

# The American Sentinel 3 (1888)

January 1888

"A 'Godless' School" *American Sentinel* 3, 1 , pp. 2, 3.

THE following ringing sentences are from the New York *Observer*, and although Father McTighe is said to have abandoned his attempt, at least for the present, this is a sound opinion upon the merits of the case:—

"Pittsburg presents the climax of Roman Catholic arrogance in destroying or capturing our public schools. Father McTighe, of St. Michael's Church, has actually succeeded in having himself appointed principal of the Thirty-third Ward public school in that city. This is the very consummation of unprincipled audacity. Having denounced the schools officially everywhere as 'immoral and godless,' a priest, sanctioned by his superiors, takes possession and pretends to administer an 'immoral, godless' school. Either he intends secretly to make it Romanist, or else he attempts to do precisely what Protestants wish, and therefore stultifies himself and his church as haters of our public schools. It is believed that he intends to keep what he and his church call a 'godless' school during the regular school hours, and then retain all those who will stay, for the purpose of giving them religious teaching in other hours. It is said that the nuns are to be employed as teachers. Such an illustration as this of the purpose and spirit of Romanists ought to rouse the nation. They ought to be taught a lesson now which will need no repetition. Our people will not tolerate this trifling with the very first principles of our polity, namely, that the State shall not in any way whatever engage in sectarian education, sectarian benevolence, or sectarian enterprises of any kind whatever. It is a disgrace to the civilization of any neighborhood, when it permits, for the sake of conciliating the enemies of the public schools, these gross violations of both the letter and spirit of our laws."

But if this "be the very consummation of unprincipled audacity," what shall be thought and said of the National Reform Association, which proposes to give the Catholic Church authority by law to do this same thing, or worse, in all places in the United States where the Catholics are in the majority? If this action of a single priest in Pittsburg ought to rouse the Nation, what ought the action of Herrick Johnson, Joseph Cook, and nearly a hundred other Protestant (?) preachers, under the lead of Secretary T. P. Stevenson, of the National Reform Association, in Saratoga last August, to do? That

action was to adopt a motion requesting the National Reform Association to bring to the attention of "Roman Catholic authorities" a scheme of religious exercises, worship, and instruction, in the public schools throughout the Nation, "with a view of securing, if possible, a basis of agreement" between Catholics and Protestants, whereby the Catholic Bible, Catholic worship, and Catholic instruction, shall be established in the public schools, wherever the Catholics may be in the majority, provided the Catholics will help these Protestants to secure a like power for themselves wherever the Protestants may be in the majority.

In the Thirty-third Ward in Pittsburg the Catholics are in the majority; Father McTighe became principal, and his nuns teachers in the public school of that ward; had they remained they would have used the Catholic Bible, would have conducted Catholic wor-

3

ship, and would have given Catholic instruction in that school; that is precisely what the Saratoga National Reform meeting decided by vote to secure if possible throughout the Nation; this action of the Saratoga meeting was taken expressly to "satisfy the Roman Catholics" and to "conciliate them to our school system." By the action of the Pittsburg School Board Father McTighe, a "Roman Catholic authority," is satisfied and conciliated with the school system in that city; Father McTighe was doing in Pittsburg exactly what the Saratoga meeting decided to get, if possible, the Roman Catholic authorities to agree to do throughout the Nation; therefore, as this case "is a disgrace to the civilization" of the neighborhood of Pittsburg, the action of the National Reform Association is a disgrace to the civilization of the Nation and of the age.

The National Reform Association "*ought to be* taught a lesson now which will need no repetition." But, alas! "our people" *do* "tolerate," and without a word or murmur of protest, "this trifling with the very first principles of our polity," and " these gross violations of both the letter and spirit" of our American institutions. "How long, O Lord, how long?"

A. T. J.

**"A Sunday-Law Convention" *American Sentinel* 3, 1 , pp. 4, 5.**

IN the *Union Signal* of October 20, 1887, Mrs. Lydia B. Clark gives an article on the "Hopeful Outlook for Sabbath Observance," and says that in its Sunday-law work the W. C. T. U. has found "most

cordial helpers" in the World's Prayer Union, the International Sabbath Association, and the National Reform Association. She reports certain legislative action that was taken last year in several States. Of the matter in California she says:—

"Two years ago in California the Sunday law was repealed, but the people last winter plied the Legislature with petitions to replace the repealed law with an improved statute, and in San Francisco a convention of ministers was called, a bill prepared and introduced in the Legislature demanding protection of the Sabbath."

Yes, that is so. And as such things are now quite widely prevalent, we propose to show to the people the way in which a typical Sunday-law convention works to secure the "demanded" legislation. This excellent lady has given us the text, and we shall supply the sermon. The Sentinel was at the Convention named, and took copious notes of the proceedings, and has preserved the report for just such a time as this. This work has now become so general that it is highly important that the public in general and legislators in particular should know the methods employed to secure the enactment of "civil" and "protective" Sunday laws.

This San Francisco Convention, like most of such conventions, was composed almost wholly of preachers. The thing originated in the "Pastors' Union" of Sacramento, it being "the sense of the Pastors' Union of Sacramento that a meeting of the pastors and members of the churches of the State, and of all other friends of Sunday legislation in the State, should be called. . . to secure the passage of a Sunday law," etc. This "sense" was approved by "the preachers of the Methodist Church" and the Convention was called, and met accordingly in the Young Men's Christian Association building, November 29, 1886.

The first and perhaps the most notable thing about the Convention that would be noticed by a looker-on was the perfect confusion of ideas as to what was really wanted. It is true that there was perfect unanimity on the point that there should be a law demanded of the Legislature, but that was the only single thing upon which there was any real agreement.

With some, nothing but a Sunday law would do; with others, nothing but a Sabbath law would answer. With some, it must be a civil Sabbath law; with others, a religious Sabbath law. With some, it must be a civil Sunday law; with others, a religious Sunday law. With some, it was a Christian Sunday that was wanted; with others, a Christian Sabbath. With some it was a religious Sabbath law that was wanted,

and a religious Sabbath law that must be had, and they were ready to go to the Legislature upon that basis; but these were very few. While with others, and these the great majority, it was a religious Sunday law or a religious Sabbath law that was wanted, but at the same time it was naively argued that to go to the Legislature with such a request would be all in vain, for the Legislature would not act upon any question of a religious nature; therefore, to get what they wanted, they must ask only for a civil Sunday law.

It was upon this last point that the discussion and the action of the Convention culminated. And by this action there was irresistibly forced upon the mind of an observer a strong impression of the insincerity of the great majority of the members of this Sunday-law Convention. The course of the discussion and this culminating action show that the majority of the members of that convention were willing to cover up the real purpose which they had in view, and deliberately to go to the Legislature of California under a false pretense. They show that while a religious law, and nothing else, is what they wanted, yet, as to openly ask the Legislature for that would be fruitless, they proposed to obtain what they wanted—a religious Sunday law—by getting the Legislature to pass a civil Sunday law. That is, they would have the Legislature to pass a civil Sunday law, and then they would enforce it as a religious Sunday law. In other words, they proposed to hoodwink the Legislature of California. They didn't succeed.

Another evidence of this insincerity was the ringing of the now familiar changes upon the "workingman." One had very great sympathy

5

for the "toiling multitudes." Another was the "friend of the workingman," and "if any people are the friends of the workingman, they are the ministers." And yet not one of them was there as the representative of the workingman, nor was it the needs of the workingman upon which the call of the Convention was based. When that which gave rise to the calling of the Convention was officially stated, it was that "the *Christian* people of Sacramento had been disturbed in their *worship*, and their *religious feelings* had been outraged by the disregard of the Sabbath; the matter had come before the Pastors' Conference; a correspondence opened with divines throughout the State on the subject of a Sunday law; and accordingly the present Convention had been called." And one of the

principal speakers in the Convention, in the speech that was the most applauded of any made in the Convention, said plainly that the movement was a religious one and that he was decidedly opposed to divorcing it from a Christian standpoint.

It was that "the Christian people" had been disturbed in their "worship," and not that the workingmen had been deprived of their rest; it was that the "religious feelings" of "the Christian people" had been outraged, and not that the workingman had been oppressed, nor that his feelings had been outraged; it was with the "divines," and not with the workingmen throughout the State that a correspondence had been opened; it was these considerations and not the needs of the workingman that formed the basis of the call for the Convention. And yet in the face of these definite statements, some of these "divines" would get up in the Convention, and fish for the favor and try to catch the ear of the workingman, by trying to make it appear that they came there as "the friends of the workingman."

And, too, just think of a lot of "divines" called in general convention to secure the enactment of a Sunday law to protect the "worship" and the "religious feelings" of "Christian people;" and then to fulfill the purpose, and to attain to the object of that call, they, in convention assembled, unanimously decide to go up to the Legislature and demurely ask for a law entirely civil! And why is this? Why could they not go to the Legislature in the name of that purpose for which they were called? Oh, that would never do! For if the word "civil" be stricken out, "you cannot reach the Legislature." Therefore just put in the word "civil and the purpose of the Convention will be accomplished, for we will get all we want and the Legislature will not know it." But the Legislature of California was not so exceedingly verdant as to be unable to see through that piece of wire-work, so deftly woven by these worthy divines.

The demand of these "Christian people" for a Sunday law, because their worship was disturbed, is just as hollow a pretense as is any other part of their scheme. For if their worship was really disturbed, they have already a sufficient resource. For the protection of religious worship from disturbance, the statutes of California make provision that ought to satisfy any ordinary mortal. Section 302 of the Penal Code of California reads as follows:—

"Every person who willfully *disturbs* or disquiets any assemblage of people met for *religious worship*, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or *by any unnecessary noise* either within the place where such meeting is held, or so near as to

disturb the order and solemnity of the meeting, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

And such misdemeanor is, punishable by "imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding six months, or by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or both."—*Id.*, sec. 19.

Are not six months in jail and a fine of five hundred dollars a sufficient punishment for the disturbance of worship? Or is this penalty so insignificant that these "divines" and "Christian people" disdain to inflict so light a punishment and therefore demand a Sunday law to make the punishment heavier?

But if the present penalty is insufficient to properly punish those who disturb their worship, then what will satisfy these "divines"? Where the State chastises with whips, do they want to chastise with scorpions? Do they want to imprison a man for *life* and mulct him of *all* his property for disturbing (?) their worship by working on Sunday on his farm, in his shop or garden, far away from any place of worship? We firmly believe that if the truth were told it would appear that it is not their worship at all but their *doctrine* that has been disturbed.

Just a word more on their pretended friendship for the workingman. We freely hazard the opinion that if they should obtain the "civil" Sunday law which they seek, then the poor workingman, who, to support his needy family, should work on Sunday, will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. We venture this opinion because of facts of which we know. In Tennessee there were at that time lying in prison, honest, hard-working men, whose families were dependent upon their daily labor, and these men were in that prison for working on Sunday to obtain the necessary means to support their families, and while they were in prison their families were in want, and had to be supported by the charity of Christian friends. *That* is the kind of friendship for the workingman that is shown in the enactment of these "civil" Sunday laws. And if the people of California, or in any other State, want to see the same thing repeated in their State, or in the Nation, then just let them allow these "divines" to secure the enactment of the "civil" Sunday law that they want. Then may be seen exemplified everywhere this solicitous friendship for the workingmen.

One of the leading members of the Convention remarked that he had "been in politics long enough to know that legislators keep their finger on the public pulse, and that they generally give what the

people want." From our observations in the Convention, of the speeches, and of its workings, we are prepared to give it as our private opinion, publicly expressed, that the most of the members of the Convention have been in politics enough to know a good deal about the ways and means by which politicians too often compass their ends.

A. T. J.

**"A Pen-Picture" *American Sentinel* 3, 1 , pp. 6, 7.**

IN the *Interior* of October 20 there is a racy report of the State Convention of the Ohio W. C. T. U. It is entitled "A Pen-Picture of the Ohio W. C. T. U. Convention." We have no doubt that that is what it is, and a well-drawn picture too, for some of the scenes are decidedly realistic—much more so in fact than we should have thought becoming in a woman's temperance convention, to say nothing of a woman's *Christian* temperance convention. In one of the scenes Miss Willard very properly paid a glowing tribute to the influence of Mrs. Hayes, Miss Rose Elizabeth Cleveland, and the present Mrs. Cleveland, in the White House. She closed with the words, "God bless Frances Folsom Cleveland," to which sentiment the applause was very properly immense. But to this sentiment one of the members of the Convention promptly took decided exception, at which the reporter, herself a member of the Union, expresses herself after this gentle, womanly, Christian style: "Out upon such littleness! Such a spirit shows a venom unworthy a civilized woman. Perhaps she was in the gall of bitterness because her husband had been turned out of office; if so we must try to excuse her."

Another, called in the report a "lively scene," ensued when the Committee on Finance reported in favor of paying salaries to the leading officers, and in favor of the President's visiting all the county and district meetings "at the expense of the Convention." Against this there was strong opposition, and

7

the report says: "Mrs. Foote led the opposition forces, and showed herself a fearless soldier, full of fire and spirit. In fact, she got mad, . . . and for a few minutes it seemed quite like a masculine assemblage." Yes, we have no doubt that it did. Women, fearless and soldierly, full of fire and spirit, and mad, at that, are not apt to appear very feminine-like.

But says the excellent reporter: "Now some people might think this little fray not a very proper thing, but I don't see why. It shows they are not afraid to do their own thinking, and although they are excellent women, they are very much like the excellent men—somewhat human." Yes, that is just the trouble. It shows they are rather too much like the not very, excellent men. And the observation which we would here make upon it is this: One of the principal reasons upon which these excellent women base their claim of the franchise and political equality with the men is that politics will be purified and all its methods elevated. But if this is the way in which the *Christian* women of the country act in a convention exclusively their own, and wholly separated from political strife, what would be the result in mixed assemblages, where not only these, but un-Christian and anti-Christian women as well, should have free scope for their activities equally with the men, and all together stirred with all the elements of political strife?

Hitherto we have been somewhat unsettled in our opinion in regard to woman suffrage, but now—well, we don't know.

This report was written by Virginia Sharpe Patterson. A. T. J.

## February 1888

### "A Reply to 'An Open Letter'" *American Sentinel* 3, 2 , pp. 9, 10.

IN the *Christian Nation* of December 14, 1887, there came to us "an open letter" from Mr. W. T. McConnell. Mr. McConnell lives in Youngstown, Ohio. He is a preacher of National Reform politics, and the president of the National Reform Prayer League: Somebody sent him a copy of the *Sentinel*, and it caused him to have "some reflections," of which he gives us the benefit in his "open letter." He proposes to comfort us by an endeavor to make it appear that the troubles are only "imaginary," which we point out as certain to come upon the Nation in the train of the success of the National Reform movement.

He starts out with the usual National Reform compliment to an opponent—that of naming us along with "Liberal Leagues," "the *Freiheits Bund*," "and the Liquor Leagues." But this is not enough relief to the pent-up charity of the Rev. W.T. McConnell; he graciously puts us in the fellowship of king Ahab in his murder of Naboth and the confiscation of Naboth's vineyard; taking good care of course to give



himself and his associates the companionship of Elijah, in the controversy, and even making Elijah to be "the General Secretary of the National Reform Association of his day." Upon all this we shall offer no comment at all. Such transcendent modesty, and such benignant charity, as is displayed in this, we have not the heart to disturb by offering the slightest criticism.

Then he clothes the National Reformers with this rendition of Elijah's answer to Ahab about who was the troubler of Israel:—

"I have not troubled Israel, said he, but you and the others who run this Government have made the trouble in that 'ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord.'"

Now as the National Reformers set themselves up as the special champions of the commandments of God, and as the enforced observance of Sunday is the grand aim of the National Reform project, we here ask Mr. McConnell, or any other National Reformer, or all of them put together, to show *any commandment of God for keeping Sunday*, or the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday. Come now, Mr. McConnell, Elijah could quote a plain commandment of God, in support of his opposition to Baal, and Ahab's worship of him. You take it upon yourself to fill Elijah's place in our day, in rebuking the Nation for desecrating Sunday, so please fill his place also in this, and cite us to a commandment of God for keeping Sunday. You take it upon yourself to rebuke this Nation for its sin against God in not keeping Sunday. Sin against God, is transgression of the law of God. Now please show the law of God that commands the keeping of Sunday. You may show it in the form of "an open letter" or in that of a sealed letter; in a public letter or in a private letter, just as you choose; but we insist that you show it. Come now, don't dodge.

