



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 30, 1890.

NUMBER 43.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 48 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. MCKEE.

A SOUTHERN paper complains that "the common council of Augusta, Georgia, has resolved to exempt from taxation a large private bridge, that had been constructed by a land company, on the ground that it was a public convenience." And why not? Church property is exempted from taxation on the ground that churches more or less directly benefit the State. If there is any force in the argument why not carry the exemption of property to its logical conclusion, and exempt it all?

"CALIFORNIA is the only State in the Union without some form of Sunday law, or legal rest-day," is the plaintive wail of the Sunday-law advocates. But do they not know that a man may legally rest in California whenever he has a mind so to do? And as a matter of fact as large a proportion of the population of that State do rest from their ordinary avocations on Sunday, as in States having Sunday laws. It is not true that in America a lack of Sunday laws "leads to Sunday slavery of the masses."

A LATE London dispatch states that as a result of the irritation aroused in Russia by the cordial and closer relations between Austria and Germany, the German language is prohibited on public signs over shops, and its teaching forbidden in the schools. The arguments in justification of these repressive measures are substantially the same as are used in Wisconsin in support of the Bennett law. "The Germans live in Russia," it is urged, "and it is their duty to know the language in which

the laws are printed." "If they want to be Germans," say the Russian officials, "let them pack up and go over into Germany." In Russia this is despotism; in the United States, it is by some supposed to be Americanism.

Religious Proclamations Unconstitutional.

THE time for the usual annual Thanksgiving day of the American people is approaching, and undoubtedly the President will issue the usual thanksgiving proclamation. This is a reminder of the manner in which principles are trodden under foot and how a wrong by custom may become a matter of course, and soon be considered as entirely legitimate and right. The drafters of each of our greatest political documents,—and there are none greater—the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States, were radically opposed to this deviation from American principles. After speaking of the violation of these principles "in Congress when they appointed chaplains," Madison says:—

There has been another deviation from the strict principle in the executive proclamations of fasts and festivals.*

President Jefferson was even more decided. While he occupied the executive chair, he would not, under any circumstances, nor with any amount of persuasion, issue thanksgiving proclamations. In a letter to the Rev. Mr. Millar, during his second term of office, he gave his reasons for his firmness in reference to the question. In the letter he said:—

I consider the Government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, disciplines, or exercises.†

Seven years previous he had declared the same thing in reply to a Baptist address. In a letter to his friend, Mr. Lincoln, dated January 1, 1802, he said:—

*Quoted from a letter of James Madison to Edward Livingston, dated Montpelier, July 10, 1822; see "American State Papers," (1800), page 75.

†Quoted in "American State Papers," page 56 et seq.

The Baptist address, now enclosed, admits of a condemnation of the alliance between Church and State, under the authority of the Constitution. It furnishes an occasion, too, which I have long wished to find, of saying why I do not proclaim fastings and thanksgivings, as my predecessors did. The address, to be sure, does not point at this, and its introduction is awkward. But I foresee no opportunity of doing it more pertinently. I know it will give great offense to the New England clergy; but the advocate of religious freedom is to expect neither peace nor forgiveness from them.

Chief Justice Waite, in discussing the meaning of the First Amendment to the Constitution, says that, to ascertain its meaning we must go "to the history of the times in the midst of which the provision was adopted;"‡ and then he proceeds to quote Jefferson who, in connection with Madison, was mainly instrumental in securing the adoption of that amendment among the others. No other individual, excepting, perhaps, Madison, was so well qualified to interpret the meaning of that provision; and Jefferson states positively that "the Constitution has directly precluded them [the United States] from" assuming an authority over religious exercises.

"But it is only proposed," says Jefferson, "that I should recommend, not prescribe, a day of fasting and prayer. That is, that I should indirectly assume to the United States an authority over religious exercises, which the Constitution has directly precluded them from. It must be meant, too, that this recommendation is to carry some authority, and to be sanctioned by some penalty, on those who disregard it; not, indeed, of fine and imprisonment, but of some degree of proscription, perhaps, in public opinion. And does the change in the nature of the penalty make the recommendation less a law of conduct for those to whom it is directed?"

Jefferson not only considered that these religious proclamations were thus an infringement on the rights of the individual, but that they were also injurious to religion and to the State as well. "I do not

‡Reynolds vs. United States, a case decided in 1878.

believe it is for the interest of religion," he continued, "to invite the civil magistrate to direct its exercises, its discipline, or its doctrines; nor of the religious societies, that the general Government should be invested with the power of effecting any uniformity of time or matter among them. Fasting and prayer are religious exercises; the enjoining them an act of discipline. Every religious society has a right to determine for itself the times for these exercises, and the objects proper for them, according to their own particular tenets; and this right can never be safer than in their own hands, *where the Constitution has deposited it.*" Thus emphatically does President Jefferson declare the proclamation of religious fasts and festivals to be unconstitutional.

Madison, in his letter to Livingston, said, in continuation: "I know not what may be the way of thinking on this subject in Louisiana [*i. e.* in reference to appointing a festival which was not recognized by the Catholics]. I should suppose the Catholic portion of the people, at least, as a small and even unpopular sect in the United States, *would rally*, as they did in Virginia when religious liberty was a legislative topic, to its broadest principle." Madison thus asserts that the "broadest principles" of the Constitution would entirely preclude the chief Executive from thus interfering in the religious affairs of the Nation, and suggests that Catholics would have the right to demand that the Constitution should be strictly adhered to.

"Notwithstanding the general progress," continues Madison, "made within the last two centuries in favor of this branch of liberty, and the full establishment of it in some parts of our country, there remains in others a strong bias towards the old error, that without some sort of alliance or coalition between government and religion, neither can be duly supported. Such indeed, is the tendency to such a coalition, and such its corrupting influence on both the parties, *that the danger cannot be too carefully guarded against.*" Yet, instead of guarding against this danger, we see the practice becoming more and more common, and even see the people petitioning by the thousands for further encroachments by the Government on the religious rights of individuals. Madison seemed to foresee this, and emphasized the importance of educating public opinion on the subject.

