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

VOLUME 6. NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 26, 1891. NUMBER 46.

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.

"THE Church's weakness has ever been the uniting herself with the forces of the State; but when holiness has been her law and the Lord her glory, she has triumphed."

IN the matter of education there is but one proper course for the State to pursue, namely, to provide facilities for giving not an irreligious, but a purely secular education to all children not otherwise provided for, and leaving to the Church and to the home the teaching of religion. To attempt any other course would be to belittle religion and destroy our common school system.

ANGLICAN Christianity is part of the law of England, but no American court has ever decided whether that Christianity which is said to be a part of the law of the land in this country is Anglican or Roman, if Anglican it must be that this is a Protestant Episcopal Nation, and all other denominations are dissenters. Is that the kind of Christianity that the National Reformers would make the "undeniable basis of the fundamental law of the land?" Or, is it not rather the Covenanter creed on which they desire to see the fundamental laws of the United States established? The visiting dissenters, from England, of the different branches of the Methodist Church who met at the Ecumenical Conference in Washington, expressed themselves with great unanimity as to the noticeable and enjoyable difference between the religious atmosphere of this country, free from a Church establishment, and that to which they are accustomed, where they must bear up under a title of somewhat opprobrious distinction as well as the civil and social disabilities entailed by their dissent. Yet, while feeling and expressing so keen an appreciation of full civil freedom of worship, the members of this same Conference passed resolutions in favor of measures which are, and which are intended to be, subversive of that very condition, in religions affairs, which they recognized as supremely fortunate. Those who still realize the unhappy situations of dissent in their own case should be thoughtful of establishing such conditions as will burden others with the duty of dissent from them.

Is This a Prerogative of the United States Courts?

LAST week we showed by unquestionable proofs from public records, as well as personal and representative documents, that the statements made by Judge Hammond as to the beliefs and wishes of Mr. King and his "peculiar sect" are not true in any sense. This, however, is a very small matter compared with the *principle* which is involved, and which underlies this action of the Judge: *that is*, the assumption of the prerogative of defining, and passing judgment upon the beliefs and wishes of citizens of the United States.

For convenience, we insert again the passage referred to, which runs as follows:—

> The petitioner cannot shelter himself just yet, behind the doctrine of religious freedom, in defying the existence of a law, and its application to him, which is distasteful to his own religious feeling or *fanaticism*, that the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, should be set apart by the public for the day of public rest and religious observances. *That is what he really believes and wishes, he and his sect*, and *not* that each individual should select his own day of public rest, and his own day of labor. His *real* complaint is, that his adversaries on this point have the advantage of usage and custom, and the laws founded on the usage and custom, *not* that religious freedom has been denied to him. *He does not belong* to the class that would abrogate all laws for a day of rest, because the day of rest is useful to religion, and aids in maintaining the churches, for none more than he professes the sanctifying influence of the fourth commandment, the literal observance of which by himself and all men, is the distinguishing demand of his peculiar sect.

As before shown, every material statement in this passage, as to the beliefs and wishes of the petitioner and his sect, is directly the reverse of the truth in the matter. And in view of this *fact*, it is evident that the Judge has presumed authoritatively to define for Mr. King and the people with whom he is religiously connected just what their "religious feeling" is, and what they really believe and wish. And it is evident that the Judge considers himself capable of defining for them what their religious feeling is and what they really believe and wish, better than they can do it for themselves; because that which he declares to be their religious feeling, and what they really believe and wish is directly contrary to what they themselves had formerly and officially declared upon the same points precisely.

Nor does the Judge stop here. Having officially declared for them what their religious feeling is and what they really believe and wish, and so having this point judicially settled he proceeded to judge their motives, and to declare them "disingenuous,"—"not noble or high-toned; mean, unworthy . . . unworthily or meanly artful," in their "demand for religious freedom." And not content with this he must needs apply to the religious feeling which he has falsely attributed to them the approbrious epithet of "fanaticism."

This is a singular proceeding for a court of the United States. It strongly reminds us of certain court proceedings in times past, which are worth recalling in this connection. There are many of them, but one will suffice for this occasion. January 18, 1573, a certain Mr. White, a Puritan, and "a substantial citizen of London, who had been fined

and tossed, from one prison to another, contrary to law and justice [yet all in "due process of law"–EDITOR], only for not frequenting his parish church," and for relinquishing the Church of England toggery, was prosecuted before an English court, the Lord Chief Justice presiding, who was assisted by the Master of the Rolls, the Master of the Requests, a Mr. Gerard, the Dean of Westminster, the Sheriff of London, and the Clerk of the Peace. The record is in part as follows:—

Lord Chief Justice.—Who is this?

White.—White, an't please your honor.

L. C. J.—White? as black as the devil!

White.—Not so, my lord; one of God's children.

. . . . . .

Master of Requests.—What scriptures have you to ground your conscience against these garments?

White.—The whole Scriptures are for destroying idolatry, and everything that belongs to it.

M. Req.—These things never served to idolatry.

White.—Shough! they are the same which were heretofore used to that purpose.

M. Req.—Where is the place where these are forbidden?

White.—In Deuteronomy and other places . . . and God by Isaiah commandeth us not to pollute ourselves with the garments of the image. . . .

Master of the Rolls.—These are no part of idolatry, *but are commanded by the prince for civil order;* and if you will not be ordered, you show yourself disobedient to the laws.

White.—I would not willingly disobey any law, only I would avoid those things that are not warranted by the word of God.

M. Req.—These things are commanded by an act of Parliament, and in disobeying the laws of your country you disobey God.

White.—I do it not of contempt, but of conscience; in all other things I am an obedient subject.

L. C. J.—Thou art a contemptuous fellow and will obey no laws.

White.—Not so, my lord: I do and will obey laws; . . . refusing but a ceremony out of conscience . . . and I rest still a true subject.

L. C. J.—The Queen's majesty was overseen not to make you of her council, to make laws and orders for religion.

White.—Not so, my lord; I am to obey laws warranted by God's word.

L. C. J.—Do the Queen's laws command anything against God's word.

White.—I do not so say, my lord.

L. C. J.—Yes, marry, do you, and there I will hold you.

White.—Only God and his laws are absolutely perfect; all men and their laws may err.

