

AMERICAN SENTINEL

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 3.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1888.

NUMBER 1.

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.

LEAVE the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contribution. Keep the church and State forever separate.—*U. S. Grant.*

A Recognition of Religion.

REV. MR. GREGG, the pastor of the Park Street Church, took the ground in his sermon on Sunday that it was the duty of Christian citizens to insist on a constitutional amendment which should give the Christian religion a recognition in our great national charter. It does not seem to have occurred to the reverend gentleman that the omission a hundred years ago of all reference to religion may have saved the people of this country from an enormous amount of trouble. We do not believe that it would have made the American people any better, that our standard of morality would have been any higher, that religion would have been any more respected, or that any of the troubles from which we have suffered would thereby have been averted; but it is certain that if religious tests had been applied, we should now be confronted with that serious problem that is engaging the attention of European statesmen; that is, how to reconcile official expressions of religious faith with the conflicting opinions of the people. Mr. Gregg's constitutional amendment would conflict with the honestly entertained religious convictions of several millions of his fellow-citizens. How would he treat these? The Constitution is as much theirs as his, or those whom he represents. Their religion cannot be legislated out of existence, and they would have the same dislike to supporting a Constitution framed in accordance with religious ideas in which they did not believe, as Mr. Gregg would have to supporting the Constitution framed in accordance with the creed of Mahomet. Is it not a proof of the good sense of the framers of our Constitution that they avoided this cause for contention, by giving to every man entire religious liberty, and allowing the civil government to remain absolutely neutral?—*Boston Herald.*

Religious Despotism in Russia.

Not long since an American citizen was imprisoned in Russia for preaching the gospel, and it is probable that only the timely and energetic efforts of the worthy American Minister at St. Petersburg saved him from being sent to Siberia. This circumstance caused much comment in the United States, and Russia was severely criticised for her religious intolerance. It is likely that the readers of the heading of this article will expect that I shall strongly condemn Russia for her religious despotism. But that is far from my purpose. I write to explain her position, and to show that she is not so far behind the spirit of this enlightened age as many suppose.

There is a homely saying that one-half the world does not know how the other half lives. The United States has a vast domain, a fast-increasing population, and her resources are immense. Yet if some of her citizens could be suddenly transported from the scenes of a Fourth-of-July celebration and be set down amid the almost countless cities of the Old World, with their ever-busy swarming millions of inhabitants, it would seem as if the glory of their own land had suddenly collapsed, and that there was another side to this busy world. Here, America is not seen, and her greatness is not appreciated. There, she alone is seen, and the greatness of the Old World is quite as little appreciated.

But the American people have less idea of the real condition of spiritual things in Europe, than of the temporal. An American traveler was speaking of the sameness of the world and the church on the Continent, when a continental friend replied: "The world is the church here. We are born church members. In our infancy we are baptized according to the ordinance of the church; in later years this action is confirmed. This is emphatically a Christian country."

In Russia the Czar is as truly the head of the church as he is the ruler of the nation. His civil and spiritual rule and authority exactly correspond; one is just as extensive as the other. To this he allows exceptions in favor of certain religions under certain circumstances. In this is manifested his religious tolerance and forbearance. A foreign or dissenting preacher may obtain permission to preach there if he has a congregation to which he can preach. And he may proselyte from other dissenting bodies, but he must not proselyte among the members of the State church. This, it is true, confines his labors to a narrow field; but this is considered a

minister's duty there. Proselyting is scarcely known and never countenanced. And the Government pursues the only course that it consistently can. To ask more than this of the Czar is to ask him to undermine his own authority.

The nation is the church. The Czar is the head of both at once—or, rather, both in one. Therefore to become a dissenter—to unite with another church—is to renounce allegiance to the Czar. If there is any difference in the strength of the ties of loyalty, preference is always supposed to be on the side of the spiritual. It is so with Catholicism. To the charge that Catholics in England and America are subjects of a foreign prince, or ruler, a Catholic writer replied: "Nowhere in the world is the Pope a foreign prince to a true Catholic." Everywhere, in every nation, the first and highest allegiance of the Catholic is to the Pope. He maintains a citizenship in other States, only subordinate to his allegiance to the Pope, and subservient to the interests of his church. This is true of every truly loyal and consistent Catholic.

From this it is readily seen that it is impossible to renounce allegiance to the Czar in the church, and yet maintain allegiance to him in the civil government. They are inseparable; to unite with another church is treason against the Czar. And no method of argument can show that it is any less than, or anything else but, treason.

This is the true logic of National Religion. On this basis, the course of the Czar is consistent. To permit foreign preachers to enter his empire and turn away his subjects from him as their spiritual head, is to tolerate treason; and every such preacher is an inciter to treason. He is not there a dissenting minister of the gospel; he is a disturber of the peace and a destroyer of the security of the empire. He is a dangerous person.

And this reasoning holds good in every place where there is State religion. And a State religion, a coerced religion, depends for its strength and perpetuity on the strength and amount of authority put forth for its maintenance. In Prussia the religion of the empire is Lutheranism. But the Government is liberal, and the result is that to-day the Catholics have virtual control of the nation. They control the courts. It has been lately decided, in a case prosecuted by the Attorney-General, that it is a public outrage to speak contemptuously of the institutions of the Catholic Church. And this while the Catholics continually heap reproach upon the name of Luther and the Reformation, without rebuke.

And in England the state of things is no better. Under a liberal system, Ritualism, or Catholicism, as it is in fact, increases in the church, undermining it in every quarter, and open infidelity is taught by ministers of the established church.

When this triumph of the Papacy in Prussia became a matter of public notoriety, the papers of the State church called upon the Government for a more liberal outlay of money, and more generous and vigorous efforts to build up the church in the realm, without which it must suffer from the aggressions of the Papal power. But a dissenting paper very aptly said that right there was the foundation of the whole difficulty. They have delegated the work of the church to the State, and instead of doing evangelistic work, they have depended on the money and fostering care of the State, until the church has lost its vital power, and the people are left open to the assaults of the Papacy, which knows so well how to make itself popular with those who have been brought up to a belief in a National Religion.

It has yet to be seen whether it is possible to retain vitality and a spirit of evangelizing in a church which is allied to the State, and depends on its patronage and support. Such a thing has never yet been known. Certainly the present condition of things in the nations of Europe is not flattering to the hopes of those who expect good to come out of such a coalition.

The advocates of National Religion may reply that this is the result of too much leniency; that the only safe and consistent course is to prevent contrary religions from spreading and gathering strength in the land. *In this reply we find a vindication of the course of the Czar of Russia.* All National Religionists in America, who plead the necessity of suppressing dissenting religions by State authority, take sides with the Czar of Russia. The logic of his actions is the logic of their arguments. And the increasing influence of the National Reform Association—the increasing demand for a legal religion in America—proves what I said in the beginning, that the Czar in suppressing the preaching of a free gospel in Russia, is not as far behind the spirit of the age as many suppose.