Then to give proof that our fears of trouble, in the event of the success of the National Reform, are wholly imaginary, Mr. McConnell tells us this:—

"You look for trouble in this land in the future, if these principles are applied. I think it will come to you if you maintain your present position. The foolhardy fellow who persists in standing on a railroad track may well anticipate trouble when he hears the rumble of the coming train. If he shall read the signs of the times in the screaming whistle and flaming headlight, he may change his position and avoid the danger, but if he won't be influenced by these, his most gloomy forebodings of trouble will be realized when the express strikes him. So you, neighbors, if, through prejudice or the enmity of

unregenerate hearts, you have determined to oppose the progress of this Nation in fulfilling its vocation as an instrument in the divine work of regenerating human society, may rightly expect trouble. It will be sure to come to you."

Of course it will. That is precisely what we are trying to get the people to see. We are doing our very best to have the American people understand that the National Reform movement is nothing but a Satanic car of Juggernaut that proposes to relentlessly crush every person who refuses to submit to the *dictum* of its managers, every person who chooses to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience;—this we know will be, as surely as these men secure the power to enforce by law what they choose to call the will of God.

See again how sweetly he manifests the grace of Christian charity, in his attributing to us "the enmity of unregenerate hearts." How do you know, Mr. McConnell, that our hearts are unregenerate? By what right do you mount the throne, and arrogate to yourself the prerogative of God, and pass judgment upon men's hearts?

And if this "fool-hardy fellow" "shall read the signs of the times in the screaming whistle and flaming headlight, he may change his position and avoid the danger." Oh yes, that is all that John Huss needed to do. If he had only read the signs in the "scream-

10

ing whistle" of the Bishop of Lodi, and the "flaming headlight" of the Pope, he might have changed his position and avoided the danger. But "fool-hardy fellow" that he was, he wouldn't be influenced by these, and so his most gloomy forebodings of trouble were realized when the Papal express struck him. His was "the enmity of an unregenerate heart" too. Devils were painted all round about him to prove that it was so, and he demonstrated it himself when he publicly refused to kiss the crucifix, and submit to the Papacy. He too, determined to resist the progress of *that* Nation in the worship of the Papacy. He too, rightly expected trouble, and it surely came to him, as it likewise came to multitudes beside him. And now these National Reformers are about to set up in this Nation the living image of the Papacy, and to compel all men to worship both it and the Papacy, and whoever lifts up his voice against such iniquitous "progress," thereby shows "the enmity of an unregenerate heart," and all such "may rightly expect trouble" for "it will surely come." All these are their own words, and yet many men think the SENTINEL is performing a useless task in telling the people about it. Well, they may think so if they want to, but they shall not cause us to cease to tell of it; and

when they find themselves fallen into the power of these men, they will wish they had believed the warning. We only wish and pray that they may believe it now.

Mr. McConnell closes his letter with an invitation to come over and join with them. He says:—

"We also have an invitation for all men of energy and power. There is room here for you, and a demand for all your talents. You may now be opposing this cause, but we frankly extend to you the invitation, 'Come with us and we will do you good,' for good is written concerning the work of our Reform Associations."

Thank you, for the compliment, Mr. McConnell, but we are not going to "come." There is plenty of room for us where we are, and there is urgent demand for all our talents in the work in which we are now engaged. Can't you come over and join us, Mr. McConnell? There is room here for you. You could not do us good if we should go with you, for good is not written concerning the work of your Reform Associations; at least there is no good written of it by any authority that can do anybody any good. The best that the Scripture has written concerning it is that those who follow its pernicious ways "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." Rev. 14:9, 10. Yes, we are now opposing that cause. And we intend by the grace of God, to continue to oppose it, with all our talents, all our energy, and all our power, till the day that Christ gives us the victory over it. Rev. 15:2.

We shall be glad to hear from you again, Mr. McConnell, especially in regard to that commandment about which we have asked. Please write soon.

A. T. J.

**"Misdirected Enthusiasm" *American Sentinel* 3, 2 , pp. 12, 13.**

THE annual address of the president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is an important document. Not for any particular views of temperance or temperance methods, but because of its views of religion and politics and of religio-political methods. We shall here note some of them. We could not attempt to notice the address in detail for it occupies more than seven solid pages of the *Union Signal*. We shall only quote the most striking passages. Addressing her beloved comrades, the president said:—

"The marshaling hosts of which you are the vanguard, represent the downfall of sectarianism in religion, and the death of

sectionalism in politics. The bugle of your advance strikes the keynote of the church universal. . . . The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, National, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king. Yea, verily, this world's king in its realm of cause and effect; king of its courts, its camps, its commerce; king of its colleges and cloisters; king of its customs and its constitutions."

The "undying enthusiasm" of these enthusiastic ladies will be dead more than a thousand and one years before ever they see any such thing as that. For it is "THE WORLD," mark it, not the world to come, of which they have so enthusiastically set themselves to make Him the King—king of its courts, camps, cloisters, commerce, etc., etc.—and no such thing as that will ever be. The word of God says that when Christ comes to "THIS WORLD" as King of kings, and Lord of lords, "Out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. . . . And I saw the beast, and *the kings of the earth*, AND THEIR ARMIES, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." See Rev. 19:11-21.

Again:—

"The kingdom of Christ 'must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics.' . . . There are enough temperance men in both [the Democratic and Republican parties] to take possession of the Government and give us national prohibition in the party of the near future, which is to be the party of God. . . . We pray Heaven to give them no rest . . . until they shall . . . swear an oath of allegiance to Christ in politics, and march in one great army 'up to the polls to worship God.' . . . I firmly believe that the patient, steadfast work of Christian women will so react upon politics within the next generation that the party of God will be at the front."

And this maps out the result:—

"Concerning the platform of our next National Prohibition Conv"ntion, I am content to leave it substantially where it is, save that it should declare Christ and his law to be the true basis of government, and the supreme authority in national as in individual

life. I greatly desire and hope that we may use our influence to secure this end. Such a declaration must be clearly divested of anything that looks toward a union of Church and State, to which all enlightened Christians are thoroughly opposed, but must as explicitly recognize Christ as the great world-force for righteousness and purity, and enthrone him King of nations in faith, as he will one day be in fact, through Christian politics and laws, no less than Christian living."

But how such a declaration as that is to be clearly divested of anything that looks toward a union of Church and State, is what we should like to know. We wish the worthy president of the National W. C. T. U. had given some instruction or at least some hint as to how it is to be done. Notice, "It should declare Christ and his law to be the true basis of government, and the supreme authority in national as in individual life;" it must explicitly recognize Christ, "and enthrone him King of nations in faith." Now Christ is the head of the church, and the church is his body. Gal. 1:18. Therefore if Christ be enthroned in national affairs it is only the enthronement of the church in national affairs; if Christ be enthroned in the State, the church is thereby enthroned in the State, for the church is his body. To declare Christ and his law to be the supreme authority in national life, is inevitably to declare the church and its law to be the supreme authority in national life; and that is the most perfect union of Church and State; because the church is Christ's body, and you can't enthrone him without enthroning his body. This is the Scripture truth of the matter, and when the Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to do what they here announce, and

13

then at the same time proposes, to divest it of anything that looks toward a union of Church and State, they are simply proposing to divest Christ's body of its head.

But that they can't do. And in truth they do not intend to try to do it. They fully purpose to enthrone the church with their enthronement of its Head. It is impossible to do otherwise. And the veil, of their being "thoroughly opposed" to a union of Church and State, under which they, and the National Reformers, altogether, endeavor to hide it, is exceedingly thin. It is said of Augustus that he "was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation, that the senate and people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoy their ancient freedom." These workers for political power in religious

things, seem not to have forgotten the opinion nor the tactics of Augustus. They too, seem to be fully sensible that mankind is still governed by names; and their expectation seems to be that the people of this Nation will submit to the slavery of a union of Church and State, provided that they are repeatedly told that there is no union of Church and State, and that "all enlightened Christians are thoroughly opposed" to it. The danger is that these aspirants to such illegitimate power will not be deceived in their expectation, any more than was Augustus in his.

Again we read:—

"To meet the new creation, how grandly men themselves are growing; how considerate and brotherly, how pure in word and deed."

Yes indeed! And if you want to see the proof of it, just read the dispatches in any principal daily, any day, in any part of the land.

This also we read in the address:—

"The W. C. T. U. and Prohibition Party must join forces to stand for nationalism as against sectionalism; the future in politics as against the past; . . . and the everlasting prohibition of sin as against any alliance between sin and the Government."

Let "the W. C. T. U. and Prohibition Party" be told that no political power nor any civil government, can ever of right have anything whatever to do with the prohibition of sin. For further comment on this read the selection from Professor Harris on "Church and State," page 15, of this paper.

In her suggestions for 1888, under the heading of "Legal" is this:—

"Respectfully to request our brothers of the Prohibition Party when the time shall come to consider names for the greater political movement into which that party is to merge itself, to consider carefully the merits of the name 'Home Protection Party' as embodying its purpose and as educational to the people; also request them to continue to stand firm for the American Christian Sabbath; the Bible in our public schools; the enfranchisement of women as a means to prohibition; and make an open declaration that Christ and his law are the supreme authority in such government as they seek to establish in this Republic.

"Designate a commission representative of the whole country, which shall bear these requests to our friends and allies, the men of the Prohibition Party."

"To stand firm for the American Christian Sabbath," as she says in another place, "as a sacred institution." What is the American Christian Sabbath? and how did it become so? If it is Christian, how can it be American? And if it is American, what made it sacred? The

Bible tells about the Sabbath of the Lord, but it nowhere speaks of any such thing as a "Christian" Sabbath, much less does it say anything about an "American Christian" Sabbath. That must be an institution that is found outside of the Bible; and the question again arises how did it become sacred?

"Stand firm for the Bible in our public schools." Which Bible? The Protestant Bible, or the Catholic Bible? which? Your "brothers" of the National Reform Party proposes to put the Catholic Bible into our public schools, even into the hands of the children of Protestants, wherever the Catholics are in the majority—that is in New York, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and a number of other States. Ladies, please define your position.

Of all this and a good deal more after the same sort, "the audience manifested its appreciation by universal hand-clapping and waving of hand-kerchiefs." And "upon motion," it was accepted by almost unanimous vote as expressing the principles of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union." And by the same token it is abundantly shown that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is pledged to carry civil government into the realms of conscience in this Nation.

A. T. J.

**"Is It Infidelity?" *American Sentinel* 3, 2 , p. 14.**

LAMST fall one of the editors of the SENTINEL made a speech in Oakland, on the coming union of Church and State in this country. A National Reformer was present and heard it, and he has written in reply and sent to us manuscript copy sufficient to make more than two full pages of the SENTINEL, and asks that it may all be printed. But it is almost wholly made up of arguments for National Reform, which have been quite largely discussed already in the columns of the SENTINEL, from both sides of the question, and we do not deem it just to our subscribers to devote so much space to mere repetitions. There is, however, one point which demands notice in our own defense as well as for the principle involved.

This point our correspondent throws into the form of a question, as follows:—

"Are you aware, or being aware do you not care, that the 'Demands of Liberalism,' and of the 'National Liberal League,' are now clamoring for the abolition of these very things which National Reformers wish continued? And do you not know that these

Liberalists oppose the amendment with great vehemence? so that in this controversy you are identifying yourselves with the infidel Liberalists. The third article of the National Liberal League states the specific objects of the association. Among these are the following: 'The total discontinuance of religious instruction and worship in the public schools;' 'the abolition of State-paid chaplaincies;' the abolition of the judicial oath; the non-appointment of religious fasts, and holidays, etc. In like manner the Liberalists demand that all laws looking to the enforcement of 'Christian' morality shall be abrogated. And all these people are furiously opposed to the amendment which we seek. They know that so long as the Constitution remains as it is, so long they and their cause are safe in case an appeal be made to the courts, whose decisions must be in accordance with the Constitution."

We are perfectly aware that the National Reformers are ready on the instant to raise the cry of "infidel" or "atheist" against all who choose to oppose the religious amendment to the Constitution, even though they know that the opponents are avowed Christians. And being aware, we do not care. They may call us infidels, they may call us atheists, or may apply to us any other term of reproach that they please, and that to their hearts' content, but it shall not make a particle of difference with us, in our attitude toward the religious amendment to the Constitution. We know that in His day they called our Master, Beelzebub; and we, doing our utmost to be counted worthy to be of his household, expect that much more they will call us of his household. Besides this we know that "it is only in the absence of argument that recourse is had to ridicule;" and as the worthy National Reformers cannot answer our arguments, we expect them to call us names. We derive our principles from the word of Christ; the principles which we advocate are those established by Christ; and when infidels advocate those principles, then we are perfectly willing to be classed with infidels. We would rather be classed with infidels in opposition to the tyranny of a religious despotism, than to be found on the side of those who call themselves Christians while promoting it. We know exactly where we stand, we know precisely what we are doing, in our opposition to the religious amendment to the United States Constitution, and to any sort of religious legislation under any Constitution. We know whom we believe, and for the National Reformers to call us infidels or atheists or anarchists, or to class us with all these, does not make us so, nor does it frighten us.

As for the "Demands of Liberalism," and of the "National Liberal League," we have never made them a subject of study; we have



never seen a copy of them except as given in National Reform literature. But there is one thing which we know to be a fact, and that is, there was never any such thing heard of as the "Demands of Liberalism" until after the National Reformers had set on foot their movement to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution, endangering the civil and natural rights of men. Then it was that the Liberal League was formed, and their "Demands" were framed in direct op-position to the National Reform demands, and in defense of their own rights. We say "in defense of their own rights," because we utterly refuse assent to the National Reform proposition, that if a man be an infidel he has no rights. And that then it was high time for them to do something in defense of their rights is shown by the words of our correspondent above quoted. He says:—

"They know that so long as the Constitution remains as it is, so long they and their cause are safe."

Of course they are, and they ought to be safe. They ought to be just as safe as anybody else in the Nation. But they know, and we know, and the National Reformers know, that just as soon as the religious amendment to the Constitution is adopted, or religious legislation is sanctioned, just so soon they will *not be safe*. In view of this it is certainly time that somebody was maintaining the principles of the Constitution as it is, under which is their safety. But according to the charitable decision of the National Reformers, for even a Christian to do this it lands him at once into infidelity.

Anybody who will take the time to compare the "Demands of Liberalism," as given by our correspondent, with the National Reform Constitution, will see at once that these "Demands" are aimed at that document, and that they are wholly defensive. And it is perfectly safe to say that if now there was no such thing in existence as the National Reform Association, there would likewise be no such thing as the "Demands of Liberalism."

Taking these "Demands" as given by our correspondent, there are some of them that are perfectly proper in themselves. On the subject of the "discontinuance of religious instruction and worship in the public schools," the position of the SENTINEL is well known to be in favor of it, because it is right. As for the abolition of State-paid chaplaincies, the SENTINEL is heartily in favor of that also; nor are we speaking at random on this subject. The writer of this article spent five full years in the United States army. He has seen State-paid chaplains in the East and in the West. He has attended their services.

He has heard them pray, he has heard them preach, and has seen them about the garrisons. And he states it as his honest conviction that unless the State-paid chaplains whom he did not see, far surpass in efficiency those whom he did see, the whole lot of them put together, do not do either the Government or the soldiers as much good as would a bag of white beans.

And as for the abrogation of all laws "looking to the enforcement of 'Christian' morality," we also heartily favor that because it is right. Any law or any proposition that looks to the enforcement of Christian morality, or anything else that is Christian, is contrary to every principle of the doctrine of Christ. And to advocate any such proposition is logically to advocate the Inquisition. The tyranny of the Papacy and the iniquity of the Inquisition, are the logical conclusions from the National Reform propositions throughout. And therefore the SENTINEL now is, and forever more shall be, outspokenly opposed to the whole National Reform scheme. If that be infidelity the National Reformers may make the most of it, while we continue to do our best to form our lives upon the model that God has set before the world in the life of Jesus Christ.

A. T. J.

### **March 1888**

**"The Elgin Sunday-Law Convention" *American Sentinel* 3, 3 , pp. 17, 18.**

THE Elgin Sunday-law Convention was held the eighth day of last November in the Baptist Church, Elgin, Illinois. It was "called by the members of the Elgin Association of Congregational Ministers and Churches, to consider the prevalent desecration of the Sabbath, and its remedy." The leading preachers present were, W.L. Ferris, of Dundee; J.M. Clendening, A.H. Ball, Wm. Craven, H.O. Rowlands, and Geo. A. Milton, of Elgin; John Mitchell, of Sycamore; Henry Wilson, of Carpenterville; W.W. Everts, Dr. Mandeville, S.I. Curtis, and C.K. Colver, of; Chicago; Staunton, of Rock-ford; Harbaugh, of Genoa Junction; Lea, of Woodstock; Stewart, of Savannah; Helms, of Forrest; Chittenden, of Wheaton; Swartz, of Leaf River; and Harris, of Byron. Besides these there were President Blanchard, President Stratton, and Professor Fisher, of Wheaton; Professor Whitney, of Beloit; State's Attorney Cooper, of Du Page County; Hon. T.E. Hill, ex-

Mayor of Aurora; and Frank W. Smith, the Evangelist and Andersonville lecturer.

