



Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, MAY 8, 1890.

NUMBER 19.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

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

Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's.

THE public school fund is drawn from the whole people, without discrimination or preference, and with no reference whatever to any question as to either religion or the Bible. Therefore the same fund should be used and applied for the benefit of the whole people *as it is raised*, without discrimination or preference. As the money is raised without reference to those who believe in the Bible or religious instruction, so it should be expended and used. If the money when raised is to be applied according to the dictation and the religious wishes of those who believe in the Bible and religious instruction, then justice demands that it shall be raised by taxation only upon those persons. Justice will never allow religious exercises or religious instruction in the public schools.

All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.

ONE of the greatest sophistries with which those please themselves who are in favor of religion in the schools is that in which they speak of the reading of the Bible "without note or comment." The truth is that the Bible, precisely as it is, without a single note or a word of oral comment, may be read in such a way that the mere reading of it will be the strongest comment that could possibly be made.

The public reader of Dickens reads that author without note or comment, but the impression made upon those who hear is deeper than all the commentators in

Christendom could make upon those same persons. Edwin Booth reads Shakespeare without the slightest note or comment, and yet it would be impossible for any commentator to convey the depths of meaning, or to make the strong impressions that are made by his mere reading of the plain words of the author.

It is so with the Bible. The one who reads the Bible to the pupils in the public schools may do so "without note or comment," and yet he may so read what he reads as to make a stronger impression than could be made by any comment that he himself might make. It is hard to believe that those who make such a plea as this in the defense of the reading of the Bible in the public schools, can be sincere. It is equally difficult to understand how those who make this plea can deceive themselves with such sophistry, even though they may hope to deceive others.

It is not Christianity to teach the children "Be virtuous and you shall be happy." It is Christianity only to teach them "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

Presbyterian Morality.

FOR nearly five years the Presbyterian Synod of New York has appointed at each annual session a standing Committee on Religion and Public Education. The object of appointing the committee is that it shall consider and report upon the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the Presbyterian Synod of the State of New York, believing that the lessons of history and the traditions of American liberty forbid the union of Church and State, *discriminates between sectarianism and religion*, and affirms that so far as public education is concerned, an enduring morality must derive its sanctions, not from policy, nor from social customs, nor from public opinion, but from those fundamental religious truths which are common to all sects, and distinctive of none.

It therefore urges upon its members the imperative necessity of opposing the attitude of indifference to religion, which appears both in public school manuals, and in the educational systems of reformatories, and at the same time, of using every proper influence to secure the incorporation with

the course of State and National instruction, of the following religious truths as a ground of national morality, viz. :—

1. The existence of a personal God.
2. The responsibility of every human being to God.
3. The deathlessness of the human soul as made in the image of God, after the power of an endless life.
4. The reality of a future spiritual state beyond the grave in which every soul shall give account of itself before God, and shall reap that which it has sown.

The committee that is appointed at each annual session considers this matter during the year and reports at the next annual session. In the report of the committee for 1888, it says:—

The earliest efforts of your committee were directed towards ascertaining the attitude of the Roman Catholics. Archbishop Corrigan, of New York, and Vicar-Generals Quinn and Preston, besides many leading priests and writers of the Roman Catholic persuasion, were interviewed with the most satisfactory results.

The result of that interview, which the committee pronounced most satisfactory, was that Vicar-General Preston told the committee that the Roman Catholics "could be satisfied with nothing less than the teaching of their whole faith." The Vicar-General further told the committee that the Protestant denominations, "if they valued their own creeds," ought to feel on this matter as the Catholics do. And further, he said, "The points you propose, while better than none, would not satisfy us, and we think they ought not to satisfy many of the Protestant churches, while the infidels who are now very numerous would certainly reject them."

These statements of the Vicar-General to the committee are the substance of the reply to the efforts of the committee to ascertain the attitude of the Roman Catholics, and express what the committee called "the most satisfactory results." And upon this the committee reported that "the position of the Roman Catholics, upon the question therefore is well defined."

The results in this case seem to have been so entirely satisfactory to the committee and to the Synod, that no further effort has been made since, so far as we can learn, to ascertain the attitude of the Roman Catholics. And aside from this, not much has been done by the committee up to the present year in any efforts toward ascertaining the attitude of other churches, but the present year a stronger effort is being made than ever before. The Wisconsin Supreme Court decision came quite opportunely to give the Synod a leverage. Consequently the Synod of 1890 appointed influential committees to visit the spring meetings of other ecclesiastical bodies.

Dr. M'Cracken, who is the second in the list of appointees to visit the Methodist Conferences, is very active and whole-souled in the work. Dr. M'Cracken is Vice-Chancellor of the University of the City of New York. The New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church convened April 2. In the minutes of the Conference we find the following statement:—

Vice-Chancellor M'Cracken, of the University of the City of New York, and representing the Presbyterian Synod of New York, was listened to with very great interest as he addressed the Conference on the subject of "Religion and Public Education," especially criticising with keen censure the already famous decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court on the Bible as a sectarian book. A committee was appointed to consider the subject.

We have not yet been able to obtain the full report of this committee, but the closing paragraph has these words:—

We repudiate, as un-American and pagan, and as a menace to the prosperity of our free institutions, the recent Supreme Court decision in the State of Wisconsin, a decision dictated and defended by the enemies of the common schools, that the reading of the Bible without comment is sectarian instruction. In the present state of the controversy, we hold it to be the duty of Christian citizens of a commonwealth, Christian in its history and in the character of its laws, to deny that the Bible is a sectarian book, and claim for it a place wherever the State attempts to educate youth for the duties of citizenship.

The New York Conference is doubtless the strongest and most influential of the Methodist Conferences in the United States. Its action in this matter is of great weight in itself, and doubtless will be of great weight in influencing other Conferences in the same direction.

