**“Catholic Schools” American Sentinel 3, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

Two men in West Chester, Pa., William S. Bowen and Philip Maguire, members of the Catholic Church, withdrew their children from the parochial school, and sent them to the public school. On Sunday, April 27, they were publicly excommunicated by the priest, he “announcing from the altar that William S. Bowen, Assistant Manager of the West Chester Gas Company, and Philip Maguire, one of the editors of the Daily News, would hereafter be forbidden a seat in the church, and that they would be refused the sacraments, living or dead.” {AMS June 1888, p. 43.1}

The priest gave his reasons for this, as follows:- {AMS June 1888, p. 43.2}

“These gentlemen were excommunicated on my own authority and the authority of the arch-bishop, with whom I had consulted in the matter. I took their pews from them because I do not propose that anyone shall hold a pew in this church who is in open rebellion against its laws, when there are faithful and obedient members who are willing to occupy them. Mr. Bowen had the audacity to apply for communion on last Easter morning, and was publicly refused. I had consulted with the archbishop months before in reference to this matter, and it was on the strength of this, and of a letter from his grace, that the refusal was made.” {AMS June 1888, p. 43.3}

Mr. Maguire gave his reasons for taking his child from the Catholic school, and sending him to the public school, as follows:- {AMS June 1888, p. 43.4}

“The reverend gentleman saw fit to use my name in connection with my refusal to send my child to the parochial school, and also notified those of his congregation present that I was formally excommunicated for this refusal, but he wisely took good care not to state the reason for my refusal to have the boy longer educated at the parish school. I took the boy away because, in my judgment, the school was far inferior to the public schools of West Chester, and because the penalty for missing a lesson in catechism was a severe whipping. When I inquired, through a letter, about the severity of the lesson and the punishment inflicted, I received, in reply, a letter from his reverence telling me to mind my own business, and that he would not tolerate interference from me. I replied in a letter, which was answered with a notice that my boy was turned out of the Sunday-school because I would not send him to the parish school, and, later on, the priest met me on the street, and in the most overbearing way threatened that he would deny the child the sacraments of the church. Nine-tenths of the parents sending their children to the parish school do so rather from a sense of fear than an understanding that it is good for them to do so. Many of them have told me of their troubles, and of the bad discipline in the school, and of the poor progress that their children make. There is a great deal of smothered dissatisfaction here, and Rev. Samuel B. Spaulding knows it, deny it as he will.” {AMS June 1888, p. 43.5}

This is a fair specimen of the foul dealing of the Roman Catholic Church in the matter of schools and schooling. And this is the sort of instruction which the National Reform Association proposes to establish in the public schools wherever the Roman Catholics are in the majority. This is the church to which the National Reform Association proposes to give the control of the public schools wherever the Catholics are in the majority. We seriously think that if there is in this world an organization more iniquitous than the Roman Catholic Church, it must be the National Reform Association. {AMS June 1888, p. 43.6}

**“An Alarming Proposition” American Sentinel 3, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

And still they travel the road to Rome. We have frequently of late given in these columns instances of the way in which Catholicism is absorbing Protestantism, or, rather, the way in which Protestantism is plunging headlong into Catholicism, and now we have another step to record. In the Christian at Work of April 12, Prof. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York, had an article which was continued in the Christian at Work of April 19. The article was entitled, “Is Rome an Ally, an Enemy, or Both?” Starting out with the assertion that “the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant churches are agreed in nine-tenths or more of the contents of Christianity,” Doctor Briggs makes some statements concerning the Reformation, and then says:- {AMS June 1888, p. 43.7}

