

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 3.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER, 1888.

NUMBER 11.

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.

Religion and Politics.

IN the ancient world religion and politics were blended. Among the Jews religion ruled the State, which was a theocracy. Among the heathen the State ruled religion; the Roman emperor was the supreme pontiff (*pontifex maximus*), the gods were national, and the priests were servants of the State.

Christianity had at first no official connection with the State.

Christ directs us to render unto God the things that are God's, and unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. Matt. 22:21. He paid the tribute money to the Jewish temple and obeyed the laws of Rome, but he refused to be a judge and divider of the inheritance of two brothers, as lying outside of the sphere of religion. Luke 12:14. He declared before Pilate that his kingdom is not of this world (John 18:36), and rebuked Peter for drawing the sword, even in defense of his Master. John 18:11. When the evil one tempted him with the possession of all the kingdoms of this world, he said unto him: "Get thee hence, Satan." Matt. 4:10. Secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the church, and ecclesiastical power has proved an engine of tyranny in the hands of the State. The apostles used only the spiritual weapons of truth and love in spreading the gospel of salvation. They enjoined obedience to the civil power, even under Nero (Rom. 13:1, 7), but they would rather suffer imprisonment and death than obey even their own Jewish magistrate against the dictates of their conscience. Acts 4:29.

If men had always acted on this principle and example, history would have been spared the horrors of persecution and religious wars.

For three hundred years the Christian church kept aloof from politics, and, while obeying the civil laws and paying tribute, maintained at the same time the higher law of conscience in refusing to comply with idolatrous customs, and in professing the faith in the face of death.—*Philip Schaff.*

Joseph Cook and Roman Catholicism.

IN the prelude to the 201st Boston Monday lecture, Joseph Cook discussed the attitude of the Catholic Church toward the public school. He said:—

"Roman Catholic authorities wholly deny to civil government the right to conduct the secular education of all the people, and intend to apply to the United States, as soon as the opportunity permits, the same educational principles which have kept the mass of the populations of Roman Catholic countries in a state of intellectual childhood. The Popes have often declared that the toleration of schools not under the control of the Catholic Church is a sin on the part of the civil government."

He referred to James Anthony Froude's statement that in his late visit to the West Indies he held a long conversation with a Catholic ecclesiastic from America, in which the discussion ranged through a long course of history, and he found that on nearly every point they differed as to matters of fact. "And the outcome of the conversation was to open the eyes of the English historian to the fact that the most systematic mutilation of history goes on in the Roman Catholic schools on the American as well as on the European side of the Atlantic."

He quoted from the *Catholic World* these words:—

"We, of course, deny the competency of the State to educate, to say what shall or shall not be taught in the public schools."

And these:—

"Before God, no man has a right to be of any religion but the Catholic."

And from a paper entitled *The Catholics of the Nineteenth Century*, he quoted this:—

"The supremacy asserted for the church in matters of education implies the additional and cognate functions of censorship of ideas, and the right to examine and approve, or disapprove, all books, publications, writings, and utterances intended for public instruction, enlightenment, or entertainment, and the supervision of places of amusement."

And yet this same Joseph Cook is a vice-president of an Association which stands pledged to join hands with Rome whenever she is ready, and gladly to accept co-operation in any way in which she is willing to exhibit it; and to put the Catholic Bible, and Catholic instruction, into the public schools wherever the Catholics are in the majority. In a National Reform Conference held at Saratoga, August 15-17, 1887, during which Joseph Cook made a speech, the corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association, of which

Joseph Cook is a vice-president, was asked this question:—

"If we put the Protestant Bible in the schools where Protestants are in the majority, how could we object to the Douay version [the Roman Catholic Bible] in schools where Roman Catholics are in the majority?"

And the corresponding secretary answered—"We wouldn't object."

Further along in the proceedings we have the following record:—

"Rev. Dr. Price, of Tennessee: 'I wish to ask the secretary, Has any attempt ever been made by the National Reform Association to ascertain whether a *consensus*, or agreement, could be reached with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, whereby we may unite in support of the schools as they do in Massachusetts?'"

"The secretary: 'I regret to say there has not. . . . But I recognize it as a wise and dutiful course on the part of all who are engaged in, or who discuss, the work of education, to make the effort to secure such an agreement."

"Dr. Price: 'I wish to move that the National Reform Association be requested by this conference to bring this matter to the attention of American educators and of Roman Catholic authorities, with a view of securing such a basis of agreement if possible.'"

"The motion was seconded and adopted."

That is what the National Reform Association is pledged and commissioned to do; Joseph Cook took an active part in that same conference; and he is yet a vice-president of that Association, exerting his influence for its success. In view of these *facts* Joseph Cook's position is rather "amphibious." His Boston Monday lecture compared with his official connection with this Association reveals a course which, to say the least, is highly inconsistent.

Note, in the above quotation they propose to secure this agreement with the Catholics "in support of the schools *as they do in Massachusetts.*" Upon this the action of the Catholic school board of Boston in banishing from the Boston schools Swinton's "Outlines of History," is a most telling comment. That is how the Catholics unite with Protestants (?) in support of the schools in Massachusetts; and that is just how the National Reform Association—Joseph Cook a vice-president—proposes that the Catholics shall unite with Protestants throughout the Nation. In other words, that association proposes to hand over the American public-school system, as far as possible, to the Catholic Church.

But Mr. Cook proposes a remedy for this "Roman Catholic aggression," which he, as

vice-president of the National Reform Association, is helping forward; and it is this:—

“We must teach in the common schools, in an unsectarian way, the broad, undisputed principles of morals and religion as to which good men agree, and thus stop the mouths of those who say that the American common schools may be justly called godless.”

That is, he will cure the disease either by increasing it, or by introducing another not quite so bad at first, but with the moral certainty that it will soon grow fully as bad.

Teach in the schools, says Mr. Cook, those “principles of morals and religion as to which good men agree;” that is, the “good men” of all denominations, of course, because the teaching is to be wholly unsectarian. And these good men would certainly be the representative men of the different denominations, as Dr. Schaff, in telling what parts of the Bible should be taught, says:—

“A competent committee of clergymen and laymen of all denominations could make a judicious selection which would satisfy every reasonable demand.”