A Conference in New England has also adopted the Presbyterian view, and so taken its stand in favor of religion and the State. The *Christian Advocate*, with other influential religious papers, likewise, indorses this position. What *The Christian at Work*, and the New York *Sun* think of it, is shown in other parts of this paper. The New York *Observer*, in a long article, seems to wish to be non-committal, yet it closes with these words:—

If it were possible to secure a universal expression of opinion, we have reason to think that an immense majority of the people would cordially

manifest their preference for unsectarian schools, in which belief in God and his word are set forth as the basis of morality and government.

Whether this be true or not, we are not prepared just now to say, but as for the churches of the country, as such, we fear that it is so. There are individuals in all the churches who are strongly opposed to any connection between religion and the State; but to take the churches as such, we seriously doubt whether there is a single denomination, except the Lutheran, amongst all the Protestant denominations which are held to be evangelical, which would not indorse the position of the Presbyterian Synod and the New York Methodist Episcopal Conference. The Lutheran Church we believe would, as a denomination, repudiate the efforts to put religion in the public schools, or to have it connected with the State in any way.

This is a matter of great importance to the people of this country. Religion and the State are both infinitely better off without any such connection. It is impossible for the State to teach religion, of itself, for religion it has none. The State must get religion before it can teach it. The only place that it could possibly get it would be the Church; but so long as the Church has any religion worth the name, the State does not need any such thing, because the Church will be diligent, active, and efficient. And, so long as the Church maintains that position, she will refuse any alliance or connection whatever with the State; but just as soon as the Church loses it, then she is ready and anxious to secure the support of the State. And when the Church has lost the power and the virtue of the religion which she professes, and then undertakes to give to the State that style of religion which she has, the more of it the State gets, the worse it is for the State. This will be seen by taking a glance at the resolution of the Presbyterian Synod, and the propositions which it sets forth as a ground work of national morality.

The Synod insists that there must be a discrimination "between sectarianism and religion;" and affirms that "an enduring morality" must derive its sanctions from those fundamental religious truths which are common to all sects and distinctive of none. It therefore sets forth those four religious truths as the ground work of a national and enduring morality. In the four religious truths proposed, the committee has certainly made a success of stating those which are common to all sects and distinctive of none; for there is not one point in the four that is not accepted by nine-tenths of all the people on earth. The Unitarian, the Trinitarian, the Jew, the Mohammedan, and the heathen all accept every point named.

First as to the existence of a personal God. What God it is, is not so much as hinted at. Whether it be Buddha, or Joss or Allah, or Jehovah, it is all the

same; all that is necessary is to assent to the *existence* of a *personal* God, and everybody on earth except the downright atheist, assuredly assents to that.

As to the second, there is nobody that believes in any kind of a god at all, who does not believe in man's personal responsibility to that god.

As to the third, the deathlessness of the human soul has been believed by almost everybody since the day that Satan told Eve she should not die; and if a person believes that the soul is *deathless*, it is not likely to be very hard for him to believe that it is made after the power of an "*endless life*."

As for the fourth point, it is already contained in the second and third, and what they want to gain by repeating it, it is difficult to see.

But this is not the worst thing about the situation. Bear in mind that it is as "*Christian* citizens of a commonwealth, which is *Christian* in its history and in the character of its laws," that the Presbyterian Synod sets forth this system of national morality. Yet in the whole statement, resolution and all, there is not a word or a hint about Christ any more than if there were no such person in existence. And this is proposed by a body of professed Christians as a statement of religious truths forming the ground work of an enduring morality!

More than this they make the whole thing but a piece of infidelity by resolving that an enduring morality must derive its sanctions from those fundamental religious truths which are common to all sects and distinctive of none. The truth is, a person may believe all four of the points named, and yet not have a particle of enduring morality in him. All men have made themselves immoral by transgression of the moral law, and no man can attain to morality except by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. An enduring morality therefore can only be secured by an abiding faith in Jesus Christ and when these men propose to make an enduring morality derive its sanctions from these fundamental religious truths which are common to all sects and distinctive of none, they, in that, set Christ aside and present to men the hope of an enduring morality without him. But such a hope is a spider's web instead of that "anchor of the soul" which belongs to the Christian.

The morality which is common to all sects and distinctive of none is simply and essentially pagan; it is paganism itself. Whereas that morality which is distinctive of Christianity and peculiar to it alone; that morality which is manifested in the life and character of Jesus Christ, and which is secured only by faith in him,—that morality alone is enduring; and it is enduring because it is divine. He who has this morality will live eternally; he who comes short of it in a single degree, will vanish as the early dew.

The fact that the Presbyterian Church, and the New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, are willing to propose to the people of the United States as a national and enduring morality a system which makes no mention of Christ, and which is but a pagan system is a fearful commentary upon the religion which they hold and set forth as Christianity. The repudiation of the Wisconsin decision as "un-American and pagan" can have but little weight, when done by those who propose the establishment of a national morality which is wholly pagan.

A. T. J.

No government can have any but an unlawful, sinister object in view by seeking the support of any system of religion, or forming a political alliance with its professors.

The Divine Right of the Parent.

THE following article is taken from the argument of Mr. J. H. M. Wigman, before the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in the late case of the Bible in the public schools. The principles here announced are worthy of all acceptance. His statement of the divine right of the parent, is the truth of God:—

If the Superintendent of Public Instruction has the right to place the King James version of the Bible in a list of text books and authorize the district board to adopt it as such and order or permit the teachers to read it to our children, then it necessarily follows that he has the right to adopt any other version; such right or power would make him the supreme in spiritual over our children and destroy all religious liberty and rights of conscience.

