

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 3.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY, 1888.

NUMBER 7.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
OAKLAND, CAL.

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

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS.

J. H. WAGGONER, E. W. FARNSWORTH, DAN T. JONES.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

A Sensible Letter.

In a recent letter from a town in Northern California ordering the SENTINEL for a public reading-room, the writer, evidently a gentleman of intelligence, takes the occasion to thus express himself in reference to our work:—

"I think your arguments are unanswerable, and the position you take in reference to the union of Church and State is the only safe one. It is for the best interests of all the people, and of all religious denominations as well.

"There is no doubt in my mind that some of the leaders of the W. C. T. U. favor the designs of the National Reformers, but the great majority of the members do not understand the matter at all. I am a Prohibitionist, and I am satisfied that the National Reform Association would like to use the Prohibition party in the furtherance of their designs; but I am fully convinced that there are very few Prohibitionists that are aware of the fact.

"I am decidedly opposed to the Prohibition party's adopting a Sunday-law plank; (1) because it can do no good religiously, and (2) because it is a great mistake politically. The Prohibition party was organized to close the saloons seven days in the week, and on this Prohibitionists are agreed, but on the Sunday-law question they are not agreed, nor can they be. The adoption of that as a party measure would, in my judgment, divide the party and render success impossible.

"I wish that the SENTINEL could be placed in the hands of Prohibitionists everywhere; and especially that it could be read by the editors of all Prohibition papers."

Our correspondent has expressed the thing exactly. The National Reform Association intends to make use of the Prohibition party, but Prohibitionists are not generally aware of that fact. In this very ignorance lies the danger. We propose to show them the danger, so that those who are really desirous of reform may not be used to further a movement which will have the semblance of all reforms, and lack the substance of any.

The Entering Wedge.

THROUGH the courtesy of the introducer, Senator Blair, we have copies of a bill and a resolution which have recently been introduced into the United States Senate, which will interest the readers of the SENTINEL, and should arouse the attention of every person in the country. We think it of the utmost importance that these be thoroughly studied, and so we print them in full. The first which we present is a "Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools." The Resolution is dated May 25, and has been read twice, and ordered to lie on the table. It reads thus:—

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:—

ARTICLE.

SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

SEC. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.

We find no fault with this Resolution save

in one particular, and that is the provision that free public schools, established and maintained by the State, shall be established and maintained "for the education of all the children living therein . . . in the principles of the Christian religion." We have no idea that the amendment proposed will ever be adopted, for it too strongly maintains the necessity of the public schools being free from denominational control, and of the denominational school being deprived of State patronage, to suit the Catholics, and no political measure which the Catholics oppose can carry in this country. But while this is so, there is great danger that by means of the introduction of such resolutions, our legislators will become so familiarized with the idea of religious legislation that it will not appear to be the unrighteous thing that it is.

It is as Christians as well as American citizens, that we stand opposed to any proposition for the State to maintain public schools wherein children shall be taught "the principles of the Christian religion." We think that it calls for opposition from Christians more strongly than from any other people. We have so often set forth the principles which condemn such legislation, and those principles are so simple, that it should be unnecessary to repeat them; but often things that are simple are overlooked because of their very simplicity, so we note the following points which should be applied by every citizen, not only to this resolution, but to every one of a similar nature:—

The resolution is directly opposed to the first amendment to the Constitution, which says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof." If it be said that the resolution does not mention an establishment of religion, we reply that for the State to teach Christianity would be most emphatically to effect an establishment of religion; for Christianity is nothing if it is not religion. If it is not religion, what is it? The plain intent of that amendment is that Congress shall do nothing whatever that will tend to influence any man's religious belief or practice, whether he be Christian, Jew, pagan, or infidel. In short, it was designed to set forth the truth that with religion the State has nothing whatever to do.

What are the principles of the Christian religion? Some will reply that they are the principles of common morality; that the design in requiring the principles of the Christian religion to be taught in the public schools, is to have the rising generation im-

bued with the principles of honesty, kindness, and courtesy. But this is not the case; the very language of the resolution shows this. It requires that the children shall be instructed "in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion." It will be seen that the fact is recognized that the principles of the Christian religion are something distinct from the principles of common virtue and morality.

The Christian religion is the gospel of Jesus Christ. The gospel of Jesus Christ is, as the apostle Paul says, "the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." In other words, it is the remedy which God has devised to save men from the guilt, the love, and the consequences of sin, and it accomplishes this salvation only for those who exercise personal faith in Christ. Now the very statement that the gospel is a *remedy*, is an acknowledgment that something existed before it did, which called for a remedy. That something was sin. But sin is immorality, the violation of God's moral law. Therefore it is as clear as noonday, that the principles of virtue and morality are older than the Christian religion. If those principles had from the beginning been strictly followed, the Christian religion would never have been introduced, because there would have been no sin from which to save men. Those principles are to a greater or less extent known and inculcated in all nations, and by all systems of religion. They are a part of the legacy which all men have inherited from their common parent, Adam.

That children should always and everywhere be impressed with the importance of honesty, truthfulness, courtesy, and kindness to one another, there is no one who will deny. No one will question the right and the duty of the public schools to teach these principles. This it may do and not teach religion, although these are necessary to religion. But to teach "the principles of the Christian religion," in the public schools, means that just such instruction should be given in those schools as is given in the Sabbath-schools of the land. It means that the children should be instructed in the nature of the sacrifice of Christ, which is so simple that any child may understand it, and should be taught the necessity of personal faith in him, and should also be instructed in regard to those ordinances which Christ instituted as media for the manifestation of faith, namely, Christian baptism and the Lord's Supper. This, and this alone, is instruction in the principles of the Christian religion.

Well, isn't it right that children should be so instructed? We say, Yes; it is right, and most necessary; but *not in the public schools*. Personally we earnestly wish that every child in the land could be brought directly under the influence of Christian teaching, but we would have it done in a way befitting Christianity. The gospel knows nothing of force. Christ never forced himself upon anybody. When the Gadarenes besought him to depart out of their coasts, he went immediately. Why? Was it because he was not as intensely interested in them as in the inhab-

itants of Galilee? Not at all; but because he recognized their right to reject him and his teachings if they chose. When he sent out his disciples, he gave them instruction to the same effect. If any should refuse to receive them, they were to leave them, and allow the day of Judgment to settle with them for their willful rejection of the gospel. We repeat, The gospel knows nothing of force; its cry is, "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." The privilege of every man to freely accept the provisions of God's grace, implies the equal privilege of every man to reject them. Religion that is not voluntary is of no value.

