



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 2, 1890.

NUMBER 39.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 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.

REFORMS are not to come from political organizations, but from your own individual work and mine. In order to make that example effective we must be on the side of right and justice.—*Col. R. W. Thompson, Terre Haute, Ind.*

AFTER speaking of the adherence of Seventh-day Adventists to the secular theory of government, the *Christian Statesman* says:—

Many other Christian people, including many ministers of religion, are intelligent and thorough-going secularists in their political beliefs.

Certainly they are; and their numbers are rapidly increasing. Nor is this strange, since the attention of thousands is now being called to this question who never before gave it a serious thought.

WE have often said that the great underlying motive of the Sunday-law agitators is a desire to secure the co-operation of the State in making men religious. Mr. Crafts, the founder of the American Sabbath Union, denies this; but Rev. D. C. Knowles, D. D. says that that is the whole "problem in a nutshell." In an article in the *New York Christian Advocate*, of September 4, Mr. Knowles says:—

This Nation needs to cultivate a profound respect for law by showing its true relations to individual and public good. This is especially applicable to Sunday legislation. Multitudes are indifferent to laws relating to secular business on Sunday, because they think men are not made good by law. They feel that moral agencies alone are to be trusted; but how can moral agencies have their fullest influence on the public conscience unless

law shall lay its prohibitory hand on the whirring wheels of business, and command, "Peace, be still?" Human cupidity will destroy that Sabbath calm which is so peculiar to our American Sabbath unless we arrest its action by law. When that religious calm has departed, how can our moral agencies reach the masses? This is the problem we have before us. The soul needs quiet if it would apprehend God and duty, and this quiet is the product of law. Discard the law and the quiet goes with it, and ere long all forms of industry will be in full blast. It is our duty to have conditions most favorable to the saving influences of the Gospel, and this is the Sabbath problem in a nutshell.

This is a plain confession of just that which we have always asserted, namely, that Sunday laws are directly in the interests of religion, and that they are designed to be so.

Those Non-Sectarian Sects.

ON the subject of the appropriation by Congress of public money to church schools, we have already given the history and the facts. We have also noticed the protest that was entered after it was discovered by the Protestant churches involved, that the Roman Catholic Church was getting an increase when they could get none. But, as already shown, there was nothing heard of the protest by any of the Protestant churches so long as they, with the Catholic Church, got their proportionate share of the public plunder. It was only when they discovered that the Catholic Church was getting something that they could not get, that a protest was raised.

This illustrates the beauties of that idea of non-sectarian religion, that is made so much of nowadays, and which is demanded shall be taught by the State and the Nation in the public schools. By this it is seen that the theory of the non-sectarian religion is apparently a very nice thing, and seems to work very well so long as each sect gets its proportion of the public plunder; but just as soon as one denomination gets a little advantage over the other, then the jealousy of all the others is aroused; that denomination instantly becomes "sectarian," and

whatever appropriation is made to it becomes an appropriation for "sectarian" uses. All the other non-sectarian sects then stand up nobly, and in righteous indignation virtuously "defend American institutions" from the encroachments of sectarianism.

In this we speak from the *Record*. Among the protests that were made in Congress on this subject when it was under consideration, was one from that so-called League for the Protection of American Institutions, which has its headquarters in this city. From all that we can gather, it appears that the chief protest was raised and carried on by this League, and the following is a part, if not all, of the protest that was made. It was read by Senator Jones, of Arkansas, as a statement which had been sent to him by an "eminent man, a minister, resident of New York:"—

Last year there was given to the Roman Catholics, for Indian education, \$356,000. They demanded from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs \$44,000 more, making a total of over \$400,000. The request was denied, and the Commissioner announced that he would not extend the contract system, and would make no contracts with new schools. On this the Catholics endeavored to defeat his confirmations, but did not succeed.

Foiled in this raid upon the public treasury, they then attempted to accomplish their ends through Congress. In the Indian Appropriation bill as introduced into the House of Representatives there are two items, one appropriating \$8,330 for a Roman Catholic school at Rensselaer, Indiana, and the other appropriating \$12,500 for a Roman Catholic school to be opened among the Mission Indians in California.

The special appropriations for the Roman Catholics in the Indian bill for last year were, for St. Ignatius school in Montana \$45,000, and for Roman Catholic schools in Minnesota \$30,000. This made a total last year of \$75,000. The total amount this year is \$95,830. In addition to this large sum they will demand of the Commissioner, doubtless, the same amount granted them last year.

It should be remembered that in 1886 the amount of money secured from the Government by the Roman Catholics was \$184,000, and in 1890 it had reached the large sum of \$356,000. Is it not time that this perversion of public money to sectarian uses should cease?

Now that would be an excellent protest

if it were an honest one. It would be a strong one if it were only fair. From this statement alone, nobody would ever get the idea that any church but the Catholic was engaged in this "raid upon the public treasury," or had been a beneficiary of "this perversion of public money to sectarian uses." Yet this statement was written and distributed to United States senators by a minister—clearly a Protestant minister. Was that minister Rev. James M. King, D. D., General Secretary of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions? It was written by a minister who knew the facts; and he knew that last year while the Roman Catholics received \$356,967, the Protestants received \$204,993. He knew that while the Roman Catholics asked an increase of \$44,000, the Protestants also requested the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to increase the appropriation to them. He knew that in 1886 although the Roman Catholics received \$118,343, the Protestants at the same time from the same source received \$109,916; and he knew that although in 1890 the appropriation to the Roman Catholic Church had "reached the large sum of \$356,967," the amount secured by the Protestants in the same time, and from the same source, had also reached the large sum of \$204,993. Yet in the face of these figures showing the large amount of money received by Protestant denominations from the public treasury for church uses, he says not a word about it, and lays against the Roman Catholics only, as though they were the only guilty parties in the whole transaction, the charge of that "raid upon the public treasury," and protests against and denounces this "perversion of public money to sectarian uses."

