

AMERICAN SENTINEL

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 3.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER, 1888.

NUMBER 10.

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.

THOUSANDS of people are signing petitions for the National Sunday law, without a thought of harm to themselves or anybody else. Yet only harm to thousands of people can ever come from the enactment of such a law. Many of those who are signing the petitions would not do so if they knew the danger that there is in the enactment of the law. The SENTINEL clearly points out the danger. Therefore the SENTINEL should be placed in the hands of every person in the land. Are you doing your part to see that this shall be done?

NOT long since a Prohibition Convention was held in Visalia, Cal. The preachers were very active and enthusiastic in it; and they succeeded in arousing a good deal of enthusiasm in the body of the convention. After the convention had dispersed the following question was put to two of the preachers: "I suppose the object of this is, in the long run, to work it into a Sunday law?" And the answer was this:—

"That is what it is; but we are not saying anything about that now, till we get the thing in running order—then we will bring that in."

That is precisely the scheme which the preachers are working through the third-party-Prohibition movement, and that is just the way that they are working it. Under cover of Prohibition and temperance legislation they are working for the establishment of a religious despotism.

RECENTLY a preacher in Selma, Cal., delivered a sermon in which he said:—

"We have laws to punish the man who steals our property; but we have no law to prevent people from working on Sunday. It is right that the thief be punished; but I have more sympathy for that man than I have for him that works on that day."

This is directly in the line of things promised by the Prohibition party. Whenever any party sets itself up as the protector of the Lord, and legislates upon things pertaining to God, then offenses, or supposed offenses, against God take precedence of all things else. Heresy becomes the highest crime. Then the thief will be let run, and receive sympathy, while the man who quietly works at his lawful and honest calling is prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned. And Senator Blair's proposed amendment and Sunday law open the way for such men as this to carry their views into effect, by the civil power.

The National Sunday Bill.

THE National Sunday Bill, introduced into the United States Senate by Senator Blair, is a queer piece of legislation for this enlightened age and country, in more senses than one. We have referred to it in our columns before; but as the legislation itself is the first step taken in an endless controversy, this is ample excuse for referring to it again. But besides this there is sufficient material in the bill itself to justify a long discussion, and even continuous repetition, until the people shall see the danger there is threatening their cherished liberties and dearest rights.

We propose to notice it section by section, and call attention, briefly, to some of the moral and civil delinquencies that show themselves in the bill.

The first section embodies legislation in regard to "the Lord's day," and is 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."

This is contrary to the word of Christ. Christ said: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." By these words it is clear that that which is the Lord's is not to be rendered to Cæsar, but to the Lord. Cæsar is civil government; therefore, we are not to render to civil government that which is the Lord's; with what is the Lord's Cæsar has nothing to do. Senator Blair's bill, in legislating upon that which pertains to the Lord, plainly sets itself against the word of Christ, and is, therefore, antichristian.

Again, this section declares that no person shall do any work, "nor 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." This leaves it entirely with the other man, or with judge or jury, to say whether that which has been done was a disturbance; and that is only to make every man's action on Sunday subject to the whim or caprice of his neighbor. But "any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror, savors of tyranny." The doctrine embodied in this section of the Blair bill is subversive of liberty. It attacks,

not only the inherent rights, but the constitutional rights, of every American citizen. For a sound judicial decision upon this principle of this section see the article entitled, "The Savor of Tyranny," in another column of this paper.

Section two is as follows:—

"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."

The object of this section is to stop the carrying of the mails on Sunday; but yet any letter that relates to a work of necessity or mercy, or the health, life, or death of any person, which has the fact plainly stated upon the face of the envelope, shall be delivered on the first day of the week.

Section 3 is as follows:—

"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."

This section embodies the same principle as the first in regard to the disturbance of others, and sets a heavy penalty upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality. Upon what principle except that of religious intolerance can it ever be made to

appear that an act which is not only perfectly innocent but entirely laudable when performed on any other day of the week, becomes so intensely criminal when performed on the first day of the week as to deserve a penalty of a thousand dollars fine?

Section 4 reads:—

"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."

So far as anything in this section is in itself concerned there is nothing particularly to be noticed except that it is directly in the line of Constantine's Sunday legislation. He, however, went a step further and caused his soldiers to parade expressly for worship, and wrote out a prayer which he had them all repeat at a given signal. Something like this may fairly be expected to follow should this bill become a law; because, as religious observance and religious worship are the objects of the bill, why should not the soldiers be required to pray on Sunday as well as to religiously observe the day? It may be said that the *religious* observance of the day is not required; but when we come to section six, it will be seen that it is.

Section 5 reads thus:—

"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 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."

This section provides that if any person works for any other person on Sunday, and receives payment for it at any time, then any person in the wide world, except the parties concerned, can enter suit, and recover the money so paid. If you work for me on Sunday, and I ever pay you for it, then the first man that finds it out can sue you and get the money. That is what the bill says. The bill says that when wages are paid for Sunday work, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by *whoever* shall first sue for the same. "Whoever," is a universal term. Therefore, this bill deliberately proposes that when any man who is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, receives payment for work done on Sunday, except of necessity or mercy, he may be sued for that money by whoever first learns that he has received it, and that person shall get the money.

To think that any such legislation as is embodied in this section should ever be thought of by any sane person, is sufficiently astonishing; but that it should not only have been thought of, but should have been thought of and embodied in a bill, and introduced into the United States Senate by a United States Senator, and that it should have passed two readings in that body without a dissenting voice, is simply astounding. It almost surpasses belief. But here are the facts which demonstrate that such things have been done in this land of liberty, in the National Legislature, in this year of the nineteenth century. When United States Senators will employ their time in such legislation as that, then whose liberties are safe? Senator Blair is a Prohibitionist of National reputation. He

may justly be considered a representative Prohibitionist, and the legislation proposed in this bill, and in this section of the bill, may justly be considered a representative piece of Prohibitionist legislation.

But if that be so, then the fewer Prohibitionists who ever, as such, secure legislative power, the better will it be for the people. And when such legislation as is here proposed can be introduced, and read twice in the United States Senate, without a dissenting voice, then it is high time that the American people were awaking to that eternal vigilance which only is the price of liberty.

