

# AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER 27, 1889.

NUMBER 44.

## The American Sentinel.

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

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

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

THE *Times* of this city is in favor of teaching the principles of our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence in our common schools. It would certainly be a step in the right direction, but would no doubt be bitterly opposed by those who denounce our Constitution as atheistic, and who contend that governments do not "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." But the fight against the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as it is, is on, and we may as well meet the issue squarely; and we know of no better way of doing this than by teaching the rising generation to love our free institutions.

THE following item from the *New York Christian Advocate* contains a thought worthy of note:—

"Twelve hundred St. Petersburg merchants have declared themselves willing to close their places of business on Sunday, with a view of keeping the day as it is understood in the United States and Great Britain. The movement cannot succeed. The Greek Church compels cessation of work in whole or in part on more than seventy man-made holidays. Until this is reformed the people will have to work on Sunday."

It should be remembered that those Sunday-law advocates who demand that all shall rest on Sunday, insist that such a law does not interfere with religious liberty, from the fact that it does not forbid the keeping of any other day. But it will readily be seen in the light of this item from the *Advocate* that it does practically forbid that very thing, from the fact that few can afford to be idle two days in each week. And a law requiring all to keep Sunday is in effect a law that they shall not observe another day.

But even granting that all could afford it, who has the right, in equity, to impose a burden of this kind upon even a few for conscience' sake? There can be but one answer, namely, that nobody has any such right. The trouble is that the observance or the non-observance of a Sabbath is a matter which lies wholly between each individual and his God, and no man nor set of men has any right to interfere in it.

## National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution.

THIS is most strenuously denied by all National Reformers, just as we should naturally expect; because if they should claim, or even admit, that the success of their movement would involve persecution, they could not proceed a step farther. As a matter of course, we expect that they will deny that persecution will follow the success of their movement. Doubtless a great majority of them are sincere in this denial, because they have never taken the trouble to look to the end of their work; and of all people in the world National Reformers seem to be most oblivious to the teachings of history; but their denials amount to nothing in the face of the declarations that they have made from the beginning, and are still making. We will quote a few statements.

Before the first annual meeting of the association an address to the public in behalf of the cause was prepared by the Rev. T. P. Stevenson, W. W. Spear, D.D., and Wm. Getty, Esq., in which the following statement was made:—

"It must be deplored that in a Constitution so universally and so justly admired and loved and studied by the American people, there is nothing to turn the mind of the nation to God, to inculcate reverence for the authority of his Son, or respect for his word."

This shows plainly that the design of the National Reformers is to so modify the Constitution that the government will act as a teacher of religion. In the address of Dr. Johnathan Edwards, at the New York convention, in 1873, it was said of the Constitution:—

"We want to put the people into it; the people in full, with their deep and noble reverence for God, the greatest and best, and for his word as the underlying and paramount law."

Again: In the Cincinnati convention, in 1872, Rev. A. D. Mayo, D.D., in an address on religion in public schools, said that "the State should teach the existence, sovereignty, and providence of God, and the duty of all men and nations to obey his laws; the spiritual nature, moral obligation, natural rights, and immortal life of man; the binding obligation of the morality of Jesus Christ as the only universal moral law; the acceptance of the New Testament morality as the moral constitution of every civilized State." He further said that the State is bound to see that the religious morality essential to good citizenship is taught.

At a convention held in Monmouth, Ill., September 29, 1884, Rev. M. A. Gault said:—

"This movement includes the triumph of every moral reform. Every true reform is simply an effort to get back to some one of the ten commandments. If that law was recognized as the standard of legislation, and if public sentiment was educated up to that standard, it would do away with lying, stealing,

intemperance, profanity, Sabbath desecration, licentiousness, murder, and every evil that now vexes society."

These statements show that the proposed reform contemplates simply the adoption of the Bible as the law of the land. This was plainly declared by Dr. Edwards in the New York convention. He said:—

"If there be anything in the law of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out (and there cannot be many of them), and we are prepared to accept them, and have them re-enacted."

We say that with such a Constitution as this, persecution would be inevitable; but as facts are better than arguments, we will give an instance illustrative of the working of such a Constitution in the past.

The *New York Observer* of March 22, 1888, contained the fifth of a series of articles on John Calvin, written by the Rev. James M. Ludlow, D.D. The articles were, as a matter of course, eulogistic of Calvin. The article in the issue referred to was upon the trial of Servetus, and the last days of Calvin. Having mentioned the visit of Servetus to Geneva, and his arrest and trial, the *Doctor* says:—

"The specific charge against Servetus was that of teaching contrary to the Bible doctrines; but this was only a specification under the more general charge of attempting to destroy the peace, and, indeed, the existence, of the Genevan State. The Genevans had adopted the Bible as a part of their constitution, and every citizen had sworn to defend it; Servetus was thus the foe to the civil order. It was in no sense an ecclesiastical trial, but one which belonged to the civil court, by which it was conducted. Calvin was an expert witness on the points raised, not a judge. That the animus was not that of religious rancor is evident from the fact that Calvin himself was at the same time in fraternal correspondence with acknowledged heretics, like Socinus. But when the heresy was made a lever for the overthrow of the republic, it became a different matter, and the Genevans would have been unworthy of their political existence if they had not been willing to defend it."

The Genevans had a model National Reform government; and the burning of Servetus was a natural result, just as Dr. Ludlow says. And the fact that a man can be found who will apologize for the burning of Servetus, and who will say that it was not an ecclesiastical trial, still at the same time admitting that it was the result of the Bible being adopted as a part of the constitution, is sufficient evidence that if the National Reformers should succeed in having the Bible adopted as part of the Constitution, doctors of divinity and influential teachers would not be lacking who would defend persecution under it.

