

# THE 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.

THE moment any religion becomes national, or established, its purity must certainly be lost, because it is then impossible to keep it unconnected with men's interests; and if connected, it must inevitably be perverted by them.—*Jenyns.*

### Government Is Secular.

THE National Reform Association held a National Conference at Philadelphia, April 24–26. In speaking of it, and the aims of the Association, the *National Baptist*, of May 3, says:—

“In their specific aims and methods, we find it impossible to agree. Their great aim is to make the Government conform to the principles of Christianity. This they propose to accomplish by putting into the Constitution a declaration of religious belief. They hold that this was founded as a Christian Government, that Christianity is a part of the common law, and some among them hold that this is not only a Christian but a Protestant Government. They hold further that the public schools, founded and sustained by the State, must teach with more or less fullness the principles and practice of religion.

“From all these views, we dissent wholly. We believe that government is secular; it is designed for one express object, and it ceases to be beneficial and efficient for this object, just in proportion as it is used for some other end. The agency divinely designed for teaching religion is the *Christian church*, not the State nor the public school.

“The dictum that the Christian religion is a part of the common law is expressly denied by not a few eminent jurists. If the dictum were granted, it would be harmless only by being nugatory. If it means anything it means that no one but a Christian can have any power, or in fact any standing, under the Government. In a Christian church, no one but a Christian has any standing room. Does not the same hold if the State be Christian? But if a Jew were elected president would anyone claim that he must not be inaugurated?

## The American Sentinel and 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 theocratic 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 gave our position in regard to that in our issue for September; 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 government 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.

A. T. J.

#### The Catholic Review on Sunday.

THE Catholic Church is ready with its advice on the Sunday issue. Some time ago the *Catholic Review* said to the workingmen:—

"The time is near at hand when those who have so warmly advocated eight hours as a workman's day, will find it necessary to agitate for six days as a workman's week. If the labor organizations are really anxious for an issue on which they can have the help of the vast majority of the American people, let them take up this of Sunday labor. They will find enormous obstacles to contend with in the widespread avarice of the non-Catholic workingmen as well as of the capitalists. If

the limit of a day's labor to eight hours is calculated to restrain the over-production to which they object, the cessation of Sunday labor, which is now carried on to an extent enormously in excess of what the general public is disposed to believe, would exercise a still further restraint in this direction. If the labor associations are sincere in their professions, they will find that temperance—if not total abstinence—on all days of the week, and the Christian observance of the Lord's day, will tend greatly to diminish many of the evils of which they justly complain."

#### Rome and the Public Schools.

ONE day in the late Convention of the National Educational Association, Professor Morgan, of Rhode Island, in replying to criticisms upon the public school, said that the opposition to the public schools comes from Roman Catholicism. The next day the following "open letter to the heads of the departments of the National Educational Association," appeared in the *San Francisco Chronicle*. The writer is chancellor of the archdiocese of San Francisco:—

GENTLEMEN: When the National Educational Convention, now in session in this city, and over which you preside, began its work, we were told that the great object of the convention was in the assembled wisdom of numbers to compare methods, to interchange ideas, and unify the best methods of promoting the object of the public schools.

We were naturally led to suppose that one other object would be carefully kept in view, namely, to maintain inviolate the boasted characteristic of the public-school system of this country, namely, its non-sectarian character.

Now, gentlemen, while these expectations were most reasonable, I beg to express what I believe to be the feeling of the great Catholic body of this community, including, I feel assured, every Catholic teacher in that convention, whether living here or coming hither from elsewhere, namely, our utter amazement at seeing your sessions regularly opened with prayer by Protestant ministers, representing the various Protestant denominations of this city.

This we might have tolerated to gratify those who delight to pray in public places, but we certainly cannot permit to go, without a respectful protest, such remarks as the following. I quote from this evening's *Bulletin*. The report given of the gentlemen's words is substantially the same in the *Post* and the *Report*. Prof. Thomas J. Morgan, of Rhode Island, said:—

"This rising opposition to the public schools comes from Roman Catholicism, and this opposition means nothing but their destruction—with them a destruction of our civilization, of our liberties, a return to the horrors of the Middle Ages."

It is stated that these words were received with cheers and with hisses, but it is not said that these sentiments were repudiated by your presiding officer. Perhaps it was not his duty to do so. But if not, it is due the public to say that these sentiments are an insult to, and an outrage upon, the feelings of half the community in which this convention is sitting; an outrage upon the feelings of a large number of teachers composing that convention; an insult to the largest body of Christians in this great and free country, where, until now, it was supposed that no law, not even a school law, should operate or permit such insult. Since the Catholic body of this

country pays more taxes than any other body of Christians to support these schools, shall we then be insulted and outraged and have no means of redress? I ask the fair-minded of every shade of opinion if this is not true.

It is not true that "this rising opposition to the public-school system comes from Roman Catholicism" alone. Some of the best and purest men and the ablest and profoundest thinkers outside of Roman Catholicism are as much opposed to it as Catholicism is.

Gentlemen, is it fair, is it honest, to oblige teachers to attend that convention under pain of incurring the displeasure of the School Board, and thus insult them in this way? I ask the heads of this convention to answer.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE MONTGOMERY.

*San Francisco, July 19, 1888.*

The following is Professor Morgan's reply:—

*To the Editor of the Chronicle*—SIR: Will you kindly allow me space for a very brief reply to Rev. Father Montgomery's "protest" against my remarks yesterday, which you publish to-day?

I assume all responsibility for my utterances and do not wish "the heads of departments" to be censured for what I have said.

I wish, however, to disclaim any intention of "insulting" my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. Some of the best friends I have in the world are Roman Catholics. If in the hurry of a three-minute utterance on a great theme I used any words that could be regarded as insulting, I greatly regret it.