The Convention passed the following resolutions:—

"*Resolved*, That we recognize the Sabbath as an institution of God, revealed in nature and the Bible, and of perpetual obligation on all men; and also as a civil and American institution, bound up in vital and historical connection with the origin and foundation of our Government, the growth of our polity, and necessary to be maintained in order for the preservation and integrity of our national system, and therefore as having a sacred claim on all patriotic American citizens.

"*Resolved*, That we look with shame and sorrow on the non-observance of the Sabbath by many Christian people, in that the custom prevails with them of purchasing Sabbath news-papers, engaging in and patronizing Sabbath business and travel, and in many instances giving themselves to pleasure and self-indulgence, setting aside by neglect and indifference the great duties and privileges which God's day brings them.

"2. That we give our votes and support to those candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil Sabbath.

"3. That we give our patronage to such business men, manufacturers, and laborers as observe the Sabbath.

"4. That we favor a permanent Sabbath organization for the State of Illinois; the object of which shall be the creation of public sentiment and to secure the enactment and enforcement of necessary laws for the protection of the Sabbath.

"5. That we favor the organization of auxiliary societies to accomplish the above object.

"6. That four committees be appointed by this convention, consisting of two persons each, a minister and a layman; one committee to carefully and accurately investigate and report to the next convention all the facts obtainable concerning Sunday business; one to investigate and report similarly concerning Sunday newspapers; one concerning Sunday pleasuring; one concerning Sunday transportation and travel.

"*Resolved*, That this association authorizes the Executive Committee to request railway corporations and newspapers to discontinue the running of Sunday trains and the publication of Sunday editions of their papers."

Notice, the Sabbath is here set forth as an institution of God, and *also* as a "*civil* institution." It is for "candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the *civil* Sabbath," that they will vote.

Now we shall present some of the arguments upon which they base this demand for laws in favor of the "*civil* Sabbath;" and also showing what they want these laws enforced for.

Rev. Henry Wilson said:—

"The industries of the world should be silent one city in seven, that the toiler may hear the invitation of the Master, 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,' and that the spiritual temple of God may be built without the noise of the hammer."

Exactly. The State must compel everybody to keep Sunday "*that* the toiler may hear the invitation of the Master" and "*that* the spiritual temple of God may be built." And then they will call that a civil statute! If such a statute as that would be a civil one, then what would be required to make a religious statute? But suppose the toiler should then refuse to go to hear that invitation; what then? Will the State compel him to go? If not, why not? The State compels him to keep Sunday *that* he may hear the invitation; now is the State to allow its good offices to be set at naught, and its purposes frustrated by the toiler's refusing to hear the invitation? And the church having gained the recognition of the State to that extent is she going to stop short of her object? Other quotations will answer these questions.

Dr. W.W. Everts, of Chicago, said:—

"This day is set apart for divine worship and preparation for another life. It is the test of all religion. The people who do not keep the Sabbath have no religion."

Is it then the province of the State to pass

18

and enforce statutes in the interests of divine worship? Is it in the nature of a civil statute to prepare men for another life? "It is the test of all religion," says the Doctor. Then what is the enforcement of the Sabbath but the enforcement of a religious test? And what is the application of it to "candidates and political officers" but the application of a religious test? And what is that but an open violation of the Constitution of the United States, which says, "No religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States"? It is true that, under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, this provision of the Constitution does not prohibit the application of any religious test as a qualification to any office under any State. And if there be no such provision as this in the State Constitution, these preachers of Illinois, and of all the other States, can go ahead unrestrained in the application of their religious

test to all the candidates for State offices. But there is one thing certain, and that is, Sunday being "the test of all religion," *no Sunday-law test can ever be applied to any candidate* for the House of Representatives, for the Senate, or for any other office or public trust under the United States, without a direct violation of the Constitution of the United States.

Further says the Doctor, "The people who do not keep the Sabbath have no religion." The antithesis of this is likewise true. The people who do keep the Sabbath *have* religion. Therefore this demand for laws to compel people to keep the Sabbath, is a demand for laws to compel people to be *religious*. And yet they have the face to call it "the civil Sabbath."

Again Doctor Everts says:—

"He who does not keep the Sabbath does not worship God, and he who does not worship God is lost."

Perfectly true, Doctor. The antithesis of this also is true, He who does keep the Sabbath, does worship God. Therefore your demand for laws to compel men to keep the Sabbath, is a demand for laws to compel them to worship God. And that is only to introduce the system of the Papacy and of the Inquisition. There is no use for you to deny that you want laws to compel the observance of the Sabbath, and that, too, with the idea of worship, because in the very next sentence you say:—

"The laboring class are apt to rise late on Sunday morning, read the Sunday papers, and allow the *hour of worship* to go by unheeded."

Here are the steps plainly to be taken, as surely as these ambitious clerics ever get the slightest recognition of their Sunday law demands. *First*, a law compelling all labor to cease on Sunday. Then the laboring class will read the Sunday papers, and so allow the hour of worship to go unheeded, consequently there must be, *Secondly*, a law abolishing all Sunday papers. But suppose then these people take to reading books, and let the hour of worship go by unheeded, then, logically, there must be, *Thirdly*, a law abolishing all reading of books on Sunday. But suppose they let the hour of worship go by unheeded, anyhow, then, logically, there must be, *Fourthly*, a law compelling them not to let the hour of worship go by unheeded. Having secured themselves in the first-two of these steps, what is to hinder these divines from taking the other two, which just as logically follow, as the second follows the first? There is just nothing at all to hinder them. Well, then, having taken the first two, will they not take

the other two? Anybody who thinks they will not, has studied human nature, and read history, to very little purpose. And anybody who thinks that they do not *intend* to take the other steps has read the Sunday-law propositions to very little purpose. Prof. Samuel Ives Curtis said in this convention: "We are not commanded to remember the Sabbath as a day of rest and recreation, but to 'keep it holy.'" And last spring in the Boston Monday Lectureship, Joseph Cook said:—

"The experience of centuries shows, that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest, unless you preserve it as a day of worship."

There, that ought to be plain enough to make anybody understand what is the purpose of the demand for "*civil*" Sunday-laws. The only safety is in never allowing them to secure themselves in the first step—that is, in never allowing them to secure any sort of a Sunday law. For just as soon as the so-called Protestant churches in this land become possessed of power to wield the civil power in the interests of religion, we shall have the Papacy over again.

But Doctor Everts continues; it is not enough that Sunday papers must be stopped in behalf of the churches, but Sunday trains must also be stopped, and for the same reason. He says:—

"The Sunday train is another great evil. They cannot afford to run a train unless they get a great many passengers, and so break up a great many congregations. The Sunday railroad trains are hurrying their passengers fast on to perdition. What an outrage that the railroad, that great civilizer, should destroy the Christian Sabbath!"

Oh, yes! The church members, and the church-goers, will go on Sunday trains and Sunday excursions, etc. Therefore the *trains* are responsible and are hurrying their passengers on to perdition. Therefore by all means stop the Sunday trains, so as to keep these excellent church-members out of perdition, for if they have any chance they will go. Shut up the way to perdition, and then they will go to Heaven. They haven't enough religion, nor love of right, to do right, therefore they must have the State to take away all opportunity to do wrong. And these people will boast themselves of their religion, and their being Christians! It is difficult to see how a Sunday train can hurry anybody to perdition who does not ride on it. And if these church-members are hurried to perdition by Sunday trains, who is to blame? Right here lies the secret of the whole evil—they blame everybody and everything else, even to inanimate things, for the irreligion, the infidelity, and the sin that lies in their own hearts.

The following statements made by Dr. Mandeville, in the convention, are literally true, in a good deal deeper sense than he intended:—

1. "There has been an alliance formed between the church and the world."

That is a fact, and it is going to ruin both  
"Let us not deny it."

Amen. We earnestly hope you will not. There is no use in trying to deny it. But instead of going about in the right way to remedy the evil, you set on foot a scheme to compel the world to act as though it were religious, and so to bind closer the alliance, and increase the evil.

3. "Influential men fasten themselves upon the church: a sort of political Christians."

Most decidedly true. And the most "influential" of these "political Christians," and the most *of* them are found in the pulpit; and they organize conventions and pass resolutions to give their "votes and support to those candidates or *political* officers who will pledge themselves *to vote* for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil Sabbath," "as a day of *worship*."

4. "Too many men are in the church for self-profit."

Indeed there are, a vast number too many.

5. "We pastors are to blame for allowing them to rule."

Yes; you are. You are especially to blame for those influential political Christians fastening themselves upon the church and ruling it, and trading off its votes through Sunday-law conventions. The churches themselves, however, are not clear of blame in this. They ought to rise up and turn out the whole company of these political Christians, and fill their pulpits with such Christians as care more for the love of Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit than they do for votes and the power of civil government.

But the following statements by the same gentleman, we do not suppose have any deeper meaning than he intends:—

1. "The subject has two sides. We must not look alone at the religious side. The interests of the Church and State are united."

And yet you are all opposed to a union of Church and State, aren't you?

2. "The merchants of Tyre insisted upon selling goods near the temple on the Sabbath, and Nehemiah compelled the officers of the law to do their duty and stop it. So we can compel the officers of the law to do their duty. . . . When the church of God awakes and does its

duty on one side, and the State on the other, we shall have no further trouble in this matter."

Yes, we remember how it was before. The gentle Albigenses in the south of France greatly disturbed the church. They refused to obey its commands. But the church was wide awake, for Innocent III. was Pope; and he awoke the State with the call, "Up, most Christian king, up and aid us in our work of vengeance!" And thus with the church awake to its duty (?) on one side, and the State on the other, the Albigenses were swept from the earth, and there was no further trouble in

19

that matter. Woe, worth the day, and thrice woe to the people, when the religious power can compel the civil. And that is precisely what this Elgin Sunday-law convention proposes to do.

It would seem from Dr. Mandeville's citation of the example of Nehemiah that they intend to set up a theocracy here. If not, there is no force in his argument, from that instance. But from the following it is quite certain that that is what they have in view. Prof. C.A. Blanchard said:—

"In this work we are undertaking for the Sabbath, we are representatives of the Lord God."

Therefore it follows that when they vote to support those candidates and political officers who will pledge themselves, etc., they will vote as the representatives of God. And if any of themselves should secure votes enough to send them to the Legislature or to Congress, they would go there and legislate as representatives of God. And when they get into their hands the power to enforce the law, and to compel the civil power to do their bidding, they will do it all as the representatives of God. And thus again it is demonstrated that if these influential "political Christians" once get the Sunday laws for which they are so diligently working, we shall have in this Nation a living image of the Papacy. And again we say the only safety is in not letting them secure the enactment of any sort of a Sunday law, nor anything else through which they may dominate the civil power.

NOTE.—We have not selected all these quotations about the *religious* Sabbath, and left out what was said about the *civil* Sabbath. We have carefully read the whole report, and we state it as the literal truth that outside of the resolutions, there is not in all the report a single sentence about a *civil* Sabbath. It is all religious and that only. And yet, just like the California Sunday-law Convention, when it came to putting the thing in form to get votes and legislation they deftly



insert the word "civil." All this goes to show what we have often stated, that there is no such thing as a civil Sabbath; and it shows that these men do not really intend to secure, nor to enforce, a "civil" Sunday-law, but a religious one wholly.

A. T. J.

**"A Dangerous Parallel" *American Sentinel* 3, 3 , pp. 20, 21.**

ALONGSIDE of the statements of the Elgin Sunday-law Convention, given in a foregoing article, we desire to place some facts of history which reveal a threatening danger that the American people do not dream of. By this we intend to show that it was in this same way precisely that the union of Church and State was formed in the fourth century, out of which grew the Papacy in its highest pretensions. There is no need of much argument; all we shall have to do is to quote the history, and the parallel can be so plainly seen that argument is unnecessary.

Neander says of the fourth century:—

"As is evident from the synodal laws of the fourth century, worldly-minded bishops, instead of caring for the salvation of their flocks, were often but too much inclined to travel about, and entangle themselves in worldly concerns."—*Church History, Vol. 2, page 16. Torrey's Edition, Boston, 1857.*

So it is now with these Sunday-law preachers, in their working up of religio-political conventions, and their lobbying almost every Legislature in the land. But what was the purpose of these worldly-minded bishops in entangling themselves in worldly concerns? Neander tells:—

"This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by *their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their own aims.*"—*Id., p. 132.*

What then were their aims? Their first and greatest aim was the exaltation of themselves; and second only to that was the exaltation of Sunday. These two things had been their principal aims, and especially of the bishops of Rome, for more than a hundred years, when Constantine gave them a chance to make their aims effectual by the power of the State. The first assertion of the arrogant pretensions of the bishop of Rome to power over the whole church, was made in behalf of Sunday by Victor, who was bishop of Rome from A. D. 193 to 202.

"He wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates, commanding them to imitate the example of the western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating Easter [that is commanding them to celebrate it always on Sunday]. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition . . . with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart, in this manner, from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the Church of Rome."—*Mosheim, Church History, 2nd. Century, part II, chap. V, par. 11.*

One of the earliest things in which these church managers secured from Constantine the use of the power of the State, was the famous edict prohibiting certain kinds of work on "the venerable day of the sun." That edict runs thus:—

"Let all the judges and towns-people and the occupation of all trades rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest, the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven."

This edict was issued March 7, A. D. 321. It will be seen by this edict that only judges and towns-people and mechanics were commanded to rest on Sunday. If mechanics were allowed to work, the spiritual temple could not be built "without the noise of the hammer;" don't you see? But this did not satisfy the political managers of the churches for any great length of time.

"By a law of the year 386, those older changes effected by the Emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege."—*Neander, Id., p. 300.*

But these laws only prohibited work on Sunday; pleasure-seeking, games, etc., were not even yet prohibited. Consequently a church convention held at Carthage in 401,—

"Resolved to petition the Emperor, that the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast days to some other days of the week."—*ib.*

But what was the purpose of all these Sunday laws, and petitions for Sunday laws? From the first Sunday law enacted by Constantine, to the last one enacted by any other emperor; from the first petition

presented by the political bishops of the fourth century to this last one circulated by the political preachers of Illinois; the sole reason and purpose has always been,—

"So that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion;" and "in order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance." *Id.*, pp. 297, 301.

But what was it that disturbed the devotion of the faithful on Sundays in the fourth century?

"Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hindrance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart."—*Id.*, p. 300.

But, again, how could a theater or a circus in one part of the city hinder the devotion of the faithful in another, and perhaps distant, part of the city, or even in the country? Thus:—

"Church teachers . . . were, in truth, often forced to complain, that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church."—*ib.*

Oh yes! That is the secret of the hin-

21

drance to their devotion. If there was a circus or a public show on Sunday, it would get a great many spectators, and "so break up a great many congregations;" the church-members would go to the circus, and "let the hour of worship go by unheeded;" and so their devotion was greatly disturbed and hindered. Don't you see? Just here, please read again the quotations from Dr. Everts's speech in the Elgin Convention, where he complains of the Sunday train and the Sunday newspaper. Is not this thing a perfect repetition of that in the fourth century?

But yet those ambitious prelates of the fourth century were not content with stopping all manner of work, and closing public places, on Sunday. They had secured the power of the State so far, and they determined to carry it yet further, and use the power of the State to compel everybody to worship according to the dictates of the church. And one of the greatest Fathers of the church, was father to this theory. That was the great church Father and Catholic saint, Augustine—and by the way, he is grandfather to National Reform too, as we shall prove one of these days. Augustine taught that,—

"It is indeed better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain to the highest grade of religious development."—*Schaff, Church History, Vol. II, section 27.*

And says Neander:—

"It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition."—*Neander, Id., p. 217.*

Of that whole fourth century Sunday-law movement, from beginning to end, Neander, with direct reference to those Sunday laws, says:—

"In this way, the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."—*Id., p. 301.*

That is the indisputable truth of the matter. And it is just as indisputably true that this Sunday-law movement in our day in this Nation, is only another attempt of the church to seize upon the power of the State and use it to further her own aims. And just as surely as these political preachers of our day secure the power and the recognition of the State in their first step, they will carry it to the last step, and the logical end to which it was carried in the fourth century, and afterward in the *working* of the theory of Augustine. The church of our day can no more safely be trusted with political power than could that of the fourth century, or of any other century. The only safety for the people, and the only security for the State, is to make it perfectly certain that the church shall never receive the help of the State for the furtherance of her own ends; and that she shall never obtain any recognition at all by the civil power, beyond that granted to every other person or class in the Nation.