But note that it is denied that the burning of Servetus was persecution, or that his trial was an ecclesiastical trial. It is stated that his heresy was made a lever for the overthrow of the government. But how could a heresy affect the gov-

ernment?—Simply because the Bible had been adopted as a part of the constitution—not necessarily the Bible as it reads, but the Bible as interpreted by those in authority; and, therefore, whoever differed in opinion from the established belief concerning the Bible, was talking treason and violating the civil law. If it be denied that the execution of the law in such cases is persecution, then there never was persecution; for when the early martyrs were put to death it was only because they were violating the laws of Rome. James and Paul were beheaded simply because their conscientious convictions in regard to the Bible compelled them to violate the civil law of Rome. And so with what we have been accustomed to call the Roman Catholic persecution in the Dark Ages. If the trial of Servetus was not an ecclesiastical trial, and his execution was not religious persecution, simply because in differing with Calvin concerning the Scriptures he was going contrary to the law of the State, then the Catholics never persecuted anybody; for Cranmer, and Ridley, and Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and thousands of others who were burned at the stake, were tried and put to death for disobeying civil laws. The laws of the church were the laws of the State. The one who defends the burning of Servetus must likewise defend the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, and the destruction of the Huguenots and Albigenses. All these people were put to death simply because the Bible, as interpreted by the priests, was a part of the civil law of those countries. The Catholic Church says that all these persons were punished by the State as law breakers. This is in one sense true; but they neglect to state that the church apprehended them, and priests tried them. The Inquisition found them guilty of violating the ecclesiastico-civil law, and they handed them over to the State for punishment, recommending them always to mercy, but expressly stipulating that they should be burned at the stake; and the civil power, as the servant of the church, was bound to obey.

Let the State become the servant of the church again, according to National Reform ideas, and let anybody's interpretation of the Bible, we care not whose, become a part of the civil law, and the same thing will take place again. It cannot be otherwise, for the State is bound to enforce whatever laws it enacts. If it enacts laws concerning matters of faith and doctrine, then it is bound to punish the man who differs from the established faith. But such punishment is simply religious persecution.

The cool way in which Dr. Ludlow disposes of Servetus, finds a parallel in the way that men defend the enforcement of Sunday laws at the present time. Says he:—

"If there was one place in the world the fugitive should have avoided, it was Geneva. The laws of that place he knew were very strict. Calvin had long before warned him not to come there to disturb the peace. The people of that commonwealth had the right to protect their political existence. They had fought for twenty years to get rid of Catholic tyranny, and were now in a life-and-death struggle with the Libertine element. Yet Servetus turned up in Geneva. His purpose was clear. Here the Romish Inquisition could not follow him, for the Calvinists would defend him against that. But while thus receiving their hospitality, he could get a dagger under the fifth rib of Calvinism by siding with the Libertines."

We say that this is simply abominable. The man that could coolly write such a paragraph as

that would be a worthy companion of Loyola, and a ready tool of the Inquisition. He says that Calvin had warned Servetus not to come to Geneva to disturb the peace, and that the people had a right to protect their political existence. But what was their politics?—It was Calvinism. Servetus' disturbing the peace did not consist in beating drums, or doing noisy work during public service, or in making any demonstrations whatever, but in writing and talking against Calvinism, as Dr. Ludlow himself says. The sum of his offense was opposition to Calvinism. For this and this alone he was burned. And a professed Protestant in this century and in this decade, upholds the cowardly and blood-thirsty deed! Yet there are men found who say that this is too enlightened an age to allow such a thing as persecution for religious opinion.

Such talk is very similar to that indulged in by the advocates of National Reform Sunday laws. They want to protect the peace of society, they say. It was only two weeks ago that a friend of ours was talking with another gentleman concerning the barbarous Sunday law of Georgia and the conviction of Mr. Conklin for cutting saplings in the woods on his farm on Sunday. Instead of expressing the contempt and indignation which every right-minded man must feel at so outrageous a law as that of Georgia, and at the persecution of an inoffensive citizen, the gentleman seemed to take his conviction as a matter of course, and threw the blame all on Mr. Conklin, saying he knew what the law was before he went to work; he need not have suffered if he had been of a mind to avoid it. If he had not known the law, there might be some ground of pity; but when he knew the law and deliberately violated it, nobody but himself is to blame for the result.

But when the National Reform American Sabbath Union movement succeeds, it will not be necessary for the person to work in order to disturb the peace. Servetus disturbed the peace of Geneva by writing and talking against Calvinism, because Calvinism was the politics of Geneva. And so when the State "re-enacts the fourth commandment," as Mr. Shepard and Mr. Crafts say, Sunday will be a State institution, and the individual who talks against that institution by declaring that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh and not the first day, will be a disturber of the public peace. As much as this is contemplated in the statement which we have before quoted from the *Western Christian Advocate*, edited by Rev. G. W. Bothwell, D.D., of Oakland, Cal. Speaking of the petition against a Sunday law and the union of Church and State, in his issue of March 22, Mr. Bothwell said:—

"Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath if they choose; but there let their privileges end. Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted them, and then going off quietly and attending to their own business as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors. None of these bills are aimed at them; but if they fail to appreciate the fact, they may yet call down upon themselves such a measure of public disfavor as that legislation embarrassing to them will result."

This is simply a threat of punishment that will be meted out to those who shall dare to protest against national religious legislation, and shall dare to teach that Sunday is not the Sabbath. It will not be necessary for them to work on Sun-

day; if by their preaching according to their conscientious convictions concerning the word, they strike against the established religion, they will be considered as violators of the public peace, and will meet with punishment.

Finally, as demonstrating conclusively, even to those who cannot draw conclusions, we quote the following bold declaration from a speech by Dr. Mayo in the Cincinnati National Reform Convention. Speaking of the people of the United States, he said:—

"They will plant in the great charter of liberties an acknowledgment of the nation's dependence on Almighty God, and its duty to conform to the laws of religious and Christian morality. They will protect the rights of every citizen, and persecute no man for his religion until that religion drives him to disobey the law which expresses the will of the majority concerning the moral duty of the citizen. And that will is always open to revision by constitutional means."

We do not know how anyone can ask for any stronger proof than this that the National Reform movement contemplates persecution. And note, it is not even claimed that the persecution will be for actual violation of the law of God, but for acting or thinking contrary to the will of the majority concerning moral duties, with the express understanding that that will may change at any time.

Any person who can defend so outrageous a scheme has no sense whatever of what constitutes liberty. If any National Reformer can explain these utterances so as to make them harmonize with the golden rule, and with simple justice, the columns of the SENTINEL are open to him.

E. J. W.

### They Are One.

THE *Christian Statesman*, of September 5, contains a report of the Lakeside Reform Assembly, by the editor, T. P. Stevenson. This assembly was a joint convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association. The first three days were devoted to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union work, in which addresses were given upon "Woman Suffrage" and "Sabbath Observance." Addresses were delivered on "The Limits of Religious Liberty," and "The American Sabbath, and How to Maintain It." After noting the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Conference, Mr. Stevenson introduces the work of the days devoted especially to the National Reform Association, with these words:—

"There was no perceptible transition between the foregoing exercises and those properly relating to the National Reform Association."

