

# THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 1886.

NUMBER 4.

## The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE  
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
OAKLAND, CAL.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

THE *Christian Herald* is not given to joking, but we can scarcely believe that it had any faith in its own words when it called New York “a Christian city.” We do not know the basis of its calculation; but we suppose if Lot could have found ten righteous persons in Sodom, it would be ready to name Sodom a righteous city. On such a basis it is not surprising that they think to make this a Christian nation by amending the National Constitution! The standard of Christianity is altogether too low now, and there is no need to lower it by legal enactments. If the advocates of the amendment spent as much time to convert people to the truths of the Bible, as they do to induce people to enforce the Bible by civil law, they would do far more towards making this a Christian nation.

### The Other Side.

THE advocates of a Religious Amendment of the Constitution love to refer to the expression of Mr. Abbot, as follows:—

“If I were a Christian, if I believed in Christianity, I do not see how I could help taking my stand at your side.”

But that expression was very unfortunate for Mr. Abbot. It did not destroy the force of his warning and his reasoning against the movement, but it did show that he was inconsistent in his positions. After showing what would be its evil effects upon the nation at large, how it would subvert the liberties of the people, he added:—

“If I wished to destroy Christianity in this country by unscrupulous means, I should encourage your attempt in every way.”

And this he said because of the reaction that the attempt will create against Christianity. There are many who are Christians who can see the dangers ahead just as readily as Mr. Abbot could, and who realize that the reaction will be detrimental to Christianity. Mr. Abbot's position implies that, though the dangers attendant upon this movement are very great, and easy to be seen; and though the reaction which it will cause will be fatal to Christianity, yet, were he a Christian, he would favor the movement! Not necessarily. There are many Christians who are not so inconsistent as his words indicate that he would be.

### Legalizing Christianity.

IN the first number of the *SENTINEL*, in outlining the course of argument which will be pursued in its columns, the following remark was made:—

“To carry this amendment into effect, any person who refuses to obey the laws and usages of Christianity must be subjected to penalties for his neglect or disobedience. As no law can exist without a penalty, no institutions or usages can be placed on a legal basis without authorizing penalties for their enforcement. This is undeniable.”

It may be well to emphasize this point in order to meet the many professions of the amendment party that their movement is harmless; that it is merely to secure a *declaration* of the supremacy of Christ and his laws, which cannot interfere with any man's rights, or do violence to any man's convictions. But such a declaration would not carry the force of law, and if that was what they are *really* aiming at, it would be harmless indeed. But, as is elsewhere shown in this paper, that is but the foundation on which they propose to erect “an imposing superstructure.” The superstructure includes the placing of the Christian religion, or its laws and usages and institutions, which means exactly the same thing, “on an undeniable *legal basis* in the fundamental law of the land.” And this means to secure the declaration as the necessary step to legalizing Christianity, which means to enforce it by “appropriate legislation” and the necessary penalties.

It has been said, strangely enough, that a penalty cannot with propriety be introduced until the law has been violated. The fallacy of this is apparent; for the penalty is that which alone distinguishes between *law* and *advice*. Advice leaves an individual free to act at his own option; while law is the expression of authority, and the only option a person has in regard to it is, to obey or suffer the penalty. But advice has no penalty; to attach a penalty thereto would be to convert it into law. The following strong language was used by Blackstone:—

“Where rewards are proposed, as well as punishments threatened, the obligation of the law seems chiefly to consist in the penalty; for rewards, in their nature, can only persuade and allure; nothing is *compulsory* but punishment.”

But it is in the very nature of law to be compulsory, and therefore without punishment or penalty, no law can exist. And so, to place Christianity on a legal basis is nothing less than to enforce it by penalties.

It was declared by a writer in the *Christian Statesman* that the religious amendment would

“disfranchise” every “consistent infidel.” But that expression only reaches to the voluntary action of the infidel himself, meaning that if he were consistent he could not support such a Government as the amendmentists contemplate. But of course it would not disfranchise the dishonorable or *inconsistent infidel*, because, as we have shown, such a Government would be every way favorable to dishonesty and hypocrisy. If it were calculated to promote morality and uprightness, it would disfranchise the dishonorable and inconsistent, instead of those of better character. They may reply, that they cannot control a person's mind, but only his overt actions. Very true; and this shows the absurdity, the arrant folly, of placing Christianity on a legal basis, or trying to enforce it by law, for without reaching the mind and the heart you have not reached the seat of Christianity. So-called Christianity without this, is only a mockery; and the amendment, at best, would only serve to enforce a mockery of Christianity. The overt actions with which alone human laws have to do, may have no relation whatever to true Christianity. The Christian religion is entirely beyond the reach and scope of civil or human Governments. And we are surprised that every person who has any understanding of the nature of Christianity, and has the capacity to reason, does not at once acknowledge this evident truth.

Such a disfranchisement as that of which the writer in the *Statesman* spoke, resting entirely upon the voluntary action of a man who acts only to preserve his consistency, *is no penalty*. It would be no part of that which enforces the usages and institutions of Christianity. But to put these usages and institutions on a legal basis, there must be penalties. And these penalties, of course, would be for the punishment of those who would not or did not observe the “laws, institutions, and usages,” of Christianity! We challenge any man to attempt to trace the facts to a different conclusion.

But these “National Reformers” have over and over said that their movement is not for the coercion of any man's conscience, and if successful it will not interfere with anybody's religion. But such an assertion is preposterous. They know better than to say what they do. In order to enforce Christian institutions and usages by law, these institutions and usages must be defined by law. And, in the midst of the interminable differences of religious beliefs, who shall define them? Who shall determine for this whole nation what are the laws, institutions, and usages of Christianity which they are to perform? Or, rather, who

shall decide, amongst the great diversity of beliefs, which we shall label "Christian," and which shall be ignored and denounced as heretical?

The American people will do well to wake up to the importance of examining these questions, for, unless this religious amendment movement shall be speedily checked, they are questions which cannot long be ignored. With the present prevailing indifference on the subject, the amendment may be carried in default of necessary action to prevent it. And we fear for the result. It will never be carried into effect *peaceably*. We have already defined our position in that respect; we shall offer no forcible resistance to its enforcement. But we cannot expect that all will be like-minded. Mr. Abbot, before the Cincinnati Convention, gave the warning which may one day be seen to be timely. He said:—

"I warn you against the peril of instigating the Christian part of our population to attempt this usurpation. I caution you against the folly of supposing that the majority of the people will finally consent to this subversion of their common liberties. I beg you to count the cost of this agitation before you carry it further. . . . I make no threat whatever, but I state a truth fixed as the hills when I say that before you can carry this measure, and trample on the freedom of the people, you will have to wade through seas of blood. Every man who favors it votes to precipitate the most frightful war of modern times; and it is simply preposterous for any of your number to speak of the liberals as 'threatening war.' You threaten war when you avow a purpose to destroy the equality of religious rights now guaranteed by the Constitution to all American citizens. On the assailant in this struggle be all responsibility of its results."

