christianity; not because Christianity is true, not because it is a divine system in its authority, not on account of its relation to the spiritual duties and immortal interests of men, but solely on the ground of its *temporal* utility. Being an existing system known to the people, it is good for this purpose—just as revenue laws, currency laws, laws of debt and credit, patent laws, commercial laws, police regulations, courts of justice, State prisons, and, indeed, all the ordinary appliances of civil government, are good to secure the material and social prosperity of the people. The State may, hence, maintain and use it as one of the wheels in its complex machinery, on the same principle that it maintains and uses other wheels to run its own system. Not what Christianity is, but what the State can get out of it for temporal purposes, is the single thing to be considered.

It is hardly necessary to say that Christ and his apostles did not preach the gospel upon any such theory. They made no mention of it as the "servant" of the State. They presented it as God's supernatural interposition for the salvation of individual sinners. What the State should gain or lose by it was not their question. Salvation, and not State utility, was their grand idea. They did not concern themselves with the relations of the gospel to Cæsar, but rather with its relations to God and sinners against his law. They preached repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and warned men to flee from the wrath to come. There is a vast distance between the conception of Christianity as preached by its Author and his apostles and the conception of it as a piece of State machinery, sanctioned and sustained by the State on account of its "political value," or as

the means of attaining a purely temporal end.

Let the State frankly enunciate the theory, and, hence, say that it uses Christianity as a mere instrument for State ends; and let the people, including the children in the public school, both understand and accept the theory, and who believes that the system would then have any power to gain these ends? No one ever was and no one ever will be made a Christian on the ground of State utility. No man ever made a prayer to God as the means of turning himself into a good citizen. A truly pious man will be a good citizen; but the motives that make him pious rise infinitely above the range of citizenship. The State can successfully work the theory of "political value" only by being a hypocrite, pretending one thing while seeking another.

If a general should hold morning and evening prayers with his army, or have religious lectures delivered to his soldiers, simply to make them better *fighters* in the day of battle, they would only need to understand the *sham* to treat the whole thing with contempt. Religion cannot be brought down to the level of State strategy or fighting strategy, and yet retain its power as religion. At this level it has no value for either purpose. The moment we make it the means of an end immeasurably less than itself, and so regard it, we destroy its power as religion. The man who is religious for the sake of making money is not religious at all; and so the State that uses the Christian religion simply for its "political value" adopts a theory that cannot survive its own exposure. Let the State by all means put the theory among the *esoteric* doctrines which are not to be known. Statesmen may perhaps be admitted into the secret; but it will not do to give it to the common people, and especially it will not do to tell the children in the public school that they are trained in religion and its duties in order to promote the temporal ends for which the State exists.

The theory, moreover, involves all the perils to religious liberty which ally themselves with the system that makes the regulation of religious belief and practice one of the *ends* of civil government. The distinction between the two theories may be very nicely worked out in an essay; yet, if the State may establish a connection between itself and religion as a means to State ends, then it may equally decide what religion it will so use—whether Christianity or some other system—and, having settled this point, then it is equally privileged to determine upon the methods by which it will sustain and apply the chosen system. The power to use Christianity as a means implies the power of employing all the means of using it. Whether, then, the State will simply teach the religion it uses for temporal ends, or enforce it by pains and penalties, how far it will tolerate other religions, to what extent it will tax the people for the support of its own system, and by what rules it will regulate the administration thereof—these and the like questions will be answered according to the bigotry or liberality of those who enact and apply the laws.

*The force of this selection will be more fully appreciated when it is understood that Judge Hagans and Doctor Seelye are both vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. Judge Hagans is a Methodist; Doctor Seelye is a Presbyterian.

The fatal step is taken by conceding that the State has any jurisdiction in the premises, whether religion be viewed as a means or an end.

The voice of history is that all such deposits of power with civil government, whether as a means or otherwise, are exceedingly dangerous to the liberties of the people. No small part of the oppressions which have cursed mankind may be traced, directly or indirectly, to the administration or regulation of religion by State authority. Their justification has been State necessity or church necessity, or both put together. Even Christianity has never been able to enter into any alliance with the civil power without receiving damage and doing damage. Many pages of its history are stained with the blood of martyrs slain in order to maintain its authority and put down heresy. The framers of our national Government were eminently wise in making all organic connection between religion and that Government, upon any theory or for any purpose, and, hence, all disabilities, proscriptions, or persecutions on religious grounds, constitutionally impossible. There are no consequences in the way of evil attaching themselves to this doctrine in practice that in the magnitude of the evil will at all compare with the consequences of the opposite doctrine.