By these evidences from the fourth century, as well as by the evidences from the church conventions of our own day, it is demonstrated again that there is no such thing as a civil Sunday, and that there is no such thing as civil Sunday laws. The first Sunday law that ever was enacted was at the request of the church; it was in behalf of the church; and it was expressly to help the church. The call for Sunday laws now is by the church; and wherever they are enacted or enforced, it is in behalf of the church, and to help the church; and it is so throughout history. The keeping of Sunday is not a civil duty, and cannot of right be made a civil duty. Sunday is wholly an

ecclesiastical institution, and the keeping of it can only be enjoined or enforced by ecclesiastical power. And whenever the civil power attempts to enjoin or enforce it, the civil power then in that is made subordinate to the ecclesiastical, and becomes only an instrument of ecclesiastical oppression.

That is the use that was made of Sunday laws in the fourth century; it is the use that has been made of them in the United States within the last three years; and that is the use that will be made of them in days to come as surely as the churches secure this help of the State in the furtherance of their own political and ambitious aims. Through Sunday laws the Papacy was developed in the fourth century; and through Sunday laws there will yet be developed a living image of the Papacy in this country. Therefore we are, and everybody else ought to be, uncompromisingly opposed to the enactment or the enforcement of any manner of Sunday laws.

A. T. J.

**April 1888**

**"Morality and Civil Government" *American Sentinel* 3, 4 , pp. 25, 26.**

THE *Independent*, of St. Helena Cal., criticises a statement of the SENTINEL, as follows:—

"Says the AMERICAN SENTINEL: 'Morality is a matter which, from its original nature and object, lies entirely beyond the reach and control of the State proper.' Then we are to understand that all police regulations, looking to the moral welfare of the community are wrong and illegal. Unfortunately for our fair California, that sentiment has prevailed too long."

The statement of the SENTINEL is strictly true. Let us enlighten our critic. Morality, as defined by Webster, is "The relation of conformity or non-conformity to the true moral standard or rule; . . . the conformity of an act to the divine law." The true moral standard is the law of God—the ten commandments. The keeping of the ten commandments is morality; the breaking of any one of them is immorality. The keeping of the ten commandments is righteousness; the breaking of any one of them is sin.

This true moral standard takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. To hate is murder; to covet is idolatry; to *think* impurely of a woman is adultery; and these things are immoral. *Morality* or immorality lies in the heart; it pertains to the thoughts and

intents of the heart; and with it the State can have nothing at all to do. The civil government has nothing to do with hatred, nor with covetousness, nor with impure thinking; yet all these things are immoral. A man may hate his neighbor all his life; he may covet everything on earth; he may think impurely of every woman that he sees; he may keep this up all his days, and the State will not touch him, nor has it any right to touch him. It would be difficult to conceive of a more immoral person than such a man would be, yet the State cannot punish him. And this demonstrates our proposition, that "with immorality the State can have nothing at all to do."

But only let that man's hatred lead him to attempt to do an injury to his neighbor, and the State will punish him. Only let his covetousness lead him to lay hands on what is not his, in an attempt to steal, and the State will punish him. Only let his impure mind lead him to attempt violence to any woman, and the State will punish him. Yet bear in mind, the State does not punish him even then for his *immorality*, but for his *incivility*. The State punishes no man because he is immoral, but because he is *uncivil*. It *cannot* punish immorality; it *must* punish incivility. This distinction is shown in the very term by which we designate State or national government. It is called civil government; no person ever thinks of calling it moral government. The Government of God is the only moral Government. God is the only moral Governor. The law of God is the only moral law. To God alone pertains the punishment of immorality, which is the transgression of the moral law. Governments of men are *civil* governments, not moral. Governors of men are *civil* governors, not moral governors. The laws of States and nations are civil laws, not moral. To the authorities of civil government it pertains to punish *incivility*, not immorality. Thus again it is demonstrated, that with immorality civil governments can never of right have anything to do.

On the other hand, as God is the only moral Governor; as his is the only moral Government; as his law is the only moral law; and as it pertains to him alone to punish immorality; so likewise *the promotion of morality* pertains to him alone. Morality is conformity to the law of God; it is obedience to God. But obedience to God, must spring from the heart in sincerity and truth. This it must do, or it is not obedience; for, as we have proved by the word of God, the law of God takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. But "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." By transgression all men have made themselves immoral. "Therefore by the deeds of the law

[by obedience] shall no flesh be justified [accounted righteous or made moral] in his sight." Rom. 3:20. As all men have, by transgression of the law of God, made themselves immoral, therefore no man can, by obedience to the law, become moral; because it is that very law which declares him to be immoral. The demands, therefore, of the moral law, must be satisfied, before he can ever be accepted as moral by either the law or its Author. But the demands of the moral law can never be satisfied by an immoral person, and this is just what every person has made himself by transgression. Therefore it is certain that men can never become moral by the moral law.

From this it is equally certain that if ever men shall be made moral, it must be by the Author and Source of all morality. And this is just the provision which God has made. For, "now the righteousness [the morality] of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness [the morality] of God which

26

is *by faith of Jesus Christ* unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: for all have sinned [made themselves immoral] and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:21-23. It is by the morality of Christ alone that men can be made moral. And this morality of Christ is the morality of God, which is imputed to us for Christ's sake; and we receive it by faith in him who is both the Author and Finisher of faith. Then by the Spirit of God the moral law is written anew in the heart and in the mind, sanctifying the soul unto obedience—unto morality. Thus, and thus alone, can men ever attain to morality; and that morality is the morality of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ; *and there is no other in this world*. Therefore, as morality springs from God, and is planted in the heart by the Spirit of God, through faith in the Son of God, it is demonstrated by proofs of Holy Writ itself, that *to God alone pertains the promotion of morality*.

God, then, being the sole promoter of morality, through what instrumentality does he work to promote morality in the world? What body has he made the conservator of morality in the world? The church or the civil power, which?—The church and the church alone. It is "the church of the Living God." It is "the pillar and ground of the truth." It was to the church that he said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" "and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." It is by the church, through the

preaching of Jesus Christ, that the gospel is "made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." There is no obedience but the obedience of faith; there is no morality but the morality of faith. Therefore it is proved that to the church, and not to the State, is committed the conservation of morality in the world. This at once settles the question as to whether the State shall teach morality. The State can't teach morality. It has not the credentials for it. The Spirit of God and the gospel of Christ are both essential to the teaching of morality, and neither of these is committed to the State, but both to the church.

But, though this work be committed to the church, even then there is not committed to the church the prerogative either to reward morality or to punish immorality. She beseeches, she entreats, she persuades men to be reconciled to God; she trains them in the principles and the practices of morality. It is hers by moral means or spiritual censures to preserve the purity and discipline of her membership. But hers it is not either to reward morality or to punish immorality. This pertains to God alone, because whether it be morality or immorality, it springs from the secret counsels of the heart; and as God alone knows the heart, he alone can measure either the merit or the guilt involved in any question of morals.

By this it is demonstrated that to no man, to no assembly or organization of men, does there belong any right whatever to punish immorality in any way. Whoever attempts it, usurps the prerogative of God. The Inquisition is the inevitable logic of any claim of any assembly of men to punish immorality. Because to punish immorality, it is necessary in some way to get at the thoughts and intents of the heart. The Papacy, asserting the right to compel men to be moral, and to punish them for immorality, had the cruel courage to carry the evil principle to its logical consequence. In carrying out the principle, it was found to be essential to get at the secrets of men's hearts; and it was found that the diligent application of torture would wring from men, in many cases, a full confession of the most secret counsels of their hearts. Hence the Inquisition was established as the means best adapted to secure the desired end. So long as men grant the proposition that it is within the province of civil government to enforce morality, it is to very little purpose that they condemn the Inquisition, for that tribunal is only the logical result of the proposition.

By all these evidences is established the plain, common-sense principle that to civil government pertains only that which the term



itself implies—that which is *civil*. The purpose of civil government is civil and not moral. Its function is to preserve order in society, and to cause all its subjects to rest in assured safety by guarding them against all incivility. Morality belongs to God; civility belongs to the State. Morality must be rendered to God; civility, to the State. "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

A. T. J.

**"Connecting Links Between Church and State" *American Sentinel* 3, 4 , pp. 27, 28.**

IN the *Homiletic Review* for December, 1887, Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., has an article on "The Connecting Links Between Church and State," and says that there are three of these links, namely, Marriage, Sunday, and the Public School. That is, these are the three links which form the union of Church and State in the United States. From the adoption of the Constitution until lately, it has ever been the just pride of this Nation, that in its form of government, Church and State were wholly separate; and that with religion the State had nothing to do, but left that matter just where it rightly belongs, as solely pertaining to the individual's personal relations between himself and God. Within the last few years, however, there has been a notable change of view in regard to this subject, in both its phases, especially on the part of prominent theologians and would-be church-leaders.

One class of these insist that the propagation of religious opinions is an essential prerogative of civil government, and therefore they with "undying enthusiasm" are determined to have the National Constitution and laws so altered as to make their views effective. Of this class the leaders of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association are the representatives. The other class insist that in this Government there is already a union of Church and State. Of these Dr. Schaff is the principal one, and this article in the *Homiletic Review* is his statement of the case. It would be an easy task to show the causes of this change of base on the part of the Church and State religionists, but we shall not enter upon that at this time. We want to notice Dr. Schaff's "Links."

He starts out with this proposition:—

"A total separation of Church and State is an impossibility, unless we cease to be a Christian people."

He offers not a particle of proof in support of this statement, while proof is the very thing that is most needed. He assumes that the people of the United States are Christians, while not one in ten of them are Christians. The Doctor ought to have offered some proof; assumptions are not proof. But granting his assumption that this is a Christian people, and this a Christian Nation, his proposition is yet defective, because he says that, that being so, "A total separation of Church and State is an impossibility." However, to call this defective is not enough—it is totally wrong. For the precept of Christ does make a total separation of Church and State. The word of Christ is, "Render unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." There is no question at all that by the term "Cesar" the Saviour means the State—the civil government. Here duty lies in two directions—to God and to the State. To each is to be rendered that which is his—to God that which is God's, to the State that which is the State's. Now the church of Christ is God's; that which is rendered to the church is rendered to God, because it is "the church of the living God." The church is not Cesar's, it is God's. That which pertains to the church does not and cannot pertain to the State; that which is to be rendered to the church is not to be, and cannot be, rendered to the State; because the church is God's, and that which is God's must be rendered to him and not to the State. Therefore it is demonstrated that in these words the Lord Jesus has totally, and forever, separated the church from the State. And therefore Doctor Schaff's proposition is contrary to the word of Christ.

Doctor Schaff counts marriage as one of the connecting links that unite Church and State. But this is impossible without making marriage a sacrament of the church and confining it to that, as the Papacy has assumed the power to do, and so to count all marriages as only concubinage which are not solemnized by the church. But this it is impossible to do, because marriage *belongs to the race*. It no more belongs to Christians than to pagans. It is an original institution, and knows no distinctions. It belongs equally to atheists, infidels, Jews, heathen, and Christians—all alike, and to one class no more than to another. And as the institution belongs to all classes that can be found in civil government; and *as it relates to man in his relations to his fellow-men*; its regulation is properly within the province

of civil government. As a matter of fact, marriage is no more a "connecting link" between Church and State, than is life, or property, or character.

But when the Doctor comes to the discussion of his second "connecting link," the Sunday, he makes a good deal worse mixture than he does with his first. We quote the whole paragraph:—

"The Christian Sabbath, or weekly day of rest, is likewise protected by legislation, and justly so, because it has a civil as well as a religious side; it is necessary and profitable for the body as well as for the soul; it is of special benefit to the laboring classes, and guards them against the tyranny of capital. The Sabbath antedates the Mosiac legislation, and is, like the family, founded in the original constitution of man, for whose temporal and spiritual benefit it was instituted by the God of creation."

This paragraph is as full of error as an egg is full of meat. We have not space to fully set forth all the errors that it contains, but we shall call attention to some. The most prominent token of error that it bears is, that it contradicts itself. He first calls it "the Christian Sabbath," and then says that it is "founded in the original constitution of man." But Christianity is not an original institution. How, then, can the Sabbath be "founded in the original constitution of man," and be at the same time the "Christian Sabbath"? It cannot be; it is a moral impossibility. Christian institutions are peculiar to the system of redemption through Christ; but the Sabbath antedates the system of redemption. The Sabbath was instituted before man had sinned, before he needed to be redeemed. It would have been kept by man had he never sinned; but had he never sinned, there never would have been any Christianity, nor any Christian institutions. Consequently it is impossible for the Sabbath to be the "Christian" Sabbath. It is utterly a misnomer to call it the Christian Sabbath. The only names the Author of the Sabbath has ever given it are "the Sabbath of the Lord," and, "the Lord's day."

Let these titles, which alone the Author of the Sabbath has given to that institution, be put alongside of his own words in relation to what men owe to civil government, and see how the matter stands. He calls it "the Sabbath of the Lord," and, "the Lord's day." He says, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and *unto God the things that are God's.*" The Sabbath is *the Lord's*. It is *the Lord's* day. Therefore it is to be rendered to the Lord. The Sabbath pertains not to Cesar. It is not Cesar's in any sense. It is the Lord's. Therefore, the Sabbath being the Lord's and not Cesar's, it is proved

by the words of Christ that the civil government has nothing at all to do with it. This annihilates at once the Doctor's idea that the Sabbath "has a civil as well as a religious side." The word of God says that the Sabbath is the Lord's, and Christ distinctly separates that which is the Lord's, from that which is Cesar's: therefore when Dr. Schaff or anybody else attempts to pass off the Sabbath as both civil and religious, as pertaining both to God and to Cesar, he confounds that which Christ has clearly distinguished, and virtually charges Christ with loose thinking.

The commandment of God does not say, Remember the Sabbath day to keep it *civilly*; it does say, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it *holy*." The Sabbath is wholly a religious institution; man's observance of it pertains wholly to the Lord. Therefore when the State undertakes to enforce the observance of the Sabbath, it thereby demands that to Cesar shall be rendered that which is God's; and in that it usurps the place of God. That which is the Lord's we are to render to him direct, without any of the meddling mediumship of Cesar. When we have rendered to Cesar that which is his, we have rendered to him all his due, and when he has so received his due, he has no right to demand any more. And it is none of his business how men render to God that which is God's, or whether they render it at all or not.

All this is written in regard to the State and the Sabbath of the Lord. It is Sunday, however, that Dr. Schaff presents as the second connecting link which forms the union of Church and State in our country. And indeed this much of his article is true. Sunday is the link which connects Church and State, whenever the State has anything to do with it in the way of legislation. We ourselves showed in the SENTINEL of last month, that Sunday was the link that united Church and State in the fourth century, and that in the same way Sunday is now being used as the link by which Church and State will be united in fact in the United States. But whereas the Sabbath of the Lord belongs to God, though not to Cesar, the Sunday Sabbath belongs neither to God nor to Cesar. There is no command of God for it. It is wholly an institution of the church. The church, instituted the practice of Sunday observance; the first Sunday law that ever was issued—that by Constantine—was at the request of the church, and was expressly to favor the church; and that has been the only purpose of Sunday legislation from that time to this. And *that* is why it is that Sunday is in truth the "connecting link" that forms the union between the *Church*

and the State. But the more permanently that link is severed amongst all people, the better it is for both Church and State. There has never yet been a union of Church and State, that has not tended only the more to corrupt both. And it never can be otherwise. The church of Christ is espoused "as a chaste virgin to Christ," and she cannot join herself to any other, without forsaking her Lord and making herself an adulteress.

Let no one blame us for saying that there is no command of God for keeping Sunday, and that it is an institution of the church. We make the statements just as we find them, and we find them made by what is certainly high authority. The American Tract Society issues a \$500 prize-essay on the subject, which says of the "Christian Sabbath," that there is "complete silence of the New Testament so far as any explicit command" "or definite rules for its observance are concerned." And the American Sunday School Union issues a \$1,000 prize-essay on the same subject, which says: "Up to the time of Christ's death there had been no change in the day." And "so far as the record shows they [the apostles] did not give any explicit command en-joining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day of the week." And this \$500 essay also fixes upon Sunday as a sacred day only by "a *consensus* of the Christian church." Now according to the word of Christ, which we are here discussing, men owe duty in but two directions—to God and to Caesar. But Sunday observance belongs to neither of these, but to "the church." Therefore as Sunday observance belongs neither to God nor to civil government, there is no power in existence that can of right command it; and there is no obligation resting upon any soul to observe it.

Dr. Schaff's third "connecting link" the Public School, we must defer till our next.

A. T. J.

**May 1888**

**"Doctor Schaff and the Public School" *American Sentinel* 3, 5 , pp. 33, 34.**

THE third of Doctor Schaff's "links" between Church and State, is, "The Public School." He confesses that,—

"Positive religious instruction is the duty of the family and the church, which has the commission to teach all nations the way of life. The State cannot be safely intrusted with this duty."

