

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER 11, 1889.

NUMBER 46.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK;
18 POST ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.

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

After January 1, 1890, this paper will be published at 43 Bond Street, New York City. Our exchanges, advertisers, and correspondents will please make a note of this fact, and send all papers and direct all correspondence, to reach us after December 15, to our new address.

A TENNESSEE judge has arrived at the conclusion that no statute is absolute while it stands unrepealed, and has therefore instructed the grand jury of his court to "indict all persons who publicly express infidel sentiments." This is an illustration of what may be expected if the "National Sunday Reformers" should ever secure a grip upon the reins of government.—*Leadville Argus.*

THE San Francisco *Chronicle* thinks that the suggestion of Editor Shepard, of New York, to annex Utah to Nevada does not furnish a feasible solution of the Mormon problem, and says:—

"The Saints would at once flock in from adjacent Territories till they would outnumber and outvote the Gentiles. . . . It is far better to deal with Mormonism in the present fashion than to put political power into the hands of men who recognize their church and its mandates as superior to the law of the government."

That which the *Chronicle* says is, we suppose, all true. Adherents of such a system as Mormonism cannot be loyal to any government other than their own hierarchy; but this is just as true of Romanism as of Mormonism.

THE *Lutheran Witness* of November 7 gives the facts relative to the conviction, in Forsyth County, Ga., of Mr. Conklin, for cutting a little wood on Sunday, and then makes this sage (?) remark:—

"Evidently the State law of Georgia prohibits Sunday work, else we could in no way see the fairness of such a conviction."

It is also evident that the *Witness* lacks the courage of its convictions, else it "could in no way see the fairness [or justice at least] of such a conviction" whether "the State law of Georgia prohibits Sunday work" or not. The law is simply an unjust, wicked, and antichristian law. If the fact of there being a State law against Sunday labor justifies the conviction of Mr. Conklin, then the fact of the existence of laws against heresy would justify all the persecutions of the Dark Ages. Is the *Witness* ready to admit that Luther ought to have been burned?

The Rights of the Minority.

[This article, which we take from the *Light of Home* (Seventh-day Baptist), is worthy of a careful reading. It is a just criticism upon Mr. Crafts' position as stated in his book, "The Sabbath for Man." The writer has, however, made a mistake in not showing that the State has no right to require anybody, either Christian or infidel, to keep any day whatever.]

THE advocates of Sunday legislation are compelled to "talk both ways," whenever the question of proscription, or the rights of the minority, are under consideration. On the one hand, they loudly assert that they do not seek legislation in favor of Sunday as a religious institution, nor do they intend to infringe upon the conscientious rights of those who observe the seventh day; that they believe in the largest religious liberty, etc. Thus they assert, when confronting those who oppose their plans and purposes. On the other hand, when left to state their position entire, they lay down a program which, though mildly worded, has in it the essential elements of medieval persecution. For example: Dr. Crafts, field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, in his "The Sabbath for Man," extracts from which appear in *Monthly Document*, No. 2, of the publications of that Union, asserts that Sunday laws are consistent with liberty, opening his discussion with the following paragraph:—

"Sabbath laws are consistent with liberty in the same way as other laws for the protection of institutions deemed, by the majority of the people, important to the welfare of society, such as the setting apart of the fourth of July and the twenty-second of February for the culture of patriotism."

That is sheer sophistry. The laws which make these national holidays do not compel abstinence from labor, business, or recreation; they specially encourage the latter. Turning to the Jews, Mr. Crafts treats his readers to the following:—

"But how is it consistent with liberty that those whose religion requires them to rest on the seventh day should be compelled by law to give up public business and public amusements on the first day also?"

"The case of Jewish immigrants is not as difficult as many have thought. Every Jew who determines to come to Great Britain or the United States knows, or might know, that while his religion forbids him to do business on the seventh day, the laws of the countries to which he proposes to go, forbid the same on the first day. If he cannot do more business in five days in Great Britain or in the United States than in six days elsewhere, he is free to remain elsewhere. If when he has come into Great Britain or the United States he finds, by experiment, that 'a conscientious Jew cannot make a living,' the world is all before him to choose where he will dwell. Jews seem to forget that their Mosaic laws compelled not only native Israelites to rest on the seventh day, but also their servants, native or foreign, and 'the stranger within their gates.' It is passing strange that a

people whose ancient law compelled the Gentile worshipers of the sun, who happened then to be in Palestine, although they kept the first day of the week for their worship, to rest on the seventh day also, out of respect to the prevailing religion, should object to Great Britain and the United States following the example of their fathers, only making the rule work the other way."

If this enunciation of the doctrine of religious liberty, by the apostle of modern Sunday legislation, be analyzed, the following elements appear:—

1. The religious convictions of the Jew deserve no recognition at the hands of the civil law. If he is bigoted enough to rest on Saturday because God commands him to do so, let him take his chances amid the bustle of the world's business, and get rest, and attain worship if he can, surrounded by the roar of Saturday's hubbub. Since they are in the minority, the civil law can make no recognition of their rights to protection in the matter of rest and worship. On the other hand, those who thus place the Jews outside the protection of the law, as to their religious convictions, insist that all others, Jews and non-Christians alike, must be compelled to remain quiet on Sunday, lest they disturb those who desire to observe the day religiously. Here then is the first glaring inconsistency in Mr. Crafts' position, viz., that the *conscience of the majority* only is to be recognized by civil law. Injustice and illiberality are further shown in the statement that—

"Every Jew who desires to come to Great Britain or the United States, knows, or might know, that while his religion forbids him to do business on the seventh day, the laws of the country to which he proposes to go, forbid the same on the first day. If he cannot do more business in five days in Great Britain or the United States than he can in six days elsewhere, he is free to remain elsewhere. The world is all before him to choose where he will dwell."

Narrow bigotry could scarcely go further than this statement. It says to the Jew, If you desire to live in Great Britain or the United States, you can do so, under the penalty of having your religious conviction concerning the Sabbath disregarded, and being compelled to obey man in the observance of Sunday, after you have obeyed God in observing the Sabbath. If you do not like that state of things, the world is before you; go where you will. The bitter prejudice born of Roman paganism has evidently been transferred to the writer of this *Monthly Document*, No. 2, in no small degree.