The point I wanted to make was this: I was asked, What answer can we give to the criticism made upon the public schools that they fail to cultivate the religious sentiment or to teach morality? My reply was that a part of this criticism comes from the Roman Catholics, and I asserted that the Catholics who make it would be satisfied with nothing less than the destruction of the public schools and the substitution therefor of parochial schools. In other words, the charge that the public schools are "godless" means that they are not Roman Catholic, and should be destroyed.

Not to multiply authorities, let me cite the words of Rev. F. T. McCarthy, S. J., used in a sermon reported in the *Boston Journal*, December 23, 1887. He says the public-school system "is a national fraud." "It must cease to exist, and the day will come when it will cease to exist." "There are some 8,000,000 Catholics in the United States, and they protest against this institution." "It is subversive of the rights of the individual, subversive of the rights of the family, subversive of the rights of religion, and subversive of the divine rights of God himself." The States "have no right to educate." "God never gave a commission to the State to educate." He asserts that if Catholics patronize the "godless" public schools, when they have other schools to send to, "they are guilty of mortal sin."

The priest, whose words I am quoting, declares that he is not "giving his opinion," but laying down "the teachings of the church."

I respectfully submit that if Rev. Mr. McCarthy correctly represents the Catholics then they are in favor of the absolute overthrow of the American public-school system, and the criticism on the schools that they are godless is not made with a view of improving them, but is intended to undermine and destroy them.

As a teacher, a member and an officer of the National Educational Association; as a friend of the public-school system; as one who believes that our free Government rests upon the virtue and intelligence of our people—I felt at liberty when called upon to answer the grave criticism made upon our schools, to point out the animus of the criticism, so

that we may know for what we are contending.

If Father Montgomery and the Catholics of the Pacific Coast agree with Father McCarthy, of Boston, I do not see that they have anything to complain of in what I have said. If, however, they do not accept his teachings, if they are the friends of the public schools, no one will rejoice over that fact more sincerely than I will.

THOMAS J. MORGAN.

*San Francisco, July 19, 1888.*

We shall not attempt to add anything to Professor Morgan's reply, as to the merits of the case; but there are two expressions used by the priest to which we would call attention for a moment.

The first of these is that in which he speaks repeatedly of Professor Morgan's words being an "insult and an outrage." Priest Montgomery knows that the Professor states the fact. Priest Montgomery, and everybody else, knows that Roman Catholicism, everywhere and always, is opposed to our public-school system. Everybody knows that Professor Morgan stated the fact. And it is neither an insult nor an outrage publicly to state what is publicly known. The priest says there are some outside of Roman Catholicism who "are as much opposed to it [the public school] as Catholicism is." Whoever outside of Roman Catholicism opposes the public-school system is but a Roman Catholic in disguise, for the principle of his opposition is essentially Roman Catholic. More than this, nine-tenths of those who oppose the public-school system, outside of the Catholic Church, do so expressly to please the Catholics and so secure their co-operation in carrying into operation certain religio-political schemes which both have in view, and which will end in that which Roman Catholicism has long desired—the destruction of the American public-school system.

The other expression is that in which the priest says that "to gratify those who love to pray in public places," the Roman Catholics "might have tolerated" the opening of the sessions of the convention "with prayer by Protestant ministers, representing the various Protestant denominations." Mr. Montgomery should be told that the American people know no such word as "tolerate." "What other nations call religious toleration we call religious rights." That Educational Convention had the right to have its sessions opened with prayer by anybody whom it should choose, or opened without prayer at all, just as it should choose. And when Mr. Montgomery talks of "tolerating" it, he casts a slur upon every man who has any respect for himself. In 1827 Lord Stanhope said: "The time was when toleration was craved by dissenters as a boon; it is now demanded as a right; but a time will come when it will be spurned as an insult." That time has now come. And every man who is acquainted with the true principle of liberty will consider it an insult when anybody, be he so-called Protestant or straight-out Catholic, proposes any such thing as religious "toleration." The vocabulary of American ideas knows no such word as "toleration;" it asserts RIGHTS.

A. T. J.

### Political Cowards.

POLITICAL courage is a quality which in the present day seems to be applied only to the heroes of the past. We revere the sterling bravery of Washington, the calm determination of Lincoln, and the dogged tenacity of Grant, but when we look about us to-day, to whom of our leading men can we apply the epithet "courageous"? In a democracy, of all forms of government, courage is the quality above all others which should command the respect of the people and lead to successful results. In a government of the people the man should rule who has the courage of his convictions, and will boldly outline a policy and defend his views to the end. Unfortunately, in the anomalous condition of the politics of this country, the man who is usually most successful is he who best understands the manipulation of the factions, and not he who throws down the gauntlet of his convictions and stands ready to champion his views without regard to personal expediency or consequence. This is an age of little men and tricksters; the great leaders of the past decade are fast disappearing, and those who survive have passed the time of political activity.

The political developments of late years tend to show that the less courage a man possesses the more sure he is of political preferment. The man who stands for his convictions is respected for his bravery by the honorable, thinking members of the community; but the party managers will have none of him, as he is sure to be offensive to this faction, or cannot be manipulated by that clique. The man with a record must of necessity have made enemies, and for that reason is considered an impossible political candidate. By the time a man has been found who is unobjectionable to the Fiji element—who is sure of the Hottentot vote, and can command the support of the Hindoo influence—all that remains is a mediocral negation as much resembling the ideal statesman as the fabled ass in the lion's skin is like to the monarch of the forest. Pure partisanship is always the most circumspect of courses, and the only road to greatness is to strike out a bold and independent line of conduct. Parties are the exponents of principles, and leaders must be the inaugurators of progression, else party and leaders will sink into negative inaction.

