

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER, 1887.

NUMBER 11.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,
OAKLAND, CAL.

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.
J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

A Sound Opinion.

WE don't suppose that one reader in ten in this country has the least idea of the progress National Reform is making in the United States. These National Reformers propose amending the Constitution of the United States so as to make this a "Christian Government." The Prohibitionists of nearly every State in the Union have in some way committed themselves to this reform. Many ministers in nearly every denomination are working earnestly for it. It is a kind of religion that is well adapted to the gushing, unstable, and illiterate religion of the time. Professors who are strangers to the spirituality of Christianity, very naturally call to their aid the civil law. They must have power in their religion, and not having the power of the Spirit, being ignorant of it, they readily accept the aid of the strong arm of the law. The masses of the people have never thought of the question and are indifferent about it. If a vote is taken on the question before the people investigate it, it will carry, for the people generally think it makes no difference, and many would vote for it just to please professed Christians. But it is the greatest heresy of the world.—*Rushville (Ind.) Jacksonian.*

THE New York *Observer* complains that "Sunday newspapers have done more than all other influences combined to destroy the popular reverence for the Sabbath." And then almost in the same breath *naively* states that "during the summer season thousands of nominal Christians will find the Sunday newspaper where they will fail to find a place of worship or the hour of prayer." Therefore abolish the Sunday newspaper without delay. By all means take away at once all opportunity for these very excellent nominal Christians to do wrong, so that they may all become real strong, vigorous Christians (?) by doing right because they have no chance to do otherwise. The Sunday newspaper may be a very wicked thing, but how much more wicked it is than the professed Christian who would rather read it than to go to worship or to prayer, perhaps the *Observer* can decide. We can't.

A Monstrous Bid.

WE have several times shown the declared purpose of the National Reform Association to "gladly join hands" with the Catholic Church, and to co-operate with the Roman Catholics in any way that *they* may choose, in carrying to success the National Reform scheme. But, although the National Reformers have for several years thus held themselves in readiness, they have not till now made any distinct official advances to gain the Papal co-operation. Now, however, they have decided on a course that can scarcely fail to win the so much, and so long, coveted assistance of the Papacy. This was the outcome, and the only immediately practical one, of the Saratoga National Reform meeting, August 15-17.

The main question there discussed was the question of religion in the public schools, under the heading of "Secularism in Education." Mr. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, and Corresponding Secretary of the National Reform Association, opened the discussion.

"The speaker argued against the secular programme: 1. That it does not satisfy the Roman Catholics or conciliate them to our school system. Their special outcry is against the atheistic tendencies of public education, and the exclusion of religious worship and instruction from the schools only gives color to the charge."

So, then, the public-school system of the United States must be revolutionized because "it does not satisfy the Roman Catholics." That the Roman Catholics may be conciliated, and "their special outcry" stopped, "religious worship" and religious "instruction" must be forced into the public schools. As, therefore, the movement is, first of all, specially to satisfy the Roman Catholics, it would logically follow that the "religious worship and instruction" that would be conducted and given in the public schools, under the National Reform regime, would be such as should specially satisfy the Roman Catholics. And for once in its history the course of the National Reform Association is strictly logical; for in the course of the discussion, Rev. S. V. Leech, D. D., of Saratoga, who has been for seven years chaplain of the New York Senate, asked the Corresponding Secretary to state how National Reformers would answer this argument:—

"If we put the Protestant Bible in the schools where Protestants are in the majority, how could we object to the Douay version [the Catholic Bible] in schools where Roman Catholics are in the majority?"

"The Corresponding Secretary" answered,—
"WE WOULDN'T OBJECT."

The National Reformers "wouldn't object!!" They "wouldn't object" to a majority of Roman Catholics forcing the Catholic Bible into the hands of the children of Protestants and other non-Catholics, in the public schools! They "wouldn't object" to twenty Catholics forcing the Catholic Bible into the hands, and the Catholic worship upon the minds, of the children of nineteen non-Catholics in the public schools!

Therefore, let it forever be borne in mind that the aim of the National Reformers is, by amendment of the National Constitution, to put it into the power of the Roman Catholics, wherever they may be in the majority, to force the Roman Catholic "worship and instruction" into the minds of the children of non-Catholics, in the public schools. And let it also forever be borne in mind, that the Rev. Herrick Johnson, D. D., of Chicago, was chairman of the meeting in which this wicked thing, this religious tyranny, was proposed and indorsed; and that Joseph Cook, of Boston, took an active part in the same conference.

Then, as though realizing the effect of his unqualified answer, the Corresponding Secretary attempted to guard his answer, and to deaden its effect, by saying:—

"We would be glad to see Roman Catholics putting the Bible, in any version, into the hands of their children."

"Into the hands of *their* children," so should we. But that was not the question, Mr. Stevenson, nor is that point involved in the question. The question was *not*, Shall the Roman Catholic put the Douay version into the hands of *his* children? But it *was*, Shall he put that Catholic version into the hands of *my* children? You said the National Reformers "wouldn't object" to it. But *I* do most decidedly object. There was no such question asked as, Shall the majority of Roman Catholics put the Catholic Bible or any other Bible, "into the hands of *their* children"? But the question *was*, Shall the Roman Catholics, when in the majority, put the Catholic Bible into the hands of *our* children? You said the National Reformers would not object to it. But, Mr. Stevenson, *we* do most decidedly object to their doing so; and we object to your National Reform scheme of putting it into their power to do so. Your "glozing" argument, Mr. Stevenson, is entirely foreign to the question; yet it is valuable in that it shows how readily, and how perfectly, the National Reformers adapt themselves to the

crafty ways of the Jesuitical system whose alliance they so deeply crave. Yet, although we should be as glad as anybody to see the Roman Catholics putting the Bible into the hands of *their* children, even then we most decidedly object to their doing it in the public schools and at public expense.

But the Corresponding Secretary goes on:—

"This is not a question of versions, but of the right of the word of God to a place at all in the public schools. Prof. Tayler Lewis once wrote two valuable articles on the theme, 'The One Bible,' in which he maintained that no body of Catholic scholars, in the face of the scholarly world, would deny that King James's version is a real version of the Holy Scriptures, while Protestant scholarship cheerfully admits the same of the Douay Bible. There are not a half a dozen passages in it which even seem to inculcate any distinctively Roman doctrine. It is a Latinized version rather than Anglo-Saxon, far less plain than ours, but it is a version."