And the horrors of such a struggle, which is certain to follow the enactment of this amendment, would be greatly increased by the fact that it would not be bounded by State lines, as was our late war. It would be a war of parties in every State, every county, and every neighborhood in the land. And if it did not break out in open violence in every neighborhood, it would lead to endless animosities and strifes which would be anything but favorable to the interests of genuine Christianity. We pray that the Lord may open the eyes of those who are trying, though unwittingly, to precipitate such a struggle in our land.

J. H. W.

#### A Christian Nation.

An agent and lecturer of the National Reform Association wrote to the *Statesman* as follows:—

"While the evangelical churches in our land spend \$3,000,000 a year on Christian missions, our nation spends \$600,000,000 a year on rum. Only think, \$3,000,000 for the conversion of the heathen world, and \$35,000,000 for tobacco alone, and yet we call ourselves a Christian nation."

And if "we call ourselves a Christian nation," it is an act of hypocrisy; for we then call ourselves what we are not, and what we never will be. And only one thing could ever make us a Christian nation, namely, the conversion of the nation to Christianity. Thousands may be induced, for various reasons, to vote for the Religious Amendment to the Constitution who care nothing for the Christian religion. But

their votes will count as much as any to make this *legally* a Christian nation!

That we are correct in our judgment that people will vote for the amendment on other grounds than their personal regard for religion, we offer proof. We recently received a letter from one of the Southern States, in which the writer said that the people of that country were in favor of the Religious Amendment for the sole reason that they had been assured that it is the only means of putting down polygamy in Utah! We repeat what we have before said that the "Amendment Party" ought to show what could be done to that end, under such an amendment, that the Government is not already doing without the amendment; and if they cannot do this—as they surely cannot—then they ought to confess the deception which they have been and still are practicing upon the people. It is a shame to the intelligence of that party of eminent men that they make no distinction between crime and religion. It is a shame to them to argue that, under our Constitution as it is, all manner of crimes may be *legally* committed under the name of religion. It is a shame to them that they try to prove the right of the Government to regulate our actions in matters of religion, because its right is undisputed to regulate our actions in things secular. We have heard just such arguments made. One speech in the National Convention held in Pittsburg, Pa., in 1874, was devoted almost entirely to examples of Government controlling the action of its citizens, and every instance was concerning secular matters; and they were given to show that what they seek is in harmony with the uniform policy of the Government! We verily believe that the speaker was so wedded to his theory that he was deceived in regard to the matter of his address. And so were many in his audience; but not all.

The Lansing (Mich.) *State Republican*, in speaking of the National Convention held in Cincinnati in 1872, gave a good testimony in regard to people voting for the amendment who care nothing about religion. It said:—

"Thousands of men, if called upon to vote for such an amendment, would hesitate to vote against God, although they might not believe that the amendment is necessary or that it is right; and such men would either vote affirmatively or not at all. In either case, such an amendment would be likely to receive an affirmative vote which would by no means indicate the true sentiment of the people. And the same rule would hold good in relation to the adoption of such an amendment by Congress or by the legislatures of three-quarters of the States. Men who make politics a trade would hesitate to record their names against the proposed Constitutional Amendment, advocated by the great religious denominations of the land, and indorsed by such men as Bishop Simpson, Bishop McIlvaine, Bishop Eastburn, President Finney, Professor Lewis, Professor Seelye, Bishop Huntington, Bishop Kerfoot, Dr. Patterson, Dr. Cuyler, and many other divines who are the representative men of their respective denominations."

And yet every vote so given would be counted as indicating the religious sentiment and feeling of the nation. We would be glad to be assured that the practice of such deceptions as those to which we have referred, will cease. Let us have honest dealing. If anything

should be fairly and candidly considered, it is the question of a change of the entire policy of our Government where the civil and religious rights of our citizens are so deeply involved.

But more than this; we have the assent of the most earnest laborers in behalf of the amendment to the fact which we have stated. Thus Mr. W. J. Coleman, a prominent lecturer of that party, spoke thus in a convention, Oct. 5, 1882:—

"The third principle raised by this National Reform movement is rather theological, so far at least as it is proved by Scripture and not by what is called 'natural religion,' if there be any such thing. I am aware that there is great distaste in this country and time to the acceptance of anything that is proved out of the Bible, and a corresponding liking for the results of *pure reason*; that is, human reason. I am aware that men in general would be fairly willing to go thus far because it would relieve the conscience from a faint suspicion of atheism, while at the same time an acknowledgment of God as Creator does not of itself impose any restraint on the conscience, nor fix a single law requiring their obedience. We have it in our State Constitutions, and it has little or no force. It would be complimentary, but not of itself binding. It is to be supposed that this is about the length that the daily papers consider that we are going."

And it is quite natural to suppose so, seeing that these "reformers" so often assure us that their movement is so very harmless,—simply the recognition of God, and his Son, and the Bible in the Constitution,—which cannot possibly infringe upon any one's rights. And inasmuch as "men in general would be fairly willing to go thus far," because it would "not of itself impose any restraint on the conscience" (as it surely ought not), therefore it oftentimes is convenient to thus present it to the hearers—to win the voters. But this is not their intention. Mr. Coleman continued:—

"If we were to stop here, I should share in their indifference. But we do *not stop here*. This is simply the foundation for an imposing structure. These principles are only premises; the conclusion is yet to come, and it has this dangerous character of the syllogism that the conclusion *must* come, and come with invincible power."

These are truthful expressions of the aims of that party. They, too, would be indifferent if they were to stop where *no restraint is imposed on the conscience!* And they ought to stop just short of that point. Human Governments are for the protection of society, and have only to deal with actions, or actual violations of law. But we must remember that this is to be a *religious* amendment, and is by no means to stop where no restraints are imposed on the conscience. Fatal admission to their professions of the innocency of their movement. What right have they to impose restraints upon my conscience, or yours, or that of any man? How would they like to have restraints imposed on their consciences? Oh, no; that is not supposable. They are the infallible ones, who alone have a right to freedom of conscience! Does Rome go further than this? People who talk like that would erect the Inquisition, if once the power were in their hands.

With all this before us, people still ask us, "What's the harm?" We fear that our motto is already true of a vast number of American

citizens who are willing to give away their birthright—"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves." But we promise that we shall never have our consciences bound by any human Government without publishing to the world our protest. And we promise to faithfully warn our fellow-citizens of the danger which impends over their civil and religious liberties, and to the best of our ability to earn the name of an AMERICAN SENTINEL. J. H. W.

### What Do They Want?

THE second article of the Constitution of the National Reform Association reads, in part as follows: "The object of this society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; . . . And to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

We must suppose that those words are intended to conceal some ulterior design; for we are morally certain that none of the National Reformers care to see just the condition of things which the above article might, on a casual reading, seem to demand. By a little examination of the subject we can see that the expressed object of the National Reform Party could not be realized unless the religious bodies of this country should undergo a great transformation.