This lack of courage amongst politicians does not signify that the American nation is without courageous men; it merely means that under the influence of our heterogeneous democracy the politicians have constructed a monstrous bugbear, in the form of what they are pleased to term public opinion, and which, to their view, possesses as many eyes as Argus, each ready to scrutinize every act which may be considered offensive to the multifold interests of the community. So accustomed are politicians to cower before this self-constructed terror of public opinion—which, in reality, is but the divisional interests of the machine managers—that they dare not risk initiating a new policy, which they believe to be essential to the nation's safety, and pro-

gressive enough to depart from the stereotyped traditions of their partisan organization. Democracy itself is not responsible for this state of affairs, as the real public opinion—and by this is meant the view of the nation at large—is quick to praise any aggressive action tending toward needed reform; but the political oligarchy which stands between the people and the would-be reformer has so surrounded itself with demagogical power that it unhesitatingly slaughters any would-be reformer before he can appear before the people and demand their suffrage.—*America.*

### The Papistic Element in the National Reform Movement.

THE *Christian Statesman*, organ of the National Reform Association, puts forth a full-fledged Papistic theory, in an editorial upon "The Sabbath and Its Legal Safeguards." It asserts that all "intelligent and earnest friends" of Sunday should unite to accomplish the following points:—

"1. To the maintenance of every right and wise safeguard of the Sabbath rest which is now to be found on the statute-books of the nation. The fundamental principles in view of which we must judge of the wisdom and rightness of these statutes are these: The supreme authority of Almighty God as the Creator and Lawgiver of the world; the fact that he has, from the beginning, and through all dispensations, reserved one-seventh of man's time as his portion, to be employed, not according to our judgment or inclination, but according to his direction. . . .

"2. These defenses must be restored where they have been overthrown. . . .

"3. To meet the altered conditions of our modern society, the laws must be enlarged and strengthened. The fine of four dollars and some cents, which sufficed to detain a Conestoga wagon until Monday in the days when all freight was carried across the Alleghanies in such conveyances, is ludicrously inadequate as a means of regulating the vast railroad system of to-day. The same is true of other lucrative and gainful occupations. To adjust penalties wisely, so as to meet the changed conditions of society, and to preserve the efficacy of the law, is one of the delicate, but imperative, tasks of statesmanship, and one for which our modern statesmen have shown little aptitude or inclination. They must be admonished and instructed by the aroused conscience of the Christian public, and if they refuse to heed they must be replaced by men who will.

"4. The action of the general government must be brought into accordance with the requirements of the Sabbath. Among the most needless, most extensive, and most injurious forms of Sabbath desecration in the land to-day is the transportation and distribution of the mails on the Lord's day. It is needless, because our telegraph system, wisely employed, obviates the necessity for any mail service on that day. In the face of the fact that London, with its five millions of inhabitants, the commercial center of the world, has neither collection nor delivery nor dispatch of letters on the Sabbath, the plea of business necessity for this form of labor on the day of rest is inadmissible. Yet none save those who have carefully informed themselves have any idea of the amount of labor performed on the Sabbath by our postal employes, of the rapidity with which this service on that day is extending itself over the land, or of the inevitable consequences which it is drawing in its train.

On this and on other points the reformation we seek must extend to the general Government.

"5. The law of the Sabbath must, by the intelligent and deliberate decision of the people, be embodied in our Constitutions, State and National. The American people are learning great lessons in these days touching the nature and purpose of written constitutions of government. They are discovering that by means of constitutional provisions they can lift great subjects, on which they have reached conclusions, out of the realm of political chicanery and party strife and set them on high as the declared policy of the State or of the Nation, which parties will vie with one another in extolling, and which all public officers are sworn to execute. So sacred and important an interest as the Sabbath deserves a place among the high provisions of fundamental law. The temperance reformation is carrying the enlightened verdict of public opinion to its legitimate expression in these great instruments of the Nation's will. The rising controversy regarding the authority of the divine law of the Sabbath over communities and Nations, will seek and will find its final settlement in the same way.

"All these considerations justify and illustrate the work of the National Reform Association, whose object, as declared in its constitution, is 'to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government, to secure needed reforms in the action of Government touching the Sabbath [and other kindred matters], . . . and to secure such an amendment [or amendments] to the Constitution of the United States as will indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of the Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. What Christian citizen, and what friend of the Sabbath, can hesitate to lend his co-operation to the work of such a society?'"

Summarized, the above says: Sunday laws must be maintained, enlarged, and strengthened by heavier penalties. The officers who will not execute such laws, must be removed to make room for those who will. The mail service and similar National institutions must be compelled to conform to the Sunday laws. That all this may be the better and more securely attained, the Sunday laws must be made a part of the constitutional law of the States and of the Nation. These ends justify the existence and the purposes of the National Reform Association. All this should be done on religious grounds, and in conformity to the law of God.

And yet the *Statesman* insists that it does not aim at a union of Church and State, but only at a union of Christianity and the State. This is a distinction without a difference, and the plea is an evasion. When the Christians of the United States, acting in concert through a Christian political party, have thus subordinated the National Constitution to a common creed, there will be set in operation the machinery of a spiritual despotism, un-Christian, and destructive of liberty of conscience. It would be a State church, composed of united denominations, whose common creed would find expression in constitutional law, State and National. This creed would be the political platform of the Christian party, which the *Statesman* hopes to form through a union of the National Reformists and the

Third Party Prohibitionists. A President of the United States, elected on such a platform, or a dictator after the model of Oliver Cromwell, would be bound to enforce the creed of those placing him in power. Even revolution, in the name of religion, would be a legitimate part of such a program. No amount of evasive statements and smooth rhetoric can disguise the logical results which are involved in this movement. Religious intolerance and civil proscription of all who could not yield submission to such a civil authority, would be the unavoidable result. Such a conception of the functions of the State in religious matters is a compound of Jewish theocracy and the State church of pagan Rome. It is Romanism in disguise. The Roman Catholic Church of the world might well join in such a movement, as being a most effectual one against her lost children, the Protestant churches.