That is all true. The State cannot teach Christian religion, or Christian morality, because, as we showed in the April SENTINEL, it has not the credentials for it. That work is committed to the church alone. It is the church which is "the pillar and ground of the truth." It is the church which was commissioned to go "into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." It is with the church that Christ promised to be till the end of the world. Without the presence and help of the Holy Spirit, no religious teaching can ever be effectual. But it is the church, which is "an habitation of God through the Spirit." None of these things are spoken to the State, nor of the State. None of these things pertain to the State. But without these things no effectual religious instruction can ever be possible. Therefore it is perfectly certain that the State never can, with any propriety whatever, take it upon itself to give religious instruction. It is indeed true that "the State cannot be safely intrusted with this duty."

But, as in this we perfectly agree with Doctor Schaff's statements, the reader may query wherein we sufficiently disagree with him to justify the writing of an article on the subject? It is in this: Although the doctor grants that to the church and not to the State belongs the work of imparting religious instruction, yet he insists that religious instruction shall be given in the public schools at the public expense. Now, as this work belongs to the church, and cannot be intrusted to the State, and as this work must be done in the public school, at the public expense, it therefore follows that Doctor Schaff proposes that the church shall use the machinery of the State with which to do her own work. In this way he makes the public school a "link" between Church and State. But we deny the right of the church to use the State for any such purpose. We protest that the church shall do her work, herself, with the means which God has appointed her, and with no other; for whatsoever is more than this is sin. If the church cannot do her own appointed work with the means which God has appointed her, she cannot do it at all. If the church cannot impart religious instruction without the help of the State, she cannot impart it with the help of the State. If the church possesses enough of the presence and power of the Spirit of God, to make her instruction effectual, she will not need the help of the State; and if she lacks that power her

instruction will not be effectual even though the doors of every public school building in the Nation be opened to her.

It is particularly interesting to notice the Doctor's plans for imparting religious instruction in the public schools. He says:—

"The Catholics certainly have a right to demand the Douay version as a substitute for that of King James, and both might be read, the one to the Catholic the other to the Protestant pupils."

There are some questions that we should like to have answered on this proposition: 1. Is the same teacher to give instruction from the Douay version to the Catholics, and from King James's to the Protestants? or shall there be two teachers—a Catholic and a Protestant—in every school? 2. If the Catholics have "a right to demand the Douay version," and the Protestant, have a right to demand King James's version, then why is it that those who are neither Catholics nor "orthodox" Protestants, have not "a right" to demand that there shall be no version at all used in the public schools? or is it true that all rights belong alone to Catholics and "Protestants"? 3. Is it so wholly essential to the welfare of the Nation that the Catholic "demanmands" shall be satisfied more than those of any other people in the nation?

The reason which Doctor Schaff gives, why the State cannot be safely intrusted with this duty, is that,—

"It might teach Rationalism, as is actually done in a great many public schools and Universities of Germany, Holland, and Switzerland."

Therefore to make it certain that there shall be just the proper kind of teaching in the public schools of our country, he offers this plan:—

"The State may, if necessary, allow the different denominations to monopolize certain school hours in the school building for religious instruction."

Let us look at this a moment. The school day consists of about six hours, and the State is to allow the different denominations to monopolize certain of these hours in the schoolroom. Of the "different denominations" there are the Catholic, Episcopalian, five of the Methodist, eight of the Baptist, ten of the

Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Dutch Reformed, Lutheran, Unitarian, Universalist, and two Adventist—this makes at least thirty-two "different denominations" who are to monopolize certain of the six school hours in the school building. Now will the Doctor have the State distribute the six hours of the school day equally among these

thirty-two denominations? If so where is the State to get in any other instruction? Or will Dr. Schaff have each of the "different denominations" monopolize one hour a day in its turn? If that be it, then let us see—there are twenty school days in a month, and there are thirty-two different denominations. As it would take more than six weeks to go round once, there would be given to the different pupils but one hour of religious instruction in about six weeks. Then the same question again arises, During this round of "religious instruction" how are the regular teachers to get anything else into the minds of the pupils to any purpose? Or would the doctor have all thirty-two of the "different denominations" go to "the school building" and monopolize an hour each day all together?!! That would be Babel risen again indeed.

And, says the Doctor:—

"In this way the problem of united secular, and separate religious, instruction could be solved, at least to the reasonable satisfaction of the great majority."

It is perfectly safe to say that in this way the problem could not be solved to the reasonable satisfaction of any reasoning person in the Nation. The "different denominations" themselves would not be satisfied with it; those who belong to none of the different denominations could not be satisfied with it; nor could the school authorities be satisfied with it. The truth of the matter is, that an attempt to carry into effect any such scheme would be the utter destruction of the whole public-school system. From another sentence in the same paragraph the Doctor seems to imply that the regular teachers of the schools are to do the work of the religious, as well as the secular instruction. He says:—

"In communities which are sufficiently homogeneous one teacher would answer; in others two or more might be chosen, and the children divided into classes according to the will of the parents or guardians."

A community sufficiently homogeneous to require but one teacher, would consist of but one denomination. But how many such school districts can be found in the United States? The places where two or more teachers would be required, would be of course where there are two or more "different denominations," and there would necessarily have to be as many teachers as there might be different denominations. Or does Doctor Schaff intend that the teachers in the schools shall all be so polemically versatile that any one of them shall be able to give religious instruction in harmony with the religious



views of any one or all of the different denominations? Then, again, who is to examine the teachers, and pass upon their qualifications to impart the requisite amount and the quality of such religious instruction? Oh! that important office would fall to the church, of course. And thus we are brought round again to the point which we made at the first, that Dr. Schaff's proposition, and that of everybody else who proposes to put religious instruction, into the public schools, is only a scheme to secure to the church the help of the State in furthering her own aims, and so the "connecting link between Church and State" is to be formed.

How it would be possible to frame a scheme of public instruction more utterly absurd than is set forth in this essay by Dr. Schaff it would be difficult to conceive. And how any man of the standing of Dr. Schaff could get off such a perfect medley of nonsense, would be surprising were it not patent on the very face of public affairs that the emasculated Protestantism of to-day has set itself to secure control of the power of the State to wield it in its own interests, and it is willing to countenance any absurd scheme, and propose any sort of a compromise to gain the support of the Roman Church, because its managers know that they cannot win without this. This is shown by another statement from the Doctor:—

"Possibly the more liberal portion of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens might agree to such a compromise" (as is proposed in the statements which we have quoted).

There is a good deal being said about the danger to our institutions, from Romanism. There is such danger, but it lies not in Romanism direct, but in this degenerate Protestantism ambitious of civil power and willing to compromise with Rome to obtain it. This it is that needs to be constantly and carefully watched.

A. T. J.

**"Not an 'Enduring Morality'" *The American Sentinel* 3, 5 , pp. 38, 39.**

SOMETHING over two years ago the Presbyterian Synod of New York appointed a committee on Religion and Public Education to 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, and 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 groundwork 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."

That is a queer sort of a resolution on religion to be passed by a body of men who pretend to know anything about the religion of Christ. In the four "religious truths" which they set forth as "a groundwork of national morality," they certainly have made a success of getting 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 the people on earth.

The Unitarian, the Trinitarian, the Jew, the Mohammedan, and the heathen can all accept every point named. As to "the existence of a personal God," whether it be Buddha, or Joss, or Allah, or Jehovah, it is all right: all that is necessary is to assent to the existence of a personal God. And there is nobody that believes in any sort of a god at all who does not believe in man's personal responsibility to him. "The deathlessness of the human soul" has been believed by the great majority of the race, almost ever since Satan told Eve that 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*." The fourth point is already contained in the second and third, and it is difficult to see what they want to gain by repeating it.

But the worst thing about it is that there is not in the whole statement a word or a hint about Christ, no more than if there were no such person in existence. And yet it is proposed by a body of professed Christians, as a statement of "religious truths." 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 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" can only be secured by an abiding faith in Jesus Christ. And when these men make "an enduring morality" to 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 an anchor of the soul. God forbid that such morality shall ever become national.

As was to be expected, the report 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."

Now just see what that committee counts as a "most satisfactory result." A member of this committee wrote a letter to Archbishop Corrigan, "requesting for publication a distinct statement of the position which the Roman Catholics would be likely to assume." Vicar-General Preston answered the letter as follows:—

"The Most Rev. Archbishop desires me in his name to say in response to your letter

39

that the Catholic Church has always insisted, and must always insist, upon the teaching of religion with education. For this reason we cannot patronize the public schools, and are forced to establish our own parochial schools. The question, where there are many different denominations, each with its own creed, is a difficult one to settle. We could be satisfied with nothing less than the teaching of our *whole faith*. Protestant denominations, if they value their own creeds, ought to feel as we do.

"*Denominational schools* are, to our mind, the only solution of the question. This plan should satisfy everyone, and would save the State a vast outlay of expense.

"The *points* you propose, while better than none, would never 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.

"We believe that the country will yet see the ruinous effects of an education from which religion has been excluded. With sincere respects on the part of the Archbishop and myself. Yours very truly,  
"T.S. PRESTON, V.G.

"REV. GEO. SHIPMAN PAYSON."

Then says the committee:—

"The position of the Roman Catholics upon the question, therefore, is well defined."

Indeed it is, a good deal better defined than is this Presbyterian spider's web. That is not a position at all, it is only a floating scheme trying to catch whatever element it can. What an edifying spectacle it is indeed, to see a committee from the Presbyterian Synod of New York, soliciting the alliance of the Catholic Church, and that not only to meet with a rebuff, but to be snubbed with the reminder that Protestant denominations don't value their own creeds, and that the "points" proposed "ought not to satisfy many of the Protestant churches!" And then, more than all, to find the committee reporting this as a "most satisfactory" result! Well, well, what will the committee do next? We have not the least doubt, however, that they will do as was suggested by the National Reformers seven years ago—they will "make repeated advances," and allow themselves to be subjected to repeated "rebuffs," to get Rome's "co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it." Because, "It is one of the necessities of the situation."

A. T. J.

**June 1888**

**"The Plea for National Sunday  
Legislation" *American Sentinel* 3, 6 , pp. 41, 42.**

APRIL 6, the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair chairman, gave a hearing to arguments in support of the petitions of the W. C. T. U., for National Sunday Legislation. Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D. D., delivered what seems to have been the principal production on the question. He has since presented the same argument in the Philadelphia National Reform Convention. The paper is entitled, "National Sabbath Reform." We propose to reproduce here some of his arguments, not only that we may examine them for their own sake, but also that they may be

examined by our readers in the light of the principles stated in the report of the United States Senate, given on another page.

The petitions in support of which the argument was made, ask Congress to prohibit Sunday railroad trains, Sunday mails, and Sunday parades in the army and navy. The Doctor instances the railroad strikes, riots, and wrecks, as proof that the Sunday train is a national evil, and says:—

"There is abundance of evidence in the testimony of railroad men themselves of the fact that their Sabbath-breaking is closely related to their train-wrecking. They feel that, having broken one commandment of God, they might as well go through the whole list. . . . It is a perilous thing to allow men to be started in law-breaking."

So, then, Doctor Crafts and his fellow-petitioners, want Congress to set itself up as the guardian of the law of God, to define what is the law of God and what is its transgression—to define and to punish *sin*—for Mr. Crafts said also in this very connection that "most of the railroad work" "is a sin against God's law."

He demands that railroad trains shall be compelled to stop over Sunday wherever they may be when Sunday overtakes them, and then inquires:—

"Why may not a few railway passengers be detained for one day, even at some slight inconvenience or loss, on the same ground that steam-boat passengers are detained in quarantine for a fortnight, namely, to protect the public health?!"

Does the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D. D., mean seriously to assert that all steamboat passengers are detained in quarantine for a fortnight? He knows better. He knows that it is only the passengers of steamboats infected with cholera, or yellow fever, or small-pox, or some such deadly disease, that are detained in quarantine at all. Well, then, does he mean seriously to assert that a railroad train running on Sunday is as dangerous to the public health as is a cholera-infected steamboat? and that the train must therefore be quarantined on Sunday "to protect the public health"? If he does *not* mean this, then his argument is an utter *non sequitur*. And if he *does* mean this, then to what absurd lengths will men not run in their wild endeavors to find a basis for Sunday legislation? The lightning express on Sunday is as a streak of cholera, says the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D. D.; so it must be quarantined.

His next proposition is of the same piece. Here it is:—

"An inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of cattle is now before the Senate. Why not add another to protect the health of railroad men?"

Well, dear Doctor, there are several reasons for this. As you seem not to have discovered any, let us endeavor to enlighten you. There are several points of distinction between railroad men and cattle. You seem not to have discovered this. Allow us to point them out.

First, there has always been recognized, by everybody, unless, perhaps, certain Doctors of Divinity, a distinction between railroad men and cattle in this, that railroad men have more sense than cattle have; that they are capable of taking care of their own health, and that they have all the facilities for it.

Secondly, a distinction between railroad men and cattle appears in this, that railroad men are not bought and sold, nor are they crowded into cars and shipped, as cattle are.

Thirdly, an important distinction between railroad men and cattle appears in this, Doctor, that railroad men are not killed and eaten as cattle are. You see, Doctor, cattle are eaten by the public. Therefore you will see, perhaps, that if the cattle be diseased, the public will be eating disease, and the public health will be endangered. Therefore an inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of cattle is a necessity to protect the public health. Now, Doctor, if the American public was killing and eating railroad men as it is cattle, then it would be the most proper thing to "add another" inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of railroad men. But, Doctor, we are happy to inform you that the American public does not do that thing yet. Therefore there is no necessity whatever for any inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of railroad men—by declaring a quarantine on all Sunday trains.

Next the Doctor discusses Sunday mails, and it is in this that there appears the "true inwardness" of his whole Sunday-law argu-

42

ment, and, in fact, of the whole Sunday-law movement. He says:—

"The law allows the local postmaster, if he chooses (and some of them do choose), to open the mails at the very hour of church, and to make the post-office the competitor of the churches."

There is the secret of the whole Sunday-law agitation. The churches cannot bear competition. They must have a monopoly. The Sun-day trains must be stopped, because they are competitors of the churches. The Elgin Sunday-law Convention, which Doctor Crafts indorses, said so. The Sunday papers must be abolished, because

they are competitors of the churches. The Elgin Sunday-law Convention said so. The post-offices must be closed on Sunday, because they are competitors of the churches. Doctor Crafts says so. Now by the side of these statements read this:—

"The Sunday train, the Sunday newspaper, and the Sunday mail are a combine against public health."

That is to say, the Sunday train is a competitor of the churches; therefore it must be quarantined—"to protect the public health." The Sunday newspaper is a competitor of the churches; therefore it must be abolished—"to protect the public health." The post-office open on Sunday is a competitor of the churches; therefore it must be shut—"to protect the public health." The nation must secure to the churches a complete monopoly of Sunday, and all "to protect the public health." How very considerate of the public health these dear Doctors of Divinity are, to be sure! No, they are not. The public health is not in all their thoughts. They don't care a continental for the public health more than does anybody else. It is national power to enforce religious observances that they want. That is what they are determined to have. They know that if they should work in the name of that which they really want, they could get no hearing at all before any legislative body in this Nation. Therefore they trump up the hypocritical plea of "protection of the public health," or "protection of the workingman from the oppression of monopolies," or anything else under which they can hide their real intentions.

This is further shown by the fact that although Doctor Crafts repeatedly stated that this Sunday legislation is to protect the public health, he declared that:—

"A National Sabbath Committee, representing the religious organizations of the Nation, will be necessary to secure clear convictions on the subject among Christians, and also the enactment and enforcement of wholesome Sunday laws. . . . This National Sabbath Committee should be appointed by the churches."

Now if this legislation is in the interest of the public health, why is it that the National Committee must be appointed by the *churches* instead of by the *public*? And why should this National Committee represent the *religious organizations* instead of the *public*? If all this legislation is in the interests of the public health, then why must the National Committee be chosen by the churches from the religious organizations, instead of by the public, from the *Boards of Public Health* of the different States? Ah! the truth is that the interests of the

public health do not enter into the question at all. The whole thing is in the interest of the churches, and in behalf of the religious organizations; and the public health is nothing but a hypocritical plea swung in to hide the real motive. But they can't hide it all.

Next Mr. Crafts tells what they want. In regard to closing the post-offices on Sunday during church hours, to stop this competition with the churches, he says:—

"A law forbidding the opening between ten and twelve would accomplish this, and would be better than nothing; *but we want more.*"

Again:—

"A law forbidding any handling of Sunday mail at such hours as would interfere with church attendance on the part of employes would be better than nothing; *but we want more than this.*"

Again:—

"Local option in deciding whether a local post-office shall be open at all on Sunday, we should welcome as better than nothing,— a wholesome incentive to local agitation; *but we desire more than this.*"

And again—

"A law forbidding all carrier delivery of mail on Sunday would be better than nothing; but we want more than this."