But when religion is taught in the public schools, it ceases to be a voluntary thing. The State then uses its power to force the gospel upon people. It gathers all the children into the schools, and then preaches the gospel to them. But under such circumstances it is not the gospel that is received; it is only a semblance of the gospel. Nothing is pure gospel except that which is truly Christ-like, and Christ never forced people to listen to him. The same power which drove the money-changers in abject terror from the temple, could as well have gathered all people regularly into the temple, or the synagogues, and compelled them to listen to his teaching. The fact that the great Author of Christianity employed nothing like force in the introduction of Christianity, shows that none of his professed followers have any right to use force in maintaining it. The disciple is not greater than his Lord. It is right to have zeal for God, and to be anxious that all men should hear the gospel; but that zeal should be according to knowledge. It should not lead to the adoption of methods which Christ condemned. To say that if the State does not use its power to cause people to be instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, it is evidence of indifference as to their eternal welfare, is equivalent to saying that Christ was indifferent, because he did not use his greater power for the same purpose.

We trust that every reader can see that our opposition to the teaching of the Christian religion in the public schools, is not simply on the ground that it is unconstitutional,—that it discriminates between the believer and the unbeliever, not allowing the unbeliever equal rights with the believer. We do oppose it on that ground. To compel the infidel against his will to have his children instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, just because his Christian neighbor wants his children to be so instructed, is to say that the infidel has not as much right in this country as the Christian has, and that is to make the rights of citizenship dependent upon one's belief. Surely this is reason enough for opposing it; but we have a higher reason still, and that is that such a course is antichristian as well as un-American.

We use the term "antichristian" advisedly. We have already shown that all enforced teaching of the gospel is contrary to the example and precept of Christ. History is full of illustrations of the antichristian

effect of enforced religious teaching. When Charlemagne conquered the Saxons, their lives were spared on condition that they would receive baptism. Says Guizot, "For three years Charlemagne had to redouble his efforts to accomplish in Saxony, at the cost of Frankish as well as Saxon blood, his work of conquest and conversion. 'Saxony,' he often repeated, 'must be Christianized or wiped out.'" Now does anybody suppose that there was any Christianity involved in the enforced baptism of the Saxons? Does not everybody know that it was by just such processes that the Papacy, the human embodiment of antichrist, was established? The illustration on page 215 of the first volume of Guizot's "History of France" (Estes and Lauriat's edition), is well named "Charlemagne inflicting baptism upon the Saxons."

The difference between this enforced acceptance of Christianity, and the teaching of "the principles of the Christian religion" in the public schools of the United States, is one of degree only, and not one of kind. The principle is the same. When instruction in the principles of religion becomes a matter of compulsion, then Christianity itself will take its leave. We submit that Christ knew how to propagate Christianity better than any man can. His gentle methods were the best and the only right way. And so it is because of our love for pure Christianity, as well as our love for equal rights to all men, that we oppose the propagation of religion by the State.

E. J. W.

The Church and State Bill.

THE "bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship," was introduced into the Senate May 21, was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, where it was championed by Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts and others. It reads as follows:—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

SEC. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided,* That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the postmaster-general shall

provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: *And provided further*, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.

SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.

SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.

We are at a loss to know how to arouse the people to a proper appreciation of the evil of allowing such a bill to become a law. The American people have become so thoroughly imbued with the idea that this is a free country, that the blessings of liberty were forever secured to us by the founders of this Government,—that it seems impossible to

make them believe that they can by any possibility be deprived of that liberty. So they will sit at ease while the cords are being drawn around them, which will hold them in a bondage as great as that which compelled the Pilgrim Fathers to flee from their native land.

We wish it distinctly understood that we do not charge anybody with intentional wrong; that is not our business. We are willing to allow that the framers, the introducer, and the champions of this bill acted in good faith, to the best of their knowledge. But the evil will be none the less, because those who establish it *think* that they are acting for the best good of the country. If the bill were entitled, "A Bill to Unite Church and State in the United States," it would only declare on its face just what it really is.

How can it need any argument to convince any thoughtful person that this bill is directly in favor of an establishment of religion, and does therefore really prohibit the free exercise thereof? We verily believe that the only reason the Senate Committee on Education and Labor has not been overwhelmed with protests against this bill, is because the people are ignorant of its provisions. It does not seem possible that people could, without protest, allow it to come so near being put upon its final passage, if they knew what it is.

We do not need to argue that this bill contemplates a law respecting an establishment of religion, for it makes an express declaration to that effect. It is to promote the observance of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, *as a day of religious worship*. If the passage of such a law would not mark the consummation of the union between Church and State, we should like to have some of the wise men tell us what would. If it would not, then there never was such a thing. The so-called National Reformers will tell us that a union of Church and State can be brought about only by the State bestowing its patronage upon, and elevating some particular denomination; and they say that they do not want this. Of course they don't; and if that is the only thing that constitutes Church and State union, then there never was any such union, and we must find some other name by which to designate the condition of things that existed in Europe from the days of Constantine till the Reformation, and in some portions of Europe till now. Constantine elevated, not a sect, but Christianity to the throne of the world. The church stands for religion. Religion and the church are inseparably connected. There cannot be one without the other, although the religion may be grossly corrupt, or wholly perverted. And so when religion and religious practices are upheld by the State, there is a complete union of Church and State.

Take our public schools as an illustration. It is rightly held that our common-school system is a part of our Government. Why? Because the State protects and upholds the schools and education. In our Government, education and the State are inseparable. It is held that whatever influence works to undermine our schools, is working to the same

degree to undermine our Government, for a republican form of government cannot exist where the rank and file of the people—the real governors—are ignorant. Now the National Reformers claim that without some such law as is proposed by the bill,—a law to establish religion and religious observances, this country cannot long continue. Thus they claim that religion must be as closely connected with this Government as is the cause of education.