The last section of the bill is as follows:—

"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."

This section is simply provisory, and requires no comment, except the last few lines, which show the object of the entire bill; and that is, "to secure to the whole people rest, . . . and the religious observance of the Sabbath day." No one, therefore, need attempt to evade the force of objections against this bill by saying that it is not the religious, but the *civil*, observance of the day that is required; because here it is plainly declared in the bill itself, that it is not only to secure rest to all the people, but that it is also to secure the *religious* observance of the Sabbath day. There is not a single reference in the bill to any such thing as the civil observance of the day. The word "civil" is not used in the bill. It is a religious bill wholly. The first section defines the Lord's day; the second section refers to the day as one of worship and rest; section three refers to it as a day of religious worship; section four refers to its observance as that of religious worship; and section six plainly declares what is apparent throughout, that the object of the whole bill is "to secure to the whole people rest and religious observance of the Sabbath day," on the first day of the week.

It is religious legislation, and that only; but as the present Constitution forbids religious legislation, it was necessary to follow the presentation of this bill by a proposed amendment to the Constitution establishing the Christian religion. Thus the two go hand in hand. They belong together; either necessitates the other. Let either be adopted, and in the language of the United States Senate in 1829, it will "involve a legislative decision on a religious controversy, and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society, or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced it will be impossible to define its bounds. . . . If admitted it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it, and the catastrophe

of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequences. . . . If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts we must pursue it to its *ultimatum*. . . . Let the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World."

The Blair Sunday Bill and its accompanying constitutional amendment bear in them, or in either of them, this desolating scourge, and if adopted will spread that scourge over all this fair land. Therefore we are eternally opposed to this bill, or anything like it. We oppose it as human beings who have respect for human rights; we oppose it as American citizens who believe in the rights and liberties asserted for mankind by the Declaration of Independence, and maintained for all by the American Constitution as it is, and which inhere in the genius of American institutions. We oppose it as men who fear God, and respect the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, or, so far as civil government is concerned, not to worship him at all if he chooses; we oppose it as Christians who love Christ and endeavor sincerely to do his will, and who, at the same time, maintain that, under civil government, every other man is entitled to all the rights to which the Christian is entitled; and we would have every soul in the United States inspired with the spirit, and, we hope, with the deathless endurance, with which our own opposition is inspired.

The National Establishment of the Christian Religion.

A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENTS OF RELIGION AND FREE SCHOOLS.

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.

This amendment to the National Constitution has been offered by Senator Blair, and is now pending in Congress. It is a singular sort of a document, though hardly any more so than was to be expected in the promotion of the scheme which underlies it, *i. e.*, the establishment of a National religion. The proposed amendment is just about as flatly self-contradictory as any proposition could be. Section 1 reads as follows:—

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

The first sentence of section 2 reads as follows:—

“Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate to 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 Christian religion.”

That is to say, No State shall ever make or maintain a law respecting an establishment of religion; but every State in this Union shall make and maintain laws establishing the principles of the Christian religion. And to make assurance doubly sure, section 3 declares that—

“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.”

And that is to say that the United States Government pledges itself that every State shall establish and maintain the principles of the Christian religion. This proposed amendment therefore, at one stroke, establishes Christianity as the National religion, *because* it declares that every State shall maintain the principles of the Christian religion in the public schools, and the Nation is pledged to see that this is done. Therefore there must be a National decision of some kind declaring just what are the principles of the Christian religion. Then when that decision shall have been made, every State will have to receive from the Nation just those principles of religion which the Nation shall have declared to be the principles of the Christian religion, and which the Nation will have pledged itself shall be taught in the public schools of every State. In other words, the people of the United States will then have to receive their religion from the Government of the United States. Therefore, if Senator Blair's proposed amendment to the National Constitution does not provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National religion, then no religion was ever established or maintained in this world.

But how shall this National decision be made as to what are the principles of the Christian religion? It would seem that the second sentence of section 2 makes provision for this. It declares that no “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.”

As therefore no religious tenets, doctrines, or beliefs can be taught in the schools, except such as are common to all denominations of the Christian religion, it will follow inevitably that there shall be officially called a National council of the churches to decide what are the principles common to all, and to establish a National creed, which shall be enforced and inculcated by National power in all the public schools in the United States. And that will be but the establishment of a National religion. And that is exactly what Senator Blair's constitutional amendment assures, so surely as it or anything similar to it shall ever be adopted. And that is what the National Reformers intend shall be.

It was in this way precisely that the thing was worked in the fourth century. Constantine made Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman Empire. Then it became at once necessary that there should be an imperial decision as to what form of Christianity should be the imperial religion. To effect this an imperial council was necessary to formulate that phase of Christianity which was common to all. The Council of Nice was convened by imperial command, and an imperial creed was established, which was enforced by imperial power. That establishment of an imperial religion ended only in the imperious despotism of the Papacy.

As surely as the complete establishment of the Papacy followed, and grew out of, that imperial recognition of Christianity in the fourth century, just so surely will the complete establishment of a religious despotism after the living likeness of the Papacy, follow, and grow out of, this National recognition of Christianity provided for in the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Blair, and which is now pending in Congress.

The Savor of Tyranny.

SENATOR BLAIR'S National Sunday Bill declares that no person shall “engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord's day, or during any part thereof.” Some of the States already have the same sort of Sunday laws as this. California has no Sunday law, much less one of this kind. But not long ago the city of San Francisco had, on another subject, an ordinance of the same nature as this passage in the National Sunday Bill. San Francisco has no such ordinance now, however; the merit of the ordinance came up before the Supreme Court, and the whole thing was treated with the contempt which all such statutes only deserve.

The ordinance read as follows:—

“No person shall in any place indulge in conduct having a tendency to annoy persons passing or being upon the public highway or upon adjacent premises.”