L. C. J.—This is one of Shaw's darlings. I tell thee what, I will not say anything of affection, for I know thee not, saving by this occasion; thou art the wickedest and most contemptuous person that has come before me since I sat in this commission.

White.—Not so, my lord; my conscience witnesseth otherwise.

. . . . . .

Dean of Westminster.—You will not, then, be obedient to the Queen's commands?

White.—I would only avoid those things which have no warrant in the word of God; that are neither decent nor edifying, but are flatly contrary. . . .

L. C. J.—You would have no laws.

White.—If there were no laws I would live a Christian and do no wrong; if I received any, so it were.

L. C. J.—Thou art a rebel.

White.—Not so, my lord: a true subject.

L. C. J.—Yes, I swear by God, thou art a very rebel; for thou wouldst draw thy sword, and lift up thy hand against thy prince, if time served.

White.—My lord, I thank God my heart standeth right toward God and my prince; *and God will not condemn, though your honor hath so judged.*

L. C. J.—Take him away.

White.—I would speak a word which I am sure will offend, and yet I must speak it; I heard the name of God taken in vain; if I had done it, it had been a greater offense there than that which I stand here for.

Mr. Gerard.—White, White, you don't behave yourself well.

White.—I pray your worship show me wherein, and I will beg pardon and amend it.

L. C. J.—I may swear in a matter of charity.

. . . . . .

White.—Pray, my lord, let me have justice. I am unjustly committed; I desire a copy of my presentment.

L. C. J.—You shall have your head from your shoulders. Have him to the Gatehouse.

White.—I pray you to commit me to some prison in London, that I may be near my house.

L. C. J.—No sir, you shall go thither.

White.—I have paid fines and fees in other prisons; send me not where I shall pay them over again.

L. C. J.—Yes, marry, shall you: this is your glory.

White.—I desire no such glory.

L. C. J.—It will cost you twenty pounds, I warrant you, before you come out.

White.—God's will be done.—*Neal's "History of the Puritans," Vol. I. chap. V.*

Hitherto, it has been supposed by the American people that we had been delivered from such judicial procedure as is here represented, and that citizens of the United States were free from attacks and abuse from the judicial bench on account of their religious beliefs and feelings. But when we are confronted with the fact that from a judicial bench of the United States thousands of citizens of the United States are fasely charged, to their reproach, and denounced as "disingenuous," and branded with the epithet of "fanaticism" solely on account of their "religious feelings," and their *beliefs* and *wishes*, with respect to religious observances, then it is certainly time for the people of the United States to look about them and inquire whether the rights and liberties bequeathed to us by our fathers, are indeed all a delusion and a snare?

Of course, this is all consistent with the Judge's views of the relationship of religion and the civil power, and the prerogatives of those religionists who can secure control of legislation, and thus enforce upon all, their own religious beliefs and observances. But, in this as in every other point of his *dictum*, the Judge's ideas become a court of the Dark Ages more than any court of the nineteenth century; and a country dominated by papal principles, instead of one dominated by the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and the United States Constitution. If the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, stands indeed in things religious as well as things civil, and if the judges of those courts really sit in the place of God, and enjoy the infallibility that belongs to such position, then it is proper enough, of course, that they should exercise that prerogative in deciding for individuals and sects what their religious beliefs and wishes really are, and whether a religious feeling is fanaticism or not. But if such be not the jurisdiction of the courts, nor the position of the judges, then they are entirely out of place when they assume to themselves such jurisdiction and exercise such prerogatives.

And that such is not the jurisdiction of any court of the United States, nor the position of any judge thereof, is evident from every principle of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States, and also from the whole history of the formation of that Constitution.

In closing we cite a passage from a decision of the Supreme Court of California, in a case involving the identical question and principle that was before the Circuit Court of the United States for the Western district of Tennessee. The principles set forth by the California Court are fully as applicable to the United States as they are to that State. We are sure that upon a comparison between this extract and that from Judge Hammond at the beginning of the article, no reader will have the slightest difficulty in deciding which has the true ring, or which sets forth the true American doctrine. The California Court said:—

> The protection of the Constitution extends to every individual or to none. It is the individual that is to be protected. The principle is the same, whether the many or the few are concerned. The Constitution did not mean to inquire how many or how few would profess or not profess this or that particular religion. If there be but a single individual in the State who professes a particular faith, he is as much within the sacred protection of the Constitution as if he agreed with the great majority of his fellow-citizens.
>
> We cannot therefore inquire into the particular views of the petitioner, or any other individual. . . . The Constitution protects the freedom of religious *profession* and worship, without regard to the sincerity or insincerity of the worshipers. We could not inquire into the fact whether the individual professing to hold a particular day as his Sabbath was sincere or otherwise. He has the right to profess and worship as he pleases, without having his motives inquired into. His motives in exercising a constitutional privilege are matters too sacred for judicial scrutiny. Every citizen has the undoubted right to vote and worship as he pleases, without having his motives impeached in any tribunal of the State.—*Cal. Rep. 9 Lee. 515.*

And let all the people forever say, Amen. A. T. J.

"CHRISTIANITY," says Blackstone, "is part of the laws of England." But if Christianity is only a part of English law then must there be other parts of the laws of England which are not Christian. And if the common law of England, as it stood in 1776, was adopted by the Constitution and became of force in the United States, then this country received into its legal code that which was unchristian as well as what was Christian. Which part was Christian and which was not?

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union Convention in Boston.

THE recent National and World's Convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Tremont Temple, Boston, was one of the most important and significant meetings of its kind ever held in any land, and marks an important era in the blending of religion and politics, and in effect, if not in name, uniting Church and State in this country. Delegates were present from every State and Territory in the United States, except Alaska. Many countries of the Old World were also represented, including South Africa and Japan.

When first organized the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was what its name implies, an association of Christian women for Christian temperance work, and nobly was that work carried forward. But it is impossible to attend such a meeting as that in Tremont Temple without being impressed with the fact that this whilom noble army of women has forgotten its first love, and is openly seeking an alliance with the civil power similar to that which grew out of the great apostasy of the fourth century, and resulted in the establishment of the Papacy.