"And in a government of opinion, like ours," he said, "the only effectual guard must be found in the soundness and stability of the general opinion on the subject. Every new and successful example, therefore, of a *perfect separation of ecclesiastical and civil matters*, is of importance and I have no doubt that every new example will succeed, as every past one has done, in showing that religion and government will both exist in greater purity the less they are mixed together. It was

the belief of all sects at one time that the establishment of religion by law was right and necessary; that the true religion ought to be established in exclusion of every other; and that the only question to be decided was, Which was the true religion? The example of Holland proved that a toleration of sects dissenting from the established sect was safe, and even useful. The example of the Colonies, now States, which rejected religious establishments altogether, proved that all sects might be safely and advantageously put on a footing of equal and entire freedom; and a continuance of their example since the Declaration of Independence has shown that its success in the Colonies was not to be ascribed to their connection with the parent country. If a further confirmation of the truth could be wanted, it is to be found in the examples furnished by the States which have abolished their religious establishments. I cannot speak particularly of any one of the cases excepting that of Virginia, where it is impossible to deny that religion prevails with more zeal and a more exemplary priesthood than it ever did when established and patronized by public authority. We are teaching the world the great truth that governments do better without kings than with them. The merit will be doubled by the other lesson: that religion flourishes in greater purity without, than with, the aid of government."

Thus closes Madison's dissertation on the subject of appointing religious observances, and these opinions coming, as they do, from the principal framers of our political system, show how unwarranted and unconstitutional it is, on the part of the President to assume the authority to appoint a day of thanksgiving or any other religious festival.

They Understand It Already.

To the Lutherans of Wisconsin and Illinois, in their opposition to the Bennett law and its counterpart, *America* proposes to teach a lesson. It proposes to instruct the Lutherans in their duty in the matter of the education of their children, and in order to do so more effectually it goes to Germany for the principles which it wishes to inculcate. It might be well to say to *America* that perhaps the Germans know as much about the system in Germany as *America* does, and that if they had wanted to follow that system they would have staid there instead of coming here.

America presents the fact that in the German schools, the German language is taught; that religion is taught; and that State inspection of schools is universal in Germany, private schools not being excepted; and then argues that as the Lutherans at home "had to submit" to that, they ought not to complain when

required to submit to the same thing in this country.

If the principles of monarchy, of paternalism, not to say of despotism, that characterize the German government, are to be the model for the States of this Union to follow, then there is no use of talking any longer of American principles. That the defenders of the Bennett law in Wisconsin and its counterpart in Illinois have to appeal to foreign principles to sustain their cause is the strongest indictment that could be made against the laws which they try thus to sustain. Any law or any movement which cannot be sustained without appealing to European principles, to principles of monarchy, to principles of Church and State governments, and of paternalism generally, has no place among American institutions, and is not worthy of recognition by the American people. And to call a paper "*America*" that does so, is a misnomer.

A. T. J.

What Are the Facts?

IN 1885 Rev. W. F. Crafts published his book, "The Sabbath for Man," in which he relates that in order to obtain a world-wide view of Sabbath observance he corresponded with more than two hundred persons residing in nearly every nation of the world. One of the questions which he asked was:—

Where have you seen the best Sabbath observance?

To this, a San Francisco pastor responded:—

Among the Christian people of California.

Mr. Crafts's question and the San Francisco pastor's answer to it are found on page 95 of his book before referred to. On the preceding page occur these words:—

Both laymen and ministers say that even in California the Sabbath is, on the whole, better observed and Christian services better attended than five years ago.

"Five years ago," from the standpoint of 1885, was three years before the repeal of the California Sunday law. Therefore, taking into consideration all that Mr. Crafts said upon this subject, we concluded that according to testimony published in his own book, California had in 1885, when the State had been without a Sunday law for two years, better and more general Sunday observance than it had under a Sunday law.

But in a recent article in the *Christian Statesman*, Mr. Crafts complains that we have been unfair in this matter. He says:—

A single Christian minister of that State wrote me that he had seen no better Sabbath observance than in some Christian families in California. This remark, quoted by me, among two hundred answers to the question, "Where have you seen the best Sabbath observance?" is used with characteristic dishonesty . . . as my own verdict that California itself—not some of its Christian homes—has the best of Sabbath observance. If Christians were as scarce and morals as bad in the rest of the land

as in that State, our country would be a Continental Sodom, without righteous men enough to save it.

It will be observed that with characteristic recklessness Mr. Crafts misquotes his own book. The San Francisco pastor did not say, "In some Christian families," but he did say, "Among the Christian people of California." Mr. Crafts should practice what he preaches. He should be fair himself before he demands that others treat him fairly. But we fail to see wherein our use of the quotation from Mr. Crafts's book was unfair. Both laymen and ministers in California testified three years after the repeal of the Sunday law that on the whole the Sabbath was better observed and Christian services better attended in California than five years before. This we still understand to apply not to "some Christian families," but to the whole community. And it is evident that Mr. Crafts himself so understood it, for the facts which we have quoted from his book are prefaced with the following, set in italics:—

Another element of hope in the United States is that the West has improved in Sabbath observance (except in the largest cities), as the communities have changed from frontier Territories into settled States.

Then, after only four and one-half lines relative to Dakota and Wyoming, follows the statement quoted, that "both laymen and ministers say that even in California the Sabbath is, on the whole, better observed, and Christian services better attended than five years ago." This Mr. Crafts gives in his book as an encouraging fact. He made it his own then; now he seeks to repudiate it, and likens California to Sodom. But we feel sure that in this he does that State injustice. Personal knowledge of the State, and of the people of that State, justify us in expressing this opinion; but we prefer to let the fact rest upon the testimony of another. In a letter to the New York *Observer* of October 2, "Holloway," a correspondent of that paper, writes as follows of Sunday observance in San Francisco:—

True, there are some drawbacks here as there are in all the cities of our land. Attractive as the city is, and in its main features very desirable as a place of residence, yet the good people who have come from the East regret the absence of some things with which they have always been familiar. There are no Sabbath laws in California and no recognition of it on the statute books of the State. Labor of all kinds can be carried on without hindrance, stores may remain open for the transaction of business as on any other day of the week, places of amusement may be open without interference from the authorities, while noisy demonstrations can go on as usual. But while there is the absence of all Sunday laws we must not draw the conclusion that there is no respect paid to the Lord's day. Truth compels us to state the fact that San Francisco is a Sabbath-keeping city. The drift is plainly in that direction. The moral sentiment of the people is largely in its favor, and with very rare exceptions you will find as much order and quiet in the streets as in some of our most favored Eastern cities. Those who knew California twenty years ago, now witness a far different order of things. The mass of the people respect and keep the Lord's day. No merchant of any respectability keeps his store open on the Sab-

bath. The wharves are deserted. The Italian fruit dealers in many localities close up their places of business, and even in the Chinese quarter of the city there is some recognition of the fact that this one day calls for a regard to decency and order, if not for religious reverence.