Now if the Roman Catholics' securing from the national Government \$118,343 was a "raid upon the public treasury," the securing by Protestants from the same source \$109,916 is just as certainly a raid upon the public treasury; and if the continuation and increase of the appropriation to the Roman Catholics up to the amount of \$356,967 was a continuous raid upon the public treasury, then the continuation and the increase of the appropriation from the same source to Protestants up to the amount of \$204,993 was just as certainly a continuous raid upon the public treasury; the only difference being that the raid of the Protestants was not quite so successful as the raid of the Catholics.

Nor is it exactly correct to put it in this way. The raid was not made by the party in two distinct divisions. They were united in solid phalanx in the raid, each division supporting the other. It was only when the Protestants found that the Catholics were securing a little more plunder than they could seize, that there was any division at all among the invading host, or that there was among them any idea that their action was a raid upon

the public treasury. As soon as this was discovered, however, the invading hosts separated in two divisions—the "sectarian" and the "non-sectarian,"—and the Protestants, the "non-sectarian" division, suddenly discovered that there was a "raid being made upon the public treasury," and that there was being carried on a "serious perversion of public money to sectarian uses."

This is a hint, but a powerful one, of what would come of the non-sectarian religion which the National League for the Protection of American Institutions demands shall be taught in the public schools, and established by constitutional amendment. It would soon end in the total destruction of the whole public school system. And that is just what this League means. Instead of the protection of American institutions, it means the destruction of the most sacred of these institutions.

A. T. J.

The Sunday Question.

REV. W. F. CRAFTS makes this statement:—

To put most men where they must choose between losing their position or their rest day, is to "force them into Sunday work."

This, we think, is by no means a necessary conclusion, nor even a logical one. To put men where they must choose between two things is not to force them to choose a particular one of the two, but simply to make a choice. Otherwise there is no choosing about the matter. Many of the early Christians were forced to choose between losing their lives and denying their faith by paying homage to idols in accordance with Roman law. They were forced to make a choice, and the nature of their choice determined their fidelity or infidelity to the cause they professed to love. The same is true of choosing between losing a position, and a day of rest. The choice made would simply determine which had the stronger hold upon the person choosing; and to say that most men, if forced to make a choice between the two, would give up the day, is equivalent to saying that most men would not do what they believe to be right, or that they have very little regard for the day. The former is not very complimentary to the man, nor the latter to the day.

What is needed, is conscience, and not law in the matter. No man is forced to work on Sunday. There is no law compelling him to labor on that day. He can rest if he chooses, though in some instances he might thereby lose his position, which would be a sacrifice he would make to his religious convictions, showing his fidelity to principle. Some man in search of an honest employe would hire him the next day. If all men conscientiously believed in keeping Sunday, and would adhere to their conscientious belief, the forcing would be on the other side.

Factories, mills, and railroads would be forced to stop on Sunday for lack of hands to run them. There are two sides to this question. Let the battle on the Sabbath question be fought out on the line of conscience and moral suasion, and not on the battle-field of a compulsory ecclesiastical law. Such laws come to us with a bloody record.—*W. A. Colcord, in Washington Post.*

The State and Parochial Schools.

ANOTHER most important phase of State interference with church schools is that in which it is advocated that the State must prohibit the Roman Catholic Church from excommunicating members of that church who persist in sending their children to the public school. And of all phases of the question this most betrays the silly blindness and unreasoning dullness of those who advocate the measure.

The facts upon which this claim is based are these: Where there is not a sufficient number of Roman Catholic children to form a school of their own, the parents are allowed to send them to the public school; but where there is a sufficient number a church school is to be established, and Roman Catholics are required, by the church, to send their children to that school. They are required to do this under penalty of church discipline. For instance, if there is a church school, and a Roman Catholic parent sends his child to the public school instead, the bishop or the priest will command him to send his child to the church school. If he disobeys, then the eucharist will be withheld from him. If he persists in sending his child to the public school, the next step will be excommunication, that is, turning him out of the church entirely, and if he should die he would not be buried in consecrated ground.

The claim that is made on these facts is, that in so doing the Catholic Church is making war upon the public schools, and in that is making war upon the State. Therefore the State in self-defense must prohibit the Roman Catholic Church from exercising church discipline upon any of its members who send their children to the public school in disobedience to church orders.

This claim is made up of a whole bundle of absurdities, and is composed of nothing else. First, it is a confession that the public school, and therefore the State, is dependent upon the Roman Catholic children for its existence; and that it is so weak that it cannot bear the effect of Roman Catholic excommunication in opposition. If this be so, neither the Roman Catholics, nor anybody else, can reasonably be blamed for not wanting to send their children to the public school. But such is not the case. The public school is not dependent upon the Roman Catholic children for its existence, and neither

the public school nor the State is in the slightest danger from all the Roman Catholic excommunications that could be pronounced in a thousand years.