Rome must have an especial interest in the application of this principle to our Sunday laws. Sunday legislation is Rome's first-born and well-beloved child. It is the only point of common union left between her and Protestants. Let the National Reform movement concerning our Sunday laws reach a point where the Roman Catholic power in the United States, thrown into the balance, would turn the scales, and Rome could dominate the National Government far sooner than she can hope to do in any other way. Holding thus the balance of power, the way to the gradual suppression of Protestantism would be plain. Neither is it improbable that by some "bold stroke," which Rome knows so well how to make, this humiliation of Protestantism would not be *gradual*. Rome could thus make Protestants their own executioners.—*The Outlook.*

### The Inquisition.

NOT to go outside of the Roman Catholic Church, the doctrine on which the Inquisition was founded is by no means abandoned by that church, nor even less tenaciously held, than it was in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The object of the Inquisition was not to punish *crime*, but to suppress *error*. It recognized no distinction between crime and sin, between offenses against man, of which man may take cognizance, and offenses against God, of which God alone can take cognizance. It was an organized revolt against the law, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." It made inquisition into the secret thoughts and interior life of the people, and judged them, not merely for acts perpetrated, but for opinions entertained. "The duty of the Inquisition, moreover, was distinguished from that of the ordinary judge by the fact that the task assigned to him was the impossible one of ascertaining the secret thoughts and opinions of the prisoner. External acts were to him only of value as indications of belief, to be accepted or rejected as he might deem them conclusive or illusory. The crime he sought to suppress by punishment was a purely mental one—acts, however criminal, were beyond his jurisdiction." Hence it was that disavowal of the heresy charged was of no avail; if persisted in, it was often

regarded only as evidence of contumacy. Hence, too, arose the use of torture, to compel the heretic to confess that he entertained the heretical opinions charged upon him; for only by confession and penance could he be redeemed from the sin; and we must give the inquisitors credit for laboring often for the salvation of the soul, though by means that were full of cruelty to the body.

One of the lessons which this history has for us is that no faculty is more cruel than that of conscience, when it is directed by self-will, not by faith and love. Now, the Roman Catholic Church has by no means abandoned its claim to judge of the thoughts and intents of the heart. It has by no means accepted the modern distinction between crimes and sins, nor agreed that to man is given alone the right to judge of and punish crime, and that God has reserved to himself the exclusive jurisdiction of sins that are not crimes. Still less does it accept the Protestant doctrine—which we believe also to be clearly New Testament doctrine—that the function of the church is a teaching, not a ruling, function, and that the State and Church should be forever kept separate. “In no age of Christianity,” says the “Catholic Dictionary,” “has the church had any doubt that in her hands, and only in hers, was the deposit of the true faith and religion placed by Jesus Christ, and that, as it is her duty to teach this to all nations, so she is bound by all practical and lawful means to restrain the malice or madness of those who would corrupt the message or resist the teacher.” And it specifies the act of Paul in striking the sorcerer, Sergius Paulus, with blindness, as an evidence of the right of the church to punish false doctrine.

Similarly the late Pope, Pius IX., explicitly reckons among the errors of our times the doctrine that “the church has not power to use force,” and anathematizes those who deny that it possesses the authority by which it “pronounces upon what is lawful and what is not lawful,” even in public and social actions, or who assert that its laws “have no binding force until they have been confirmed by the sanction of the civil power.” Indeed, the very existence of the confessional is a continuous claim by that church of a right and a duty to inquire into the secret thoughts and inner life of at least all its communicants; while its writers frankly concede that, if it no longer uses force to compel obedience to its laws, this is due, not to the want of will, but to the want of power. Nor is this disregard of the distinction between crimes and sins, and this notion that the State could be redeemed if only the church and the ministry, or at least professedly Christian people, could get the control of politics, and the prayer-meetings become primaries, by any means confined to Roman Catholic circles. But this hint must suffice; to follow it out would take us too far from our immediate and legitimate purpose.

There is no room here to write or even to suggest the history of the Inquisition. . . . It is a history of despotism, inaugurated by

conscience, but carried on by greed and by ambition. It is a history of the awful results which flow from lodging despotic power in the hands of any man or class of men—results more awful the more conscientious the men are to whom it is at first intrusted. It is a history which illustrates and enforces the truth that it is not safe to lift any set of men above the laws, or to give to any set of men irresponsible power over their fellows. It is a history, not merely of the Roman Catholic Church, but of humanity, and one which in a different form might easily be repeated if ever a like power were lodged in any class, civil or ecclesiastical, Papal or Protestant.—*Christian Union, in notice of Lea's History of the Inquisition.*

### The Pope and the Clergy.

DURING the winter of 1853-54, the Senate of the United States was discussing the Nebraska Bill. A protest against the passage of that bill was sent to the Senate, signed by three thousand and fifty “clergymen” of New England. This memorial called out an earnest and curious debate, as the Senators felt the full force of the “astounding fact” that here was a body of men, in this age and country, claiming that they “were authorized by the Almighty, and in his name, to pronounce an authoritative judgment upon a political question pending before the Congress of the United States.”