Our first question is, What is Christianity? Webster defines it as, "The religion of Christians; the system of doctrines and precepts taught by Christ." Then right in connection with this, we must answer the question, What are Christian institutions? The obvious answer is, The ordinances of the Christian religion; those instituted by Christ. And as all the professed followers of Christ, professors of the Christian religion, are termed as a body, the church, we may say that Christian institutions are the ordinances of the Christian church.

When we come to an examination of the subject of Christian ordinances, we shall find that there are very few of them. The apostle Paul describes one of them in 1 Cor. 11 : 23-26: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

One Christian ordinance, then, is the Lord's Supper. It was instituted by Christ, is enjoined upon all his followers, and is peculiar to Christianity. One more: Just as Christ was about to ascend to Heaven, he said to his disciples: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and

is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16 : 15, 16. To these two ordinances some Christians add the washing of feet as found in John 13 : 1-15; but all are agreed on the first two. Here, then, we have two, or at the most, three Christian ordinances. They are peculiar to Christianity, and besides them there are no others.

Some one will exclaim, "What about the Golden Rule?" We reply, That is not peculiar to Christianity. Do not misunderstand us. We do not say that the keeping of it is not necessary to Christianity, but that it is not peculiar to Christianity. When our Saviour said, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," he immediately added, "for this is the law and the prophets." The golden rule is simply a summary of the last six precepts of the decalogue; but the decalogue was in existence and of obligation before man fell, and consequently before there was any need of Christianity. The ten commands, which comprise all primary obligation, would have been just as much in force as they are now, even if there had been no fall involving the necessity for a Christian religion; and more than this, they are now, as they were in the beginning, of universal obligation; so that they are equally binding on Jews, Mohammedans, Christians, and pagans. But baptism and the Lord's Supper not only are not obligatory upon Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans, but they are positively denied to such until they profess allegiance to Christ.

We repeat, therefore, that the only possible Christian ordinances are baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the ordinance of humility, or feet-washing. These are the features which outwardly indicate the possession of Christianity. And therefore if a nation is to be really a "Christian nation," these features must exist in it. If it demands that all its subjects submit to these ordinances, then it will be, *in name*, a Christian nation; but if none of these features exist in it, then it is in no sense a Christian nation.

Has the United States any of these Christian features? Does it require any or all of them as a condition of citizenship? Everybody answers, No. Then it has no "existing Christian features" to be maintained. National Reform zeal, therefore, in that particular, is entirely misapplied.

Now for a brief consideration of the difficulties in the way of making this a "Christian nation," *i. e.*, a nation having Christian features. At the outset we are met with a controversy over baptism. A large and respectable body of Christian professors hold that nothing but immersion is baptism. Many more hold that sprinkling meets the requirement of the Saviour; while still others teach that either immersion, sprinkling, or pouring is baptism. Most immersionists hold that a single immersion is all that can be allowed, while some claim three immersions are necessary to constitute baptism. Here is an irreconcilable controversy; for though the matter has been under discussion for centuries, it is no nearer a settlement than in the beginning. Concerning the Lord's Supper there is almost equal division. A large part of the so-called Christian church with-

holds the cup from the laity, while many are of late disposed to dispense with the entire ordinance. As for the third ordinance, it is celebrated by but few, the greater part of professed Christians being utterly opposed to it.

But it is useless to carry this point any further, for if you were to put the question, the entire body of "National Reformers" would with one voice declare that they desire no such thing as that the nation shall recognize baptism, the Lord's Supper, etc. And in so saying they would speak the truth. Nevertheless they do declare that this is, or ought to be, a Christian nation, and that "all Christian laws, institutions, and usages," should be placed "on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land;" and we know that that can be done only by making the Constitution require the celebration of baptism and the Lord's Supper as a condition of citizenship. It must be that they have something else in mind, which in their opinion is peculiar to Christianity, and upon which there would not be among professed Christians so much difference of opinion. What do they want, anyway? In a future article we shall let them tell for themselves. E. J. W.

### The Stranger—the Dissenter.

THE following poetry appeared in the *Christian Statesman*, copied from *Harper's Magazine*:

#### AN EASTERN LEGEND.

An aged man came late to Abraham's tent.  
The sky was dark, and all the plain was bare.  
He asked for bread; his strength was well-nigh spent;  
His haggard look implored the tenderest care.  
The food was brought. He sat with thankful eyes,  
But spake no grace, nor bowed he toward the east.  
Safe-sheltered here from dark and angry skies,  
The bounteous table seemed a royal feast.  
But ere his hand had touched the tempting fare,  
The patriarch rose, and leaning on his rod,  
"Stranger," he said, "dost thou not bow in prayer?  
Dost thou not fear, dost thou not worship God?"  
He answered, "Nay." The patriarch sadly said:  
"Thou hast my pity. Go! eat not my bread."

Another came that wild and fearful night.  
The fierce winds raged, and darker grew the sky;  
But all the tent was filled with wondrous light,  
And Abraham knew the Lord his God was nigh.  
"Where is that aged man?" the Presence said,  
"That asked for shelter from the driving blast?  
Who made thee master of thy Master's bread?  
What right hadst thou the wanderer forth to cast?"  
"Forgive me, Lord," the patriarch answer made,  
With downcast look, with bowed and trembling knee,  
"Ah, me! the stranger might with me have staid,  
But, O, my God, he would not worship thee."  
"I've borne him long," God said, "and still I wait;  
Couldst thou not lodge him one night in thy gate?"

Also the following words are copied from the *Christian Statesman*, original with the "Reverend" gentleman who uttered them at a "National Reform Convention:"—

"If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own on infidel and atheistical ideas, and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die."

And when they are "disfranchised" and banished, or dead and gone, the model Christian Reformers (?) can reverently sing:—

"Ah, me! the stranger might with us have staid,  
But, O, our God, he would not worship thee."

But in the meantime we recommend them to use the words of Burns:—

"O wad some power the giftie gie us,  
To see oursel's as ithers see us."

### Judge Black on Utah.

WHEN we were in Salt Lake City, last year, we had a 28-page pamphlet presented to us by a zealous Mormon, the pamphlet being an argument by Judge Jeremiah S. Black before the Judiciary Committee of the United States House of Representatives. In this are some strange statements, but we notice only the closing paragraph. It reads as follows:—

“Coming back to the original and fundamental proposition that you have no right to legislate about marriage in a Territory, you will ask, Then what are we to do with polygamy? It is a bad thing, and a false religion that allows it. But the people of Utah have as good a right to their false religion as you have to your true one. Then you add that it is not a religious error merely, but a crime which ought to be extirpated by the sword of the civil magistrate. That is also conceded. But those people have a civil Government of their own, which is as wrong-headed as their church. Both are free to do evil on this and kindred subjects if they please, and they are neither of them answerable to you. That brings you to the end of your string.”

As the argument of a paid attorney, for in this capacity he made the argument, it is passable. But as the opinion of a statesman and a jurist, it is more than questionable. He concedes that polygamy is “a crime which ought to be extirpated by the sword of the civil magistrate.” But the civil magistrate and the Territorial lawmakers and the church are alike in collusion with crime, and therefore you have no remedy! Now it is a fact beyond denial that the property and even the lives of anti-Mormons, and especially of seceding Mormons, have not been safe in many parts of Utah, except when protected by a power outside of that of the Territory. And if they have authority to legalize one crime, they may legalize any and all crimes. And Judge Black would coolly say: “And what are you going to do about it?”