Christianity is a divinely-given system of religion, and, hence, authoritative over the individual conscience; yet there does not exist on all the face of the earth any civil Government that has the right for any purpose to administer this authority. The assumption of the right is an act of tyranny, and every exercise thereof is simply the continuance of that tyranny. When Massachusetts, as was the fact prior to 1833, made every citizen taxable for the support of the Protestant religion, whether he was a Protestant or not, her constitution in this respect bore the distinctive mark of religious despotism. When, as was the fact prior to 1821, no person in Massachusetts was eligible to the office of governor, lieutenant-governor, or counselor, or senator, or representative in the legislature, unless he upon oath declared his belief in the religion adopted and sanctioned by the State, then the same feature marked her constitution. Such provisions are virtually persecuting, no matter upon what theory they are defended.

Those who talk about the "political value" of religion as a reason why the State should maintain and teach it, would do well to remember that Christianity has uniformly made its largest contribution to the State when left to depend upon the voluntary efforts of its friends, unconstrained and unregulated except by the law of Christ. Its brightest pages are the ones written when such has been the fact, and its darkest pages are those written when the reverse has been true. What the State really wants for its own good is the elevating and purifying power of Christianity in the hearts of the people; and all history shows that in reference to this end the State can do nothing so wise for itself as simply to do nothing

and leave the work of maintenance and propagation to other and more appropriate agencies. It has always proved itself to be a poor preacher of the gospel, and quite often a worse theologian. It never did the work well, and it never can, because it is not well adapted to the work.

The Bible speaks of Christians, and not of the State, as the visible kingdom of God, and as the habitation of God through the Spirit. To the former, and not the latter, Christ gave the preaching and propagating commission, and never said a word implying that the civil power, as such, was to be called into his service. The simple truth is that the church, composed of His friends and inspired with holy zeal in His cause, holding in her hands the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, and, without any State battalions or State tax-gatherers, assailing the citadels of sin and error—yes, the church, unlicensed and unpatronized by the State, yet strong in argument, patient in effort, persuasive in love, and, above all, having the assurance of divine help—constitutes the effective soldiery in this warfare. It can make more converts than the State can, and make better ones. Christianity, in itself, in its own appointments, in the inspirations which it imparts and the laws which it prescribes, contains all the necessary instrumentalities for its own diffusion; and the State can add nothing thereto with any advantage.

Granting, then, as we most cheerfully do, the great "political value" of the Christian religion as the means of producing good government, we come to a conclusion entirely different from that drawn by Judge Hagans and substantially drawn by Dr. Seelye. The surest way to realize this value is to leave the spiritual agencies of Christianity entirely to the voluntary, the self-imposed, and self-directed efforts of its friends. Let them build their own churches, choose and support their own ministers, and, subject to the rules of good public order, manage their affairs according to their own discretion. Let them replenish their own money-chest and disburse their own free-will-offerings. Let them organize as many religious schools as they choose, and in those schools teach what seems to them good, whether on the Sabbath or the week day, and then let them pay the expenses thereof. Let the State afford to them impartial protection, and stop there. This gives Christian truth, and its friends a fair and open field, without patronage and without State resistance. More would be bad policy, even if we concede that the State has a right to do more. By doing more it would lose rather than gain.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D., in Religion and the State.*

End of the Quarter.

SEVERAL subscriptions expire with the quarter ending September, 1888; if yours is among the number, please send us your renewal this week. The address label on your paper will show the month to which your subscription is paid.

Subscription price only fifty cents per year, or if you will send us two new subscribers at fifty cents each we will send you the AMERICAN SENTINEL one year free.

"The Abiding Sabbath."

"The Abiding Sabbath and the Lord's Day." A review of the \$500 and \$1,000 prize essays. By Alonzo T. Jones. Pamphlet, 175 pages; price, 20c. Pacific Press Publishing Company, Oakland, California.

Of this pamphlet the *Herald of Gospel Liberty* (Disciple, Dayton, Ohio) says:—

"The prize essays contain the best thought on the question that can be given. The quotations are ample for an appreciation of the essays, while the review is both candid and able. The pamphlet is well worth its price to parties interested in the Sunday question."

VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM.

PACKAGE NO. 1, 184 PAGES, 20 CENTS.

THIS package contains thirteen tracts treating upon the various phases of the National Reform movement, as follows:—

NO.	PAGES.
1. Religious Legislation,.....	8
2. Religious Liberty,.....	8
3. National Reform and the Rights of Conscience,.....	16
4. The American Papacy,.....	16
5. Bold and Base A Vowal,.....	16
6. National Reform is Church and State,.....	16
7. Purity of National Religion,.....	8
8. The Salem Witchcraft,.....	8
9. What Think Ye of Christ?.....	8
10. National Reformed Constitution and the American Hierarchy,.....	24
11. The Republic of Israel,.....	8
12. National Reformed Presbyterianism,.....	32
13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity,.....	16

The above package will be sent post-paid to any address for twenty cents.
Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

THE SABBATH QUESTION

IS THE LEADING SUBJECT OF THE DAY.