No dissenter can be a good citizen of Russia; no dissenter will be considered a "*bona fide* citizen" of the United States, if National Religion ever becomes an established fact. They who plead for it are not blind to the results—they plainly declare that all who will not consent to the established religion will be disfranchised.

Another logical result of such a procedure is also shown. It is evident that a dissenter in Russia is held to be a despiser of civil authority. Even so, if National Religion ever obtains in the United States, a neglect to observe the usages of the established religion will not be held an offense against religion; it will be an offense against the State. Punishment for failure to observe the institutions of Christianity, or what they may call such institutions, will not be religious persecution, it will be punishment for disregarding

civil authority—for violating the laws of the State. True, the laws of the church, or of religion, and the laws of the State will be identical; the laws of religion will become the laws of the State. But violation of those laws will not be punished as violations of religious laws, but as State laws! "Here is wisdom." Dissenters will not be church culprits; they will be rebels and traitors. The old story will be repeated; heresy will be the highest crime—but always against the State.

And why not? Spiritual laws are the highest; church relations are the most important. Religious laws, on becoming State laws, are doubly important. The violator of such laws is a greater criminal than the violator of a merely civil law, and his punishment should be greater. But it must always be borne in mind that he is punished for their violation *only as State laws*. Religion is not a factor in the article of punishment.

Such was the logic of Romanism. And already this logic is adopted in America by statesmen and religious papers of high and commanding influence. When men are punished for dissenting from religious tenets, which are in contradiction of their own faith, they are not then to be considered religious tenets—they suddenly become "police regulations."

Let the American people calmly regard this picture, in the light of history, of the action of Russia, and of passing events in the United States. National Reformers may still deny that their movement tends to a union of Church and State. Their denial is no better than a studied deception. Let them call it what they will; the fact remains that in its results it is exactly in harmony with the present action of Russia in shutting out a free gospel from her dominions. And what further witness can anyone ask than their indorsement of the Roman Catholic Church as the advocate and exponent of National Religion? Deny as much as they will, dissemble as they may, just such a National Religion as the Catholic Church upheld in the days of her power, and which she still advocates, is just the form of National Religion for which they plead. Are the American people ready to accept their plea? Are they willing to have religion established on such a basis?

To every lover of American liberty, of the sacred privileges granted under her benign Constitution, the AMERICAN SENTINEL must be an acceptable messenger of good-will. May it ever prove a faithful sentinel, and may its faithful warnings be heeded by every lover of his country.

J. H. W.

Basel, Switzerland.

As American citizens, we hold to the American doctrine that human government relates solely to external affairs, and does not reach, and is not intended to control, our spiritual relations. Civil government covers the relations of citizens to each other, and to the State. Divine government concerns our relations, both individually and collectively, to the Supreme Being, and does not come under the control of State enactments. The only office of civil government relating thereto is to "hold its hands off."—*Selected.*

A "Godless" School.

THE following ringing sentences are from the New York *Observer*, and although Father McTighe is said to have abandoned his attempt, at least for the present, this is a sound opinion upon the merits of the case:—

"Pittsburg presents the climax of Roman Catholic arrogance in destroying or capturing our public schools. Father McTighe, of St. Michael's Church, has actually succeeded in having himself appointed principal of the Thirty-third Ward public school in that city. This is the very consummation of unprincipled audacity. Having denounced the schools officially everywhere as 'immoral and godless,' a priest, sanctioned by his superiors, takes possession and pretends to administer an 'immoral, godless' school. Either he intends secretly to make it Romanist, or else he attempts to do precisely what Protestants wish, and therefore stultifies himself and his church as haters of our public schools. It is believed that he intends to keep what he and his church call a 'godless' school during the regular school hours, and then retain all those who will stay, for the purpose of giving them religious teaching in other hours. It is said that the nuns are to be employed as teachers. Such an illustration as this of the purpose and spirit of Romanists ought to rouse the nation. They ought to be taught a lesson now which will need no repetition. Our people will not tolerate this trifling with the very first principles of our polity, namely, that the State shall not in any way whatever engage in sectarian education, sectarian benevolence, or sectarian enterprises of any kind whatever. It is a disgrace to the civilization of any neighborhood, when it permits, for the sake of conciliating the enemies of the public schools, these gross violations of both the letter and spirit of our laws."

But if this "be the very consummation of unprincipled audacity," what shall be thought and said of the National Reform Association, which proposes to give the Catholic Church authority by law to do this same thing, or worse, in all places in the United States where the Catholics are in the majority? If this action of a single priest in Pittsburg ought to rouse the Nation, what ought the action of Herrick Johnson, Joseph Cook, and nearly a hundred other Protestant (?) preachers, under the lead of Secretary T. P. Stevenson, of the National Reform Association, in Saratoga last August, to do? That action was to adopt a motion requesting the National Reform Association to bring to the attention of "Roman Catholic authorities" a scheme of religious exercises, worship, and instruction, in the public schools throughout the Nation, "with a view of securing, if possible, a basis of agreement" between Catholics and Protestants, whereby the Catholic Bible, Catholic worship, and Catholic instruction, shall be established in the public schools, wherever the Catholics may be in the majority, provided the Catholics will help these Protestants to secure a like power for themselves wherever the Protestants may be in the majority.

In the Thirty-third Ward in Pittsburg the Catholics are in the majority; Father McTighe became principal, and his nuns teachers in the public school of that ward; had they remained they would have used the Catholic Bible, would have conducted Catholic wor-

ship, and would have given Catholic instruction in that school; that is precisely what the Saratoga National Reform meeting decided by vote to secure if possible throughout the Nation; this action of the Saratoga meeting was taken expressly to "satisfy the Roman Catholics" and to "conciliate them to our school system." By the action of the Pittsburg School Board Father McTighe, a "Roman Catholic authority," is satisfied and conciliated with the school system in that city; Father McTighe was doing in Pittsburg exactly what the Saratoga meeting decided to get, if possible, the Roman Catholic authorities to agree to do throughout the Nation; therefore, as this case "is a disgrace to the civilization" of the neighborhood of Pittsburg, the action of the National Reform Association is a disgrace to the civilization of the Nation and of the age.

The National Reform Association "ought to be taught a lesson now which will need no repetition." But, alas! "our people" do "tolerate," and without a word or murmur of protest, "this trifling with the very first principles of our polity," and "these gross violations of both the letter and spirit" of our American institutions. "How long, O Lord, how long?"

A. T. J.

An Examination of Principles.

(Concluded.)