This debate on the clergymen's memorial provoked the wrath of the entire fraternity. A public meeting of twenty-five clergymen of the city of Chicago was soon held to discuss the Senate debate. This body of clergy also sent in a protest “in the name of Almighty God,” and signed it “as ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ,” and accompanied the protest with four resolutions.

This second clergyman's protest and resolutions were sent to Senator S. A. Douglas, whom these clergymen boldly accused of “want of courtesy and reverence toward man and God,” in his speeches on the first memorial.

This was a grave charge for clergymen to prefer against Douglas, and it aroused the Little Giant. He replied to this charge and reviewed the debate on the memorial of the three thousand and fifty, and then paid his best respects to the protest and resolutions of the twenty-five Chicago clergymen. In pamphlet form I have his letter, dated Washington, April 6, 1854.

Since reading many comments on the Pope's late rescript on the political affairs of Ireland, I have re-read the letter of Senator Douglas to Protestant clergymen in this country, who tried to dictate to the Senators of the United States how they should vote on a political question. The claims of Leo XIII. are not any more extravagant or startling than the claims of Protestant clergy in this age and country. Have the clergy of to-day repudiated the high claim of “speaking in the name and by the authority of Almighty God”?

This year there have been several great assemblies of “ministers” in New York and in

Philadelphia, and I have carefully read the reports of their proceedings, but have failed to discern that the assumption of the divine prerogative of speaking by the authority of Almighty God, has been denied. Without this sweeping prerogative, the clergy know that their words are wicked.

The Chicago clergy charged that “the whole tone and spirit of the debate” on the New England clergy's memorial, was “an outrage upon the privileges of a large and respectable body of citizens,” and “upon the claims of the divine name, word, and institution.” They insisted on being recognized in their “office as ministers,” who had lost none of their prerogatives as citizens when “called of God” to be his vice-regents.

But neither the New England three thousand and fifty, nor the Chicago twenty-five clergymen, approached the Senate of the United States in their capacity as *citizens*, whose right to petition either or both houses upon any subject of public interest pending before that body, never should be denied. They declared that they came before Congress as ministers, in the name of Almighty God, to pronounce “his will upon all points of moral and religious truth.” In this high character, the Government does not know them.

Those New England clergymen, of different religious denominations, in “their official characters as ministers of Almighty God, and in his name, protested against the passage of the Nebraska Bill” as a “great moral wrong;” as a matter “exposing us to righteous judgment of the Almighty.”

The Senators who objected to this protest urged that the protest was not presented in the name of citizens, or human beings, nor in the name of any human authority or civil right. Its obnoxious feature was, the signers “assumed the divine prerogative and spoke to the Senate in the name of Almighty God.” This conduct was understood by Douglas and other Senators as “asserting a divine power in the clergy of this country higher than the obligations of the Constitution, and above the sovereignty of the people and of the States,” and, in virtue of this “divine power,” to command Senators how to vote on any question.

In the eyes of Douglas, this assertion of a divine power in the clergy, when adopted and repeated by the Chicago clergymen in their protest and resolutions on behalf of their New England brethren, looked as if it was the “fixed and deliberate purpose” of all the clergy of different religious denominations, to “force an issue upon this point [divine authority] with the civil and political authorities of the republic.”

The Chicago clergymen “removed all obscurity and avowed the purpose distinctly and boldly” in this resolution, sent up to the Senate of the United States:—

*Resolved*, That the ministry is the divinely appointed institution for the declaration and enforcement of God's will upon all points of moral and religious truth; and that, as such, it is their duty to reprove, rebuke, and exhort, with all authority and doctrine.”

Has the leopard changed his spots?

Let the reader note that this bold resolution, so sweeping in its claim of authority, was adopted by a council of twenty-five Protestant clergymen of different denominations, assembled in Chicago in 1854. . . .

Pius IX. had then been nearly eight years on his pontifical throne, reared upon the ruins of the throne of the Cæsars. That proud, shrewd, and power-grasping old monk must have been pleased at what he also considered a daring invasion of his prerogatives, when he read this resolution of the Chicago clergymen. And their sincerity in the reality of their "divine appointment" was revealed to the astonished old man, in the sending of this resolution to the Senate of the United States. . . .

Cardinal Manning boldly asserted in the name of the Pope: "I am the sole, last, supreme judge of what is right and wrong." Not much bolder than the resolution of the Chicago "divines."

The Pope interferes on the "moral bearings" of the affairs in Ireland now. Our Chicago "divinely appointed ministry" asserted before the Senate of the United States that "it is our duty to recognize the moral bearings of the conflicts of political parties, and to proclaim, in reference thereunto, the principle of inspired truth and obligation." Whew!

Whenever these "divinely appointed ministers" please to "declare in the name of Almighty God," that a measure, passed by Congress, signed by the President, interpreted and sanctioned as constitutional by the Supreme Court, is, in their judgment, "immoral and unrighteous," those who obey Congress expose themselves to the wrath of the Almighty. If this is not equal, in haughty arrogance, to any assumption of the divine prerogative ever uttered by any Pope of Rome, I know not how to distinguish between the pretensions of these divine functionaries.

What say the present "ministry"? As an organized, "divinely appointed" body, those clergymen spoke "in the name of Almighty God," to the constituted authorities of this young, free nation! Thirty-four years have passed away since Senator Douglas informed the clergy that "your claims for the supremacy of this divinely appointed institution are subversive of the fundamental principles upon which our whole republican system rests." This clerical presumption makes its existence known in various ways, even in these days. As a "divinely appointed institution," even this present year, it will propose to apply the test of inspired truth to each of the political contests, "and presume, in the name of God, "to exhort and rebuke with all authority."