All the various versions of the Bible are sectarian books, whether it be the Douay version used by Catholics, or the King James version used by most Protestants, or the recently revised version given to the world by the American and English Commission. And it is a violation of our Constitution to allow any Bible, be it either Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or Mormon, to be read in the public schools and thus force, or surreptitiously impose, a doctrine upon a child adverse to the faith of a parent.

It will not do to say that only certain chapters were read and that these chapters are substantially the same; if the teachers have the right to select these chapters, they have the right to select others. Neither will it do to say that the Bibles are substantially alike; every one who has ever made a comparison knows such is not the case. But suppose that all the Bibles were substantially the same, but that while Catholics so regarded them, Protestant neighbors should just as honestly, though mistakenly if you choose, take a very different view of the

matter; would it, we ask, be right for Catholics because of their numerical majority to force Protestant children against the protesting consciences of their parents to study or read the Catholic instead of the Protestant Bible, accepting the Catholic *ipse dixit* for the fact that both Bibles were alike, while the Protestant could believe nothing of the kind? Certainly this would not be our idea of religious liberty, whether practiced by Catholic on Protestant or by Protestant on Catholic.

If the Superintendent of Public Instruction or the board of education of Edgerton, composed as it may be of self-righteous Christians may require the King James version of the Bible to be read to the children of unwilling parents, he or they may require it to be taught and expounded; another board made up of another class may require another version to be read, taught, and expounded: for while the Protestants have their King James version, the Catholics have their Douay version; the Jews, while rejecting the New Testament, have the Old for their Bible; the Mormons have their version and if the Board at any time be made up of professed infidels, they may substitute the teachings of Tom Paine's "Age of Reason," or another class may substitute the Koran.

The question is not as to whether the Catholic is right, for this is purely a theological question which not even the Legislature, in all the profundity of its wisdom and the plenitude of its power, has the authority to determine. The only thing which the State has a right to demand of Catholics is that they act the part of good citizens and the naked question, stripped of all disguises, resolves itself into this simple proposition:—

"Can a Catholic, believing as he does about the Bible be a good and faithful citizen? If he can, why allow a school board or teacher to force upon the children of the relators an abandonment of their faith by impressing on their minds a doctrine contrary to the faith of their parents? Why mock them with the idea of religious liberty while compelling them to be taught that their religious belief which they derived from their parents is false?"

The reading of the King James version may be in accordance with the teachings of most Protestant sects, but it is against the teachings and belief of the Roman Catholic Church and if allowed, it gives one sect an advantage over another sect. It is an attempted control of and interference with the right of conscience, by giving a preference to the Protestant sect.

Our Constitution gives the right to every man to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience and provides that that right shall never be infringed, nor shall any control

of or interference with the right of conscience be permitted or any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship. [SEC. 18, Art. 1, Constitution of Wisconsin.]

Judge Cooley in his work on Constitutional limitations, page *469, says: "There is no religious liberty where one sect is favored by the State and given an advantage over other sects. Whatever establishes a distinction against one class or sect is to the extent to which the distinction operates unfavorably, a persecution, and, if based on religious ground, a religious persecution."

We say then that the attempt of the district board and the teachers of the schools of Edgerton to read the Bible to the children of unwilling parents is a violation of the Constitution; it is a violation of the liberty of conscience; as much so as it would be to compel them to embrace Judaism or Paganism.

Suppose that at some future time a Jewish citizen should be elected to the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, and that he should place upon, and recommend in, a list of text books, (amongst which should be Jewish books,) a Jewish Bible, and that the district board of Edgerton should be composed of Jewish citizens who, animated with the profundity of the wisdom of the present school board, should undertake to adopt such books, what would our self-righteous Christians, who now compose the school board, say? Would they raise no objection? Would they call this non-sectarian teaching? Would they allow a teacher, either directly or indirectly, to teach their children against their will, that he whom they believe to be the Messiah, the Lord, and Maker of heaven and earth was, after all, only an imposter? Are any of them base enough to answer this question in the affirmative? Upon what principles of justice dare they then deny to others the right and privilege they claim for themselves? It will not do to say that the Superintendent of Public Instruction has selected the King James version. Who has given him authority so to do, from so many other translations, no two of which even agree in all essential particulars?

Can he or the school board ostracise the children of a denomination of Christians by having a book introduced, read or taught as a "Bible" which they are taught and believe is not the Bible? We should be pleased to know what the qualifications of the Superintendent of Public Instruction or the school board are for ascertaining which amongst all the conflicting translations of the Bible is the correct one. Has either of them ever studied, or is either of them familiar not only with the Latin and Greek but also with the Hebrew, the original language of the Scripture? The Old Testament was written in Hebrew except some parts in Chaldee and Syriac.

If the State Superintendent or the district school board of Edgerton may determine between the different religious denominations which has the correct version of the Bible and cause it to be read in the public schools to our children, against the will of their parents, it would completely overthrow everything in the shape of religious liberty, for it is a palpable violation of the principles of religious liberty to force anybody's child, whether the child of a Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or non-denominationalist, against the conscientious objections of its parents to listen to the reading of a book called "Bible," in which the parent does not believe.

The parents are the only earthly sovereigns who rule directly by divine right. This authority over their child and their exclusive right to train and educate it in their own way dates back to the very morning when the first born of Adam and Eve lay a helpless infant in the arms of its mother. This authority was afterwards re-affirmed and ratified by the Almighty from the mountain top where, with a tongue of lightning and a voice of thunder, he gave the command: "Honor thy father and thy mother;" and however poor and humble the family may be, there is surrounding its family government a "charmed circle" within which the mightiest monarch on earth should not dare uninvited to set his foot, or intrude his unwelcome presence; and this is the educational circle in religious matters; this is that sacred circle which encompasses the tender, plastic, untaught mind and heart during the earlier years of childhood, when the character of the future man or woman is in the embryo state and liable to be made or marred by the very slightest touch and to be swayed for good or evil by the most imperceptible influences.