Further, this claim demands that the State shall assume control over the discipline of the Catholic Church in this particular thing. But that involves a union of the Roman Catholic Church and the State, and if the State may assume jurisdiction over the discipline of that church it may exercise it also over the discipline of every other church; and if the State may assume jurisdiction over the Roman Catholic Church in this one thing, it may exercise jurisdiction in that church in everything that it chooses; and if in that church, it may do so in every other church, so that a union of Church and State is unavoidable in any attempt to enforce the claim that is made in behalf of it.

Again, this claim is made by those who profess to be Protestants, or at least, if not Protestants in faith, strong opponents of the whole Roman Catholic system. Yet their position is, that the power and authority of the State shall be exercised in prohibiting the Roman Catholic Church from excommunicating any of its members. Therefore the proper thing for them to do, would be to put forth their utmost efforts to make the public school as nearly perfect as possible, so that every Roman Catholic parent would choose to send his child there instead of to the parochial school, and thus get himself excommunicated. This would soon make the Roman Catholic Church so small that even the danger which these parties dread would be utterly dispelled.

As for THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, we believe in the public school, and support it heartily; and we are opposed to the whole Roman Catholic system from beginning to end. But we shall never sanction for an instant, any proposition for the enactment of a law, either constitutional or statutory, to prohibit the Roman Catholic Church, or any other church, from exercising to the fullest extent all the provisions of its discipline upon any church member who chooses to send his children to the public school instead of to the church school, or for anything else. The discipline of the Roman Catholic Church is its own affair. That church has the right to establish, and to exercise upon its members, its own form of discipline; and to excommunicate any member of the church for any offense to which that church wishes to attach the penalty of excommunication. And we should be heartily glad if the Roman Catholic Church would excommunicate every person that belongs to it in the United States. We think that one of the best things that could ever happen to a Roman Catholic would be, to be turned out of that church so far that he could never get back. Therefore we say let the public school

be made so good, that every parent in the Roman Catholic Church will choose to send his children there instead of to the parochial school, and that he will be so persistent in doing so, that the church will inflict its impotent penalty of excommunication.

But it is gravely argued that the Roman Catholic Church compels its members to obey. For instance, Rev. E. H. Ashmun, of the Boulevard Congregational Church, of North Denver, soberly presents the following:—

It is claimed that the parent has the sole authority over the child in education, but it is difficult not to charge Cardinal Manning and Bishop Keene with insincerity when they make this claim, for no Catholic parent is free to choose the education of his child. The church dictates and he must obey.

But why must he obey? What force or what power is there at the command of the church by which he is compelled to obey? The answer must be that *there is no force nor power at all* except such as exists in the *belief* of the individual himself. Therefore if the State is to interfere with the exercise of the authority of the Roman Catholic Church over its membership, it must necessarily enter into the realm of doctrine and belief of the church and its membership. And thus again it is found that a union of the State and the Roman Catholic Church is inevitably involved in any attempt on the part of the State to exercise jurisdiction over the discipline of the church.

Neither Cardinal Manning, nor Bishop Keene, nor any other Roman Catholic prelate or priest, can be charged with insincerity, when he says that in this country at least, the parent has the sole authority over the child in education, and that the Roman Catholic parent is free to choose the education of his child. This is the truth. He is just as free as any other person to do so. If there be any limit to his freedom in this connection it is simply because of his own belief, and this is simply a matter of his own free choice. And therefore we say again that if the State is going to interfere with the exercise of the authority of the Roman Catholic Church upon its membership, then the State will necessarily have to exercise its authority over the doctrines and beliefs of that church and its membership; because in the doctrines and beliefs is where the whole difficulty lies. If the Roman Catholic did not *believe* that the threatened excommunication is a real and forcible thing, he would not be restrained by it from sending his children to the public school. And as his belief is solely a matter of his own free will it is certain that there is where the difficulty lies; and therefore it is also certain that no effort of the State can ever reach the difficulty without sweeping away every safeguard to the free exercise of thought and religious belief.

Yet more absurd than all, it is actually argued by professed Protestant ministers

that there is real merit, force, and power in a Roman Catholic excommunication. For instance, a Congregational minister in Milwaukee (we have lost his name but think it is Caldwell), in a sermon last spring on "The Bennett Law, and American Liberty," discussed the comparative force of the Bennett law and the Roman Catholic opposition to the public schools. After stating the penalty of the Bennett law, which is "not less than three dollars nor more than twenty dollars," he said:—

Bishop Hennessy, of Iowa, issued an edict compelling the people to take their children out of the public schools and put them in parochial schools. The penalty affixed was excommunication which to a Catholic means damnation. Which is the greater penalty?

Well we should say so, too. Which is the greater penalty, indeed! a three dollar fine or a Roman Catholic damnation? Why, a three dollar fine is a heavier penalty in a minute, than ten thousand times ten thousand Roman Catholic damnations would be in all eternity!

But what shall be thought of this professed Protestant preacher in his magnifying the merits of Roman Catholic damnation? For this is precisely what he did in his argument. A fine of from three to twenty dollars is a real, tangible thing, and therefore when he compared to this the force of the Roman Catholic damnation he did thereby distinctly argue that that also is a real, tangible thing and the greater penalty.