That gives it wholly to the church to say what shall or shall not be taught in the public schools; and that is precisely the declaration of the Catholic Church as quoted from the *Catholic World* by Joseph Cook himself. If Mr. Cook would confine to Protestants the exercise of this prerogative that is not much relief, for the principle is the same as the Catholic, and the exercise of it by a Protestant censorship would be scarcely less unbearable than by a Catholic censorship.

But it could not be confined even to a Protestant censorship; for Senator Blair's proposed Constitutional Amendment, which Joseph Cook heartily indorses, distinctly specifies “the Christian religion.” Now the leading Protestants acknowledge the Catholic to be an important branch of the Christian religion. Therefore, amongst these “good men” suggested by Mr. Cook, and that “competent committee of clergymen and laymen” mentioned by Dr. Schaff, there would assuredly be numbered “good” Cardinal Gibbons, and a troop of “good” archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church. And when it shall have been decided and settled just what principles of religion shall be taught in the public schools, they will be such principles as will be satisfactory to the Catholic Church, which will only open the way for the Catholic Church to enter the public school and teach the Catholic religion at the public expense. And that is precisely what Joseph Cook's “remedy” amounts to—it only fastens the disease more firmly upon the victim.

As the principle laid down by him is essentially Catholic, it was hardly to be expected that he would leave the subject without supporting his Catholic principle by Catholic doctrine and argument, accordingly he says:—

“With a rule excusing children from any religious exercise to which their parents object, the private right of conscience need not come into conflict with public rights. It is a legal principle that where the right of society and the right of the individual come into conflict, the former is deemed paramount. We need not insist on making religious exercises

compulsory against the will of parents; but it is preposterous to suppose that because a Jew objects to our Sabbath laws therefore we must repeal the Sabbath laws for the whole Nation. Shall we allow the fly to rule the coach-wheel upon which he happens to sit?”

Any public speaker who would count, even by comparison, the consciences and the rights of men, as worthy of no more consideration than a fly, ought not to be listened to. But such views of the consciences and the rights of the minority have ever been those of the National Reformers, and although Mr. Cook has been a vice-president of the National Reform Association only about two years, he appears already to be entirely worthy of the position. These views moreover are being popularized very fast by the influential politico-religious leaders, such as Joseph Cook and his W. C. T. U.-Prohibition-National-Reform *confères*. A. T. J.

That Banished Book.

By the exclusion of that little book from the public schools of Boston, there has been revived considerable notice of the subject of indulgences. We have owned, for a number of years, a copy of the little book that has caused all this stir—Swinton's “*Outlines of the World's History*.” The passage that has shut out the book, and a teacher with it, from the public schools of Boston, is as follows:—

“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 a 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.”

To this paragraph in the book there is added the following note:—

“These indulgences were, in the early ages of the church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal on the community. But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins.”

Now we should like for anybody candidly to state where there is anything said in this that should subject the book to banishment from the public schools. It is simply a statement of facts, and a very mild statement at that. Whether the treasury of the church had been exhausted by the ambitious projects of Leo's predecessors; or whether it was exhausted by his predecessors at all, is a question upon which it is not necessary to enter, because it is not germane to the subject. The main question is one of simple fact, Was the treasury exhausted? and did that lead to the traffic in indulgences, which stirred up Luther, and led to the Reformation?

Leo's immediate predecessor, Julius II., had spent the whole time of his pontificate—a little more than nine years—in almost

constant wars, in some of which he led the troops himself and acted the part of general.

It was he who began the building of the Church of St. Peter at Rome; and he issued a bull granting indulgences to those who would contribute to the project. Although to sustain his wars and alliances the expenses of Julius were enormous, yet he did leave considerable treasure. But even though the treasury was not exhausted by his predecessors, it was easy enough for Leo X. to exhaust it, for he was almost a matchless spendthrift. Says Von Ranke:—

“That the Pope should ever keep a thousand ducats together was a thing as impossible,” says Francesco Vettori of this pontiff, ‘as that a stone should of its own will take to flying through the air.’ He has been reproached with having spent the revenues of three Popes: that of his predecessor, from whom he inherited a considerable treasure, his own, and that of his successor, to whom he bequeathed a mass of debt.”—*History of the Popes*, book 4, sec. 2.

Says Lawrence:—

“He was the spendthrift son of an opulent parent; he became the wasteful master of the resources of the church.” “It was because Leo was a splendid spendthrift, that we have the Reformation through Luther. The Pope was soon again impoverished and in debt. He never thought of the cost of anything; he was lavish without reflection. His wars, intrigues, his artists and architects, his friends, but above all the miserable Lorenzo [his nephew], exhausted his fine revenues; and his treasury must again be supplied. When he was in want, Leo was never scrupulous as to the means by which he retrieved his affairs; he robbed, he defrauded, he begged; he drew contributions from all Europe for a Turkish war, which all Europe knew had been spent upon Lorenzo; he collected large sums for rebuilding St. Peter's, which were all expended in the same way; in fine, Leo early exhausted all his spiritual arts as well as his treasury.”—*Historical Studies*, pp. 66, 77.

The “*Encyclopedia Britannica*” says that Leo “bequeathed his successors a religious schism and a bankrupt church;” that “his profusion had impoverished the church, and indirectly occasioned the destruction of her visible unity.”—*Art. Leo X.* It is a fact, therefore, that the Papal treasury was exhausted.