It will not do to say that the State may step within this family circle and cut asunder the sacred bonds of love, harmony, and reciprocal confidence between parent and child, transfer the control of the child's religious education to the hands of strangers—public school teachers. It will not do to declare that the State, through the Superintendent of Public Instruction and a school board, has the right to control the consciences of the children against the will of their parents by prescribing the particular sources from which they shall derive their religious ideas and opinions,—a most dangerous power to be exercised in a free government. No; if the State Government desires to fill this land with free, intelligent, well-educated, upright, law-abiding men and women, let it not thwart the fathers and mothers in their honest endeavors to preserve intact their parental authority and to maintain the honor, dignity, and harmony of the family government by educating their own children in religious matters, according to their own best judgment and conscience.

The State that undertakes to teach religion in order to inculcate principles of good citizenship, will fail to secure either religion or good citizenship.

The Methodists and the Public Schools.

ON the last day of its session the Methodist Conference in this city adopted resolutions against secularizing the instruction in the public schools. "Purely secular education," say the resolutions, "is impossible in a land whose literature, history, and laws are the product of Christian civilization." "Christian citizens," they declare further, "must deny the right of the State to assume to give such an inadequate education."

We should look upon this action of the Conference as a more grievous one than we do, but for the fact that it will accomplish nothing in the way of diverting the public school moneys to sectarian ends. The plain fact is whether or not it be true that purely secular education is impossible in a Christian land: it certainly is true that only secular education can be given in the common schools. The moment sectarian instruction is given, that moment the schools cease to be "common" or "public;" that moment the Catholics are driven out of them, as are the Jews and those of other religions, while if evangelical instruction is supplied the Unitarians will be driven out; and what a "confusion worse confounded" we should have! Our Methodist friends declare their attachment to the public schools; but their course would destroy the schools. That this is so is evidenced by the fact that the Roman Catholics are in entire accord with our Methodist friends in their position. They say, with the Methodists, not merely that children must be religiously educated—for we are all agreed as to that—but that this sectarian education—and all religious education is sectarian—must be supplied by the State.

To this position *The Christian at Work* cannot for a moment assent. Religion is necessary to the children, but it must be supplied by the Christian home, by the church and Sunday-school, and by other Christian agencies. The public schools are maintained to protect the State against the evils of illiteracy. Its citizens should know how to read and write, and perform the simple operations of arithmetic. And they should be made familiar with the history of their own country. But further than this the State should not go; nor can it go in the direction the Methodists wish without disestablishing the schools—and in this work the Catholics are with the Methodists, yet singularly enough, in their resolutions the Conference stigmatizes the Romanists as "enemies of the common schools."

We do not here consider the value of a half-hour's instruction in religion in the public schools, nor traverse the qualifica-

tions of the teachers to impart such instruction. We only put before our readers the situation as it presents itself to this journal, with the conviction that they who would force sectarianism into the public schools as the Roman Catholics and the Methodist Conference would, are compassing the destruction of these schools.—*Christian at Work.*

The truth itself forced on man otherwise than by its own inward power becomes falsehood.

The State Cannot Do It.

EDUCATION is defective if the spiritual nature is neglected. We all ought to insist on this. Shall we then insist on introducing religious instruction into the schools of the State? By no means. Why? Because the State does not purpose to give complete education. The State aims to improve the citizen and not to perfect the man. It does this for its own efficiency and protection. But is not the citizen based on the man? Yes. Is not morality an element of good citizenship? Yes. Is not morality based on religion? Yes. Why, then, does not the State aim at perfecting the man for the sake of the citizen? Why does not the State teach religion in order to foster morality which is so essential to good citizenship?

We answer: The State does not undertake to teach religion, because it knows that it cannot. The State is by its very nature unqualified for teaching religion or for completing the education of a human being. No cause can produce an effect different in kind from itself. No force reaches higher than its own source. Bread feeds the body and not the mind. Truth feeds the mind and not the body. Social influences effect the social nature only. Moral results are produced by moral forces and by no other. In order to awaken, nourish and train the spiritual, we must have a spiritual power. Now, the State is a civil power. It exists for civil purposes. Its functions, its agencies, its rewards and its punishments are civil. But man is a moral and spiritual as well as a social and industrial being. The moral and spiritual require moral and spiritual forces for their education. These the State does not possess, and hence the State cannot give a complete education. It cannot touch the moral and spiritual in man.

The State cannot teach morality, because it does not know morality. It does not know absolute right and wrong; it knows rights and wrongs. It does not know absolute goodness and badness; it knows the efficient and the detrimental. It does not know the holy and the sinful; it knows the loyal and the criminal. It does not know theft and murder and adultery and slander as wrong; it knows

them as wrongs, as infractions of the rights of others, and as hurtful to the body politic. Thus not having a cognition of morality, it is impossible for the State to teach morality.

In like manner, the State does not know religion. It does not know dependence on God, obligation, responsibility, duty, love, or obedience to God. These all are personal cognitions and experiences. Persons having them may, and frequently do, organize on them as a basis and for their cultivation. The Church is such an organization. But such a society the State is not. It is based on cognitions and experiences entirely different and for entirely other purposes. Persons who do not have these cognitions and experiences, and who deny the possibility of having them, belong to the State. . . . A religious character is impossible for a nation. The phrase "a Christian nation" is absurd. If every man, woman, and child in the State were a Christian, we should then not be a Christian nation, but a nation of Christians. Christianity is not a national characteristic; it does not run in the blood. No one is a Christian in virtue of his birth of a certain race, or of citizenship in a certain State. Christianity is a personal and an acquired characteristic, and is not essential to nationality or to citizenship. The State neither knows nor recognizes religion when it exists. It is impossible, therefore for the State to teach religion; of those truths and experiences it has no cognitions.