The most prominent feature of the Woman's Christian Union as it exists today is political and not religious; for this reason, that, losing sight of the power of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, it is invoking the power of the State to effect reforms, which can never be accomplished in any such way or by any such means; reforms and results which according to the word of God can be effected only by the operation of the divine Spirit upon the individual human heart. This fact stood out prominently in the Boston convention. Said Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt, Honorary Life President of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, "I beg of you to bring us women into the Government *that we may bring in righteousness.*" The end sought is a noble one; the means proposed are ignoble and contrary to the gospel of Christ. Of the divine law the apostle says: "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." How idle then to talk of bringing in righteousness by political action, when even the divine law is too weak through the flesh to accomplish that result. But this is the underlying thought of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, moral reform by legislative action. The convention of 1887, declared:—

> The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiam, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king; yea verily this world's king in its realm of cause and effect,—king of its courts, its camps, its commerce,—king of its colleges and cloisters,—king of its customs and constitutions. . . . The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics.

The utterances at the Boston convention were in perfect keeping with this declaration. In an address in Tremont Temple, on Sunday evening, November 15, Mrs. Leavitt declared that there were but two divinely ordained forms of government, family government and a theocracy; and deplored the fact that since the time of the Jewish theocracy, a theocratic government had been maintained in only two countries, and only for a short time, namely, under Cromwell in England, and by the Puritans in Massachusetts. "The Colony of Massachusetts," she said, "was for a time governed by God." But she forgot to say that under that wicked government—not as she asserted, by God, but by bigoted and selfish men in the name of God—Baptists were whipped, Quakers banished, and inoffensive old women hanged as witches. But she did declare that "the law of God must be strengthened by human enactments," and that men must be made to obey it by adequate penalties. The student of history knows what that means, it means that like the National Reform Association, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is pledged to a movement that can result in nothing short of persecution for conscience sake.

Further notice of this convention must be postponed until next week, when we hope to have before us the full text of the resolutions adopted, and of the several papers read and addresses made.

C. P. B.

A Peculiar Decision.

THE New York *Nation* of August 20, 1891, contains an article reviewing a single point in the decision lately rendered in the case of R. M. King, the Tennessee Sabbatarian, who was convicted for committing a nuisance by plowing his field on Sunday. It is already well understood that King sued out a writ of *habeas corpus* upon the ground that there was no law in Tennessee to justify his conviction, and that he was therefore deprived of his liberty without due process of law. The case was then brought before Judge Hammond, of the Federal Court, who sustained the decision of the lower courts.

In his written opinion Judge Hammond expressed the belief that the prisoner was wrongfully convicted, but said that the courts of the United States have no power to interfere in the matter, on the ground that they are not tribunals which may review and reverse convictions in the State courts even though such convictions may be illegal, through erroneous judgment, as to what the statute or the common law of a State may be. "If so," he says, "every conviction in the State courts would be reversible in the Federal courts where errors of law could be assigned."

The average mind, however, fails to see why that is a sufficient reason for the Federal courts not having such power. On the same ground, why may not the Supreme Court throw off all responsibility concerning the decisions of the courts below it, and affirm that, even though a judge in one of them, through his ignorance of the law, or prejudice against a defendant, charges his jury in a prejudicial way and thus secures a conviction wrongfully, that there is no redress for the one thus wrongfully convicted? Do these courts have no jurisdiction in such matters? Can they not interfere that justice may be secured? If the decision of a lower court is final, then why the need for the higher courts to exist? Why may not the lower courts do the work now assigned to the higher?

Judge Hammond decides that it is not possible for the judges of States to err in their knowledge of the common law; for he affirms that these judges are the depositaries of the common law of their respective States, just as the statute book is the depository of the statute law. In other words, whatever version they may give of the common law establishes it, just as the statutes are established by the way they are expressed upon the statute book. He makes his decision upon this point plain by the following words: "When they [the judges] speak, the law is established, and none can gainsay it." If this be true, it is hard to see on what ground Judge Hammond should declare Mr. King "wrongfully convicted." For if when the judge in Tennessee, in whose court Mr. King was convicted, in rendering his decision pronounced as to what constituted common law, and thus *established* his utterances as law, then Mr. King was convicted by a law of Tennessee.

But if, on the other hand, the decision of Judge Hammond regarding the infallibility of the decisions of State judges is not sustained in fact, and that therefore there is no common law in Tennessee as was declared by the Court of that State, then Mr. King violated no law, and was therefore illegally convicted; "for where no law is, there is no transgression." Then what shall be said of the justice of the next higher court that renders a decision to sustain the lower courts in punishing an innocent man?

Again, if any State judge has the power to establish any point he may express, as law, simply because he says it is so, it follows that a law could be made to suit any case, at the time of its trial, and in any way that might suit the prejudice of the judge trying the case. But if this state of things is to be admitted, where is the voice of the people in the establishment of the laws under which they are to live, and by which they will be tried

in the courts? Is this a Government of the people, or is it not?

But, although Judge Hammond expressed himself so strongly upon the point that the decision of a State judge establishes common law, he nevertheless is satisfied that there is no such common law as the Tennessee court has declared. And yet, Mr. King was remanded by the decision of Judge Hammond himself. It is not so much wonder then that the *Nation* closed its stricture on this point by saying: "We should have been glad to have Judge Hammond state just what rights are secured by the Fourteenth Amendment, if it does not protect a citizen against being punished for violating a law which has no existence."

The *Nation* is not the only journal which can not understand the consistency of Judge Hammond's decision. The *Central Law Journal*, of October 30, in commenting on the same point, says: "Without desiring to challenge the correctness of the opinion, which is exceedingly well considered, we are inclined to join with the *Nation* in the regret that Judge Hammond did not state just what rights are secured by the Fourteenth Amendment, if it does not protect a citizen against being punished for violating a law which has no existence." And so says every citizen of the United States, who cares for the rights guaranteed to him by the Federal Constitution.

J. O. CORLISS.

A "Chance" to Attend Church.

WHEN Sunday-law advocates are charged with seeking the aid of a civil law to fill their empty pews, they indignantly deny the accusation and in return, charge the accuser with willful misrepresentation. There may be a misunderstanding, which, when explained will throw light on the position of both parties.