Yet this is no more than is argued in this whole theory from which comes the claim that the State shall prohibit the Catholic Church from excommunicating its members for sending their children to the public school. This argues that membership in the Roman Catholic Church is a thing of real, tangible worth, at least equal to that of attendance upon the public school; and the demand that the State shall by law, prohibit that church from excommunicating its members for sending their children to the public school, is a demand that the State shall set its sanction to the idea that there is real, tangible worth and value in membership in that church, and that there is actual force and virtue in the excommunication pronounced by that church.

Of all the wild ideas that are connected with this subject of State interference with church schools, this certainly takes the lead; and yet such laws are gravely demanded in Massachusetts; and in New Jersey even a constitutional amendment is advocated. The proper thing is for the people of every State to keep the statutes and the Constitution entirely clear of any interference, to the slightest extent, with any private or parochial school. Let them put their attention upon the public school and keep it there. Let them make the public school what it ought to be. Then there need be no fear from the

schools of the Catholic Church, nor the Lutheran Church, nor any other, nor all of them together.

A. T. J.

A Lesson From Paine.

INFIDELS of the present day profess to believe that bigotry and intolerance are inseparable from Christianity, that it is indeed part and parcel of Christianity. But they should learn better than this, even from their patron saint, Thomas Paine. In his "Rights of Man," Paine says:—

All religions are, in their nature, mild and benign, and united with principles of morality. . . . How is it that they lose their native mildness, and become morose and intolerant? By engendering the State with the Church, a sort of mule animal, capable only of destroying, and not of breeding up, is produced, called the Church established by law. . . . The Inquisition in Spain does not proceed from the religion originally professed, but from this mule animal engendered between the Church and State.

And again, of governments established by force, Paine says:—

Governments thus established last as long as the power to support them lasts; but that they might avail themselves of every engine in their favor, they united fraud to force, and set up an idol which they called *divine right*, and which, in imitation of the Pope who affects to be spiritual and temporal, and in contradiction to the founder of the Christian religion, twisted itself afterward into an idol of another shape, called Church and State.

Paine, infidel though he was, knew full well, and was man enough to acknowledge it, that the doctrine of Church and State was not *Christian* doctrine in any proper sense of the word, and it would be well if his disciples of the present day had equal discernment, and as great candor.

The "Loyal American" against Facts.

As an illustration of careless reading, and an utter disregard of facts, an article in the *Loyal American*, of September 17, surpasses anything that we have seen recently. The first paragraph of the article runs thus:—

A. J. J. in THE AMERICAN SENTINEL says it is all wrong for the State to dictate what language shall be taught in the schools, public or private. He bases his dictum upon the *private rights* of parents, and like the religious bigots, forgets that the State and child have rights.

In the first place, no such person as "A. J. J." writes for THE AMERICAN SENTINEL. The initials are "A. T. J." in plain Roman type. In the second place, neither "A. T. J." nor any other writer for THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, has ever denied the right of the State to dictate what language shall be taught in the *public schools*. The very article from which the *Loyal American* quotes, in making its criticism, has in the first and second paragraphs these plain words:—

We have not yet seen it denied that the public has the right to teach English solely, in the public schools. That which is denied is that the public has

a right to say what shall be taught in the private schools; and this is not a denial of the right of the State to say that English shall be taught in the public schools. It is not opposition to the teaching of English; but this opposition is to the assumption that if the State can say that English shall be taught in the public schools, that concedes the right of the State to say that whatever it pleases shall be taught in the private schools, and that consequently there is no such thing as a private school; that the State arbitrarily turns the private school into a public school at private expense.

How anybody can say, as the *Loyal American* does say, that this is a denial of the right of the State to say what language shall be taught in the public schools, is more than we can understand. The State has clearly the right to say that English *and English only* shall be taught in the schools supported by the State; but we deny the right of the State to say what shall be taught in the private schools. If the *Loyal American* wishes to do us justice let it quote *all* we said about the right of the State to require the teaching of English, and not make garbled quotations, merely.

But again, the *Loyal American* says:—

It is evident that A. J. J. is under a misapprehension as to what the State really is, he forgets that the American State is a majority of the citizens; that when it undertakes to protect all citizens in certain rights, it cannot be hampered in doing so by cranks, bigots, self-elected censors, or men who fancy that God should resign and call on them to run the universe. The State must first protect itself, this done, it can turn its protecting arms toward men, women, and children. And while the American State is permitting the oppressed of all climes to come here for refuge from tyranny, and to enjoy greater freedom and opportunities, it must take care that the oppressed do not become our oppressors, as is the fact here in Chicago.

"A. J. J." is under no such misapprehension. The editors of THE SENTINEL are all native-born Americans, as were also their fathers before them, and know as much about what constitutes the American State as does the editor of the *Loyal American*, or any other naturalized foreigner. They know, too, that the whole people, and not merely a majority of the people, constitute the State. But this fact does not make justice out of injustice, nor warrant the majority in meddling with the private affairs of the minority. John Stuart Mill never wrote a truer thing than when he said that such "power itself is illegitimate. The best government has no more title to it than the worst. It is as noxious, or more noxious, when exerted in accordance with public opinion, than when in opposition to it." The idea that whatever the majority decrees is right is no more true now than it was when the majority demanded the crucifixion of Christ, or when the majority demanded the hanging of witches in Massachusetts, or when, as in our own day, the commune of a Russian village decrees the exiling of innocent men and women to Siberia. It is possible for majority rule to be just as tyrannical and just as wicked as the rule of a single man.