Still further does Mr. Crafts attempt argument by claiming that, under the Jewish theocracy, "the Gentile worshipers of the sun, who happened to be in Palestine, although they kept the first day of the week for worship [were compelled] to rest on the seventh also," and therefore the Jews in the United States ought not to complain if they are compelled to keep Sunday. That is illiberalism worthy of Russian despotism. To make legislations concerning religious liberty

which were necessary when the Jews were surrounded by most corrupting forms of heathenism, the standard by which to determine the application of the same principles under a Christian republic, is a step backward, worthy of the darkest period of the middle ages. According to this document, might is right in religious matters. And while the writer insists, in another part of the same document, that the law has no right "to enforce upon anyone the religious features of the day," he here assumes that the first religious features of the day, viz., cessation from *secular business*, must be enforced, even upon those who conscientiously regard another day. Mr. Crafts' illiberalism does not stop with the Jews. Christians who observe the Sabbath are placed in the same category, and their rights are openly ignored in a similar way.

Witness the following:—

"The one or two very small sects of Christians who worship on Saturday, holding, as they do, that the observance of one day in seven for rest and worship is necessary for personal and political self-preservation by a law of God as old as the race, are not less inconsistent than the Jews in seeking to break down such an observance in all who will not observe the day which their method of Bible interpretation has pointed out. The tendency of legislatures and executive officers toward those who claim to keep a Saturday-Sabbath, is to overleniency rather than overstrictness. For instance, the laws of Rhode Island allow Seventh-day Baptists, by special exception, to carry on public industries on the first day of the week in Hopkinton and Westerly, in each of which places they form about one-fourth of the population. This local-option method of Sabbath legislation, after the fashion of Rhode Island or Louisiana, if generally adopted, would make not only each State, but the nation also, a town heap, some places having two half-Sabbaths, as at Westerly, some having no Sabbath, as at New Orleans, to the great confusion and injury of interstate commerce, and even of local industry. Infinitely less harm is done by the usual policy, the only constitutional or sensible one, to let the insignificantly small minority of less than one in a hundred, whose religious convictions require them to rest on Saturday (unless their work is of a private character such as the law allows them to do on Sunday), suffer the loss of one day's wages rather than have the other ninety-nine suffer by the wrecking of their Sabbath by public business."

Here it is asserted that the tendency of civil government toward Seventh-day Baptists is to "overleniency" rather than to overstrictness, and because, in two townships in the State of Rhode Island, Seventh-day Baptists are permitted to carry on public business on the first day of the week, Dr. Crafts apprehends great danger to the interests of the nation, lest by an extension of this policy the nation will become a "town heap, some places having two Sabbaths, as at Westerly, some having no Sabbath, as at New Orleans, to the great confusion and injury of interstate commerce and even of local industry." In view of such an appalling danger to the nation, he declares that it is infinitely less harmful "that the insignificantly small minority of less than one in a hundred" should "suffer the loss of one day's wages rather than for the other ninety-nine to suffer by the destruction of Sunday." How terribly dangerous to the welfare of the nation this insignificantly small minority of "less than one in a hundred" is! How evident it is that the permission granted to the Seventh-day Baptists in Hopkinton and Westerly has produced widespread Sabbathlessness in the United States. True, few people knew anything about Hopkinton or Westerly until the appearance of Dr. Crafts' book. But who can fail to see that Sunday trains, Sunday newspapers, the crowds at Coney Island, the riotings in the beer-gardens of

Cincinnati, the theater-going which abounds in New Orleans, and the bull-fights in Spanish Mexico, have arisen directly from the influence of this "local-option" method of permitting the Seventh-day Baptists, in two towns in the State of Rhode Island, to enjoy their God-given rights under the civil law? Where is the school-boy who is not able to trace the under-ground currents by which the baneful influence of these Rhode Island Seventh-day Baptists (for they have been there for more than two hundred years), has crossed the continent, passed under the Rockies, and brought about the repeal of the "California Sunday law." How is it possible not to see, on the other hand, that if the "insignificantly small minority" of Seventh-day Baptists, Seventh-day Adventists, and Jews, were wholly deprived of their civil rights, so far as the Sabbath is concerned, and were compelled to fold their hands in idleness on Sunday, all interstate commerce on Sunday would cease, the enormous issue of the Sunday newspaper would soon be a thing of the past, and universal quiet, peace, and religious worship would obtain, "where'er the sun doth his successive journeys run."

While there is no other way to meet such bigotry as is set forth in Mr. Crafts' utterances, the brush of sarcasm is yet not sufficient to paint the medieval bigotry which is contained in his high-sounding sentences. If the principle enunciated by him, that the majority alone is to be protected as to conscience, were enforced, the scene would change at once, and the comparatively few who now seek religious services on Sunday, would be compelled to desist therefrom, lest their expression of religious regard might throw too somber a shade over the jollity and pleasure seeking of the masses.

Every effort to sustain the position set forth in this *Document*, No. 2, reveals the fact that the just province of the civil law is to grant uniform protection to all worshipers, at any time, and on any day when they seek rest and worship. On no other ground can the doctrine of religious liberty be sustained. The fact that the great evils complained of in connection with Sunday desecration exist, wholly independent from, and beyond the influence of, the Christians who keep the Sabbath, and ask the privilege of treating Sunday as an ordinary secular day, destroys all foundation for the assertions that if Sabbath-keepers be granted their constitutional rights, injury will accrue to the commonwealth. Worst of all, this sneering at the "insignificant minority" is the language of bigotry and tyranny. It shames this century of Protestant history.

THE *Christian Commonwealth* of July 25 relates that the Moslem preacher of Liverpool publicly rebuked the Prince of Wales for teaching the Shah of Persia to gamble. He had never known the vice till it was taught him by a so-called Christian prince. The above journal says:

"It seems to us extremely disgraceful that just at the time when the Church of England is waking up to the enormity of this vice, and is becoming sensible of the extent of its spread, the future head of that church should be teaching a Mohammedan how to add another vice to the list of those which he habitually practices."

And this shows the beauty of an established religion. According to law the Prince of Wales, should he become king of England, would be the head of the Established Church; but law can never make Christians.—*Signs of the Times*.

ADDRESS all orders communications, etc., for the AMERICAN SENTINEL, 43 Bond Street, New York City.

The Sunday Newspaper.

CHRISTIAN and thinking men have expressed much anxiety concerning the influence of the Sunday newspapers on the morals and religious sentiments of the community and the increase of Sabbath-breaking. The marvelous growth of this department of journalism is worthy of attention. Many of the prosperous city dailies issue Sunday numbers. And what is remarkable, the Sunday issue is the largest in size and circulation. They also put into this issue the productions of their best writers. It is said that they pay higher rates per column than for articles in their week-day issues. Thus they make the Sunday paper the most attractive.