"Holloway" has stated the facts just as we know them to exist in California. Truth, he says, compels him to say that "San Francisco is a Sabbath-keeping city. "Truth is mighty," but it seems to be powerless to compel Mr. Crafts to do California justice. Sunday work and Sunday business instead of being on the increase in that State are on the decrease even in the cities. The drift is in the direction of more general rest upon that day. We do not say that this is due to a growing regard for the day; indeed we incline to the opinion that it is right in line with the general tendency of the times, which is toward shorter hours and more holidays; but that does not alter the case. Mr. Crafts insists that civil law is essential to the preservation of the working man's rest day. The growth of Sunday rest in California in the absence of a Sunday law is a complete refutation of Mr. Crafts's arguments in favor of "a civil Sabbath;" hence the anxiety of himself and his friends to secure as soon as possible the passage of a Sunday law in that State. The drift is now toward more general rest on Sunday. Now if they can only secure a Sunday law they can in a year or two claim that the improvement is due to the law.

According to Mr. Crafts's theory California ought to be just what he represents it to be, a veritable Sodom; but according to the facts it is as the *Observer's* correspondent represents it. The trouble with Mr. Crafts is that he cannot at the same time be loyal to the facts and to his theory; therefore he remains true to the theory, regardless of the facts. He cannot conceive of the possibility that *he* is mistaken, as he must be if the facts are as we know them to be, and as "Holloway" states them; therefore he closes his eyes to the facts, and accuses those who decline to do the same thing, of dishonesty.

C. P. B.

The Work of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

WITH that which its name indicates to be the legitimate work of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union we have ever been in the most hearty sympathy. But we regret to say that the Union has not always confined itself to Christian temperance work; it has turned aside into politics, and instead of relying for success upon the power of God as manifested through the gospel, it has invoked the power of the State to enforce what it understands to be Christian duty. In short, neglecting the power of the gospel, the

Woman's Christian Temperance Union has allowed lust for political power to become its ruling spirit. This has been a source of sincere regret to us, as it has been to other friends of Christian temperance work, and we have from time to time, as we have observed these digressions, criticised the Union. Nor are we alone in this. This same lust for power has led the Union to demand an important change in the fundamental law of the Methodist Church, and to accompany that demand by a threat of establishing a rival church. This threat the *Christian Advocate*, of this city, makes the occasion of administering a rebuke to these good women, quite as sharp as any criticism that we have ever made. We reprint, for the information of our readers, the following somewhat lengthy extract from the *Advocate's* article:—

THE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

With the history of this powerful organization we have been familiar from its beginning, nor has it ever been referred to in the *Christian Advocate* except in words of commendation. To its internal controversies no reference has been made; none of its principles or proceedings have been criticised, directly or indirectly, in this paper. Its editor has on various occasions presided at its meetings, introduced its speakers, and served it according to his measure and the desire of its members.

In his capacity as a member of the General Conference of 1880 he strenuously opposed the granting of permission to Miss Frances E. Willard to address the Conference—not because she was a woman—for he has listened to her, spoken on the same platform with her, and never has been opposed to women speaking in public on religion or any other subject in the proper time and place. The opposition was upon these grounds, that she did not represent an ecclesiastical body; her admission would require the admission of representatives of another similar association; and that there were a large number of non-ecclesiastical bodies desiring to obtain admission. On these principles he has ever acted, both in the Annual and the General Conference, opposing the admission of men on the same grounds, and is ready to do so again in any ecclesiastical executive or legislative body of which he may be a member.

But it now becomes necessary to show that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has adopted female suffrage as a principle in both State and Church, and that it discusses and as an *organization* has committed itself to the promotion of changes in the Methodist Episcopal Church, using its societies, which obtain access to

our churches and congregations on the ground of its temperance and other moral reformatory work, to interfere with the management of the said church.

The evidence of the truth of this statement is now to be submitted. Its *State Conventions* are in the habit of passing resolutions commending female suffrage; its *National Conventions* have done the same. It is so closely connected with the original Female Suffrage Association that the assistant editor of the *Woman's Journal*, Alice Stone Blackwell, is also the Assistant Superintendent of the Department of *Franchise* of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. (One of the principal text-books, if not the chief, in the Department of Franchise in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is John Stuart Mill's *Subjection of Woman*, whose author repudiated Christianity as a supernatural religion, and on various occasions denounced it as an oppressor of women.) Female suffrage has become one of its chief corner-stones, so that temperance and its allied moral questions, according to the prophet whom we heard in San Francisco, are now made the draft-horses to bear the female suffrage movement onward.

In harmony with this partnership we find a long article in the *Woman's Journal*, organ of the old-line Female Suffragists, for September 13:—

This is a subject of great moment, not only to the church in which the important action is to be taken, but also to the cause of woman's emancipation in all its various phases. All the friends of woman's advancement, whatever their religious views may be; should do their utmost to rouse those upon whom the decision devolves to an active and intelligent interest in the question.

The resolution does not involve the question of licensing and ordaining woman to preach, but the relation of women to the legislative councils of the church will eventually determine their positions and privileges in the ministry.

Great is the change which has taken place in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and most interesting is the method by which it has been brought about. When these ideas—never thought of in the incipiency of the organization—were first broached, some who were positively and uncompromisingly opposed to them were gradually displaced; others who were more malleable were surrounded by "an influence," were spoken of as "true and good," but as "not having yet seen the heavenly vision which had been revealed" to the leaders. If in process of time they saw this vision, according to their gifts and usefulness they rose; but if they still continued in darkness, gradually they were frozen out until it came to be understood that only those who hold these principles and adhere to them should be admitted, whatever their interest in temperance and the reformation of men, to important positions. Hence it has come to pass that this organization is an active propagandizing power for woman suffrage and allied questions.