Now to the second question of fact, Did this lead to the sale of indulgences? Before his coronation as Pope, Leo had entered into an engagement “to issue no brief for collecting money for the repair of St. Peter's;” but neither that, nor anything else, was allowed to stand in the way when he wanted money. Says D'Aubigne:—

“Leo was greatly in need of money. . . . His cousin, Cardinal Pucci, as skillful in the art of hoarding as Leo in that of lavishing, advised him to have recourse to indulgences. Accordingly, the Pope published a bull announcing a general indulgence, the proceeds of which were, he said, to be employed in the erection of the Church of St. Peter, that monument of sacerdotal magnificence. In a letter, dated at Rome, under the seal of the fisherman, in November, 1517, Leo applies to his commissary of indulgences for one hundred and forty-seven ducats to pay for a manuscript of the thirty-third book of Livy. Of all the uses to which he put the money of

the Germans, this was doubtless the best. Still, it was strange to deliver souls from purgatory, in order to purchase a manuscript history of the wars of the Roman people."—*History of the Reformation, book 3, chap. 3.*

Says Bower:—

"Leo, wanting to continue the magnificent structure of St. Peter's Church, begun by his predecessor Julius, but finding his coffers drained, chiefly by his own extravagance, in order to replenish them, granted, by a bull, a plenary indulgence, or remission of all sins, to such as should charitably contribute to that work."—*History of the Popes, under Leo X., A. D. 1517.*

Says Macaulay:—

"It was to adorn Italy that the traffic in indulgences had been carried to that scandalous excess which had roused the indignation of Luther."—*Essays, Von Ranke.*

And a Roman Catholic "History of the Church of God," written by B. J. Spalding, Roman Catholic priest, with a commendatory preface by Bishop Spalding, of Peoria, Ill., says:—

"The incident which served as an opportunity for the breaking out of Luther's revolt, was the promulgation by Leo X. (1517) of a plenary [bull] indulgence, the alms attached to the gaining of which were to defray the expenses of a crusade against the Turks and aid in completing the magnificent basilica of St. Peter's at Rome. The Dominican Tetzl was appointed to preach this indulgence in Germany."—*Page 506.*

It is a fact, therefore, that the papal treasury was exhausted, and that Leo resorted to the sale of indulgences to replenish it.

Now to the third question of fact. The banished book says: "These indulgences were, in the early ages of the church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal on the community." Notice, this does not say that indulgences were remissions of sins, but that they were remissions of the penances, or penalties, imposed upon persons because of their sins. Nor does it say by whom the penances were imposed. Now read the following definition of indulgence by Archbishop Purcell:—

"An indulgence is nothing more nor less than a remission of the temporal punishment which often remains attached to the sin, after the eternal guilt has been forgiven the sinner, on his sincere repentance. . . . The doctrine of indulgences is this: When a human being does everything in his power to atone for sin, God has left a power in the church, to remit a part or the entire of the temporal punishment due to it."—*Debate with Campbell, pp. 307, 308.*

What Archbishop Purcell means by "temporal punishment," is precisely what Swinton's note means by penances imposed; for, to sustain his doctrine, the archbishop quoted 2 Cor. 2:6, 10, where Paul, speaking of that man who had been disfellowshipped and had repented of his sin, says: "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted [penance imposed] of many." "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ." Then the archbishop says:—

"In the person of Christ, mark those

words, that he, in the person of Christ, forgave—what? Not the eternal guilt of the incestuous man—God alone can forgive that—but the temporal punishment; to restore him to the privileges of the church and Christian society."

Therefore it is demonstrated that Swinton's note in that book is precisely the same statement of the doctrine of indulgences as that given by an archbishop of the Catholic Church.

The other statement in the note is, that, "in process of time they [indulgences] were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins." Notice, this does not say that they were actual pardons of guilt, but only that they were represented as such. He does not say that the representation was true. It is but the statement of the fact that they were represented to be so and so. The note does not say that the purchaser of indulgence was delivered from all his sins; nor does it say that the Catholic Church teaches or taught that it was so; it simply states the fact that the purchaser was said to be delivered from all his sins.

Now is it a fact that they were represented as actual pardons of guilt? Says the "Encyclopedia Britannica":—

"The doctrine of indulgences is singularly open to misunderstanding; and in its practical applications it has too often been used to sanction the most flagrant immorality."—*Art. Indulgences.*

If, therefore, that doctrine has been so used, will the Catholic Church say that indulgences were never represented as actual pardons of guilt? or that the purchaser was never said to be delivered from all sin? Will that church say that no person who ever handled or dispensed indulgences ever gave a wrong impression as to the precise effect of them? This of itself would show that in the words used there is no reproach cast upon the Catholic Church. But read the following. A Jesuit historian, quoted by D'Aubigne, speaking of the associates of Tetzl, the chief indulgence peddler, says:—

"Some of these preachers failed not, as usual, to outrage the subject which they treated, and so to exaggerate the value of indulgences as to make people suppose they were sure of their own salvation, and of the deliverance of souls from purgatory, as soon as the money was paid."—*History of Reformation, book 3, chap. 1.*

And the Catholic "History of the Church of God," before quoted, says:—

"There had been for some time abuses in the form of dispensing and preaching indulgences; pious bishops had pointed them out, and statesmen had protested against them. Tetzl did not altogether avoid the abuses, and later the Papal legate, Miltitz, sharply rebuked him for his indiscretions."—*Id., p. 506.*

Now read the following words of Tetzl himself:—

"Think, then, that for each mortal sin you must, after confession and contrition, do penance for seven years, either in this life or in purgatory. Now, how many mortal sins are committed in one day—in one week? How many in a month—a year—a whole life? Ah! these sins are almost innumerable, and innumerable sufferings must be endured for

them in purgatory. And now, by means of these letters of indulgence, you can at once, for life—in all cases except four which are reserved to the Apostolic See—and afterwards at the hour of death, obtain a full remission of all your pains and all your sins."

These words make positive the fact stated in Swinton's note that indulgences were represented to be actual pardons of guilt, and that the purchaser was said to be delivered from all sin. It is not sufficient for Catholics to say that such is not the teaching of the Catholic Church. The banished book does not say that such is or ever was the teaching of the Catholic Church. It simply says that such things "were represented," and "were said," and here are the words of Catholics showing that that is the fact.

So the case of the book and the Boston School Board stands just thus:—

1. The book says that at the time of Leo X. the Papal treasury was exhausted: and that is a historical fact.

2. The book says that to recruit his exhausted finances, he adopted an extensive sale of indulgences: and that is a historical fact.