3. WITH the statement that "the revealed will of God is of supreme authority in civil affairs," we also take direct issue. That the union of Church and State is a pernicious thing, is so generally conceded that National Reformers themselves are careful always to deny that their movement tends toward any such result; nevertheless the statement which we have just quoted contains the whole substance of Church and State union. For the Bible, not a part, simply, but the whole, is the revealed will of God, and is the whole of the revealed will of God; and it must be admitted that the Bible is a religious book. It was given to men for the sole purpose of teaching them the true religion. But religion and the true church are inseparable. There may be a church and not religion, but there cannot be religion and not the church. In a word, the revealed will of God is the true religion, and is the standard of the true church. Therefore, if that will should be recognized as of supreme authority in civil government, that government would be an ecclesiastical government; in other words, it would be a union of Church and State.

Men may assume to take the revealed will of God as of supreme authority in civil affairs, and to oblige all men to conform to it, but in reality such a thing is impossible. For to make all men conform to the will of God would be nothing less than to make them all perfect, not only in outward actions, but in thought. The will of God, which is the law of God, requires that men shall not be angry, that they shall not indulge in the least degree of hatred or envy, that they shall not be covetous; and it declares that the harboring of such evil thoughts is just the same as the commission of outbreaking sin. Now when

it is stated that any document is of authority in civil affairs, it is implied that the power to enforce the provisions of that document, and to punish those who violate it, rests with the men at the head of civil affairs. But there is no man, or set of men, who has the power to determine whether or not a man is covetous, or whether he is cherishing hatred or other evil in his heart; therefore we say that it is utterly impossible that the revealed will of God should be the authority in civil affairs. Civil government is for the purpose of keeping men civil, and not of making them moral. When it attempts to interfere in the matter of morals, it assumes prerogatives that belong to God alone.

We might cite another instance which shows that to take the revealed will of God as the supreme authority in civil affairs, would be to unite Church and State. The Bible, which teaches the revealed will of God, says that it is the duty of men to believe on Christ and to be baptized. Now if National Reform ideas should be adopted, the Government would not only have the right, but it would be under obligation, to require every citizen and everyone who desired to be a citizen, to be baptized. In other words, baptism would be the evidence of naturalization, just as it is the evidence of church membership, and so the Church and the State would be identical. But it needs no argument to show that such a state of affairs would simply make hypocrites of more than ninety-nine-one-hundredths of the people.

Again, the apostle Paul says: "In everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you." 1 Thess. 5: 18. It is manifestly the duty, as it is declared to be the will, of God, for everybody to give thanks for the blessings which they daily receive. Now if the revealed will of God is to be of supreme authority in civil affairs, then civil rulers must enforce that will, and compel every man in the nation to give thanks. Of course they could not compel people to give thanks privately, and that shows the folly of their claim, but they could force them to church to offer thanks nominally, or by proxy, just as people now celebrate Thanksgiving day. But such enforced thanksgiving would be mockery, and it is not the will of God that people should thank him with their lips, while their hearts are far from him.

4. The second paragraph of the preamble contains a bit of sophistry and an assumption which is entirely at variance with the golden rule. It assumes that because the people who came over in the *Mayflower*, for the National Reformers do not go back of that date, were professed Christians, and because the founders of the early colonies made church membership a test of citizenship, and subjected those who differed with them in belief to the same persecutions to which they had been subjected as dissenters from the ecclesiastical organization of the Old World, therefore this Government ought to be professedly a Christian Government. But when they make this argument, which is a standard plea with

them, we ask them, Who was here first? Long before the arrival of the *Mayflower*, or the voyage of Columbus, this country was inhabited by powerful tribes of Indians, all of whom were pagans. Therefore if the National Reform argument were good for anything it would prove that the religion of this country should be paganism. But the argument does not amount to anything.

Notice further that the assumption is that the people who first settle a country, or who are in the majority in any country, have the right to determine what religion shall be tolerated. The National Reform constitution assumes that Governments must recognize some religion, and that such State religion must of course be the religion of the majority, and that no other religion can be tolerated. According to their claim for this country, the established religion of China or India ought to be Buddhism, and that of Turkey ought to be Mohammedanism; and the rulers of those countries ought to say to the missionaries who go there from England and America: "If you do not like our institutions, and cannot conform to them, you can return to your own land; you must not think to bring your foreign customs here." If this were done, what a howl of indignation would be raised, and the National Reformers would be the very first ones to raise the cry of "persecution." We agree that it would be persecution, and unjust persecution, too; but, if the National Reform theory of majority rule be true, it is just what ought to be done. If such a course would be wrong in Turkey, how can it be right in the United States? To state the question differently, does an act which is wicked and unjust when done by a Mohammedan, become virtuous and just when done by a professed Christian?

National Reformers seem to be blind to the fact that if their scheme should prevail, and they should carry it out as they propose, making a profession of Christianity the basis of citizenship, and declaring indifference to Christ to be treason to the State, they would run directly counter to many things which they now profess to desire. For instance, they profess to be staunch friends to the native Indians, and to the Chinese who are here. They declaim loudly against the injustice that is done to both of these races, and yet if their ideas were carried out, both the Indians and the Chinese would be outlaws, and both would be subject to persecutions, by the side of which all that they have had to suffer would be considered pleasure.

5. Our Government has no Christian features. The Constitution of the United States expressly forbids any religious test of any kind being required as a qualification for office or citizenship. Thus the National Reform preamble is self-contradictory, in that it speaks of the Christian features of our institutions, and the Government's connection with the Christian religion, while at the same time it admits the fact that the Constitution, which is the basis of the Government, is utterly silent concerning Christianity, or any other religion.

Yet it is said that the object of this National Reform movement is "to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government." These Christian features are declared to be the reading of the Bible in our public schools, prayer in our National and State Legislatures, days of fasting and thanksgiving, etc. But the reading of the Bible in the public schools is not a feature of our Government, for there is no law requiring it; whenever it is done, it is a merely voluntary exercise. We will not here discuss the propriety of requiring the Bible to be read in the public schools, but simply call attention to the fact that it is not an existing feature of our Government, as the National Reformers claim.

The same may be said of prayer in our National and State Legislatures; there is nothing obligatory in the matter, and it is only a matter of form, as anyone can testify who has ever witnessed the opening of one of these assemblies. We believe in prayer; we believe that the divine injunction to "pray without ceasing" ought to be obeyed by all men, by members of Legislatures as well as ministers of the gospel; but we do not believe that anybody ought to be forced to pray, or to listen to prayers. And we can see no more reason for opening the State Legislatures with prayer than for merchants to open their stores with prayer. To be sure, it would be a very proper thing for the merchant to do; but he ought not to be forced to do it. But there is as yet no law requiring public prayer on any occasion, and so this is not an existing feature of our Government.