The vaporings of the *Loyal American* about private schools that "teach children to beg, to steal, to burglarize houses, to perpetrate highway robbery," are unworthy of an answer. There may be "schools" of that kind in Chicago, but they are not under the management of German Lutherans, nor even of German Catholics. We know Chicago did once have an Anarchist Sunday-school, but anarchy can be taught quite as well in English as in German, and we believe as a matter of fact English was the language employed in that "school." We fear that the real animus of the *Loyal American* is religious intolerance. It wants to force its language and its religion, and probably its own cut of collar, and style of cravat, upon everybody else; and it wants the power of the State to enable it to do it. We regard the Lutherans and the Romanists as in error upon many very important points; and not only so, but we deplore the Roman Catholic influence in politics in this country; but it is no more dangerous to our liberties than are the paternal tendencies, and theory advocated by the *Loyal American*.

C. P. B.

Religious Liberty and Polygamy.

RELIGIOUS liberty has become so sacred in the eyes of the American people, and religious persecution so obnoxious, that any man, or body of men, appealing to religious liberty in defense of their practices, will be granted a speedy and impartial hearing. Until recent years, polygamy, unmolested, has been practiced by one branch of the Mormon Church, and every legal step toward its suppression has been opposed by its defenders, on the ground that such interference would be an abridgment of religious liberty; and even now there are those not in sympathy with the practice of polygamy, who doubt the right of the Government to prohibit it.

The object of this paper is to define the basis upon which polygamy may and should be prohibited, and to show that such prohibition is consistent with the principles of both civil and religious liberty.

The first question to be settled, is, whether marriage is a civil or religious relation. For if marriage is a religious relation it cannot be regulated by civil government. But marriage, as we shall prove, is, primarily, a civil relation; and since the few who will question this proposition are found among believers in religion, we will address this portion of the argument to them.

Mutual aid and companionship are among the primary objects for which marriage was instituted (Gen. 2:18); hence marriage is clearly a social relation. Another primary object of the marriage relation is the propagation of the race. Gen. 1:28. But reproduction is

wholly natural. Ps. 51:5; John 3:6. This argues the natural character of the marriage relation. It is dependent on natural conditions for its existence, and must end with mortality (Matt. 22:30; Rom. 7:2); hence is temporal and natural, not spiritual.

That marriage was instituted by the Creator does not prove that it is a spiritual relation. God has instituted government, and commands men to be subject to "the powers that be." But our relation to governments ordained of God is, primarily, civil. If marriage is a religious ordinance, only those are married who are religious, or spiritual. But this principle would nullify all marriages between parties who reject all religion, but who are faithful and happy in obedience to their marriage vows. Further: If marriage is a religious relation, it must be a relation of the *true* religion, thus confining legitimate marriages to possessors of the true religion, not merely the professors of it. In other words, if marriage were a religious, or spiritual, relation, it would follow that all marital obligations between infidels, hypocrites, and all but the few who profess and possess the true religion, would be null and void. This is the position of the Church of Rome. "Marriage," says the Romish Church, "is purely religious. We alone are the possessors and guardians of the true religion. Hence all marriages not sanctified by the church, are void." This is the logical and inevitable conclusion to which they arrive, upon the assumption that marriage is a religious institution or sacrament. This conclusion, with all its disastrous consequences, is embodied in a formal decree of the Catholic Church. (See records of the Decrees of the Council of Trent, November, 1563.)

While maintaining that marriage is primarily, a civil relation, we would not be understood as excluding from it the benign influences of pure and undefiled religion. The blessings of religion ought to be taken, not only into the marriage relation, but into every relation of life, social and civil.

Having shown that marriage is a social or civil relation, and therefore within the purview of civil legislation, *provided the rights of society demand it*, we will next inquire, Do the rights of society demand the regulation of the marriage relation? We maintain that they do, and for the following reasons, among others: The State must regulate marriage, for the purpose of ascertaining the paternity of children. This the State must do, in order that it may impose upon the proper parties the parental care of the child, that the tax-payer who is not responsible for its existence, may not be charged with its support. Hence it is proper and just for the State to require, as it does, that those entering upon the marriage relation shall furnish competent evidence of having en-

tered upon that relation, and that they accept its duties and responsibilities.

Having shown that the government may in right, and must in justice to the tax-payer, regulate the institution of marriage, we next inquire, May it regulate that relation *to the extent of prohibiting plural marriages?* It will be conceded that it is the province and the duty of civil government to protect its citizens; and, if any right of the citizen is invaded by the practice of polygamy, and such practice can be shown to be a menace to the peace and good order of society, irrespective of religious prejudice, it can and should be prohibited by civil law. That polygamy is an invasion of the natural rights of man we shall proceed to prove.

All men are created equal, and are by nature endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which is the right to the undivided companionship of a wife. But, while this proposition will not be disputed, our position is, that for men to take unto themselves a plurality of wives, is abnormal and will invade that right. Polygamy is abnormal, since nature has made no provision for it. For that institution to be normal and within the reach of every man, nature must provide at least twice as many females as males; or, if we take the number of wives associated with Brigham Young in the marriage relation as a precedent (and once admit the principle the number cannot be restricted), nature would have to produce more than twenty times as many women as men. "It is fully established," says the "Encyclopædia Britannica," "that among all races of mankind, the number of male infants born slightly exceeds the number of females, the ratio being about twenty-one males to twenty females." After mentioning the comparative mortality of the two sexes, the same authority says: "Taking the human race as a whole the numbers of married and marriageable men and women are practically equal." ("Encyclopædia Britannica" Supplement, Vol. 4, pages 222, 223). For one half of the male population to take even two wives, or one more than is allotted to each man by nature, would be to deprive the other half of the one wife which nature has provided.