The *Baltimore American* has ordinarily only six or eight pages on any other day; but on Sunday it has twelve and sometimes sixteen pages. So the *New York Tribune* is sent forth on Sunday with a larger amount of matter than on any other morning. The *Philadelphia Press* of last Sunday is before me, with three large sheets, or twelve pages (eighteen by twenty-four inches), of carefully written articles on all variety of subjects. The same can be said of the Sunday papers generally in all the great cities of the country. The publishers exercise great care to secure the choicest productions of the pens of the most popular writers. They pay in proportion to the literary excellence or attractiveness of the contributions. They gather news from all parts of the world, and from all the departments of human interest, to enrich the Sunday issue. What an amount of choice and entertaining reading is thus put into a single number! Take, for example, the copy of the *Philadelphia Press* of last Sunday. There we have a graphic description of the king, or khedive, of Egypt, with his gorgeous palaces, his kingdom, his family, his home life, his ability as a statesman, written by one of the best-known and popular writers of the day. Then we look farther, and find much of an entertaining and instructive character about Russia, India, Africa, Germany, England, with its statesmen—the political bodies of that country, the political situation of Europe, full accounts from every part of our own country, literature, art, society, amusements of all kinds, from the best concerts and dramatic performances to the low base-ball and horse-race and prize-fight, with cheap illustrations and pictures. The *New York Sunday* issues are of the same character, as are those also of the great cities of the West.

Why do the shrewd publishers put so much money and so much brain work and journalistic excellence into their Sunday papers? The answer is a simple one: It pays. That number secures the largest number of readers and buyers. Their circulation, from twenty thousand up to fifty thousand, stimulates this enterprise. There is more newspaper reading by those who buy secular papers on Sunday morning than on any other day of the week. There is a public demand for the ablest Sunday newspaper, and hence the supply. The universal laws of business create this journal. While the demand continues, the supply will be forthcoming. No clamor against it by lovers of Sabbath consecration, no rebukes from the pulpit, no condemnation by the religious press, can stop it so long as the public calls for it. It is indeed to be regretted that hundreds of thousands in the cities of the country spend the sacred hours of the Lord's day in such reading, instead of public and private worship. Lament it as we may, we cannot ignore the fact. I have not the statistics at

hand, but it may be assumed that one hundred thousand men in New York, and a proportionate number in other cities, read the Sunday papers.

To what extent is the Sabbath violated?—Not largely in the work of getting out the paper. Most of the composition and press-work, and perhaps nearly all the writing, is done before midnight on Saturday. Some type-setting and much press-work is done after midnight. The work done in the printing office on Sunday is chiefly for the Monday issue. Those who get their Sunday paper by mail on Monday morning, and then read it, do not break the Sabbath. So that this sin of Sunday desecration is confined chiefly to the newsboys who distribute the paper, and those who read it on Sunday. But these Sabbath-breakers are a great multitude.

The evil cannot be abated by preaching against it. The thunders of the pulpit don't reach the ears of men who sit in their easy-chairs poring over the fascinating columns of the *Press* or *Tribune*, nor do the scolding editorials of the religious press. Can journalism supplant the secular Sunday paper by offering something better adapted to the day and equally entertaining?—This is hopeless. No religious journal can afford to pay the high prices for their contributions. And if the publishers had the money to engage the ablest pens, the subjects would necessarily be moral and less exciting. Religious papers could not fill their columns with gorgeous descriptions of all worldly affairs, society notes, theaters, concerts, horse-races, base-ball contests, and all exhibitions of rowdiness and vice. Even those papers that have the widest circulation and largest revenue, like the *Independent* and the *Advance*, cannot compete financially, or in entertaining matter, with the Sunday issues of the great city dailies.

All that can be done is to instill an increasing reverence for the Lord's day in the minds of the children and young of the church and the country. This is the work of Sunday-schools and catechetical classes. Until a generation shall arise with a deeper sense of the sacredness of our Christian Sabbath than our present American people, the Sunday newspaper will flourish and be a power in the land in moulding public sentiment.—*G. D., in Lutheran Observer, August 16, 1889.*

Sound Doctrine.

THERE has been a great hurrah made during the past few days over the agitation of the Sunday-Rest movement. . . . Perhaps it would be well in the midst of this agitation to pause and inquire who is back of this movement, and what its real object is. The people at large have never made a demand for a law of this kind, and no complaint has ever been heard because of the absence of such a law, from anyone except a few religious fanatics. These are the people that are back of this movement, and their object is not so much to give the poor workingman a rest as to close every avenue of recreation and amusement and give the church a monopoly of Sunday entertainments. They are making the first effort for a union of Church and State, and their next one will be to introduce God into the Constitution, which is already planned.

This movement, under the thin disguise of making Sunday a day of rest for laboring people, is an outrage and an imposition which a purely secular government like ours should never tolerate for a moment, and never will if the people

awake to their danger. We have seen the effect of Sunday laws and religious tyranny in the past, and the Puritan Sunday is something we don't wish to revive. We don't want such restrictions placed on us as our ancestors had, or any laws enacted like the following from the blue laws of Connecticut:—

"No man shall run on the Sabbath, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, excepting to and from meeting.

"No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or fasting-day.

"No one shall travel, make beds, sweep houses, cut hair, or shave, on the Sabbath-day, etc., etc."

These are laws we don't want resurrected, but the Blair bill is a long step in that direction, and the warning cannot be sounded too soon or too loud. "Let Church and State be forever separate," said General Grant, and every student of history knows the evil effects of their union. With countless religious sects at war with each other, and unable to harmonize on creeds and systems, it does not need remarkable perspicuity to perceive the total unfitness of the religious element in politics. There is no law in existence which prevents a man from keeping the Sabbath and worshiping God as he sees fit, and while there isn't it would seem that religious people have all the rights and privileges they need, and no Sunday laws are needed, unless they desire to restrain and coerce those who differ from them in their religious views.

While perfect freedom exists for a man to attend church or remain away, and stringent laws are in force against disturbing any religious assembly while at worship, I for one see no need of other Sunday laws. While religious people are protected in their rights and no restraints are placed upon them, every non-religionist under a purely secular government should have equal freedom to conduct himself as his conscience directs and approves. To say that a man shall not work on Sunday if he so desires, and that he shall "engage in no play, game, amusement, or recreation," is an unjust infringement on his natural rights.

Let this government enact such a law on any other day than Sunday, and a protest would go up from millions against it. Now, if Church and State are separate and intended to remain so, why is a religious day chosen in the enactment of such a law?