When it is charged that Sunday-law agitators are working for laws to people their empty pews, no one means to intimate that they are asking for laws empowering the police to arrest and bring to church unwilling listeners. What is meant is that they are trying to secure laws closing all places of amusement or recreation excepting the churches, and thus indirectly to compel people to go to church or else stay at home. That this is their object there is abundant proof. The latest utterances confirmatory of this position are from Rev. Mr. McLean, Chicago Secretary of the American Sabbath Union. In an address recently delivered in the Campbell Park Presbyterian Church, of this city, he stated that their object was to give the people a "chance" to go to church. To do this he proposed first to close the theatres. The question at once arises how will closing the theatres give the people a "chance" to go to church? Manifestly by denying them a "chance" to go to the theatre, and thereby reducing their "chance," of being publicly entertained, to a choice between nothing and the church. Again, to the same end, he proposes to stop the running of street-cars on Sunday.

Touching the question of visiting the parks by means of the street-cars, the same gentleman stated, in a previous address, that the objection made by some that the occupants of crowded tenements ought to have an opportunity to visit the parks, and breathe the fresh air, was mere "sentimentalism without foundation." "There are no tenement houses," said he, "that will not hold all the occupants when assembled on Sunday, and they had better be there than desecrating the Sabbath by going to the parks."

The "chance" to go to church which would result from stopping the running of the street-cars on Sunday is simply a "chance" to decide between a crowded tenement house and a church service in which some persons take no interest. In this second case Mr. McLean might attempt to defend his attitude on this question by stating that he had reference to the street-car conductor, who if the street-cars were stopped, would have a "chance" to go to church. The probabilities are that a majority of them would not attend church services on Sunday if the cars were stopped; but admitting for argument's sake that they would all attend church services if the cars did not run, would it be justice to the one thousand persons served by the cars on Sunday, to leave them no chance to get to the parks in order to give the one conductor a chance to go to church, a chance which he already has if he is conscientious enough to leave his job to follow his convictions?

It is apparent that these Sunday-law advocates are working for laws which shall leave no chance for the people to take recreation, or be entertained, excepting at church services, and yet they deny that they are asking for laws in the interest of church attendance.

Said the same gentleman previously referred to: "Close the Fair [Sunday] and open places where the gospel shall be preached in song and by the greatest speakers of this and other lands." If this is not an indirect attempt to compel attendance at religious services, what is it? Let us illustrate: Should the civil authorities of any village close a church of one denomination and then inaugurate services of an opposing creed, would not the friends of the first congregation have reason to believe that it was done in the interests of attendance at the services of the second congregation? They most certainly would, and that is the view many take of this so-called "chance" to attend religious services.

A. F. BALLENGER.

Chicago, Ill.

Legal Anachronisms.

THE Boston *Daily Globe* does not hesitate to call the existing statutes and ordinances, upon Sunday observance, "anachronisms in the law," and to suggest that their removal from the statute books is a needed legal reform.

That two great dailies of as much distinction and influence as the New York *World* and the Boston *Daily Globe* should recommend this radical change in existing laws at this time is significant.

The *Globe* expresses itself thus:—

"Outgrown and outworn theories too often find their last stronghold in the law. A vivid illustration of the power of traditions long since outgrown is the recent conviction of a western farmer of seventh day opinions, on the charge of plowing his field on Sunday.

"It is expressly provided in the Constitution that Congress shall make no law establishing any form of religion. To the conscientious man who believes that the seventh day of the week is the true Sabbath, for Christian as well as Jew, the theory that Sunday is in an especial sense the Lord's day is a heresy.

"The keeper of Saturday has an undoubted moral right to his convictions. More than this, his legal right to observe Saturday as a holy day and Sunday as a secular day ought not to be called in question, in free America, by any civil authority. It would not be in doubt for a moment were it not for the existence of legal anachronisms that should have gone out with the witchcraft laws, or at the latest with George the Third.

"That the body of Christians who observe Saturday as the Sabbath is a 'feeble folk,' does not in the least affect the question of national consistency, nor that broader issue of equitable dealing between man and man. If these people numbered but a hundred, the individual rights of each would claim no less justice than now, when their grievance must also be the grievance of the great number of orthodox Israelites throughout the country.

"Upon the statute books of many of our States are still to be found laws that were passed on the theory of government by a theocracy. They are out of harmony with the spirit of the Constitution of this Republic, and altogether repugnant to the spirit of the time.

"Being on the statute books, such enactments must, we suppose, be enforced until they are repealed. The work of reform should begin without delay. The agitation resulting from this conviction of a man who had simply done his duty according to the dictates of his conscience, without trespassing on the rights of others, should result in a general revision of our laws, in the interest of common sense, as well as of freedom of thought and religion."

Politics and Religion in Iowa.

IN some respects the gubernatorial contest in Iowa, just past, was one of the most remarkable ever held in the State. Never was there so large a vote polled, and rarely has there been so much activity and earnestness manifested on both sides. Every inch of ground was contested with the doggedness of desperation, for each felt that the battle was a decisive one.

It will be remembered that this State has for the past ten years been under a prohibition law. In seventy-five of the ninety-nine counties in the State it is conceded that the law has suppressed the open saloon, and in over half of the counties of the State, no liquor can be obtained, except at the drug stores on a written prescription. The larger river towns together with a few inland cities have defied the law, and on account of popular sentiment (largely among the foreign element) together with the character of the officers, prohibition is not enforced. Des Moines, the largest city of the State, has not one open saloon, though there are "holes in the wall" where those known to the parties controlling the same can obtain liquor. This is also the case in some other places where there are no open saloons, and Judas like, a certain class have raised the cry, "Why are these permitted to run without revenue?" Because of this and because of the reproach that has been brought upon the cause by disreputable "searches," together with some other reasons, there has within the past few years been developed quite a large anti-prohibition element who see no way of regulating the sale of intoxicants so effectually as by high license.

The Democratic candidate for Governor boldly took his stand on the side of high license, and waged the war with the courage of his convictions. The Republican candidate, though a prohibitionist in principle, was not so aggressive in promulgating his views on this subject as his opponent, and the future began to look pretty dark for the friends of prohibition.

There were other really important measures up for consideration but these were almost wholly lost sight of in the fight of prohibition, and it may be said that this was *the* issue of the campaign. At this juncture the various religious bodies thought it time for them to "have a finger in the pie," the first to take action being the Methodists, who have in this State eight hundred stationed ministers, and 140,000 communicants. In their State Conference a short time before the canvass was on, they denounced, by resolution, the Governor in the most unmeasured terms, one of the resolutions being as follows:—

> We believe it monstrous mockery to pray, "Thy kingdom come" and then vote for the devil's mightiest agency—the licensed saloon. We insist that in the present crisis, our politics and our religion should be "well shaken before using."