Polygamy is therefore a violation of the natural rights of man, and as such, should be prohibited by civil law. The statement that the supply has always equaled the demand in countries where polygamy has been practiced, even if true, loses its force, when we consider that the practice has been restricted to the wealthy and powerful. Even in Utah among the modern polygamists, the number of wives is restricted by a property qualification, and even then, the supply has not equaled the demand, as will be shown further on. All such restrictions, based on property or other qualifications, are inconsistent with the equal rights of man, and the principles of our free Government.

The Mormon community in Utah is a practical and forcible illustration of the fact that polygamy is an abnormal state of society. It is an acknowledged fact that this community does not furnish the excess of females required to meet the demand for a plurality of wives, their offspring there, as elsewhere, being about equally divided between the sexes. This demand has been met by the efforts of missionaries who have induced women (in some cases wives and mothers who deserted their families), to join the Mormon community and add another wife to the already well supplied Mormon husband. To say that the females drawn from non-polygamous districts to furnish women for polygamous communities do not materially alter the proportionate number of marriageable men and women in those districts, does not in the least militate against the argument. Having shown that in principle it violates the inalienable rights of men, the limited extent of its practice cannot be advanced in support of the institution. The State should not abolish its laws against polygamy (thus giving it legal sanction), and then wait until one half of the male population of the country are deprived of their rights, in order to prove that the practice would invade natural rights. As well wait until the seals are destroyed, to prove that the present method of killing will destroy them, before enacting laws against their destruction. The necessity of the Government thus taking precautionary measures, was advocated by Secretary Blaine in the recent seal-fishery dispute, and admitted by the English Premier. All the Government needs to know, is, that the practice will invade the rights of men; its duty in the matter is then made clear. It must prohibit the practice in order to preserve those rights.

Having shown that the practice of polygamy invades the rights of men to the undivided companionship of a wife, we will next show that it is an invasion of the natural rights of women to the undivided companionship of a husband, which nature by its producing as many men as women, proves to be her natural right.

The husband by taking the second wife, invades the rights of the first wife to the undivided companionship of a husband. To say that both women voluntarily accept the relation, does not place the matter beyond the jurisdiction of civil government, because the Government cannot sanction the invasion of natural rights even though the parties are agreed. It may be objected, that because the Government cannot sanction the practice, it does not follow that it must prohibit it. It is true the Government cannot be regarded as sanctioning a practice by not prohibiting it when the practice does not come within its jurisdiction. But, since the practice of polygamy has been proved to be a violation of natural rights, the very

thing for which governments are established to prevent, this comes within the rightful jurisdiction of civil government, and a failure to prohibit it is to give it legal sanction. *The absence of law prohibiting a practice, when that practice comes within the jurisdiction of civil government, is to give the practice the sanction and protection of government.* To illustrate: The government has no law against murder. A man is murdered, and his friends bring the murderer before the authorities for punishment; but they are told the State has no law against murder, and orders are given that the murderer be set at liberty. By this the government sanctions the act of murder. A failure to prohibit the act makes the government responsible for it.

Thus it is with the invasion of the rights of the first wife by her husband's taking other wives. A failure on the part of the government to prohibit it gives the act the sanction of the government, and, having by its failure to prohibit the act given legal sanction to it, it cannot contradict itself by declaring the marriage illegal at some subsequent time in order to secure to the woman her rights. The law ought therefore to prohibit polygamy that it may be faithful to its duty of securing to its citizens their natural rights.

Neither can the plea that polygamy is practiced as a part of the religion of the Mormon, affect the argument. No religious practices, however sacred in the eyes of the believer, can receive the sanction of a just government, if they infringe upon the rights of others.

Again, to protect the Mormons in their practice of polygamy on account of their religious convictions, and prohibit the same practice among others, would be class legislation, which is opposed to the principles of free government. If polygamy is permitted in Utah, it must be permitted in every State and Territory in the Union. If this permission is granted the Mormon it must be granted the "Gentile;" and, since the "Gentile" has not the religious convictions which alone make order possible in a polygamous society, it would be destructive of the family relation, and, through that, destructive of civilized government itself.

For these reasons, we arraign this whole system as unnatural, an infringement of human rights, a menace to the good order of society, and maintain that it may be suppressed by law without infringing any principle of religious liberty, and must be suppressed in order to preserve civil liberty.

A. F. BALLENGER.

THE opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Cassody is, to our understanding, clear and conclusive. Bible-reading in public schools has the form and intention of religious worship; and this being the fact, then to compel the people by taxation to erect and support public schools, in which such reading is a practice, is to compel them by law to erect and support places of worship.—*New York Independent.*

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.



DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.
We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.
We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.
We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.
We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.
We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

OFFICES.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY;
225 A ST., N. E., WASHINGTON; 28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO.

C. ELDRIDGE, - - - - - President.
W. H. MCKEE, - - - - - Secretary.

The Massing of the Forces.