With Douglas, I say: "I cannot, shall not, recognize in your divinely-appointed institution, the power either of prophecy or of revelation."

Douglas wrote his reply to the protest and resolution of the Chicago clergymen, in April, 1854. I can well remember his canvass of 1856, seeking the Democratic nomination for President. How much his bold repudiation

of the arrogant claims of the "divinely appointed institution of the ministry," as the one only competent tribunal to both "declare and enforce God's will on all points of faith and morals," had to do with the fierce opposition which Douglas had to endure until his death, June, 1861, cannot be estimated. The clergymen never forgave the man who questioned their assumption of the "divine prerogative of the Almighty God."

Senator Mason, of Virginia, in the debate on the New England Memorial, said that when men came before Congress as vice-regents of the Almighty, they came "as a class unknown to the Government—a class whom the Government does not mean to know in any form or shape."

Both Douglas and Mason have joined the "silent majority," but their earnest, outspoken warnings remain on the national records for the instruction of other "constituted authorities." The "Government does not mean to know" any class of men as the "vice-regents of the Almighty." Has the "Government" changed its intentions?

The other day, after the laying of the cornerstone of the great Papal university, with a great parade, in Washington, Mr. James Gibbons, not as a citizen, but as a prime minister of the Pope of Rome, decked out in gorgeous robes of red, as cardinal, head of the church in the United States, went to the White House to introduce his obedient servants, the bishops, to the President. After this service was performed, so great was the crowd, and so strong the desire to behold a live cardinal, that the said Gibbons was forced to hold a kind of informal reception in the famous east room.

Senator Butler, of South Carolina, was right when he, in that public debate, charged those clergymen with assuming "to be the foremen of the jury which is to pronounce the verdict and judgment of God upon earth." He saw their true disposition, their best-liked avocation, when he said they "would convert the lamb into the lion, going about in the form of agitators seeking whom they might devour," hiding in their dark or red robes of hypocrisy.

The Government cannot afford to know these men claiming to exercise the divine prerogative in any form or in any shape. Various are the forms or shapes of this "arrogant and insatiable priestcraft."—*James S. Bell, in Christian Leader.*

AMERICA is a country where politics is brought to the attention of every man, but Americans know less about public affairs than almost any other nation. The English read all the debates in Parliament, and carefully study all questions. They know all their Ministers by name, and feel almost personally acquainted with the leaders in the House of Commons. Every four years the American is aroused by the excitement of the presidential campaign, but during the intervening period he pays little attention to public affairs, and leaves all questions to the politicians.

In England the papers contain extensive

accounts of all the proceedings of Parliament, while in this country the reports of the actions of Congress are condensed, and in many papers are banished to the supplements, while base-ball and divorces are described in every detail. We do not study sufficiently the questions of the day, and are not sufficiently cognizant of the actions of our Representatives. How many Americans can name twenty-five United States Senators, with the States they represent? How many know, by name, the Cabinet officers, or the Justices of the Supreme Court? We like to hurrah for someone during the campaign, but we do not sufficiently weigh the question as to whom we shall hurrah for.—*America.*

### The Sentinel and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

THE following letter is from a thorough-going National Reformer. We willingly give it space.

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: Your last month's article, under the head of "The AMERICAN SENTINEL and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union," and signed "A. T. J.," will bear criticism; and I hope you will permit a friend of the Woman's Union to write a word in their defense.

1. Your assertion that the W. C. T. U. is in favor of using the civil power to compel people to favor or to practice Christian temperance, or to compel people to conform to the principles of temperance, is unfair because it is untrue. No temperance society known to the writer is "in favor of using the civil power to compel anybody either to favor or to practice" temperance. Yet all agree that no license should be granted to sell liquor to common drinkers. But there is a vast difference between "compelling people to favor or practice temperance" and compelling men to desist from selling poison to people who wish to poison themselves.

3. You err when you say that "Christian principle knows no power but the power of God as manifested in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ." This is a grave error. There is a divine power in law as well as in the gospel. God is the Author of both. "The powers that be are ordained of God." That means *civil* powers. "There is no power but of God." This, too, includes *civil* power. "He beareth not the sword in vain." This means the *civil* men; and he who "resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." If civil government has not the power to pass civil law to prohibit the liquor traffic, then it bears the sword in vain. "The law was made for man-stealers." This means *civil* law. And there is power as well as majesty in law, because all righteous law is from God, the source of all power. And "rulers," *civil* rulers, legislators, governments, "are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." The SENTINEL knows very well what kind of works, whether good or evil, are perpetrated by saloonists. The women are worthy of commendation, not of censure, for endeavoring to bring the power of *civil* law to bear against saloons. Your charge against the W. C. T. U. is unjust. All temperance prohibitionists wish the power of law to be brought to bear against the ruinous traffic.

And why should not Christian women, as well as Christian men, desire civil prohibition? Why are you so "decidedly opposed" to such "*political aspirations* of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union"?

That I may not occupy too much of your space, what I wish to say further in defense

of the women must be deferred until your next number. N. R. JOHNSTON.

Mr. Johnston's denial on behalf of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union will not answer. It is not sound. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union Convention of 1887 declared "Christ and his law to be the supreme authority in National as in individual life," and in other places it is added, "to whose laws all human laws should conform." Human laws are made to be enforced; if not enforced they are a nullity. If therefore the law of Christ is of supreme authority in National life, and human laws are to conform to it, then the enforcement of such laws can be nothing else than to compel men to practice Christian duties, whether of temperance or any other. Our assertion is only the logic of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union premises. It is therefore neither unfair nor untrue.

We know full well that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" we also know that though they are ordained of God, they are not ordained to exercise any authority in things which pertain to God. The *civil* powers are ordained only to the exercise of power in *civil* things, and not at all in moral or religious things.