This strikes us as very significant. It shows how rapidly the great Woman's Christian Temperance Union is losing sight of the object for which it was established, and is becoming simply a National Reform organization. The meetings of one cannot be distinguished from those of the other.

From Mr. Stevenson's report, we would not get the idea that the subject of temperance was mentioned in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Conference. Of course we are not to suppose that the subject of temperance was entirely ignored, but the report warrants us in believing that temperance received less attention than woman's suffrage and Sunday legislation. We are sorry that this is so. We are sorry that in combating religious legislation, which is evil, and only evil, we are placed in antagonism to the work of a professedly temperance organiza-

tion. We believe in temperance of the strictest kind, and wish to support every temperance measure and every temperance organization; therefore we hope that the women of the National W. C. T. U. who believe that it should be devoted exclusively to temperance work—and there are very many of them—will be able either to convert the national association, or else to form a branch which will work in a legitimate way for real Christian temperance, and which we can support.

E. J. W.

### A Pagan Theory.

At Bay View, Mich., the past summer, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union held a school of methods, at which Prof. E. E. White, superintendent of public schools of Cincinnati, made a speech on "The Duty of the Hour," in which, according to Miss Willard's report in the *Union Signal*, he made the following statement:—

"You must either concede the right of the State to teach everything or deny the right of the State to teach anything. We must take conscience as the compass and put reason at the helm of the ship of State or we cannot weather the gale. The family, Church and State, should in a holy alliance gather about the cradle."

This is a part of the plea for the establishment and enforcement of religion in public schools. It is not true that the State has the right to teach everything or nothing. The State has no right to teach religion. In the first place, it cannot do it without establishing a State religion, and a State religion is not genuine religion at all, but is only a wicked mixture of worldliness with the forms of religion, and amounts to nothing but religious despotism; and such a despotism is the worst of all. Instead of being an educator and an enlightener, such a government crushes out freedom of thought, and ends only in ignorance and superstition; and ignorance mixed with superstition is worse than ignorance alone; and when the superstition is enforced by governmental power the evil is increased a thousand-fold.

If it be indeed true that the only alternative is to concede that the State must teach everything or nothing, then we will take the latter, and deny the right of the State to teach anything, because it is vastly better for the State to do nothing than for it to attempt to do what it is impossible for it to do, with the inevitable result—the establishment of a religious despotism enforcing superstitious forms by governmental power.

But, although it is not the right, and is not in the power, of the State to teach religion, the State has a right to teach something. It has the right to teach the rights and the duties of the citizen as a citizen to his fellow-citizens and to the State. This it can do; this it has the right to do; and there its rights and its powers end. It has no right to undertake authoritatively to declare what are men's duties to God, or whether there is any God. That is for the individual to find out for himself, and to render according to the dictates and the light of his own conscience. When it shall ever come to that place where the State presumes to put itself above the parent in his relation to his child, and shall put itself between the parent and his child, and dictate what religion that child shall be taught, such a State is unworthy to stand for an hour. The right of the parent to the religious care and instruction of his child is paramount and absolute. And to the parent and the child this right is worth more

than all the States in Christendom. That some parents neglect to exercise this right and fail to give to their children religious instruction, can never justify the State in usurping the place of the parent and destroying the right, either of those who neglect it or those who exercise it.

The State can never of right have anything to do with forming any alliance in which the church is concerned, whether about the cradle or anywhere else; and any alliance of the State with the family with reference to the cradle must end with its simple pledge of protection to both the family and the cradle. The child belongs to the parent and not to the State. Both the dictum and the theory that the child belongs to the State is pagan and not Christian; and throughout this whole discussion in behalf of religion in the public schools by the would-be leaders of thought, there is a current that is carrying them, and those who follow them, into downright paganism. It is true they profess to be doing it all in the name of Christianity, but the theory of the State which they maintain is the pagan theory; and when they propose to sanctify it with the form of Christianity as the State religion, then the result is a system exactly conformed to that of the Papacy, and is essentially papal.

A. T. J.

### Building on the Sand.

AN exchange quotes from the words of Rev. Dr. Strong the following concerning the "civil Sabbath":—

"Rev. Joshua Strong, secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, in the course of an excellent discourse on 'The Civil Sabbath,' recently delivered, has this to say regarding the grounds for its observance:—

"We observe two Sabbaths, entirely distinct in origin, character, and authority—the one civil, the other religious. The latter is divine in its origin and authority, and sacred in character; the former—the civil Sabbath—is wholly human in its origin and authority, and secular in character. Because these two Sabbaths coincide, they are very easily and commonly confounded, and there results much popular misconception as to the meaning and value of Sabbath laws. . . . Much bad blood and much injury to the cause of Sabbath observance result from the common failure of both the enemies and friends of Sabbath laws to perceive that they are wholly secular, and that they in no wise depend for justification on the divine authority and sacred character of the religious Sabbath. If the words, 'Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy,' had never been uttered, there would be exactly the same ground for Sabbath legislation which now exists,—a ground full, broad, and solid."

"The tenable grounds, therefore, on which legislation regarding Sabbath observance rests, are these, namely: 'First, the duty of the State to secure to every man the right to rest on the Sabbath; and second, the duty of the State to guard the leisure of the day from uses subversive of its object as a day of rest, and uses dangerous to public morals.'"

The position here laid down by Dr. Strong—one of the most thoughtful and able American writers concerning national questions—is as strongly put as it is possible to make an illogical position. He fails to recognize the fundamental truth that "Sabbath keeping" is primarily and only a religious act, and that the benefits which come from it to man's lower nature, and to the so-called non-religious interests of a community, come only when the abstinence from labor is brought about through religious conviction. In other words, the expression "civil Sabbath" is at once and always contradictory; this is shown by the fact that in all places, and on the part of all individuals where rest is induced without religious conviction, Sabbath keeping and its blessings disappear. The "continental Sunday,"

of which so much is said, and concerning which so much fear is expressed, is the unavoidable result of a social and civil system from which the idea of a divinely-appointed Sabbath has been eliminated. When a religious conviction does not control, abstinence from labor induced by social customs, by mere desire for relief from the fatigue of labor, or by the compulsion of civil law, must result in holidayism, the character of which will be determined by the religious and moral atmosphere of the time. Holidayism thus induced has always resulted in much positive irreligion and immorality.