We have now to show that the *Union Signal*, its official organ, loses no opportunity of discussing the Methodist Episcopal Church and its movements in relation to the ecclesiastical position of women.

The attempt is made to connect the deaconess movement in our church with the ordination of women in the ministry. Observe this, and a declaration of the faith of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in the following, taken from a recent copy of that paper:—

The training school for Deaconesses in Chicago, under the care of Mrs. Lucy Rider Meyer, is on a broad plane, and deserves the study of all interested in this great problem. *Its evolution will naturally conduct to the final emancipation of woman, by which she will enter the pulpit on the same plane with her brother man, and they two will prove that, inspired by the Spirit of the Highest, they are adequate to the conversion of the world; that life in wickedness can never be saved by the ministrations of one-half the unit. This is the faith of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, firmly held and frankly stated.*

Various of its organizations passed resolutions condemning the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church by name for its rejection, on a point of law, of women from membership in the last General Conference;—in one instance classing it in a paragraph of condemnation with certain liquor dealers.

Soon after the adjournment of that General Conference the National Convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was held in the Metropolitan Opera House, in the city of New York, and at that Miss Frances E. Willard delivered her annual address as President, from which we quote what to us is an astonishing passage. Quoting what persons have said to her, she said:—

"Stay in the church, and help reform it," says one "No; that is impossible; old churches and old parties are equally crystallized," comes the reply. "Let the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* organize a church; and we will join it, every man of us," is the declaration of an influential group of earnest men. "No, we have too many churches already," objects a listener; "let the wheat and tares grow together until the harvest."

But for myself I love my mother-church so well, and recognize so thoroughly that the base and body of the great pyramid she forms are broader than its apex, that I would fain give her a little time in which to deal justly by the great household of her loving, loyal, and devoted daughters. I would wait four years longer in fervent hope and prayer that the great body of her ministers and of her membership may make it manifest to all the world that the church of Lady Huntingdon, Barbara Heck, and Phebe Palmer does not hesitate to march with the progressive age it has done so much to educate, nor fear to carry to their logical sequence its life-long teachings as to woman's equality within the house of God. I say this frankly, from my present outlook, though so often urged, and not a little tempted, and sometimes quite determined to take a new departure. The time will come, however, and not many years from now, when, if presentation is still denied us, it will be our solemn duty to raise once more the cry, "Here I stand, I can do no other," and step out into the larger liberty of a religious movement where majorities and not minorities shall determine the fitness of women as delegates, and where the laying on of hands in consecration, as was undoubtedly done in the early Church, shall be

decreed on a basis of "gifts, graces, and usefulness," irrespective of sex."

[The italics in the above quotation are the *Advocate's*.]

This is a professedly undenominational body, and it has had remarkable assistance from the Methodist Episcopal Church in resolutions passed by the General Conference, in the use of church buildings, and in the giving of its notices by the pastors. When the Woman's Christian Temperance Union discusses the church in this way, and in such a spirit, after it had submitted the question to a vote of its ministers and members, and interferes by a declaration which has the force of a threat, we are compelled to say, that—while it shows how many are the ramifications of this movement—it does not furnish ground for the presumption that the legislation or the real interest of the Methodist Episcopal Church would be benefited if the change called for were made.

It must be true, for Miss Willard declares it, that "an influential group of earnest men have called upon the Woman's Christian Temperance Union 'to organize a church!'" It is not wonderful that such things should affect the judgment of the recipient of such confidence.

If such a spirit exists, the church should know it. With genuine admiration for Miss Willard's gifts, and full recognition of her varied services, but with the faithfulness of friendship, we assure her, that were the Woman's Christian Temperance Union to attempt to "organize a church," that "group of influential men" would fail to stand by it or her, and if they did the organization would simply add another to the successors of Jonah's gourd, instead of continuing a growing power for good.

It is a matter of astonishment and grief to us, that our old friend, Professor Luther T. Townsend, whose intellectual gifts and personal character we have always admired, should strengthen such dangerous advisers by writing thus in his article on "Woman in the Pulpit," addressed to and published by Miss Willard:—

These noble women should knock only once more at the doors of the Methodist General Conference, and if their signals and entreaties are again uncivilly disregarded, they should never knock again; they should call together some of the noblest Christian women of the land, and in solemn convocation, by the laying on of hands and by prayer, they should set apart for pulpit and parish work those who trust that they are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon themselves the office of the ministry of the Church of Christ, to serve God, for the promoting of his glory and the edifying of his people. . . . When that step is taken, if these women are willing to extend an invitation, they will be surprised at the number of clergymen who, with a noble Wesleyan spirit, will hasten to render assistance at the ordination.

It is such passages which have, as we regret to have to say, led the justly distinguished and worthily loved woman into such utterance as this quoted from her annual address of 1888.

In Miss Willard's address in 1889 at the National Convention she called for a res-

olution asking "the laymen of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who will in the fall of 1890 take action on the question of making women eligible as delegates to the General Conference, to 'do as they would be done by,' and the laywomen to remember that 'there is neither male nor female in Christ Jesus,' and 'who would be free, himself must strike the blow.'"

But a larger scheme of a Woman's Council has been devised, the attempt being made to induce all woman's societies, such as the Woman's Foreign and Home Missionary Societies, to send delegates so as to come under the influence of the same principles. The King's Daughters also were solicited to join the Council, that young and old might be indoctrinated with these aspirations and ambitions.

It is due to many private members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and a few remaining leaders in State organizations to say they do not agree with these views. Many of them, however, have not fully awakened to the real condition.

Our readers may now *in part* see what is the meaning of the movement. If the Methodist Episcopal Church in the first quarter of its second century desires to become a "Woman's Christian Temperance Union" Church, or a mere adjunct to that organization, it needs only to proceed in the direction to which it is urged.

The Sunday Campaign in California.