Some will doubtless question our statement that the provisions of this bill not only contemplate an establishment of religion, but the prohibition of the free exercise thereof. But whenever a law is made respecting an establishment of religion, somebody's free exercise thereof must of necessity be interfered with, except in the un-supposable case that all believe exactly alike. Now take the bearing of this law upon those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the only Lord's day, and who as conscientiously regard the first day of the week as an ordinary working day. It will be said that the bill does not prohibit them from keeping holy the seventh day, and therefore does not interfere with their religion, but this is only a one-sided view. Let us briefly consider the whole matter.

Those who observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, do so in obedience to the strict letter of the fourth commandment, which says, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Ex. 20:8-10. In this commandment the Lord expressly claims the seventh day as his day, so that the first day of the week, "commonly called the Lord's day," is not the Lord's day at all. He also commands that the seventh day shall be kept holy to him, but freely gives to man the other six days as working days. Now whether all admit that the fourth commandment limits the Sabbath to the seventh day of the week, or whether they hold that it sanctifies any seventh part of time that men choose to keep, all must admit that it gives men the privilege of working six days. That is, men have the same authority for working on six days of the week that they have for resting on the seventh.

Suppose now that this bill becomes a law, and those who conscientiously keep the seventh day are required to keep the first also. Then we say that they are interfered with in the free exercise of their religion. So far as this argument is concerned, it makes no difference whether they are right or wrong in their interpretation of the commandment. Their religion requires them to keep the seventh day; the law of God allows them six days in which to labor, and their necessities require them to devote the whole six days to labor. To force them to keep the first day would be not only to interfere with their God-given privilege of working six days, but also, by taking advantage of their necessities, to compel them to labor on the seventh day,

thus doing violence to their consciences. That is, providing they yielded obedience to the law. Surely this would be to prohibit the free exercise of religion. And when the penalty of the law should be inflicted upon those who should rest on the seventh day and labor on the first, it would be punishment inflicted because of their religious belief, and that is religious persecution. So surely as this bill becomes a law, religious persecution will disgrace this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Again, some will say that the same plea could with equal propriety be made in behalf of the Mormons, when they are indicted for practicing polygamy. We say, No. The cases are not parallel to the slightest extent. Polygamy is a sin against society. It inflicts cruel wrongs upon thousands of people. The Judgment-day alone will reveal the murders that have been committed, and the hearts that have been broken, as the direct result of polygamy. Many a loving and trusting wife has died of a broken heart, or has been transformed into a demon of hate, because another was brought in to occupy the place sacred to her alone. Polygamy interferes with the inalienable rights of every creature, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore it should be extirpated as a crime.

But the keeping of the seventh day and the secularization of the first is nothing of the kind. The man who works on the first day of the week does not hinder anybody else from resting. Of course it is understood that such work shall not disturb any religious assembly. But a law protecting religious and all other assemblies already exists, so that a Sunday law is not needed on that score. That Sunday work by seventh-day people does not interfere with Sunday rest by others is shown by the fact that there are over fifty thousand people in this country who religiously and sacredly keep the seventh day of the week, in spite of the fact that over fifty millions of their fellows are laboring on that day. Yet we never heard a complaint by a Sabbatarian, nor a request for a law to secure to him his Sabbath.

It is said that the workingmen must have a day of rest secured to them. The workingmen can have a day of rest if they want to take it. Those who keep the seventh day are nearly all workingmen, but nobody compels them to labor on Saturday. If the workingmen of this country didn't want to work on Sunday, there is no power that could compel them to. If they should individually and collectively declare that they want Sunday as a rest day, and are determined not to labor on that day, the problem would settle itself.

But they don't care for the rest. The ones who are clamoring for the Sunday law are not the workingmen but the ministers. Read the bill carefully, and you will see that it is worded so as to specially guard the hours of worship. When it becomes absolutely necessary to handle the mails on Sunday it must be "during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience, and *least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest.*" The bill is in behalf not

simply of an establishment of religion, but of the churches. And if it should become a law, and it should be found, as it certainly would be, that the churches were not filled in consequence, the next thing would be a law to compel these indifferent ones to attend church. And this law would be declared to be a law in behalf of the workingmen, and not at all in behalf of religion. Some may think that nobody would have the boldness to ask for such a law; but if they are countenanced in asking for a law requiring that children, many of whom attend Sabbath-school and receive religious instruction at home, should be instructed in the principles of the Christian religion at school, they would certainly be warranted in asking that the man who toils all the week without opportunity for moral or mental culture, should be required, for his own good, to listen to such instruction for an hour in the week.

We might go on much farther with this subject, but lack of space forbids. Compared with its merits, this is a very brief presentation of the case. We may have more to say upon it next month. But we earnestly hope that those who love liberty and pure Christianity will arouse to a sense of the danger, and not let these bills become laws without at least a strong protest. The time to act is *now*.

E. J. W.

The Presbyterian Cardinal.

HENRY M. FIELD, D. D., is one of the foremost men of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and a man of much more than national reputation. He is editor of the *New York Evangelist*, which appears to be the official organ of the Presbyterian Church in the East. He is, we believe, the only Protestant ecclesiastic who has entered upon a set discussion with the representative of infidelity—Colonel Ingersoll. He is quite an extensive traveler, and has written books about his travels, which have a wide circulation. Last summer he traveled in Spain, and wrote a book entitled "Old Spain and New Spain," in which he pays flattering tribute to the Catholic Church, and its influence in Spain, as being in harmony with the institutions of the country. Of this book the *New York Observer* says:—

"From a Protestant point of view, such an extensive charity towards a system which in all times and lands has been hostile to liberty, and oppressive in the last degree, we can neither understand nor sympathize with. There are doubtless many devout persons who are Romanists, but the Roman Church is corrupt and cruel; under its present rulers it seeks not so much the salvation of souls as the political control of States and nations, and its supremacy in any country is the signal for decline in piety, morality, and prosperity. We therefore regret that so interesting and attractive a book should be pervaded by a spirit so favorable to the chief enemy of Protestantism."

Doctor Field, very properly, as will be seen further on, sent a copy of this book to Cardinal Gibbons.