The statement that the State must "secure to every man the right to rest on the Sabbath," finds no counterpart in existing Sunday legislation. If that be all which the State may do, it can only declare that each man shall be free to cease from labor on Sunday if he choose so to do. The moment that it *forbids* labor, it has passed beyond the matter of guaranteeing rest, and has introduced compulsion. The evident confusion into which so clear a thinker as Dr. Strong falls, must continue until men cease to teach the illogical and impossible theory that there can be a "civil Sabbath." We shall escape from the thralldom of this inconsistency only as we rise from the lowland into which the pagan-born State-church theories out of which Roman Catholicism grew, are wholly laid aside.

—*Sabbath Recorder*.

### That Unwritten Agreement.

BISHOP FOSTER urges that there was an "unwritten agreement" made between the observers of Sunday and the observers of the seventh day; that the former came to America first and established the keeping of Sunday; that the latter in coming afterwards tacitly agreed to keep the laws. By this "unwritten agreement" the keepers of the seventh day were bound to keep Sunday also. This mode of reasoning is worthy only of the Papacy and the Inquisition. It is the argument of tyranny; but let us see how it would work in another case.

When America was discovered the Indians were the undisputed owners of the continent. So far as the whites were concerned, the Indians established themselves here first. They had certain "unwritten" laws regulating warfare, the chase, and social life. A solemn council determined the fate of the captives taken in war. Certain ceremonies were performed before undertaking the chase. The women were obliged to do all the drudgery, that the men might the better be prepared for war and the chase. By the working of these "unwritten" laws Sunday was as much used for the chase as any other day. In fact, they "had no Sunday."

Now when the *Mayflower* landed a small company at Plymouth, did not these individuals tacitly agree to keep the laws of the red men? When William Penn bought land of the Indians was it not the "unwritten agreement" that whoever should settle on this land would keep the laws of the red men? Whenever settlers came to America would they not be bound by this "unwritten agreement" to keep Sunday as the Indians kept it? How is this, anyway, Mr. Foster? Do not the Indians' claims antedate yours? Then, too, the whites were in the minority. They were not even one-seventh of one per cent. of the population.

R. M. CAVINESS.

Keokuk, Iowa.

### He Don't Belong.

WHEN the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union was "swinging round the circle" last summer, he gave two addresses at Fresno, Cal. Among other questions sent up for him to answer at one of his public meetings, was this one, "Do you indorse the principles of the National Reform Association?" The evasive answer came with readiness, "I don't belong to that party." After a somewhat lengthy and rambling talk he said, "I am not ashamed of it." Then it seems he doesn't "belong" but has a "warm side" for it. His sympathies are for it and with it. Does he sustain the same relation to it as he does to the Knights of Labor? At their general assembly last year at Indianapolis, he told them that he was so closely in "accord" with their "principles" that he had almost decided to become a Knight himself. He said if he did not it would be because he believed he could "advance" their "principles better as an outside ally."

Dr. Crafts gets apparently much "worked up" when anything coming from National Reform sources is brought to bear upon his work. He immediately repudiates it. It is almost pitiful to notice how much pain the galling imputation gives him. He don't belong, it isn't his purpose, etc., yet he's "not ashamed of it." Can he "advance" its "principles better as an outside ally"? Can he do it more service where he is, just as he can help the Knights more by not belonging to them?

Now let us look at one or two of the principal results wished for, which spring from National Reform principles. The words about to be presented are not those of obscure and indifferent men, but those of leading and zealous advocates:

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and, of course, Congress establishes a standard for money, weights, and measures. So Congress must establish a standard of religion," etc.—*Dr. Blanchard, in Pittsburg National Reform Convention in 1874.*

"It is the duty of the State, as such, to enter into alliance with the church of Christ, and to profess, adhere to, defend, and maintain, the true religion."—*Secretary J. M. Foster, in Christian Statesman, 1834.*

"To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel."—*Secretary W. J. Coleman, in Christian Statesman, Nov. 1, 1833.*

"Of course a government organized on a basis embracing Christianity could not, with propriety, intrust those with office who are hostile to its characteristic faith. And none of this class have any right to claim that they should be legally eligible to office with those who are *bona-fide* citizens."—*Christian Nation, September 15, 1836, National Reform organ, New York City.*

Secretary Foster, in speaking of the National Reformed State, says:—

"The expenses of the church in carrying on her aggressive work, it [the State] meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury."—*Christian Statesman, March, 1834.*

Lastly:—

"But shall we take—is it right to take—public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are opposed?—Most certainly. The gospel from its very nature is aggressive, contemplates the rectification of corrupt, disorderly, and degraded human nature, casts down every high thing that would exalt itself against the knowledge of God, and brings every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."—*Wm. Somerville, in Christian Nation, July 7 and 14, 1836.*

Here we have a few things—quite a small crop—growing out of National Reform principles,

viz.: 1. Congress, to establish a standard of religion. 2. The State to enter into alliance with the Church—Church and State union. 3. Disfranchising infidels, which means everybody "hostile" to the National Reform idea of Christianity. 4. "None of this class" to be treated as "*bona-fide* citizens." 5. Providing public money to carry on "the aggressive work" of the church, the preachers to be fed out of the "public crib." 6. It is right to so use the public funds, because the gospel is "aggressive" and "casts down" everything that would "exalt" itself against it. In other words, nothing must stand in the way of the National Reform *régime*, not even the United States treasury, and Dr. Crafts is "not ashamed" of such principles!

N. J. BOWERS.

*Fresno, Cal.*

### Religious Liberty in Maryland.

THE proposition to rear a monument in honor of Lord Baltimore as founder of the colony of Maryland would seem to be eminently proper; for whether we consider the personal character of the man, his zeal and enterprise as the projector of a colony in the New World, or the magnificent results that have attended his settlements on the shores of the Chesapeake, his fame is as truly meritorious as that of the founder of any other commercial enterprise in America. In this day of multiform centennial glorification let not the name of Cecilius Calvert be overlooked.

But it is to be hoped that his co-religionists—the Romanists—of the present day will not compromise themselves, nor mar the fair fame of an honorable man of affairs by persisting in claiming for him an honor to which he did not aspire, and an administration of the colony which he had no authority to grant—that of being the pioneer, founder, and patron of religious liberty in the American colonies. If the leaders of Romanist thought in the United States, and especially in Maryland, really desire to conciliate their Protestant fellow-citizens, and to verify the truth of history, they have on this occasion a fine opportunity to retire from an offensive and untenable position—to recede from their wonted claim for Lord Baltimore—a claim inconsistent with an essential, abiding principle of their own church; false, in fact, and impossible according to the terms of the charter of Maryland.