6. We affirm most positively that the object of the National Reform Association, as set forth in its constitution, is not merely erroneous, but is unchristian and directly opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Its object is to amend the Constitution of the United States so that it will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of "the moral laws of the Christian religion," whatever they may be. This means, in plain language, that the Constitution is to be so amended that the officers of this Government may compel everyone who desires to be a citizen to profess Christianity, and to disfranchise all others. If it does not mean this, it does not mean anything. We have the statement of National Reformers themselves that this is just what it does mean. But the Christian religion knows nothing of any such coercive measures as this. The gospel call is, "Whosoever will, let him come." The implied permission is that whosoever will not come may stay away. The ministers of Christ are simply ambassadors whose duty it is to entreat people to become reconciled to God, but who have no authority to compel any. Therefore we say that the day that sees the consummation of the National Reform designs will mark the blotting out of Christianity in this country, except among the few who will dare to dissent from such an iniquitous form of government. That national Christianity, so-called, is the enthronement of antichrist, is proved by the Dark Ages, which

followed immediately upon the professed conversion of Constantine, and the lifting of Christianity to the throne of the world.

We also view with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, and the immorality not only of those who are exalted to high places in the nation, but of the nation itself; but we know that politics cannot be purified nor immorality checked by legal enactment. There is only one remedy for immorality and corruption, and that is the gospel of Jesus Christ. By this alone can men be saved either from the guilt of sin or the love of it. We do not say that the preaching of the gospel will purify politics by making politicians and all others moral men; for the Bible nowhere holds forth the hope that all men will ever repent, and it expressly declares that the righteous will ever be few in number as compared with the wicked, and that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." See 2 Tim. 3:13; Matt. 7:13, 14; 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-30, etc. But we do say that whatever of purification is ever accomplished must be solely by the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Therefore we conclude, from the very constitution of the National Reform Association, that while a large majority of its advocates may honestly desire to see a reform brought about in this country, the means by which they propose to secure it are both impolitic and unscriptural, and such as would soon rid the country of what little morality it now possesses.

E. J. W.

A Sunday-Law Convention.

In the *Union Signal* of October 20, 1887, Mrs. Lydia B. Clark gives an article on the "Hopeful Outlook for Sabbath Observance," and says that in its Sunday-law work the W. C. T. U. has found "most cordial helpers" in the World's Prayer Union, the International Sabbath Association, and the National Reform Association. She reports certain legislative action that was taken last year in several States. Of the matter in California she says:—

"Two years ago in California the Sunday law was repealed, but the people last winter plied the Legislature with petitions to replace the repealed law with an improved statute, and in San Francisco a convention of ministers was called, a bill prepared and introduced in the Legislature demanding protection of the Sabbath."

Yes, that is so. And as such things are now quite widely prevalent, we propose to show to the people the way in which a typical Sunday-law convention works to secure the "demanded" legislation. This excellent lady has given us the text, and we shall supply the sermon. The *SENTINEL* was at the Convention named, and took copious notes of the proceedings, and has preserved the report for just such a time as this. This work has now become so general that it is highly important that the public in general and legislators in particular should know the methods employed to secure the enactment of "civil" and "protective" Sunday laws.

This San Francisco Convention, like most of such conventions, was composed almost wholly of preachers. The thing originated in the "Pastors' Union" of Sacramento, it being "the sense of the Pastors' Union of Sacramento that a meeting of the pastors and members of the churches of the State, and of all other friends of Sunday legislation in the State, should be called . . . to secure the passage of a Sunday law," etc. This "sense" was approved by "the preachers of the Methodist Church" and the Convention was called, and met accordingly in the Young Men's Christian Association building, November 29, 1886.

The first and perhaps the most notable thing about the Convention that would be noticed by a looker-on was the perfect confusion of ideas as to what was really wanted. It is true that there was perfect unanimity on the point that there should be a law demanded of the Legislature, but that was the only single thing upon which there was any real agreement.

With some, nothing but a *Sunday* law would do; with others, nothing but a *Sabbath* law would answer. With some, it must be a *civil* Sabbath law; with others, a *religious* Sabbath law. With some, it must be a *civil Sunday* law; with others, a *religious* Sunday law. With some, it was a *Christian Sunday* that was wanted; with others, a *Christian Sabbath*. With some it was a *religious* Sabbath law that was wanted, and a religious Sabbath law that must be had, and they were ready to go to the Legislature upon that basis; but these were very few. While with others, and these the great majority, it was a *religious* Sunday law or a religious Sabbath law that was wanted, but at the same time it was *naively* argued that to go to the Legislature with such a request would be all in vain, for the Legislature would not act upon any question of a *religious* nature; therefore, to get what they wanted, they must ask only for a *civil* Sunday law.

It was upon this last point that the discussion and the action of the Convention culminated. And by this action there was irresistibly forced upon the mind of an observer a strong impression of the insincerity of the great majority of the members of this Sunday-law Convention. The course of the discussion and this culminating action show that the majority of the members of that Convention were willing to cover up the real purpose which they had in view, and deliberately to go to the Legislature of California under a false pretense. They show that while a religious law, and nothing else, is what they wanted, yet, as to openly ask the Legislature for that would be fruitless, they proposed to obtain what they wanted—a *religious* Sunday law—by getting the Legislature to pass a *civil* Sunday law. That is, they would have the Legislature to pass a civil Sunday law, and then they would enforce it as a religious Sunday law. In other words, they proposed to hoodwink the Legislature of California. They didn't succeed.

Another evidence of this insincerity was the ringing of the now familiar changes upon the "workingman." One had very great

sympathy for the "toiling multitudes." Another was the "friend of the workingman," and "if any people are the friends of the workingman, they are the ministers." And yet not one of them was there as the representative of the workingman, nor was it the needs of the workingman upon which the call of the Convention was based. When that which gave rise to the calling of the Convention was officially stated, it was that "the Christian people of Sacramento had been disturbed in their worship, and their religious feelings had been outraged by the disregard of the Sabbath; the matter had come before the Pastors' Conference; a correspondence opened with divines throughout the State on the subject of a Sunday law; and accordingly the present Convention had been called." And one of the principal speakers in the Convention, in the speech that was the most applauded of any made in the Convention, said plainly that the movement was a religious one and that he was decidedly opposed to divorcing it from a Christian standpoint.

It was that "the Christian people" had been disturbed in their "worship," and not that the workingmen had been deprived of their rest; it was that the "religious feelings" of "the Christian people" had been outraged, and not that the workingman had been oppressed, nor that his feelings had been outraged; it was with the "divines," and not with the workingmen throughout the State that a correspondence had been opened; it was these considerations and not the needs of the workingman that formed the basis of the call for the Convention. And yet in the face of these definite statements, some of these "divines" would get up in the Convention, and fish for the favor and try to catch the ear of the workingman, by trying to make it appear that they came there as "the friends of the workingman."