THE political campaign incident to the State election is now in full blast. The Sunday-law campaign is not really a part of the political strife. The two leading parties are letting the subject alone as hard as they can; and the Prohibitionists, although carrying a State Sunday law as a plank in their platform, are not united in urging it upon the people. Some of them are decidedly opposed to it, and one of their leading speakers told me that he did not refer to the subject at all. Furthermore he said that some of their candidates for legislative honors, if elected, would not vote for a Sunday law.

There is, however, a Sunday-law movement on foot on the outside, and it is being vigorously pushed. The American Sabbath Union is working its game of secretly extorting pledges from candidates in return for pledges of votes. They issue a monthly document of eight large octavo pages, for the purposes of their campaign. The Union labors to enlist the interest of the ministers, and work through the churches; and in all the public efforts the ministerial character of the movement is plainly manifest.

Rev. Dr. Thompson, Pacific Coast Secretary of the Union, was in Oakland on the 12th inst., and spoke his piece in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, in the morning, and in the First Congregational Church, in the evening. He read from the book of Nehemiah, chapter 13, verses 15-

21, with an air that betokened a strong desire to be the Nehemiah of California, and squelch somebody for Sunday-breaking.

In his discourse he reiterated the old "chestnuts" about this being a Christian Nation, and ought, therefore, to have a Christian Sabbath; that the framers of the Declaration of Independence recognized that the Nation derived its powers from the Almighty; that Benjamin Franklin demanded that a minister of the gospel be brought in to ask God's blessing upon the Constitution Convention; that the Constitution of the United States contains a Sunday law in its provision that the President shall have ten days, exclusive of Sundays, in which to sign bills, etc., etc.

He argued that a nation may be religious or non-religious; that it may be Christian, pagan, or Mohammedan; but our fathers chose to make this a Christian Nation. He seemingly forgot that his Union denies any thought of, or belief in, a union of Church and State; and if his argument amounted to anything, such an election on the part of the founders of the Government would have established a Church and State oligarchy at the very beginning.

In his glorification of the virtues of Sunday legislation, Mr. Thompson declared that the Sunday law is the *magna charta* of religious liberty. Without it men are held in slavery; there are now in the United States three million of men *compelled* to work on Sunday. If this were true, it would not argue much for the efficiency of the "great *magna charta*;" for the three million workmen asserted to be in slavery, cannot all be in California, and the few sparsely settled Territories where there are no Sunday laws. But it is not a fact that any hired man is compelled to work on Sunday; he may leave if he wants to. The law will protect him from being compelled to work any day, except as a punishment for crime.

Who ever heard of a seventh-day keeper being compelled to work on Saturday? Hundreds of them, laboring men, have given up their situations rather than work on the Sabbath-day, and not one of them ever starved. None of them ever dreamed of asking for a law to compel men to hire them and let them off on Saturday.

The Doctor's sentimental story about the young man in a Los Angeles County village who could not get off on Sunday to hear him lecture, is considerably spoiled by Mr. Crafts's book, which was so urgently commended at the close of the discourse. In this the author takes special pains to show wherein a conscientious determination not to work on Sunday works to the advantage of the laborer, by increasing the employer's confidence.

A rather novel challenge was thrown out to California young men. It was this: The speaker proposed to show, by contest, that a young man of twenty-five years brought up in a strict Sunday-law village would prove more intellectual than one

brought up in a California town without a Sunday law. Of course everybody knows that such banter is all sheer bluff; but I take space to mention it here as showing to what straits Sunday-law stump speakers are driven to make a show of argument.

The speaker's effort was closed by calling attention to sundry specimens of Sabbath Union literature, among them being the document sent out from Washington to signers of the petition, against religious legislation in Congress. This is a deceptive effort to convince the signers that they had not sense enough to know what they were doing, when they signed the petition, although it was couched in the plainest language.

He also had the house canvassed for subscriptions to his monthly document, and advertised some other literature designed to work up a sentiment among the people in favor of his pet scheme. A lady in the audience, who acknowledged that she had become somewhat "confused on the subject," asked an individual near her how it was the Doctor was doing such business in church on Sunday, if the day were so sacred as it was represented to be. He gave it up, but supposed it was because laborers in the Sunday-law interest have generally had poor success in getting audiences on other days.

I cull the following, from the Sabbath Union's Pacific Coast monthly document, accredited to the *Century*:—

If this were a Jewish country, the Jewish worship on Saturday should be peculiarly protected from molestation. If it were a Mohammedan country, Friday should be in a like manner protected. This is simple common sense applied to things as they are, and no action of *Doctrinariæ* theory. Where there is a conflict of sacred days, as among Jew, Christian, and Mohammedan, all cannot be protected, and hence the majority must determine the question.

If the majority must determine such questions, why does not the American Sabbath Union, whose mouthpiece Dr. Thompson is, let the majority alone in California? An acknowledged majority of twenty thousand have said that they do not want a Sunday law; yet the Union is secretly endeavoring to bribe legislative candidates, by promises of votes, to violate the will of the majority and enact such a law at the next session of the Legislature.

But why is it that "all cannot be protected"? This is a republican Government, and guarantees religious freedom to all. If all cannot be protected in their religious privileges, then the Republic is a failure. If all cannot be protected, it is because those who chance to have the power covet a monopoly of religious privilege, and are selfish enough to deny equal rights to all who do not follow them. If this sentiment had emanated from a pagan or Mohammedan source, it would not have been surprising; but to throw it out as representative Christian principle, is libelous upon that faith whose Founder commanded to "love thy neighbor as thyself."

W. N. GLENN.

Oakland, Cal., Oct. 13, 1890.

Majority Rule.

THE following upon majority rule is from a speech by Hon. Joseph Wheeler, of Alabama, in Congress, February 13, the House having under consideration the report of the Committee on Rules. While all will not concede the honorable gentleman's implied claim that the Democrats have greater regard for the Constitution than the Republicans have, all must, laying aside political prejudices, acknowledge the truth of the principle laid down. Commenting upon the statement that "the rule of the majority is at the very basis of our Government," Mr. Wheeler spoke as follows:—

While it is true that the majority should rule, all that the Democrats desire is that they shall rule under the Constitution. Judge Cooley in his Principles of Constitutional Law says:—

So far, then, from the Government being based on unlimited confidence in majorities, a profound distrust of the discretion, equity, and justice of their rule is made evident in many precautions and checks; and the majority is, in fact, trusted with power only so far as it is absolutely essential to the working of republican institutions.