Traced to its legitimate conclusion, the case would then stand thus: It is the right and duty of the United States to appoint judges to hold courts in Utah. And if theft and murder were legalized in Utah, the Federal Courts would be compelled to rule in favor of theft and murder, because they were protected by the Territorial statutes! And the General Government would be powerless, would have no right to interfere, because the Territory is independent of the Federal Government. If the argument of Judge Black were conceded to be correct, then all Congressional laws for the government of Territories would be nullities, and United States Courts in the Territories would be farces. Fortunately for our nation, this doctrine of crimes is not accepted by the General Government.

But there is one class in the United States which ought to rejoice at the state of things which has obtained in Utah; it is the “National Reform Association.” In Utah was presented an illustration of the workings of just such a Government as that for which they are laboring. In Utah the civil Government existed “to serve the interests of the church.” In Utah the civil power “formed an alliance” with the church, and acknowledged its obligation “to adhere to, defend, and maintain” the

religion which the church decided was the right religion. If this is not just such a Government as they wish ours to become, then their words give the lie to their desires.

But they may reply, We do not want an alliance between the State and the Church for such an object; we do not want that it should uphold polygamy. Very likely. But, unfortunately, if you ally the Church and the State, as you avow that it is your object to do, you have no possible means of determining what kind of religion, or what acts as religious acts, will be upheld. In such a Government as ours, the religion of the nation would be liable to be changed with every change of administration! Of this we challenge a denial. To hope that the whole body of people would quietly acquiesce in any particular form of religion, year after year, would be the height of folly. The truth is that people are changing their religious faiths continually; and with every change of faith there would be a clamor for a corresponding change in the religious laws. And the vote of the careless, the indifferent, or the unbeliever, would carry just as much weight in the settlement of these questions, as the vote of the most pious Christian.

We do not believe that *the people* are so blind as not to see the truthfulness of our remarks. We shall try, in all honesty of purpose, to arouse the attention of the country to the danger which awaits our liberties if this Religious Amendment shall be carried. J. H. W.

### Church and State.

WE have already proved, on two distinct counts, that the movement represented by the National Reform Association carries in itself “the promise and potency” of a union of Church and State in the United States. We shall here present additional proofs to the same purpose.

In the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, January 31 and February 1, 1872, Mr. Francis E. Abbot presented a remonstrance against the object of the convention. Rev. A. D. Mayo, D. D., of Cincinnati, replied to it. In his remarks he said:—

“One would think the gentleman had come all the way from Toledo to Cincinnati to utter a prophet’s warning against some future danger threatened by us. Why, he is now living as a citizen of Ohio, under a Constitution that substantially includes every idea we propose to place in the national charter. The Constitution of Ohio begins with a confession of dependence on Almighty God as the author of the liberties it is made to preserve. It declares that ‘religion is essential to good government.’ And by ‘religion’ it means just what this proposed amendment means,—that in order that a State shall endure, its citizens should be religious men; should live according to the highest idea of morality, which, in this State, is the moral system of Jesus Christ; and that the State itself should conform to that idea of morality in its legislation and character, as it hopes for life. *That’s all there is in this thing.*”

Dr. Mayo also cited the new Constitution of Missouri, formed after the war had closed, as another example, and said:—

“Just what the people of the State of Missouri did will the people of the United States finally do. They will plant in their great charter of liberties an acknowledgment of the nation’s dependence on Almighty God, and its

duty to conform to the laws of religious or Christian morality.”

Here is a plain argument that the Constitutions of Ohio and Missouri contain and mean all that the religiously amended Constitution of the United States will mean; that the Constitution of Ohio “substantially includes every idea” that the National Reform Association proposes to place in “the national charter;” that the Constitution of Ohio embraces “all there is in this [National Reform] thing.” Very well, be it so. From this it follows that in the State of Ohio, under that Constitution, there should be found a condition of government and society such as is expected to be formed in the whole nation by the Religious Amendment to the National Constitution. That is the theory; how stands the fact?

The Constitution of Ohio declares that “religion is essential to good government,” and that “means just what this proposed [National Reform] amendment means.” Now how much more religion, or how much better government, is there in Ohio than there is in any other State in the Union? How much purer is politics in Ohio than it is anywhere else? Let the late elections in the State testify.

The Constitution of Ohio means just what the Religious Amendment means; and under this proposed amendment the National Reform party insists that our rulers must be “Christian men;” if not actually church members, they must be “men who believe in Christianity” (*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 8, 1877). How does this work under the Ohio Constitution? Why, in 1883 Hon. George Hoadly, an avowed infidel, was elected governor. And under the title of “An Infidel Elected Governor,” the editor of the *Christian Statesman*, Nov. 1, 1883, said:—

“By a decision of the popular will, Mr. Hoadly, a pronounced unbeliever in the Christian religion, is governor-elect of the great State of Ohio. His record on this point is unmistakable, not merely in that he was counsel against the Bible in the schools, for a professed Christian like Stanley Matthews stood with him in that effort, but in that he has been for years one of the vice-presidents of the Free Religious Association. He is well known also to favor the programme of the Liberals as to the complete secularization of the State by the abolition of all vestiges of Christian usages from the administration of government. The Christian people of Ohio, therefore, believers in the supreme authority of the Christian religion, are to have for their chief magistrate a man who denies that the Christian religion is revealed from God, and who looks elsewhere for the grounds of moral obligation.”

The Constitutions of Ohio and Missouri mean, on this subject, just what the Religious Amendment means; and one of the chief, avowed purposes of the Religious Amendment is to secure forever the reading of the Bible in the public schools of the nation. Now, at the very time when Dr. Mayo uttered these words in Cincinnati, there was then pending in the courts of the State of Ohio this very question of the Bible in the schools. The case went to the Supreme Court of the State. And under that Constitution which they say means just what the proposed National Amendment means, the Supreme Court affirmed the legality of the Cincinnati School Board, prohibiting prayer and the reading of the Scriptures in the public



schools. In St. Louis, also, under their model Missouri Constitution, the Bible has been excluded from the schools. We might thus go through the whole list of subjects which they make prominent in their work; but these are enough to expose the sophistry of the National Reform advocates.