"Christian women as well as Christian men" should "desire civil prohibition;" but it is essentially *religious* prohibition that is desired by both the W. C. T. U. and the Prohibition party, and not the religious prohibition of the liquor traffic alone, but the religious prohibition of things that are not irreligious nor even uncivil. And that is why we are "so 'decidedly opposed'" to the *political* aspirations of the W. C. T. U., and the *religious* aspirations of the Prohibition party. A. T. J.

### Sound Sentiments.

THE following preamble and resolutions were sent to us by the organizations named. They have our hearty endorsement:—

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of the city of Boston has recently discarded a text-book from use in the public schools of the city, through the influence of a Roman Catholic priest, because the said text-book contains a historical statement with reference to the abuses of the Papal church at the time of the rise of Protestantism in Europe.

(The book is Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History," a standard text-book, and the objectionable language used by the author is as follows:—

"There was complaint of many practical abuses of the church, and at the claims of the Popes to interfere in the affairs of nations; and there was also a growing feeling among many, that not a few of the doctrines which were believed, and of the ceremonies which were practiced, in church were contrary to Scripture.

"It was in this state of affairs that there arose a dispute, trivial, indeed, in its nature, but which kindled a flame that quickly spread over most of Western Europe. When Leo X. came to the Papal chair, he found the treasury of the church exhausted by the ambitious projects of his predecessors. He therefore had recourse to every means which

ingenuity could devise for recruiting his exhausted finances, and among these he adopted an extensive sale of indulgences, which in former ages had been a source of large profits to the church. The Dominican friars, having obtained the monopoly of the sale in Germany, employed as their agent Tetzl, one of their own order, who carried on the traffic in a manner that was very offensive, and especially so to the Augustinian friars.")

And for this historical fact, stated in the mildest language possible, this text-book is excluded from the free schools of Boston, the honorable Board of Education bowing in meek submission to the arbitrary mandate of this hierarchy; therefore,

*Resolved*, By Camp 22 of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Leadville, Colorado, that we *do most earnestly protest* against this arbitrary ecclesiastical interference with the literature of the free schools of our land.

At this rate it is but reasonable to expect the next scene in the drama will be the expulsion of "Froude's History of England" as a text-book in our common schools, because the author states the truth respecting the bloody persecution of the Roman Catholics by the Church of England at the time of the execution of Mary Stuart by the rapacious Protestant, Queen Elizabeth.

Or, through the influence of some religious fanatic, some standard History of the United States will be discarded from use in our public schools, because the author records the abuses and prejudices of the early Puritans in their bitter persecutions of other denominations in New England; and in condemning to death poor old innocent women supposed to be possessed of witchcraft.

In passing this resolution of censure it is with no malice to the Catholic Church; but we would raise our voice equally strong against the interference of any Protestant Church in the dictation of the literature of the free schools of our common country.

Had this ecclesiastical edict have been prescribed for any parochial school, it would have been none of our business. But that such an outrage should have been perpetrated upon the public schools of the very city where the first battles were fought to free the American Colonies from British tyranny, beneath the shadow of Bunker Hill and old Faneuil Hall, the "cradle of American liberty," the city where once lived the Adamses, Franklin, Parker, and Wendell Phillips, it is enough to make these illustrious patriots return from the tomb and with sepulchral voices rebuke the pusillanimous cowards who compose the Board of Education in the so-called "Athens of America."

*Resolved*, That a copy of these expressions of our sentiments be forwarded to the Board of Education of Boston, and for publication in the *Boston Herald* and the *AMERICAN SENTINEL*.

Respectfully submitted,

T. H. BAKER,  
W. H. VAN BUREN, } *Com.*  
A. C. WILSON,

These resolutions were unanimously adopted by Camp 22, at their session July 16, 1888.

W. W. COBLE, *Pres.*  
W. M. VAN BUREN, *Rec. Sec.*

And I certify that these resolutions were unanimously indorsed by Camps 5 and 13, at their session July 18 and 21, respectively.

WILLIAM P. HAYHURST, *District Pres.*

### Bound Volumes of the Pacific Health Journal.

VOLUMES 1 and 2 of the *Pacific Health Journal*, from June, 1885, to November, 1887, inclusive, have been bound up in *one* neat volume, leather back and corners, cloth sides. It contains over 400 large octavo pages of very useful and instructive reading. Every family should possess a copy of this book. Price, post-paid, \$2.25. Address, *Pacific Health Journal and Temperance Advocate*, Oakland, Cal.

### The American Sentinel.

THE demand for extra copies of the July, August, and September *AMERICAN SENTINEL* is so great that we have had to print a second edition of those three numbers.

The July *SENTINEL* contains: "A Sensible Letter," "The Entering Wedge," "The Church and State Bill," "The Presbyterian Cardinal," "Religion in Japan," "A Word of Warning," "Woman Suffrage," etc.

The August number contains: "A Calm View of National Reform," "Rome's Influence," "The National Reform Vice-Presidency," "Russia and Religion," "Let There Be No Alliance with Rome," "That Sunday Commandment," "National Reform in the South," "A Congressman's Opinion," etc.

And the September issue has been pronounced the best number of them all. It contains: "The *AMERICAN SENTINEL* and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union," "What Constitutes a Catholic School?" "Religious Wickedness," "The Savor of Tyranny," "Bad Institutions and Good Men," "The National Establishment of the Christian Religion," "The Political Value of Religion," "Comments on National Sunday-law Petitions," etc.