This was all that was needed to kindle the flame, and immediately nearly every religious body in the State passed similar resolutions and entered the political arena to a greater or less extent, the Methodists taking the lead. The question was raised as to the propriety of such a course the discussion of which was participated in by the entire secular press of the State, of course almost wholly from a partisan standpoint. So largely did the religious element enter into the campaign that one of the transparencies at a torch-light procession bore these words: "We have the Methodist ministers, you have the bootleggers." A reporter remarked to one of the presiding elders at the Methodist Conference that he noticed but few changes being made, and inquired the cause, and was told that the principal reason was that *they did not want their votes to be lost.*

Papers that are on ordinary occasions avowed in favor of the principles of the Religious Liberty Association, so far as mixing politics and religion, vigorously urged the opposite; and the editor of one such paper confessed to the writer that he did it because popular sentiment and the success of his party demanded it. The course of the ministry called out most severe criticisms, not only from the opposition but from the friends as well, as the following, from an influential man and Superintendent of one of the leading Methodist Sunday schools of Des Moines, will attest:—

> Because of the partisan action of the Methodist ministers in conference assembled, we are led to ask this question: Is it expedient for ministers of the gospel to take an active, aggressive, partisan part in politics? For the sake of the argument we may grant that they have the right to be politicians. Paul says that all things that are right are not expedient. Thus we may infer that there are some things that as citizens the ministers have a right to do, that are not expedient for them to do. Does active participation in a heated political campaign come under this head? In other words, does the minister who engages in the work of the politician, directly or indirectly, hamper or hinder his influence as a soul winner? . . . Would it not be more in keeping with their high calling, to heed the admonition of the Book wherein they are commanded to keep themselves "unspotted from the world?" Suppose a conference of Catholic priests should, by resolution, intermingle their faith with politics, and ally themselves with one of the political parties as the ministers have done. They would be the first to cry out with vehemence to keep the Church and State separate. In the same conference these same ministers after passing the resolutions which virtually make it a test of fealty to the Methodist Episcopal Church that the members should belong to the Republican party, rejoice and shout hallelujah, because the Pope is losing his power to direct what the policy of the State shall be.

The precedent of "mixing religion and politics" in this way, even to aid a good cause, is a dangerous one. One journal in defending its position remarked: "The mixing of religion and politics will never lead to any bad effects in Iowa or anywhere else, if it never does anything worse than to urge men to vote for purity, honesty and temperance." But all history proves that when this first step is taken, it is but the first of what will surely follow, and the result has always been, and always will be, a detriment both to the Church and to the State. The legitimate sphere of the Church lies outside the domain of dictating how civil affairs shall be administered.

Nothing has ever occurred in this State to so thoroughly awaken the people, to a consideration of the evils of this fast-growing sentiment, of the divine right of religious people to dictate how civil affairs shall be administered, as the course of the religious element in this campaign; so let it be hoped that from this a lesson may be learned that will be of benefit to the masses in days to come.

W. E. CORNELL.

Des Moines, Iowa.

Church Exemption.

AN item of news from Toronto, Ontario, has not received the attention which it deserves; it may prove to be the first step of a very important movement.

The Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, has passed a vote requesting the municipal authorities to assess the church property just as any other property, and to impose taxes upon it. These taxes will amount to about $1,100 a year.

This action is an example of adherence to conviction even when the adherence involves expense. Nor can any one deny that the action is a logical sequence from the doctrine of the entire severance of Church from State—a doctrine which the Baptists were the first to proclaim, and on the basis of which Roger Williams founded his immortal little Commonwealth.

The key to the situation is found in the fact that exemption from taxation, up to any certain amount, is exactly the same in practice and in principle as a grant of money to the same amount. If it is right for the State to grant money to a denominational or religious body, then it is right for the State to exempt such a body from taxation; if not, then not. If my taxes amount to $100, he who gives me a receipted bill or a certificate of exemption gives me the equivalent of $100 in cash. And while the exemption of churches from taxation is erroneous in theory, it is no less harmful in practice. It has all the evils that would attend a grant of money, and it is less honest and aboveboard. And it all inures to the advantage of the Church which is always asking favors of the State, and never asking in vain. Where the Protestant churches gain one dollar by exemption the Roman Catholic gain at least ten; the amount of their church property is out of all propor-

tion to the taxable property of the individual members. A congregation, scarce any of whose members are taxed, will have a lordly church or cathedral, which receives the care of the State, the benefit of roads, protection from fire, etc., without paying a cent of equivalent.

And the vicious principle once granted, no one can tell where we are to stop. If the Protestant churches in the city, and State of New York, had maintained from the start the only tenable ground, the Roman Catholic churches and schools and protectories and hospitals would hardly have received such lavish endowments from the State and city; and the ground on which St. Patrick's cathedral stands would not have been conveyed by the city for the sum of one dollar.

The objection to church exemption may be stated in a few words: "We do not want to pay our money if we can help it." Here is a church which has a valuable property; but changes in population have left it weak. It would come very hard to pay the taxes. This is quite likely. But exactly the same reason would hold for maintaining the religious establishment in England, in Wales, in Germany, in Russia. If it is said that the churches are not money-making institutions, the same reason would argue the exemption of art galleries, club-houses and, in fact, of all residences that are not productive of direct and visible income.

When this matter was somewhat profusely and warmly discussed eighteen years ago, only two religious papers (if I recollect aright) took distinct and positive ground against the policy of exemption, *The Independent* and *The National Baptist*. It is a source of gratification to those who were then in the minority, and who got a great many more kicks than half-pence, to see that the world is gradually coming around, and that men everywhere are approaching the only tenable, logical position.