The moment Sunday legislation is made to restrict in any manner the rights of the people, that moment there is a virtual union of Church and State, and I for one rise to protest long and loud against it.

Says Mr. Crafts: "The right arm of the American Sabbath Union is the promotion of the religious Sabbath. These two things—the Christian Sabbath on the one hand and the American Sabbath on the other hand, are as distinct as my two arms, that resemble and co-operate, and yet by no means the same. This distinction is itself an answer to the objections to Sunday laws." Let us dissect this delusion. What does a secular government know or care about a Christian Sabbath? And what better is a civil Sabbath than a civil Saturday? Does a secular government know any distinction?—No! Then to legislate for the preservation of enforced rest on Sunday, is to exceed the authority of the Constitution on which the government rests. This cannot be successfully denied or disproven, and if a Sunday law is passed the strong arm of the secular government, instead of the power of the American Sabbath Union, will be used to enforce

it. We have laws establishing legal holidays, but no penalty is prescribed for a failure to keep such days, and one can work or play as conditions or inclinations lead, without being punished, but on Sunday the proposed law will inflict penalties for a failure to refrain from work or recreation. Again I say this is a virtual union of Church and State, and it is time that every man who loves his liberty was awake to the dangers that lurk in the movement just inaugurated in our city, but actively at work all over our country.—*Channing Severance, in Los Angeles Tribune, September 5, 1889.*

Correct Principles Stated.

It is contrary to the teachings of Christ, as well as treasonable to free government, to legislate at all with regard to the Sabbath or any other religious institution, whether spurious or genuine. People differ in opinion on religious subjects, and each has a right to enjoy and be protected in the exercise and expression of his views. Those who believe it to be their duty to observe Sunday as a day of sacred obligation, whether in recognition of the authority of the Creator or that of the pope, have a perfect right to do so, and are accountable to God alone in the matter; but those who believe it to be their duty to accept the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice, and to "remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy," according to the Creator's specific direction, and for the reason he has given, have an equally valid right to similar protection in the enjoyment, exercise, and expression of their views, and neither has any right, either moral or civil, to interfere with the other. If the activities of the Sunday observer may not legally be restrained on the seventh day in recognition of a belief in its sanctity by one class of citizens, then the activities of the seventh-day observer may not legally be restrained on Sunday in recognition of a belief in its sanctity by another class of citizens. Neither may the activities of the non-observer legally be restrained on either day, because his rights are involved equally with the others, and he is equally with them amenable to God.

If a man is irreligious, Christians are commissioned to preach the gospel to him, and, as ambassadors of Christ, to persuade and beseech him to repent; they are instructed to pray for him, and are commanded to treat him in all respects as they would wish to be treated, but they have no authority to judge and punish him for sin against God, nor to compel him to act as if he were a Christian when he is not one. Majorities should rule in all matters which may properly be submitted to their action, but the rights of minorities must always be protected by constitutional limitation of the power of majorities, and our Constitution wisely withholds from Congress the power to enact any religious legislation, because such legislation would inevitably violate the rights of conscience. Let every man who believes in free government upon the basis proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, no longer remain inactive. Let no Christian who loves the Lord with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself, longer remain silent. It is time that all should recognize the fact that this National Reform-Sunday-enforcement scheme is a revival of papal ideas, using papal methods to compel governmental recognition and enforcement of Sunday, and that a confederacy of nominal Christians, claiming to represent all the Protestant Evangel-

ical denominations, but who are so utterly destitute of the Spirit of Christ, and so entirely controlled by lust for civil power to persecute those who differ from them, that they openly court alliance with Rome and brazenly avow their treasonable and wicked intentions. It is time that every conscientious person should study carefully the relations of civil government and religion, and be prepared to defend these inseparable gems of gospel truth—human equality in civil matters and individual accountability to God alone, morally.—*Ira D. Blanchard, in Western American, Chicago.*

Public Schools and Church Property.

ONE of the most prominent of the demands now being made is that the nation shall insert the name of God, if not a formal recognition of Christianity, into our national Constitution. But surely this would not make the nation any more Christian if public and private sentiment be not in accordance with it. The Southern Confederacy placed such a clause into their articles of federation; but, while their republic was based on human slavery, what was it but a solemn mockery? I take it, the true way for this people to show its Christianity is not to write its dogmas in their Constitution, but to exhibit its virtues in their public and private lives. Remember, too, that such an acknowledgment of God or Christ or Bible would amount to nothing in itself, would be a mere dead letter, unless made vital by a definition of it. That would be the next and necessary step. There is not a word, a sentence, a doctrine in our National Constitution that is not subject to some interpretation, and made an authority in our civil and political life. But the moment you thus define the new amendment you recognize some explicit form of religion in the land, and commit a flagrant injustice upon your fellow-citizens who do not share that form of belief. For who is to decide upon that interpretation?—The majority, of course. Now, this majority to-day is an orthodox Protestant one, and will be for a long time to come. But to give such a definition of the amendment would be to violate the consciences of the Catholic, the Jew, the Unitarian, and a vast number of religious Liberals and Freethinkers. They would not be slow to resist such an invasion of their personal rights; and thus this seemingly harmless Christian amendment in reality has in it the seeds of social strife, religious war, and a possible disruption of the republic.

What blindness, what madness, then, possessed the Protestant advocates of such an amendment? Honest they no doubt are, but grievously unwise. If the proposed amendment should pass Congress by the requisite two-thirds majority, and receive a three-fourths vote in three-fourths of all the States, as is required,—a contingency most unlikely to occur in the present temper of the American people,—it would prove the most dangerous weapon against the Protestant religion that could be put into the hands of its opponents. The only really practical benefits would accrue to the Roman Catholic, as the strongest ecclesiastical body. That church would soon make an application of it that would make the overzealous Protestant look with affright at the consequences of their folly.

Another demand put forth by the Protestant opponents of the American doctrine of Church and State is for the retention of the Bible in the public schools. A sufficient reason for its exclu-

sion is to be found in the fact that the public reading of the Bible is a liturgical act, as much so in the public schools as in the public service of religion.

Now, we have no right to introduce liturgical acts into a professedly secular institution, especially one supported by a tax levied indiscriminately on all. To read the Bible in the public schools is to inculcate religion there, and a particular form of religion as well. . . .