Since the first dawn of civil liberty the wisest statesmen of all nations have agreed that an unbridled and unrestrained majority is the most dangerous foe of liberty, and therefore, in perfecting systems of government, the greatest care was taken to devise means by which a majority could be checked by certain powers given to the minority, and the history of civilization has proven the wisdom of maintaining such checks and balance.

If a man perfect in all respects and of unquestionable and infallible wisdom could be found, a people would be fortunate in giving such a person absolute power, because undoubtedly his rule would be wise and perfect in all respects, and that is all that was ever asked for or is desired by any people, but the history of the last eighteen hundred years shows that during that period no such man has existed, and therefore it has been demonstrated that the only way to preserve liberty is for the people to govern themselves.

If ages of experience demonstrate that one-man power is destructive to liberty, how much more dangerous is an unrestrained rule of a majority. It contains all the evils which follow from the concentration of all power in one man, without a single element of the advantages of such a system of government. It is the existence and presence of absolute power and the absolute absence of any tangible responsibility. It is possible for such a government to exist for some time without becoming tyrannical and despotic, but it is impossible for such a government to exist without finally overthrowing all the safeguards of liberty.

America vs. Europe.

[THE following lines—written some thirty years ago—depict from the standpoint of liberty the principles on which the United States Government was founded as compared with the principles of the European governments. The author is Count A. de Gasparin, a fearless advocate of liberty, and a warm admirer of the American institutions. This extract is translated from the author's French work; "Un grand Peuple que se Releve," and may serve to awaken new love and vigilance for the immortal boon of religious and civil liberty.

JOHN VUILLEUMEIR.]

THE United States is not a Latin nation; a nation clad in the robes of a Roman or Greek civilization; a nation having according to the ancient fashion, a religion and a set of customs blindly admitted by all. This Republic of the New World is not at all one of the republics of the ancient continent, where the citizens loved to talk about public affairs, but where nobody was foolish enough to raise questions of conscience respecting the public belief, pagan life,—with its compulsory worship, its uniform education, its suppression of the family and the individual for the benefit of the State; pagan life,—where the citizen supersedes the individual, and where the calm uniformity of the ages gives every one a national mold,—has no likeness to moral and social life in the United States.

Here you will not find the least vestige of that system which tries to make nations, and forgets to make men. These States can truly be said to have originated out of a protest of the human conscience. How many things are explained by this noble origin! Yes, it was the reaction of religious independence against compulsory uniformity and against the State church, that created this country, two hundred years ago. I do not need, here, to examine the intrinsic truth of the Puritan belief; I simply affirm that it landed in America in the name of liberty, and that its mission here was to establish liberty, and to build the true wall against democratic tyrannies.

At the very outset, the State was denied the direction of the intellectual and moral man. Notwithstanding the unavoidable inconsistencies and hesitations which attend all our beginnings, the Colonies, which were to become the United States, were walking steadily on the road which leads to liberty of belief, of thought, of speech, of press, of association, of teaching. The highest, the most important rights, were stripped, at the very start, from the province of democratic deliberations; insuperable limits were laid to the sovereignty of majorities; the rights of minorities, of the individual, the right of standing alone against all, the right of being of one's own opinion, was distinctly affirmed.

More than that, it was not very long before the bands between Church and State were completely severed, thus destroying the last pretext for the official administration of belief; *self-government* was founded, that is to say, the most

explicit denial of democratic bondage. While democracy pleads for a maximum of government, American individualism pleads for a minimum of government, the *par excellence* definition of liberalism. And it did not contemplate bringing this about, as in the Middle Ages, through anarchy, absence of national ties, and by depriving the individual of his rights of conscience and thought; no, American individualism has other means of action; while restraining with a wise energy the province of government to its true limits, it was enlarging all the more the purview of the human soul.

Grand conquest that was! The whole future of our modern world is there contained.

SOME weeks ago, we printed the following item from one of our Western exchanges, together with the subjoined comment:—

"The voice of the people is the voice of God," is as true to day, as when spoken in a city of Greece two thousand years ago.

"Just about as true! For instance, when, a century later, the people crowded around the Son of God, shouting, 'Crucify him! Crucify him!'"

The item has come back to us with this question from the *Orleans Herald*:—

Then will you please tell us what is the voice of God? Was not the crucifixion a fulfillment of the prophecies?

The word of God as contained in the Scriptures is, properly speaking, the voice of God, because it expresses the will of God; but can we believe that the unchangeable One who said, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," could also have said, "Crucify him, crucify him"? True, the crucifixion was in fulfillment of prophecy, but prophecy is simply an announcement of future events, which may or may not be according to the will of God. It is the *will* of God that "all men should come to repentance," (2 Peter, 3:9); but prophecy tells us that all will not repent, that on the contrary, "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3:13.

POSTMASTER VAN COTT has resolved to carry out the purposes of the special delivery system on Sundays as well as on other days. He considers that the public, which pays for special delivery, is entitled to it at all proper times. Hitherto it has been the custom to send out special delivery letters on Sunday morning only, by the first carriers leaving the General Post Office at 7 o'clock. In future all special delivery letters will be sent to the persons addressed in this city on Sunday up to the evening hour. This will enable those who desire to communicate with friends on important business on Sunday afternoon, and feel willing to pay the extra fee, to have their letters delivered as they desire. —*Mail and Express.*

HEALTH FOOD CRACKERS

HEALTH produces wealth; and good health can not be made of poor material. The agitation of this health question for some years in the past has created a demand for

HEALTHFUL FOODS,

in the manufacture of which we have for the past ten years been engaged. The demand having constantly increased, we have found it necessary to greatly increase our facilities by the addition of new and the latest improved machinery, etc. We are now well equipped, and prepared to fill all orders, and to extend our business into new fields.

Our Foods and Crackers are made from the choicest grains and are strictly pure, justly entitling them to the name above given.