It seems to me that there is very often in our utterances an unexpressed, but very real, proviso. Before every election the citizen is exhorted to exercise his liberty as a freeman, with the proviso "*Provided you go with the party.*" We adjure the minister and the theological aspirant to study the Bible, to study it candidly; and we add (in an undertone, as it were), "*provided your study brings you out just where we want it to.*" The merchant says to his traveling salesman, "Be honest with every one; represent everything as it is; do not vary from absolute rectitude, always *provided you sell the goods.*" The owner leases his premises to the saloon-keeper, and says: "Preserve perfect order; do everything for the welfare of the neighborhood; and do not cause any scandal, *provided you pay the rent promptly.*"

The American citizen is asked if he believes in perfect religious liberty and in the severance of Church from State. He replies: "Oh, yes! I do devoutly. I believe in every religious denomination supporting itself without State aid, *provided* that this does not interfere with our receiving from the State, annually, the amount of our taxes, in the form of exemption."—*H. L. Wayland, D.D., in the Independent.*

"The World's Fair and the Sabbath."

WITH the foregoing for a subject, the Galveston (Texas) *Daily News*, of October 6, contains the following:—

If the World's Fair is to be closed on the Sabbath day, agreed upon by a majority of the Christian world, then it would seem fair and reasonable that it should be closed by law upon all the Sabbath days in the week. In fact, it would not be in line with the Constitution and spirit of our Government to grant to one community of religious belief a demand that all others would not have an equal right to make. If the management of the World's Fair should agree to close the gates on Sunday they would doubtless be requested to close them on Saturday, the Sabbath of the Jews, of the Seventh-day Adventists, and of others. As we have some Mohammedans in this country, and will have a number of Mohammedan visitors to the Fair, a like request would naturally come to close the gates on Friday; and likewise petitions from the Pharisees, the Theosophists, and probably others, until every day in the week might be consumed. So the question of closing or not closing for Sabbatic observance, now being considered by the World's Fair management, broadly viewed, would seem to be not whether the great Exposition shall be opened to all who choose to attend it on Sunday, but whether there shall be any Fair at all. This statement may seem to be a trifle extravagant at the first reading, but when carefully examined in connection with the organic law of the country in which we live, and with plain rules of irresistible logic, it will appear much more reasonable. This is a country in which every citizen has, theoretically, at least, a right to select his own Sabbath, and to worship God by going to the Fair, if he wants to. The Fair should be opened for people who wish to attend it on Sunday. No free American citizen should be forced to attend the Fair on Sunday, and no free American citizen should be prevented on that or any day from going if he wishes to.

The gospel is an invitation to come, not an arbitrary force compelling us against our wishes and desires. And it should ever be kept before the people that Christianity is never advanced by legal suasion or any other forceful methods. And since the World's Fair is gotten up by the State and for the State, and not by the Church, if any considerable number of our citizens wish to keep the Fair open and attend it on Sunday, it is not becoming in Christians to resort to the law to oppose it. Nothing would degrade Christianity more in the eyes of the world than to admit, by the slightest action, that it is in any way dependent on the civil law for its advancement. So if those who believe in Sunday cannot persuade men to stay away from the Fair on that day, do not make a burlesque of Christianity by trying to compel them.

I WOULD have you know, that the head of every man is Christ. 1 Cor. 11:3.

A CORRESPONDENT from St. Paul, Minnesota, writes that a Mrs. Mary Spilker, living in that State, has been tried for "Sabbath breaking," and fined $32.65.

BISHOP TUTTLE, of the Episcopal High Church, St Louis, Missouri, in acknowledging the receipt of some copies of THE SENTINEL that had been sent him by a member of the Religious Liberty Association, says he "quite agrees with the main discussion of THE SENTINEL, and that Church and State should be entirely separated, and that the enforcing of morals as such, belongs to the former and with the home—not with the latter."

THE *Herald*, Orleans County, New York, makes a very apt comment on a plank in the platform of the New York State Prohibition Party:—

The Prohibition Party of the State of New York, in convention assembled, acknowledge allegiance to almighty God as Governor of the Nation.—*Prohibition Platform.*

"If God is Governor of the Nation, why is it that the prohibitionists are trying to elect one of their own stamp? The prohibitionists, in the above plank, and in their acts, are trying to supersede God."

OF the centenarian Sunday law of Pennsylvania, into which the "National Reformers" are now injecting the fervent blood of a renewed youth, Judge Paxson of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court says:—

A man may shave himself or have his servant or valet shave him on the Lord's day without a violation of the act of 1794, but the keeping open of his place of business by a barber, and following his worldly employment of shaving his customers, is another matter.

Upon this the *Christian at Work* gravely comments:—

This is called "fine hair splitting" in some quarters, but there is no hair cleavage about it. The law always discriminates between the public act and the private act—between doing or having done something for one's self at one's own home, and keeping open a public place for doing the same acts for the public. It is related of the late Dr. Guthrie that his landlady once indignantly refused him hot water for shaving on Sunday, for she would countenance "no work o' the Lord's day", but she added that if he wanted hot water for a toddy he could have it. This was in Edinburgh in the twenties. They and we do better now—for if there is more Sunday shaving there is far less Sunday drinking.

This incident of the shaving water and the toddy

so naively told marks a characteristic human failing. When artificial religion is carried to a hypocritical extreme a corresponding laxity of conscientious scruple will be found to offset the irksomeness of Phariseeism. The finding of one end of a clue is the best of evidence that the other end exists. The refusing of hot water for shaving is naturally followed by the offer of hot water for a toddy. In the make-up of the "unco guid" the other extreme is sure to be found. In their effort to do away with personal Sunday shaving the Wesleyans, in conference in Michigan, are reported to have voted it sacrilege to shave at all; for these idle cups of hot water Satan will be sure to find some mischievous use.

The *Christian at Work* claims that in the enforcement of Sunday laws discrimination is always made "between doing or having done something for one's self at one's own home, and keeping open a public place for doing the same acts for the public." Is it true that this discrimination is always made? Was it made in the case of Elder J. W. Scoles, a Seventh-day Adventist of Arkansas, who was convicted and fined for painting his own church building on Sunday; of Allen Weeks, fined for planting potatoes in his own field on Sunday; of Joseph McCoy, fined for plowing his own farm; James Pool, for hoeing his own garden; James Armstrong for digging his own potatoes; William Fritz for working in his own cabinet shop; and other similar cases in Arkansas? In Georgia, Day Conklin was fined for cutting wood at his own kitchen door, for use in cooking the Sunday morning breakfast for his family, and was threatened with the chain-gang if he repeated the offense. Was his own door a public place, and was he cutting wood for the general public, to cook the public a breakfast? Judge Winn who presided at the trial of this case charged the Grand Jury that for a woman to knit in her own house on Sunday was indictable, and that he who saw the act and made no complaint was *particeps criminis.* There is no hair splitting in this. That is avoided in this judicial expression by cutting off the whole Sunday breaking head just above the shoulders.