“We are agreed as to the essentials of Christianity. Our common faith is based on the so-called Apostles’ Creed, and worship on the Lord’s prayer, our morals upon the ten commandments and the sermon on the mount. Who will venture to say that the Roman Catholic Church is not as faithful to these foundations of our common religion as Protestants? Taking our stand on the apostles’ creed, we must add to the articles of faith on which we are agreed, all the doctrinal achievements of the church for fifteen centuries, the doctrine of the unity of God, the person and work of Jesus Christ, the holy Trinity, original sin and human depravity, salvation by divine grace, the absolute need of the atonement of Jesus Christ. On all these great doctrines of our religion Romanism and Protestantism are one. Here we are allies, and it is our common task to proclaim these doctrines to the heathen world, and to overcome by them all forms of irreligion and infidelity in Christian lands. And differences about justification by faith, and salvation by the divine grace alone, and the authority of the church as regards the determination of the canon of Scripture, and its interpretation, ought not to prevent our co-operation and alliance in the great work of indicating and proclaiming the common faith. Our conflict over the doctrines in which we differ would be more fruitful in good results if our contest should be based upon concord and alliance in the common faith. If our contest could be narrowed to the real points of difference, and that contest could be conducted in a brave, chivalrous, and loving manner, the results would be more fruitful. {AMS June 1888, p. 43.8}

“Taking our stand upon the Lord’s prayer, we observe that as to the greater part of Christian worship we are agreed. We worship God in common, in morning and evening assemblies, by prayer, songs of praise, the reading and preaching of the Scriptures, and the celebration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper. All this is common. Furthermore, we take the liberty of affirming that the matter of all this worship is for the most part common in both these great bodies of Christians. I have heard sermons in Roman Catholic Churches of Europe which were more evangelical and less objectionable than many sermons I have heard in leading Protestant Churches in Berlin, London, and New York. It is well known that the Protestant books of liturgy contain a considerable amount of material derived from the old mass books, and they are all the more valuable for that. Roman Catholic baptism has many superstitions connected with it, but the essentials of baptism are there in the baptism by the minister in the name of the holy Trinity. Roman Catholic observance of the Lord’s Sup-per is connected with the worship of the materials of the supper under the doctrine that they are really the body and blood of the divine Lord, but who can deny that pious souls by faith really partake of the body and blood of Christ in this holy sacrament, notwithstanding the errors in which it is enveloped? If we look with eyes of Christian charity upon the Lutheran and Zwinglian views, which are regarded as serious errors by the standards of the reformed churches, and would not deny to the participants real communion with Christ, why should we deny such communion to pious Roman Catholics? {AMS June 1888, p. 43.9}

“In all matters of worship we are in essential concord with Roman Catholics, and we ought not to hesitate to make an alliance with them so far as possible to maintain the sanctity of the Sabbath as a day of worship, and to proclaim to the world the necessity of worshiping God in his house, and of becoming members of his church by baptism, and of seeking union and communion with the Saviour by Christian worship, the study of the Scripture, and the observance of the Lord’s Supper. With this recognition of con-cord, Protestants can then debate with Romanists in a friendly manner, and seek to overcome their errors, remove the excrescences they have heaped upon the simple worship in the spirit and in truth which seems to us more in accordance with the Scripture and the wishes of our Saviour. {AMS June 1888, p. 43.10}

“We should also note that in the great constituent parts of prayer,-invocation, adoration, thanksgiving, confession of sin, petition, inter-cession, and consecration, Roman Catholic and Protestant worship are agreed, and consequently the matter of prayer is essentially the same, the differences are less than most people imagine. In Christian song the differences are still less. If our hymn-books were stripped of hymns from the ancient and medieval church, and from modern Roman Catholics, they would be bare indeed. Looking now at the sphere of morals we take our common stand on the ten commandments and the sermon on the mount. As to the vast majority of all questions of morals, Romanism and Protestantism are agreed. It is true there is a great deal of immorality in the Roman Catholic Church in some countries, and we think it may be shown that as a rule Protestantism is productive of better morals than Romanism; but this, after all, is a question of more or less, and to say the least, Protestantism has little to boast of. On all these questions it is of the highest importance that the Roman Catholic Church and Protestant churches should make an alliance. Their joint efforts would have an influence upon public and private morals such as the world has not yet witnessed. We may agree to differ and debate on all questions of morals where there is discord. But when we are agreed on the vast majority of questions that come before the public it is sheer folly for us to waste our energies in antagonism when co-operation and alliance would be productive of vast good. {AMS June 1888, p. 43.11}