THE GREAT DEMAND OF THE HOUR, FROM THE PULPIT AND THE PRESS, IN SOCIAL CIRCLES AND IN LEGISLATIVE HALLS, IS

That the Sabbath be more strictly observed. To assist the intelligent-minded of our land to have correct views of this important question, a book has been prepared which thoroughly discusses the Sabbath institution in every conceivable phase. Such is the valuable work entitled

"History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week."

BY ELD. J. N. ANDREWS.

This great and exhaustive work is the result of ten years' hard labor and historical research. The book contains 548 12mo pages, and is printed in clear type, on good paper, and is well bound. Price, post-paid, \$2.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

TEMPERANCE PACKAGES.

WE have put up in neat packages, with printed wrappers, three different assortments of our health and temperance works, which we will furnish, post-paid, at the prices named.

TEN CENT PACKAGE.

This package contains 100 pages in twenty-five tracts, as follows:—

The Code of Health—How to Live a Century—Pure Air—How to Ventilate a House—A Back Yard Examined—Inventory of a Cellar—What's in the Well—Cayenne and Its Congeners—A Live Hog Examined—A Peep into a Packing House—The Contents of a Tea-Pot—Tea Tasters—Tea Drinking and Nervousness—Tea Topers—Tea and Tippling—Tobacco Poisoning—A Relic of Barbarism—Tobacco Blindness—Science vs. Tobacco—Using—The Smoke Nuisance—The Rum Family—A Drunkard's Stomach—Gin Livers—A Rum Blossom—Alcoholism.

Of the twenty-five tracts, ten are devoted to general hygiene, five to the subject of temperance, five to alcoholic drinks, and five to tea and coffee. Twelve packages, post-paid, for \$1.00.

FORTY CENT PACKAGE.

The second package, costing forty cents, post-paid, contains the following tracts and pamphlets:—

True Temperance—Alcohol, What Is It?—Our Nation's Curse—Cause and Cure of Intemperance—Effects of Intemperance—The Drunkard's Arguments Answered—Alcoholic Medication—Alcoholic Poison—Tobacco Poisoning—Tobacco—Using a Cause of Disease—Tobacco—Using a Relic of Barbarism—Evil Effects of Tea and Coffee—Ten Arguments on Tea and Coffee—Pork, the Dangers of Its Use—Diphtheria, its Causes, Prevention, and Proper Treatment. By J. H. Kellogg, M. D. This book should be in every household.

ONE DOLLAR PACKAGE.

The third package, costing \$1.00, post-paid, contains in addition to the forty cent package the following pamphlets:—

Proper Diet for Man, price 15c.—The Uses of Water, price 25c.—Dyspepsia, Its Cause and Cure, price 25c.

The object of Arranging these Packages is to get them in a convenient form for sale and for selection.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER, 1888.

NOTE.—No papers are sent by the publishers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to people who have not subscribed for it. If the SENTINEL comes to one who has not subscribed for it, he may know that it is sent him by some friend, and that he will not be called upon by the publishers to pay for the same.

DOCTOR CRAFTS reports that between three and four million names have already been secured to the petitions in behalf of the National Sunday law.

THE names of *seventeen hundred* new subscribers have been added to the SENTINEL list within the last thirty days. The reason of existence of the SENTINEL is becoming every day more and more a living issue, and we are glad to know that the SENTINEL grows in favor with the people accordingly.

THE Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party have become so entirely National Reform organizations that the regular National Reform organizers have ceased to organize local National Reform clubs as such, but work through these to spread the National Reform ideas. So says District Secretary M. A. Gault in the *American*, June 27, 1888.

THOUSANDS of people are signing petitions for the National Sunday law, without a thought of harm to themselves or anybody else. Yet only harm to thousands of people can ever come from the enactment of such a law. Many of those who are signing the petitions would not do so if they knew the danger that there is in the enactment of the law. The SENTINEL clearly points out the danger. Therefore the SENTINEL should be placed in the hands of every person in the land. Are you doing your part to see that this shall be done?