Early in February Doctor Field was in Washington City, and attended a reception

given in honor of Cardinal Gibbons, to whom he personally paid his respects. At this, somebody in Washington addressed Doctor Field, expressing surprise and pain that any Protestant minister, and much more such a prominent and influential one, should so far forget his profession and compromise his dignity. It is true the writer of the letter did not sign his name, in which he showed a trait which was unbecoming if not cowardly. Doctor Field printed the letter in the *Evangelist*, and in reply administered a strong rebuke, not only to the writer of the letter, but also to all who concur in the sentiments expressed in the letter. He calls it "a piece of gross impertinence;" says that he prints it "as a specimen of the narrowness which exists in the minds of some well-meaning, but very simple (not to say silly) people;" and further says:—

"It is not that we take any personal offense at this communication, that we notice it; but because it is the manifestation of a spirit which itself needs to be rebuked—a disposition to stand entirely aloof from Roman Catholics, which we believe is most mischievous to the church and to the country."

Somebody sent to Cardinal Gibbons a copy of the *Evangelist* which contained this letter and the reply to it. This, with the present of Mr. Field's book, drew from the Cardinal a very gracious letter, which in its turn so pleased the editor of the *Evangelist* that he gushed clear over. We insert the matter just as it stands in the *Evangelist* of March 29, 1888:—

"Private correspondence is commonly of interest only to the parties, and of no concern whatever to the public. But a man in high position is a public character, in whose personality all may feel a legitimate interest. And if it discloses itself in a letter written with the freedom of private correspondence, it may, with his consent, be seen by the eyes of others. Certainly few men in Church or State hold so high a dignity as our only Cardinal, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in America. His letter grew out of a slight incident—our attendance at a reception given him in Washington, for which some unknown person in that city wrote us a very sharp letter, which, instead of throwing into the fire, we published, and answered as we thought it deserved. This correspondence someone sent to the Cardinal, which called forth the following, that we now have his full consent to give to the public:—

"CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, 408 N. Charles St., }
Baltimore, March 6, 1888. }

"REV. DEAR SIR: I beg to thank you very cordially for the copy of your work, "Old Spain and New Spain," which you kindly sent me through Mrs. Mullan. From the praise which she bestows on it, I am sure I will read it with interest and pleasure. [In a postscript he adds: "Since writing the foregoing, I have read with great satisfaction and edification your beautiful tribute to the good Archbishop of Granada. Had you lived in the days of Ignatius Loyola, I am sure you would have revered and cherished the man on account of his burning love for Christ.]"

"I avail myself of this occasion by tendering to you my sincere expression of gratitude for your manly and well-merited rebuke to the writer who had the hardihood to expostulate with you for attending the reception given to me at Mrs. Admiral Dahlgren's. I was delighted to meet yourself and your honored brothers on that occasion, but you have risen

still higher in my estimation by your noble reply to the writer in question. Such men as that writer exhibit very little of Christian charity, and do much to make the enemies of Christianity rejoice.

"Your words, on the contrary, serve to remind us all that if we cannot agree in matters of faith, we should never be wanting in the courtesy and urbanity which Christians of all denominations owe to one another.

"I am with great regard, yours faithfully in Christ,

"JAMES CARD. GIBBONS, *Abp. Baltimore.*

"REV. H. M. FIELD, D. D."

"Could anything be more gentle than this? Can anyone detect in it the slightest tone of arrogance? The writer does not assume that the Roman Catholic Church is the only Christian body on earth; on the contrary, he distinctly recognizes 'Christians of all denominations,' and asks only for the 'courtesy and urbanity' which all Christians 'owe to one another.' The gentleness of the letter is the best answer to the fierce intolerance which will not recognize a Christian faith or Christian life anywhere but within the narrow bounds of its own sect. Comparing it with the one in which a correspondent (who did not dare even to sign his name to his own letter) undertook to call us to account, we think our readers will agree that the Cardinal may well say that 'such men as that writer exhibit very little of Christian charity, and do much to make the enemies of Christianity rejoice.' Are we to refuse the outstretched hand of one who signs himself, 'Yours faithfully IN CHRIST'—that blessed name which is the bond that holds the world together?"

This is a good specimen of the mawkishness that now passes for the best Protestantism; with the exception, however, that this is the first instance in which we have seen Mr. Gibbons acknowledged as a Cardinal outside of the Catholic Church. We do not know exactly in what sense it is that Doctor Field uses the word "our" in calling Mr. Gibbons "our only Cardinal." We do not know whether he uses it as a representative Presbyterian, or whether he presumes to speak for the whole nation. If he speaks as a representative Presbyterian, and thus acknowledges Mr. Gibbons as the Presbyterian Cardinal, as well as a Catholic Cardinal, then we have nothing to say, it is their right to do so if they choose. Nevertheless we shall watch with considerable interest to see whether there are any Protestants in the Presbyterian Church, or whether they have gone bodily over to allegiance to their "only Cardinal, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in America."

If Mr. Field has in this taken it upon himself to speak for the whole Nation, and, for the Nation, to acknowledge Mr. Gibbons as our only Cardinal, then, as American citizens, we do most decidedly protest. He is not our Cardinal in any sense. The United States knows no Cardinal, it recognizes no such dignity as a Cardinalate. And as for Doctor Field's saying that "certainly few men in Church or State hold so high a dignity as our only Cardinal," it is utterly false. So far as the church is concerned, the humblest Christian in it holds an infinitely higher dignity than does Doctor Field's "only Cardinal." And as for the State, there is not an American citizen in this Union, who appreciates what

American citizenship is, who does not hold a dignity vastly greater than that of Doctor Field's "only Cardinal," who is bound in a contemptible vassalage to a foreign and despotic lord.

But the strangest thing in this whole connection is to see how unquestioningly Doctor Field accepts the dignity of a disciple of Loyola, conferred upon him by his Cardinal in the words: "Had you lived in the days of Ignatius Loyola, I am sure you would have revered and cherished the man on account of his burning love for Christ." Not only does the Doctor unquestioningly accept this high honor, but he shows his high appreciation of it by acknowledging the donor as "our only Cardinal."