The writer has in his possession an old folio volume containing a copy of the original charter of Maryland in Latin and English, and colonial records and acts of the assembly from 1637 to 1765. These furnish incontestible evidence that religious liberty in the colony of Maryland was not contemplated by Charles I., who granted the charter; that such liberty was never accorded to the colonists by the proprietor or his lieutenants, and never secured to the freemen by acts of the assembly. On the contrary, acts were at times passed on the subject of religion as intolerant, fierce, and bloody as any to be found in force elsewhere in the Old World or in the New. Compared with some of Maryland's "religious liberty" enactments, under the Calverts, the "Blue Laws" of Connecticut were "gentle doves," and the laws which hung Quakers in Boston, and witches in Salem, were righteous regulations.

The charter patent granted by Charles I. to Lord Baltimore incorporating the Province of Maryland opens with the usual preamble and the terms of the general purpose of the grant. Then follows a particular designation of the geographical metes and bounds of the region to be occupied.

That is followed by an extended enumeration of the rights, franchises, and authority confirmed unto the proprietor, his heirs and assignees, "in and to the region designated, its soils, woods, marshes, lakes, rivers, bays, islands, etc., with fishings of every kind of fish, as well of whales and sturgeon and other royal fish as of other fish; and, moreover, the opening and working of veins, mines, and quarries." And then occurs the following: "And furthermore, the *patronage* and *advowsons* of all churches which—with the increasing worship and religion of Christ—within the said region, islands, islets, and limits aforesaid, hereafter *shall happen* to be built, together with license and faculty of erecting and founding churches, chapels, and places of worship in convenient and suitable places within the premises, and of causing the same to be dedicated and consecrated according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England; with all and singular such, and as ample rights, jurisdictions, privileges, prerogatives, royalties, liberties, immunities, and royal rights, and temporal franchises whatsoever, as well by sea as by land, within the region, islands, islets, and limits aforesaid, to be had, exercised, used, and enjoyed as any Bishop of Durham within the bishopric or country—Palatine of Durham, in our kingdom of England, ever heretofore hath had, held, used, or enjoyed, or of right could, or ought to have, hold, use, or enjoy."

The above is all that Lord Baltimore's charter contains on the special subject of religion or ecclesiastical affairs. It is proper to explain the reference to "the Palatine county of Durham." At that period there were in England three Palatine counties—those of Chester, Lancaster, and Durham. They were called Palatine because the proprietors exercised, each in his county, royal prerogatives as a king in his palace. In the case of Durham the bishop was the proprietor, and hence he exercised the chief authority in the county, both civil and ecclesiastical; he was, in fact, a royal bishop of the county, which was, at the same time, his diocese. Taking, therefore, the Palatine county of Durham and the jurisdiction of its bishop proprietor as the model and measure of corresponding authority in Maryland, that colony was thus constituted a Palatine province, and its proprietor invested with an episcopal oversight of its churches.

But while the proprietor of Maryland was thus invested with Palatine, episcopal authority, the terms of the charter were not *mandatory*. He *might* found churches and chapels, but he *was not required* to found them; and then all such places of worship that *might happen* to be established *must be* "dedicated, consecrated," and ordered after the model and according to the ritual of the established Church of England, observed in the Palatine county of Durham.

Manifestly, then, according to the terms of his charter, the proprietor of Maryland could not officially tolerate any form of dissent from the established Church of England, nor could he lawfully found or dedicate in the province a dissenting meeting-house, church, or chapel; neither was it in his power, as Lord Palatine of the province, to authorize or permit other persons to establish within his jurisdiction such places of worship for the use of dissenters from the form and faith of the Church of England.

Much less could Cecilius Calvert, or any of his successors, holding under his original charter, lawfully establish and proclaim the general principle of personal religious liberty. The very idea of such liberty was alien to all existing eccle-

siastical institutions, and as an actuality, then, nowhere to be found. It appears, however, that the Romanist Lords of Baltimore, or their representatives in the province, *did not molest* dissenters from the English established church, for the reason that, being themselves dissenters, they could not consistently or prudently enforce upon others those charter principles which they themselves were openly violating. And thus the ideal church of the province of Maryland, designed after the model of the Palatine Church of Durham, became from the first a nullity; while there prevailed for a time a degree of religious freedom in which all dissenters participated—Romanists and Protestants alike.

Now if for this happy state of the church in Maryland, Lord Baltimore was entitled to thanks, it must have been on the principle of a certain man who generously gave away his neighbor's apples. As this man was helping himself to apples one day in his neighbor's orchard, a stranger came along who, supposing him to be the proprietor, politely asked permission to gather a few apples. "Certainly," said the supposed proprietor, "help yourself; take as many as you want." When the stranger had filled his pockets with the choice fruit, he was quite profuse in his thanks for the kindness. "Oh, no," replied the other, "don't thank me; these apples are not mine. I am myself stealing them just as you are."

It is evident Lord Baltimore had no *authority* to grant religious liberty to his colonists, and it is equally manifest he had no *intention* of granting such privilege to his followers. It could not have been his original purpose to found a State on the principle of general religious liberty; for then, as an honest, candid man, he would have refused a charter which forbade the granting of that liberty. Nor did his lordship or his Romanist adherents subsequently intend to establish universal religious freedom in the colony. This is evident from their public acts.

At a general assembly held at St. John's, and terminating March 19, 1638—about four years from the founding of the colony—an act was passed on the closing day of the session ordaining certain laws for the government of the province, of which the first was, "That holy church within this province shall have all her rights and liberties." At an assembly held at the same place two years later, 1640, "An Act for Church Liberties" was passed October 23, ordaining "that holy church within this province shall have and enjoy all her rights, liberties, and franchises, wholly and without blemish." This was subsequently confirmed as a perpetual law.

Now, why this special legislation in behalf of "holy church"? Why were not all the churches, any and all sects, included if universal religious toleration was the design of the benevolent and enlightened proprietor and his general assembly? Why the necessity of this special legislation? If liberty of worship had been from the first legally accorded to all dissenting sects, the Romanists enjoyed it in common with all the rest; and hence they did not need this special protection; but if they, or any other dissenters, required legislative protection, all did, and to limit such legal assurance to one sect was not universal toleration. The authors of this partial and special toleration, therefore, could not have been those pioneers of universal liberty of conscience of whom we hear so much at this time. —*Paul Le Clair, in Converted Catholic.*

### Religious Education by the State.

In a plea for religious instruction by the State, Rev. Geo. B. Cheever asks the following question:—

"Shall God himself be intrusted with the dominion over the consciences of rational beings instructed by his own laws and providences, or shall the States, by majority of voters, uninstructed from infancy in the holy requisitions of God's law, be the supreme governors of the human soul?"