And, too, just think of a lot of "divines" called in general convention to secure the enactment of a Sunday law to protect the "worship" and the "religious feelings" of "Christian people;" and then to fulfill the purpose, and to attain to the object of that call, they, in convention assembled, unanimously decide to go up to the Legislature and demurely ask for a law *entirely civil!* And why is this? Why could they not go to the Legislature in the name of that purpose for which they were called? Oh, that would never do! For if the word "civil" be stricken out, "you cannot reach the Legislature." Therefore just put in the word "civil" and the purpose of the Convention will be accomplished, for we will get all we want and the Legislature will not know it." But the Legislature of California was not so exceedingly verdant as to be unable to see through that piece of wire-work, so deftly woven by these worthy divines.

The demand of these "Christian people" for a Sunday law, because their worship was disturbed, is just as hollow a pretense as is any other part of their scheme. For if their worship was really disturbed, they have already a sufficient resource. For the protection of religious worship from disturbance, the

statutes of California make provision that ought to satisfy any ordinary mortal. Section 302 of the Penal Code of California reads as follows:—

"Every person who willfully *disturbs* or disquiets any assemblage of people met for *religious worship*, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or *by any unnecessary noise* either within the place where such meeting is held, or *so near as to disturb* the order and solemnity of the meeting, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

And such misdemeanor is punishable by "imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding six months, or by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or both."—*Id.*, sec. 19.

Are not six months in jail and a fine of five hundred dollars a sufficient punishment for the disturbance of worship? Or is this penalty so insignificant that these "divines" and "Christian people" disdain to inflict so light a punishment and therefore demand a Sunday law to make the punishment heavier? But if the present penalty is insufficient to properly punish those who disturb their worship, then what *will* satisfy these "divines"? Where the State chastises with whips, do they want to chastise with scorpions? Do they want to imprison a man for *life* and mulct him of *all* his property for disturbing (?) their worship by working on Sunday on his farm, in his shop or garden, far away from any place of worship? We firmly believe that if the truth were told it would appear that it is not their *worship* at all but their *doctrine* that has been disturbed.

Just a word more on their pretended friendship for the workingman. We freely hazard the opinion that if they should obtain the "civil" Sunday law which they seek, then the poor workingman, who, to support his needy family, should work on Sunday, will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. We venture this opinion because of facts of which we know. In Tennessee there were at that time lying in prison, honest, hard-working men, whose families were dependent upon their daily labor, and these men were in that prison for working on Sunday to obtain the necessary means to support their families, and while they were in prison their families were in want, and had to be supported by the charity of Christian friends. *That* is the kind of friendship for the workingman that is shown in the enactment of these "civil" Sunday laws. And if the people of California, or in any other State, want to see the same thing repeated in their State, or in the Nation, then just let them allow these "divines" to secure the enactment of the "civil" Sunday law that they want. Then may be seen exemplified everywhere this solicitous friendship for the workingmen.

One of the leading members of the Convention remarked that he had "been in politics long enough to know that legislators keep their finger on the public pulse, and that they generally give what the people want." From our observations in the Convention, of the speeches, and of its workings, we are prepared to give it as our private opinion, publicly expressed, that the most of the members of the

Convention have been in politics long enough to know a good deal about the ways and means by which politicians too often compass their ends.

A. T. J.

Religious Teaching in Secular Schools.

THAT children should be taught religion, which with us means the essential doctrines of Christianity, is a proposition advocated as strenuously by all classes of Protestants as it can be by the Romanists. The real question is, How can this best be done? Our minds should not be diverted from this main point. Rome claims that this religious education should be not only co-ordinate with the secular, but intermingled with it in the instruction of each day, and should form a part of the school curriculum, and must be under the supervision and control of her priests. In other words, that the State must provide for instruction in the tenets of each denomination. She must do what she never has done—recognize denominational distinctions in her public policy.

Certainly, when so radical a change is demanded, very substantial and convincing reasons should be presented. It is not enough to appeal to denominational preferences or prejudices. It should be shown most clearly that such a method of combining the secular and religious in the same school, is the completest way of imparting religious truth. And to persuade of this, we require more than philosophical argument. Facts should be adduced. We should inquire whether such a system has been tried, and what have been the results. I propose to show that the experiment has been made under circumstances more favorable to success than we can inaugurate in this country, and that the result is such as by no means to encourage us. The idea which Rome advances has been worked out in Prussia on a Protestant basis. And the statements I make are culled from a paper read before the Western College Association at Grinnell, Iowa, December 27, 1882, by Prof. Hugh M. Scott, of the Chicago Theological Seminary. This is a paper which has not attracted the attention its importance deserves.

1. Let me present the *principle*. The fundamental idea, as in every German school system, is that the nation is Christian in instincts, history, and aims, and therefore no plan of instruction is complete which does not include the thorough teaching of Christian doctrine and morals. Von Muhler, the Minister of Public Instruction, said in 1870: "An attempt to dissolve the intimate union between culture and religion, between school and church—a union of more than a thousand years' growth—would be an impossibility." This was proposed in 1848, but dropped because of opposition throughout the country. The Constitution, he says, "determines that religious instruction shall not be given apart from the schools, but in the schools; and that the churches and religious societies shall have a leading influence in giving such instruction. It desires to have confessional (denominational) distinctions regarded as far as possible

in the schools. . . . We regard religious instruction as an integral part of the sum total of school instruction. . . . The training of teachers is not to be separated from connection with the church and religious culture."

A Government circular announces: "It is the aim of the religious instruction in schools, in connection with the catechumen and confirmation teaching, to help lead the youth to a living knowledge of their belonging to the kingdom of God on earth, and to evangelical church fellowship in it." This is their theory of public schools, and this defines accurately the position of the Romish church in our country.

2. Let me now sketch the *plan* by which this principle is carried into operation. Prussian educational institutions are divided into three classes—the common school, the high school, and the university. In the first, elementary religious instruction is given by the ordinary teachers, preparatory to and in harmony with the more advanced curriculum of the high school. In the *high schools*, the Prussian system of teaching religion finds its most important field, and to those we shall restrict ourselves. Omitting much that would be very interesting as to the general methods of these schools, of which there are four grades, space requires that we be restricted to the plan of *religious* instruction. Religion is regarded as one of the regular studies of the course, and occupies the place of honor at the top of the list. All teachers must pass an examination in religious knowledge. Teachers in the highest classes must stand an examination in the contents of the Bible, the fundamental doctrines of faith and morals, church history, New Testament Greek, and Hebrew. But these qualifications are acquired less seldom than formerly, so that in many cases the local clergy must undertake the religious instruction by single hours in school.