“We hold, therefore, that the Roman Catholics and the Protestants ought not to hesitate to ally themselves for the maintenance and the preparation of those great principles of Christian doctrine, Christian worship, and Christian morals that they hold in common.” {AMS June 1888, p. 44.1}

We think that no apology is needed for this long quotation. The proposed alliance with Rome, the necessity for which Doctor Briggs reiterates so often, is a noteworthy sign of the times, and we could not ignore it and be true to our name. The Doctor seems to base his plea for an alliance quite largely upon the fact that Protestantism is about as bad as Catholicism. He says above that Protestantism has little to boast of over Roman Catholicism, in the way of morality, and elsewhere in the same article he says:- {AMS June 1888, p. 44.2}

“Why should we complain of the persecutions that our ancestors suffered from Rome, when we have to lament that others of our ancestors were merciless to Roman Catholics? Roman Catholic intolerance and bigotry may be matched by Protestant intolerance and bigotry. I doubt whether God looks with any more favor upon these detestable vices in the one than in the other.” {AMS June 1888, p. 44.3}

Now all that we can say about this is, “Pity ‘tis, ‘tis true.” It is, no doubt, a valid reason why Protestantism and Roman Catholicism should join, for when Protestantism becomes as bad as Catholicism, we can see no necessity for maintaining a separate existence. For ourselves we think that there is yet quite a difference between the two bodies; but when a prominent professor in one of the leading theological seminaries in the land can see no difference between the Lord’s Supper as celebrated according to the divine command, and the Roman Catholic mass, and when he indorses “all the doctrinal work of the [Catholic] Church for fifteen centuries,” the point of perfect union cannot be far off. {AMS June 1888, p. 44.4}

What an array of names we now have in favor of Protestant union with Catholicism,-Doctors Hodge, Hitchcock, Schaff, Patton, Briggs, Field, etc. But who has heard or read of a Catholic priest clamoring for Catholic union with Protestantism? Nobody. Why not? Would not the Catholic Church be willing to enter into such an alliance as these Protestant Doctors of Divinity propose? Most certainly it would be, but the movement must all be made by the Protestants. The Catholic Church will gladly receive the Protestant churches to her bosom,-she will accept their aid in the furtherance of her peculiar schemes,-but she can afford to wait till they come of their own accord, for if they make the proposals, she can dictate the terms. {AMS June 1888, p. 44.5}

One more thought. What must we conclude will be the effect of an alliance between Protestantism and Catholicism, when we remember that one of the strongest pleas for such an alliance is-not that Catholicism is as good as Protestantism-but, that Protestantism is nearly, if not quite, as bad as Catholicism? Those who know anything of Rome’s peculiarities, do not need to have an answer given them. {AMS June 1888, p. 44.6}

Some may say that we are alarmists. Indeed we are; and we think that anyone who sees such danger approaching and does not sound an alarm, deserves to suffer all the ill that may follow. Our only wish is that we might sound the alarm so loud that it would awaken the thousands who seem to be asleep, and who are in danger of being taken in the snare. {AMS June 1888, p. 44.7}

E.J.W.