Exactly what Mr. Stevenson means by the phrase "distinctively Roman doctrine" we cannot say, because the popular Protestantism of the day is making so many compromises with Romanism that it is difficult to tell just what is distinctively Roman doctrine. But we here quote one verse from the Douay version, and ask the non-Catholic people of this country whether this is not enough distinctively Roman in doctrine to distinctively condemn the National Reformers in their proposal to give the Catholics power to teach such stuff in the public schools of this Nation. We quote Hebrews 11:21, which in the Douay version reads thus:—

"By faith Jacob dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod."

To *adore*, is "to worship with profound reverence; to pay divine honors to; to honor as a god."—*Webster*. Therefore the Douay version distinctly inculcates the doctrine that Jacob worshiped with profound reverence the top of his rod; that he paid divine honors to, that he honored as a god, the top of his rod. And this is the version of the Bible which the National Reformers "wouldn't object" to have a majority of Catholics by law to put into the hands of the children of a minority of non-Catholics. This is the doctrine which the National Reformers propose, by constitutional amendment, to empower a majority of Roman Catholics in any school district of the United States, to teach to the children of non-Catholics. Therefore, if National Reform succeeds, what is to hinder the Roman Catholic majority from teaching your children and mine to adore the top of the priest's rod, in the public schools? For what is the Bible to be taught for in the public schools if it is not to be obeyed in the public schools? And if the Catholic Bible is to be taught in the public schools where the Catholics are a majority, then is not the Catholic Bible to be obeyed in such schools? As the National Reformers propose to have "religious *worship*" as well as religious instruction in the public schools; as they propose to have Catholic worship and instruction in the Catholic Bible in the schools where Catholics are in the majority; and as the Catholic Bible says that Jacob

"adored the top of his rod," "as a figure of Christ's scepter and kingdom, as an instance and argument of his faith"—then why should not the children in those schools adore the top of the priest's rod, "as a figure of Christ's scepter and kingdom," whose vicegerent on earth the Pope is, and also "as an instance and argument of *their* faith"? Who can prevent it, when once the Roman Catholics are empowered by constitutional amendment to do so?

How long shall it be before the American people will awake to the essential wickedness of the National Reform movement?

Whether, according to Mr. Stevenson's idea, this passage is one of the less than half a dozen passages which inculcate any distinctively Roman doctrine, we know not, but we do know that it inculcates distinctively *idolatrous* doctrine. But even then that is not the primary question involved here. Whether there be in the Douay version a half dozen such passages, or one such passage, or none at all, the principle is the same. And it is the *principle* upon which we stand. That principle is that the Catholic majority has just as much right to force the Catholic Bible, and the Catholic instruction, and the Catholic worship, upon the non-Catholic minority in the public schools as the Protestant majority has to force the Protestant Bible and the Protestant instruction, and the Protestant worship, upon the non-Protestant minority in the public schools. And that is but to say that there is no right at all on either side of the question, nor in the question anywhere. And this only illustrates the principle that neither the Bible, nor religious instruction, nor religious worship, can of right have any place in the public schools of the United States Government, or of any other civil government on earth. We have cited the above passage from the Douay version, and made the argument upon it, only to make more clearly apparent the justice of the principle, and not because we think that the Catholics have any less right in the matter than Protestants have.

But is there any prospect of the National Reformers succeeding in this project? There is decidedly a favorable prospect of it, and therein lies the danger. It must always be borne in mind that the phrase National Reform Association embraces all the "evangelical" churches, the Prohibition Party, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Now all this force, allied with the Catholic Church, and increasing its strength by the support of the professional politicians whom it can influence, can carry their issue at the polls as soon as they can bring the matter to a vote. The only question that remains an open one is, Can they gain the alliance of the Catholic Church? With a few more such bids as this one made by the Saratoga meeting, we are sure they can, even if they do not by this one. To set forth the matter a little more fully, let us size up the proportions of the bid that was made at Saratoga.

First, they said in substance that the Douay version and King James's version of the Script-

ures are the one Bible; that the Catholic Bible is just as nearly the true word of God as is the Protestant Bible; and that the great question is not one of versions, but of the right to this word of God to a place in the public schools, while the question of versions is a secondary matter, to be decided after the main question has been decided.

Secondly, they declared that wherever the Catholics are in the majority, they may put the Catholic Bible, and Catholic instruction, and Catholic worship, into the public schools.

Now let us suppose that the Catholic Church accepts the bid, what would be the result? By this alliance the National Reform Party can carry a constitutional amendment, declaring that the Bible shall forever have a place in the instruction of the public schools of this Nation. Thus that question will be fixed, and whether the Bible and its instruction shall be in the schools, would be no more a matter of controversy. The only question then remaining will be, What Bible? And by the main question already decided, this question will be reduced to very narrow limits. It will be only a question between Catholics and Protestants. Because so far as the non-religionists are concerned, the question is already decided that the Bible shall be in the schools; and to the man who cares nothing particularly about the Bible or its instruction, it will make not a particle of difference what Bible is in the schools; and this indifference will be justified and emphasized by the National Reform Protestant concession, already made, that there is no difference. Therefore the question of, What Bible? being solely one between Catholics and Protestants, what would be the result? Here are some figures from the census of 1880.

In	Catholics.	Protestants of all classes.
California,	216,000.	52,621.
Louisiana,	280,000.	100,223.
Massachusetts,	500,000.	253,397.
Wisconsin,	306,000.	189,844.
Minnesota,	139,500.	118,627.
New York,	1,210,000.	771,171.
Connecticut,	175,000.	131,450.
Rhode Island,	96,000.	37,150.
Colorado,	28,000.	14,992.
Nevada,	5,000.	2,117.
Washington Ter.,	12,000.	6,023.
Montana,	16,450.	1,896.
Arizona,	42,000.	141.
New Mexico,	121,000.	290.

Therefore, if the Catholic Church should accept the Saratoga National Reform bid for her alliance, and the question of the Bible and religious instruction in the public schools were decided to-morrow, or next year, or at any other time, the Catholic Bible, Catholic instruction, and Catholic worship, could be established in all the public schools of these ten States and four Territories.

Nor did the Saratoga meeting stop with this. Read the following from the official record of the proceedings:—

"REV. DR. PRICE, of Tennessee: 'I wish to ask the Secretary, Has any attempt ever been made by the National Reform Association to ascertain whether a *consensus*, or agreement, could be reached with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, whereby we may unite in support of the schools as they do in Massachusetts?'

"THE SECRETARY: 'I regret to say there has not. . . . But I recognize it as a wise and dutiful course on the part of all who are engaged in or who discuss the work of education, to make the effort to secure such an agreement.'