In the lowest class, Bible narratives from the Old Testament to the times of the kings are taught from a book of Bible stories. The first part of the catechism, with Luther's explanations, is learned by heart, the second and third parts being committed to memory without the explanation. A certain selection of texts and hymns is given to be memorized.

In the next class the New Testament narrative is to be learned in the same way, and the general division and order of the books of Scripture, catechism, and hymns are reviewed.

In the next higher class prominent portions of the Old and New Testaments are read and studied in their connection, also the geography of Palestine. Catechism is reviewed, and the third part learned with Luther's explanations, and proof-texts. The fourth and fifth parts are committed to memory. Hymns are reviewed and new ones learned. As occasion offers, the meaning of church usages is to be taught.

In the yet higher class a more advanced course in biblical instruction is imparted. In addition to a review of hymns and texts already acquired, apostolic and church history

is begun. In the next class higher these studies are continued, and the history of dogma is entered upon.

The highest class takes up the exegetical study of the Gospel of John, and the epistles to Romans, Galatians, Hebrews, and parts of 1 Corinthians. The fundamental doctrines of faith and morals in their connection are taught, also an outline of creeds.

The teaching in all these classes is accompanied by proper devotional exercises, at least in form. These consist of singing, reading the Scriptures, and prayer. This is held every morning with the whole school. Each hour's work in the forenoon is to be begun with prayer. The school closes on Saturday at noon, usually with devotional exercises, including a short address by the principal. Teachers are directed to induce their pupils to attend public worship in church; also at the proper time to turn their thoughts toward the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. A similar course is followed in the Roman Catholic religious teaching, with such modifications as their doctrines would require.

We have now an outline of the religious instruction in the Prussian school system. Thus the State maintains the compulsory *religious*, as well as secular, education of every child. It must be admitted that this scheme is well-nigh perfect. One more comprehensive and thorough cannot easily be devised. It seems to meet every requirement of a complete religious education. It should lead into the fellowship of the church, as it is designed to do. Fully complied with, it would fit the apt scholar almost to enter the ministry. And now we may well inquire—

3. What has been the *result*? This system has been in operation nearly one hundred years, and during all this period religion has declined, so that the skepticism and rationalism of Germany have become proverbial. In 1838, students of theology left the gymnasias so ignorant of the Scriptures that they could be put to shame by children. Teachers came in who regarded religion as only a moral department of the State; in whose tuition, as Christlieb declares, "Heathen classics and natural science are exalted, the Christian belief constantly pulled down, or even ridiculed in the eyes of the pupils." "In most of our high schools the religious instruction is given so badly that this is one of the chief causes of our common rationalism, and the infidelity and religious indifference amongst our educated classes." So writes the same high authority.

This system, so admirably arranged, has failed to keep Prussia Christian except in name. It produced a formalism which made everyone a member of the church, but at the expense of vital piety. This system superseded the necessity of Sabbath-schools, because the children were supposed to be taught the same religious truths which are inculcated in the Sabbath-school system. Yet, as a fact, this end was not secured, so that the evangelical portion of Germany feel the need of the Sabbath-school, and are establishing them in all parts of the empire. The wisest and most

devout clearly understand that their elaborate course of religious instruction in the public schools cannot be relied upon to make the children truly Christian.

England and America, on the other hand, have maintained and perfected the Sabbath-school system during the same period. And what have we to show as results? A most marked improvement in public morals, and a great advance in all forms of religious activity. Space will not permit me to present the proofs of this. They can be abundantly furnished. Let those who doubt this read the chapter on the "Social Condition of Great Britain," in Mackenzie's "Nineteenth Century," or Dorchester's "Problem of Religious Progress." In our own land churches have kept pace with the marvelous growth of population, and untiring efforts are made to elevate the masses. The multiplicity of denominations presents an insuperable obstacle to the State in any endeavor to teach that amount of religion which each denomination desires for its own children. Those specific doctrines must be left to the family and the Sabbath-school. If they are not inculcated there, they cannot be imparted satisfactorily in any other mode. This plan has been so successful in our own land that we have no reason to venture on some other scheme. Much less can we adopt the method advocated by Rome, which has produced such undesirable results in Germany.—*Rev. Geo. S. Mott, D. D., in New York Observer.*

"A Pen-Picture."

In the *Interior* of October 20 there is a racy report of the State Convention of the Ohio W. C. T. U. It is entitled "A Pen-Picture of the Ohio W. C. T. U. Convention." We have no doubt that that is what it is, and a well-drawn picture too, for some of the scenes are decidedly realistic—much more so in fact than we should have thought becoming in a woman's temperance convention, to say nothing of a woman's *Christian* temperance convention. In one of the scenes Miss Willard very properly paid a glowing tribute to the influence of Mrs. Hayes, Miss Rose Elizabeth Cleveland, and the present Mrs. Cleveland, in the White House. She closed with the words, "God bless Frances Folsom Cleveland," to which sentiment the applause was very properly immense. But to this sentiment one of the members of the Convention promptly took decided exception, at which the reporter, herself a member of the Union, expresses herself after this gentle, womanly, Christian style: "Out upon such littleness! Such a spirit shows a venom unworthy a civilized woman. Perhaps she was in the gall of bitterness because her husband had been turned out of office; if so we must try to excuse her."

Another, called in the report a "lively scene," ensued when the Committee on Finance reported in favor of paying salaries to the leading officers, and in favor of the President's visiting all the county and district meetings "at the expense of the Convention." Against this there was strong opposition, and

the report says: "Mrs. Foote led the opposition forces, and showed herself a fearless soldier, full of fire and spirit. In fact, she got mad, . . . and for a few minutes it seemed quite like a masculine assemblage." Yes, we have no doubt that it did. Women, fearless and soldierly, full of fire and spirit, and mad, at that, are not apt to appear very feminine-like.

But says the excellent reporter: "Now some people might think this little fray not a very proper thing, but I don't see why. It shows they are not afraid to do their own thinking, and although they are excellent women, they are very much like the excellent men—some-what human." Yes, that is just the trouble. It shows they are rather too much like the, not very, excellent men. And the observation which we would here make upon it is this: One of the principal reasons upon which these excellent women base their claim of the franchise and political equality with the men is that politics will be purified and all its methods elevated. But if this is the way in which the *Christian* women of the country act in a convention exclusively their own, and wholly separated from political strife, what would be the result in mixed assemblages, where not only these, but un-Christian and anti-Christian women as well, should have free scope for their activities equally with the men, and all together stirred with all the elements of political strife?

Hitherto we have been somewhat unsettled in our opinion in regard to woman suffrage, but now—well, we don't know.

This report was written by Virginia Sharpe Patterson. A. T. J.

Entirely Too Familiar.