3. The book says that indulgences were remissions of the penances imposed upon persons because of their sins: and that is a doctrinal fact of the Catholic teaching according to the words of a Catholic archbishop.

4. The book says that in process of time indulgences were represented as actual pardons of guilt: and that is a literal historical fact.

5. The book says the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins: and that is the literal historical fact as to what was said.

All of which conclusively demonstrates that the action of the Boston School Board in banishing that book from the public schools, rests not upon the slightest particle of justice or reason, but is wholly an exhibition of that arbitrary and unreasoning despotism which is characteristic of the Papacy everywhere that it secures enough power to make itself felt. It demonstrates the fact that it is not the statements in the book that the Catholics hate, so much as it is that they hate everything that is not subject to the despotic authority of Rome. For if historical facts in regard to which both Catholic and Protestant authorities agree, cannot be taught in the public schools without the interference of Rome, then what can be taught there without her dictation?

That everyone may see for himself how the matter stood we append a copy of the indulgence that was actually sold by Tetzl. Here it is:—

"May our Lord Jesus Christ have pity on thee, N—— N——, and absolve thee by the merit of his most holy passion. And I, in virtue of the apostolic power intrusted to me, absolve thee from all ecclesiastical censures, judgments, and penalties, which thou mayest have deserved; moreover, from all the excesses, sins, and crimes, which thou mayest have committed, how great and enormous soever they may have been, and for whatever cause, even should they have been reserved

to our most holy father the Pope, and to the apostolic See. I efface all the marks of disability, and all the notes of infamy which thou mayest have incurred on this occasion. I remit the pains which thou shouldst have to endure in purgatory. I render thee anew a partaker in the sacraments of the church. I again incorporate thee into the communion of saints, and re-establish thee in the innocence and purity in which thou wert at the hour of thy baptism; so that, at the moment of thy death, the gate of entrance to the place of pains and torments will be shut to thee; and, on the contrary, the gate which leads to the heavenly paradise, will be opened to thee. If thou art not to die soon, this grace will remain unimpaired till thy last hour arrive. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

"Friar John Tetzel, commissary, has signed it with his own hand."—*D'Aubigne, History of Reformation, book 3, chap. 1.* A. T. J.

Jonathan Edwards's Speech.

[THIS speech was delivered at the National Convention of the National Reform Association, held in New York City, February 26, 27, 1873. It is part of the published proceedings of that convention, and, together with the other speeches, is circulated to this very day, as representative National Reform literature. Although extracts have previously been made from it in the SENTINEL, we publish a large portion of it at the present time, in order that our readers may feel fully assured that there is necessity for just such work as the SENTINEL is doing; and that in opposing what is mis-called National Reform, we are opposing nothing but a scheme of wicked selfishness. The few comments that we make will be found in brackets. E. J. W.]

We want State and Religion—and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of State require Religion, it shall be revealed Religion, the Religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and Christian morality shall have in this land "an undeniable legal basis." We use the word Religion in its proper sense, as meaning a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God.

[What is Christian morality? It is simple Christianity. As Mr. Edwards says, it is "a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God." And this takes in not simply outward acts, but the thoughts and intents of the heart. This is what Mr. Edwards and the National Reform Association want to see placed on "an undeniable legal basis." That is, the Christian religion and Christian morality shall be enforced by law. A man's personal relation to God, in matters of faith and obedience, is to be interfered with by the law of the land. In reality, the National Reform Association proposes that no man shall have any direct, personal relation with God, but that he shall approach God only through the medium of the State, controlled by "the Church." In other words, the State Church is to be to the individual in the place of God. And what will that be but another Papacy, or an exact copy of the present one? Nothing else in the world.

But it will be asked, "How will it be possible for the State to deal with Christian mo-

rality, since it has to do with the thoughts of the heart, and the faith which one holds? How can the laws take cognizance of a man's thoughts and personal belief?" In the very same way that the Papacy did, in whose steps the National Reform Association is following, and after which it is modeled. By means of the inquisition the church forced the mass of people to believe just what it wanted them to believe. Whenever a man was suspected of heresy, he was dragged into the secret chamber, and was stretched upon the rack. In most cases that succeeded in making him an obedient child of the church. Yes, the church will have ample power to deal with heretics when it has its dogmas fixed on an "undeniable legal basis." The rack, the thumb-screw, and the stake are wonderful promoters of "orthodoxy." To say that the National Reform theocracy when formed would not follow the Papacy in this respect just as much as in the formation of a man-made theocracy, is to say that men are now made of different material from what they were three hundred years ago. Religious persecution will be the necessary result of the success of the National Reform Association.]

Now, we are warned that to engraft this doctrine upon the Constitution will be found oppressive; that it will infringe the rights of conscience; and we are told that there are atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists who would be sufferers under it. I accept it as a compliment that we are called upon to consider objections of this sort, if there be any ground for them. We are the conscience party, the free conscience party. We are the very people to be held responsible if we trespass upon the conscience of others. And it will be found that we do not intend to do this, and that we do not do it in fact. . .

The atheist is a man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character.

The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he ever manifests himself and his will in a revelation.

The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or, worse, sheer imposture.

The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry—the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. 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. Now look at it—look at this controversy. The question is not between opinions that differ, but opinions that are opposite, that are contradictory, that mutually exclude each

other. It is between Christianity and infidelity. It is between theism and atheism, between the acknowledgment of a God and the denial that there is any God. We cannot too seriously ponder this, since the rights of conscience are held to be involved. The atheist does not believe in the soul; he denies that there is any such thing as conscience; yet he comes to those who confess both to insist upon his rights of conscience! I have a few plain, earnest words about all this.