"DR. PRICE: 'I wish to move that the National Reform Association be requested by this Conference, to bring this matter to the attention of American educators and of Roman Catholic authorities, with a view to securing such a basis of agreement, if possible.'

"The motion was seconded and adopted."

We believe it is not only possible but probable, for very opportunely with this action of the National Reformers at Saratoga, there came from the Pope to the Catholic prelates assembled at Baltimore to discuss the plans of the new Catholic University at the capital of the Nation, the following:—

"The unlimited license of thought and writing, to which erroneous notions concerning both divine and human things have given rise, not only in Europe but also in your country, has been the root and source of unbridled opinions, while, on the other hand, with religion banished to a great extent from the schools, wicked men strive by craft and fallacious wisdom to extinguish the light of faith in the minds of the young, and to enkindle there the flames of irreligion. Wherefore it is necessary that youth be nourished more carefully with sound doctrine, and that these young men especially, who are being educated for the church, should be fully armed to fit them for the task of defending the Catholic truth. We therefore most gladly welcome and heartily approve your project for the erection of a university, moved as you are by a desire to promote the welfare of all and the interests of your illustrious republic."

Now when the National Reform Association, to gain the religio-political alliance of Rome, goes as "requested" to these Roman Catholic authorities, carrying in its hands the concession that the Catholic Bible is as nearly the word of God as is the Protestant Bible, that they are virtually all one; and also carrying in its hands the public schools of ten States and four Territories of this Union, to be delivered over bodily to the religious rule of Rome—*will the Romish Church accept the bid?* We fear she will. But whether she will or not, we call it a MONSTROUS BID. And if she does not, we are sure the National Reformers will increase the bid, and will keep on increasing it till she does accept it.

And what are you going to do about it?

A. T. J.

THE National Reform Association will have to look out for itself; we have received a paper printed at Buffalo, N. Y., entitled the *National Reformer*, the organ of what it proposes to call the "National Reform Party." Its platform is not exactly that of the original simon-pure National Reform party. It seems to be kind of half-and-half; in some things it seems to incline toward the original, but it declares that "the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed," and this is political atheism in the eyes of the regular National Reformers. It may be that the regular National Reform Association will swing this new party into its train, as it has the "evangelical" churches, the W. C. T. U.,

Prohibition, and as it proposes to do with the Workingmen, the Catholics, and everything else. We rather expect that it will. It will have to do something, or else there will be a serious clash of voices and aims, with both parties running under the same name. However, as "District Secretary" M. A. Gault is an adept in dealing with "clashing voices," we have no doubt that he can bring this matter out all straight. We hope he will try, for the SENTINEL expects to have something to say about the regular, original National Reformers, and we don't want to be misunderstood.

What Was the Point?

In the *Christian Statesman's* report of the Ohio Prohibition Convention we find the following item:—

"John B. Finch brought down the house when, with allusion to Governor Foraker's prompt invocation of the power of the courts a fortnight ago to forbid the return of the rebel flags, he inquired why the Governor, when it was first proposed in the Ohio General Assembly two years ago to repeal the Sabbath law, did not instantly telegraph to the bishops of the M. E. Church to serve out an injunction, etc. The audience saw the point, and cheered till they were tired, and then renewed the applause, with fluttering handkerchiefs, high lifted fans, and straw hats in profusion."

Just exactly what the point was which the audience saw in this and cheered so lustily, we cannot imagine. Is it possible that Mr. John B. Finch meant that Governor Foraker *should* have telegraphed to the bishops of the M. E. Church to serve an injunction against the repeal of the Sabbath law? and is that the "point" that the audience saw and cheered till they were tired? Did Mr. Finch mean to convey the idea that the bishops of the M. E. Church have, or ought to have, power to serve injunctions upon the civil authorities of the State of Ohio? and is that the "point" which was applauded with handkerchiefs, fans, and straw hats, in such vociferous profusion? Or, above all, did he mean to imply that either the body of bishops of the M. E. Church, or any other earthly power, has, or ought to have, the right to serve an injunction upon the legislative power of the State of Ohio? and is that the "point" (?) over which the convention went so wild? If it is, the idea is certainly wild enough in itself to justify even the wild demonstrations so admirably described in the report.

There is, however, that about the affair which serves to perfectly illustrate the real point which we are now emphasizing in the SENTINEL, that all legislation enforcing the observance of the Sabbath is essentially religious legislation. Else why should it be thought the proper thing for a governor to do to call upon a board of bishops to serve an injunction against any legislation adverse to its compulsory observance? The point is that Sunday laws cannot be separated from religious legislation. Perhaps that is the point that the convention saw in Mr. Finch's speech, and which they so heartily cheered. Church and State ideas are becoming very popular now in Prohibition conventions.

The Bible in the Public Schools.

IN the June number of the SENTINEL there was an article in which the following sentence occurred: "To shut the Bible and religious instruction out of the public school seems, to some people, to be a sacrilegious proceeding; but to maintain them in the public schools is not only very difficult, but very hazardous." To this statement a good friend of the SENTINEL took exception, thinking that it argued a lack of appreciation of the Bible. Although our private explanation of the matter was satisfactory to him, we propose to consider the subject somewhat in detail, for the benefit of others who may think that loyalty to the word of God demands that its study be maintained in the public schools.

In the first place we will say that we yield to none in reverence for the Bible. We believe it to be the inspired word of God, and that it is "true from the beginning." As an educator it is invaluable. We believe that if the Bible is rightly studied, a man can get a better education from it alone than from any other book that was ever printed. He would have a better disciplined mind and would be better fitted for society and business, than he could be by studying any other book ever written. Take all the eulogies of the Bible that have ever been written or spoken, and it may still be said that "the half has not been told." And still we hold that it is a great mistake for Christians to insist upon the Bible being used as a text-book in the public schools. Our reasons are these:—

The Bible is not an ordinary text-book. It is not a book to be studied as an arithmetic, beginning at the first page and mastering it point by point until the end is reached. It is not a book of logic, nor a book of science, although it is logical, and is scientifically exact, and is the basis of all true science. But it is primarily and solely a book of morals. It is true that there is no other book in the world the study of which will so admirably discipline the mind as will the Bible; and it is for this reason that many think the Bible should be used as a text-book in the public schools. But such ones forget that the disciplinary effects of the Bible are not obtained when it is studied for that purpose alone, as people study geometry or read the orations of Cicero, but that the discipline of mind from the study of the Bible comes only when it is studied with a view of carrying out its precepts in the daily life.