A man by the name of Ferdinand Pape was distributing some circulars on the street, which had “a tendency to annoy” somebody; he was arrested. He applied to the Superior Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*, claiming that the offense charged against him did not constitute a crime, and that the ordinance making such action an offense was invalid and void, because it was unreasonable and uncertain. The report of the case says:—

“The writ was made returnable before Judge Sullivan, and argued by Henry Hutton in behalf of the imprisoned offender. Disposing of the question, the Judge gave quite a lengthy written opinion, in which he passed a somewhat severe criticism upon the absurdity of the contested ordinance, and discharged Pape from custody. Said the Judge:—

“If the order be law, enforceable by fine and imprisonment, it is a crime to indulge in any conduct, however innocent and harmless in itself, and however unconsciously done, which has a tendency to annoy other persons. The rival tradesman who passes one's store with an observant eye as to the volume of business is guilty of a crime, because the very thought of rivalry and reduction of business has a tendency to annoy. The passing of the most lenient creditor has a tendency to annoy, because it is a reminder of obligations unfulfilled. The passing of a well-clad, industrious citizen, bearing about him the evidence of thrift, has a tendency to annoy the vagabond, whose laziness reduces him to a condition of poverty and discontent. The importunities of the newsboy who endeavors with such persistent energy to dispose of his stock, has a tendency to annoy the prominent citizen who has already read the papers, or who expects to find them at his door as he reaches home. He who has been foiled in an attempted wrong upon the person or property of another, finds a tendency to annoy in the very passing presence of the person whose honesty or ingenuity has circumvented him. And so instances might be multiplied indefinitely in which the most harmless and inoffensive conduct has a tendency to annoy others. If the language of the ordinance defines a criminal offense, it sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.

“But it may be said that courts and juries will not use the instrumentality of this language to set the seal of condemnation on unoffending citizens, and to unjustly deprive them of their liberty and brand them as criminals. The law countenances no such dangerous doctrine, countenances no principle so subversive of liberty as that the life or liberty of a subject should be made to depend upon the whim or caprice of judge or jury, by exercising a discretion in determining that certain conduct does or does not come within the inhibition of a criminal action. The law should be engraved so plainly and distinctly on the legislative tables that it can be discerned alike by all subjects of the commonwealth, whether judge upon the bench, juror in the box, or prisoner at the bar. Any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror savors of tyranny. The language employed is broad enough to cover conduct which is clearly within the constitutional rights of the citizen. It designates no border-line which divides the criminal from the non-criminal conduct. Its terms are too vague and uncertain to lay down a rule of conduct. In my judgment the portion of the ordinance here involved is uncertain and unreasonable.”

This decision applies with full force to Senator Blair's proposed National Sunday law. Under that law all that would be necessary to subject any person to a criminal prosecution, would be for him to engage in any sort of play, or game, or amusement, or recreation, on Sunday, because there are many of those rigid National Reformers who would be very much “disturbed” by any such amusement or recreation, however innocent it might be in itself. And it is left entirely to the whim or the caprice of the “disturbed” one, or of the judge or jury, to say whether the action has really disturbed him or not.

The California decision is, that such a statute “sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.” California courts “countenance no such dangerous doctrine, countenance no principle so subversive

of liberty," or which so "savors of tyranny." It is very likely that should Senator Blair's bill be enacted into a law, the United States courts would decide in the same way as did the Superior Court of California. But it is an exceedingly ominous sign, and one most startling in the danger which it displays, when a bill which so "savors of tyranny," and which embodies a "principle so subversive of liberty," can be introduced into the National Legislature, can be received and reported favorably, can pass two readings, can be spread broadcast throughout the land, and only one single voice—that of the AMERICAN SENTINEL—be raised against it.

The American people have so long enjoyed the liberty which has been justly their boast, that they seem, from appearances, to think that now they can lie down safely and hibernate undisturbed for all time to come. We wonder what can ever awaken them. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty;" but "corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

The National Reform Association.

THE National Reform Association is an organization composed of representative men of all "evangelical" denominations, and its object is to secure an amendment to the National Constitution, making Christianity the National religion. Among its vice-presidents are: Joseph Cook, President Seelye, Bishop Huntington of New York, George W. Bain of Kentucky, Miss Frances E. Willard, Mrs. Josephine Bateham, Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, Mrs. Hoffman, Mrs. Lathrop, and others of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, besides such a number of Reverends, D. Ds., LL.Ds., that we cannot take the time to name them, but which number in all about one hundred and twenty. All these are simply the vice-presidents of the Association. This Association, we have said, was organized to secure an amendment to the National Constitution, recognizing the Christian religion as the religion of this country, and enforcing its precepts upon all who live under the Government. The proposed constitutional amendment introduced by Senator Blair, which we print in another column, is just the kind of an amendment which they seek to have adopted, and with this amendment they are intensely pleased. The *Christian Statesman* is the organ of that Association, and in its issue of July 18, 1888, it indorses this amendment as furnishing an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people, and as embodying principles which have been advocated by the Association for a quarter of a century. In the same paper, of September 6, Mr. John Alexander, father of the Association, urges without delay the circulation of petitions favoring the amendment in such numbers, and signed by so many people, that it will require a procession of wheel-barrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the Nation, in the Houses of Congress. Other such commendations might be given, but these are sufficient to show how entirely the Blair amendment meets the mind of the managers of the National Reform Association.

Now we propose to give a few items showing what the National Reformers wish to do when they get that which the Blair Amendment embodies.

The *Christian Statesman*, of October 2, 1884, said:—

"Give all men to understand that this is a Christian Nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain, by all right means, our Christian

character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. . . . Enforce upon all who come among us the laws of Christian morality."

"Enforce," according to Webster, is "to force, to constrain, to compel, to execute with vigor." Therefore the proposition of the National Reformers is to force, to compel, all to keep the laws of Christian morality; to execute with vigor upon all the laws of Christian morality.

It will be seen at once that this will be but to invade the rights of conscience, and this, one of the vice-presidents of the Association declares, civil power has a right to do. Rev. David Gregg, D. D., now pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, a vice-president of the National Reform Association, plainly declared, in the *Christian Statesman*, of June 5, 1884, that the civil power "has the right to command the consciences of men."

Rev. M. A. Gault, a district secretary, and a leading worker, of the Association says:—

"Our remedy for all these malific influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it."

Rev. E. B. Graham, also a vice-president of the Association, in an address delivered at York, Nebraska, reported in the *Christian Statesman* of May 21, 1885, said:—

"We might add in all justice, if the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then if they can stand it stay there till they die."