SAMPLE PACKAGES

Of assorted Health Food Crackers sent post-paid on receipt of fifty cents. Write for descriptive circular and price list to

Battle Creek Bakery Co.,
168 WEST MAIN ST.,
Battle Creek, Mich.

IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

BY THE

Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,
Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

The above is the title of a treatise written by the author at the request of the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, California. It grew out of a discussion upon the present aspect and aims of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, the author taking the ground that the rise, progress, present and future condition of the temporal power known as the Papacy, or Vaticanism, is outlined in the prophecies of Holy Scriptures with sufficient accuracy to determine what the "Papacy" is, and what is to be its future development and ultimate end.

PAPER COVERS, 25 CENTS.
CLOTH COVERS, 60 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address,
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.,
Or, LOS ANGELES CHURCHMAN, 85 California
Bank Building, Los Angeles, Cal.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

Neat, cheap, serviceable. They perfectly secure pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it cannot fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

No. 1	Russia leather, for 2 pens	10c.
No. 2	" " " " " "	15c.
No. 3	" " metal back, 2 pens,	15c.
No. 4	" " " " " "	20c.
No. 5	Sealskin, for 2 pens,	15c.
No. 6	" " " " " "	25c.
No. 7	Russia Leather, for 4 pens	25c.
No. 8	Sealskin, " " " "	40c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
Or OAKLAND, CAL.

THE BEST DUPLICATING INKS

FOR USE WITH

"CYCLOSTYLE," "MIMEOGRAPH,"
"COPYGRAPH."

Or any Duplicating Process in which a Stencil is used, are the

Celebrated "Redding Inks."

They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog the stencil, Dry or Harden on Roller or Pallet, and are in every way

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done with these Inks.

REDDING INK CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK

TEN LECTURES ON NASAL CATARRH

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention, and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye, and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of

CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and **SIX BEAUTIFULLY COLORED PLATES**, besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs only 30 cents, and is in great demand.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Or OAKLAND, CAL.

GOOD FOR ALL TIME!

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

THIS PAMPHLET CONTAINS THE ARGUMENTS IN BEHALF OF THE RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS, AND IN OPPOSITION TO THE BLAIR SUNDAY-REST BILL, WHICH MR. JONES PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, DECEMBER 13, 1888.

Mr. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"MIGHTY INTERESTING READING."

And Mr. Jones' comments make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruptions, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments. As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially Legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is based on Scripture and history, constitution and law, showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the

Sunday-Law Movement of the Fourth Century,

AND THE

Sunday-Law Movement of the Nineteenth Century.

The Methods Used in Securing Indorsements to the Petition for the Blair Bill, and the Workings of Such Sunday Laws as are Proposed for the United States.

The Work Contains 192 Pages and will be Sent Post-paid on Receipt of 25c.

Send for it! Read it! Send it to Your Friends!

Address all Orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Or OAKLAND, CAL.

NEW EDITIONS

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN

By A. T. JONES,

One of the Editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain, and Forcible.

THIS IMPORTANT WORK SHOWS CLEARLY THE RELATION THAT SHOULD EXIST BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE AT THE PRESENT TIME, AS PROVEN BY THE BIBLE AND HISTORY OF THE PAST TWENTY-FIVE CENTURIES.

CHAP. I outlines vividly the relation that existed between "Christianity and the Roman Empire."
CHAP. II distinguishes between "What is due to God and what to Cæsar."
CHAP. III shows for what purpose the "Powers that Be" are ordained.
CHAP. IV ably discusses "The Religious Attack upon the United States Constitution, and Those Who Are Making It."
CHAP. V unmasks "Religious Legislation," calling special attention to the Blair Sunday Bill now pending in Congress.
CHAP. VI is devoted to the "Sunday-Law Movement in the Fourth Century, and its Parallel in the Nineteenth."
Chap. VII shows The Workings of Sunday Laws when they are enforced.
These chapters, with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States which are printed in Appendices C and D, make this treatise INDISPENSABLE TO EVERY LOVER OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

Is a Pamphlet of 182 Large Octavo Pages, in English, Price 25 Cents; and in German, 228 Pages, Price, 35 Cents;

MILLIONS OF COPIES

Should be Placed in the Hands of Thinking People at once. It Clearly Defines what Position American Citizens should Sustain Toward the Effort now on Foot to Secure Religious Legislation. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK

Or OAKLAND, CAL.

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 8 or 10 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. Weighs when filled with ink less than three ounces.

Imitation Rose-wood case, 25c.
Real Box-wood, " 50c.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price.

Address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
Or OAKLAND, CAL.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

A Semi-monthly Publication

Devoted to the defense of

AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

And the Preservation of the

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AS IT IS.

TERMS, 75 CENTS PER YEAR.

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

- No. 1 *The National Reformed Constitution.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 2 *Religious Liberty.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 3 *Evils of Religious Legislation.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 4 *The Blair Sunday Rest Bill.* Price, 7 cents.
- No. 5 *The Blair Educational Amendment.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 6 *Purity of National Religion.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 7 *National Reform and Rights of Conscience.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 8 *The American Papacy.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 9 *The Salem Witchcraft.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 10 *National Reform in Church and State.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 11 *What Think Ye of Christ?* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 12 *Bold and Base Avowal.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 13 *The National Reform Movement an Absurdity.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 14 *The Republic of Israel.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 15 *National Reformed Presbyterianism.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 16 *A Lutheran View of the National Reform Movement.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 17 *Religion and the Public Schools.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 18 *The National Sunday Law.* Price, 25 cents.
- No. 19 *Rev. W. F. Crafts Against the Editors of The American Sentinel.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 20 *Romanism and Civil Liberty.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 21 *Why We Oppose Religious Legislation.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 22 *The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 23 *A Civil Sunday Holiday.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 24 *Blair's Sunday Rest Bill and Joint Resolution, introduced December 9, 1880.* (Exact copies, with notes). Price, 1 cent.
- No. 25 *Civil Government and the Decalogue.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 26 *National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 28 *A Religious Political Movement.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 29 *Arguments on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill. The Object and Price of Exemption Clauses.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 30 *A Civil Sabbath. What It Amounts to.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 31 *Union of Church and State. What Constitutes Such a Union?* Price, 1c.