Proof of this is found in the following texts: Ps. 111:10: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have all they that do his commandments." Deut. 4:5, 6: "Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. *Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.*" The Bible is like no other book that was ever written. Its language is

simple and may be understood by the common people, yet it withholds its treasures from the most learned if they do not study it with reverent hearts. The one who studies it with no thought of its value as an educator of the mind, but solely to know what is the will of God, will find his mind expanded so that he can better comprehend affairs of every-day life; while the one who attempts to study it in the same manner and with the same spirit as he would study some secular author, will not derive any material benefit.

The sum of all this is, that the Bible is a book whose sole object is to teach men the true religion, the religion of Jesus Christ. Now what is the public school? It is an institution of the State; it is supported by the State, and all those connected with the public-school system are in the employ of the civil government. They are, if you please, officers of the State. Therefore if the Bible be taught in the public schools, it will be simply the State teaching religion. The State will have to determine what views of the Bible shall be taught; for, let it be remembered, the Bible is not like mathematics, which is a fixed science, and concerning which there cannot possibly be a difference of opinion; but it affords opportunity for much variety of opinion. This is not because the Bible is so obscure that people cannot see alike, but because God has ordained that man shall be a free agent in matters of morals. And here is where the danger comes in, for if the Bible be taught in the public schools, it must be taught in accordance with some system, and whatever theories may be taught, somebody's conscience is sure to be outraged.

For example, there are many sincere Christians who believe that immersion is the only true baptism, while others conscientiously hold that sprinkling is baptism, and that infants should receive the ordinance. Most people believe that man has the principle of immortality by nature, while many believe that immortality is given only to those who believe in Christ, and they hold that any contrary teaching robs Christ of his chief glory. One person believes in the perpetuity and universal obligation of the ten commandments, while another believes that they were only for the Jews, and are now abolished. One man is a Unitarian and his neighbor is a Trinitarian, and so on. It is not within our province to say which of these views are right and which are wrong. It is sufficient that each one believes his own view to be the correct one, and does not wish to have his children taught a contrary view; neither does he wish to have the money which he pays as taxes to support the school, used in propagating doctrines which he holds to be vital errors.

So we say that Christians themselves should not merely refrain from insisting that the Bible be used in the public schools, but should rather insist that it be kept out. There is indeed danger in having it placed there, for when that is done somebody's religious convictions are sure to be trampled upon. It is of the very essence of Church and State union to have the Bible taught in the public schools,

for that would be nothing else but the State teaching religion; and the standard of the religion taught would be the opinions of the majority. Let each professed Christian who thinks that it is little less than sacrilege to say that the Bible ought not to be taught in the public schools, consider the matter seriously. He will find that what he wants and expects is that *his views* of the Bible shall be taught. But he has no warrant that this will be the case. It will not be the case unless he chances to be among the majority, and in that case he is helping to outrage the conscience of some other man. The simple fact is this: If the State adopts the Bible as a text-book in its schools, then it must decide how it shall be taught, or, in other words, must fix a standard of religion.

But suppose that all Christians were agreed concerning the principal points of Bible doctrines; they are not the ones who are to be considered. The public schools are for the public, and among the people there will be many who do not accept the Bible at all. What shall be done in their case? Here is the answer that Pastor Joshua Denovan gives in an article on, "The Bible in the Public Schools," which appeared in the *Faithful Witness*, of Toronto, Canada:—

"Some advanced champions for freedom of conscience and the rights of man, in Britain and the United States, can't be accommodated. In this category must be classed agnostics, atheists, and scientific infidels. For my part, without hesitation or apology, I deny such men any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions and privileges at all."

And again, speaking of the consciences of such men, he says: "Such consciences are peculiar—abnormally unique—and their owners must suffer for conscience' sake."

The *Christian Statesman* of July 7, 1887, contains a reprint of the article in which these words occur, and the editor called special attention to it as a "masterly article." Such sentiments are in keeping with National Reform ideas of the gospel, but they are as different from the gospel of Jesus Christ as night is from day. The gospel knows nothing of compulsion; "*Whosoever will, let him come,*" is its gracious call. The use of force in connection with matters of religion was conceived and is fostered only by the prince of darkness, "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." An infidel is a man, and, as such, he is entitled to the same rights and privileges in a human ("belonging to man or mankind") government that his Christian neighbor is, who is only a man. He may be and should be invited and urged to accept the Bible as the revealed will of his Creator, but so long as it would be wrong to compel a Christian to help support schools which should teach views of the Bible which he cannot conscientiously adopt, so long will it be wrong to compel unbelievers to support schools for the teaching of religion.

How, then, can the youth of Christian parents receive the Biblical instruction which their parents desire them to have? Let their parents instruct them at home, as is their duty. To the parent, and to the parent alone, has

God intrusted the moral and religious instruction of children. The divine command is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Deut. 6: 5-7.

If any number of parents who are of the same faith wish to send their children to a school where they can study the Bible to better advantage than they can at home, they may combine and form a denominational school, which is independent of State patronage, and to the support of which none need contribute except those who believe in the principles taught. Such schools are on the same footing as the various religious denominations themselves. The religious instruction is private, because it is supported by the private, voluntary contributions of those who favor the views taught by any given denomination; it is public only in the sense that anybody who wishes is privileged to come. This is all that anybody should desire; whatsoever is more than this, cometh of evil. E. J. W.

A PREACHER ON SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

THE following ringing words from the Rev. Bird Wilkins, pastor of Bethesda Baptist Church, Chicago, are of a sort that is too seldom heard nowadays. If the whole Protestant Church should take this position, she would have no need to seek political aid to make her power felt.

It is no advantage to the religion of Christ or his church that laws are being enacted at our State capital, looking to a strict observance of Sunday as a holy day. That is what it means. It is church legislation. Whenever and wherever the church has entered the halls of legislation, she has left her power outside. She, upon entering the political arena, lays aside her robes of victory. She may have a majority, and thus carry her point, but I tell you it is contrary to the genius of the gospel of Christ. He did not leave us the political sword with which to set up his kingdom in the hearts and lives of men.

I tell you, the United States herself will lose her robes of honor whenever she puts religion into her statute-books. Whenever Jesus is to appeal to Blackstone, then will Jesus become a politician; then will come to pass the attempt to force men to bear the mark of the beast. I am not ready to see the church scrambling amidst the political corruptions of the day to have laws passed for the preservation of her holy days. Whenever I think the religion of love given by Jesus needs the arm of the State to support it or protect it I will renounce it. Whenever I believe the Baptist Church covets secular power to save her holy days, I will be Baptist no more. It is a declaration of weakness on

our part to ask such legislation, and suicidal to rejoice over it. Say it is not religious intolerance if you choose, but I know it is, and you know it is.