I do not believe that every man is an atheist who says he is one. I distinguish between minds that doubt or deny the existence of God, and those who doubt or deny the sufficiency of the logic usually employed to prove it. And I love to think genuine atheism impossible to the human soul. But now bring forward your atheist, your man who confesses to neither God, angel, nor Spirit, your man who believes in all unbelief, and in nothing else, and I know at once what his position is. His religion is irreligion; his morals are only natural morals—the morals of the body, the animal in man, which, in his view, is all there is of man. His speculations do not rove or float among the dreams of philosophy, but they run into the concrete forms of politics—into the platforms of parties and the enactments of Legislatures. Atheism is always political. What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate 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. He not only rejects and opposes my faith, but he aims to overturn every institution, and to dissolve every relationship growing out of my faith. He would destroy the very foundations, pull down everything, and build up nothing. But he shall be tolerated. He may live and go free, hold his lands and enjoy his home, he may even vote, but for any higher, more advanced citizenship, he is, as I hold, utterly disqualified. And we are aiming, not to increase, but to render definite his disqualification; to give to our Government and all our free institutions a guarantee that he shall never have control over them.

[In the above declarations, we have religious persecution defended as plainly as words can do so. Notice: The man who believes in God, the Bible, and the gospel of Jesus Christ, but who differs with the mass of professed Christians solely upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as the Sabbath, is declared to be an atheist. The man who observes the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, is declared by this representative of the National Reform Association, to be an atheist, although he implicitly believes in God and the Bible, and trusts in Jesus Christ as his Saviour. He conscientiously observes the seventh day as a religious duty, and does it as an act of worship to the God who created "the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them is," yet he is to be treated as an atheist. And what sort of treatment is the atheist to receive? He is to be treated as a conspirator or a lunatic. That is, he is to be kept underground, and shut up. If he has the courage of his convictions, and attempts to teach others what he believes to be a matter of solemn obligation to God, he is "raving," and must be shut up as a dangerous man. One would suppose that Igna-

tius Loyola must be the patron saint of the National Reform Association. Whatever plea its leaders make, they invariably run into religious persecution. That is the logic of National religion.]

Yes, to this extent I will tolerate the atheist, but no more. Why should I? The atheist does not tolerate me. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith. He hates my faith, and he hates me for my faith. He is bent on exterminating me and my faith altogether. "Crush the wretch!" said Voltaire of my Saviour and his cause. And this is still the atheist's motto and his aim. I have received letters and tracts which show this very clearly. Were I to read to you the shocking blasphemies, the words of hate and of murder, which they contain, you would shudder in horror. He means to make all these words good among us as soon as he can. And I am asked to accord rights of conscience to a man who says to me, "Come, let me show you how I can use the knife with which I purpose one day to cut your throat." "Come, let me explain to you the force of some nitroglycerine which I have prepared to blow you up!" I can be as calm and as willing in the one case as in the other. And I am asked to tolerate the atheist's creed under peril of violating the rights of conscience. And this tolerating of atheism means, I suppose, that our Constitution and laws shall be so framed as to imply that there is as much of truth, probability, and good in atheism as in Christianity! Tolerate atheism in this sense, sir? Never, never! We know what atheism is, and what atheism does. We know what it builds, and how it operates with its "Natural Morals, its "Death an Eternal Sleep," its "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Twice, at least, in the world's history has it shown what it is capable of doing. Twice across the plains of gay and sunny France has it driven its car of progress, and the whole track has been rapine, and blasphemy, and blood.

[If this is a true specimen of National Reform Christianity, may we be delivered from it. That it is a fair representation, cannot be denied. Few, however, are so incautious as Mr. Edwards, in revealing the true inwardness of the scheme. The argument is, "The atheist does not tolerate me, therefore I will not tolerate him. He does not love me, therefore I will not love him." Christ says: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven." Matt. 5:44, 45. But the National Reform idea of Christianity is just the opposite of this. It is to hate those that hate you, and to set them an example in hating, and to give them cause for hatred by hating them first. Therefore it is as plain as anything can be that National Reform religion is antichristian. How could it be anything else? It is modeled after the Papacy, and the Papacy is antichrist. While there are many good people who are indifferent now, or are even in the ranks of the National Reformers, because of imperfect knowledge, the time will soon come when no man can be a Christian—that is, a real follower of Christ—unless he actively opposes the work of what is called National Reform. National Reformers accuse us of joining hands with infidels in opposing their work. We oppose it

because we are Christians, and because we want the pure religion of Christ to have free course.]

I can tolerate difference and discussion; I can tolerate heresy and false religion; I can debate the use of the Bible in our common schools, the taxation of church property, the propriety of chaplaincies and the like, but there are some questions past debate. Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon. The atheist may live, as I said, but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the civil institutions of all this fair land! Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent. And let us note that this atheism among us is busy. It is aggressive, with societies, with organs, with agents, with their papers and their preachers. But recently they have imported a man, the papers say, at a salary of \$15,000, to go through the land lecturing and organizing, telling us how to Germanize and un-Americanize our country. Their organizations raise money, issue publications, form public sentiment, and secure votes against our Sunday laws, our blasphemy laws, our temperance laws, our cruelty laws, our laws for social purity and home sanctity, our oath-sealed guaranty for truth and fidelity, and to bring us all down to mere natural morals. We, too, must organize and make effort. "The Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge!"

Another anticipated difficulty which is urged against us is to determine what Bible to recognize. This difficulty is but imaginary. There is but one Bible. What is called the Catholic or the Protestant Bible is but the Catholic or the Protestant version of the one original Bible. And with every strong conviction that the Protestant version is the better one, I am free to say that any Bible is better than no Bible.

And yet another objection is that the laws of Moses will have to be re-enacted and enforced among us, and that these laws are not at all fitted to our times, our freedom, our civilization. I confess that I am not at all afraid of Moses. I find among his institutions the germs of our own glorious republic, and the provisions and the spirit of our best laws. But the objectors do not seem to have read the Bible enough to see what a self-interpreting book it is. It records a prophecy, and afterwards records its fulfillment. It records a promise, and afterwards states when and how the bestowment was effected. It records a ritual, and afterwards records what abrogated it and took its place. It gives of itself the clue to distinguish what is of enduring value and moral obligation from what is local, typical, transitory. Now, if there be anything in the laws of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out—there cannot be many of them—and we are prepared to accept them and have them re-enacted. Thus much as to objections and objectors. . . .