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



NEW YORK, OCTOBER 30, 1890.

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

In an editorial on Sunday laws, the *Colorado Graphic* says: "The people will resist these invasions of their personal rights, and with the example of other countries before them will bitterly resist ecclesiasticism. They fear the result of the union of Church and State, which means the oppression of personal liberty. As Dean Milman said, 'In proportion as the ecclesiastics became co-legislators, heresies became civil crimes and liable to civil punishments.' Such a result would be disastrous to the corner-stone of American independence. Our 'great' dailies are cowards who fear to defend a principle in deference to an uneducated sentimentalism."

UPON President Woodruff's promise that the Mormons will obey the anti-polygamy laws of Congress, the *Christian Advocate* remarks:—

Mormonism has such a bad reputation that promises to obey are suspected of covering a plan to disobey. But we are inclined to think they mean this; if so, or if not so, let them be watched. If they break no laws in this country, they have the same right to be Mormons as others have to be Roman Catholics, Spiritualists, or Methodists.

This is in refreshing contrast with the utterances of some papers which insist, not only that polygamy, but that *Mormonism* must be stamped out. But all of Mormonism, except the practice of plural marriages, has just the same right not only to exist, but to be protected, that any other ism has, and it will be a sad day for the country when this fact ceases to be recognized.

THE *Central Christian Advocate* says:—

It is not to the public school that we must look for the religious education of our children. The most we can do in this respect, so far as the public school is concerned, is to see that all the teachers are religious men and women. The public school cannot be maintained except as a secular school.

The *Observer* quotes this, and comments as follows:—

The one proper place for the Christian training of children is the home. Neither the day school nor the Sunday school can fully take the place of a Christian home. Where the home is not a Christian one children are reared at a terrible disadvantage. But the same considerations which would make our schools secular, and solely secular, would certainly prevent our being able to ensure that only religious teachers should teach in them.

The first part of this paragraph is sound.

"The one proper place for the Christian training of children is the home." And it is because Christian training is so much neglected in the home that professedly Christian parents imagine that it is necessary to give, or rather to attempt, such training in the public schools. Our schools should not be irreligious, but they should be kept strictly secular, and no such qualifications as that suggested by the *Advocate* should ever be permitted to be required of our public school teachers. The State has no way of determining that one teacher is religious, and that another teacher is not, except by the profession which they make, and such professions are too cheap in these days to be of any value in such a case. Besides, such a requirement would be utterly opposed to the spirit of our institutions, and to sound public policy.

THAT "drowning men catch at straws," is exemplified in the case of the Sunday-law advocates. In the hearing before the Senate Committee on the Sunday Rest bill, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, D.D., said:—

The law of the Sabbath is binding on nations and governments as well as on individual men. This obligation is recognized through our whole history by the general cessation of business in our courts and legislatures, and in all other parts of the Government on the first day of the week.

The argument which this is supposed to contain is about as weak as distilled water. Public business is properly suspended on Sunday because the State has no right to drag before courts of justice, on that day, people who regard it as sacred. The law of the State of New York likewise exempts observers of the seventh day from attendance at court upon that day; the Legislature did not, however, in enacting that law say that the State is bound to keep the seventh day; no more should it say that the State shall keep Sunday.

A Correction.

WE have received the following letter, which we take it is designed for publication. We cheerfully give it place:—

Merrill, Wisconsin, Oct. 18, 1890.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL: "They Agree on the Main Point," is one of the articles in your last paper. Therein is stated that also the *Protestants* hold that, "as a Nation we ought to see to it that our youth receive religious instruction." Commonly the Lutherans are also called *Protestants*. According to this, your statement, the Lutherans also would be in favor of religious teaching by the State. But this is not so. We Lutherans, or better, we German Lutherans, do not ask such a thing of the State or Nation; on the contrary, we believe in a total separation of Church and State. We never asked nor will ask the State or Nation for any such thing. You have judged *all* *Protestants* according to the views expressed in the *Christian Statesman*. You forgot or did not know that this paper is not representing the views of *all* *Protestants*, not even on this subject. There are, no doubt, *Protestants* favoring such religious instruction, but they are not Lutherans. The Lutherans deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions. And on this principle we are making

the fight against the Bennett law. We perfectly agree with you on this principle, and are glad to have such an able paper as yours working for such a noble end.

To me, personally, your paper has always been of great interest, and I wish you the greatest success.

Please correct your statement, and oblige all Lutherans.

Yours truly,

H. DAIB.

We must confess to some inaccuracy in statement, in the first part of the article referred to. We should have said in the outset, as we did in the latter part of our article, "many *Protestants*," etc. We had in mind only those *Protestants* who demand that some measure of religious instruction shall be given by the teachers in the public schools. We are ourselves *Protestants*, and are well aware that *all* *Protestants* are not in favor of teaching religion in schools supported by the State.

THE following from the *Rome Sentinel* of October 11, relative to the proceedings of the Central New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is significant:—

The Rev. Dr. Torry of Utica, a fine-looking old gentleman with snow white hair, was introduced and gave an address of some length on the subject of religious education.

The Rev. Cortland Myers, of Syracuse, also spoke in regard to the religious education in our common schools. He talked very earnestly on the subject, stating that the Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists, should not have their children attend schools at which religion was not taught. He also read some testimonials from different clergymen relating to this subject. Chancellor Simms immediately offered a resolution that the Bishop appoint a committee of three to consider a project for securing the introduction of a course of religious study in the common schools. The resolution was adopted. The Bishop appointed Brethern Simms, Vernon, and Oran as the committee.

We shall watch this matter with interest. With the Catholics on the one hand demanding a division of the school funds, and on the other hand the most influential *Protestants* demanding that the public schools give religious instruction, it is not too much to say that the future of our schools is not bright. Roman Catholics, and such mistaken *Protestants* are alike the enemies of the public schools.

LACK of knowledge as to the powers of civil government is leading our country into grave and compromising positions. Leave religion alone, is the spirit of our Constitution.—A motto that comes down to us in blood and flame from the past ages.—*Moral and Scientific Companion*.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO

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

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, \$1.00

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, each, .75c.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, .5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

48 Bond Street, New York,