IN an address delivered at the Lakeside Assembly, in August, Miss Frances E. Willard thanked God for the marshalling of the National Reform soldiery "marching as for war."

At such a time, when reinforcements are so rapidly joining themselves to the ranks of the party which assumes to be the army of moral reform, it does not come amiss to enumerate the detachments of which this marching host is composed.

Dr. McAllister says of these gathering forces, in the preface to his "Manual of Christian Civil Government:"—

These days of peace do not call patriots to the battle-field. The God of nations is blessing us with rest from war. But the Christian patriot's ear catches stirring calls to more strenuous and momentous conflicts than any "battle of the warriors" with its "confused noise, and garments rolled in blood." The enemies of our national Christianity are both powerful and active. They have begun their attack. Our Christian institutions of Government are at stake. And the same love of country that would summon the patriot to the field of battle, summons him now to the field of moral conflict, where the friends and foes of our American national Christianity are deploying and skirmishing, and must soon come to the decisive engagement.

The issue is stated here. Although by implication, still it is direct implication. What is it? It is between "American national Christianity" and the Christianity of the Bible,—God's religion pure and undefiled, which savoreth not of the things which be of this world.

In whatever country it has been established, and by whatever name it has been called, whether it has been the Church of Rome, the Greek Church, the Church of England, or the American national Christianity, the intent and effect of the organization of a "national Christianity" has invariably been to uphold the "traditions of men," and maintain them in the face of the divinely spoken truth of the word of God. This is the case now. Can the result be expected to differ from past similar conflicts? It cannot, except in de-

gree. And this is the only way in which it will differ. Prophecy shows it surely, clearly, definitely. But then the end comes. Here is the final deliverance, and the right does triumph eternally. Sin and wrong die with the wicked and the unjust, and exist no longer. The joy of eternal bliss and the grandeur of heavenly perfection are then attained. But these hosts, who call to one another with such sounding of the trumpet, and gather with such worldly pomp and pageantry, truly and literally an "army with banners," should stop and ask themselves who is it that will be called "great in the kingdom of heaven?" and who is it that "in no case shall enter" therein?

Did not He in whose name they profess to assemble, accept the crown of thorns as a lowly symbol of his ministering service to mortality? and did He not most sternly reprove his disciples when they spoke the things which savored of this world? And who did He say should be with him in his kingdom? Was it not the persecuted, the peacemakers, the pure in heart, the merciful, the meek, the mourners, the poor in spirit, and those that hunger and thirst after righteousness? Are those terse sentences, in which Christ named the host of the blessed, descriptive of the serried ranks that march as for war in behalf of a "national Christianity?"

Let them who would choose between the mortal error into which the Jews fell at the first coming of Christ, (when they in their vainglory of race, and pride of the world looked for him to assume an earthly scepter, and his true kingdom which is not of time and death), take thought not to fall into such an error at his second coming. At that time the Jews stood for a distinctively national Christianity, with the Messiah as their earthly king. Who is it that stands similarly, for a distinctively "American national Christianity"? It is the National Reform party, that for twenty-seven years has been a growing power in this country.

Who is it with clear-voiced utterance, "local, State, national, and world-wide" in the scope of its influence, says that Christ shall be king of this transitory, sin-defiled world,—King of its despotic and corrupt courts—of its camps of license and violence—of its commercial robbery and injustice,—King of its tyrannical and extortionate customs, and of its imperfect Constitutions,—and that through the gateway of political corruption Christ shall enter the realm of law—human law? It is the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in unison with the National Reform party.

Next to this detachment from the motherhood of the State, comes a maidenly contingent of human loveliness, fit only for a war of roses indeed, which steps in delicately, stately trippings to the martial music of National Reform.

With the sweetest and loveliest and last

of fashions, graceful concessions to a silken Christianity, they say, with haughty humility which fits so well their perfect manner and easy courtliness of bearing, "We are the 'King's Daughters,' we command you 'In His Name.'"

But who are these who pass as a brook of rippling youthful laughter fit to flow through the golden streets? It is the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, the children's crusade of the nineteenth century, marching to as pitiful an end, and for as futile a purpose, as were the Crusaders when led by fanatic zeal to the conquest of the holy sepulchre.

As a rear-guard to this marvellous religious army of the world, marches a vast body of churchmen at arms, whose very presence is a benediction, and whose benign graciousness assures to the motley host protection and safety for time and eternity,—the Evangelical and Ministerial Alliance.

As outposts, and flying patrol along the whole line, the Law and Order Leagues are stationed.

This is "the National Reform soldiery 'marching as for war.'"

Does this display of worldly influence and human force tally well with that meek and saintly patience which the Bible says must characterize those who become subjects of our Lord and of his Christ in his eternal kingdom?

W. H. M.

It is remarkable that in this country of boasted religious liberty, Christians use the civil courts to persecute other Christians who insist upon obeying the Bible by working six days in the week and resting on the seventh.

—Denison (Texas) Gazetteer.

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.,
163 WEST MAIN ST.,
Battle Creek, Mich.

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 Caesar."
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 is 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, 1889. (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 2, 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.

THE Mayor of Altoona, Pennsylvania, has caused the cigar stores and ice-cream saloons in that city to be closed on Sunday, and expects to keep them closed. Persons who wish ice cream for Sunday, will have to eat it the day before.