We believe that Cardinal Gibbons is entirely correct in his estimate. We do not doubt at all that had Henry M. Field, D. D., "lived in the days of Ignatius Loyola, he would have revered and cherished the man in his burning" fanaticism—"burning" in more senses of the word than one, as is abundantly proved by the dreadful history of the Jesuits in every nation. We do not doubt at all that had Doctor Field lived in the days of Ignatius Loyola, he would have stood with him and his Jesuitism against Luther and Protestantism. Doctor Field accepts the discipleship of Loyola which his "only Cardinal" gives him. Loyola was the founder of the Society of the Jesuits. He was a Spaniard. Spain has seen more of Jesuitism than has any other nation. Jesuitism may fairly be said to be a Spanish institution. Doctor Field spent part of a summer there, and flatters the influence of the Catholic Church there as being in harmony with the institutions of the country. Now let us have an estimate of Jesuitism and its influence, recorded by a native Spaniard who has spent his life in that country and knows its history as he knows its language. Señor Castelar says of Jesuitism:—

"Never was there founded an institution so openly at war with the spirit of its time. The sixteenth century was the century of renovation; Jesuitism a sect of relapse. The sixteenth century founded the liberty of thought; Jesuitism founded intellectual slavery. The one tended to religious reform, the other to religious reaction; the one celebrated the emancipation of the conscience, the other adored the person of the Pope; the one heard the divine voice, the Holy Spirit, in the idea of every man, the other saw God only in traditional and ecclesiastical authority; the one wrenched the conscience away from Rome, the other returned to Rome the absolute dominion over time and eternity. Never in human memory has there existed a religious association, regular and secular at once, equally at home in palaces and in deserts, lying in wait for the courtier, the minister, and the monarch, as well as for the savage lost in the pampas of America, or the forests of Asia; never, I repeat, was there a religious association like this, founded upon absolute authority and obedience, which with such sovereign command exacted the subjugation of man and his living spirit, his indomitable liberty, his unconquerable inclinations to the cold apathy of a corpse."—*Harper's Monthly Magazine, October, 1873.*

Another writer speaking of the wounds

which turned Loyola from a soldier into a fanatic, says:—

"They were the cause of many an *auto-da-fé* in Italy, and of a persecution worse than that of Diocletian, in Spain. . . . They led to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, the death of Mary, Queen of Scots, the Spanish Armada, and the Gunpowder Plot. They disturbed the New World, gave rise to many deeds of self-denial and piety, and many horrible crimes and woes. They were felt in distant Russia. They aroused the Poles against the Russians, and excited a fierce war in which Poland inflicted injuries upon its feeble neighbors that have scarcely yet been expiated in seas of blood. They spread their fatal influence over China, and stirred that vast empire with a violent impulse. They were felt in Ethiopia and Hindostan, in Canada and Brazil; they gave rise, in fact, to the company of the Jesuits."—*Eugene Lawrence, Historical Studies, p. 99.*

Loyola himself procured the erection of the Inquisition in Portugal, in 1545-46. And yet to be commended by a Papal Cardinal, as one who "would have revered and cherished" such a man as this, the intentional founder of such a system as this, is considered by Doctor Field as of sufficient honor to deserve in return the grateful platitude that "certainly few men in Church or State hold so high a dignity as *our only Cardinal!*"!! We do not wonder at all that the Cardinal gave his "full consent" that the letter should be published in the editorial columns of the *Evangelist*. Nothing pleases "our only Cardinal" better than to see the Presbyterians recognizing in him "so high a dignity," and acknowledging as their "only Cardinal the head of the Roman Catholic Church in America." Protestants there are yet some, but Protestantism is dead.

A. T. J.

Religion in Japan.

It is well known that much missionary work has been done in Japan, and that Christianity has been looked upon with favor by those high in authority; and it has been declared highly probable that the empire will ere long become officially "Christian." The emperor is expected, like Constantine of old, to declare Christianity to be the religion. This step has been looked for with a great deal of anxiety by those interested in foreign missions, as a wonderful victory for Christianity. We have before expressed our opinion on the subject, that if such a step is taken, it will be the worst thing that could possibly happen for real Christianity in Japan. The Christianity that would be adopted would be a formal religion, a matter of policy alone, and it would put an effectual stop to the growth of vital godliness. The empire would no longer be missionary ground, and the labors of devoted missionaries would soon cease. Those who accepted the State religion in obedience to the imperial edict, would be forever content with the *form* of religion, and so the last state of the empire would be worse than the first. We have no faith in charms, and we don't think that the *name* of Christianity will make a man or a nation any better than will the name or the reality of paganism.

To show that our statement of the case is correct we copy the following London dispatch to the San Francisco *Chronicle* of June 10:—

"The Japan *Weekly Mail* in a recent issue summarizes the discussion now being carried on in Japan by several eminent publicists respecting the advisability of the people of that country embracing Christian religion. A movement, started by some very prominent persons, is on foot to give an impetus to the speed of Christianity by laying stress on the secondary benefits its acceptance insures. Those connected with the movement say that Christian dogmas are a bitter pill to swallow, but advise that it be swallowed promptly for the sake of the after effects. Fuka-Zawa, a well-known writer, urges this course, although he says he takes no personal interest whatever in religion, and knows nothing of the teachings of Christianity, but he sees that it is the creed of highly civilized nations. To him religion is only a garment to be put on or taken off for pleasure, but he thinks it prudent that Japan assume the same dress as that of her neighbors, with whom she desires to stand well.

"Professor Toyma, of the Imperial University, has published a work to support this view. He holds that Chinese ethics must be replaced by Christian ethics, and that the benefits to be derived from the introduction of Christianity are: (1) The improvement of the mind; (2) a unit of sentiment and feeling leading to harmonious co-operation; (3) furnishing a medium of intercourse between men and women. Kabolat, president of the Imperial University, who says that religion is not needed for the educated, and confesses his dislike to all religion, urges the introduction of religious teachings in the Government schools on the ground that the unlearned in Japan have their faith in the old moral standards shaken, and that there is now a serious lack of moral sentiment among the masses."

And that is just as high as the standard of religion would be in this country if Christianity were declared to be the national religion. A State religion never was and never will be adopted except from selfish motives.

"Very Gracious."