You may do this if you have the power, but you cannot do it justly. You may vote down the Catholic, the Jew, the Rationalist, but you cannot reason them down. In retaining the Bible, you are only encouraging the Roman Catholic demand for a division of the public school funds, and justifying parochial and private schools for the education of Catholic youth. Both policy and justice, then, should lead to the prompt and total withdrawal of the Bible from all public schools of America. If Protestant interests suffer thereby, so much the more shame to the Protestant Church. But let us not do evil that good may come. The only public-school system possible or just in a community like ours, in which there is so much diversity of religious opinion, and in which all are taxed indiscriminately for its support, is one based on secular education, and from which all religious features are excluded. The only school in Oakland where this secularization is not carried out is the Oakland High School, and this matter ought to be remedied there also.

Another notable demand by the upholders of the divine right of the church is for a continued exemption of all church property from taxation. This is not only wrong to the other interests of the community, which have to make up the deficiency, but also directly encourages both the sectarian rivalry and the luxury and ostentation of the churches, which are such serious obstacles to the progress of a true Christianity. In Chicago I visited recently a splendid and luxurious temple, the property of a few rich men, which they use but a few hours each week. The rest of the time it is given over to silence and emptiness—handsome to look at, but otherwise as useless a piece of property as you will find in the whole city. Its cost was, perhaps, a quarter of a million of dollars; and if justly taxed, as it ought to be, it would place in the city treasury some five or six thousand dollars, or enough to furnish the suffering poor with fuel during the hard winter. Now why should these excellent gentlemen be exempted from paying for their private luxury in worshipping God, when the poor mechanic or laborer who happens to own the roof over his head, however humble it may be, must come forward promptly and pay his tax upon it—a tax larger because of this very exemption of church property?

In that very city I knew a Roman Catholic priest who purchased quite a tract of land, built a small chapel, and for eight years had the whole tract exempted from taxation. At the end of this time he sold the land at a large increase and built a costly church nearly a mile farther south. Is the State to be a partner in such ecclesiastical real-estate speculations?

Consider, too, how rapidly the church property is increasing in this country. In San Francisco it amounts to something like \$6,000,000, and is taxed for only \$1,769,915. If justly taxed it would maintain all the city charities, and half pay for the public schools besides. In New York City the single corporation of Trinity Church

owns property valued at \$25,000,000. According to the census of 1850, the amount of property held by the different religious denominations in the United States was \$87,000,000. In 1860, only ten years after, it had doubled, and was returned at \$171,000,000. In 1870 it had again doubled, amounting to \$354,000,000. If this rate of increase be kept up till the end of the present century only, it would reach the enormous sum of \$2,835,000,000. Will not our government soon have to take steps to restrict and regulate this dangerous monopoly—a monopoly more threatening to our future peace as a nation than any other which afflicts us? Now the best restriction upon it is to equitably tax all church property; and, in view of its enormous wealth, the demand of the church for a continued exemption seems singularly immodest and unfair.

In the Catholic parish church at Monterey I read a complaint affixed to its walls that California is the only State in the Union which taxes its churches. All honor to our State for that. It only points the way which all our States will, sooner or later, be compelled to follow. I am proud of the action of our Unitarian Society in Tacoma, which sent up last month to the Constitutional Convention of the new State of Washington a petition that all church property be equally and equitably taxed. Let me ask once more, "Has civil society a right to give the public money outright to a religious or ecclesiastical body, to a missionary or tract society, or to a church?" According to our American doctrine of Church and State, it has not.

"But is there any difference between releasing one from a debt of \$10, which he is bound to pay, and giving him \$10? Is there any difference whatever between paying out money from the public treasury and remitting taxes that are coming into the public treasury?"

It is often said, in reply to this, that churches ought not to be taxed because they yield no income. But the question of income does not enter into the reasons of taxation at all. A great many things yield no income, and yet are taxed—wild lands, for instance, and other unproductive real property. A great many of our merchants to-day would like to be exempt from taxation on their unsold or depreciated stocks, from which they receive no returns.

But most commonly it is argued in behalf of the churches that there are many substantial benefits arising to the State from their existence, and this ought to be considered a fair exchange for their unpaid taxes. But the argument proves too much. Nearly all kinds of private property render important public service to the State. All private schools, for example; all art galleries, opera houses, and music halls; all life insurance companies, railways, and banks—might claim a similar exemption on the ground of public services rendered the State. The only honest and sensible way is for churches to bear their fair share of public taxation, as well as other corporations.

In the Old World the property exempt from taxes often amounted to one-third or even one-half of the entire amount returned. At last the evil became so unbearable that the governments took the matter in hand and remedied it. Shall we maintain in free America a system, which the monarchies of Europe have found impracticable and dangerous to the State?

To the other demands made by an unwise Protestantism, I can only refer by name. Such

are the religious tests for holding office, and even for jurors and witnesses, still found on the statute-books of some of the States, or which discriminate for or against the church; the legal recognition of Sunday, not from motives of natural morality and civil expediency, but because of its supposed supernatural institution and religious authority; the enforcement of oaths in the public courts, which to many are a violation of conscience, and to most a solemn farce; and the issue of Thanksgiving and similar proclamations by the President or Governors of States. For while such occasions as this of public praise and gratitude are fitting in the life of a people—I wish we had more of them—they should be left to the discretion and piety of the churches. As these find it possible to agree on an annual week of prayer, they might be equally harmonious in appointing a day of universal thanksgiving. . . . Education, reason, justice, humanity—to these we appeal, and we are confident that ours shall at last be the victory. —*Rev. Chas. W. Wendte, Oakland, California.*

Stand by the Constitution.

It is to the credit of our national Constitution that the Sunday observer is protected in his worship on the first day of the week; that the Sabbatarian is protected in his worship on the seventh day; and that the conscience of the non-observer is protected in his seven days' toil. The fact is here recognized that the man who conducts himself on a proper civil basis is a good citizen, irrespective of his religious views, which are deemed inalienable rights that cannot be appropriated or trifled with.

Through the wise principle that protects all religions alike, the unhappy scenes that have attended State religions in the past are averted, and America has become the marvel of nations—the home of the persecuted refugee driven to our shores by the despotic power of the foreign church.

Considering to what is due our prosperity as a nation, considering the grave lessons taught us by those powers that have suffered from religious dictation, it becomes us to guard with jealous severity against a repetition in our fair land of the disgraceful alliance, and to check at once those movements that threaten to destroy the recognition now given to the rights of conscience.

Individually we all have the right to persuade others to embrace our acting interpretation of divine ethics, but, happily, no authority to compel their adoption. Were it otherwise, man's highest feelings would become the slave of chance, the foot-ball of politicians. Then were the Catholics to rule, we must become, outwardly, Mariolaters; were the Hebrews to outvote us and claim their rights, we must renounce Christianity; were the race of Tong San to find a majority, we must all turn to Confucius; and so on, we must change our conscience to suit the popular creed, under pain and penalty of statutory judgment.