Consider again what it is to teach morality. It is something other than the enumeration and exposition of moral duties, or than a dissertation on the philosophy of ethics. Persons may be very learned in all this, and yet be utterly wanting in moral education as the word is used in the objection of the Catholics. Moral education is the awakening of the moral nature to a vivid sense of right and wrong, to a love of right and a hatred of wrong, to a choosing of the right and a rejection of the wrong, and to a consequent constant exercise of the will in right volitions. But these results are produced by the impingement of a moral nature already educated on an unawakened moral nature. But the State has no such educated moral nature. It has no moral nature at all. It does not, it cannot, exact such an educated moral nature as a qualification in its servant the school teacher. All that it asks, or can ask, is power and aptness to impart information with an inoffensive outward conduct. For this reason the State cannot become the agent of moral education.

The same is true of religious education. This does not consist in conveying information concerning God and man, Christ and the Bible, sin and salvation, the Church and holiness. Mere knowledge of these things is utterly worthless. It improves neither the citizen nor the man.

As mere knowledge, stopping with itself, it is not worth teaching at all. Religious education is the awakening of the spiritual nature of man so that he may feel his dependence on God, his obligation to God, his sin against God, and the love and mercy of God toward him in Christ Jesus, and so that he may come back to God in Christ Jesus in repentance and faith, love, consecration and obedience. This alone is that religious education which our Catholic fellow-citizens so justly tell us is essential to complete human education, and which produces the manhood and the morality so necessary to good citizenship. This education can be produced, generally speaking, only by the impingement of a spiritually educated nature, on an unawakened spiritual nature. But the State has no such educated religious nature. It has no religious nature at all. Hence, the State cannot impart the religious education here spoken of.

The best instrument for the awakening and nurture of a spiritual nature is the Bible. But the Bible is a spiritual instrument, and can be properly used only by the spiritually-minded. The carnally-minded and the worldly-minded can teach facts and truths about the Bible, and expound intellectually some of the contents of the Bible. But to use the book as a means of spiritual awakening and nurture is possible for the spiritually-minded only. The State is utterly void of this spiritual-mindedness, and hence is utterly unfit to use the Bible for religious instruction.

We are thus shut in to the conclusion that the State is not competent to give man a complete education. It has not the power, and hence it is not its function to impart moral and spiritual instruction.—*Rev. Owen James, in National Baptist.*

Those who preach to rulers the duty of employing power to propagate the truth, would do well to remember that falsehood, though no match for truth alone, has often been found more than a match for truth and power together.

The Best Defense of the Public Schools.

THE friends of the public-school system have need to be on the alert. Its enemies are active, and will destroy the best scheme of public education ever devised, if not resisted. But we must not only defend it against its enemies; we must save it from some of its friends. No small part of the present agitation concerning it is due to that class of its professed friends who are fighting outside of the legitimate lines of defense. For example, a protest has been made because the mayor of this city appointed a Roman Catholic as School Commissioner in place of another Roman Catholic. This protest would be legitimate, if the new commissioner were opposed to our public schools and wished to break them down. But there is no evidence that this is the fact, nor is it even

alleged. In the absence of any such proof it is manifestly unfair and unjust, and savors of religious proscription to insist that no Roman Catholic shall serve on a public school board. The strong defense of the public school is that it *is* public, for the benefit of all without distinction of race or religion. There is no other ground upon which to justify the taxation of people of all races and religions for its support. Catholics are taxed for it, Catholics patronize it extensively, and Catholics as such should not be excluded from its management. This is an impregnable position for the friends of the public school to take. If they take it and adhere to it they will compel all enemies to surrender.—*Independent.*

Any invasion of the rights of another done of purpose is persecution. Any invasion of the rights of others, by large bodies, is none the less persecution; and when these rights are rights of conscience, it is persecution, and the men who suffer from it feel it as persecution the moment their attention is addressed to it. The moment that a Jew becomes aware that his taxes are appropriated to a form of worship alien to his faith, and which teaches its falsehood, he is persecuted, and it is only a question of time and humanity whether those who persecute him shall be persuaded to persecute him more.

The Common Schools are Common to All.

THE following extract is from the concurring opinion of Justice Orton in the decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. It is the clearest statement of the case of the "common school" that we have seen, and is valuable as well for its sound principles:—

I most fully and cordially concur in the decision and in the opinions of Justices Lyon and Cassoday in this case.

It is not needful that any other opinion should be written, but I thought it proper to state briefly some of the reasons which have induced such concurrence in the decision.

The right of every man to worship almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed; nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship; . . . nor shall any control or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted or any preference be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship.—Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 18.

No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust, under the State, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity, in consequence of his opinions on the subject of religion.—Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 19.

The interest of "the school fund," and all other revenues derived from the school lands shall be exclusively applied, etc, to the support and maintenance of *common schools* in each school district, Art. X, Sec. 2, subdivision 1.

The Legislature shall provide by law for the establishment of district schools which shall be as nearly *uniform* as practicable; and such schools shall be *free*, and without charge for tuition, to *all* children between the ages of four, and twenty

years; and no *sectarian* instruction shall be allowed therein.—Art. X, Sec. 3.

Each town and city shall be required to raise *by tax* annually for the support of *common schools* therein a sum not less, etc.—Art. X, Sec. 4. Provision shall be made by law for the distribution of the income of the school fund among the several towns and cities of the State for the support of *common schools* therein, etc.—Art. X, Sec. 5.