R. M. King, of Tennessee, has just gone to his death while a sentence of fine and imprisonment was hanging over him, for plowing his own corn in his own field on the first day of the week, when he had conscientiously remembered on the seventh day of the week that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord."

The truth is that whatever may be the theory, it is the fact, that in the application of religious laws by their upholders and promoters the only rule of practice is "anything to convict."

IN a convention of the American Sabbath Union, for Indiana, recently held in Indianapolis, one of the speakers on their regular programme, Stanton J. Peele, made use of the following language:—

Let us labor to reform the individual rather than the law. Let us depend more upon that higher law of man's moral nature for restraint, and less upon human enactments.

A correspondent writes that the sentiment was rather a surprise to the managers of the convention. They had expected their chosen speakers to express themselves more in harmony with the principles of law to compel, rather than to depend upon the real power of the gospel to work reform.

THE *Mirror*, of Lake Crystal, Minnesota, reports a meeting of the Religious Liberty Association thus:—

"The 'Religious Liberty meeting,' held at Garden City the 5th inst., was a success. Much interest was manifested, and the principle held up was 'equal rights to all, and special favors to none.' If a law is just let it rest with equal force upon every citizen; if it cannot rest with equal force upon all, without invading the 'inalienable rights of man,' erase it from the statutes and let justice have undisputed sway, for injustice is inequality before the law. Are our liberties in jeopardy? Read the decision of Judge Hammond, of the United States Circuit Court, in the case of R. M. King, of Obion County, Tennessee, and draw your own conclusions."

A REMONSTRANCE against closing the World's Fair on Sunday was circulated here Tuesday and Wednesday, and over 400 signatures were secured on Front Street alone, covering a length of 13 feet of legal cap paper. The petition read as follows: "The undersigned citizens of the United States of America, do hereby insist that this Government of these United States is a purely secular Government, in which all its citizens of whatever religious or non-religious belief have equal rights. That the absolute separation of Church and State should in all matters under the direction of the Government be maintained. That we insist upon the right of all citizens feeling thus disposed having the right to visit such Exposition on Sundays as well as any other day of the week. That all citizens may have an opportunity to visit such Fair on such days as shall not conflict with their particular convictions." —*The Eye, Snohomish, Washington.*

THE "Washington League" has been organized in Texas for the purpose, as given in its first "address to the American people," of antagonizing the encroachments of the Romish Church upon our public school system. This adds another to the long list of organizations already established for this ostensible purpose. Some of these societies are but wolves in sheep's clothing, covering under the vail of opposition to Rome the intent to establish a Protestant hierarchy just as subversive of pure religion and civil liberty undefiled, as the power to which they offer defiance. With these are joined others who ignorantly worship at the same shrine, deluded with the idea that they are inspired by patriotism or misled by a mistaken but earnest religious zeal. Some of these organizations are secret in character and all are certain, in time to come, to be hot-beds of private and public violence. The secret semi-military Catholic societies are legion; and a higher intelligence, whether Papal or Satanic makes little difference, is fitting them all,—both parties,—for a contest sure to come.

When will these forces give battle, and what will be the result?

THE Paris correspondent of the *Mail and Express* describes the opening by religious ceremonial of the courts of law in Paris, and elsewhere in France, wherever there is a Court of Appeal. At Paris, the officials and dignitaries of the different courts pass in procession to the Sainte Chapelle which is opened to the public only on this particular occasion The choir of Notre Dame and the Archbishop are present and take part in the ceremonies, and the mass of the Holy Ghost is celebrated. The whole affair is said to be very striking and impressive.

It has been the wont of the most prominent worker for the Sabbath Union to hold up California and France to execration as being the only spots in the civilized world totally devoid of religious law and State religious observance. It would seem that this has been a slander upon France. The National Reformers and Sabbath Unionists have long expressed an earnest hope that the civil courts of this country might be opened with religious exercises. It is evident that this has been an established custom in France, and instead of pointing the finger of Sabbath Union scorn at France any longer it must be held up to us as an example of religious and devotional spirit to be imitated. That these ceremonials are Roman Catholic in character cannot be pleaded against them by the "Reformers" for are they not ready, professedly so, to join hands with the Roman Catholics in the enforcement of Sunday and other religious observances? Cardinal Gibbons has publicly expressed himself as in sympathy with the purposes of the Sabbath Union and Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and Archbishop Ireland says, "Thank God we stand together in demanding the faithful observance of Sunday!"

Let the Protestant Church, and let all the people, look before they leap into the bottomless pit toward which these blind leaders are drawing them.

THE use to which Sunday laws are put, and are to be put in the future still more than now, is well illustrated by the way they are utilized in Russia for the persecution of the Jews. Throughout the Russian Empire the general, legally authorized, market-day is Sunday, but in the towns and cities to which the Jews are restricted, stringent Sunday laws prohibit all buying and selling on that day. So the desecration of Sunday is made legal to those who profess to observe it, while its strict observance is enforced upon those who deny its sacredness.

This is a naked example of the use and purpose of all religious laws, stripped bare of the hypocritical pretense used by those who are promoting the legal enforcement of religion in this country. That this is so is demonstrated by the fact that a significantly large proportion of the prosecutions thus far, for Sunday labor, have been directed against those whose conscientious scruples require them to observe the seventh day religiously, instead of the first, while those who formally acknowledge the sacredness of the first day of the week are privileged to labor or play on Sunday as they see fit.

These prosecutions are of record and their animus is self-evident. That they are what they are constitutes strong circumstantial evidence. Upon which side of the case does this evidence bear?

THE National Swine Breeders' Association at a meeting in Chicago have made a plea to the Christian world for the acceptance of American pork. As the highest evidence that they could bring of the perfect health, pure blood, and sound morals, of the American hog, they advertised the tender solicitude of the Swine Breeders' Association for the moral character, religious sensibility, and future possibilities of the swine of America, by the passage of this resolution:—

Whereas: The proposed Sabbath opening would deprive the animals on exhibition of the rest which is in accordance with the laws of nature and God's plan in the institution of the Sabbath, and which is so much needed in order that they may appear at their best on the remaining six days, therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of the National Swine Breeders' Association assembled in Chicago, respectfully and earnestly petition the proper authorities that the Columbian Exposition be closed on the Sabbath day, that we may be spared the stain of a conspicuous and flagrant act of disobedience to God.