[Nothing more is needed than to ask the reader to stop a minute and consider the un-paralleled presumption of this statement. Could anything more clearly show the spirit of the Papacy? The apostle Paul described the Pope as "that man of sin," "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess.

2:3, 4. And what position does the National Reform Association occupy? It proposes to occupy the very same position. If there is anything in the Old Testament that has not passed away,—that was not transitory and local, and that has not expired by statute of limitation,—they propose to re-enact it when they set up their theocracy. That is to say, that none of the laws of God will be valid until they have set to them the seal of their approval. What more could they say to show that by their proposed scheme of government they oppose and exalt themselves above all that is called God?]

It will not do to say, We had better leave things as they now are. Things are in a state of change, of transition; they will not stay as they now are. It will not do to say, Let us trust the voice of a Christian people for the perpetuity of Christian principles and usages among us; for, in despite of their voice and their influence, the moulding, over-riding force of our national Constitution has more and more eliminated the notion of God and of moral character from our recent State Constitutions and from the decisions of our courts. If we do not carry this measure, we take the side of atheism. You are called upon, fellow-citizens, to make your election between Christianity and atheism. "Under which king, Bezonian?" You cannot be too soon in making your response. I cannot doubt what your decision will be.

[We would that we could be assured that the great majority of the people would decide against such a scheme of iniquity as this. But we have no such hope. Our greatest hope and desire are to arouse those who still have the spirit of true Protestantism in their hearts. It matters not how many fine speeches National Reformers may make, nor what good professions they may make, it is by such utterances as those that we have been considering that the thing must be judged. To all who read this, we say, You are called upon to make your decision between the religion of Christ and that of antichrist. Which will you choose? You cannot be too soon in making your response.]

Shall American Children Receive Their Educational Instruction from Rome?

THE American people who are so quick to resent an insult to one of their fellow-citizens when abroad, seem slow to resent the insults and indignities heaped upon them by those same foreigners here in America.

It is well known by every citizen of this country that the Catholic Church has declared war against our public schools and proposed by every means within her power to wreck them, and to place her parochial schools upon their ruins.

The attack which was at first so secret and insidious is now made openly and boldly. The assumed humble mien has given place to open attack, and it behooves the American citizens to at once assert their rights or bend their knees and bow their heads and declare their recognition of but one law, one power, that of the Roman Catholic Pope

Where is the pride of the American people? Is it not enough that your politics are dic-

tated and controlled by the Pope at Rome? that you must permit your children to be educated by that church? Is it not enough to have flung at you, as Father Schaner, representing the Roman Catholic Church, flings,—“The public schools have produced nothing but a godless generation of thieves and blackguards,”—without their further taking their children from them and educating them in the belief that not alone were you raising generations of thieves and blackguards when alive, but that when dead you have gone to *hades*, never to be seen by them more?

Our dictionaries, our encyclopedias, our histories, give definitions of inquisitions and indulgencies, but all those dictionaries, encyclopedias, and histories must be laid aside for those made by Roman Catholics, and the process has already commenced in Boston, and the teacher who dares to give the generally-acknowledged definition of these two words, those given in dictionaries, the statements of encyclopedias, and the recitals of history, is removed.

And so it is that the glorious day that the Catholic *Telegram* talks about, when our public-school system shall be shivered to pieces, is approaching.

You have heard a good deal of talk about the Travis case in Boston, where a teacher was removed from his school at the request of the Roman Catholics, for teaching the history as it was given to him; and yet this is not the only instance of Roman rule in Boston. A teacher there who had been marking some Roman Catholic children for coming late to school, was warned by the Catholic priest that he would make trouble for her if she continued to do that, which meant a dismissal, and she knew it and ceased.

The fact is the Catholics feel justified in insulting our public schools in any way they can; by every act they say, as the *Freeman's Journal* says: “Let the public-school system go to where it came from—the devil.”

All this they mean, and more too; they have played their cards shrewdly; they have seen to it to get a sufficient number of Catholics on the school board, and in no instance where they had the power has a Protestant teacher been put in the public schools when a Catholic teacher could be obtained. And all this is allowed to be done for fear of losing the Irish vote; and so it is that, while they are but a small minority, they are actually ruling the majority.

We defy contradiction when we state that there is no country under the sun but what more freedom and tolerance is permitted than in this boasted land of freedom and liberty. You have more freedom of expression, and less danger in criticising the Roman Catholic Church, under the shadow of the Vatican in Rome than you have under the shadow of the old State House or Faneuil Hall in Boston. The teachers and scholars of the schools in Ireland are in less danger of insult and obloquy from the Irish people under English reign than the teachers and scholars here in America under alleged American reign. What a burlesque it is to talk

about freedom and home rule for Ireland when our school-teachers dare not utter a word that may be construed as reflecting upon the Roman Catholic Church here in alleged free America!—*Peabody (Mass.) Reporter*.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union Defended.

MR. JOHNSTON has sent us another communication in reply to our article in the September SENTINEL on the Woman's Christian Temperance Union; and here it is:—

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: The next charges you bring against the Woman's Christian Temperance Union are, first, that it “proposes to establish a theocracy in this country,” and to this end demands the ballot for women. Second, that it is the closest ally and the most powerful support of the National Reform Association.

What you say under the first charge I confess I am not sure that I understand. If I do, the burden of your objection lies against “putting the ballot into the hands of women.” But how this would “establish a theocracy” I cannot see. A theocracy is a Government immediately directed by God. A true theocracy in the United States now would be a pure republic in which the people—not the men only, but both men and women—would choose all the officers, and in which the will of God would be supreme, higher than the will of the people, and higher by the consent and will of the people. And I cannot see how any Christian man or woman can object to such a theocracy. I wish our Government was such now.

As to woman suffrage I may say that I am not aware the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has ever given any deliverance. No doubt many of the members favor it and have so said; and probably some local Unions may have so voted. I do not know. Good women as well as good men all over the country favor it; multitudes of both oppose it. Your charge against the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is founded only on what somebody in 1886 wrote for some monthly reading. It seems to me, therefore, that it is “far-fetched.”