In an address to the National Reform Convention recently held in Philadelphia, Rev. J. A. Wylie said of the proposed Sunday law:—

"It is true we meet with the plea that the rights of those who do not wish to observe the Sabbath, are violated by such legislation as we claim, but these laws bind all alike, no discrimination is made in favor of any. Like the pressure of the atmosphere on the human body, no injury is produced, because all parts are affected alike. In regard to those who observe some other than the first day of the week as a day of sacred rest, the law should not prohibit this, and if their consciences require they should observe a different day, they may thank the law which secures to them an additional Sabbath every week."

The *Review and Herald*, of Battle Creek, Mich., is the organ of a large body of people who observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, and the following from that paper shows how they regard the "gracious" utterance of Mr. Wylie:—

"Isn't this very liberal and beneficent! After keeping the true and only Sabbath according to the commandment of God, and the dictates of conscience, seventh-day observers

'may thank the law which secures to them an additional Sabbath.' Yes! thank the law which deprives them of one-sixth of their means of support! thank the law which would oblige them to pay a tax of sixteen and two-thirds per cent of their entire income to a hostile religious system! thank the law which steps in and unceremoniously takes from them one-sixth of the privilege and duty granted them alike by God and nature, of healthful and often necessary six days' labor! thank the law which compels them to pay honor to an institution which they know is founded in falsehood, and antagonizes the law of the great Jehovah! The doctor of divinity who represents this view of the matter may think seventh-day people are such phenomenal fools that they will rush up and in the ecstasy of their gratitude hug and kiss an old Moloch like this. But we think we know them better.

"Let us test the matter in a clearly supposable case: Suppose Mr. Wylie, who formulates this proposition, is called upon to go as a missionary to some heathen land. They have their false gods; he worships the true. Let us suppose further, that the heathen are found so bigoted as to enforce by law the worship of some one of their chief gods upon all the people. Mr. Wylie objects on the ground that his conscience requires him to worship the true God alone. They reply, 'We do not prohibit this. If your conscience requires you to worship that God, that is your privilege; but, having done this, you may thank our law, Mr. Wylie, which secures to you an ADDITIONAL GOD! And, remember, this law is binding on all alike; there is no discrimination made in favor of any. Like the pressure of the atmosphere on the human body, no injury is produced, because all parts are affected alike!' How would Mr. Wylie fancy that situation, and that way of reasoning to support it?"

We are very sure that Mr. Wylie would write most pathetic and indignant letters about the religious intolerance of that country. It makes a great deal of difference whose ox is gored. The proposed law will not incommode Mr. Wylie, and so what reason has anybody to complain? The colossal selfishness and impudence of the man are greater than words can express.

It is evident that Mr. Wylie forgot his illustration of the equal pressure of the air, just as soon as he used it. It is true that there is perfect ease so long as the air presses equally on every part; but just let one portion of the body be subjected to double pressure, and there will be a continual sense of discomfort. And this equal pressure on every part is just what it is proposed to change. To one who should complain because he was subjected to double pressure, the National Reformers would say, "You ought rather to thank the man who has secured to you twice as much air as other people have." He would doubtless fail to appreciate the kindness, and would prefer to take his air just as the Lord provided it for him, without having it tampered with by man. So long as men have Sabbath laws as God fixed them, there is no unequal pressure; but when they attempt to improve upon his plans they make trouble.

A Word of Warning.

UNDER the above heading, George W. Colles, of Morristown, N. J., makes a vigorous protest in the *Christian Union*, of May 31, against the growing tendency of the churches not only to accept but to seek aid from the State. It was drawn out by a previous article concerning the grasping nature of Romanism. Some may think his words too strong, but nothing but strong words will arouse anybody to the danger. Here are his words, and our readers can judge of them for themselves:—

"I would like the writer as well as the readers of 'Breakers Ahead,' in your issue of May 17, to consider also how the Roman conspiracy against our liberties is assisted by Protestant short-sighted grasping of public funds for the support of their institutions. All ecclesiastics are alike, be they Romish, Protestant, Jewish, or pagan, in this: that they grasp at power, and, to get it, will put their feet through the Charter of Human Rights. The non-Romish institutions who yearly accept a share (however small) in the annual steal out of the public taxes know perfectly well that it is a steal, and that it shuts their mouths from saying a word to oppose the Romanists' grab, and that the priests throw them the sop for this very purpose; yet the dollars are hard enough to dispel their scruples, as well as to show what is their sincerity in adherence to American principles. The Church of Rome is by no means the only one which has no faith in human liberty; they all want to make the Government draw their individual loads. The most advanced Protestants are determined, if they can, to ecclesiasticize our Constitution and laws, and to destroy the equality before the law of all shades of thought, belief, and non-belief. When Protestant Christians acquire a deep-rooted and passionate love for the principle of absolute and entire separation of church from civil rule and from force, then, and not till then, can they as a unit oppose the hostile approaches of humanity's greatest enemy, the Roman conspiracy. This deep-rooted and passionate love for a high and absolutely vital principle does not now exist among Protestant churches as such; for they accept with smiles gifts and advantages that will in the end prove their own destruction.

"History repeats itself. Just what we now are, enjoying a large measure of freedom, just so was Europe at one time. Just as Rome begins here now, she began in Europe—in Italy and in Spain. Just what Spain is to-day, we may be in a hundred years. Religion is one thing; its priests are quite another—merely men; at first animated with love for souls, and in their zeal seeing but a little way before them, and but one thing at a time, and pushing to their aim over every merely temporal object. Afterward, they or their successors, less pure in motive, or exchanging the true worship for the worship of an institution, become the despots who are perpetually arising to overturn that liberty which they abuse. Grasping at public money is only one form of grasping at temporal power, just as grasping

at the schools is another. It can only be on a righteous principle, faithfully adhered to by the patriotism of our Protestant bodies, acting as Americans, that the encroachments of Rome can be successfully withstood."

Woman Suffrage.