Well, then, what do they want?

"What we ask is a law instructing the Postmaster-General to make no further contracts which shall include the carriage of mails on the Sabbath, and to provide that hereafter no mail matter shall be collected or distributed on that day."

And THEY WANT MORE THAN THIS. This is sufficient for them to begin with, but they will never stop here. Just as soon as these men get what they here ask, and find by that that the religious power can influence the civil in its own behalf, then they will push that power to the utmost extent that their influence can carry it. If they get what they here ask, in the very words of Doctor Crafts, there will be no stopping-place short of the fullest claims of the Papacy. If they get what they here ask, the first thing to be done will be for the national power, by some tribunal, either the legislative or judicial, to declare what day is the Sabbath. To do this will demand the interpretation of Scripture, and the decision of a religious question. Therefore, by this one act, by this single step, the Nation will be plunged at once into a whirl of religious controversy, of judicial interpretations of Scripture and judicial decisions of religious questions; and where shall the thing stop? This is precisely what the National Reformers are trying to do—



and Doctor Crafts is one of them. They intend, in their own words, that "the whole frame-work of Bible legislation" shall be "thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens;" and then, again in their own words, "the churches and the pulpits [will] have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and *with interpretations of Scripture* on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical, points;" "and the *final decisions* will be developed there." And that will be the times of the Papacy over again. And the one single step that will plunge the nation into this maelstrom is this Sunday-law action which Congress is now petitioned to take, and in behalf of which the *Union Signal* has promised that Senator Blair is to frame and present a bill.

When this question came before the United States Senate before, the Senate replied: "Let the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World." We are anxiously waiting to see what reply the United States Senate now will make upon the same question. We are anxious to see whether Senator Blair will indeed frame and present a bill, and thus show himself ready to carry the National Legislature beyond its legitimate bounds. And if he does that thing, then we are anxious to see whether the National Legislature will allow itself to be carried beyond its legitimate bounds. We are anxious to see whether the National Legislature will establish the precedent, and lay the foundation, for the usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country. We are intensely anxious to know whether the National Legislature is ready to inflict this desolating scourge upon this fair land.

Besides all this, we are really anxious to know whether or not the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair chairman, is so blind as not to be able to see the fallacy, the sophistry, and the hypocrisy, of the address of the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D. D. If it is so, then we must confess that our estimate of the degree of intelligence that ought to be found in a United States Senator is greatly lowered.

A. T. J.

**"An 'Open Letter'" *American Sentinel* 3, 6 , pp. 46, 47.**

IT will be remembered that in the February SENTINEL we replied to an "open letter" to us from Rev. W. T. McConnell, of Youngstown, Ohio. In the *Christian Nation*, of February 29, Mr. McConnell wrote to us another open letter, which we have not till now had the opportunity to notice. As in his first "open letter" he started out with the stock argument of the National Reformers—that of classing with infidels, atheists, liquor leagues, liberal leagues, etc., etc., every opponent, whoever he may be or whatever may be the grounds of his opposition—so in this "open letter" the first thing he does is to enter upon a long defense of it. But he need not have done that at all; we did not mention it with the object of having it enter as an element into the controversy between us and the National Reformers. As Mr. McConnell was a new champion in the lists, we simply called his attention to this point to see whether we might not be able to get from him some sort of an argument upon the merits of the controversy between us. But our effort was in vain. Mr. McConnell proves to be as destitute of argument on the merits of the controversy as are all the rest of the National Reformers.

From the beginning we have invited the National Reformers, both as individuals and by their organs, to show wherein our opposition to the National Reform movement is not based upon sound principles. We have asked them repeatedly to show wherein our arguments against it are faulty, or wherein our conclusions are illogical. We have offered them our own columns in which to show this. But with a single exception—Rev. Robert White, of Steubenville—the principal, the first, the leading reply, has always been to call us names and to class us with all the elements of wickedness that they can think of. But we do not care for that. We know that "it is only in the absence of argument that recourse is had to ridicule; and that the chair of the scoffer is never filled until that of the logician is vacated." Therefore, as the National Reformers are destitute of arguments against us, we couldn't have the heart to deprive them of their only recourse—that of calling us names. We are not what they call us; and we know that their calling us bad names does not make us what they call us.

In his first "open letter" it will be remembered that Mr. McConnell likened the National Reform movement to an express train which is fairly to knock into finders everybody who does not get off the track. In reply we freely confessed that "the National Reform movement is

nothing but a Satanic car of Juggernaut that proposes relentlessly to crush every person who chooses to think for himself." This sets Mr. McConnell's imagination all aglow, and he says:—

"Now, neighbor, let us step one side and take a look at this 'Satanic car.' . . . There is the venerable Mr. Brunot holding the lines [yes, he is], while Doctors Stevenson, Barr, and McAllister urge on the high-spirited district secretaries, who are straining every nerve to increase its speed [yes, they are]. Then notice

47

the it material of which the 'car' is composed. Its wheels and axle, its panels and arches, its furniture and adornments, are the names of men."

The "*names* of men!" Yes, that is true, and a goodly number of those names are the names of *dead* men; others are the names of men who are decidedly opposed to the whole National Reform movement; others are the names of men who are not in the United States at all, and do not belong to the United States; others are names of men as living in certain places, while those men are not only not in those places but are not known there at all. Yes, sir, Mr. McConnell, that is a happy hit that you make, in saying that these were the *names* of men. We personally know that what we have here said is true. We know that the National Reform Association's Executive Committee in its very latest published list of vice-presidents has printed the names of men who have been dead for years.

Then Mr. McConnell makes great ado, because we confessed his destructive express to be a Satanic car.

To this we have just a word to say. Doctor Philip Schaff says:—

"Secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the church."—

*Church and State in the United States, page 11.*

Now secular power is precisely what the National Reform Association proposes to give to the church; therefore the National Reform Association proposes to make a Satanic gift to the church. And as Mr. McConnell proposes that this Satanic gift shall be in the form of an express car upon which the church shall ride in her course of tyranny and destruction, then it is demonstrated by Doctor Schaff's sound principle, and by Mr. McConnell's sounding proposition, that that car is a Satanic car.

A. T. J.

**July 1888**

**"The Presbyterian Cardinal" *American Sentinel* 3, 7 , pp. 52, 53.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"I am with great regard, yours faithfully in Christ,  
"JAMES CARD, GIBBONS, *Abp. Baltimore.*

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

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

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

If Mr. Field has in this taken it upon himself to speak for the whole Nation, and, for the Nation, to acknowledge Mr. Gibbons as our only Cardinal, then, as American citizens, we do most decidedly protest.

He is not our Cardinal in any sense. The United States knows no Cardinal, it recognizes no such dignity as a Cardinalate. And as for Doctor Field's saying that "certainly few men in Church or State hold so high a dignity as our only Cardinal," it is utterly false. So far as the church is concerned, the humblest Christian in it holds an infinitely higher dignity than does Doctor Field's "only Cardinal." And as for the State, there is not an American citizen in this Union, who appreciates what American citizenship is, who does not hold a dignity vastly greater than that of Doctor Field's "only Cardinal," who is bound in a contemptible vassalage to a foreign and despotic lord.

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

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

"Never was there founded an institution so openly at war with the spirit of its time. The sixteenth century was the century of renovation; Jesuitism a sect of relapse. The sixteenth century founded the liberty of thought; Jesuitism founded intellectual slavery. The one tended to religious reform, the other to religious

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

Another writer speaking of the wounds which turned Loyola from a soldier into a fanatic, says:—

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

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



Protestantism is dead.  
A. T. J.

**August 1888**

**"Rome's Influence" *American Sentinel* 3, 8 , pp. 59, 60.**

IF anybody fails to see that the Papacy is now fast moving into the place of the greatest influence of any earthly organization, not only in Europe, but in this Nation as well, we can only wonder what he can be doing with his eyes. In Europe, to say nothing of Catholic countries, which, as a matter of course, are subject to the Pope, Germany is subject to the dictation of the Pope; England is glad to obtain his help in her political affairs; and even the autocrat of all the Russia is willing to make overtures to the Pope.

In our own country Rome's influence is growing faster than any other one thing. Everybody knows that it was the word "Romanism" in an unfortunate alliteration that cost Blaine the presidency in 1884. The editor of the *Converted Catholic* says that more Senators and Representatives send their sons to the Jesuit College at Georgetown, than to all the other institutions of learning at Washington. This proves, either that a large number of Senators and Representatives are Catholics, or that Rome has more influence with Senators and Representatives than have all the other educational institutions in Washington put together.

L. Q. C. Lamar was lately Secretary of the Interior. He was charged with giving to Catholics more positions in his department than to other denominations. His reply was, that "if the Roman Catholics have been recognized to a greater extent than other denominations, it is only because they have asked more largely;" and explains this by saying that the Romish Church has at Washington "an energetic and tireless director, who is active to seize opportunities for extending missionary and educational work among the Indians." The Government Superintendent of Indian Schools is a Catholic; and the *Christian Union* says that four-fifths of the Government Indian schools, under religious control, have been given to the Romish Church.

The Assistant Attorney-General of the Department of the Interior—Mr. Zach. Montgomery—is a Roman Catholic, with all the Roman Catholic enmity to the public schools, and hesitates not to use his

official influence to show it. Not long since, in an address at Carroll Institute, he openly denounced the public-school system as godless, anti-parental, and destructive of happiness. And the Senate knew his enmity to the public schools when it confirmed him as Assistant Attorney-General.

We would not have a word to say against Catholics being given public and official positions in any department of Government, were it not that the allegiance of every Catholic is paid to the Pope before it is to the United States, and must be so paid, or else he ceases to be a good Catholic; every soul of them enters politics, or into official positions, *as a Catholic*; and the Pope has commanded all Catholics to do all in their power to cause the legislation of States to be shaped upon the model of the "true church."

Next the secular press is captivated by the seductive influences of the Papacy. Not only is this true of that portion of the press which makes politics a trade, and which professedly follows, while it leads, public influence; it is equally true of the great magazines. In the *Century* for May, 1888, there was published a most flattering tribute to the Pope, with full-page portrait, under the title of "The Personality of Leo XIII." And in the *Forum* for April, 1888, Rome forms the subject of two long articles—one, "Civil Government and Papacy," the other, "Socialism and the Catholic Church."

Next after the political world and the secular press, there is the "Protestant" religious world and its press. And in hardly anything does this take second place after the others, in this truckling flattery to the Papacy. The *Evangelist*, the *Christian Union*, the *Christian at Work*, the *Independent*, and other papers of lesser note, all pay flattering tribute to Rome. The *Evangelist* acknowledges Cardinal Gibbons as its "only Cardinal;" the *Independent* wishes the Pope "a long reign and Godspeed in his liberalizing policy;" the *Christian at Work* salutes him as "Holy Father," and in the name of "the whole Christian world" glorifies him as "this venerable man whose loyalty to God and zeal for the welfare of humanity are as conspicuous as his freedom from many of the errors and bigotries of his predecessors, is remarkable;" and the *Christian Union* acknowledges him as "a temporal prince" and "Supreme Pontiff." Nor are the "Protestant" doctors of divinity one whit behind these "Protestant" papers. Rev. Charles W. Shields, D. D., of Princeton College, writing of the reunion of Christendom, said of a certain position, that it would not do to take it, because—

"You would exclude the Roman Catholic Church, the *mother of us all*; the church of scholars and saints, of Augustine, and Aquinas, and Bernard, and Fenelon; the church of all races, ranks, and classes, which already gives signs of being American as well as Roman, and the only church fitted, by its hold upon the working masses, to grapple with that labor problem before which our Protestant Christianity stands baffled to-day."—*New York Evangelist*, February 9, 1888.

Yes, the Catholic Church *does* give signs of becoming American as well as Roman, and the surest sign of this is the readiness with which Americans and professed Protestants surrender to her all their dearest interests of man in order to secure her influence.

60

Now to all these elements add the National Reform Association, which, under the name and form of Protestantism, proposes to unite all Protestant bodies in one, and then to trade them off bodily to Rome for her influence, for the sole purpose of securing to the church the control of the civil power, and the scheme is completely sketched, as it now stands.

At the present rate, how long will it be before Rome's influence will be supreme everywhere? This question is worth thinking about.

A. T. J.

**"The National Reform Vice-Presidency" *American Sentinel* 3, 8 , p. 60.**

IN his report in the SENTINEL for June our correspondent from the Philadelphia National Reform Convention, made a remark which lets considerable light upon the National Reform method of getting the names of so many eminent men in its list of vice-presidents. It has been a puzzle to some of these gentlemen, whom they run as their vice-presidents, to know how they ever became vice-presidents of an association whose objects they utterly oppose. The following sentence reveals the secret:—

"The motion was made and supported that all those citizens of Philadelphia whose names were attached to the call for the convention, should be made vice-presidents of the association, when, without discussion, it was put and unanimously carried. By this simple act, and without the consent of the persons concerned, seventy-eight new officers were elected."

Now everybody knows that it is the easiest thing in the world to get names, and the names of eminent men too, signed to a petition or call for a convention or public meeting to consider important

questions. Men will sign such a call without even fairly looking at it, much less reading and considering it. So the National Reformers circulate a "Call for a National Conference on the Christian Principles of Civil Government," and get a large number of signatures to it. That is a most innocent-looking thing; who would not sign it? And in the circular sent out it is distinctly stated that "the sessions of the Conference will be distinct from the sessions of the National Reform Association." That makes doubly innocent the "Call for a Conference." But, lo! at one of the sessions of the association, all who signed the call for the conference are at one swoop made vice-presidents of the National Reform Association; and henceforth those names, whether their owners be living or dead, will be made to do service for all they are worth in behalf of National Reform and as officers of its association.

More than this, the National Reform managers know that not all of those gentlemen are in favor of the object of the association. In the circular before referred to, it is plainly stated that—

"Some of the signatures of citizens concurring in the 'Call for the National Conference' are those of persons who . . . have not yet been convinced of the necessity for the proposed Christian amendment to the National Constitution. An eminent representative of this class is found in Bishop O. W. Whitaker, of the diocese of Pennsylvania."

And yet Bishop O. W. Whitaker, with all the rest of these gentlemen "who have not yet been convinced," is now a vice-president, in eminent standing, of the association whose sole purpose is to secure just such an amendment. That is to say, they are all vice-presidents of an association whose sole object is to do a thing of the necessity of which they have not yet been convinced.

In 1872 the National Reformers played this same trick on Marshall Jewell. They got his signature to a call for a convention, and then swung him in as a vice-president of the association. But Mr. Jewell issued a circular in which he said:—

"Such action on the part of the association was entirely unwarranted, and, so far from consenting to it, I desire that my name be stricken from the list. I should have refused my name had I received notice of it. After giving the matter considerable thought, I am entirely opposed to the movement, and the objects sought to be accomplished by it, believing that it is impracticable and uncalled for. If the people at large do not acknowledge in their actions the divine authority, it is worse than useless to attempt a national acknowledgement."

Such, therefore, is the National Reform method of securing such abundance of eminent "names of men" as vice-presidents to their association. And it is in perfect keeping with other of the methods which they employ to make their movement a success. Anything for influence seems to be their motto.

A. T. J.

**"Russia and Religion" *American Sentinel* 3, 8 , pp. 60, 61.**

IN the *April Century*, Mr. George Kennan gave an invaluable article on the "Russian Penal Code," from which we make the following extract on the subject of religion. In reading it it must be borne in mind that Russia is a "Christian nation," that the religion of Russia is a national religion, and that what is there called Christianity is the national religion. Also in reading it, it will be well to bear in mind the National Reform scheme to make the United States a "Christian nation," to establish here a national religion, and to make what the National Reformers call Christianity, the national religion. At the same time, too, may very properly be borne in mind the National Reform proposition in regard to dissenters from their national religion when they get it established, which is as follows:—

"If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and . . . stay there till they die."

Let the reader compare this with the Russian Penal Code on "Crimes against the Faith," and tell, if he can, what would be the difference between this and the oft-repeated Russian penalty of "exile for life to the most remote part of Siberia."

Mr. Kennan says:—

"The first important title or division of the Russian penal code is that which comprises what are called 'Crimes against the Faith,' and the severity with which such crimes are punished furnishes a striking illustration of the importance which the State attaches to the church as the chief bulwark of its own authority. The first section, which may be taken as fairly indicative of the spirit of the whole title, is as follows:

"SECTION 176. Whoever dares, with premeditation, and publicly in a church, to blaspheme [literally, "to lay blame upon"] the glorious Triune God, or our Most Pure Ruler and Mother of God, the ever-Virgin Mary, or the illustrious Cross of the Lord God Our Saviour Jesus Christ, or the incorporeal Heavenly Powers, or the Holy Saints of God and their images, such person shall be deprived

of all civil rights, and exiled for life, with not less than twelve nor more than fifteen years of penal servitude. If such crime shall be committed not in a church but in a public place, or in the presence of a number of assembled people, be that number large or small, the offender shall be deprived of all civil rights and exiled for life, with not less than six nor more than eight years of penal servitude.'