The *Christian Advocate* says:—

"An ill-constructed school-house in New York City collapses before its completion, burying its builders in its ruins and causing much of death and suffering. The Roman Catholic priest for whose parochial uses it was being erected is among the victims. Blame is laid on the 'building inspector,' by whose connivance or oversight illegal expedients were resorted to, which brought about this terrible accident. What is his defense? Simply this: He knew the priest had sufficient political influence to obtain a permit for any constructive irregularities he might choose to indulge in. Whether this be true or not is of less importance than the appalling fact—which none will deny—that such a charge may be brought against a priest without astonishing anyone. Roman Catholics justify the employment of all forces—moral and immoral—for the advancement of 'the church;' and Protestants are so familiar with the intermeddling of Rome with politics that they are no longer shocked by them."

Yes, Protestants are becoming entirely too familiar with the intermeddling of Rome with politics. In California one of the foremost preachers of the Methodist Church on the Pacific Coast—C. C. Stratton, D. D.—goes on a mission to Archbishop Riordon, to gain the co-operation of the Catholic Church in a matter entirely political. In New York City the leading Protestant divines organize for political work, and propose to ask Archbishop

Corrigan to serve on the committee which they appoint, to make their move politically effective. In the same State the fashionable watering-place preachers gathered at Saratoga, get together in a meeting and pass a motion commissioning the National Reform Association to secure if possible a basis of agreement with the Roman Catholic authorities, by which the public schools of the nation shall be given into the control of the Roman Church wherever the Catholics are in the majority.

Yes, indeed, Protestants are becoming decidedly familiar with the intermeddling of Rome with politics. As greedy as these Protestant leaders are of political power, it is evident that they will be apt pupils, and under the tutorship of Archbishop Riordon, Archbishop Corrigan, Cardinal Gibbons, and the "Roman Catholic authorities" generally, we may rest perfectly assured that this familiarity will be rapidly and vastly increased. Nor does this familiarity at all seem to breed contempt on the part of these Protestant preacher-politicians; it seems rather to increase their admiration for the "well-favored harlot."

Not the Church's Business.

SOME time ago a prohibition paper quoted a lot of statistics concerning the last presidential election, and made the following comment and calculation:—

"There are in the United States 15,210,141 church members. The vote for President in 1884 was . . . St. John, 151,809, or about 10 to 1,000 church membership. Had the church been united on the question of prohibition it might have polled instead . . . about 3,042,028 votes."

To this the *Interior*, in its issue of March 24, 1887, responded as follows:—

"This is very pretty arithmetic, no doubt, but it offers no help to prohibition. When telegraph wires can carry merchants' circulars with samples of goods inclosed, then may 'the church' be expected to bear the burdens of statesmanship. 'The church' is so handy—for tired people to growl at. Every energetic soul with a scheme for the public good on hand, wants 'the church' to load up with his particular cargo. The church wasn't made for this sort of business. As well might the victim of pneumonia ask his heart to pull him through by doing his breathing for him, or the bankers in time of panic whine because the public-school system does not go to work to restore public confidence. A pretty mess these well-meaning but inconsiderate reformers would make of it—mixing up the nation's brains and bowels in this fashion! 'The church' has one business in relation to the commonwealth, and one only—to produce a high type of manhood. Statesmanship belongs to an entirely different department of public effort. We sympathize deeply with the temperance cause, and we spare no pains to advocate prohibition; but we are bound to say that a census of church members' votes in any particular issue is a piece of intolerable impertinence; and it will be a cold day both for the church and for prohibition when the church can be counted as solid for any prohibition candidate or party organization. We propose to reach the prohibition goal, but we are not going to do it by fetching our heels and head together and

turning ourselves into a rolling hoop for demagogues to drive with their little sticks."

We like the style of the *Interior's* remarks. They are refreshing, and will do to refer to at some future time. Nevertheless we are morally certain that the *Interior* will ere long perform the very gymnastic feat which it now scouts. A little time will work great changes.

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 CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS RIGHTS.

It Will ever Be Uncompromisingly Opposed to Anything Tending Toward a

UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE,

Either in Name or in Fact.

It will discuss subjects of the deepest interest to all American citizens, and every position taken will be fortified by sound argument.

Terms: Fifty cents per year, post-paid; sample copies free.

If you will send us the names of two new subscribers at fifty cents each, we will send you the paper one year free, or in club^s of five or more copies we will send the papers at the rate of thirty cents each per year.

We will send the AMERICAN SENTINEL one year, and any book mentioned below, post-paid, for the price named opposite the book. Or they can be obtained from any State T. and M. Society.

- "Practical Manual of Hygiene and Temperance," - - - \$1 00
 - "Revised Version of the New Testament," - - - 1 00
 - "The Life of Christ" (800 pp.), by C. Geikie, D. D., - - 1 00
 - "The United States in Prophecy," - - - - - 1 00
 - "The Coming Conflict in this Country," - - - - - 1 00
 - "The Constitutional Amendment, the Sunday Law and the Sabbath Question," - - - - - 1 25
 - "The Atonement in the Light of Nature and the Revelation," by J. H. Waggoner, - - - - - 1 25
 - "Our Country—the Marvel of Nations," its Past, Present, and Future, by Uriah Smith, - - - - - 1 35
 - The *Pacific Health Journal*, a 32-page monthly magazine of Hygiene and Temperance, one year, - - - - 1 35
 - "The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan," over 20 full-page illustrations, popular edition, - - 1 75
- Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, 1059 Castro St., Oakland, Cal.

HEALDSBURG COLLEGE,

HEALDSBURG, CAL.

A MODEL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION, ESTABLISHED IN 1882.

FIVE YEARS OF GREAT PROSPERITY BECAUSE FOUNDED ON SOUND PRINCIPLES. LABOR COMBINED WITH STUDY.

Four courses of instruction, classical, scientific, biblical, and normal; also preparatory instruction given in a primary and a grammar course.

Instruction thorough and practical, not only in the collegiate courses but especially so in the preparatory courses.

Discipline rigid, yet parental, combined with strong moral and religious influences.

Expenses moderate. The whole cost to the student for tuition, board, lodging, lights, washing,—all expenses except for books and clothes, from \$16 to \$22 per month of four weeks.

Spring term begins January 3, 1888. For descriptive catalogue and further information address the principal,

W. C. GRAINGER, Healdsburg, Cal.

VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM.

PACKAGE NO. 1, 184 PAGES, 20 CENTS.