These provisions of the Constitution are cited together to show how completely this State as a civil Government, and all its civil institutions, are divorced from all possible connection or alliance with any and all religions, religious worship, religious establishments or modes of worship, and with everything of a religious character or appertaining to religion; and to show how completely all are protected in their religion and rights of conscience, and that no one shall ever be taxed or compelled to support any religion or place of worship, or to attend upon the same; and more especially to show that our *common schools*, as one of the institutions of the State created by the Constitution, stand, in all these respects, like any other institution of the State, completely excluded from all possible connection or alliance with religion or religious worship, or with anything of a religious character; and guarded by the constitutional prohibition that “no sectarian instruction shall be allowed therein.”

They show also that the common schools are free to all alike, to all nationalities, to all sects of religion, to all ranks of society, and to all complexions. For these equal privileges and rights of instruction in them, all are taxed equally and proportionately. The constitutional name, “common schools,” expresses their equality and universal patronage and support. *Common schools* are not common as being low in character or grade, but *common* to all alike, to everybody and to all sects or denominations of religion, but without bringing religion into them. The common schools, like all the other institutions of the State, are protected by the Constitution from all “control or interference with the rights of conscience,” and from all preferences given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship.

As the State can have nothing to do with religion except to protect every one in the enjoyment of his own, so the common schools can have nothing to do with religion in any respect whatever. They are as completely secular as any of the other institutions of the State, in which all the people alike have equal rights and privileges. The people cannot be taxed for religion in schools more than anywhere else. Religious instruction in the common schools is as clearly prohibited by these general clauses of the Constitution as religious instruction or worship in any other department of State supported by the revenues derived from taxation.

The clause that “no sectarian instruction shall be allowed therein” was inserted *ex*

industria to exclude everything pertaining to religion. They are called by those who wish to have not only religion, but their own religion taught therein, “godless schools.” They are godless, and the educational department of the Government is godless, in the same sense that the executive, legislative, and administrative departments are godless. So long as our Constitution remains as it is, no one’s religion can be taught in our common schools. . . . Let it once enter into our civil affairs, our Government would soon be destroyed. Let it once enter into our common schools, they would be destroyed. Those who made our Constitution saw this, and used the most apt and comprehensive language in it to prevent such a catastrophe.

No State Constitution ever existed that so completely excludes and precludes the possibility of religious strife in the civil affairs of the State, and yet so fully protects all alike in the enjoyment of their own religion. All sects and denominations may teach the people their own doctrines in all proper places. Our Constitution protects all and favors none. But they must keep out of the common schools and civil affairs. It requires but little argument to prove that the Protestant version of the Bible, or any other version of the Bible, is the source of religious strife and opposition, and opposed to the religious belief of many of our people. It is a sectarian book. The Protestants were a very small sect in religion at one time, and they are a sect yet, to the great Catholic Church against whose usages they protested, and so is their version of the Bible sectarian, as against the Catholic version of it.

The common school is one of the most indispensable, useful, and valuable civil institutions this State has. It is democratic, and free to all alike, in perfect equality, where all the children of our people stand on a common platform, and may enjoy the benefits of an equal and common education. An enemy to our common schools is an enemy to our State Government. It is the same hostility that would cause any religious denomination that had acquired the ascendancy over all others to remodel our Constitution, and change our Government and all of its institutions, so as to make them favorable only to itself, and exclude all others from their benefits and protection. In such an event, religious and sectarian instruction will be given in all schools. Religion needs no support from the State. It is stronger and much purer without it.

This case is important and timely. It brings before the courts a case of the plausible, insidious, and apparently innocent entrance of religion into our civil affairs, and of an assault upon the most valuable provisions of the Constitution. Those provisions should be pondered and

heeded by all of our people, of all nationalities and of all denominations of religion, who desire the perpetuity and value the blessings of our free Government.

Wherever there is a system of religious instruction endowed and patronized by law, with a preference given to it by the State over all other systems, and a preference given to its teachers over the teachers of all other forms of belief, there is a religious establishment.

The Only Alternative.

THE Methodists, in conference here, passed resolutions last Monday against the secularization of the common school education.

“Purely secular education,” say the resolutions “is impossible in a land whose literature, history, and laws are the product of a Christian civilization,” “Christian citizens,” they declare farther, “must deny the right of the State to assume to give such an inadequate education.”

Yet the State can give no other than a purely secular education. It has no right to give any other, for we have no State religion to teach. The public schools must be wholly secular, or we must give them up.

That is the alternative, and Methodists, Baptists, Roman Catholics, and Episcopalians must look it squarely in the face. The schools must go, or they must remain secular, and become more so rather than less.

If people’s convictions lead them to require that their children shall receive in the schools which they attend, religious education along with the secular, they must send them to other than the public schools. If they do not think that they can give their children sufficient religious instruction at home and in the Sunday-schools of their churches to save them from spiritual peril, they must keep them out of the free schools maintained by public taxation. They must send them to religious schools of their way of thinking, and support such schools themselves.

In working for the introduction of religion into the public schools the Methodists are therefore, working for their destruction. There can be no question about that. They speak of the Roman Catholics in their resolutions as “enemies of the common schools;” but they are precisely as much enemies of the schools themselves when they demand what cannot be granted without breaking up the whole system. The schools must be altogether secular or they will be torn to pieces. There is no other logical conclusion.

As a matter of fact, are the schools unsatisfactory to the public at large because they are necessarily purely secular?—They do not seem to be so. Everywhere they are crowded. The school accommodations in New York are insufficient to meet the demand upon them, and this demand

grows with the growth of the population. The complaints are, not of the absence of religious instruction, but that the secular education is not afforded to all and is not what it should be.

The public schools are maintained simply to protect the State against the evils of illiteracy. Its citizens should know how to read and write. They are for no religious purpose whatsoever. The churches, maintained by voluntary contributions, must look after the matter of religion, each in its own way, and according to its own conscience and its own dogmas.—*New York Sun.*

Every subject's duty is the king's; but every subject's soul is his own.