In a speech in a National Reform Convention held in New York City, in February, 1873, Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., named atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Christians, and summed them all up under the head of atheists, and said:—

"These all are . . . as far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together. . . . The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry. It is his class. . . . The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him. They must be treated, as for this question, one party."

Then he tells how they propose to deal with these people when they get what the Blair amendment supplies. He says:—

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. . . . Tolerate atheism, sir! There is nothing out of hell I would not tolerate as soon. . . . Atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent."

As though this were not enough, and as though their tolerant intentions were not sincere enough, they propose in addition to all this to join hands with the Catholic Church and enlist her efforts in their work. The *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884, said:—

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

These are the men, and this is the Associa-

tion, which rejoices and is glad at the prospect opened before us by Senator Blair's proposed amendment to the National Constitution. This is how they propose to use the power that will be bestowed upon them if that amendment is adopted. This is the Association that is filling the country with petitions to be signed by the people asking that that amendment be adopted. With this Association both the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party are allied.

Fellow-citizens, these petitions you will be asked to sign. By these presents you know who it is that is asking you to sign them. You know what they propose to do under the amendment if they succeed in securing it. What are you going to do? Will you sign the petitions and thus lend your influence to establish such a religious despotism as is here shadowed forth? or will you refuse to sign, and tell your neighbor about the wicked scheme, that he may refuse to sign? The danger is upon us, will you awake to the occasion? Do not delay your answer, but act promptly and energetically we beg of you.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

THE SENTINEL has had occasion frequently to criticise some of the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Upon the part of those who favor the establishment of a *religious* instead of a *civil* government here, this fact has been made the means of an attempt to create prejudice at the expense of the SENTINEL. They try to make it appear that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is opposed to temperance. We propose to make plain our attitude toward temperance in general and toward the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in particular.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL is thoroughly and consistently devoted to the genuine principles of temperance. And what the SENTINEL considers to be the genuine principles of temperance can be stated in this single sentence, viz.: *Total abstinence from all stimulants and narcotics of whatever kind or nature or degree.* More than this, it is out of allegiance to Christian principle that the SENTINEL is devoted to this principle of temperance. It is thoroughgoing Christian temperance in which the SENTINEL thoroughly believes. It is because allegiance to Christ demands that we shall be temperate in all things, that we advocate the principle of temperance. Both of the editors of the SENTINEL are doing their very best to act strictly in accordance with this principle of temperance. It must therefore be manifest to every soul that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is decidedly in favor of temperance, and *Christian* temperance at that. And in this it must likewise be manifest to everybody that whatever criticisms we have ever made, or shall ever make, upon the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, are not in any sense in opposition to the purest principles of Christian temperance.

Although we are decidedly in favor of Christian temperance, and endeavor personally to practice it, and to persuade others to practice it, we are *not* in favor of using the civil power to compel anybody either to favor or to practice it. And when the Woman's Christian Temperance Union attempts, as it does, to use the civil power to compel people to conform to the principles of Christian temperance, it goes beyond its legitimate province, it acts contrary both to civil polity and Christian principle, and *therefore* we oppose it. Christian principle knows no such thing as outward force; it never seeks either the support or the control of the civil power.

Christian principle knows only the force of conscientious conviction, aroused to action by persuasive reason, under the blessed influence of the Spirit of God. Christian principle knows no power but the power of God as manifested in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Believing this with all our heart, although we are decidedly in favor of *temperance*, of *Christian temperance*, of *woman's Christian temperance*, and even of *woman's Christian temperance union*, we are just as decidedly opposed to the *political aspirations* of the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union*.

The *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* proposes to establish a theocracy in this country, and to that end demands that the ballot shall be put into the hands of women. Proof:—

"A true theocracy is yet to come; . . . hence I pray devoutly, as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the *National Woman's Christian Temperance Union* has so long championed this cause."—*W. C. T. U. Monthly Reading for September, 1886*.

Now the establishment of a man-made, or a woman-made, theocracy will be but a repetition of the establishment and working of the hideous principles of the Papacy, if not the establishment of the Papacy itself, in this country. The Papacy is a theocracy. Its workings throughout history have been but the practice of the principles of a man-made theocracy—such a theocracy as the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* proposes to establish here by the ballot. The rule of such a theocracy is the wickedest rule that the world has known or can know.

It puts man in the place of God, and deifies human passions; and such a *régime* is but one remove from that of Satan himself. Therefore, as such a theocracy is such a wicked thing, as it is such an utter perversion of every principle of government, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to it. And as the *National Woman's Christian Temperance Union* is pledged to the establishment of such a theocracy, and rejoices that it has so long championed such a cause, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to *that part* of the aims and workings of the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union*. And why should we be blamed for it?

In order to the establishment of this theocracy here, they "pray devoutly for the ballot in the hands of women." But whenever the ballot is put into the hands of women, for any such purpose as that, then the ballot will be the worst thing that was ever put into the hands of a woman.

Again; the *SENTINEL* is first, last, and all the time, opposed to the aims of the *National Reform Association*. That Association likewise proposes to turn this Government into a theocracy, ruled by the "leaders and teachers in the churches." It declares that dissenters from *National Reform* opinions "cannot dwell together on the same continent" with the *National Reformed Christianity*; and that "there is nothing out of hell" that should not be "tolerated" as soon as these. In Senator Blair's proposed *National Sunday law* and constitutional amendment, both of which are now pending in the *United States Senate*, the *National Reformers* see taken the first steps towards making effective their "tolerant" intentions. Now the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* is the closest ally, and the most powerful support, that the *National Reform Association* has in this Nation to-day. Many of the officers of the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* are also vice-presidents of the *National Reform Association*. It was the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* that first started the petitions for this *National*

Sunday law, which pleases the *National Reformers* so well, and which so fitly plays into their hands; and the Union went before the *Senate Committee* with the names of one and a half million petitioners, and more to follow, in favor of that law which, in more than one of its provisions, is subversive of liberty, and which savors all over of tyranny. It is perfectly safe to say that from the position which she occupies, the present president of the *National Woman's Christian Temperance Union*, herself alone, is doing more to spread *National Reform* ideas and principles than are all the *National Reform "District Secretaries"* put together. And there are other leaders of the Union who are not much behind her in this bad accomplishment.