To indorse these Sunday laws as a church is to indorse or to approve one of the festivals of the ancient sun-god, and an edict of a Pope of Rome. And how our Protestant divines, and Baptist ministers, especially such men as Dr. P. S. Henson, of this city, and Dr. Fulton, of Brooklyn,—I say, how these brethren can defend a law that attempts to consecrate a day which is made holy by the decree of a heathen idolater, I do not understand, nor can they explain it. I do not oppose these Sunday laws, however, on account of their origin, but because I do not want to see the church creeds put into our law books. No, not a single line of any creed do I want to see there. And I think the larger number of candid-minded people in this country, upon sober second thought, will follow the example of California in this matter, should such laws be enacted here, and repeal them.—*Selected.*

Religious Exercises in State Schools.

In May, 1885, the Secretary of State at Washington officially rebuked the Austrian Government for declining to receive our appointed minister because his wife was a Jewess. In the letter of censure he says: "Religious liberty is the chief corner-stone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter, and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws."

This is the boast of America. Moreover, religious liberty is her own contribution to the science of government. For, until ours was formed, there had never been a government in Christendom which was not a crude alloy of the gold of Christianity with the iron of civil power. The reformers did not reform the adulterous union of Church and State. There is not a creed or a confession of faith framed by them that does not give to the civil magistrate coercive authority in religion. The proclamation of religious liberty attracted to America the exiles of every land.

Yet the dissenters who sought freedom here would hardly permit dissent. William Penn established "free soil for Christianity" only. Lord Baltimore tolerated only theists, and allowed only Christians in office. The charter of Roger Williams proposed to propagate Christianity, and under it Jews were denied citizenship. Still, it is the glory of Rhode Island that, for a century and a half before the Federal Constitution, she maintained a system of religious liberty which was, of all that the world had ever seen, the nearest to perfection.

The sovereign Convention of Virginia framed and adopted unanimously, June 12, 1776, the famous Bill of Rights. This enactment, far surpassing *Magna Charta*, laid the foundation of all American government, both State and Federal. Sections 15 and 16 read as follows:—

"No free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by

a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles.

"Religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience; and it is the duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity toward each other."

Mr. Jefferson, as one of the committee to revise the laws of Virginia, wrote the "Act to Establish Religious Freedom," which was passed December 16, 1785. From the original text of the long and grand preamble we quote a few select clauses:—

"Well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free, and manifested his supreme will that free it shall remain, by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord of both body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercion on either, but to extend its influence by reason alone; that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagations of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion is depriving him of liberty; that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction:

"We, the General Assembly, do enact, That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities. . . . And we do declare that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present, or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right."

The Constitution of the United States, as originally adopted in September, 1787, contained no guarantee of religious liberty. The only reference to the subject was in Section 3, Article 6, in these words: "No religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." But the First Amendment, which was proposed by Virginia and adopted because of her insistence, explicitly declares: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And so the stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner. Thus perfected, the Federal Constitution was ratified by all the then existing States, and to-day every State, old and new, has a similar provision in its own organic law. So it is that "religious liberty is the chief corner-stone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter, and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws."

It is very evident, in the light of these well-known facts, that any religious exercise whatever in a State school is a violation of religious liberty; for it is essentially of the nature of a religious establishment, consisting of religious observance ordained by civil law, and conducted by a ministry whose pay is furnished by general taxation. Religious instruction is necessarily sectarian; for, though the law may not prescribe the doctrine, yet if it prescribe or even permit a teaching, it gives its sanction to what is taught, and thereby maintains a certain, yet very uncertain, form of doctrine. It is impossible for any instructor in religious matters to teach what will be approved by all; his teaching will inevitably be colored by his own adopted views. Thus, in many of our State schools we have a sectarian establishment, and citizens are taxed to sustain religious observances which in conscience they disapprove.

The sort of horizontal reduction enacted in some States, that the Bible be read without comment, is a concession that is a confession. Shall the Pedobaptist be forbidden to enlarge on household baptism? That were hard. But what is the Bible? Does it exclude the Apocrypha? The Romanist says, No. Does it include the New Testament? The Jew says, No. The concession stops short of justice.

But, says some shallow casuist, education with us is not compulsory; the objector need not patronize the public schools. It is sufficient to reply that the question is not concerning patronage, but concerning taxation. Yet observe; by ordering the school so that the objector cannot in conscience patronize it, you rob him of the share in free education to which his tax entitles him. Equally shallow is the proposition to make the religious exercises elective. Then, indeed, the objector, availing himself of the other courses alone, may get all that he wants, for himself or his children, free and untainted. But the crying fact remains; the spot that will not out. He is taxed to maintain a teaching for others which he believes to be false and injurious.

We, the great majority, enact; they, the small minority, must submit. And so, the tax. We, the wise and powerful majority, are orthodox, no doubt; they, the foolish and weak minority, are guilty of shocking heresy, no doubt. Then why not also the rack? To the chivalric and the just, the feeble are sacred. And therefore our fathers proclaimed religious liberty, made it organic law, imbedded it in State and Federal Constitutions. What is a Constitution but an ægis of the minority to shield them from the tyranny of the majority? Only within its provisions may the majority rightly overrule. Nevertheless, we, the boastful heirs of a freedom which proclaims that there shall be no religious observance established by law, go about, and establish a religious observance by law.

Oh! that some Hampden would arise in this far nobler cause, and resist, even to imprisonment, an impious impost, and bring the Supreme Court to pronounce upon the constitutionality of a law imposing a tax in support of

religious teaching. Were the law to give its sanction to the teaching of "the priestly power of the keys," or even of "the new theology," and lay a tax in support of it, I fancy there would beat once on hand a host of Hampdens. Then, indeed, we should see very clearly that "the opinions of men are not the object of civil government," and that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical."—*Judge Noah K. Davis, in Forum, February, 1887.*

The National Reform Head.

At the Lakeside National Reform Convention, the following question was asked:—

"Does your movement not appeal more exclusively to the educated classes than to all classes in general?"

The question was answered by both Dr. McAllister and "Secretary" Coleman. Dr. McAllister's answer we shall notice at another time. Mr. Coleman's answer was this:—

"It is true our movement in the past has had a great deal more head than body."