"The next section, which deals with another aspect of the same crime, is as follows:—

"SECTION 177. If the offense described in the foregoing section [No. 176] be committed not in a public place nor before a large assemblage of people, but nevertheless in the presence of witnesses, with an intention to shake the faith of the latter, or lead them astray, the offender shall be deprived of all civil rights, and exiled for life to the most remote part of Siberia.'

"SECTION 178 provides that 'whoever, with premeditation, in a public place and in the presence of a large or small assemblage of people, dares to censure [or condemn] the Christian faith, or the orthodox church, or to revile [or abuse] the sacred Scriptures or the holy sacraments [literally, "mysteries"], such person shall be deprived of all civil rights, and exiled for life, with not less than six nor more than eight years of penal servitude. If such crime shall be committed not in a public place nor in the presence of an assemblage of people, but nevertheless before witnesses, and with an intention to shake the latter's faith, and lead them astray [literally, "to seduce them"], the offender shall be deprived of all civil rights, and exiled for life to the most remote part of Siberia.'

"SECTION 179 declares that if any person shall witness or have personal knowledge of the commission of the crimes set forth in sections 176-178, and shall fail to inform the authorities thereof, he shall be imprisoned for not less than four nor more than eight months, according to the circumstances of the case.

"SECTION 181 is as follows: 'Whoever, in a printed work, or even in a written composition, if the latter be by him in any manner publicly circulated, indulges in blasphemy, or speaks opprobriously of the saints of the Lord, or condemns the Christian faith or the orthodox church, or reviles the sacred Scriptures or the holy sacraments, such person shall be deprived of all civil rights, and exiled for life to the most remote part of Siberia. The same

61

punishment shall be inflicted upon all persons who knowingly sell, or in any other way publicly circulate, such works or compositions.'

"SECTION 182 provides that 'all persons who shall be found guilty of so-called scoffing—that is, of making sneering or sarcastic gibes that show manifest disrespect for the rules or ceremonies of the orthodox church, or for Christianity in general—shall be imprisoned for not less than four nor more than eight months.'

"It would be hard, I think, to find in the criminal laws of any other civilized State punishments of such severity attached to crimes of such a nature. In most countries an insulting or contemptuous reference, even in a church and during service, to the 'Incorporeal Heavenly Powers' [the angels] would be regarded merely as a misdemeanor, and would be punished with a small fine, or with a brief term of imprisonment, as a disturbance of the public peace. In Russia, however, disrespectful remarks concerning the 'Saints of the Lord and their Images,' even although such remarks be made to three or four acquaintances, in the privacy of one's own house, may be punished with 'deprivation of all civil rights, and exile for life to the most remote part of Siberia'—that is, to the coast of the Arctic Ocean in the territory of Yakutsk. . . .

"Blasphemous or disrespectful remarks concerning holy persons or things are not, however, the only offenses contemplated by Title II, and included among 'Crimes against the Faith.' One whole chapter is devoted to heresy and dissent, and punishments of the most cruel severity are prescribed for adjuration of the orthodox faith, for secession from the true church, and for the public expression of Heretical opinions. Section 184, for example, provides that if a Jew or Mohammedan shall, by persuasion, deception, or other means, induce an orthodox Christian to renounce the true church and become an adherent of the Jewish or Mohammedan faith, he shall be deprived of all civil rights, and exiled for life, with not less than eight nor more than ten years of penal servitude.

"SECTION 187 declares that if any person tempt or persuade an adherent of the Russo-Greek Church to leave that church and join some other Christian denomination, he shall be banished to Siberia for life.

"SECTION 188 provides that if any person shall leave the orthodox church and join another Christian denomination, he shall be handed over to the ecclesiastical authorities for instruction and admonition; his minor children shall be taken into the custody of the Government; his real estate shall be put into the hands of an administrator; and until he abjures his errors he shall have no further control over either.

"Parents who are required by law to bring up their children in the true faith, but who, in violation of that duty, cause such children to be christened or educated in accordance with the forms and tenets of any other Christian church, shall be imprisoned for not less than eight nor more than sixteen months. During such time the children shall be taken in charge by orthodox relatives, or shall be turned over to a guardian appointed by the Government. [Section 190.]

"If a Jew or a Mohammedan shall marry an orthodox Christian and shall fail to bring up the children of such marriage in the

orthodox faith, or shall throw obstacles in the way of the observance by such children of the rules and forms of the orthodox church, the marriage shall be dissolved, and the offender shall be exiled for life to the most remote part of Siberia. [Section 186.]

"All persons who shall be guilty of aiding in the extension of existing sects, or who shall be instrumental in the creation of new sects hostile or injurious to the orthodox faith, shall be deprived of all civil rights, and exiled for life, either to Siberia or to the Trans-Caucasus. [Section 196.]

"I met large numbers of dissenters exiled under this section, both in the Caucasus and in all parts of Siberia. It is the unvarying and universal testimony of both the civil and military officers of the Russian Government that these dissenting Christians form the most honest, the most temperate, the most industrious, and altogether the most valuable part of the whole population in the regions to which they have been banished. The *ispravnik*, or chief police officer, of Verkhni Udinsk, in Eastern Siberia, speaking to me of three or four settlements of dissenters in his *okrug*, or circuit, said: 'If all the people in my territory were only exiled heretics, I could shut up the jails and should have little or nothing to do; they are the best people within my jurisdiction.' I need hardly comment upon the cruel injustice of sending good citizens like these to the remotest part of Eastern Siberia simply because they do not believe in worshiping images and kissing bones, or because they cross themselves with two fingers instead of three.

"It would be easy to fill pages with illustrative examples of the unjust and oppressive character of Russian penal legislation in the field of religious crime. Every paragraph fairly bristles with threats of 'imprisonment,' 'exile,' and 'penal servitude,' and the whole title seems to the occidental mind to breathe a spirit of bigotry and intolerance. One might perhaps expect to find such laws in a penal code of the Middle Ages; but they strike one as an extraordinary anachronism when they appear in a code which was revised and amended in the capital of a so-called Christian State in the year of our Lord 1885."

And yet, in the face of such an infamous code as that, Prince Gortschakoff, Chancellor of the Russian Empire, declared, in 1871, that Russia is "the most tolerant country in the world." Now, with this Russian code and the Russian Chancellor's idea of tolerance, read the following proposition of the National Reform Association upon the subject of tolerance, as announced by Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., one of its Vice-Presidents, bearing in mind that Mr. Edwards holds that all who oppose National Reform are atheists:—

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic. . . . 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. . . . Yes, to this extent I will tolerate the atheist, but no more. . . . 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."

Let the reader compare this with the Russian Penal Code and Prince Gortschakoff's idea of tolerance, and then honestly say, if he can, whether the establishment of the National Reform principles in this Government would not be the establishment of the same sort of a despotism that now reigns in Russia—with the advantage, however, in favor of Russia. For whereas Russia will allow the victims of her tolerance to dwell on the same continent with her, the National Reformers will *not* allow the victims of their tolerance to dwell on the same continent with them. And yet we are compelled to contemplate, and are asked to condone, the fact that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is a close and fond ally of the National Reform Association, and that Joseph Cook, President Seelye, Bishop Huntingdon, Dr. Crafts, and scores of others like them, are Vice-Presidents of it!

A. T. J.

**"That Sunday Commandment" *American Sentinel* 3, 8 , pp. 62, 63.**

IN the February SENTINEL, in reply to Mr. McConnell's first "open letter" to us, we asked him or any other of the National Reformers to cite us to a commandment of God for keeping Sunday. Mr. McConnell accepted the invitation, and in the *Christian Nation* of April 11, devoted to the task a six-column article, the columns the same size as those of the SENTINEL. But we did not ask for arguments, we asked for a commandment. We did not ask the National Reformers for statements of their own, we asked for a commandment of God.

After four and a half columns of special pleading Mr. McConnell says:—

"The most important testimony is that in Paul's letter to the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. 16:2). This constitutes our warrant for observing the first day of the week as the rest day or Sabbath."

Very well, now let us read 1 Cor. 16:2, and see what it says. Here it is:—

"Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come."

And "this," says the Rev. W. T. McConnell, "constitutes our warrant for observing the first day of the week as the rest day or Sabbath." This then is the commandment for the keeping of Sunday, or the first day of the week, as a rest day! But what is said there about resting or about a rest day, or anything of the kind? Not a single word. It seems to us that anybody who can find in that a commandment for the keeping of a rest day, must be hard pushed and easily satisfied. But Mr. McConnell not only chooses to find there such a commandment, but he wants a National law which shall compel everybody else to keep Sunday because he chooses to find a warrant for it in a text which says not a word about it. He seems to be conscious of the weakness of his case, for he begs off, after this manner:—

"If anyone has time or inclination to quibble about the possible interpretation of subordinate clauses in the verse quoted, let such please themselves, remembering, if they please, that 'the letter killeth but the spirit maketh alive.'"

But we have no confidence in the leading of any spirit which leads, not only contrary to the letter of the word of God, but contrary to the whole spirit and purpose of the word of God. And that only such is W. T. McConnell's application and interpretation of this text, we shall conclusively show, and that in but few words. The whole connection in which the verse is found, is this: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. And when I come, whom-

63

soever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem. And if it be meet that I go also, they shall go with me." 1 Cor. 16:1-4.

From this it is seen at a glance that the subject of rest, or a rest day, was not in the apostle's thoughts at all, but that the direction is wholly concerning collections for the poor Christians; and that the matter might be systematically followed up, he directed that upon the first day of the week each one was to lay by him in store as God had prospered him, what he should choose to give for this purpose. But into this manifest and only purpose of the apostle's the Rev. W. T. McConnell proposes to read a "warrant for observing the first day of

the week as the rest day, or Sabbath," and thereby to clothe himself and his fellow National Reformers with the prerogative of enforcing its observance, by National power, upon everybody in the Nation.

The way in which Mr. McConnell gets into this text a warrant for the observance of a rest day is by claiming that that was the day on which the Corinthians met for worship, and that this text, in view of that, means that "it is more than likely that the money was separated from the rest to be put that day into the treasury of the church, if one existed."

That is to say, When Paul said, "Let every one of you *lay by him* in store," the money he would send to the poor, he *meant*, Let every one of you *put into the hands of others*, as God hath prospered him. He meant no such thing. A year afterward he wrote again to the Corinthians on this very subject, and said to them:—

"For as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you; for I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. *Yet have I sent the brethren*, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; *that*, as I said, *ye may be ready*; lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, ye) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore I thought it *necessary* to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and *make up beforehand* your bounty, whereof ye had notice before, *that the same might be ready*, as a matter of bounty, and not as of covetousness." 2 Cor. 9:1-5.

Now if Mr. McConnell's theory be correct, that the Corinthians were to separate this money from the rest and put it "that day into the treasury of the church," and if that is what Paul meant that they should do, then why should he think it "necessary" to send brethren to Corinth, before he should come, "to make up" this bounty, so "that it might be ready" when he came? If Mr. McConnell's invention be correct, what possible danger could there have been of anybody finding them "unprepared"? The truth is that Mr. McConnell's theory is contrary both to the Scripture and to the facts. And that is the "warrant" under authority of which the Rev. W. T. McConnell proposes to arrest the demon of Sabbath-breaking in this nation. Mr. McConnell, your warrant is bogus. It is forged.

Further says Mr. McConnell:—

"In giving this direction for the performance of religious duties, the apostle Paul, incidentally, but positively, locates a time for such duties in the Christian church at Corinth, but with the statement that he had given the same apostolic instructions to the other gentile churches, he extends the appointment of a day to all under the apostolic jurisdiction."

Now for the sake of the argument, and for that reason only, let us grant all that Mr. McConnell here claims—suppose that we grant that in this scripture the apostle Paul extends the appointment of a day to all under the apostolic jurisdiction. Then we want to know by what right it is that the National Reformers claim the power to extend that appointment *beyond* the apostolic jurisdiction? The apostolic jurisdiction extends only to those within the bounds of the church. The bounds of the church extend only to those who voluntarily take upon them the obligations of the name of Christ. Those who are not members of the church are not under the apostolic jurisdiction. Again we ask, By what right is it that the National Reformers claim the power to enforce the apostolic instructions upon those who are not subject to the apostolic jurisdiction? It can be by no right whatever. It is downright usurpation. To attempt to extend the apostolic jurisdiction beyond the distinct bounds of the church of Christ, is of the very spirit of the Papacy. But this is precisely what the National Reformers propose to do. They intend to make National the power and jurisdiction of the church, and whoever will not submit to the appointments of the church cannot remain in the Nation. And that is but the Papacy over again.

But Mr. McConnell and the National Reformers as such, are not alone in this project. Every person who claims the right to enforce the claims of the "Christian" Sabbath upon those who are not Christians is guilty of the same usurpation. No person who is not a Christian has any right to partake in any way in the celebration of Christian days or in the observance of Christian solemnities. If the Sabbath be, as is almost unanimously claimed, the Christian Sabbath, then not only have its advocates no right to enforce its observance upon those who are not Christians, but those who are not Christians have no right, even voluntarily, to observe it, any more than they have to partake of the Lord's Supper. Christian institutions and Christian ordinances are for Christians only.

Then in closing Mr. McConnell makes his "application" thus:—

"Now in closing, a word of application. The National Reform Association has a 'plain commandment' for its demand that the Nation shall by law direct the keeping of a rest day."

And, according to the National Reform "warrant," the Nation shall direct the keeping of a rest day, by commanding everyone "upon the first day of the week" to "lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him." Is that it, Mr. McConnell? If not; by what right shall the Nation direct the observance of what is not in the "warrant"?

Dear boy, you had better study your lesson some more, and try again.

A. T. J.

## September 1888

### "The American Sentinel and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union" *American Sentinel* 3, 9 , pp. 65, 66.

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

The AMERICAN SENTINEL is thoroughly and consistently devoted to the genuine principles of temperance. And what the SENTINEL considers to be the genuine principles of temperance can be stated in this single sentence, viz.: *Total abstinence from all stimulants and narcotics of whatever kind or nature or degree.* More than this, it is out of allegiance to Christian principle that the Sentinel is devoted to this principle of temperance. It is thorough-going Christian temperance in which the SENTINEL thoroughly believes. It is because allegiance to Christ demands that we shall be temperate in all things, that we advocate the principle of temperance. Both of the editors of the SENTINEL are doing their very best to act strictly in accordance with this principle of temperance. It must therefore be manifest to every soul that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is decidedly in favor of temperance, and *Christian* temperance at that. And in this it must likewise be manifest to everybody that whatever criticisms we

have ever made, or shall ever make, upon the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, are not in any sense in opposition to the purest principles of Christian temperance.

Although we are decidedly in favor of Christian temperance, and endeavor personally to practice it, and to persuade others to practice it, we are *not* in favor of using the civil power to compel anybody either to favor or to practice it. And when the Woman's Christian Temperance Union attempts, as it does, to use the civil power to compel people to conform to the principles of Christian temperance, it goes beyond its legitimate province, it acts contrary both to civil polity and Christian principle, and *therefore* we oppose it. Christian principle knows no such thing as outward force; it never seeks either the support or the control of the civil power. Christian principle knows only the force of conscientious conviction, aroused to action by persuasive reason, under the blessed influence of the Spirit of God. Christian principle knows no power but the power of God as manifested in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Believing this with all our heart, although we are decidedly in favor of *temperance*, of *Christian* temperance, of *woman's* Christian temperance, and even of woman's Christian temperance *union*, we are just as decidedly opposed to the *political aspirations* of *the* Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

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

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

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

It puts man in the place of God, and deifies human passions; and such a *rÈgime* is but one remove from that of Satan himself. Therefore, as such a theocracy is such a wicked thing, as it is such

an utter perversion of every principle of government, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to it. And as the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is pledged to the establishment of such a theocracy, and rejoices that it has so long championed such a cause, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to that part of the aims and workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. And why should we be blamed for it?

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

66

Again; the SENTINEL is first, last, and all the time, opposed to the aims of the National Reform Association. That association likewise proposes to turn this Government into a theocracy, ruled by "the leaders and teachers in the churches." It declares that dissenters from National Reform opinions "cannot dwell together on the same continent" with the National Reformed Christianity; and that "there is nothing out of hell" that should not be "tolerated" as soon as these. In Senator Blair's proposed National Sunday law and constitutional amendment, both of which are now pending in the United States Senate, the National Reformers see taken the first steps toward making effective their "tolerant" intentions. Now the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the closest ally, and the most powerful support, that the National Reform Association has in this Nation today. Many of the officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union are also vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. It was the Woman's Christian Temperance Union that first started the petitions for this National Sunday law, which pleases the National Reformers so well, and which so fitly plays into their hands; and the Union went before the Senate Committee with the names of one and a half million petitioners, and more to follow, in favor of that law which, in more than one of its provisions, is subversive of liberty, and which savors all over of tyranny. (See the judicial decision, in another part of this paper.) It is perfectly safe to say that from the position which she occupies, the present president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, herself alone, is doing more to spread National Reform ideas and principles than are all the National Reform

"District Secretaries" put together. And there are other leaders of the Union who are not much behind her in this bad accomplishment.