Here are really two questions; and of course Mr. Cheever intends that the first one shall be answered in the affirmative, and the second one in the negative. In this view, the questions contain the very essence of the doctrine always advocated by the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and are exactly opposed to the principles of so-called National Reform. For whenever religion is put into the hands of the State, an attempt is made to transfer "the dominion over the consciences of rational beings" from God to the State. There is no dodging this conclusion, because Mr. Cheever admits all through his article that this is emphatically a case of conscience.

Our proposition is still further confirmed by Mr. Cheever's second question. This question shows that in his mind the reason why the States should not "be the supreme governors of the human soul," lies in the fact that the "majority of voters" are "uninstructed from infancy in the holy requisitions of God's law." Mr. Cheever must intend to convey the idea either that the majority of voters will always remain uninstructed "in the holy requisitions of God's law," and therefore the States can never become "the supreme governors of the human soul," or else that the time may come when the majority of voters will be instructed in the requisitions of God's law, and that when they are so instructed it will then be perfectly proper for the States to "be the supreme governors of the human soul." Evidently the latter view is the one which he indorses; for the sole object of his lengthy argument is to show the necessity and utility of religious instruction provided by the State. Only let the States instruct "the majority of voters" "in the holy requisitions of God's law," and they will be eminently fitted to "be the supreme governors of the human soul," says the Rev. Geo. B. Cheever, D.D.

It is of course well understood that the SENTINEL has never indorsed this sentiment implied in Mr. Cheever's second question. The friends of religious liberty are perfectly satisfied to intrust the Almighty "with the dominion over the consciences of rational beings;" and they forever deny the right of the States, no matter how well instructed their voters may be, to usurp that dominion, or constitute themselves "the supreme governors of the human soul." And this is why they are opposed to having the State dictate to the people what they shall study, or what they shall practice, in matters of religion.

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

### The W. C. T. U. and Politics.

REGARDING the recent convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Chicago, the following is from the press dispatches:—

The event of the session was the report of the Committee on Resolutions touching the non-partisan question. The majority report says:—

"We believe it is vital to temperance reform that the principle of prohibition be made the dominant issue in American politics. We therefore give our approval to that party only which declares

in its platform for prohibition in the State and nation, and stands in action for its application to law."

The minority report was brought in by Mrs. Mattie M. Bailey, of the Iowa delegation, and read as follows:—

"That the recent amendment contests demonstrate the need of more persistent and persuasive educational temperance work among all classes of people; the results of these several contests have given us practical proof that the success in the effort for the overthrow of the legalized liquor traffic can only be assured where the intelligent convictions of the people are in favor of prohibition, and that defeat is certain where such convictions are lacking; therefore, resolved, further, that as forty odd departments of the W. C. T. U. work are for no party, but are for the education of the people in the truths of total abstinence and prohibition, and as we have in our membership women whose differing political preferences lead them to sympathize with and support different political parties, therefore it is unjust and unwise for this organization to pledge its influence, support, or allegiance to any political party.

"Unjust because if this organization is non-partisan, as our president has lately declared, such a pledge of influence, support, or allegiance, representatively given, interferes with the individual freedom of any and every member to prefer and work for the political party of her choice. Unwise because in the practical carrying out of that pledge our religious and educational work is thereby subjected to party limitations and antagonized by disastrous partisan opposition."

Mrs. Foster and Mrs. Bailey spoke in favor of the adoption of the minority report. Mrs. Clara Hoffman spoke against its adoption. The majority report was adopted. The Iowa delegates alone voted in favor of the minority report.

At this point Mrs. J. Ellen Foster arose and read a long protest on behalf of the Iowa delegation, setting forth that they had met with rebuffs and insults until forbearance had ceased to be a virtue. At the conclusion of the reading the entire Iowa delegation left the hall.

### The Right to Rest.

THE Rev. Dr. W. W. Evarts, of Chicago, is an active worker for a national Sunday law, and, like all his companions in the work, he uses arguments which, on account of their weakness, he would be ashamed to use in any other cause. The *Golden Censer* published a portion of one of his speeches some time ago, from which we extract the following:—

"It is not proposed to make people pious, to compel them to pray, but to protect those who wish to worship and pursue higher education. It is not declared, You shall be a Catholic, or a Protestant, or a Mohammedan, or a Jew, or anything of the sort. The church wants to give the people a day that is necessary for all men alike. Every man knows the necessity for it if he knows himself at all. One day in seven, it is that right the Sabbath law protects, and that is all. The church simply gives the right, guards the right, for all men."

Notice first the expression, "The church wants to give the people a day." The same idea is even more strongly expressed in the paragraph preceding the one just quoted, in which we find the statement, "The church, by enforcing the Sabbath, is taking better care of humanity than liberty leagues or infidel reformers." So, notwithstanding their pleading for a civil Sunday, we have an admission by one of the leaders in

the movement, that it is purely a church affair, and that although when the law is passed the State will be the nominal enforcer of it, the church will be the real power behind it. In other words, the State will be the cat's paw for the church; yet we doubt not that if Dr. Everts were asked directly if the Sunday movement is religious in its nature, he would say no. It is strange how this Sunday-law craze leads people virtually to deny any connection between the church and religion.

But the point which we wish particularly to notice is the idea that the Sunday law is designed simply to protect the people's right to rest and to worship. We can scarcely imagine how such an argument as this should deceive anybody, for anyone can see that the object is entirely different. Granting that it is everybody's right to rest on Sunday, suppose there are some who do not wish to avail themselves of that right, what will the State do in that case under a rigid Sunday law?—It will say, You *must* do so. In other words, it will declare that nobody has a right to choose his own day for rest and worship, and so instead of preserving rights, it will deprive people of their rights. As a matter of fact, everybody has a right to be protected in resting on Sunday, provided he wishes to do so. If a movement were set on foot to deprive people of their right to rest on Sunday it would find no more vigorous opposer than the AMERICAN SENTINEL; but who ever heard of any such a movement being started? Who ever heard of such a thing as an attempt to secure a law forbidding people to rest on Sunday?—No one. The fact is that under our present Constitution everybody has that right, and everybody who wishes to avail himself of it is protected in it.

There is no necessity for a Sunday law in order to protect people in their right to worship on Sunday. This plea for a Sunday law, on the ground that it is necessary to protect people in their right to Sunday rest, is equivalent to saying that those who wish to rest cannot do so unless everybody else does.