This package contains thirteen tracts treating upon the various phases of the National Reform movement, as follows:—

- | NO. | PAGES. |
|---|--------|
| 1. Religious Legislation,..... | 8 |
| 2. Religious Liberty,..... | 8 |
| 3. National Reform and the Rights of Conscience,..... | 16 |
| 4. The American Papacy,..... | 16 |
| 5. Bold and Base Avowal,..... | 16 |
| 6. National Reform is Church and State,..... | 16 |
| 7. Purity of National Religion,..... | 8 |
| 8. The Salem Witchcraft,..... | 8 |
| 9. What Think Ye of Christ?..... | 8 |
| 10. National Reformed Constitution and the American Hierarchy,..... | 24 |
| 11. The Republic of Israel,..... | 8 |
| 12. National Reformed Presbyterianism,..... | 32 |
| 13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity,..... | 16 |

The above package will be sent post-paid to any address for twenty cents.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1888.

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.

THERE is no question that is growing faster in the United States to-day than is the Sunday question. It is coming nearer and nearer to the point where it will be an essential factor in the political field. And the *Christian Nation* announces the intention of it all, thus:—

“Let those who will remember the Sabbath to keep it holy from motives of love and obedience; the remnant must be made to do so through fear of law. We have no option.”—*Christian Nation*, September 28, 1887.

This is the National Reform version of the fourth commandment.

A GOOD many people imagine that they love law and order, when they do not. It is a fact that many, indeed the great majority of men, are perfectly indifferent as to whether or not the laws are enforced, so long as they themselves do not suffer by their violation. Laws are enforced in this country principally from selfish motives, and not from a love of justice. There is not an abhorrence of evil because it is evil. Men will make an outcry against a crime which involves their interest, and will excuse the same if they are in no way concerned.

ON Sunday, October 23, the corner-stone of a Catholic college was laid in Oakland. After the ceremony, Rev. Joseph Sasia, of the Jesuit college in San Francisco, delivered a sermon on education, in which, as a matter of course, he referred to the fact that Catholic schools and churches are taxed, and that the Government does not give Catholic schools a share of the public money, and then said: “We earnestly believe that, by the blessing of Providence, our grievances will be redressed, and our just claims shall justly prevail.” If the obsequiousness with which the Catholic Church is treated by the press, both political and religious, is any just indication, we may well believe that the priest will not have to wait long to see his desire fulfilled.

IN this number of the SENTINEL we have shown how the representative California preachers proposed to secure from the Legislature the passage of a “civil” Sunday law. We confess that it does not present them in a very enviable light, but we can’t help that, it is a simple statement of the facts in the case. Yet these men are no worse than the representative ministers in any other State in the Union. We have, for instance, the minutes of the Preachers’ Convention, held for the same purpose precisely, in Elgin, Ill., last November, and they reach their point in the same way. The thing is fast becoming universal,

and the methods are all of a piece. The trouble is that in this they are all working for legislation upon a matter that is wholly religious, and which every argument that they make proves to be wholly religious, while they try to cover it all up with the word “civil;” but the covering is too narrow for them to wrap themselves in it.

THE National Reformers indignantly deny the charge that they are laboring for a union of Church and State, but insist that what they want is a union of Religion and the State. The Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D., General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, and author of the well-known book, “Our Country,” has expressed himself to the same effect. He, with the National Reformers, wants not Church and State, but Religion and State. Says Dr. Strong, “I distinguish, as some apparently do not, between *Church and Religion*.”

Now we think we know enough about mathematics to work out so simple a problem as is here presented. The three terms are these, the State, the Church, and Religion. They say that they design to keep Church and State forever separate and distinct, but that Religion and State must be closely united. The result of our calculation is that if they succeed in their design they will necessarily have to divorce the Church and Religion. If this solution is not correct, we should be glad if someone would point out the defect in our calculation. We verily believe that when the National Reformers, and their many friends who do not go by that name, shall have accomplished their purpose, no one of acute perception will have any difficulty in distinguishing between Church and Religion. There may be a *form* of Religion but the power will have fled forever.

What Does it Mean?

WHAT means this almost universal uprising over the question of “How shall our American Christian civil Sunday sabbath be preserved?” Large Conventions of ecclesiastics are held solely to discuss this question. The W. C. T. U. works it up all over the United States. Prohibition Conventions put it in their platforms. The leading preachers and lecturers of the Nation discuss it from pulpit and platform. Legislatures, both State and National, from beginning to end of their sessions, are petitioned for the enactment of stringent laws in its behalf. The religious papers of the country lift up one united cry that it must and shall be preserved. Knights of Labor, and workingmen’s unions, and socialists, call loudly for laws enforcing its observance. Political Conventions are “worked” and Legislatures are “lobbied” in the interests of the Christian Sunday. Saloon-keepers enforce laws for its observance. Only a few years ago there was no sign of any such thing, and even those who now make the most of it, then insisted that it was one of the least of the questions that concerned religion. But now, instead of its being the least and most incidental of the questions of religion, it is by

their own confession the greatest and most urgent of all. Now, instead of the question of how to reach the masses with the gospel being the greater, that question must take a back seat, while there comes to the front the universal demand for stringent Sunday laws strictly enforced, that *by this means* the masses may be reached. Now instead of the questions of infidelity and atheism taking the far greater precedence, it has come to this, that if you don’t favor Sunday laws you are an infidel, and if you oppose them you are an atheist. Now, instead of the questions of infidelity and atheism taking precedence, it has come to pass that the question of the Sunday sabbath is made the test of fidelity and theism. Yet in “demanding” laws to compel everybody to observe the day, and submit to the test, they will gravely argue that the movement is entirely civil, and that there is nothing religious about it.

What, then, does all this mean? *It means that, through this question of compulsory Sunday observance, the civil power is to be subordinated to the ecclesiastical in these United States.* We know that this statement will be pooh-poohed by many, and especially by those who are working for it, but in making the statement we but speak forth the words of truth and soberness. This is precisely the way in which the civil power was subordinated to the religious, in the fourth century, out of which came the tyranny of the Papacy; and both time and events will shortly demonstrate that we state the exact truth. Therefore, without hesitation, we lift up our voice against the whole scheme. To laugh at the fears of the SENTINEL will not avert the evil. To despise its warnings is only to rivet your own chains. In perfect sincerity the AMERICAN SENTINEL adopts the memorable words, “I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—and *I will be heard.*”

Sample Copies.

WE send this number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to many who are not subscribers. Please read the paper carefully, and then send us your subscription for 1888. We are certain that you will find it worthy of your patronage.

If you will send us two *new* subscribers at 50 cents each, we will send *you* the SENTINEL one year *free*.

THE duty of the State is to protect its citizens, to preserve order, and to *dispense justice*. The duty of the church is to teach religion and to *dispense charity*. Charity, divorced from religion, provided for by public taxation, and dispensed by the State, loses its essential quality. It then becomes a certain and secure provision which society makes for its unfortunate and pauper classes.—*Selected.*

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.

Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, - - - 50c.
In clubs of five or more copies, per year, each, - - - 30c.

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

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