One copy of each of the above three numbers of the *AMERICAN SENTINEL* will be sent post-paid to any address for 10 cents. Sixty assorted back numbers of the *SENTINEL* (four different dates), post-paid, for \$1. One hundred back numbers, for \$1.50; or \$15 per 1,000 copies. Address, *AMERICAN SENTINEL*, 1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

### OUR COUNTRY—THE MARVEL OF NATIONS.

ITS PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE, AND WHAT THE SCRIPTURES SAY OF IT:

By U. SMITH.

AUTHOR OF "SMITH'S PARLIAMENTARY RULES," ETC., ETC.

THIS is a new and popular work on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a *Historical, Political, and Religious Standpoint*.

*The Sunday Question,*

*Modern Spiritualism, and  
National Reform*

ARE PROMINENT AMONG THE TOPICS ABLY DISCUSSED IN THIS WORK.

THE *MARVEL OF NATIONS* is a work of 300 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type, and bound in cloth; price, \$1.00.

Address, *AMERICAN SENTINEL*, 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, 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.

AN ardent State-religionist sends us the information all the way from Connecticut, that "Christ himself is to be the President of the United States . . . before long."

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 newspapers report the proposed removal of a prominent chimney glass manufactory from Pittsburgh to Belgium. One of the reasons given for removal is the continual recurrence of strikes among the men employed here. A member of the manufacturing firm is reported as saying: "Just at the present time our works are lying idle and the men are sitting around and taking it easy. We want to be at work, and so do at least three-quarters of the men, but on account of the union not a single man dare go to work, nor do we dare to start up. It is just this condition of affairs that has almost decided us to pull up stakes and leave." We

shall not be surprised to hear of more of these removals in the near future. It must come to this or something worse if the business of "striking" is not brought to an end. It is a humiliating state of affairs outlined in the statement that three-fourths of the men in the glass manufactory desire to go to work, "but on account of the union not a single man dare go to work, nor do we dare to start up." Is there any tyranny in the land like this "union" tyranny? How can any industry succeed that is subject to it?—*New York Observer*.

## Valuable Books.

PROTESTANT theological ideas, or ideas favoring the union of Religion and the State, are gaining ground in this nation with dangerous rapidity. The bold encroachments of the Catholic Church, and the hardly less bold encroachments of the Protestant churches, upon the civil power in this country, are both movements which deserve the most careful watching. Books which throw light upon these questions make most important reading just now. It is therefore with pleasure that we call special attention to three books which should be diligently studied by all. The first is,

"THE PAPACY AND THE CIVIL POWER."

This is a book written by Hon. R. W. Thompson, Secretary of the Navy under President Hayes' administration. It consists of twenty-three chapters, on the claims, the teachings, and the history of the Papacy in its relation to the civil power, with an appendix containing "The Bishop's Oath," "The Third Article of the Pastoral Letter of the Second National Council of Baltimore," "The Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius IX.," and "The Syllabus of Pope Pius IX." We have not space now for extracts; we can only say here that it is a perfect mine of invaluable information in regard to the meddling of the Papacy with the civil power, from the time of Constantine to this day, both in Europe and our own country. It has 750 well-printed pages, and is sold for \$3.00, post-paid. Not a family in the land should be without it. Send for a copy, and read it, and you will say so too.

The next is,

"THE EMANCIPATION OF MASSACHUSETTS."

This is a sketch of the establishment and working of the Puritan theocracy in Massachusetts, and her emancipation from it. It gives some—enough certainly—of the naked facts in regard to the cruel oppressions practiced by those who, to use Doctor Schaff's expression, "came from Europe to seek freedom for themselves, and then inconsistently denied it to others, from fear of losing the monopoly." Here, from original documents, is set down the record of some of the hideous enormities inflicted upon the Baptists, the Quakers, the witches, and other dissenters from the established religion, by the ruling preachers, to whom, says Bancroft, "in their self-righteousness, it never occurred that vanity and love of power had blinded their judgment." From

two or three statements it would seem that the author of the book is a skeptic, but that does not lessen the value of the facts which he sets forth. And just now, when the National Reform Association, aided by the Prohibition party and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is about to restore such a rule and make it national, and while a constitutional amendment to that effect is pending in the national Legislature, the important lesson to be derived from these facts should be fastened upon the mind of every person in the nation—the lesson that no ecclesiastics can ever safely be intrusted with the control of the civil power. The book has 382 pages, and will be sent post-paid for \$1.50.

The third of these books is,

"CHURCH AND STATE IN THE UNITED STATES."

This book is an enlargement of the inaugural address delivered by Philip Schaff at his induction into the professorship of church history in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. It states sound principles in regard to religious liberty, and the rights of conscience. It gives much valuable information upon the subject of the national and the State constitutions, and upon religious liberty in the countries of modern Europe. In discussing "The Nation and Christianity," and "The Connecting Links between Church and State," the author is inconsistent with the genuine principles which he lays down in the beginning of the book. Here he inculcates the idea that there is already in this nation a union of Church and State, while the object of the book at the beginning is to maintain the propriety of a separation between the Church and the State. The doctor, like thousands of others, is led into this inconsistency by the demand for Sunday laws. Anybody who studies the first parts of the book will have no difficulty in detecting the inconsistency of this part, nor will he find any difficulty in relegating it to that "limbo large and broad" to which it belongs. Yet even this part, inconsistent as it is, is not wholly without value, for it, with the judicial decisions accompanying it, serves most admirably to display the miserable sophistry under which even State Supreme Courts are willing to cloak Church and State ideas, and give Papal principles the sanction of the final judicial decisions in the highest courts of States, particularly New York and Pennsylvania. The book has 161 large pages, and will be sent post-paid for \$1.50.

All these books are for sale by Pacific Press, Oakland, California. Address accordingly.

## 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.