THE *Christian at Work* says:—

"The Spanish Constitution guarantees equal religious liberty to all. But that did not prevent two Protestant citizens of Madrid from being arrested, tried, and condemned, the other day, to six months' imprisonment for refusing to kneel before the *Vaticum*. We do not know if the offenders were Englishmen or Americans, or of what nationality—perhaps they were Spaniards. But some action should be taken that will secure to Protestants in Spain their just constitutional rights. They must spell liberty in a queer way in the Andalusian country."

Oh, no, they don't! They spell it just as it is spelled in New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, and just as they are fast learning to spell it all over this country. Spain has a national religion; it is Catholicism; and refusing to kneel before the *Vaticum* "disturbs" the devotees of the national religion. Such "disturbance" must not be allowed, hence these prosecutions; precisely as the New York law punishes those who "disturb"

the Sunday worshipers by working on Sunday, and as Senator Blair's proposed Sunday law will punish men all over the country. The American method of spelling liberty has descended almost to a level with the Andalusian.

COMMUNICATIONS have been addressed to the SENTINEL asking its influence in favor of a certain party or candidate. We have but one reply that we can make to all communications of this kind, viz.: The SENTINEL cannot lend its influence to any party or candidate as such. The SENTINEL is not in politics in that sense. It is not partisan in any sense. The SENTINEL is devoted to the defense of the National Constitution as it is, so far as religion is concerned; and in this is devoted to the defense of the civil and religious rights and liberties of every person in the nation, regardless of party or creed. And now that the National Constitution is attacked at this very point, and by a United States Senator at that, this question ought to take precedence of every other in National affairs. With the SENTINEL this question does take precedence of everything else, therefore the SENTINEL cannot be partisan in any sense.

THE latter part of July, "Sam" Jones, the great revivalist, preached in Windsor, Canada, to an audience composed mostly of Americans, who went over there to hear him. One of his devout, elegantly refined, and intensely instructive passages was this:—

"Now I'll tell you, I think we are running the last political combat on the lines we have been running them on. It is between the Republicans and Democrats, this contest, and it is the last the Republicans will make in America. The Democrats are going in overwhelmingly. Four years from now the Prohibition element will break the solid South. The issue then will be God or no God, drunkenness or sobriety, Sabbath or no Sabbath, Heaven or hell. That will be the issue. Then we will wipe up the ground with the Democratic party, and let God rule America from that time on."

And this the *Christian Statesman* inserts under the heading, "The National Reform Movement!" It is very appropriately placed. It is a worthy addition to the literature of the National Reform movement. But what consummate mountebanks many of those popular "revivalists" do make of themselves!

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 9, Rev. R. C. Wylie praises Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment, because it would, if adopted, give the National Reformers many advantages which they have not now. He says:—

"We would then have a vantage-ground we have not now. The leading objection that has been urged against us will have lost its power. That objection, which has such a tender regard for the infidel conscience, will have spent its force against this amendment, and will be no more fit for use against us."

That is to say: The charge of invading the rights of conscience has, so far, lain against the National Reformers; but now, if this amendment is carried, this charge will lie

against the amendment, and will spend itself there, while the National Reformers escape. This charge is justly made against the National Reformers; for they distinctly affirm that the civil power has the right to compel the consciences of men. And the admission that if the amendment were adopted the charge would then lie against that, is a confession that the proposed amendment, if adopted, will invade the rights of conscience. And that is the truth. It will surely do so. If it would not, it would not be so heartily indorsed by the National Reformers.

REV. R. C. WYLIE says the National Reformers should advocate Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution,—

"Because of the aid it will give us in discussing National Reform principles. Some of these are clearly embodied in the amendment. Senator Blair's amendment marks an epoch in our history. . . . The pulpit and the platform should herald the truths it teaches, from ocean to ocean."

Yes, the amendment will not only aid in discussing National Reform principles, it will also, if adopted, most materially aid the National Reformers in carrying those principles into practice by the civil power, and in satisfying their intense longing to tolerate dissenters as lunatics and conspirators are tolerated.

As was to be expected, the National Reformers are delighted with Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution. It is in substance just what they have been working for all these years. The *Christian Statesman* of July 12 says the amendment "should receive the strenuous support of all American Christians." In its issue of July 19 the *Statesman* says:—

"Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people."

Then, after mentioning "Christianity, the religion of the Nation," and "The Bible, the textbook of our common Christianity, in all the schools," it says:—

"These have been our watch-words in the discussions of a quarter of a century. And now these ideas are actually pending before the Senate of the United States in the form of a joint resolution proposing their adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Here is a great opportunity. Shall we boldly and wisely improve it?"

We are afraid that the iniquitous scheme will actually carry.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact
Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, - - - 50c.
In clubs of five or more copies, per year, each, - - - 30c.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 2s.
Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 CASTRO ST., OAKLAND, CAL.