Religious motives should arise from voluntary recognition of the claims of the supreme power from an invisible source. It is the height of presumption for any civil tribunal to raise up an arbitrary standard to judge whether we are loyal to the mighty will of Jehovah, to whom the interference of puny earthly dictation becomes a foolhardy failure. Trouble is brewing on that question—the aspiring church is becoming restless and aggressive—a stormy time of religious frenzy and bloodshed is close at our doors, yet the

drowsy occupants sleep on, unwilling to heed the tempest that will soon get beyond human control.—*Moral and Scientific Companion.*

The Papal Theory.

[This article, taken from the "Progress of Religious Freedom," by Dr. Schaff, is of special interest just now in view of the professions of attachment to the principles of our government recently made by the Catholic Congress in Baltimore. The evidence is conclusive that the Romanist who is really attached to our free institutions feels that attachment, not because he is a Catholic, but in spite of that fact, for the utterances of the popes and the traditions of "the church" are all against liberty of conscience or of worship.]

THE principle of intolerance is held by the Roman Church to this day. She claims the monopoly of Christian truth, and can tolerate no departure from it, but will punish it to the extent of her power. Liberal Catholics, in obedience to the better spirit of the age and the charitable instincts of the human heart, disown persecution and all civil punishments of spiritual offenses, as belonging to a by-gone age and inconsistent with the modern structure of society. But the official Roman Church does not and cannot give up the theory of intolerance without forfeiting her claim to infallibility. Every progress in favor of toleration and liberty during the last three centuries has been made in spite of her, and against her express protest. She has repeatedly denounced toleration and reasserted the principle of intolerance, which implies persecution under favorable circumstances. And these declarations proceed from the highest seat of authority, whose decisions the Vatican Council of 1870 has made infallible and irrevocable.

Pope Gregory XVI., in an Encyclical of August 15, 1832, identifies religious toleration with the liberty of error and indifferentism, and condemns it as "the most fruitful cause of evils with which the church is at present afflicted," and goes on to say: "From this noxious fountain of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or, rather, that form of madness, which declares that liberty of conscience should be arrested and maintained for everyone. For this most pestilential error, that full and immoderate liberty of opinion paves the way which, to the injury of sacred and civil government, is now spread far and wide, and which some, with the utmost impudence, have extolled as beneficial to religion."

The Papal Syllabus of 1864, issued by Pius IX., the first infallible pope, condemns among the eighty errors of the age the following propositions, which are among the fundamental principles of the government of the United States:—

"Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion which he believes to be true according to the light of reason." Sec. 3, 15.

"The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church." Sec. 6, 55.

"In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship." Sec. 10, 78.

The Encyclical "*Immortale Dei*" of Pope Leo XIII., concerning the "Christian constitution of States," issued November 1, 1885, is a moderate and prudent explanation, but not a retraction, of the doctrine of his predecessors; it expressly and approvingly refers to the Encyclical of Gregory XVI., of August 15, 1832, and to the Syllabus of Pius IX., and adds: "From these decisions of

the popes it is clearly to be understood that . . . it is a crime of private individuals and a crime for States to make no account of the duties of religion, or to treat different kinds of religion in the same way. . . . The church judges it not lawful that the various kinds of divine worship should have the same right as the true religion."

In a more recent Encyclical, "*Libertas præstantissimum naturæ donum*," issued June 20, 1888, the same pope—one of the wisest, most moderate, and most liberal of modern times—reiterates the same doctrine even more strongly. He begins by praising liberty as the most excellent gift of nature, which belongs only to intellectual or rational beings, but he makes true liberty to consist in submission to the will of God, as expressed in an infallible church with an infallible head. He expressly condemns what he calls the modern liberties, (1) of worship, (2) of speech and of the press, (3) of teaching, and (4) of conscience, because they tacitly assume the absence of truth as the law of our reason, and of authority as the law of our will. He first caricatures or misstates the liberal theory, which he seems to know only in the form of infidel radicalism, and then denounces it. In the same document he incidentally calls the separation of Church and State a "pernicious maxim." And he concludes: "From what has been said, it follows that it is in no way lawful to demand, to defend, or to grant promiscuous freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of religion, as if they were so many rights which nature had given to man."

Cardinal Manning, in a preface to the English translation of this Encyclical, fully approves of these sentiments, and predicts that "the pontificate of Leo XIII. will be known in history at the time when, upon a world torn and tossed by anticristian and antisocial revolutions, the abundant seeds of divine truth sown broadcast, revived the conscience of Christendom." He also predicts that the two Encyclical Letters to which we referred "will be recorded as the pronouncements which have vindicated the political order of society from confusion, and the liberty of men from the license of liberalism." But we venture to say that Pope Pius IX. and Pope Leo XIII. have seriously injured the cause of the Roman Church by placing her in open antagonism to the irresistible progress of history, which is a progress of liberty. By declaring the separation of Church and State a "pernicious maxim," Leo XIII. has unwisely as well as unjustly condemned the Constitution of the United States, which makes such separation the law of the land, not from indifference or hostility to religion, but from respect for religion, and which secures to the Roman Catholic Church a greater amount of liberty and prosperity than she enjoys in Italy or Spain or Austria or France or Mexico or Brazil. The highest American dignitary of that church, Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore, who attended the centennial celebration of the Constitution at Philadelphia, September, 1887, said in his letter of acceptance: "The Constitution of the United States is worthy of being written in letters of gold. It is a charter by which the liberties of sixty millions of people are secured, and by which, under Providence, the temporal happiness of countless millions yet unborn will be perpetuated." The same cardinal, in a communication to the New York *Independent* of November 29, 1888, thus eulogizes the condition of this free country as compared with others:

"Assuredly we have many reasons to praise 'the Giver of all good gifts' for the blessings we enjoy as a nation and as individuals. We are in profound peace, while other nations are preparing for war. We are enjoying unexampled prosperity, while other people are struggling for the means of subsistence. Above all, we possess the luxury of liberty tempered by law and justice, while other races are bound by the yoke of tyranny."

The logic (granting the Romish premises) is on the side of the pope, but the facts are on the side of the cardinal. The facts ought to rectify the logic, not *vice versa*; for facts are stubborn and cannot be undone.

New Gospel of Paternalism.