The Baptists of Canada on Religion and the State.

THERE is just now in Canada, considerable agitation of the same questions that are fast becoming so prominent in the United States, namely, the union of Church and State, Sunday laws, and religion in the public schools. On the question of religion and the public schools, as well as on that of the total separation between Church and State in everything, the following petition of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec, is of interest. We wish the Baptists of the United States were as outspoken on these questions as are those of Canada. We know that in this country there are individual Baptists who have as clearly defined views on these questions, and as much readiness to express them, as the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec have shown themselves to have; but we have not yet heard of a single Baptist Association in the United States, which as a body has taken such a position. We should be glad to learn of scores of them. This report is taken from the *Canadian Baptist*:—

To the Honorable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

The petition of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec humbly sheweth:—

1. That the denomination of Christians called Baptists stands historically identified with, and has always been foremost in, maintaining certain principles touching civil and religious rights, which may be summarized as follows:—

That the State is a political corporation simply; that freedom of religious opinion and worship is inherently a vested right of the individual conscience, and not a grant from the State; that parliament may not prescribe any form of religious belief or worship, nor may it tax in any form any citizens for the support or teaching of religion.

2. That in harmony with these principles the following resolution was passed at the annual meeting of your petitioners, held in the city of Ottawa, in the month of October last: Moved by Rev. R. G. Boville, M. A., seconded by Rev. J. Dempsey, that,—

Whereas, The historic belief of the Baptist Church has always been that Church and State should be separate, and that all citizens and denominations should be equal in every way before the law; and,—

Whereas, Said principle is being violated in all ecclesiastical exemptions, whether in favor of Baptists or of other denominations; in the continuance of the mediæval tithing system of the Roman Catholic denomination in Quebec; in the existence of separate schools supported out of public rates;

in State provision for religious instruction in public schools; and in public grants for denominational purposes, as well as in other respects; therefore,—

Resolved, That we hereby declare our conviction that the only permanent and sufficient remedy for these evils that are subversive of the principles of Religious Liberty and equality, and therefore a hindrance in the development of our national life, is the absolute and final separation of Church and State, and the revision of our constitution in harmony with the same.—Carried.

3. Believing that in all regards in which the State violates the principles above summarized, it transcends its rightful power and unjustly infringes on individual rights; and believing further, that nothing short of the thorough and consistent application of these principles throughout the whole Dominion will produce harmony and secure the welfare of the people of Canada, your petitioners pray—

That your Honorable Body may be pleased to speedily adopt measures,—

1. To absolutely abolish all exemption of ecclesiastical property and persons from their due share of municipal taxes and burdens.

2. To effectually prevent the making of gifts or grants from the public funds to denominational institutions or purposes, whether charitable, educational, or otherwise.

3. To abolish all laws providing for the imparting of religious instruction in the public schools.

4. To bring about the entire abolition of separate denominational schools supported by rates levied by process of law.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Witness the hands of the President and Secretary of your petitioners, subscribed at Toronto this 17th day of March, A. D., 1890.

(Signed) D. E. THOMSON,
President.

(Signed) JAMES GRANT,
Secretary.

The spirit of republican institutions casts out and rejects as an extraneous and foreign and ruinous element in its civilization, any preference by law to one set of religious opinions, to one system of religious teachings, over another.

Orthodox Presbyterianism.

WE here present an extract from the speech of Hon. Stanley Matthews in the Cincinnati case of the Bible in the schools. In these times when Presbyterian Synods and Presbyterian papers are demanding that the State shall teach religion, and denouncing Supreme Court decisions to the contrary, it is important that the public, as well as the Presbyterians themselves, should know just what is orthodox Presbyterianism on this question. Mr. Matthews said:—

I wish, partly as a personal gratification to myself, and partly for the sound and wholesome truth conveyed in sound and wholesome words, which it contains, to read to your Honors a part of the confession of the church to which I belong, on the duties and functions of the civil magistrate. *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, chapter xxiii, section 3, says:—

Civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, or in the least interfere in the matters of faith. Yet, as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such manner that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger. And as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his church, no law of any commonwealth should inter-

fere with, let or hinder the due exercise thereof among the voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief. It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people in such an effectual manner as that no person be suffered, either upon pretense of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse or injury to any other person whatsoever; and to take order that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance.

Thus, may it please your Honors, am I taught by my own church—a church which teaches elsewhere in the same confession that “God alone is lord of the conscience”—and which here plainly defines and declares its own rights and the rights of the whole Christian Church, and the limits of the civil power in respect of them; and in so doing denies to the civil magistrate any assumed right *in the administration of the word*, which means neither more nor less, than, any part or lot in instructing in religion—denies his right, *in the least, to interfere in matters of faith*, which he attempts to exert when, by law, he decrees that a particular version or translation of the Bible shall be publicly read, as part of a system of religious worship and instruction, by and to particular persons, at stated times and places, thereby implicitly sitting in judgment upon the questions relating to its inspiration, its canonical character, the accuracy of its translation, its character and claims as the word of God, and opening the way, if such a power is admitted, for a further claim, to expound, interpret and teach by authority its true meaning; denies his right to give the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, a right which is clearly exercised where the State authorities, school boards or courts of law imperatively ordain a form of religious devotion to be practiced, or a mode of religious instruction to be adopted, in the public and common schools, which the consciences of any Christian denomination prevent them from attending, supporting or countenancing; declares the right of every denomination of Christians, to exercise its discipline and government ecclesiastically, among its voluntary members, according to their own profession and belief, without let, hindrance or interference with, by the law of any commonwealth.