America is an excellent journal printed in Chicago. The *Dexter Gazette*, of Maine, asked *America* why it did not give itself "to the advocacy of the enfranchisement of the wives and daughters of the white race native of this country that have reached the years of understanding." In reply *America* gives some points which are worthy of careful consideration. Here they are:—

"There is no call to discuss, much less to advocate, the enfranchisement of women throughout the republic. When that subject really presses to the front for solution, if it ever does, *America* will discuss it upon its merits. It will not permit any of that worshipful regard and admirable courtesy toward women, which is the honorable attitude of true Americans, to interfere with its view of the injurious effect the grant of the suffrage would have both upon the women themselves and the republic. It would take the position that nature has placed an insuperable barrier to equality of the sexes; that as the defense of the nation must ever devolve upon the men, the whole responsibility for the Government must always be intrusted to them. And if ever the question shall come squarely before the people, it will contend that not only the republic, but women and humanity, have nothing to gain at all commensurate with what they would lose through the obliteration of the line which makes man the responsible party in public affairs, as he must be in the family. Only cranks and sentimentalists talk about the practicability of leaving men at home to rock the cradles and manage the cook, while women go forth to canvass the ward and run the political machine.

"When any newspaper advocates the enfranchisement of white native-born women only, it exposes what is the fallacy underlying the whole woman-suffrage movement, to wit, the possibility of discriminating between the wise and the foolish, the educated and the ignorant, the virtuous and the vicious, the white and the black. When it comes to enfranchising women, they will all have to be taken together. There can be no separating the sheep from the goats. It will have to be another case of fifteenth amendment. The right to vote will have to be extended to all women, unabridged by any condition on account of sex, character, color, or previous condition of disfranchisement.

"All advocacy of women suffrage is based on the theory that the exclusion of good women from the exercise of the franchise is detrimental not only to them but to the best interests of the republic. Common sense and experience teach that the influence of good women is decreased by the grant of the ballot,

because they fail to avail themselves of it, while bad women and those under the control of depraved and ignorant men, are bold to seize upon the advantage for evil it affords. According to the United States census, the percentage of illiteracy is greater among females than among males, and if illiteracy were construed to include ignorance of principles of government and justice, the disparity would be almost beyond estimation. That there are many women better fitted mentally and morally to vote than millions of men must be conceded. But this begs the question. Until it can be shown that all women are equally equipped for the suffrage with all men, and that the virtuous among them would attend to their political duties more faithfully than the majority of the men in their sphere in life do, where is the reason or expediency of the extension.

"The question of extending the franchise to women will have to be discussed and settled not according to what a few women think, but upon broad principles as to the fitness, wisdom, and expediency of the revolution, for such it will be, as it affects the sexes, the propagation of species, and the permanence of the American home and the American republic. Such joint resolutions as that introduced in the House of Representatives, 'by request,' by Congressman Mason, providing for a woman's suffrage amendment to the Constitution, are the sheerest buncombe. Not one intelligent woman in ten wants to be enfranchised, and scarcely one respectable woman in a hundred would use the ballot if placed in her hands."

In the late Democratic Convention there was an excellent example of "national Christianity," such as we shall have when the National Reformers succeed in their efforts. There were present the usual horde of hungry office-seekers in addition to the delegates. According to the published reports, the most of them were distinguished for their ability to swallow champagne. Probably not one in ten of those present ever uttered the name of the Deity except in blasphemy. But this is a "Christian country," therefore the proceedings must be opened each morning by prayer! And so the mob of howling politicians actually quieted down and listened to a prayer? Not much. They cared no more for the prayer than does the average Congress, or State Legislature; and for all the influence Bishop Granberry's prayer had upon the Convention, it might better have been delivered in his closet. His lips were seen to move, by those who took the trouble to look at him, but "his words were heard only by the official stenographer below and the listening angels above." But nevertheless prayer was offered, and so the country is safe, because the Convention was conducted in a Christian manner.

To us such scenes are disgusting and irreverent. But, according to the statements of National Reformers, that is just the thing that they want to have perpetuated. All they want is to fix the Constitution so that there will be no possibility of dispensing with

prayer on such occasions as political conventions, possibly so that it will be necessary for the ward caucus to be opened with prayer, and then this will be "in name as well as in fact, a Christian country." Heaven save the mark! What a travesty on Christianity that will be. That friends of the Christian religion should be anxious to see it so trampled in the dust, is almost beyond the possibility of belief.

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 ABIDING SABBATH AND THE LORD'S DAY.

A REVIEW by Alonzo T. Jones, Oakland, Cal., Pacific Press Publishing House; 173 pp.; price, 20 cents, post-paid.

This pamphlet is devoted to a critical review of two prize essays: One, "The Perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day," by Rev. George Elliot, of West Union, Iowa, which was awarded a prize of \$500 by the trustees of Dartmouth College, in 1883; the other, "The Lord's Day; Its Universal and Perpetual Obligation," by A. E. Waffle, M. A., formerly Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Lewisburg, Pa., in 1884, which was awarded a prize of \$1,000. To those who have a taste for theological controversy, this little work will prove interesting reading. Those not familiar with arguments adduced from Scripture and history in behalf of the seventh-day Sabbath will find many of them here concisely and pointedly set forth.—*True Educator*.

BOUND VOLUMES OF THE SENTINEL.

HERE is something that every Bible student, every student of history, every lover of religious liberty, and every American citizen should have; and we have reduced the price so that it is within the reach of all. Buy it, read it, study it. Place a copy in every free library and public reading-room in the United States.

We can furnish Volume 1 (1886), and Volume 2 (1887), of the AMERICAN SENTINEL bound in strong paper covers, with index, at 50 cents per volume, post-paid.

The two volumes bound in one, in cloth, with index and gilt title, for \$1.50 post-paid. Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, 1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

ASSORTED BACK NUMBERS

OF the AMERICAN SENTINEL, \$1.50 per hundred copies. Just the thing to use in depot racks, tract distributors, and to hand to friends. They should be circulated largely at all political gatherings, religious and temperance conventions, etc. Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL AND TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, devoted to the dissemination of true temperance principles, and instruction in the art of preserving health. It is emphatically

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE,

Containing what everybody wants to know, and is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is unlimited, embracing everything that in any way affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and housekeepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by all. Price, \$1.00 per year, or with the 300-page premium book—"Practical Manual of Hygiene and Temperance," containing household and cooking recipes—post-paid for \$1.40.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY, 1888.