**“Congress and Sunday Legislation” American Sentinel 3, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have before referred to the petitions to Congress which were being circulated by the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, asking the National Legislature to pass laws stopping Sunday trains, Sunday mails, and Sunday parades in the army and navy. The following from the Union Signal, of May 3, is the latest information that we have on this subject:- {AMS June 1888, p. 44.8}

“The Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair chairman, gave a hearing to the friends of the Sabbath, on April 6, from ten to twelve. Mrs. J.C. Bateham, our national superintendent of this department, presented the opening paper-a statement of the legislation asked for by the million and more petitioners, with the reasons thereof, basing these on humanitarian grounds, in behalf of the half million laborers deprived of Sabbath rest directly or indirectly by Government work, and because the observance of a rest-day is for the best good of the Government, the people, and our free institutions. Rev. W.F. Crafts then gave a forcible and exhaustive argument for the Sabbath, which will soon appear in Our Day. Able addresses followed: by Dr. T. A. Fernley, secretary of the Philadelphia Sabbath Association; Rev. M.P. Nice, secretary of the Maryland Sabbath Association; Rev. Yates Hickey, secretary of the International Sabbath Association, and Rev. Dr. Elliott, author of “The Abiding Sabbath.” The attendance was large, and the attention most courteous. Senator Blair will now draft and present a bill for us.” {AMS June 1888, p. 44.9}

This same question was, in the same way, brought before the United States Senate in 1828-29, and the Senate Committee to whom the subject was referred, made a report, which we herewith reproduce entire. It is of double importance just now, first, because of the soundness of the principles which it enunciates, and secondly, as a standard by which to try the position of the United States Senate as now composed. The report will amply repay careful study. We have italicized certain portions, not only as worthy of special note, but also to render them easier for future reference; because we shall yet have abundant occasion to refer to the report. It is as follows:- {AMS June 1888, p. 44.10}

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT - TRANSPORTATION OF THE MAIL ON THE SABBATH.

“The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the following report and resolution, presented by Mr. Johnson, with which the Senate concurred:- {AMS June 1888, p. 44.11}

“The committee to whom were referred the several petitions, on the subject of mails on the Sabbath, or first day of the week, report,- {AMS June 1888, p. 44.12}

“That some respite is required from the ordinary vocations of life is an established principle, sanctioned by the usages of all nations, whether Christian or pagan. One day in seven has also been determined upon as the proportion of time; and inconformity with the wishes of a great majority of the citizens of this country, the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, has been set apart to that object. The principle has received the sanction of the National Legislature, so far as to admit a suspension of all public business on that day, except in cases of absolute necessity, or of great public utility. This principle the committee would not wish to disturb. If kept within its legitimate sphere of action, no injury can result from its observance. It should, however, be kept in mind that *the proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious as well as civil rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike holy*. {AMS June 1888, p. 44.13}

“We are aware that a variety of sentiment exists among the good citizens of this Nation, on the subject of the Sabbath day; and our Government is designed for the protection of one as much as another. The Jews, who in this country are as free as Christians, and entitled to the same protection from the laws, derive their obligation to keep the Sabbath day from the fourth commandment of their decalogue, and in conformity with that injunction pay religious homage to the seventh day of the week, which we call Saturday. One denomination of Christians among us, justly celebrated for their piety, and certainly as good citizens as any other class, agree with the Jews in the moral obligation of the Sabbath, and observe the same day. There are, also, many Christians among us who derive not their obligation to observe the Sabbath from the decalogue, but regard the Jewish Sabbath as abrogated. From the example of the apostles of Christ, they have chosen the first day of the week instead of that day set apart in the decalogue, for their religious devotions. These have generally regarded the observance of the day as a devotional exercise, and would not more readily, enforce it upon others than they would enforce secret prayer or devout meditations. {AMS June 1888, p. 44.14}