It is so seldom that we find a National Reform expression with which we can agree heartily, unreservedly, and without any ifs or but's, that we hasten to give to this statement our unqualified indorsement. We perfectly agree with it. It is true. It is as full of truth as an egg is full of meat. The National Reform movement in the past, and from its very beginning, *has* had a great deal more head than body. We not only perfectly agree with Mr. Coleman's statement, and give it our unqualified indorsement, but we feel disposed just now, for the sake of the cause, to emphasize the fact somewhat by giving some proofs in its support.

It is well known that the National Reform Association has had for years, and has now, a string of vice-presidents numbering about one hundred and twenty—this year they number one hundred and twenty-two. Those who have ever seen the list know that, with but two exceptions, it is made up of titled names to the fullest extent that titles can be obtained; such as Rev.; Rev. D. D.; and Rev. D. D. LL.D.: Right Rev. D. D.: and Right Rev. D. D. LL.D.: Rev. Bishop; Rev. D. D. Bishop; and Right Rev. D. D. Bishop: Rev. Professor; and Rev. D. D. Professor: Rev. President; and Rev. D. D. President: President D. D.; President D. D. LL.D.; President Ph. D. LL.D.; and President W. C. T. U.: Hon.; Hon. Ex-Governor; and His Excellency Governor: Col.; Brev't Brig.-Gen.; etc., etc., *ad nauseam.*

All this is generally known, but it is not generally known that *nobody knows whether the one-half of these people are in favor of National Reform or not.* The National Reformers themselves do not know whether all the men whose names they publish as vice-presidents, are in favor of National Reform or not. No, there are some of them of whom they do not know whether they have been dead or alive for the last five years. We know that they are not all citizens of the United States, and that they do not all even live in the United States. We

know that they are not all in favor of National Reform.

We know that in the very latest published list of their vice-presidents they have the name of a man who is a bishop of the Church of England *in Canada*, and has been for five years. Yet all these years the National Reformers have run his name as a vice-president of their association, calling for an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and still do so! Of this we have the written evidence. Will the National Reform gentlemen please tell us what a Canadian bishop can have to do with amending the Constitution of the United States?

We know that they have run for five years or more the names of men as vice-presidents representing certain States, while those men have not lived in those States at all in all that time. Of this also we have the written evidence.

We know that in their latest published list they have the name of one man at least who is openly opposed to the whole National Reform movement. We are not at liberty to print the gentleman's name (he is a clergyman to whose name the title of "D. D." is annexed), but we may insert some of his words on this point; it throws some light upon the National Reform method of getting so many and such distinguished names in their list of vice-presidents. He says: "I was placed there [among these vice-presidents] evidently as a mere *figure-head*, never having done, or been asked to do, anything to further its objects. Some months ago I was written to, and asked if I had any objections to my name being retained on the list, and if I did not answer *silence* would be taken for *consent*. From sheer indifference I did not answer."

And *that* is how this gentleman's name remains on the list of vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. How it got there in the first place he does not know. But they got his name and made him a Vice-president, and then asked him whether his name might be "retained" and "silence" would give "consent." Out of "sheer indifference" he kept "silence," and so he is still a vice-president of the National Reform Association. If he had been dead it would have been all the same, because then there would have been "silence," and silence would have given "consent," and so, even though dead, he would yet have been a vice-president, in good standing no doubt, of the National Reform Association.

Indeed, just such a thing as this was stated in the Pittsburg Convention last May. One of the secretaries said they ought to revise their list of vice-presidents, because a number of names that had been on the list for several years were of men who were dead, and he thought those names ought to be dropped. As long as it is only the *name* that is used, anyhow, we see no use in dropping the name just because they find out that the *man* is dead. The name of the Right Rev. John Smith, D. D., LL.D., Ph. D., President of a Female Institute in a place where

there is no such institution, is of just as weighty importance after he is dead as before. And as the influence of his name is all that is asked of a vice-president of the National Reform Association, the name can be used just as well after he is dead as when he is alive. As our correspondent further says, "As it seems that *names* and *not active co-workers* is all that is cared for . . . this holding on to men, dead or alive, is doubtless true of others in the list.

And *that* is how so large and influential a list of vice-presidents of the National Reform Association is kept up. And these facts, for they are facts, serve to illustrate and to emphasize Mr. Coleman's statement that the National Reform "movement in the past has had a great deal more head than body." Yes, indeed, a great deal more. But we are perfectly assured that it will not be always thus. With the immense bids that the National Reformers are making for the alliance of Rome, we are fully persuaded that they will yet gain the active, abiding efforts of Rome exerted in behalf of a national religion here. Then their movement, so far as *they* are concerned, will change ends, and in the proportion will have "a great deal" more *tail* than body—unless indeed they then become incorporated into, and a part of, the great body of Rome itself.

That Mr. "Secretary" Coleman's statement may state the exact truth a little more exactly, we propose an amendment so that the statement shall read as follows:—

"It is true our [National Reform] movement in the past has had a great deal more head than body, and the head itself has been a great deal more *figure-head* than anything else."

That is the exact truth in the case according to the facts. We have more to say on this but haven't space just now. A. T. J.

What about Persecution?

AMONG the questions asked at the Lakeside National Reform Convention, was the following:—

"Will not the National Reform movement result in persecution against those who in some points believe differently from the majority, even as the recognition of Christianity by the Roman power, resulted in grievous persecutions against true Christians?"

This is a question in which many people are deeply interested, and we would call special attention to Dr. McAllister's answer:—

"Now notice the fallacy here. The recognition of the Roman Catholic religion by the State made that State a persecuting power. Why? Because the Roman Catholic religion is a persecuting religion. If true Christianity is a persecuting religion, then the acknowledgment of our principles by the State will make the State a persecutor. But if the true Christian religion is a religion of liberty, a religion that regards the rights of all, then the acknowledgment of these principles by the State will make the State the guardian of the rights of all men. False religion will be persecuted, and the State will be the persecutor. True religion never persecutes."

We may well say of Dr. McAllister's answer, "Now notice the fallacy here." And notice also the cool air of superiority with which he

pats himself and his fellow-reformers on the back. "Our movement will not result in persecution, because true religion never persecutes, and of course we wouldn't handle anything but the genuine article." Well, we will not now dispute the genuineness of their religion, but we are sure that they will not persecute so long as they have not the power, and there is no telling what the best of men may do when suddenly elevated to power to which they are not accustomed, and which is not theirs by right.

Let it be remembered that the possession of great power by any man, or by any organized body of men, is always dangerous. Mr. McAllister says that the recognition of the Roman Catholic Church by the State made that State a persecuting power, because the Roman Catholic religion is a persecuting religion. Wonderful! But if the Roman Catholic religion is a persecuting religion, why did it not persecute before it was lifted to the throne of the world? Oh, because it did not have the power! Exactly; and if it had never received the power, the world would never have found out that it was a persecuting religion, would it? Certainly not. Then it was not the nature of the Catholic religion that made it a persecutor, but it was the power that was given to it.