Henceforth no "Christian nation" can consistently deny admittance to the "Christian" hog, and no citizen of any "Christian nation" can consistently refuse to eat American Sunday-keeping pork.

Lecture Bureau of the National Religious Liberty Association.

THE Lecture Bureau of the National Religious Liberty Association is composed of competent lecturers in various parts of the United States, and any one desiring lectures on the subject of religious liberty and the relation of Church and State, may secure a lecturer by corresponding with Allen Moon, the Secretary of the Bureau, 28 College Place, Chicago, Illinois.

EVERY man has a right to his own religious belief.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 26, 1891.

IT is stated that the German Socialists threaten to attack the emperor's measures for the suppression of immorality when they come up in the Reichstag. When European crowned heads and Socialists cross swords upon moral issues, the contest is not without interest, but true morality can gain nothing in any event. Morals are not to be mended by legislation.

WE do not deny the *right* of the State to make any day or any number of days *legal holidays*, leaving the individual citizen free to observe or not to observe such days just as he sees fit, as is now the case with the Fourth of July, and other holidays; but to require the observance of such days, or to forbid upon one day, acts which are freely permitted on other days, is an abuse of the power of the State.

IN making her report at the late convention in Boston, Mrs. J. C. Bateham, Superintendent of the Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, said:—

We have been holding the question of a national Sunday law in abeyance that we might devote all our energies to the Sunday closing of the World's Fair. We expect that that question will be settled, next April, in favor of the Sabbath, which will be greatly in our favor in securing the passage of a national Sunday law.

And this simply proves that which THE SENTINEL has constantly asserted, namely, that the great object sought in the Sunday closing agitation is not to benefit "the poor workingman," but to secure if possible some national recognition of Sunday sacredness.

IN an editorial paragraph entitled "Sunday Laws and Vice," the *World* gives expression to a truth worthy the attention of the law-makers of the State when it says:—

It is time for a thorough revision of our barbaric laws on this subject. . . . The new Legislature should take up this matter earnestly and give us a body of nineteenth century statutes instead of the sixteenth century Sunday laws we now have. It is not the business of the State to enforce religious observance or to restrain liberty in any of its innocent manifestations. When the State attempts anything of the kind it makes itself the effective minister of vice and demoralization.

The *World* is right in thinking that Sunday laws are remnants of sixteenth century semi-barbarism and that all needed civil regulations should apply as much to one day of the week as to another. There is no legal reform more needed at the present hour than just this for which the *World* calls; but is there a Legislature in the United States which will attempt to expunge from the statute books of its State its unrighteous religious laws, and substitute enactments in consonance with the principles of Christian equity and civil righteousness? There is none!

ACCORDING to the *Christian Nation*, the American Sabbath Union is about to act upon a hint given by the aforesaid journal. In its issue of the 12th inst., it says: "A very practical effort to secure the closing of the Columbian Fair is that of the American Sabbath Union. Following up the plan indicated in an editorial of the *Christian Nation* several weeks ago, it has prepared a petition to Congress urging that the additional $5,000,000 loan asked for the Exposition, be granted, accompanied by a condition that the gates shall be closed upon the Sabbath. Fifty thousand petitions are to be mailed this week to as many pastors, with a request for the signatures of their parishioners."

THE theory that makes the government the father of the people, and charges it with the oversight of everybody's business is bad enough in all conscience, but in a sermon in Tremont Temple on the 15th inst., Dr. Lorimer, presumably to please the ladies of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, advanced the idea that the government was also the mother of the people. This, of course, serves to settle finally the question of the origin of the species; for if the government is both the father and the mother of the people it follows that it existed before the people, and of course is the creator of the people. Those who stumble over the Bible statement that God "made of one blood all nations of men," but who do not find themselves equal to the task of believing the Darwinian theory that man sprang from protoplasm, via. the monkey, can now take refuge in this new theory of the fatherhood and motherhood of Government. God may now be left out of the question, and the people have only to shout "Great is Government that made us, and Dr. Lorimer is its prophet!

IN describing a Tennessee convict camp, the *Sun* of this city says:—

On Sundays the dining room is changed into a chapel and religious services are held. As most of the convicts are negroes, these services are at times scenes of intense religious excitement. It is the one great distraction of prison life, and a convict under religious conviction has privileges in the use of his lungs and bodily contortions that are much sought. Aside from this benefit the services are a farce. The life of the convicts here can lead to no elevation in religion or morality. It usually leads to a depravity deeper and more hopeless than ever.

The idea that convicts cannot be reached and reclaimed by Christian influence simply because they are convicts, is a mistake. It is a fact, however, that the formal, spiritless religious services maintained by civil governments has no power to reform anybody. Conversions among convicts are brought about by personal effort on the part of consecrated men and women who labor for them from a sincere love of souls.

THE *Union Signal*, of November 5, has the following note:—

The Church of Christ of the Christian denomination of Elgin, Illinois, has passed resolutions making prohibition part of its creed and refusing fellowship to all who vote otherwise. It is said to be the second church in the country to do this.

This may be, as stated, only the second instance of this kind in this country, but it is not likely to be the last one. Leaders in the popular religious thought of the day are looking in the direction of a far-reaching supervision of political action by the various denominations of the country. In a prayer offered in Tremont Temple, Sunday, November 15, Joseph Cook said:—

May our churches knot their whips of small cords and drive from their membership not only the liquor seller but all who persistently vote to legalize the traffic.

Possibly those who practice and advocate church dictation in civil matters are not aware of the fact that they have ancient and honorable precedent in their favor. According to Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," the Council of Arles in A. D. 314, charged the bishops to take the oversight of such civil magistrates in their respective sees as were church members; and if in the discharge of their duties the magistrates acted inconsistent with their Christian profession, they were to be turned out of the church. This at once gave the bishops the direction of civil affairs, *for they alone were the judges of what action was inconsistent with the Christian profession.* And so it will be with these modern censors of political action who are already using the club of excommunication to compel men to do their bidding.