Therefore, if it be true that, on the subject of religion, the Constitution of Ohio means just what the proposed Religious Amendment to the National Constitution means; if in that there is "all there is in this," then it is positively proven that when they shall have secured their Religious Amendment to the United States Constitution, a pronounced unbeliever in the Christian religion, a man who is "well known to favor the abolition of *all vestiges* of Christian usages from the administration of government,"—in short, a man who is opposed to every principle which they advocate, may be president of the great nation of the United States. Under their religiously amended Constitution, the Bible may be excluded from all the schools in the land. Then, too, politics may be just as corrupt everywhere as they are now in Ohio. Where, then, will there be any practical difference between the workings of government under the amended Constitution, and those workings under the Constitution as it now is? None at all. If then they mean what they said at Cincinnati, where lies the efficacy of their movement? Ah! there is the point; they do not mean at all what they said by Mr. Mayo, at Cincinnati. They know that the Ohio Constitution does *not* substantially include every idea which they propose to place in the national charter. They know that that is *not* "all there is in this thing." Says the *Christian Statesman* of November 1, 1883:—

"An acknowledgment of God does not of itself impose any restraint on the conscience, nor fix a single law requiring obedience. We have it in our State Constitutions, and it has little or no force. It would be complimentary, but not itself binding. . . . But we do *not stop here*. This is simply the foundation for an imposing structure. These principles are only premises, the conclusion is yet to come, and it has this dangerous character of the syllogism, that the conclusion *must* come, and come with invincible power."

And what is the conclusion? This:—

"That such changes with respect to the oath of office, and *all other matters*, should be introduced *into the body* of the Constitution as may be necessary to *give effect* to these amendments in the preamble."—*Memorial to Congress, in 1864*.

Exactly; and one of the very first changes that will have to be introduced into the body of the Constitution to *give effect* to the Christianized preamble, will be to so alter the First Amendment that Congress shall make laws establishing religion, and prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and the Sixth Article will have to be changed so that religious tests shall be required as qualification for office.

But in the almost endless discussion that will necessarily arise in regard to the changes with respect to the oath and *all other matters*, where shall the final decisions be made upon what changes shall, or shall not be made? By what shall these questions be tested? That is easily enough discovered; here is the wonderful touch-

stone that is to detect all false legislation and prove the true.

"The churches and the pulpits 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 it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the *final decisions* of most points will be developed there. Many nations shall come, and say, 'Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the *law shall go forth of Zion*.'"—

Again:—

"We will not allow the civil Government to decide between them [the churches] and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws."—*Statesman, Feb. 21, 1884*.

To be sure, the united churches are "Zion;" "the law shall go forth of Zion;" "the *final decisions* will be developed there," and "we will not allow the civil Government to do this or that. And when the churches as one body, under the title of the National Reform Association, shall have reached that place where they can say in the plenitude of their power, "We will not allow the civil Government" to do so and so, there will be no single element lacking to the perfect union of Church and State. However often they may declare by word that their movement does not contemplate such a union, all their affirmations and re-affirmations in denial cannot hide the evidence of their works, nor disprove the fact that the National Reform Association affects to render the ecclesiastical "independent of, and superior to, the civil power," in this Government. A. T. J.

#### Have Infidels any Rights?

THEY who have heard the "National Reformers" speak, or have read their writings, know full well that they wish to have our Government so changed as to deny the rights of citizenship to infidels. First, they shall be declared ineligible to office in the proposed "Christian" Government, and secondly, they will necessarily be disfranchised. This leads us to ask, in all sincerity, if infidels have *any* rights.

The Saviour, in his "sermon on the mount," taught that the perfection of Christian character is found in disinterested and universal benevolence. We are to be "perfect even as our Father in Heaven is perfect," who "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." See Matt. 5: 43-48.

Were we going to answer our own query as to whether infidels have any rights, we should say that it depends altogether on the relations covered by the question. In the church they have no rights; in our religious systems they have no rights. On this point there can be no dispute. In the church the infidel would be out of his place; he has no rights there—he has no right to be there. By all means keep the infidel out of the church. And as the church has jurisdiction only over its own members, it has no jurisdiction over infidels. To the church is committed the power and duty to exercise discipline, but in the exercise of this

power it has no authority or right to go outside of its own membership.

But the infidel has a right *to live*. He was born in his fallen condition, for no one is born a Christian. "Ye must be born again," are the words of Christ to all. The disabilities of the infidel he inherited from our common birthhood. And we may not deny him a place in the Creator's domain because he does not, as well as we, appreciate the responsibilities of his position. We all "were by nature the children of wrath, even as others," and it is only by divine grace that we differ from others.

He has a right to *acquire the means of living*. This necessarily attends upon the right to live. No avenue to business, to the acquisition of property, should be shut up against him because he is an infidel.

He has a right to *family* privileges. As a son of Adam he has a right to that institution given to the father of the race—to Adam. We cannot agree with the Catholic Church, which makes marriage a Christian ordinance or sacrament, for marriage is older than the Christian church—older than Christianity. That which the Creator gave to the father of the race belongs to the race, and not alone to any class.

He has a right to *social* privileges. He and his family are not to be ostracized because of his unbelief. In the neighborhood, in the ordinary transactions of life, all stand on an equality.

And it follows of necessity that he has rights *in the Government*. He has an interest in the proper administration of Government equal to that of any other man. He has the same interest to be protected in his right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." He pays taxes to the Government even as others, and has the same right to Government protection that others have. His ability and his judgment in business transactions, and in matters of civil Government, are not to be disputed, nor should they be scorned because of his unbelief. He often has these desirable qualities in a far higher degree than has his Christian neighbor. On this subject we commend the following words of Macaulay to the candid consideration of all:—

"All civil disabilities on account of religious opinions are indefensible. For all such disabilities make Government less efficient for its main end; they limit its choice of able men for the administration and defense of the State; they alienate from it the hearts of the sufferers; they deprive it of a part of its effective strength in all contests with foreign nations. Such a course is as absurd as it would be in the governors of a hospital to reject an able surgeon because he is a Universal Restitutionist, and to send a bungler to operate because he is perfectly orthodox."

But we must not be surprised that these self-styled National Reformers are ready to deny the infidel these rights; to deny them is a legitimate consequence of the course they are pursuing, for *they have always been denied where Church and State were united*. And more than this, they are not only denied to infidels, but to all Christians who dissent from the faith of the dominant party. It was so when the church of Rome became fully allied to the secular power. It was so in New England to just the extent that the Church and the State were al-

lied. Both Quakers and Baptists, no matter how pure was their Christian life, were denied the common rights of citizenship. It was so in Maryland when the State allied itself to the Protestants, and tried to put down the Catholics. It is so in Utah, where the "Gentiles" are not considered as having any rights which the "saints" are bound to respect; and were it not for our National Government the rights of no dissenters would be regarded. It is perfectly consistent for these religious amendmentists to follow in the footsteps of their predecessors in the union of church and State.

If the infidel has a right to live, to acquire the means to sustain life, to enjoy family and social privileges, he has a right to enjoy these privileges in the Government wherever he may chance to be. By virtue of his citizenship he is an integral part of the Government.

But if the infidel has rights in the Government, and has no rights in the church, then the church and the Government must be kept clearly distinct and separate; otherwise he will be deprived of his rights in the State, or exercise them under church regulations. If the church has the right to say that none but Christians shall be eligible to office, or to vote for officers, in the State, it has then the power to administer discipline outside of its membership. And then it would be truly consistent for the church to disfranchise and even to banish infidels, for *infidels have no rights within church jurisdiction*. Every one ought to see that this effort to subordinate the State to the church, and to make the State an instrument "to serve the interests of the church," to "profess, adhere to, defend, and maintain the true religion," inevitably tends to usurpation in the State and to the corruption of the church.