And let it be also remembered that the Roman Catholic religion was simply a perversion of the purest form of religion that was ever exhibited to the world,—that taught by Christ and his apostles. Some of the same churches that were founded by the apostles themselves, became the worst instigators of persecution. What was it that brought about this change? Nothing else than their seeking for power, and for the aid and friendship of the State. Says the apostle James, "The friendship of the world is enmity with God. Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." No matter how pure the religion may be which any body of men possesses, it is sure to be corrupted when they seek alliance with civil power.

It was not because the Popes of Rome were the worst men that ever lived, that they persecuted. It was simply because their religion was made a part of the State, and disobedience to that religion thus became disloyalty to the State, and therefore there was no alternative but to punish the offender. But when the State punishes a man for a crime against it, which crime is only a matter of conscience, then such punishment becomes persecution. The following words from Buckle's "History of Civilization in England" are very true, and we recommend them to the serious thought of National Reformers and of all others:—

"Protestants, generally, are too apt to suppose that there is something in their creed which protects them against those hurtful extravagances which have been, and, to a certain extent, still are practiced in the Catholic Church. Never was a greater mistake. There is but one protection against the tyranny of any class, and that is to give that class very little power. Whatever the pretensions of any body of men may be, however smooth their language, and however plausible their claims,

they are sure to abuse power if much of it is conferred upon them. The entire history of the world affords no instance to the contrary. In Catholic countries, France alone excepted, the clergy have more authority than in Protestant countries. Therefore, in Catholic countries they do more harm than in Protestant countries, and their peculiar views are developed with greater freedom. The difference depends, not on the nature of the creed, but on the power of the class. This is very apparent in Scotland, where the clergy, being supreme, did, Protestants though they were, imitate the ascetic, unsocial, and the cruel doctrines which in the Catholic Church gave rise to convents, fastings, scourgings, and all other appliances of an uncouth and ungenial superstition."

It was not because the people of Arkansas are worse than the people of Kansas, nor because the religion professed by the citizens of Arkansas is of a worse type than that professed by the people of Kansas, that the former State a year ago persecuted citizens even to the death, and the latter did nothing of the kind. It was simply because there was a law in Arkansas which made it a crime for the few to worship God in a different manner from what the majority did; and Kansas had no such law. Any other State in the Union, having a law like the Arkansas Sunday law, would do just as she did.

It is true that true Christianity never will persecute; but it is also true that true Christianity is never found in alliance with civil power. People often make the mistake of confounding true Christianity with the profession thereof. But true Christianity is known by fruits, and not by profession merely. A man is not necessarily a Christian because he professes the Christian religion. Even though his creed may be a perfect one, and he may hold to no doctrinal error, he may lack the vivifying influence of the Spirit of God, which alone can make the true Christian. Lacking this, his profession of the purest form of doctrine will avail him nothing. But this Spirit is never found in an alliance with civil authority. See James 4:4, already quoted.

Lastly, in the very answer in which Dr. McAllister disclaimed any intention on the part of National Reformers to persecute, he admitted that persecution would come. Said he: "False religion will be persecuted." Well, when did any people ever persecute those whom they thought were professing the true religion? The Papal persecutions were all directed against "heretics." The Catholics never professed to persecute the holders of the true religion; they would indignantly resent any such accusation. But the trouble was, they arrogated to themselves the power to decide who were heretics, and what was the true religion. If they had allowed the poor Huguenots and Waldenses a voice in the matter, the decision would have been different. But no; the Catholics were in the majority, and had the power, and that made them infallible. So the National Reformers, when once they get the power, will virtually declare themselves the infallible judges of true and false religion; and woe to the un-

fortunate few who profess what they decree to be the "false religion," because it differs from theirs. Who is willing to help the National Reformers into power, after hearing their own statement of their intentions? No beings but glorified saints or angels, with Christ himself as leader, could be trusted with all power, both civil and religious; and without any disrespect to National Reformers, we say that they are a long ways from being either saints or angels.

Yes, Mr. McAllister, we see the fallacy, and we think that other people can, unless they are National Reformers. E. J. W.

"IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS"

Has been out but a short time, but it has already attained a large sale, and has come to the front as the finest book for agents to handle which has ever been published on this coast. It is a book which sells to all classes of readers. As a work of art it surpasses anything of the kind which has ever before been attempted. The beautiful full-page "artotypes" present the Yo Semite in all its grandeur, and bring out the scenery in a more life-like manner than it could be produced in any other way. The Yo Semite Valley is now the leading attraction for tourists, and it is visited every year by thousands. It is one of the wonders of the world, and this work written by a man who has lived so long amidst these scenes is one which all will be eager to possess.

This new book is not only the most authentic and finest historical description of the Yo Semite which has ever been written, but it is a complete and reliable guide to the valley and Big Tree Groves. It gives every route to these places of interest, and is the only work which, without bias or preference for any particular route, gives truthful information in regard to all the ways by which one can reach the Yo Semite.

This unrivaled work of nearly 600 pages, with 160 illustrations, of which 50 are full page, and 28 are elegant artotypes, will be furnished to subscribers at the following low prices:—

Fine English Cloth, embossed in jet and gold,	\$3 75
Fine English Cloth, embossed in jet and gold, gold edges, 4 50	
Full Sheep, library style, marbled edges,	5 00
Half Morocco, gold edges,	6 00
Full Turkey Morocco, gold edges,	7 00

If a copy of the book is desired, drop a line to the publishers, and an agent will call and show you the work, or if there is no agent in your place, the publishers will send you a copy, prepaid, at the above prices. Address, Pacific Press Publishing House, Twelfth and Castro Streets, Oakland, Cal.

VINDICATION OF THE TRUE SABBATH.

BY J. W. MORTON.

FORMER MISSIONARY OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH TO HAYTI.

THIS pamphlet is an able treatise on the divine appointment of the Sabbath of the Bible. The personal narrative of its author contains a noble instance of self-sacrifice and devotion to the truth for the truth's sake.

The reader of this little work will find breathed throughout its pages a mild and Christian spirit, worthy the imitation of controversialists of every name; while at the same time, its candid, convincing, and logical arguments challenge refutation. Paper covers, 68 pages, sent post-paid for 10 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

MISCELLANEOUS TRACTS.

ASSORTED PACKAGE NO. 6. PRICE, 25c.