Therefore, as we are totally opposed to the aims of the *National Reform Association*, and as the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* is the most powerful support of that Association, we are, consequently, totally opposed to *that part* of the workings of the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union*. And why should we not be?

Nor is this all. We view with grave apprehensions the encroachments of the Papal power, on its own part, upon the civil institutions of this Government. Everybody knows that the Papacy has never wearied of condemning our public schools because they are not made the medium of religious instruction. The *National Reform Association* and its allies now echo the Papal condemnation, and seek to remove the cause of it, by the pending amendment to the *National Constitution*, in which the *National power* is pledged to see that every State "shall establish and maintain" a system of religious public schools. Now to secure this and the co-operation of the Papacy at the same time, the *National Reform Association* agrees that the *Catholic Bible*, and *Catholic instruction*, shall be established in the public schools wherever "Roman Catholics are in the majority." And also in securing and enforcing the pending *National Sunday law*, the *National Reformers* pledge themselves to "gladly join hands" with the *Roman Catholics*, and to make repeated advances to secure the co-operation of the *Roman Catholics* "in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it." Therefore the two points,—the *National Sunday law*, and religion in the public schools,—upon which the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* is diligently working to secure *National religious legislation*, are the very points upon which the *National Reform Association* stands pledged to unite with the Papacy.

Now the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* supports the *National Reform Association*. The *National Reform Association* is pledged to Rome. Rome stands pledged forever to the subversion of every principle of liberty. Therefore, as we are forever opposed to the encroachments of Rome, so we are forever opposed to *that part* of the working of the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* which supports the *National Reform Association*, which is pledged to Rome. And why should we not be opposed to it? And why should not everybody else be opposed to it?

We know that there are many of the women of the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* who do not favor the political, nor the theocratical, nor the *National Reform*, aspirations of the leaders of the Union. We know a number of women who have separated themselves from the workings of the Union because of the very things which we have here pointed out. They joined the Union to work for *Christian temperance* upon *Christian principles*, and to secure the practice of *Christian temperance* by *Christian means*. But when they saw that by the lead-

ership of the Union, political efforts and means were supplanting the *Christian principles*, efforts, and means, they left it. They did well to leave it. And so will every other woman do well to leave it, who does not want to be sold into the hands of Rome through the political, theocratical, and *National Reform* aspirations of the present leadership of the *National Woman's Christian Temperance Union*.

We only pray that the whole body of the Union, leadership and all, may awake to the danger of their position before they shall have delivered the civil power, and themselves and us all with it, into the hands of a religious despotism.

The Prohibition Party.

NOT long since one of the editors of the *SENTINEL* made a speech in San Diego, Cal., on religious legislation in general, and Senator Blair's proposed *National Sunday law* and religious amendment to the *Constitution* in particular. We gave a sketch of the theocratical workings of the church, the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union*, and the *Prohibition party*, with the *National Reform Association*, and the aim of the *National Reformers* to hand over the whole thing to the Papacy as soon as the Papacy is ready. The *San Diego Sun* stated that in this we "assumed what every member of these organizations will promptly deny." We do not think that the statement of facts can rightly be considered *assumption*. As to the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union*, we give our position in regard to that elsewhere in this paper. We wish now to show that when we name the *Prohibition party* in the same category we assume nothing.

It cannot be denied that the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* and the *National Reform Association* are pledged to the establishment of a theocracy in this country. Nor can it be denied that the *Prohibition party* is inseparably connected with both the *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* and the *National Reform Association*. The *Woman's Christian Temperance Union* demands the ballot in the hands of women, in order to establish a theocracy; the *Prohibition party* is pledged to secure the ballot in the hands of women; therefore the *Prohibition party* is pledged to the establishment of this woman-made theocracy. In order to establish a theocracy, the *National Reform Association* demands a constitutional amendment empowering Congress to legislate in religious things; a leading *Prohibitionist*—Senator Blair—proposes in Congress just such an amendment, accompanied by a bill legislating upon things pertaining to God; and the *Lever*, in commending the "moral element" in the make-up of the *Prohibition party*, "the foundation" for which is laid in the recognition of "Almighty God as the source of all power in government," says:—

"At this point the *Prohibition party* stands out in bold contrast with the old parties. It recognizes the authority of God in human government, and proposes that all legislation shall be in harmony with *Christian morality*."

This is precisely what the *National Reform Association* has in view, therefore the aim of the *Prohibition party* and the aim of the *National Reform Association* are identical. And besides this the *National Reformers* have pledged themselves to join hands with the *Catholic Church* as soon as she is ready.

More than this, this is only that at which the Papacy itself is aiming in this country. Pope Leo XIII. commands that,—

"All Catholics should do all in their power

to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church."

Senator Blair's constitutional amendment and religious legislation are modeled exactly "on the principles of the true church;" and the Prohibition party is pledged to such legislation; therefore the aim of the Prohibition party and the aim of the Catholic Church, so far as religious legislation is concerned, are identical. *And they are working together to secure it.* At the county Prohibition convention for Tulare County, Cal., held in Tulare City not long ago, a Catholic priest was introduced by a Methodist minister, and made a strong speech and offered the Catholic Church free to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at any time, to hold their Prohibition unions in. About the same time a Catholic priest spoke in a Prohibition convention in Los Angeles, in which he made most prominent the necessity for religious legislation, particularly in regard to enforcing the observance of "the Lord's day," as Senator Blair's Sunday Bill provides. These things greatly please the Prohibition party, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the—Catholic Church.

Now we would like for some Prohibitionist to tell just about how much any advocacy of Prohibition by the Catholic Church is worth, while everybody knows that there is not a saloon keeper in all the land who cannot keep a saloon and be a member of the Catholic Church as long as he lives, and (if he pays money enough) go straight through purgatory without even getting scorched, when he dies. We can tell what it is worth, and that is, just what influence and support the Catholic Church can get out of the Prohibitionists in accomplishing the Papal scheme of causing "the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church."

That is what it is worth, and that is all it is worth. But if the Prohibitionists think that a safe investment, they have vastly more confidence in the wheedling charms of the Papacy than we have. For we never can forget the truth of Macaulay's words, that—

"The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity [of Rome] to such perfection that, among the contrivances for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place."—*Essays Von Ranke.*

"Rev." "Sam" Small, the associate revivalist with "Sam" Jones, was secretary of the National Prohibition Convention, held at Indianapolis. And what he wants to see, as stated in his own words at Kansas City last winter, is this:—

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, National, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws."