In the convention in Cleveland, Ohio, Dr. McAllister well said that nations "are a necessity of life." "It is optional with a man," he said, "whether he becomes a member of any of these artificial bodies, banks, bridge companies, etc., or not; he may join them, or not, just as he pleases. But a man cannot prevent his membership in a nation." And why not? Because he cannot prevent his being born within the limits of the nation. His rights as a member of the nation (not of a church) he acquires by birth; and of these none may deprive him. From this conclusion there is no escape, unless our "Reformers" take another (and to them consistent) step, and deny that the infidel has a right to be born! Whether or not he has the right, we consider that it would be *unfortunate* for him to be born under the rule of this "National Reform Association," or in any State of which they had any control.

J. H. W.

#### Injustice of Religious Intolerance.

THE following thoughts are taken from a work entitled "Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions." The author is unknown. The principles advanced are so much to the point, and so clearly set forth the utter impropriety of a movement just being put forth by the National Reform Party, that we take pleasure in submitting them to the candid reader. He says:—

"Whether established opinions are false or

true, it is alike the interest of the community that investigation should be unrestrained, in order that if false, they be discarded, and, if true, rendered conspicuous to all. The only way of fully attaining the benefits of truth is to suffer opinions to maintain themselves against attack, or fall in the contest. The terrors of the law are wretched replies to argument, disgraceful to a good, and feeble auxiliaries to a bad cause. If there was any fixed and unquestionable standard by which the validity of opinions could be tried, there might be some sense, and some utility, in checking the extravagances of opinion by legal interference; but since there is no other standard than the general reason of mankind, discussion is the only method of trying the correctness of all doctrines whatever; and it is the highest presumption in any man, or any body of men, to erect their tenets into a criterion of truth, and overwhelm dissent and opposition by penal inflictions. Such conduct can proceed on no principle which would not justify all persecutions that disgrace the page of ecclesiastical history.

"Let established opinions be defended with the utmost power of reason; let the learning of schools and colleges be brought to their support; let elegance and taste display them in their most enchanting colors; let no labor, no expense, no arguments be spared in upholding their authority; but, in the name of humanity, resort not to the aid of the pillory and the dungeon. When they cannot be maintained by knowledge and reason, it will surely be time to suspect that judicial severities will be but a feeble protection.

"The allurements and the menaces of power are alike incapable of establishing opinions in the mind, or eradicating those which are already there. They may draw hypocritical professions from avarice and ambition, or extort verbal renunciations from fear and feebleness; but this is all they can accomplish. The way to alter belief is not to address motives to the will, but arguments to the intellect. To do otherwise, to apply rewards and punishments to opinions, is as absurd as to raise men to the peerage for their ruddy complexions, to whip them for the gout, and hang them for the scrofula.

"The penalty of the law can change no man's opinion. In order to change the perceptions you must change the thing perceived. To illustrate: Take any controverted fact in history; let a man make himself perfectly acquainted with the statements and authorities on both sides, and, at the end of his investigation, he will either believe, doubt, or disbelieve the fact in question. Now apply any possible motive to his mind. Blame him, praise him, intimidate him by threats, or allure him by promises, and after all your efforts, how far will you have succeeded in changing the state of his intellect in relation to the fact? It is true that you may so intimidate by threats that you can succeed in making a man assert that he believes so and so, but all the powers of the universe could not make him believe his assertion."

How utterly unjust and absurd, then, to enact laws, and enforce them, that restrict men in their opinions concerning certain doctrines. Men may be forced to yield to the menaces of law, but this brutal way of compelling men to

submit to what they do not believe, serves only to destroy their individuality and check that spirit of investigation which is so essential to intellectual growth.

E. HILLIARD.

Minneapolis, Minn.

#### Macaulay on Gladstone.

IT is the duty, Mr. Gladstone tells us, of the persons, be they who they may, who hold supreme power in the State, to employ that power in order to promote whatever they may deem to be theological truth. Now, surely, before he can call on us to admit this proposition, he is bound to prove that these persons are likely to do more good than harm by so employing their power. The first question is, whether a Government, proposing to itself the propagation of religious truth as one of its principal ends, is more likely to lead the people right than to lead them wrong? Mr. Gladstone evades this question; and perhaps it was his wisest course to do so.

"If," says he, "the Government be good let it have its natural duties and powers at its command; but, if not good, let it be made so. . . . We follow, therefore, the true course in looking first for the true idea, or abstract conception of a Government, of course with allowance for the evil and frailty that are in man, and then in examining whether there be comprised in that idea a capacity and consequent duty on the part of a Government to lay down any laws, or devote any means for the purposes of religion,—in short, to exercise a choice upon religion."

Of course, Mr. Gladstone has a perfect right to argue any abstract question, provided that he will constantly bear in mind that it is only an abstract question that he is arguing. Whether a perfect Government would or would not be a good machinery for the propagation of religious truth is certainly a harmless, and may, for aught we know, be an edifying subject of inquiry. But it is very important that we should remember that there is not, and never has been, any such Government in the world. There is no harm at all in inquiring what course a stone thrown into the air would take, if the law of gravitation did not operate. But the consequences would be unpleasant, if the inquirer, as soon as he had finished his calculation, were to begin to throw stones about in all directions, without considering that his conclusion rests on a false hypothesis, and that his projectiles, instead of flying away through infinite space, will speedily return in parabolas, and break the windows and heads of his neighbors.

It is very easy to say that Governments are good, or, if not good, ought to be made so. But what is meant by good Government? And how are all the bad Governments in the world to be made good? And of what value is a theory which is true only on a supposition in the highest degree extravagant?

We do not, however, admit that, if a Government were, for all its temporal ends, as perfect as human frailty allows, such a Government would, therefore, be necessarily qualified to propagate true religion. For we see that the fitness of Governments to propagate true religion is by no means proportioned to their fitness for the temporal end of their institution. Looking at individuals, we see that the princes under whose rule nations have been most ably

protected from foreign and domestic disturbance, and have made the most rapid advances in civilization, have been by no means good teachers of divinity. Take, for example, the best French sovereign, Henry the Fourth, a king who restored order, terminated a terrible civil war, brought the finances into an excellent condition, made his country respected throughout Europe, and endeared himself to the great body of the people whom he ruled. Yet this man was twice a Huguenot, and twice a papist. He was, as Davila hints, strongly suspected of having no religion at all in theory, and was certainly not much under religious restraints in his practice. Take the Czar Peter, the Empress Catherine, Frederick the Great. It will surely not be disputed that these sovereigns, with all their faults, were, if we consider them with reference merely to the temporal ends of Government, above the average of merit. Considered as theological guides, Mr. Gladstone would probably put them below the most abject drivelers of the Spanish branch of the house of Bourbon.