Boston's latest intellectual movement has taken the form of advanced Socialism, under the inspiration of "Looking Backward," a novel by Mr. Edward Ballamy, and it is not unlikely that the public discussion of the book in that city will win for it that which the criticism of Mr. Gladstone achieved for "Robert Elsmere," namely, a wide circle of thoughtful readers.

Without the stimulus given by Col. T. W. Higginson, the Rev. M. J. Savage, Mr. William D. Howells, the Rev. Dr. Edward Everett Hale, and others, representing the advanced culture of New England, the book would be valued for whatever literary merit it possessed; the ideas of social revolution of which it is an exponent would not either be entertained or discussed. But when eminent men approve these theories, establish societies for the promulgation of the ideas, and publish a magazine to extend them, it becomes necessary to examine the theories and see whether or not they stand the test of logical expediency.

The theories taught by Mr. Bellamy's book are: No man shall be better than his neighbor. All who are able to work shall be provided with labor best suited to their capacity, and the proceeds of this toil to be so divided that there shall be equality of income. All competition is to be abolished; individualism is to be suppressed; every citizen shall attend public school until the age of 21; every man shall work until he reaches the age of 40, after which he must be pensioned. There will be no crime, poverty, legislation, or politicians. These and other projects of like nature the author seeks to teach. The whole question is summed up by Colonel Higginson, who says: "Modern life demands organized business action. There are two great organizations, either one of which can manage it, organized capital or organized government. If this be the real alternative there is certainly an increasing number of people who would prefer to trust the government."

This form of Socialism is purely a figment of the imagination. It has no practical worth, and if it could be made to permeate our system would be dangerous to the welfare of society. If the question as to what should control business enterprise should ever be narrowed down between corporation and government, the former would be the more universally preferred. In all the history of railroad legislation it has been incontestably demonstrated that the government cannot manage railways successfully and honestly, whereas, under the form of corporate co-operation the greatest material triumphs of the age have been achieved. The State has all it can do to transact properly its present functions. Railroads, tele-

graphy, farming, and merchandise should never be managed by the government, and as long as the republic lasts never will be so controlled.

But this theory of reducing all men to equal condition, can it be made to apply practically to our American life? To begin, what is the reason of our rapid national development? The simplest answer that can be given is, The incentive held forth to individual industry, the rewards to be gained and the power to be attained through the medium of these rewards. Even if the law of compulsory education could be enforced so that each individual was possessed of equal educational advantages, the law of nature reveals the fact that some would profit, and others derive little benefit, therefrom. Some would be intelligent and others would be more or less fools. Some would lead and others would follow. Some would work and others play, and in a generation or less some would beg and others steal. The theory must not only give all men an equal start, but it must be so fortified as to keep them so, and therein is shown the utter futility of the idea, and that which is intended to cause more equality in the world would work the greatest injustice that righteous men have ever suffered. The intellectual and moral giant would be doomed to the same life as his mental and moral inferior, and deprived of those superior advantages to which he is entitled by every principle of natural equity. The end of it all would be the reduction of mankind to the level of the commonplace; the incentive to human effort would be removed, and society, if obedient to the decrees of the new dispensation, would sink into monotonous stagnancy and drift into the dark age of a twentieth century.—*Oregonian, July 30, 1889.*

Poor, "Hampered" Rome.

In its issue of November 3, the *Catholic Review* says:—

"In this land which makes liberty of conscience its fundamental principle, we are hampered in the practice of our religion more than are Catholics in England and her colonies, although there the faith of the nation is professedly hostile to ours."

What do Romanists mean by being "hampered"? Because the government does not support its parochial schools, Rome is hampered! Until the government declares in favor of the "freedom" (temporal power) of the pope, that church will deem itself hampered. In short, until the government is entirely moulded by the influence of the church, the latter will no doubt feel very much hampered. Here is a specimen wail from the *Review*:—

"We are obliged to pay double taxes for the education of our children. Our priests are excluded from many of the prisons and reformatories, and are admitted to others only under restrictions that are galling and unjust. We have no proper appointment of chaplains among the Indian tribes, although many of these wards of the nation profess our faith and could easily be reduced to useful citizenship under its benign influences."

The following item especially must be accomplished before Rome is content, and this end gained will soon appease all other grievances:—

"The Pope must be free! The power he wields is too vast for its free exercise to be permitted by any earthly ruler to whom he may be subject. The united public opinion of the world is probably the means God will use to restore the liberty of his vicar. And the public opinion of America leads and directs that of the earth."

The last sentence explains why the pathetic appeal is made through a great Catholic gathering on the eve of a new session of Congress.

But Rome should take courage; surely everything is rapidly tending toward her desired end. Protestant bodies of almost every shade are moving to open the way for religious legislation, which, when once inaugurated, will open wide the door for Rome to step in and take the helm. The National Reform Association, backed in its various enterprises by nearly every denomination, is asking the Catholics to help it in establishing church domination in the government, and in such a way as will give Rome the balance of power; politicians in high political station are hobnobbing with Roman dignitaries at every favorable opportunity; and from whatever standpoint the view may be taken, the outlook is favorable to the progress of papal influence. If the Catholic Church is any less hampered in England and her colonies than in this country, the Church of England and the British lion itself must be well-nigh overcome by the "imprisoned" Leo of Rome. W. N. GLENN.

Stealing the Lord's Day.

If a man has lost valuable property by a thief, the loser is the first to complain, and the first to seek redress. Now those in favor of a Sunday law, say that Sunday is the Lord's day; that the laboring classes, pleasure-seekers, etc., are stealing it for their own advantage and gratification, and they want a law to make them stop it.

If Sunday is the Lord's day, and people are stealing the Lord's property, why not let the Lord be first to complain and seek redress? To hear those who favor a Sunday law tell how people who appropriate the day to worldly interests ought to be made to desist, or how those who keep another day ought to be ostracised, one would think that *their* property had been stolen instead of the Lord's. They seem to forget God is able to care for his own property. But where has the Lord expressed his incapability for so doing, and commissioned civil government to protect his Sabbath by civil law? He has authorized civil government to protect life and property from persons of evil intent; but he has nowhere empowered it to punish its subjects for the non-performance of a duty that they owe to God.

He who uses the Sabbath to advance his selfish interests is stealing God's time, but is committing no crime against his neighbor or the government; therefore none but God has a right to punish him. E. HILLIARD.

Duluth, Minn.

The "Angelus."