Was ever the Papacy more than that? Did ever the Papacy *ask* more than that? *Could* it ask more?

From these evidences it is plain that the Prohibition party, as it is, is set for the establishment of a religious despotism of which the Papacy shall be at least a part. And whoever works for, or votes, the Prohibition ticket, works and votes for the establishment of such a despotism.

The following letter, from a prominent Prohibitionist in an Eastern State, but who does not work for the Prohibition party as at present constituted, is sound and to the point: "The church may adopt any form of gov-

ernment for itself that it chooses, but must keep hands off the civil government. The worst despotism the world ever experienced was under a theocracy. The church party, misnamed Prohibition party, seeks to proselyte and carry on a religious crusade under the guise of a so-called political party. Put that party in power, and the priest and minister would supersede the judge, the jury would disappear, civil courts would give place to ecclesiastical courts, the public court-room to the star chamber, the ordinary jail to the inquisition.

"My vote, and my voice, shall ever be for a free, civil, enlightened, and progressive Government.

"I am a dyed-in-the-wool Prohibitionist, and daily practice what I preach, but do not belong to the clerical party."

This letter exactly expresses the views of the SENTINEL. The AMERICAN SENTINEL is entirely and consistently in favor of Prohibition; but it is not in any sense in favor of religious legislation. What we here say is not against Prohibition, but against the religious legislation element, the Church and State element, in the Prohibition party and in the Prohibition platform. Opposition to Church and State was hissed and yelled down in the California State Prohibition Convention of 1888. And a consistent Prohibitionist told the Prohibition party in that same convention, that if they went into the campaign with the platform as it is, "they would have to pass half the time in convincing the people that it was not a religious movement." The Prohibition party, both State and National, have gone into the campaign with that very platform, and that party may spend *all* the time in the endeavor, but it can never convince any thinking person that it is not a religious movement. The Prohibition movement as it is now manifested in the Prohibition party, and under its present platform, is nothing else than a religious movement; and that is only what the majority of the preachers, whether Protestant or Catholic, have in view who are making themselves so prominent in behalf of Prohibition—they are only making Prohibition the stepping-stone to religious legislation, and the establishment of their own power by it. And in view of the ecclesiastical engineering of the Prohibition party, Dean Milman's weighty words are of living importance to every American citizen: "In proportion as ecclesiastics become co-legislators, heresies become civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments."

The AMERICAN SENTINEL is in favor of Prohibition everywhere and all the time; but it is not in favor of religious legislation anywhere at any time. We would shut the saloon everywhere and forever, not because it is irreligious nor because it is violative of the law of God, for with such reasons the civil power can have nothing to do, but because it is uncivil. If the saloon were only irreligious, or were only violative of the law of God, the State would have no right to interfere with it to any extent whatever. But as it is essentially uncivil, the State can and ought to abolish it entirely, yet never with any question as to whether or not it is irreligious or violative of the law of God. We would shut the saloon for the same reason that we prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons.

We know there are many Prohibitionists who, like the correspondent whose words we have quoted, are as much opposed to religious legislation, or priests in politics, or churches in civil affairs, as we are; we know that in the California State Prohibition Convention there were powerful speeches made against the Church and State element in the Prohibition party; but that element carried the day,

and that element rules in the so-called Prohibition party; and whoever would not help forward the union of Church and State, and the establishment of a religious despotism in this Nation, should be as far as the East is from the West from voting the present Prohibition ticket, or working in any way for the Prohibition party as it is.

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 6, M. A. Gault says:—

"I had a long talk with Hon T. C. Richmond, leader of the Prohibition party in Wisconsin. He is a popular speaker and a logical reasoner. He is almost constantly in the field addressing large audiences, endeavoring to convince the people that the Prohibition party should drop every other issue but Prohibition."

Mr. Richmond's idea is correct. If Prohibition is what the Prohibitionists want, why are they not willing to work for that alone? If Prohibition is what they want, why are they not willing to secure the help of every element that can be enlisted in favor of Prohibition? The very fact that the so-called Prohibition party will not work for Prohibition alone, is proof that the religio-political managers of that party are only using the Prohibition issue as a stepping-stone to the establishment of their power, and the subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power.

Oakland Lawyers on the Blair Bills.

PUBLIC interest has recently been so directed to the two measures proposed by Senator Blair, namely, "a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free schools," and 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," that the *Tribune* of this city deemed the matter of sufficient importance to call for the opinions of the Oakland bar upon the proposed legislation. Accordingly a reporter of that paper submitted copies of the Blair bills to a number of attorneys and asked for an expression of opinion on them, with the following result:—

H. I. Adams—I gave my opinions through the columns of the *Tribune* last week, but will repeat sufficiently to say that while I was formerly of the opinion that the first day should be generally enjoined by statute, a careful study of the question has led me to change my views in that regard, and I now believe that any law which compels the observance of one day of the week upon all classes of people without regard to their religious belief constrains them of their liberty, and is in violation of the form of thought and religious worship guaranteed by the inventors of this Government in the present Federal Constitution.

J. R. Glascock—It is an infringement upon the personal liberty of the people. It is a step backward and not forward. If carried to its legitimate result it would relegate us to the days of Connecticut blue laws. Church and State should be kept as far apart as possible. Let our schools teach knowledge and not religion.

In this opinion Mr. Glascock recognizes the fact that religious legislation of any description whatever is a virtual union of Church and State, whether that legislation be in the interests of one denomination or of many. The next opinion likewise covers both the bill and the amendment:—

A. L. Frick—I am opposed to teaching the principles of the Christian religion or any other religion in the schools. Religious education should be left to the church and the home. The Sunday bill in my opinion is unjust and unwise. I believe in Sunday regulations only in so far as necessary to protect persons in the uninterrupted observance of worship, and this matter should be left to the several States as distinguished from the Federal Government.

This opinion might seem to favor State regulation of Sunday observance, but a careful reading of it will reveal the fact that it does nothing of the sort. Every State now has wholesome and just laws protecting from disturbance all religious assemblies, as indeed all lawful assemblies, and so all that is indicated by Mr. Frick as a duty of the State with regard to Sunday is already secured without Sunday laws.