Suppose I get tired and want to take a holiday, making a trip into the country. Everybody will say that I have a right to do so if I can afford it; but I demur. I raise a great ado and say that the State has to protect me in that right. Our Sunday-law friends would tell me that the State does protect me in that right; that if anyone should attempt forcibly to restrain me from pursuing my journey, the State would punish him; but I say, No, I am not protected in my right to take a holiday trip to the country, unless the State shall compel everybody else to go with me. While I am going to the country there are scores of people who would go about their business as usual, and I ask that they be compelled to take a holiday too, in order that I may be protected in my right to recreation! Anyone can see the nonsense of this, and yet this very argument is used in behalf of Sunday laws. The idea that one person cannot rest because someone else happens to be working, was never heard of until necessity compelled the movers for a national Sunday law to invent it. It is not the language of reason, but of bigotry; it is the language of those who wish to compel everybody to do as they do.

That a law compelling all to rest is not necessary in order to protect all in their right to rest is shown by the fact that people keep the seventh day, concerning which no civil law has ever been

made, and they feel that they have a right to do this. We know of several instances where a very few observers of the seventh day live alone in the midst of a very large city, surrounded by thousands who pay no regard whatever to that day; and yet this few feel that they have a right to observe the seventh day if they wish to, and they do so, and find no difficulty whatever. They do not ask for a law compelling other people to rest on that day in order that they may be protected in their right. Yet they surely have the same right to be protected in their observance of the seventh day as others have in their observance of the first. If not, we would like to know why not. Those who admit that they have a right to be protected in their seventh-day rest thereby relinquish all claims for a national Sunday law; and those who will not admit that they have the right, thereby admit that they desire class legislation which will favor some but which will work injustice to others who are equally deserving. We would like to have our friends think seriously of this matter and state whether they believe that the only persons in this country who have any rights are those who observe Sunday.

E. J. W.

#### Enforced Sunday Observance — Who Are Its Allies?

In the *Bulletin* of August 27 we attempted to show the inconsistency of the *Chicago Daily News* in its attempt to bring into Chicago enforced Sunday observance over the deceptive issue of closing the Sunday saloons. Since the writing of that article, the utterances of the *Daily News* have been more pronounced than before, and the charge then made abundantly proven to be just. In the *Morning News* of September 9, under the leading editorial, "Sunday Observance," we find these significant words: "And this suggests the point, which has doubtless occurred to many of our readers, that a wide-open saloon is only one of many forms of violation of the divine command, 'Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy.' Open barber shops, open grocery stores, and other open places of traffic, are infractions of this command, only less mischievous than the open saloon." In the *News* of September 23, in the leading editorial, "Some Progress," we find these words: "For nearly two months the *Morning News* has devoted an unusual amount of its space to an endeavor to bring about Sunday observance in Chicago. . . . The fight has been carried on because the *Morning News* believes in Sunday observance. It believes in it, not only from a religious and moral standpoint, but also from an economic and hygienic point of view." And how does it work to bring about Sunday observance?—By appeals to the civil authorities. We deny the right of any civil ruler to enforce the fourth commandment, or to enforce Sunday observance, from a religious, or any other standpoint. God says to this self-appointed guardian of the Almighty, "Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord." Heb. 10:30. The *News* quotes Cardinal Gibbons, and many Catholics, to show that the Church of Rome favors Sunday closing. In a letter commending the course of the *News*, from "Fides," of St. Charles, Illinois, which appeared in the *News* of September 21, we read: "No man with a knowledge of the teaching and doctrine of the Catholic Church could be so inconsistent as to accuse her of failure in the slightest degree to enforce the most exact

and religious observance of Sunday." This is too true ever to be contradicted. The question is whether the country is ready for such enforced religious observance of the fourth commandment as shall please the *Daily News* and the Catholic Church. The fight is not for temperance; it is not against the saloon; it is not for prohibition.

*News* of September 17, editorial, "One War at a Time." "It may be even admitted that in a certain sense the fight is not specifically against the saloon, but against unlawful Sunday toil and traffic of every sort. Nevertheless, the fight on hand now is against the Sunday saloon, open in violation of an express law of the State. When we have won this fight, we will reform the lines, plant the standard on the ground thus gained, and press the attack on other specific instances of Sunday violation. But just now, 'one war at a time, gentlemen, if you please.'—*Workers' Bulletin, Des Moines, Iowa.*

#### The Civil Law Did It.

WHEN the Roman Catholics are charged as being responsible for the terrible persecutions during the twelve hundred and sixty years of papal rule, they very meekly seek to excuse themselves from all blame by saying, "The civil law did it." And now when the Sunday-law advocates get their ideas embodied in the civil laws of our country, and should sore persecution be the result, as it certainly will, will not these same professed Christian people seek to clear their blood-stained skirts by saying, as the mother church said, "The civil law did it"?

A. W. SANBORN.

THREE men—say a Christian, an infidel, and a Jew—ought to be able to carry on a government for their common benefit, and yet leave the religious doctrines and worship of each unaffected thereby, otherwise than by fairly and impartially protecting each, and aiding each in his searches after truth. If they are sensible and fair men they will so carry on their government, and carry it on successfully and for the benefit of all. If they are not sensible and fair men, they will be apt to quarrel about religion, and, in the end, have a bad government and bad religion, if they do not destroy both. Surely they could well and safely carry on any other business, as that of banking, without involving their religious opinions, or any acts of religious worship. Government is an organization for a particular purpose. It is not almighty, and we are not to look to it for everything. The great bulk of human affairs and human interests is left by any free government to individual enterprise and individual action. Religion is eminently one of these interests, lying outside the true and legitimate province of government.—*Supreme Court of Ohio.*

THE defeat of Governor Foraker, in Ohio, is charged, not so much to the saloon influence as to the Sunday-law issue, and the belief that he favored a crusade against all sorts of activity on Sunday, even to the stopping of the delivery of milk on that day. Assuming this to be a correct statement, it is proof that the extremist often defeats himself. Radical suasion in the interest of good morals is not objected to by the people, but the attempt to legislate radicalism on the Sunday question into the people, oftener than not suffers defeat.—*Sacramento Record-Union.*



# The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER 27, 1889.

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

THE *United States American* has removed to 419 Folsom Street, San Francisco, to which number all communications should be addressed. The *American* is "devoted to choice literature and to the dissemination of American principles."