THIS great painting, by François Millet, recently sold to the N. Y. Art Association for one hundred and sixteen thousand dollars, is to be reproduced by the S. F. Wasp Publishing Co., and will be presented free to every purchaser (and subscriber) of the great Christmas Holiday *Wasp*, now in preparation. The picture will be 24x28 in size, illustrated in nine colors and printed on 120-lb. paper. Although the picture could not be purchased for less than \$5.00 at the art stores, it will be presented free with the Christmas *Wasp*, which will be a gorgeous edition of 52 pages, containing 12 full pages of illustrations. The Christmas *Wasp*, including the great picture, will only cost 25 cents. Leave your orders in advance with the newspaper agency.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER 11, 1889.

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.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

Please send all orders for the AMERICAN SENTINEL to our New York Office. Subscriptions can commence with the First Number in January, 1890.

Remember the Address,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

WE desire to thank our many friends who have so kindly sent us marked copies of papers containing articles of special interest to us. Of course it sometimes happens that we can make no direct use of the matter sent, but even when that is the case it may be suggestive of some point which should be noticed. Some of the matter sent us has been very useful and we trust that our friends will still remember us. Please mark the articles which you wish us to notice.

It is not necessary in order to have a union of Church and State that a particular church or sect should be recognized by the civil law, to the exclusion of others. Nor is it necessary that the Church should be supported by the State. The great and popular churches are agreed in what they term "essentials." They unitedly demand that the government shall crystallize their interpretation of the divine will into statute law. If through their combined influence it is done, the Church dictates, the State accepts; the Church interprets, the State enforces that interpretation by law. It is a union of Church and State, as all must admit.

It is stated that the question of Sunday observance is one which disturbs the clergy of England even more than it does the ministry of any other country. In some places the clergymen themselves, it is said, have, in order to secure some sort of respect for the day, inaugurated Sunday cricket clubs, the only restriction being that as soon as the church bells ring the players shall leave the game and attend to their religious duties. An effort is also being made to encourage the opening of museums and picture galleries on Sunday. The position is taken that "it is better to provide some innocent amusement than to allow the men to idle about the streets and otherwise pass the Sabbath in vicious idleness." And this is only another evidence that the only proper basis for Sabbath observance is a conscientious regard for the divine law.

PRESIDENT HARRISON and Vice-President Morton, and several members of the cabinet, were present, October 13, at a banquet given in honor of the dedication of the new Catholic university at Washington. The President's health was drunk standing; Mr. Blaine was applauded, and then all hands cheered Cardinal Gibbons' toast, "The Hierarchy of the United States." *Free Thought* states the foregoing facts and then adds: "We should have two objections to indorsing a

toast of that kind. In the first place, the United States is not a hierarchy, which is a government of the priesthood; and in the second place, if it were a hierarchy, a patriotic American should lament instead of rejoicing over the fact." The criticism is just, though it is not likely that it was intended to imply that the United States is a hierarchy, but only that a hierarchy exists in the United States. That, however, does not mend matters much. The Roman hierarchy in the United States is an enemy to several institutions which ought to be dear to every loyal heart, and the President and his cabinet were out of place on the occasion.

IN giving testimony before the United States Court in Salt Lake City, November 18, Charles W. Penrose, a prominent Mormon, denied that the president of the church ever ordered the killing of any man for apostasy, and said he understood the doctrine of blood atonement to mean that when a man had committed murder or adultery he should be killed, that is, the murderer should be turned over to the civil law. The church had not authority to kill a man for adultery, but he believed when the law of God was fully established the penalty should be death. It is evident from this that the Mormons are consistent National Reformers. Of course that which they wish to see enforced by the civil authorities is not the law of God as others view it, but that which they themselves understand to be the law of God. But the principle is the same in either case, for if the State had the right to enforce the law of God, it would have to decide what that law is, and that decision would be liable to change as courts and majorities changed. A fine theory, truly! But it is National Reform doctrine, pure and simple.

REFERRING to the expressed willingness of the Roman Catholics to "come together with non-Catholics and shape civil legislation for public good," and to "seek an alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance," the *Times* of this city says: "It is a splendid omen for society at large that such good policy exists." And again: "It is a sign of the times worthy of note, this position of so powerful a religious body. Christians are now more nearly hand in hand in this matter than they have ever been before."

Indeed, "it is a sign of the times worthy of note," a most significant sign, but one which forebodes, not good, but evil to our free institutions. We fully believe with the Senate Committee of 1828, that "extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are always dangerous."

"All religious despotisms," said the committee, "commence by combination and influence, and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequences."

We have in this country a powerful Protestant element, so called, who boldly demand an amendment to our national Constitution which they confess would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel. And not only so but the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. published in 1885 makes it the duty of all Catholics to "make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert the utmost vigi-

lance and energy to prevent the usage of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled to the principles of the true church."

This simply means that Protestants and Romanists are working together to accomplish the overthrow of religious liberty in our beloved country. The danger is a grave one, and it is the more grave because of the fancied security and blindness of the people, lulled into indifference as they are by a time-serving secular press which fears to antagonize Rome, and by a bigoted religious press which sees in this movement worldly prosperity for the church.

IN a recent communication to the *Christian Nation*, M. A. Gault says: "Our strongest ally in Christian reform is the W. C. T. U." By "Christian reform" Mr. Gault means, of course, his pet scheme of so-called National Reform, and he certainly states a sad fact when he says that the W. C. T. U. is its strongest ally. These enthusiastic but misguided women are doing all in their power—and their influence is not to be despised—to forward the movement the avowed purpose of which is to change that feature of our Constitution which accords with the idea that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that, as they say, they may make Christ this world's King. But as they can do that only in name, and as men will rule in the name of Christ, but without his guidance, it follows that should they succeed they would have at best only a man-made theocracy, a veritable image of the Papacy, and the deeds of the Papacy it would do.

SOME of the good people of Riverside, Cal., want Sunday horse-racing and theatricals prohibited in that city. But the *Press and Horticulturist* of that place says:—

"In the nineteen years of Riverside's existence we have never known a case of Sabbath horse-racing or theatricals here. We see no indications that such things are desired, and therefore no need of a law prohibiting them."

Possibly some of the good people of that city think that if they could only get an ordinance against horse-racing and theatricals it would be broad enough to cover some other things, which, however, public opinion does not just at present condemn sufficiently to outlaw them even on Sunday. Sunday laws are very elastic and erratic sometimes; for instance, in Arkansas a law framed for the ostensible purpose of shutting up saloons never interfered with the saloons at all, but fined and imprisoned several conscientious, God-fearing, Seventh-day Christians, who, in country places, followed their usual quiet occupations on Sunday after having observed the seventh day. Is something of the same sort wanted in Riverside?

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,
43 Bond St., NEW YORK.