S. F. Daniels, ex-Police Judge—I am not in favor of this resolution. I think that the teaching of religion should be kept entirely out of our free schools. I do not see how it could be beneficial in any way. I am opposed to Christian religion or any other religion being taught in our schools. With regard to the Sunday law, I am opposed to it. We had a Sunday law in the State at one time, and as Police Judge I had to enforce it, but I did not think it was right, being an injustice to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week. Neither do I believe in prohibiting persons from observing any day they choose to. I think that should be left entirely with the conscience.

J. M. Poston, ex-City Attorney of Oakland—I think the amendment of the Constitution is impracticable, inasmuch as it involves the union of Church and State, to which I am positively opposed. As to the Blair Sunday Bill, I think some parts of that are impracticable, and interfere with the rights of the State, and I think it is the work of a crank anyway. I think that the matter of educational system belongs to the State.

Here again the idea that the proposed amendment involves a union of Church and State is made prominent.

J. K. Peirsol—I am not in favor of having any law for the establishment of religion in the school. I am in favor of education and the teaching of morality, but not the teaching of any religion. I am in favor of all classes of people refraining from work one day in the week, but that their conscience should be their guide as to which day they observe as a rest day. I think the penalty clause of the Blair bill is useless.

George M. Shaw—I do not think it would be advisable to amend the Constitution. I think the inventors of the Constitution understood that matter. I think that is going too far with the Sunday law. Any regulation of that question would be a serious disturbance to the country, and I am not in favor of interfering with a person's religious belief.

L. N. Church—I think that religion in the schools is all right so far as morality and virtue are concerned; but I could not indorse the sentiment of the bill as it reads, as no one should be restricted in his religious belief.

Bernard McFadden—I do not think that religion should be taught in the public schools.

Thomas H. Smith—I am not in favor of the principles of Christian religion in schools, for this reason, that they have no right to teach one religion to the exclusion of all others. In regard to the Sunday bill, I am in favor of the observance of the first day; but I believe that every man should have the privilege of worshipping Almighty God when-

ever he wants to do so without the interference of others. I think more can be done by moral suasion than by the State.

E. C. Robinson—I am opposed to any union of Church and State. I believe there should be no work done on the day set apart for rest; but I think every man should have the privilege of worshipping according to the dictates of his own conscience.

A. M. Church—Keep Church and State separate forever. Morality is all well enough, but the "principles of Christian religion" should be left out. We had better let the Constitution entirely alone so far as it relates to the rights of a man's conscience.

Judge F. B. Ogden—If you strike out that portion that relates to the Christian religion being taught in the schools it would be all right. I think religion should be taught at home and in the churches. Such a law as that would inaugurate a union of Church and State. I do not like the Blair Sunday Bill for this reason—I believe that each State should set apart one day for rest, but I do not believe in prohibiting innocent pleasure.

Judge Ogden is the only one expressing himself unreservedly in favor of even State Sunday laws, and even he recognizes in the Blair bills an attempt to unite Church and State.

E. C. Chapman—I believe in the principles of morality, but I do not believe that States should have the right to legislate on these things at all. I do not believe in teaching religion of any kind in the public schools. I am not in favor of any law that would force people to observe any particular day.

J. W. Harriss—I indorse the statement of Mr. Chapman.

A. C. Lawson—If the principles of virtue and morality be taught, I think that is all that is necessary. With regard to the Sunday bill, I believe that any measure to set apart any particular day as a day for religious worship is in opposition to the Constitution of the United States, and whenever the Government projects to put the religious element under its wing it is wrong. I am a believer in the first day of the week as a day of worship, but I am not in favor of forcing it upon anyone else.

S. B. McKee—I should not favor the teaching of any particular religion in the schools. In reference to the Blair Sunday Bill, I understand that the foundation of our Government was religious liberty for all classes. The courts have held the observance of Sunday, but I think it is impractical from a business standpoint, and against the policy of the country.

Robert L. McKee—I am decidedly opposed to any instruction in Christianity in our free public-school system.

William Lair Hill, of the firm of Davis & Hill—In regard to these matters I am a Baptist, and therefore, of course, I am positively of the opinion that religion should be taught in churches and not in public schools. I see no reason for legislating the Christian religion into the State, which (under the principles of our Government, and the only true principles of any civil Government), would not apply with equal force in favor of legislating Mohammedanism and Buddhism and Confucianism into those countries where these religions have already the majority of the people.

Thus it is seen that the consensus of opinions among the lawyers of Oakland is that Sunday laws are subversive of religious liberty, that they are religious legislation, and that the success of the Blair bills would unite Church and State in this country. But it is to just such

measures as this that the National Reform Association, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Prohibition party stand pledged.

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.

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 is well known that there is a large and influential association in the United States bearing the name of the "National Reform Association," which is endeavoring to secure such a

RELIGIOUS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Of the United States as will "place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

While there are many persons in this country who are opposed to, or look with suspicion upon, this movement, there are few, outside of the party, who realize what the influence of this Amendment would be. The object of the *American Sentinel* will be to

VINDICATE THE RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS,

Which, we believe, are threatened by this association. It will appeal to the very fundamental principles of our Government, and point out the consequences which would be sure to follow should they secure the desired Amendment to the Constitution.

Every position taken will be carefully guarded and fortified by sound argument. Due respect will always be paid to the opinions of others, but

The Rights of Conscience will be Fearlessly Maintained.

TERMS.

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

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

Specimen Copies Free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, 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.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH

AND FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

By ELD. J. N. ANDREWS.

THIS WORK CONTAINS A MINE OF INFORMATION.

THE Bible record of the Sabbath; the secular history concerning it; the successive steps by which the change to the first day was made, and the work of restoration, are given in detail.

Every text of Scripture concerning the Sabbath is commented on at length; and the complete Testimony of the Fathers in regard to the Sabbath and first day is given. The comparative merits of the seventh and the first-day Sabbaths are fully shown. A copious index enables the reader to find any text, or the statement of any historian.

Should be read by everybody. 648 pp. Price, \$2.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER, 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.