“Urging the fact that neither their Lord nor his disciples, though often censured by their accusers for a violation of the Sabbath, ever en-joined its observance, they regard it as a subject on which every person should be fully persuaded in his own mind, and not coerce others to act upon his persuasion. Many Christians, again, differ from these, professing to derive their obligation to observe the Sabbath from the fourth commandment of the Jewish decalogue, and bring the example of the apostles, who appear to have held their public meetings for worship on the first day of the week, as authority for so far changing the decalogue as to substitute that day for the seventh. The Jewish Government was a theocracy, which enforced religious observances; and though the committee would hope that no portion of the citizens of our country would willingly introduce a system of religious coercion in our civil institutions, the example of other nations should admonish us to watch carefully against its earliest indication. With these different religious views, the committee are of opinion that Congress cannot interfere. *It is not the legitimate province of the Legislature to determine what religion is true, or what false*. {AMS June 1888, p. 44.15}

“*Our Government is a civil, and not a religious institution*. Our Constitution recognizes in every person the right to choose his own religion, and to enjoy it freely, without molestation. Whatever may be the religious sentiments of citizens, and however variant, they are alike entitled to protection from the Government, so long as they do not invade the rights of others. The transportation of the mail on the first day of the week, it is believed, does not interfere with the rights of conscience. *The petitioners for its discontinuance appear to be actuated by a religious zeal, which may be commendable if confined to its proper sphere; but they assume a position better suited to an ecclesiastical than to a civil institution*. They appear in many instances to lay it down as an axiom, that the practice is a violation of the law of God. Should Congress in legislative capacity adopt the sentiment, it would establish the principle that the Legislature is a proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God. It would involve a legislative decision on a religious controversy, and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced, it will be impossible to define its bounds. {AMS June 1888, p. 45.1}

“*Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God*. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has wisely with-held from our Government the power of defining the divine law. It is a right reserved to each citizen; and while he respects the rights of others, he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions. *Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object, are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous*. This first effort of the kind calls for the establishment of a principle, which, in the opinion of the committee, would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizens. *If admitted, it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence*. *All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence*. {AMS June 1888, p. 45.2}

“Under the present regulations of the Post-office Department, the rights of conscience are not invaded. Every agent enters voluntarily, and it is presumed conscientiously, into the discharge of his duties, without intermeddling with the conscience of another. Post-offices are so regulated that but a small proportion of the first day of the week is required to be occupied in official business. In the transportation of the mail on that day, no one agent is employed many hours. Religious persons enter into the business without violating their own consciences or imposing any restraints upon others. Passengers in the mail stages are free to rest during the first day of the week, or to pursue their journeys at their own pleasure. While the mail is transported on Saturday, the Jew and the Sabbatarian may abstain from any agency in carrying it, on conscientious scruples. While it is transported on the first day of the week, another class may abstain, from the same religious scruples. The obligation of Government is the same on both these classes; and the committee can discover no principle on which the claims of one should be more respected than those of the other; unless it be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority. {AMS June 1888, p. 45.3}

“It is the opinion of the committee that the subject should be regarded simply as a question of expediency, irrespective of its religious bearing. In this light it has hitherto been considered. Congress has never legislated upon the subject. It rests, as it ever has done, in the legal discretion of the Postmaster-General, under the repeated refusals of Congress to discontinue the Sabbath mails. His knowledge and judgment in all the concerns of that department, will not be questioned. His intense labors and assiduity have resulted in the highest improvement of every branch of his department. It is practiced only on the great leading mail routes, and such others as are necessary to maintain their connections. To prevent this, would, in the opinion of the committee, be productive of immense injury, both in its commercial and political, and also its moral bearings. The various departments of government require, frequently in peace, always in war, the speediest intercourse with the remotest parts of the country; and one important object of the mail establishment is to furnish the greatest and most economical facilities for such intercourse. The delay of the mails one whole day in seven would require the employment of special expresses, at great expense, and sometimes with great uncertainty. {AMS June 1888, p. 45.4}

“The commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests of the country are so intimately connected as to require a constant and most expeditious correspondence betwixt all our seaports, and betwixt them and the most interior settlements. The delay of the mails during the Sunday would give occasion for the employment of private expresses, to such an amount that probably ten riders would be employed where one mail stage would be running on that day, thus diverting the revenue of that department in-to another channel, and sinking the establishment into a state of pusillanimity incompatible with the dignity of the Government of which it is a department. {AMS June 1888, p. 45.5}