But this noble article of the Westminster Confession of Faith goes one step farther, in its vindication of the rights of conscience against the power of the civil magistrate. It recognizes and throws the mantle of its protection, not merely over rights which it claims for those whom it regards as peculiarly its own—the confessors of its own faith—but concedes the same to all others, even to those who deny, not only its own confession, but the very faith itself—even infidels; for it maintains it to be the duty of civil Government equally to protect and defend all the people, both in person and good name, and so effectually, that no person be suffered to offer any indignity, violence, abuse or injury to any other person whatsoever, *either upon pretense of religion or infidelity!*

In other words it is not orthodox Presbyterianism in this country, to deny to an infidel the same civil rights that belong to a saint.



NEW YORK GB Wheeler Jan 91

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

THE Wisconsin decision has awakened such widespread discussion of the subject of Religion and Public Education, that we have made this number of the SENTINEL somewhat of a special upon that subject. We give to our readers some of the most valuable matter to be found upon this subject. The argument of Mr. Wigman, in the Wisconsin case, is a powerful and noble vindication of the right of the parent to instruct his own child. Judge Orton's opinion in the same case is an excellent statement of the case of the common school. The article by Rev. Owen James is a masterly statement of the impossibility of the State's ever having anything to do in any way, with religious instruction. And it is difficult to see how the Presbyterian Church can favor the teaching of religion in the public schools in the face of its own Confession of Faith, as so eloquently expounded by Stanley Matthews.

All these articles are most worthy of acceptance for all that they say, and for all that they mean, and in view of the condition of things in this Nation to-day, and in view of the powerful influences that are at work to secure action by the State which shall commit it to the cognizance of religious things, it is important that the principles so well set forth in the articles which we have the pleasure of presenting to our readers in this number of the SENTINEL, should be made known everywhere.

We hope all to whom this paper comes will give it the widest possible circulation.

THE Presbyterians throughout the whole United States are now discussing the question of the revision of their Confession of Faith. A great majority of those Presbyteries which have already expressed themselves, are in favor of revision. But there is one point in the Confession which we have not yet seen mentioned by any one of the Presbyteries, which will need to be revised if the position of the Presbyterian Synod of New York is orthodox. That is, the article which declares that

"civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the word, or in the least interfere in the matters of faith." If the State is to teach religion as this Synod demands that it shall, then that part of the creed needs to be so revised as to declare it to be the duty of the civil magistrate to administer the word and regulate matters of faith.

RESOLUTIONS are being adopted by ecclesiastical bodies, and many petitions are being sent to the United States Senate, urging the passage of the Blair Educational bill.

THE teaching of religion belongs to the Church, and to the Church only. God has committed to the Church this work, and endowed her with the power to do it effectively. The State has no authority to do it, nor has it the power by which, alone, the attempt to do it can be effective. This work then, having been committed to the Church, when the Church passes it over to the State and the State assumes the task, what then is the Church to do? What is there left for her to do, and what further use is there for her in the world? More than this, the Church will not stop at that. When once the State has assumed the task of carrying on and supporting the work of the Church, the next thing it will have to do will be to support the Church itself, and that in idleness, as every State has ever had to do, and will ever have to do, which takes upon itself the task of teaching religion. Therefore if the Government of the United States, or of any State, wants to keep forever clear of the galling burden of a lazy, good-for-nothing Church, let it keep forever clear of any attempt to teach religion.

APPARENTLY with some surprise the question is asked, Would you object to the use of the Bible in the public schools merely as a reading book? We answer decidedly, Yes. We object to the Bible's being made less than it is, or to any impression being conveyed that it is less than that which it is. The Bible is the word of God and that is all that it is. In it is the revelation of the eternal purpose of God which he purposed in Christ Jesus for the redemption of the race of man lost and ruined by sin. It is that and that only, and to make it less than that is to make it worse than nothing. And to use it in the public schools, or anywhere else, merely as a reading book, is to put it upon a level with all other mere reading books, and is to make it less than that which it is. Such procedure conveys the impression to the minds of the children in school that the Bible is no more, and of no more worth or authority, than any other reading book; and to do that is to destroy in their minds the true idea of what the Bible is, and of what its worth

and authority is. Therefore everybody who has any regard for the Bible for what it is, ought to object to its being put to any use that will convey to anybody any idea that it is less than that which it is—the word of God.

THE Presbyterians and the Methodists of New York,—the Calvinists and the Arminians—have heartily joined together in denouncing the Wisconsin decision and demanding religious instruction in the public schools. Yet if the State should decide to establish religious instruction in the public schools and should leave it to these two denominations to decide just what form of religion should be taught there, and to what degree, it would be difficult to find any two denominations in all the land between which there would be a wider divergence of view, or a more bitter contention.

THE New York *Herald*, not long since, secured an interview with the Pope, in which that dignitary expressed great love for America and the Americans. He expressed great anxiety over the "discontent, disorder, hatred, and profound unhappiness" that is seen in the present condition of society; and says he has studied how to bring about a change, and that, while he lives, he will labor to relieve the world of this terrible confusion. These good professions of the Pope had the effect of greatly pleasing the *Christian Union*, and it gives vent to its delight in these words:—

We cordially greet the Pope as an honored leader of a great international community in the work of industrial and social reform, no less than as a witness of the first importance to the fact that such a reform is the imperative need of our time.

Yes, we are perfectly satisfied that in the settling of this social confusion, the Pope will have much to do, and with the result that when it is settled, it will be to the advantage of the Papacy, and with the Pope as the head over all and supreme arbiter for the world.

THE Telluride *Republican* should experience no difficulty in deciding what the AMERICAN SENTINEL means. That journal cuts too clean to be misunderstood. It objects to placing God on a level with vile man, and *The Graphic* takes the same high ground. The religion that Jesus of Nazareth taught, first; the statutes of the State next. Both separate and distinct.—*Colorado Graphic*.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY 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, \$1.00

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, each 75c.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid. 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
43 Bond Street, New York.