THE National Prohibition Convention introduced into its platform the same Church and State ideas that the California Prohibition Convention did. The Prohibition party everywhere may now very properly be called the Church and State party.

It is stated that through the efforts of Mrs. Bateham in the unions, over a million signatures have been secured to the petition to Congress asking it to enact a national Sunday law. The SENTINEL has not a big list of names to present to Congress, but it can present some facts that are consistent with justice and liberty.

WE had a very pleasant talk on National Reform last month, with Prof. J. L. McCartney, of Beaver Falls, Penn., who was visiting in Oakland. The Professor delivered a sermon on National Reform, upon which we made some comments for this number of the SENTINEL; but after our review was in type, other matter came in, and it was crowded out. It will appear next month.

IN 1829 the United States Senate told the Sunday-law petitioners that they then already enjoyed "all that Christians ought to ask at the hands of any Government—protection from all molestation in the exercise of their religious sentiments." This is just as true now as it was then. It is also true of these, and now, as it was of those political bishops of the fourth century, that they seek "not protection for themselves, but power against their opponents."

ACCORDING to the speech by Dr. Crafts before the Senate Committee, the churches are going to be content with nothing short of a monopoly of all Sunday action. This, say the leaders, is to protect the workingman from the greed of the grinding monopoly of wealth. But when the churches shall have succeeded in thus protecting him from that monopoly, then we want to know who or what is going to protect us all from the far worse monopoly thus secured to the churches?

THE Chicago *Advance* says that churches and labor organizations East and West are adopting the following resolution:—

"Resolved, That we indorse the petition to Congress, asking it to stop Sunday work in its mail and military service, and in interstate commerce."

The *Advance* says that the latest indorsements to this resolution are those of "the Central Labor Union and the Carriers' Association of New York City, the Knights of Labor Council of Chicago and vicinity, the Presbyterian General Assembly, and the State Sunday-school Associations of Missouri and Kansas." "The Congregational ministers' meeting of Chicago has recommended that all Congregational Churches take action in

this matter either by resolution or petition." What are the friends of freedom of conscience doing to offset this pressure that is being brought to bear upon Congress? If there are any such who don't know what to do, we will tell them: Give the AMERICAN SENTINEL a ten-fold larger circulation.

LET those who are so zealous to have "the principles of Christianity" taught in the public schools, remember that in many of the public schools in our cities the teachers are Roman Catholics. What kind of Christianity will they teach? Nobody needs to be told that they will teach only the principles of Catholicism. If such a step as is proposed should be taken, thousands of children of Protestants would at once be placed under Roman Catholic instruction. How the Pope must rejoice as he sees professed Protestants playing into his hands!

THE SENTINEL goes to press as the Republican National Convention is organizing, so we cannot tell how it will treat the various petitions sent to it, but we state as a straw which shows the way the wind blows, the fact that a petition indorsed by the Missouri and Kansas State Sunday-school Conventions, and by thousands of individuals, is in circulation, asking the Republican Convention to insert in its labor blank, a declaration against Sunday labor and trade. The way it is stated is, "against the encroachments upon the workingman's Sunday rest by toil or trade." Notice that it is the Sunday-schools, and not the workingmen, who ask this.

THE *Union Signal* says that Rev. W. F. Crafts is working in Chicago in the interest of what is known as the Blair Sunday Bill. It says:—

"He met representatives of the labor organizations, and secured their co-operation in the effort to secure national laws against Sunday mails and Sunday trains. Thus these great organizations in New York City and Chicago are now working unitedly with the W. C. T. U. and the churches to secure a Christian Sabbath."

But we thought it was only a chance for the workingman to rest, that they want. That's what they say sometimes; but what they want is the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest and worship. Mr. Crafts secured many hundred signatures to the petitions to Congress.

THE *Occident* in noting the Papal rescript against Ireland says:—

"The hope is that a combined effort among the friends of Home Rule may have the decree revoked. But how can an infallible Pope revoke a decree made ex-Cathedra?"

How? Why, easy enough. All that he has to do is to revoke it. That is all. The power to issue contradictory decrees and decisions is the highest, the very crucial, proof of the supreme infallibility of the Pope. That is one of the points in which the Pope is above the Almighty. The Lord, the Creator of heaven and earth, cannot enact contradictory laws, nor issue contradictory decrees, nor

render contradictory decisions. His infallibility does not reach so far as that. "He cannot deny himself." But the Pope can do all these things. He *has* done them time and again through all the dismal history of the Papal Church, and yet has retained all the infallibility that he ever had, and yet more loudly than ever asserts all the infallibility that he ever claimed. Any sovereign, fallible or infallible, can issue *consistent* decrees; but no sovereign in Heaven or on earth, except the infallible Pope, can issue inconsistent and contradictory decrees, and yet remain infallible. That is the supreme test of his supreme infallibility, and, therefore, he is "that man of sin, . . . the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped." 2 Thess. 2:3, 4.

WE heartily welcome to our table the *American Constitutional Vidette*, published monthly by the Mississippi Valley Publishing Company, Beauregard, Miss. We all the more heartily welcome it because it works in the same line as does the AMERICAN SENTINEL—"the defense of the Constitution as it is, and to battle earnestly for civil and religious liberty." It also is "uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact, let it come from whatever source it may." Here is our neighbor, we are not a bit jealous; would to God they were all prophets.

CHARLES CAREY, who, at Chicago, on the 24th of May, pleaded guilty to the deliberate, wanton murder of a Chinaman, has been sentenced to fifty years' imprisonment. He ought to have gone to the gallows, and he would have gone to the gallows had it not been for the brutal influence of the political demagogues of both parties, who yell, "The Chinese must go," and palliate the crime of those who eject a Chinaman by taking his life. The defense of the self-confessed murderer, "I've only killed a Chinaman," reveals the horrid state of public opinion which demagogues have created at the heart of a so-called Christian civilization. Suppose a Chinaman in Canton or Amoy should stab an American missionary or merchant to the heart, and say that he "had only killed an American," what would the United States do and say about it?—*Oregonian*.

"THE conscience of the majority is not a law for the minority; the conscience of A is not a law for B."—*Christian Union*.

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.