“Passengers in the mail stages, if the mails are not permitted to proceed on Sunday, will be expected to spend that day at a tavern upon the road, generally under circumstances not friendly to devotion, and at an expense which many are but poorly able to encounter. To obviate these difficulties, many will employ extra carriages for their conveyance, and become the bearers of correspondence, as more expeditious than the mail. The stage proprietors will themselves often furnish the travelers with those means of conveyance; so that the effect will ultimately be only to stop the mail, while the vehicle which conveys it will continue, and its passengers become the special messengers for conveying a considerable portion of what otherwise constitutes the con-tents of the mail. Nor can the committee discover where the system could consistently end. If the observance of a holiday becomes incorporated in our institutions, shall we not forbid the movement of an army; prohibit an assault in time of war; and lay an injunction upon our naval officers to lie in the wind while upon the ocean on that day? Consistency would seem to require it. Nor is it certain that we should stop here. *If the principle is once established, that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum*. We shall, if consistent, provide for the erection of edifices for worship of the Creator, and for the support of Christian ministers, if we believe such measures will promote the interests of Christianity. It is the settled, conviction of the committee, that the only method of avoiding these consequences, with their attendant train of evils, is to adhere strictly to the spirit of the Constitution, which regards the general Government in no other light than that of a civil institution, wholly destitute of religious authority. *What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which Government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them*. {AMS June 1888, p. 45.6}

“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. {AMS June 1888, p. 45.7}

“Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion, for enforcing religious observances. Let the professors of Christianity recommend their religion by deeds of benevolence, by Christian meekness, by lives of temperance and holiness. Let them combine their efforts to instruct the ignorant, to relieve the widow and the orphan, to promulgate to the world the gospel of their Saviour, recommending its precepts by their habitual example; Government will find its legitimate object in protecting them. It cannot oppose them, and they will not need its aid. *Their moral influence will then do infinitely more to advance the true interests of religion, than any measure which they may call on Congress to enact*. The petitioners do not complain of any infringement upon their own rights. They enjoy all that Christians ought to ask at the hands of any Government-protection from all molestation in the exercise of their religious sentiments. {AMS June 1888, p. 45.8}

“*Resolved*, That the committee be discharged from any further consideration of the subject.” {AMS June 1888, p. 45.9}

**E. J. Waggoner., “Another ‘Open Letter’” American Sentinel 3, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

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. {AMS June 1888, p. 46.1}

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. {AMS June 1888, p. 46.2}

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 Hinders 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:- {AMS June 1888, p. 46.3}

“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 in-crease its speed [yes, they are]. Then notice the material of which the ‘car’ is composed. Its wheels and axles, its panels and arches, its furniture and adornments, are the names of men.” {AMS June 1888, p. 46.4}

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. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.1}

Then Mr, McConnell makes great ado, because we confessed his destructive express to be a Satanic car. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.2}

To this we have just a word to say. Doctor Philip Schaff says:- {AMS June 1888, p. 47.3}

“Secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the church.”-*Church and State in the United States, page 11*. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.4}

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. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.5}

**“National Reform in the Public Schools” American Sentinel 3, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

It will be remembered that last summer the Saratoga National Reform Convention announced its willingness to put the Catholic Bible, Catholic instruction, and Catholic worship, into the public schools wherever the Catholics are in the majority, if the Catholics would help the Protestants to put the Bible and religious instruction and worship in the public schools. It will also be remembered that the convention commissioned Secretary T. P. Stevenson to secure if possible the co-operation of the Roman Catholic authorities upon this basis. We showed at the time that if the Romish Church should accept this proposition, and the scheme should carry, it would at once place the public schools of ten States and four Territories bodily in the hands of the Catholic Church. We showed that two of these States are Minnesota and Wisconsin. The following from a late number of the New York *Evening Post* shows that in those States Rome is pushing the matter on her own account:- {AMS June 1888, p. 47.6}