On the 23d ult., the World's Fair Commission referred to a committee, a resolution offered by Commissioner Rush Strong, of Tennessee, declaring that, "as a Sabbath-keeping nation, and being desirous of following in the channel of all great American Expositions, the Commission is opposed to opening, or keeping open, the Exposition on Sunday."

This is supposed to mean that definite action on the question will not be taken for two years, or just before the opening of the Fair.

THE *Truth Seeker* thinks that clergymen should not be disfranchised as they are under the new *regime* in Brazil. It says:—

It is not right, though it may be expedient considering the character of the clergy and their proneness to maneuver for the aggrandizement of the Church. Ministers should be treated the same as other men. . . . Give them freedom and suffrage, treat them as though they were not dependents, and they will come out all right in time.

Government should be purely secular, and should give itself not the least concern about the religion or religious calling of its subjects.

REV. JAMES MCCOSH, D. D., LL. D., ex-President of Princeton College, in discussing the question of the revision of the "Confession of Faith," says:—

There are some ministers and elders who have been speaking very unadvisedly as to revision, and leaving the impression that they are ready to abandon some of the essential truths of religion on which the hopes of Christians depend. They are persons who have not been trained in the severer truths of the Word (we are to "behold both the goodness and severity of God"). A few of them have come from other denominations, where they were not taught the sovereignty of God. The greater number have received their higher training in Germany under professors elected, not by the Church but by the State; in other words, by politicians, and have no fixed faith in the inspiration of Scripture.

This is not a very good testimonial to the benefits of State religion, nor to State teaching of religion; but it is fully justified by the facts. Germany has long been

noted for its infidelity; and, as Dr. McCosh intimates, it is unquestionably due to the fact that its ministers of religion are for the most part trained in colleges supported by the State, and presided over by men selected, not because of their piety, but through political favoritism. A similar state of affairs would produce like results in this country.

FELIX R. BRUNOT, President of the National Reform Association, has issued a call for a conference on "the Christian principles of civil government," "to be held in Nashville, Tennessee, on, or about, the 15th of February next." The conference should also consider the Christian principles of the Golden Rule. A conscientious study of that matchless Rule, in Nashville, might lead to a repeal of the wicked and oppressive Sunday law which now disgraces the State of Tennessee.

SOME time ago the whole plea for the closing of the proposed World's Fair was made on the ground of morals; now the spectacle is presented of ministers and churches uniting as one man to secure Sunday closing in order that the employes may rest! It seems just a little strange, however, that the religious element of this country is never concerned about the welfare of the workingman except in the matter of Sunday observance. Can it be that Sunday rest is the only thing to be desired by the toiling masses

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the National Reform Association, held in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, September 5, this, among other recommendations, was adopted:—

That we resume the circulation of petitions to Congress for the Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that a hearing be secured, if possible, on this subject before the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House.

The Secretary was also instructed to prepare, and forward to both houses of Congress, a memorial praying for a constitutional amendment forbidding sectarian instruction in the public schools, but providing that it shall not be so construed as to exclude the use of the Bible in such schools.

THE *Christian Statesman* has an editorial note, which says:—

We have never seen the Hebrew theocracy fully and correctly discussed. Foolish and incorrect ideas on the subject pervade our literature, and are heard continually on the platform, and even in the pulpit.

This is quite an acknowledgment. We have long known that National Reform literature was pervaded by foolish and incorrect ideas of a theocracy, but we had scarcely looked for such a frank acknowledgment of this fact from the *Christian Statesman*. What is said of the platform

and pulpit is no doubt equally true; we are well aware that National Reform speakers are very prone to "foolish and incorrect ideas," and not only so, but they have a fondness for parading them before the public.

THAT the present demand for Sunday laws is largely to supply a lack on the part of those who profess to revere that day, is shown by the following editorial note in the *New York Observer*:—

For all this breaking down of Sabbath sentiment the religious people of this country are to blame. It is not the reaction from Puritanism. It is the self-indulgence of nominal Christians that makes them powerless to support by their words and actions the national Sunday.

Just so; "nominal Christians" are so given to self-indulgence that they set a bad example; therefore an appeal is made to civil law to bolster up a tottering morality which, at best, is only skin deep.

DR. JOHN HALL, writing from England, to the *New York Mail and Express*, devotes considerable space in his letter to the consideration of the agitation of the question of the relations of Church and State, now going on in the Old World, Dr. Hall says:—

To an extraordinary degree the questions of the relations of the Church and State are now occupying the European mind. Not in Great Britain only, but in Germany and other sections in which intellectual activity is found, there is, on many grounds, deep dissent from the view of Milton that the Church of Christ is not strong enough to stand unless buttressed by temporal power and civil resources. In some cases the stir is on the ground of taxation without benefit; in some it is on the ground of taxation without representation; in some it is based on direct dislike to the cause of religion, and in some it is unhappily the outcome of religious discussion. "The Welsh Nonconformist ministers are becoming political preachers," say the clergy who are for establishment. "Well" they reply, "the bishops and rectors have always been political nominees; they have no right to criticise us."

Dr. Hall continues for a third of a column to describe the agitation and recrimination upon Church and State questions now going on in England. At the present rate of increase in the general attention paid to this subject, how long will it be before the relations of religion and government will be the all-absorbing political issue of the world?

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 towards 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, . . . 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, 5c.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
48 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.