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

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

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

We know that there are many of the women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union who do not favor the political, nor the



theocratical, nor the National Reform, aspirations of the leaders of the Union. We know a number of women who have separated themselves from the workings of the Union because of the very things which we have here pointed out. They joined the Union to work for Christian temperance upon Christian principles, and to secure the practice of Christian temperance by Christian means. But when they saw that by the leadership of the Union, political efforts and means were supplanting the Christian principles, efforts, and means, they left it. They did well to leave it. And so will every other woman do well to leave it, who does not want to be sold into the hands of Rome through the political, theocratical, and National Reform aspirations of the present leadership of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

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

A. T. J.

**"The Savor of Tyranny" *American Sentinel* 3, 9 , pp. 67, 68.**

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

The ordinance read as follows:—

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

A man by the name of Ferdinand Pape was distributing some circulars on the street, which had "a tendency to annoy" somebody; he was arrested. He applied to the Superior Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*, claiming that the offense charged against him did not constitute a crime, and that the ordinance making such action an

offense was invalid and void, because it was unreasonable and uncertain. The report of the case says:—

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

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

68

And so instances might be multiplied indefinitely in which the most harmless and inoffensive conduct has a tendency to annoy others. If the language of the ordinance defines a criminal offense, it sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.

"But it may be said that courts and juries will not use the instrumentality of this language to set the seal of condemnation on unoffending citizens, and to unjustly deprive them of their liberty and brand them as criminals. The law countenances no such dangerous doctrine, countenances no principle so subversive of liberty as that the life or liberty of a subject should be made to depend upon the whim or caprice of judge or jury, by exercising a discretion in determining that certain conduct does or does not come within the inhibition of a criminal action. The law should be engraved so plainly and distinctly on the legislative tablets that it

can be discerned alike by all subjects of the commonwealth, whether judge upon the bench, juror in the box, or prisoner at the bar. Any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror savors of tyranny. The language employed is broad enough to cover conduct which is clearly within the constitutional rights of the citizen. It designates no border-line which divides the criminal from the non-criminal conduct. Its terms are too vague and uncertain to lay down a rule of conduct. In my judgment the portion of the ordinance here involved is uncertain and unreasonable."

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

The California decision is, that such a statute "sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality." California courts "countenance no such dangerous doctrine, countenance no principle so subversive of liberty," or which so "savors of tyranny." It is very likely that should Senator Blair's Bill be enacted into a law, the United States courts would decide in the same way as did the Superior Court of California. But it is an exceedingly ominous sign, and one most startling in the danger which it displays, when a bill which so "savors of tyranny," and which embodies a principle so "subversive of liberty," can be introduced into the National Legislature, can be received and reported favorably, can pass two readings, can be spread broadcast throughout the land, and only one single voice—that of the AMERICAN SENTINEL—be raised against it.

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

A. T. J.

**"The National Establishment of the  
Christian Religion" *American Sentinel* 3, 9 , pp. 69, 70.**

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

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

The first sentence of section 2 reads as follows:—

"Each State in this Union *shall establish and maintain* a system of free public schools adequate to the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality and *the principles of Christian religion.*"

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

"The United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of the free public schools as is herein provided."

And that is to say that the United States Government pledges itself that every State shall establish and maintain the principles of the Christian religion. This proposed amendment therefore, at one stroke, establishes Christianity as the National religion, *because* it declares that every State shall maintain the principles of the Christian religion in the public schools, and the Nation is pledged to see that this is done. Therefore there must be a National decision of some kind declaring just what are the principles of the Christian religion. Then when that decision shall have been made, every State will have to receive from the Nation just those principles of religion which the Nation shall have declared to be the principles of the Christian religion, and which the Nation will have pledged itself shall be taught in the public schools of every State. In other words, the people of the United States will then have to receive their religion from the Government of the United States. Therefore, if Senator Blair's

proposed amendment to the National Constitution does not provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National religion, then no religion was ever established or maintained in this world.

But how shall this National decision be made as to what are the principles of the Christian religion? It would seem that the second sentence of section 2 makes provision for this. It declares that no "instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, beliefs, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools."

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

It was in this way precisely that the thing was worked in the fourth century. Constantine made Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman Empire. Then it became at once necessary that there should be an imperial decision as to what form of Christianity

70

should be the imperial religion. To effect this an imperial council was necessary to formulate that phase of Christianity which was common to all. The Council of Nice was convened by imperial command, and an imperial creed was established, which was enforced by imperial power. That establishment of an imperial religion ended only in the imperious despotism of the Papacy.

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

now pending in Congress.  
A. T. J.

### October 1888

#### **"Rome and the Public Schools" *American Sentinel* 3, 10 , pp. 74, 75.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

75

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

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

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

Very respectfully,  
GEORGE MONTGOMERY.

*San Francisco, July 19, 1888.*

The following is Professor Morgan's reply:—

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

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

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

The point I wanted to make was this: I was asked, What answer can we give to the criticism made upon the public schools that they fail to cultivate the religious sentiment or to teach morality? My reply was that a part of this criticism from the Roman Catholics, and I asserted that the Catholics who make it would be satisfied with

nothing less than the destruction of the public schools and the substitution thereof of parochial schools. In other words, the charge that the public schools are "godless" means that they are not Roman Catholic, and should be destroyed.

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

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

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

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

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

THOMAS J. MORGAN.

*San Francisco, July 19, 1888.*

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

The first of these is that in which he speaks repeatedly of Professor Morgan's words being an "insult and an outrage." Priest Montgomery knows that the Professor states the fact. Priest Montgomery, and everybody else, knows that Roman Catholicism,



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

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

A. T. J.

**"The Savor of Tyranny" *American Sentinel* 3, 10 , pp. 75, 76.**

SENATOR BLAIR'S National Sunday Bill declares that no person shall "engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, *to the disturbance of others* on the first day of the week, commonly called

the Lord's day, or during any part thereof." Some of the States already have the same sort of Sunday laws as this. California has no Sunday law, much less one of this kind. But not long ago the city of San Francisco had, on another subject, an ordinance of the same nature as this passage in the National Sunday Bill. San Francisco has no such ordinance now, however; the merit of the ordinance came up before the Supreme Court, and the whole thing was treated with the contempt which all such statutes only deserve.

The ordinance read as follows:—

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

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

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

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

in which the most harmless and inoffensive conduct has a tendency to annoy others. If the language of the ordinance defines a criminal offense, it sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.

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

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

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

of liberty," or which so "savors of tyranny." It is very likely that should Senator Blair's bill be enacted into a law, the United States courts would decide in the same way as did the Superior Court of California. But it is an exceedingly ominous sign, and one most startling in the danger which it displays, when a bill which so "savors of tyranny," and

which embodies a "principle so subversive of liberty," can be introduced into the National Legislature, can be received and reported favorably, can pass two readings, can be spread broadcast throughout the land, and only one single voice—that of the AMERICAN SENTINEL—be raised against it.

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

**"The Sentinel and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union"**  
***American Sentinel* 3, 10 , pp. 78, 79.**

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

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

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

3. You err when you say that "Christian principle knows no power but the power of God as manifested in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ." This is a grave error. There is a divine power in law as well as in the gospel. God is the Author of both. "The powers that be are ordained of God." That means *civil* powers. "There is no power but of God." This, too, includes *civil* power. "He beareth not the sword in vain." This means the *civil* men; and he who "resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." If civil government has not the power to pass civil law to prohibit the liquor traffic, then it bears the sword in vain. "The law was made for man-stealers." This means *civil* law. And there is power as well as majesty in law, because all righteous law is from God, the source of all power. And

"rulers," *civil* rulers, legislators, governments, "are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." The SENTINEL knows very well what kind of works, whether good or evil, are perpetrated by saloonists. The women are worthy of commendation, not of censure, for endeavoring to bring the power of *civil* law to bear against saloons. Your charge against the W. C. T. U. is unjust. All temperance prohibitionists wish the power of law to be brought to bear against the ruinous traffic.

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

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

79

of the women must be deferred until your next number.

N. R. JOHNSTON.

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

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

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

A. T. J.

**November 1888**

**"Joseph Cook and Roman Catholicism" *American Sentinel* 3, 11 , pp. 81, 82.**

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 in-tended 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

82

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 *confreres*.

A. T. J.

**"The Banished Book" *American Sentinel* 3, 11 , pp. 82-84.**

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 Tetzels, 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 the 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 indulgence. 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. Can all the uses to which he put the money on the

83

Germans, this was doubtless the best. Still, it was strange to deliver souls from purgatory, in order purchase a manuscript history of the wars of 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 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 are, 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 is 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. Tetzel 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 Tetzel himself:—

"Think, then, that for each mortal sin you must, after confession and contribution, 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 Tetzel. 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

84

to our most holy father the Pope, and to our most holy father the Pope, and to the 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.

**"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union Defended" *American Sentinel* 3, 11 , pp. 86, 87.**

MR. JOHNSON 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 farfetched." 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.

87

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 editorial 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.

**December 1888**

**"The American Sentinel and the Churches" *American Sentinel* 3, 12 ,  
pp. 89, 90.**

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL has occasion frequently to criticise the actions, political and otherwise, of the churches, yet this does not in any way spring from any disrespect for the churches as such, nor for the religion which the *Protestant* churches profess. The SENTINEL is entirely Christian so far as we are able to understand Christianity from the Scriptures. As true Christianity is as far as the east is from the west from the principles and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, and we being to the best of our ability allied to true Christianity, it follows as a matter of course that we are decidedly Protestant.

We believe in one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. We believe in Jesus Christ as the Word of God, who is God, by whom "were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers," who is before all things, and by whom all things consist; by whom alone there is salvation; and who "is able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God by him." We believe in the Holy Spirit as the one who convinces the world of sin and of righteousness, and of judgment; and as the Comforter and the Guide into all truth, of all who believe in Jesus. We believe that "except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," either here or hereafter; and that in order to this new birth, men must be "justified by faith without the deeds of the law." We believe that it is by the obedience of Christ alone that men are made righteous; that this righteousness is the gift of God; that it is received by faith and kept by faith; and that there is no righteousness that will avail for any man, except this "righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." We believe the Bible to be the word of God.

We believe, according to the word of God, that the church is utterly separated from the world, and bound to Christ in the love of God, as a chaste virgin to a lawful and loving husband. This being so, the members of the church cannot be joined to the world without being counted by the word of God as adulterers against him to whom they

profess to be joined in love. Says the Scripture, "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." James 4:4. "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." 1 John 2:15, 16.

As the individual members of the church of Christ cannot be joined to the world without being counted by the word of God as adulterers against him, so also the church as a body cannot be joined in any way to the powers of the world without likewise being declared by the word of God an adulteress and a harlot. When the professed Christian church of the fourth century forsook her Lord and joined herself to the imperial power of Rome, she was fully committed to that corrupt course in which the word of God describes her as that great harlot, "with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication." "And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication." "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. 17:2, 4, 6. That is the Lord's description of the Church of Rome; and in the light of history no man can deny the truthfulness of the description. But everybody knows that she never could have committed fornication with the kings of the earth if she had maintained her allegiance to Christ. She never could have been made drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus, if she had not traded upon her lascivious charms for the control of the civil power, by which she could persecute to the death those who denied the authority which she had so adulterously gained.

Now the leaders of the Protestant churches of the United States are going in the same way in which the church leaders of the fourth century went. They are seeking an alliance with the civil power. They are seeking for this alliance for the same purpose, in the same way, and by precisely the same means. And when they shall have secured the alliance and gained the control of the power, the same results will inevitably follow this in our day that followed that of the fourth century. And to make the surety of this success doubly

sure, they are seeking an alliance with Rome herself. And when these professed churches of Christ shall have formed their illicit connection with worldly power, they will have thus turned themselves into a band of harlots committing fornication with the powers of earth, as did their harlot mother before them. And then the inspired description of Babylon the Great will be complete: "Upon her forehead was a name writ-ten, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." Rev. 17:5.

Let not the professed Protestant churches blame us for this application of the Scripture. They themselves have acknowledged the Church of Rome as their mother, and they need not blame us if we call attention to the Scripture description of the family. In the New York *Evangelist* of February 9, 1888, Rev. Charles W. Shields, D. D., of Princeton College, in proving that it would never do, in the reunion of Christendom, to forbid a doctrine of Apostolic Succession, said:—

"You would exclude the Roman Catholic Church, *the mother of us all*, the church of scholars and saints. . . You would exclude also the Protestant Episcopal Church, the beautiful daughter of a beautiful mother."

This declaration, although made in one of the most influential religious papers in the country, has never yet, so far as we have read, been repudiated or even criticised by any of the leading denominations, or by any paper of any of those denominations. We say again that when these churches declare and admit Rome to be their mother, and "a beautiful mother" at that, they cannot justly blame us for calling attention to the Scripture description of the family. The only things of which the Scriptures declare the Church of Rome to be the mother, are harlots. Therefore whatever church confesses Rome to be its mother, therein confesses itself to be a harlot. And the Protestant churches of the United States, by their religio-political workings, are doing their best to make Doctor Shields's apparently representative confession a fact.

We recognize and maintain the right of every people who believe alike to organize themselves into a church on whatever order they choose, and to call themselves by whatever name they please; but we utterly deny the right of any church, or all of them together, to use the civil power for any religious purpose whatever. We maintain that any man has as much right to be a Methodist, or a Presbyterian, or a Congregationalist, as any other man has to be a Baptist, an Episcopalian, or a Lutheran; but we deny that any one of these

denominations has any right to seize upon the civil power and compel all the others to act as that denomination shall dictate. We deny that all the others have any right to band together and compel any one denomination to conform to the dictates of the many. We maintain that any man in this Nation has just as much right to be a Catholic as any other man has to be a Protestant; but we deny the right of the Catholics to compel any Protestant to act as though he were a Catholic, as we deny the right of the Protestants to compel any Catholic to act as though he were a Protestant. We maintain that any man has just as much right not to be a Christian as any other man has to be a Christian; but we deny any right in those who are not Christians to compel any man who is a Christian to act as though he were not. *And we likewise deny that there is any shadow of right in those who are Christians to compel any man who is not a Christian to act as though he were.* Christians have no more right to compel any man to partake of Christian ordinances, or to observe Christian institutions, than those who are not Christians have to compel Christians not to partake of Christian ordinances nor to observe Christian institutions.

This is the position of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and we are Christians too. We know that to many this sounds strange, but it is a fact. We know that many who call themselves Christians are just as ready to call us Liberals, and do call us that; but we are Christians nevertheless. We are glad, however, to let all men know that there are Christians—we do not say that we are the only ones, but there are not enough of them—who are liberal enough to maintain that all other men inalienably possess all the rights, human, civil and religious, that Christians possess.

We are compelled, also, in the interests of truth and right, occasionally to criticise the political workings of professed ministers of the gospel. We have all the respect for ministers of the gospel that the Scriptures require men to have, but when professed ministers of the gospel set themselves up as ministers of the law, both civil and moral, and of politics, then we no longer respect those men as ministers of the gospel; for such they are not. Christ never sent any man forth as a minister of the law, either civil or moral, nor of politics; and whenever any professed minister of the gospel sets himself to work by political influence to secure the enactment and enforcement of statutes compelling religious observances, then he is doing what

Christ never sent him to do, and he then ceases to be a minister of Christ or of his gospel.

Both the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL are regularly ordained ministers of the gospel, but neither of them ever expects to become a minister of the law, either civil or moral, nor of politics.

NOTE.—Let no one misconstrue our statement that any man has as much right to be a Catholic as any other man has to be a Protestant; and any man has as much right not to be a Christian as any other man has to be a Christian. This is not by any means an admission that the man who is not a Christian is as near right as is the Christian, nor that the Catholic is as near right as is the Protestant. This is not a question of moral right but of civil *rights*. Of course no man has any moral right to be anything else than perfect before God; and this perfection can only be attained through faith in Christ. But if any man chooses to despise the riches of God's goodness and grace, and refuses to believe in Christ, no power on earth has any right to call him to account. He is responsible alone to God, and whoever attempts to call him to account for neglect of the word or ordinances of God, thereby usurps the prerogative of God. And that is how it is that all men have the same equal and inalienable rights.

A. T. J.