DOCTOR CRAFTS reports that between three and four million names have already been secured to the petitions in behalf of the National Sunday law.

THE Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party have become so entirely National Reform organizations that the regular National Reform organizers have ceased to organize local National Reform clubs as such, but work through these to spread the National Reform ideas. So says District Secretary M. A. Gault in the *American*, June 27, 1888.

THE Executive Committee of the National Reform Association held a meeting in Pittsburgh September 14; and one of its recommendations is this:—

"That Secretary Weir be appointed especially to press the cause of National Reform upon the attention of political parties, during the next four years, and to enlist, as far as possible, in this endeavor the influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union."

THE National Reform Association is circulating for signatures petitions to Congress asking that Senator Blair's proposed religious amendment to the Constitution may be passed by Congress and submitted to the States for their approval. One of these petitions was presented to the Prohibition County Convention of Wood County, Ohio, August 8. It was unanimously indorsed, and a copy of a resolution to that effect was sent to Senator Blair, together with the respects of the convention.

JOHN ALEXANDER, of Philadelphia, is the father of the National Reform Association, as such, and in the *Christian Statesman* of September 6 he congratulates the Association on the introduction of the Blair religious amendment to the Constitution; declares "the National Reform Association ought to spare no pains and omit no effort which may promise to secure its adoption;" and further says:—

"Let us begin without delay the circulation of petitions (to be furnished in proper form by the Association), and let an opportunity be given to all parts of the country to make up a roll of petitions so great that it will require a procession of wheelbarrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the Nation in the Houses of Congress." And "let a mass convention of the friends of the cause be held in Washington, when the Blair resolution shall be under discussion, to accompany with its influence the presentation of the petitions, and to take such other action as may be deemed best to arouse the Nation to a genuine enthusiasm in behalf of our National Christianity."

Isn't it about time that somebody was arousing to a genuine sense of the danger to civil and religious liberty that inheres in this scheme?

THE *California Christian Advocate* some weeks ago gravely informed its readers that "Congressman Plumb, of Kansas, has offered an amendment to the Sunday Civil Bill providing an appropriation for the building of a public drinking fountain in the Capitol." Of course the bill to which the Kansas Congressman has offered an amendment is the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill; but in these days of proposed Sunday legislation it is perhaps not strange that the friends of Sunday laws fail to discern what to them seem so small a difference. The time may come, however, when even the Sundry Appropriation Bill may contain clauses relative to Sunday, and then it will indeed be literally the "Sunday Civil Bill."

REV. R. C. WYLIE says the National Reformers should advocate Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution,—

"Because of the aid it will give us in discussing National Reform principles. Some of these are clearly embodied in the amendment. Senator Blair's amendment marks an epoch in our history. . . . The pulpit and the platform should herald the truths it teaches, from ocean to ocean."

Yes, the amendment will not only aid in discussing National Reform principles, it will also, if adopted, most materially aid the National Reformers in carrying those principles into practice by the civil power, and in satisfying their intense longing to tolerate dissenters as lunatics and conspirators are tolerated.

THE *Tribune* of this city thinks that we are needlessly alarmed about the Blair Sunday Bill. The *Tribune* evidently does not understand the situation. The bill in question may fail to become a law, but that does not prove by any means that the serious consideration of such a measure is not a menace to religious liberty in this country.

The systematic and persistent efforts which are being made by hundreds of thousands of people banded together in various churches, associations, and societies throughout our land to secure religious legislation in this country, should arouse every liberty-loving citizen to a sense of danger, and set him to work to enlighten others in regard to National Reform designs and practices.

Senator Blair may be, as the *Tribune* intimates, a harmless "crank," but there are many thousands afflicted with the same religious-legislation mania, and there is a dangerous method in their madness. We cannot afford to settle down in fancied security when such measures are being seriously proposed in the Senate of the United States.

THE latter part of July, "Sam" Jones, the great revivalist, preached in Windsor, Canada, to an audience composed mostly of Americans, who went over there to hear him. One of his devout, elegantly refined, and intensely instructive passages was this:—

"Now I'll tell you, I think we are running the last political combat on the lines we have been running them on. It is between the Republicans and Democrats, this contest, and it is the last the Republicans will make in America. The Democrats are going in overwhelmingly. Four years from now the Prohibition element will break the solid South. The issue then will be, God or no God, drunkenness or sobriety, Sabbath or no Sabbath, Heaven or hell. That will be the issue. Then we will wipe up the ground with the Democratic party, and let God rule America from that time on."

And this the *Christian Statesman* inserts un-

der the heading, "The National Reform Movement!" It is very appropriately placed. It is a worthy addition to the literature of the National Reform movement. But what consummate mountebanks many of those popular "revivalists" do make of themselves!

As was to be expected, the National Reformers are delighted with Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution. It is in substance just what they have been working for all these years. The *Christian Statesman* of July 12 says the amendment "should receive the strenuous support of all American Christians." In its issue of July 19 the *Statesman* says:—

"Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people."

Then, after mentioning "Christianity, the religion of the Nation," and "the Bible, the text-book of our common Christianity, in all the schools," it says:—

"These have been our watch-words in the discussions of a quarter of a century. And now these ideas are actually pending before the Senate of the United States in the form of a joint resolution proposing their adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Here is a great opportunity. Shall we boldly and wisely improve it?"

We are afraid that the iniquitous scheme will ultimately carry.

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 9, Rev. R. C. Wylie praises Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment, because it would, if adopted, give the National Reformers many advantages which they have not now. He says:—

"We would then have a vantage-ground we have not now. The leading objection that has been urged against us will have lost its power. That objection, which has such a tender regard for the infidel conscience, will have spent its force against this amendment, and will be no more fit for use against us."

That is to say: The charge of invading the rights of conscience has, so far, lain against the National Reformers; but now, if this amendment is carried, this charge will lie against the amendment, and will spend itself there while the National Reformers escape. This charge is justly made against the National Reformers; for they distinctly affirm that the civil power has the right to compel the consciences of men. And the admission that if the amendment were adopted the charge would then lie against that, is a confession that the proposed amendment, if adopted, will invade the rights of conscience. And that is the truth. It will surely do so. If it would not, it would not be so heartily indorsed by the National Reformers.

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,
1039 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.