“The Roman Catholics of the Northwest appear to be making a carefully planned war upon the public-school system, and they are meeting with enough success in isolated cases to arouse general interest in the question. In one district in the town of Barton, Wis., the Catholics rallied in force at the annual meeting last year, and *carried a resolution that no public school should be maintained during the year; and none was held*. This year the contest was renewed, but the Catholics took advantage of the new law giving women the right to vote at school elections, to bring out all their women, and carried the same resolution again. At Melrose, Minn., the Catholic priests engineered a movement to *shorten the school year of the public schools, in order to compel children to attend a parochial school*. Throughout Stearns County, Minn., the *Roman Catechism* is said to be *taught openly in the public schools, and either the opening or the closing hours of the session are devoted to religious instruction given by the priest*, all this being in direct violation of the State constitution, and especially of an amendment adopted in 1877, to meet this very condition. Most of this work has been done so quietly as not to attract wide attention, but the evidences of a determined assault upon the public-school system are now so clear that its friends are becoming aroused to the necessity of action.” {AMS June 1888, p. 47.7}

This piece of news will doubtless greatly encourage Mr. Stevenson and his constituents. And, at the same time, it ought to arouse every lover of American institutions-every lover of civil and religious liberty-to the most vigilant watchfulness in every State in the Union. But will it? {AMS June 1888, p. 47.8}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

Doctor Crafts says of the Sunday in politics:- {AMS June 1888, p. 47.9}

“Its enemies have already attacked it on the field of politics.” {AMS June 1888, p. 47.10}

But “its enemies” never attacked it on the field of politics until its friends attempted to sustain it on the field of politics. The first advances into the field of politics were by the Sunday-law forces, the gauntlet was by them first thrown down upon the political field, and if “its enemies” accepted the challenge, its friends have but themselves to blame. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.11}

In the matter between England and Ireland the Pope has spoken, and has spoken in favor of England, as was the foregone conclusion, because on the side of England is power, and it is official recognition by the power of England which just now the Pope wants more than any other imaginable thing. Besides this, the Pope knows that Catholic Ireland is forever secure to the Papacy whatever he may do, and therefore he can afford to traffic with England at Ireland’s expense to any extent that the necessities of the case may demand. If consistency were an attribute of the Papacy, then consistency would demand that the Pope should have decided this question just as he did, because it was the Pope who first gave Ireland to England. But the question of consistency never enters into any action of the Papacy; the sole question always is, What will advance the interests of the Papacy? And as now the supreme consideration is to secure the recognition of the Pope as a sovereign, England must be favored. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.12}

In his argument before the Senate Committee in behalf of National Sunday legislation, Dr. Crafts started out with the statement that,- {AMS June 1888, p. 47.13}

“A national evil requires a national remedy.” {AMS June 1888, p. 47.14}

Well, that depends. If it be meant by this that any evil that is as widespread as is the Nation, must be met by a remedy that is as widespread as is the Nation; or if it be meant that an evil done by the national power, should be remedied by the national power-then, very good, that is only to say that the plaster must cover the sore, and is self-evident. But if it be meant that any evil that is as widespread as is the Nation must be met by a remedy applied by national power, then no proposition can be more fallacious. It might very properly be said that covetousness and selfish greed is a national evil, but no remedy that could ever be applied by national power could effect anything at all toward curing the evil. Sin might be said to be a national evil-it is as much so as many of the things which Mr. Crafts mentions-but no remedy that can ever be applied by national power can affect sin in any way but to increase it. From Mr. Crafts’s whole argument, it is evident that it is in this latter sense that his proposition is to be understood. But a moment’s thought shows that the proposition as meant is to be taken with decided limitations. National evils require national remedies only when those evils are such as to be within the just province of civil government; and such the Sunday question is not in any of its forms. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.15}