But the big end of your assault upon the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is its affiliation with the National Reform Association. And in your amplification of the charges against said Association, you make various propositions that I think are without foundation. I am not a member of the Association (I like my church better), but I indorse its principles and am familiar with its history and work, and I most unhesitatingly deny the statements you make. The Association does not “propose to turn this Government into a theocracy,” except in the sense defined above. The Association does not “declare that dissenters from National Reform opinions cannot dwell together on the same continent with National Reformed Christianity.” The Association never did declare that “there is nothing out of hell that should be tolerated as soon as these.”

You do not like Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment. Will you be so kind as to publish it in the SENTINEL, so that your readers may judge of it for themselves, for I think your greatest objection must be that it is worded on the presumption that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath.

Finally, you charge the National Reform Association with being an ally of the Papacy. Among other things of the same kind and very doubtful you say that “the Association argues that the Catholic Bible and Catholic

instruction shall be established in the public schools wherever Roman Catholics are in the majority.” This, like your other statements, must be positively denied. The Association never said anything of the kind. Secretary Stevenson, I think, at some public meeting at Saratoga a year ago, said something about permitting the Catholics to read the Douay Bible in their schools rather than have no Bible-reading at all; but I never heard that other National Reformers agreed with him. And sure I am that the Association never said a word in approval of what he had said at Saratoga. This, your charge against the Association, is therefore not only “far-fetched” but unfair.

In reference to what you say about National Reformers pledging themselves to join hands with the Roman Catholics to secure and enforce the National Sunday Law, I am not so well informed and cannot deny so positively. Perhaps some of them have been guilty of it. But even if they have been it is unfair to charge it against the Association or against other members of it. N. R. JOHNSTON.

1. Mr. Johnston says we “charge” that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish a theocracy in this country, and then defends the Union by declaring such a theocracy a good thing, and by saying he cannot see how any Christian man or woman can object to it. In other words, he defends the Union against the charge, by confessing that the charge is valid. A theocracy is a Government immediately directed by God; and it must be established immediately by God. But these people nowadays do not intend that this proposed theocracy shall be either established or directed immediately by God. They intend to establish it by popular vote, and to have it directed by human administration as now. Then, such a Government being, as they claim, a Government of God, whoever shall sit at the head of the Government will sit there in the place of God, and as the representative of God and the executor of his will. And that is all that the Papacy has ever claimed to be. Under the theory of the National Reform-Woman's Christian Temperance Union the claims of the Pope are neither presumptuous nor extravagant. And if the Woman's Christian Temperance Union theory shall ever be formed into Government here, there will be here but the Papacy over again.

2. He says our charge “against the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is founded only on what somebody in 1886 wrote for some monthly reading. It seems to me, therefore, that it is far-fetched.” Yes, our charge is founded only on what “somebody” wrote, etc. Exactly who wrote it we do not know, but we do know that *Miss Frances E. Willard* edited it; and we count her *somebody*, at least so far as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is concerned. She edited it and published it in her official capacity as president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union; and it was sent abroad to the local Unions as an official document, and it was received and read in the local Unions as such. Mr. Johnston or anybody else can find the whole reading with these particulars in the *Christian Statesman* of September 30, 1886.

This it is upon which our charge is founded, and it is not "far-fetched."

3. Next he defends the National Reform Association, by saying that it does not propose to turn this Government into a theocracy, "except in the sense indicated above." That is to say that the National Reformers do not propose to turn this Government into a theocracy except by turning it into a theocracy.

4. He says, "The Association does not declare that dissenters from National Reform opinions cannot dwell together on the same continent with National Reformed Christianity;" and that "it never did declare that there is nothing out of hell that should not be tolerated as soon as these." The speech in which both these statements were made is printed in this number of the SENTINEL, which Mr. Johnston may read, and our readers may read it and judge between us and Mr. Johnston. That speech was made by Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., a vice-president of the Association, in a National Reform National Convention held in New York City, February 26, 27, 1873. It was officially published by the Association, of whom we bought it; and it is at this day still advertised and sold by the Association as official and representative National Reform literature. If that does not make it the declaration of the National Reform Association, then how would it be possible for the Association to declare anything.

5. We printed in full in the July SENTINEL (1888) both the Sunday Bill, and the proposed constitutional amendment introduced by Senator Blair. We oppose them both because they are both antichristian, subversive of liberty, savoring of tyranny, and directly in the line of the establishment of a religious despotism.

6. Our charge that the Association agrees that the Catholic Bible and Catholic instruction shall be established in the public schools wherever the Roman Catholics are in the majority, Mr. Johnston says must be positively denied, and then admits that Secretary Stevenson did say something about it at Saratoga, but that the Association never said a word in approval of it. Mr. Stevenson did say it,—and he was officially representing, and acting for, the Association when he said it. And when Dr. Price made his motion, that motion commissioned "the National Reform Association" to secure such an agreement with the Catholic officials "if possible." And Mr. Stevenson, as secretary of the Association, and for the Association, accepted the commission; and the whole thing was printed in the *Christian Statesman*. If that is not the word and act of the Association then what could be?

7. About pledging the National Reform Association to join hands with the Catholic Church, he thinks that "perhaps" some of them have been guilty of it. Yes, they are guilty of it. There is no perhaps about it. The statement was made in an editorial in the *Christian Statesman*, December 11, 1884. The *Christian Statesman* is the official organ of the National Reform Association, and if its edito-

rial utterances are not the utterances of the Association then whose utterances are they?

The SENTINEL does not dwell on technicalities; it does not take unfair advantages; it does not make people or parties transgressors for a word. By the plainest, fairest, and most logical interpretation possible, the iniquity of this National Reform, Woman's Christian Temperance Union political scheme is great enough. There is no need to dwell on technicalities. And as for our statements, they are always made on authority, and as nearly correct as we can possibly make them. The SENTINEL knows precisely what it is doing, and Mr. Johnston and others like him had better stop criticising, and go to believing, what the SENTINEL says.