### The Tobacco Plague.

JOSEPH COOK, in a late Boston lecture, spoke as follows, every word of which we heartily indorse:—

"A gentleman long in a public position of honor and responsibility, sends me in writing a very suggestive illustration. A lady from the country came to Boston to do shopping. On her way to Boston a gentleman occupied half the seat with her on the cars. Half his time was spent in the smoking car and the rest with the lady. When she arrived in Boston, she was sick and was obliged to send for a physician. He examined her case, and informed her that she had been made ill by tobacco. She paid the doctor's bill and went home without doing her business, and wondering whether non-smokers have any rights which smokers are bound to respect. Another lady says she cannot come to Boston to do business on account of the ever-present fumes of tobacco in the street and shops.

"No doubt tobacco blunts the sense of propriety. The narcotic nosegay is as unconscious of the odors he exhales as is the eater of onions and garlic. 'Indifference or apathy with regard to the comfort of others,' says the *London Times*, 'is one of the most remarkable effects of tobacco. No other drug will produce anything like it. The opium-eater does not compel you to eat opium with him. The drunkard does not compel you to drink. The smoker compels you to smoke; nay, more, to breathe the smoke he has just discharged from his own mouth.'

"A lady coming from the South for her health was kept in the state-room of the steamer during all the voyage, on account of tobacco smoke on every part of the vessel, and lost the whole effect of the voyage because she could have no fresh air. Her husband, a lawyer, thinks that in equity she could bring a suit for damages against the steamboat company.

"The new State House in Des Moines, Ia., will not allow smokers to enter its portals. An edict has just gone forth that tobacco must not

be used in the halls and corridors of the White House in Washington. Our military and naval academies do not allow their pupils to use tobacco. Several colleges in the West prohibit the use of tobacco by their students. Germany has excellent laws forbidding the sale of tobacco to minors. Eighteen States in the American Union are now teaching children to abstain from alcoholics and narcotics, and my proposition is that the churches, both preachers and members, should rise at least to the secular level of the State Legislatures on both these subjects."

THE following, told by John B. Gough, shows the danger of using alcoholic wine at the communion. And we can but express our surprise that some ministers will persist in using it as a substitute for—"the fruit of the vine" used by our Saviour. Alcohol is in no sense the fruit of the vine:—

A gentleman told me in New York: "I was a sad drunkard; I became a Christian at Mr. Moody's Hippodrome meetings at New York. I had signed the pledge. I wanted to do work for the Lord. I joined a certain church because the pastor was very sympathizing with us, and I had been working in his gospel tent, and trying to rescue men. Well, I believed and boasted that the love of Jesus had taken away all appetite for drink. Three weeks ago there was the communion service. I smelled the drink and wanted it. My fingers began to tingle. There was an itching, burning, dry sensation in my throat. I wanted it. I tried to pray. I tried to think that I had come there to show forth the 'Lord's death till he come.' It was of no use. I gripped the seat. I ground my teeth. I sat in perfect agony. The wine approached me. I shuddered from head to foot. If I had taken it in my hand there would not have been a drop of it left. I know it, and I have been fighting that appetite for three weeks with all the power I had to fight anything, and I am very glad you have comforted me by the assurance that I may yet be a child of God, though subject to this terrible temptation."

BREWERS and distillers use per year 40,000,000 bushels of grain, averaging, if ground, forty pounds of flour to the bushel. This would make sixty pounds of bread, or fifteen four-pound loaves to the bushel. Here we have equal to 600,000,000 loaves of bread each year changed into slops containing slow, sure poisons, that do not nutrify or build up the strength of the user, but, on the contrary, slowly and surely destroy his ability and disposition to earn the money with which to buy bread for himself or children.

A man needn't become an abandoned drunkard to impoverish his family. To drink two or three glasses a day is sufficient to make a certain deficiency in the amount of their comfort.

You doubt it? Well, suppose you use at twenty years one glass of beer a day; at twenty-three, two glasses a day; at twenty-five, three glasses a day; at thirty, four glasses a day; at forty, five glasses a day—at an average cost of five cents each. You will have spent, between twenty years and forty years of age, \$1,222.75.

THE *Troy Times* tells of a Troy editor who went into the tailoring establishment of a German to order a suit of clothes. After the cloth had been selected and the measure taken, the tailor demanded a deposit as a guarantee that the customer would come for the goods. To this the editor demurred, saying that he did not know the tailor any better than the latter knew him. After some little conversation, the German, however, waived the deposit, and the clothes were made. When our genial news editor called and paid cash down for the suit, the German was so delighted that he asked his customer to go out and take a drink with him. The editor declined, saying he did not drink; whereupon a gleam of satisfaction and intelligence combined shot across the tailor's countenance as he exclaimed, "Dot's de reason vy you pay for de clothes so quick as you got 'em."

### Marvel of Nations.

"OUR COUNTRY, the Marvel of Nations; Its Past, Present, and Future, and What the Scriptures Say of It," is the title of a new and popular work, on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens, by U. Smith, author of "Smith's Parliamentary Rules," and other popular works. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a historical, political, and religious standpoint.

It also shows that the United States is a subject of prophecy; that an outline of its history was written nearly two thousand years ago. It calls the attention of the reader to a chain of prophecy of which our Government is an important link, and shows that the location, the time of its rise, the nature of its Constitution, and its wonderful growth and subsequent influence, as well as its future attitude, were all clearly foreseen and pointed out by the prophet of God, hundreds of years ago.

The "Marvel of Nations" is a work of 282 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. Price, post-paid, \$1.00.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

### Combination Offer.

THE "MARVEL OF NATIONS" WITH THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, ONE YEAR, POST-PAID, FOR \$1.25.

THE publishers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, being desirous of securing a large subscription list at once, have made arrangements with the publishers of the "Marvel of Nations," whereby they are enabled to furnish this interesting and popular book, together with the *American Sentinel*, for one year, for \$1.25. We trust that many of our readers will avail themselves of this privilege of securing both the book and the paper for so small a sum. Order at once, so as to secure all the numbers of the SENTINEL.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

### Geikie's Life of Christ.

THE Life and Words of Christ, by Cunningham Geikie, Acme Edition, extra cloth, 800 pages, 50 cents; postage, 10 cents. Profoundly interesting—marvelously cheap.—*Albany Evening Tribune*.

The best of all the lives of Christ—a marvel of cheapness.—*Portland Christian Mirror*.

A great and noble work, rich in information, elegant and scholarly in style, earnestly devout in feeling.—*London Literary World*.

It is a work of profound learning.—*Archbishop of York*.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

### The Great Controversy.

THE new (1886) illustrated edition of "The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan during the Christian Dispensation," by Mrs. E. G. White, contains over 500 pages, a portrait of the author, and is illustrated by twenty-one full-page cuts. The book is printed and bound in the very best style; olive green muslin with jet and gold stamp. Over ten thousand have been sold in six months.

This volume presents the most wonderful and intensely interesting history that has ever been written of the great conflict between Christianity and the powers of darkness, as illustrated in the lives of Christian martyrs and reformers on one hand, and wicked men and persecuting powers on the other.