Passing by a cigar stand the other day, we saw in bold letters the following free advice: “Smoke Sanitary Cigars!” and straightway we began to wonder what kind of cigars sanitary cigars could be. We could not think of anything that could make cigars healthful except the absence of tobacco, and that evidently was not what the enterprising cigar vender meant to suggest. Finally we concluded that sanitary cigars are just the ordinary vile compounds that we meet on the cars and the ferry-boats, and that their sanitary property is the same as that of certain “disinfectants,”-they smell so bad that people are forced to open the windows, and so they get a little fresh air. Even with that view, we think that “sanitary cigars” are a failure, for they usually smell bad enough to vitiate all the air in the neighborhood. Ordinary air stands no show in the presence of a dozen men with cigars. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.16}

The Christian Union’s Chicago correspondent, commenting on the fact that Dr. Fulton was not allowed by the city authorities to fill his appointment to lecture on the topic, “Is Popery in the Way?” because they feared a riot, thinks that refusal was unnecessary, and adds: “It surely is a dishonor to the Catholic Church if it is supposed that bloodshed would result if ever so violent addresses were made against it.” Indeed it is a dishonor to that church, and a dishonor which it has brought upon itself many times. The Catholic Church has had about fourteen centuries of such dishonor, for everybody who knows anything about that church knows that when it has had the power it has never hesitated to shed the blood of those who spoke against it. No man’s life would be safe if he should go into any community in the United States, where the Catholics are numerous, and should openly tell the truth concerning that church. A false religion has no other argument at its command but violence. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.17}

The following item from the Michigan Christian Advocate, which came to our notice just after the above was written, is a very good comment on the Christian Union’s statement that the Catholic Church is too good to cause blood to flow in consequence of addresses made against it: {AMS June 1888, p. 47.18}

“Michael Welch was telling a Gladwin audience why he left the Catholic Church, when a party of men entered the room, and informing him that they were after blood, began throwing bottles at his head.” {AMS June 1888, p. 47.19}

An apparently specious argument in favor of Sunday legislation, and one eminently satisfactory to those who make it, is this:- {AMS June 1888, p. 47.20}

“The liberty of rest for each demands a law of rest for all.” {AMS June 1888, p. 47.21}

Here are some kindred propositions: The liberty of worship for each demands a law of worship for all. The liberty of prayer for each demands a law of prayer for all. The liberty of singing psalms for each demands a law of singing psalms for all. The liberty of going to church for each demands a law of going to church for all. And thus we might extend such propositions to an in-finite length, every one of them being just as sound as is the one set forth by those Sunday-law advocates. The truth is that the liberty of rest for each demands nothing at all, unless it be that each shall be allowed to exercise his liberty or not, just as he in his liberty chooses. The proposition that “the liberty of rest for each demands a law of rest for all,” is a palpable absurdity. What these Sunday-law advocates mean to say is about as follows: We, in the exercise of our liberty of rest, demand a law that shall compel everybody else to rest just as we do. They will probably get their law in the end, but they will never accomplish their purpose with it, even though they do get it. {AMS June 1888, p. 47.22}

Not long since in the town of Livermore, California, a Catholic boy named Michael Hartigan went to a base-ball game instead of going to Catholic Church one Sunday. In the afternoon of the same day the boy met the Catholic priest in the road, when the priest took him severely to task in the way of a tongue-lashing, and finished it off by beating him with a cane. It is into the hands of such religious worthies as this, that the Sunday-law advocates want to put the power to prosecute everybody who does not choose to keep Sunday as they shall dictate. We are happy to announce that the priest was convicted of battery. But when everybody’s actions on Sunday shall, by law, be made subject to the officious surveillance of such religious meddlers as this, then what protection, what security, will there be for anybody? {AMS June 1888, p. 47.23}