"WE cordially, gladly recognize," say the National Reformers, "the fact that in South American republics, and in France, and other European countries, the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity, and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism." This is especially true of Equador and Spain, particularly the former, some account of the moral condition of which we published last week.

"TO-DAY the Province of Quebec is," says the *American Citizen*, "under the exclusive control of the Roman Catholic Church. The public officers are Roman Catholic, the religion is Roman Catholic, and it has just been shown that the courts are equally Roman Catholic."

The Province of Quebec is, then, Mr. M. J. Foster's ideal State: it has, in the common acceptance of the term, no established church, but "the State and its sphere exist for the sake of, and to serve the interests of, the church." This is just what Mr. Foster says should be, and it is just the condition of affairs which he would like to see in this country.

THE field secretary of the American Sabbath Union has discovered a new argument for closing saloons on Sunday. He says, as reported in the *Christian Nation*, "The saloon should be closed on the Sabbath, because in being open it jeopardizes the safety of the people in passing along the public streets going to and from church." We are perfectly agreed that saloons should be closed on Sunday, but the same arguments that would close them on that day would close them on every other day. They are no more a menace to passers-by on Sunday than on any other day, and people are entitled to no more protection on Sunday than on other days. The idea is absurd, and shows the true animus of the Sunday movement; it is to honor and favor the church and the day; and that is just what civil government has no right to do.

IN an article in the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester Scovel, writing of the desirability of uniting with Roman Catholics for the purpose of securing so-called national reform, said:—

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches, as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit. It is one of the necessities of the situation."

And again in the same line the *Christian*

*Statesman* of December 11, 1884, said editorially:—

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."

And now comes the Baltimore Catholic Congress, which closed its session in that city on the 11th inst., and says in its platform:—

"There are many Christian issues in which the Catholics could come together with non-Catholics and shape civil legislation for the public good. In spite of rebuff and injustice, and overreaching zealotry, we should seek an alliance with the non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance."

At present we leave our readers to draw their own conclusions, and forecast the probable results of this Roman Catholic National Reform alliance now as good as formed.

IN concluding a report of an address by Mr. Crafts on his favorite theme, "The American Sabbath or the Continental Sunday," the *Christian Nation* says:—

"The address was listened to with deep interest. We hope that the agitation of this most important subject may mean the better enforcement of the Sabbath laws now existing in our own city, that we may not see men reeling to and fro in our streets on God's holy day. In the desecration of the Sabbath, as in all other evil, the liquor traffic is foremost. Prohibit the liquor traffic and you stop a very large proportion of the public desecration of the Sabbath. May the time soon come when the Sabbath shall be protected by law, not merely because it is needful for man to have a rest-day, but because it has been instituted and set apart by God, and because he has said, 'Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy.'"

There is something very peculiar about this Sunday-law question. The law, we are told, is wanted to secure a day of rest for workingmen, and as a temperance measure, but somehow or other, try as they will, they cannot conceal the fact that the real object is to honor the day. They don't want men to be drunken on the day, and Sunday prohibition would prevent the desecration of the day, and they want the law because God has said, "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy." But they don't want religious legislation; oh no! they only want to enforce their version of the fourth commandment by civil law. That is all.

THE *Catholic Review* of November 9 has the following on the proper relation of Church and State, which should commend itself to National Reformers:—

"It would be hardly worth while noticing the eternal changes which Americans ring on 'the union of Church and State' phrase, except to ask those that use it what do they mean when they declare so firmly that union of Church and State shall never exist in America. What the phrase formerly meant is done away with in all civilized countries almost completely, although these countries may have Catholicity or a Protestant sect down in the Constitution as the State religion. The old state of union will probably never return. Harmony is now the proper word for expressing the desirable relations of Church and State, and this harmony must exist or the world will continue to endure the discomforts of eternal quarreling. The State must admit that the Church ranks above it, and has a deeper interest in men than it can ever have. It must act accordingly. The present attempt of the atheists and foolish secularists to push Christianity out-of-doors, and leave the people to the mercies of State officials in their necessities, must be resisted and overthrown. The State is bound to assist the Church in her work quite as much as the Church is bound to keep the people mindful of their salvation and faithful in working for it. The two powers are a mutual aid to each other,

and must be always in relationship. Harmony is the word for the present moment, but users of the phrase, 'No union of Church and State,' know too little of the matter to produce anything but discord."

"Harmony" is an excellent word, and in this connection is about the equivalent of Mr. J. M. Foster's proposition, that "the State and its sphere [should] exist for the sake of, and to serve the interests of, the Church," and that "the Church and the State [should] exist in friendly recognition and co-operation." It is well known what Catholics regard as "harmony" between Church and State; it is about equivalent to the relation which may properly exist between one man and one woman, namely, marriage. And that which Secretary Foster means by "friendly recognition and co-operation" is explained by his own words, as follows: "The expenses of the Church, in carrying on her aggressive work, it [the State] meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury. Thus the Church is protected and exalted by the State."

It certainly ought not to be very difficult for National Reformers to join hands with Romanists in "resisting the demands of political atheism," since on this question these so-called Protestants and the Papists occupy the same ground. If they are kept apart it will be only because each party will insist that it is the church to the exclusion of the other. But inasmuch as they have each expressed a willingness to join hands with the other in a propaganda by civil law, there is little ground for hope that they will not agree to unite their forces for their mutual advantage, and for the discomfiture of political atheists, by which they mean all who do not agree with their theory of civil government.

IN commenting upon the result of the late election in Ohio, the *Cincinnati Commercial Gazette* of November 6 says:—

"The German Republican guard will be accused of enlisting again under the banner of the saloonists, but they did not do anything of the sort. They rebelled against the peculiar combination on the Sunday question. No, it was not the saloonists who won the Democratic victory in Hamilton County, though they will claim it and use their power to the uttermost, but it was the Sunday crusade which struck not only the saloons but extended to base-ball, ice-cream, soda-water and cigar stands, and seemed to be threatening the milk wagons."

The fact is that the advocates of Sunday laws are for Sunday first and prohibition second; that which they wish most of all is not to close the saloons on that one day, but to exalt Sunday as a religious institution. For the present, at least, politicians who do not care to get scorched would do well to let the Sunday question alone. The time foretold by National Reformers when the politicians will all demand front seats on the Sunday-reform (?) car has not yet come, though no one knows how soon it may dawn.

## THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,  
DEVOTED TO

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

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.  
Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, - - - \$1.00  
In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, each, - - - 75c.  
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 5s.  
Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.