A. T. J.

Woman and the Advent.

WE used to think that the ballot in the hands of women would be the "handwriting on the wall" for the saloons of our land. But when we learned that there are in the city of Philadelphia alone 6,000 women engaged in the liquor business, that fact gave the prospect a somewhat different complexion. Whether or not there are in Philadelphia 6,000 well-bred, pure, and noble women who, if women could vote, would arm themselves with the ballot and go to the polls in behalf of law, sobriety, and home, may be something of a question; but if the privilege of suffrage was theirs, it is pretty certain that 6,000 ballots in that city would go from the hands of a certain class of women solid for rum. There are vicious women as well as vicious men; and the ballot in the hands of these would offset as many in the hands of the good and true.

But while the prospect in this direction appears less hopeful, evidence is more and more frequently appearing to show that women are as susceptible, at least as men, to fanaticism, and would be in danger of using the power of the ballot under the influence of prejudice and blind impulse, as often, perhaps, as under the guidance of intelligence and reason. That this is no uncharitable judgment, we offer as evidence the following paragraph from the "Prospectus of Evangelistic Board of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union for 1888," as published in the *Christian Statesman*, of April 26, 1888:—

"As Christ came first by Mary alone in the stable at Bethlehem, so shall he come the second time, to reign King and Lord, by this confederation of the women of the whole world, exalted to the high place which is hers under the gospel; not only as the mother and educator of law-makers and rulers, but set free from the domination of mere animal force, herself co-ruler and legislator in the State as well as in the home, according to God's evident plan that the world should not always be left *comfortless*."

In this quotation the italics are ours, with the exception of this last word, which we give as we find it. Allusion is evidently made to John 14: 18, where Christ assures his sorrowing disciples, to comfort them in view of his departure to Heaven, that he will return again:

"I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you."

Does the language of the extract quoted above mean that this "confederation of the women" is to be the second coming of Christ? that *through them* he is to reign King and Lord over the earth? Or does it mean that his second personal coming is dependent on this "confederation of the women"? With either view the position is unscriptural and fanatical enough to suit an Ignatius Loyola. It is easy to see how women who are ready to entertain such views, could be induced, under the subtle deceptions of the National Reform Association, to embark in favor of an oppressive Sunday law, which would ride rough-shod over the most sacred rights of conscience, and the dearest liberties of mankind.

—*Review and Herald*.

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.

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS.

BY J. M. HUTCHINGS.

THIS new work is a complete historical and descriptive summary of the wonderful Yo Semite Valley and Big Tree Groves. The author, Mr. Hutchings, is an old pioneer, and has for more than 20 years resided in the Valley. He took the first sketches of it that were ever taken, and was the first to make its

MARVELOUS GRANDEUR KNOWN TO THE WORLD.

The work is complete in one volume of nearly 600 pages, and is illustrated with over 150 illustrations, 28 of which are

BEAUTIFUL FULL-PAGE ARTOTYPES.

These artotypes are the most charmingly characteristic of any illustrations ever produced, and are perfectly true to life, having been photographed from nature.

Sold only by subscription. Agents wanted everywhere. For prices and terms,

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, 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. 548 pp. Price, \$2.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

MISCELLANEOUS TRACTS.

ASSORTED PACKAGE NO. 6. PRICE, 25c.

THE Plan of Redemption—The Sufferings of Christ—The Sanctuary of the Bible—Scripture References—The Spirit of Prophecy—Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion—Samuel and the Witch of Endor—The End of the Wicked—The Two Thrones.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER, 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.

THE *Christian Statesman* says:—

“The AMERICAN SENTINEL is gradually defining its position, and American Christians will know exactly where to find it.”

Yes, we intend that “American Christians” and everybody else shall know exactly where to find the SENTINEL.

NATIONAL REFORM petitions in favor of Senator Blair’s constitutional amendment, are being circulated for signatures. They will be presented to you before long, and when they are, you want to bear in mind that that amendment provides for the establishment of a National religion, and a consequent religious despotism.

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.”

IN 1596, when James VI. of Scotland (I. of England), was attempting to force Episcopacy upon Scotland, a number of the Scottish clergy had an interview with the king, and when his Majesty accused them of holding seditious meetings (for so he characterized the meetings of the church for its own purposes), and of alarming the country without reason, one of them, Andrew Melville, thus answered him:—

“Sir, as divers times before I have told you, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is King James, the head of this commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus, the king of the church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. . . . We will yield to you your place, and give you all due obedience; but again I say, You are not the head of the church; you cannot give us that eternal life which we seek for even in this world, and you cannot deprive us of it. Permit us then freely to meet in the name of Christ, and to attend to the interests of that church of which you are the chief member.”

Which was equivalent to saying that they recognized the king’s authority in civil matters, but that in matters of religion they acknowledged no sovereign but Christ. And that is just what the Lord himself taught when he said: “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.” It is to be regretted that all men have not as clear views of the true relation of Church and State as were expressed by Andrew Melville to King James.

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 religious-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.

A SHORT time ago a preacher in Selma, Cal., delivered a sermon on Temperance, Prohibition, etc., 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 *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 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 seems 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.”

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.

IN a speech in Boston on “The Prospects of Catholicism in the United States,” Dr. Daniel Dorchester (Methodist) said:—

“Some people have been very anxious lest the Pope should come to this country. But I say, Let him come; it is the best thing that could be done. And I really think I would attempt to raise money to buy 10,000 acres of the best land in the United States, and make him a present of it for the seat of his Government. But when he comes here, he will be a great deal less of a man than he is at Rome.”

No, he would not. If the Pope should come here, with the politicians, and the Protestant ecclesiastics ambitious of civil power, he would soon be the head of the Nation in all matters of advice and arbitration—he would virtually soon be the dictator. See the influence of Cardinal Gibbons. But if it is thus with only a Cardinal, what would it not be with the Pope? No, indeed; let not the Pope ever set foot in the United States.

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.