The closing chapters give a vivid picture of the warfare of the church, her final redemption, and vividly describe the triumph of the people of God, the destruction of Satan and all his followers, and the renewing of the earth, which ends the awful controversy between the Son of God and the powers of darkness.

Earnest Christians of all classes and creeds will find in it encouragement and instruction. The style of the author is clear, forcible, and often sublime, and, although simple enough in its statements to be understood and appreciated by a child, its eloquence calls forth the admiration of all.

Sent post-paid to any address in America for \$1.50, or to foreign countries 8s., post free.

Address,

PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal., U. S. A.

# The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., APRIL, 1886.

THE pages of the AMERICAN SENTINEL are stereotyped, and we can furnish it at any time in any quantity desired. We can but be pleased with the favor with which it has been received throughout the country.

OHIO is the birthplace of the "National Reform Association." It is a large and well-populated State, and the Reformers are putting forth the greatest efforts to convert it to its movement. It is to be hoped that the friends of civil and religious liberty—of equal religious rights before the law—will put forth every effort to give the SENTINEL a wide circulation in Ohio. Doubtless there will be a hard struggle over that important ground.

THE *Christian Statesman*, upon its first view of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, congratulated itself that it was going to have opposition, for want of which its cause was languishing. But since that time it has preserved the most decorous silence on the subject. As it said that this is the first real opposition that it has received, and appeared to feel so pleased with the prospect before it, we have been led to wonder that it does not further make its delight manifest to the public. We do not court opposition; we stand for the defense of the truth, and are very willing to be corrected if we are in error. The National Reform Association is a large and influential body, boasting amongst its members some of the most eminent men in the land. We recognize and freely acknowledge the ability of these men, but we think they are in error on this question, having wrong views of the proper objects of civil Government, and of the proper relations of the State to religion. We should hesitate to enter into combat with them on equal ground; but with the advantage of such clear truth as we are striving to maintain, we do not fear the result of the most thorough investigation.

A PAPER in Texas, after speaking of the object of the National Reform Association, says:—

"Up to the first of January there was no publication in the country especially devoted to the work of combatting this politico-religious heresy, but the void is now well filled by the AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, California. The SENTINEL is one of the neatest printed publications we have seen, and is edited with a vim that shows brains are at the back of it that will give the 'Religious Amendment Party' plenty to do to defend their sophistries. It is refreshing to see some of our religious journals opposing this amendment business, notably the *New York Independent*; but this party will cause trouble if it is not set down upon vigorously by those who venerate the wisdom of our forefathers, who wisely declared the complete divorcement of Church and State is the safeguard of our liberties."

An editor of a paper in Ohio, sending for the SENTINEL, which he had not seen, wrote:—

"This is a community of National Reformers, and many people are subscribers to the *Christian Statesman*, with whose principles I do not agree. I am an advocate of the principles of

Christianity, and a firm believer in the religion of Christ, yet am opposed to making religion the foundation of our national Government. The rule of Christ is spiritual and not civil, and we regard any approach to a union of Church and State with a great deal of apprehension. We believe that a resort to the civil power for the protection of the truth of the word of God, and for the defense of the church, would result disastrously to both. We hope that your paper will, while not occupying infidel ground, successfully combat the doctrines taught by the National Reform Association, and prevent any radical change in our national Constitution that will render it in any form a confession of the religious faith of any class of citizens."

We believe in both "protection" and "defense" when anybody's rights are assailed, but on this question the "Reformers" are the assailants, and the Government should protect the rights of all classes of its citizens against their machinations.

## There Is Danger.

THE following brief notice of the SENTINEL is from the Boston *Herald*:—

"Somebody out at San Francisco is so scared by the good people who want a Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that he has started a paper to oppose their designs. The next thing some one will be organizing a society to fight the movements for inducing water to run up hill. Such a society would be as useful as such a paper."

Every one who is acquainted with the Boston *Herald* knows that it is an able paper, but in this case it has not read up on the strength and doings of the National Reform Association, or it has not considered well what may be done by a comparatively small body which has influence to turn the majority in a political contest. An association which can number among its officers four governors, five State superintendents of public instruction, nine bishops, fifteen judges of higher courts, and forty-one college presidents and professors, with Doctors of Divinity, and other eminent men, must command influence. In fact, there is no other association of any kind in the United States that can equal it in this respect. If the *Herald* will stop a moment to consider, it must know that a society with such strength and influence could easily organize a force which would turn the scale either way in a general election; they could control a body of voters which either party would consider worth its while to capture by the strongest pledges.

And then it must be borne in mind that their profession is high, and their object *apparently* praiseworthy. They claim that they will purify the atmosphere of the political field, elevate the standard of public morality, reconcile differences which disturb our peace, eradicate such abominations as Mormon polygamy, etc. If we were to credit all their utopian schemes or professions, we must believe that they could inaugurate the millennium by a general convention, if the people would only amend the Constitution as they desire. And we are not ignorant of the fact that thousands are captivated by these specious claims, and are pledging support to their measures when the time comes for action.

It is a singular fact that in New England,

the home of the Puritans, the National Reformers seem to be doing little or nothing. It is, perhaps, owing to this fact that so able a paper as the *Herald* seems to think there is as little danger of securing a Religious Amendment to our Constitution as of reversing the law of gravitation. But we know what influence they are gaining in the great West; we know by the experience of a religio-political campaign in the State of California, what such a movement may accomplish when it can offer success to a political party for espousing its cause. And we verily believe that it will be but a short time when the *Herald* will change its mind, and wonder why there have not been more to sound the alarm of danger ahead.

It is but a few years since the "National Reform Association" was organized, and its growth has been almost without a parallel. And no wonder, considering the standing of its leaders, and the persistency of their efforts to bring their views and aims before the public. We have received a letter from an observing gentleman in one of the States of the Mississippi valley, who says that our paper is timely, and its arguments just and unanswerable, but considers it tardy in its appearing. To keep pace with the progress of the amendment work it should have been started a number of years ago.

A WORKER in the amendment cause reports from Topeka, Kan., as follows:—

"Monday I presented the subject before the Ministers' Association. The question was heartily seconded by the pastor of the Lutheran Church. He moved that the Association give its indorsement to the cause. It seemed as if this motion would have been carried unanimously, but two Baptist ministers expressed their decided opposition, saying that such an amendment would have no more effect on the Government than the inscription on our coins, 'In God we trust.' Government, they said, had no right to legislate on religion."

These Baptist ministers were true to the noble history of the Baptist denomination on the question of liberty, both civil and religious. We are always surprised when we hear a Baptist minister, as we sometimes do, favor the amendment.

DR. J. P. THOMPSON, in his work entitled "Church and State in the United States," says:

"Liberty of opinion, liberty of worship, liberty in all matters pertaining to religion, is not a privilege created or conceded by the State, but is a right inherent in the personality of the individual conscience; and the State is pledged not to interfere with that right. Such is the theory of the National Constitution."

## THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE MONTHLY JOURNAL,  
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

### TERMS.

SINGLE COPY, per year, - - - - - 50 cents.

To foreign countries, single subscriptions, post-paid 2s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.