THE Plan of Redemption—The Sufferings of Christ—The Sanctuary of the Bible—Scripture References—The Spirit of Prophecy—Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion—Samuel and the Witch of Endor—The End of the Wicked—The Two Thrones.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH?

A TRACT of 24 pages, which fully answers this question, and shows how Sunday displaced the Bible Sabbath. Extracts given from Catholic writers. Price, 3 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER, 1887.

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

THE proceedings of the Saratoga Convention, to which reference is made in the leading article of this paper, are printed in full in the *Christian Statesman*, September 1, 1887.

THE article in this paper in which John B. Finch is mentioned, was in type more than a month before Mr. Finch's death. His death, however, does not affect the matter, as the principle is the same; and it is with principles and not persons that the SENTINEL deals.

LET it be graven as with an iron pen, upon the minds of the American people, that Herrick Johnson, Joseph Cook, and the National Reform Association as a whole, are in favor of putting the Roman Catholic Bible into the public schools of the United States, whenever the Roman Catholics are in the majority.

THERE are few clergymen of the United States who are more prominently before the people than Dr. Josiah Strong, author of "Our Country," and now secretary of the Evangelical Alliance. Recently in Boston, before a company of ministers and prominent laymen, he "represented that it was of the utmost importance that the masses be made to know that the gospel, and not the ballot, is the panacea for social problems." National Reformers and others please make a note of this.

THE School Board of Pittsburg, Pa., have made a Catholic priest, Father McTighe, principal of one of the public schools of the city, and have appointed two nuns as teachers in the same school. Now if only that priest and those nuns will establish the Catholic Bible, and Catholic worship, and Catholic instruction, in that school, we may expect that the hearts of the National Reformers will sing for very joy. For this is a long stride toward the point at which the National Reformers are aiming, and this is the very thing which the National Reform Association is commissioned by the Saratoga resolution to secure "if possible," by an alliance with the Romish Church.

THE Rome correspondent of the *Catholic Mirror*, writing under date of July 12, says:—

"Monsignor Ruffo and his companions were well received in England, as you know from the reports of the English press. Mgr. Ruffo is convinced that the time is not distant when an amicable arrangement will be made between the English Government and the Papacy and official representatives accredited from both. The queen was especially kind to the Papal envoy, and assured him

that she remembered with great pleasure the visit made by the present Pope to Windsor [before he became Pope] after completing his mission in Belgium."

We have no doubt at all that the convictions of Mgr. Ruffo are well founded.

THAN Right Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone there is no Protestant who is better acquainted with the ways of Romanism; and of it he says:—

"Ultramontanism has been very busy in making controversial war upon other people with singularly little restraint of language; and has far too little of the truth told to itself. Hence it has lost the habit, almost the idea, of equal laws in discussion. Of that system, as a system, I must say that its influence is adverse to freedom in the State, the family, and the individual; that when it is weak it is too often crafty, and when strong tyrannical."

And yet the National Reformers "regret to say" that up to August 17, 1887, no decided attempt had been made to secure the active co-operation of the Roman Catholic Church in subjecting this Government to the religious power! As such an alliance could be wished for only by the crafty or the tyrannical, the openly expressed "regret" of the National Reformers that it has not been secured reveals at once the nature of the National Reform movement.

Religious Intolerance.

A SHORT time ago we gave an account of a Catholic procession in France, at which a man was beaten nearly to death for not taking off his hat as the procession went by. It will be remembered that that was given by the *Christian at Work* as proof that France is not a godless nation. In the same paper, August 18, we have an account of another such procession, this time in Spain, as follows:—

"The Spanish republic under Prim sought to establish religious toleration; and it was so successful that when the revolution came, and Alfonso ascended the throne, he had to accept the fact as a fundamental law. But the new law is not always respected, as the following shows. As the reader doubtless knows, in cases of administering the rite of extreme unction to the dying, it is customary in Spain to go in procession through the streets, the priest carrying aloft the 'custodia,' and an acolyte ringing a hand-bell, at the sound of which all passers-by are expected to kneel until the procession passes. Since the establishment of religious liberty in 1868 it is no longer obligatory on all to conform to this custom, and consequently many, from conscientious scruples, refrain from doing so, although, if possible, they endeavor to get out of the way, so as not to give needless offense. But the other day a poor woman—a member of the Protestant community—was passing through one of the streets of the town, and on turning a corner came into contact with 'the procession of the host.' Not prepared to kneel, and unwilling to appear disrespectful, she stepped aside into a doorway to let the procession pass; but the priest rushed after her, dragged her out, and with great violence endeavored to force her on her knees. Not succeeding in this, he handed her over to two policemen, and charged her before the Judge of First Instance with insulting the 'established religion.' The judge took the priest's declaration [in writing], absolutely refusing to hear the poor woman, and ordered her off

to prison to await her trial. Heaven knows when this 'trial' may come on, and so this poor wife and mother is excluded from her home for an indefinite period. It is gratifying to know, however, that the matter having come to the knowledge of influential parties in London, counsel has been secured and funds raised for the purpose of seeing that the poor woman receives justice."

France and Spain are two of the European countries in which the *Christian Statesman* and National Reform "cordially and gladly recognize the fact that the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of National Christianity and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism," and which "in a world's conference for the promotion of National Christianity could be represented only by Roman Catholics."

NEARLY every Protestant paper in the country, whether religious or secular, has confessed it to have been the duty of Dr. McGlynn to go to Rome when he was commanded by the Pope to do so, to answer for his opinions that were already condemned. The truth is, that if he had gone to Rome, he could, and no doubt would, have been kept there forever, and that too in a dungeon, just as likely as not, unless he should have recanted. And even had he recanted he would never have been allowed to return to free America. The chances are ten to one that had Dr. McGlynn gone to Rome he would never have been directly heard of more. The *Christian Advocate* (N. Y.) has come nearer to the truth in the matter than any other paper we have seen. It says:—

"Once in Rome he could have been kept their indefinitely. He could be assigned to duty in any part of the world; could be cut loose from his life-work, and removed from all his associations and centers of influence, and be compelled to begin a new career under a ban."

But Dr. McGlynn knows Rome's methods too well to be caught in the toils of the Romish Inquisition, and he still breathes the free air of yet free America. But how long America shall remain free from Rome's pernicious power is a question. With the National Reform party and its allies endeavoring to create a constitutional basis for religious legislation in national affairs, and bidding for Rome's influence to help secure it; and with the press of the country siding with Rome in a controversy involving the right of free thought and free speech of an American citizen, the prospect is not very reassuring.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

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

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

TERMS.

Single Copy, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.