The American Sentinel.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1. OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MAY, 1886. NUMBER 5.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

OAKLAND, CAL.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

Story on The First Amendment.

JUDGE STORY, in his "Exposition of the Constitution," speaks thus of the object of the First Amendment:—

"The same policy which introduced into the Constitution the prohibition of any religious test, led to this more extended prohibition of the interference of Congress in religious concerns. We are not to attribute this prohibition of a national religious establishment to an indifference to religion in general, and especially to Christianity (which none could hold in more reverence than the framers of the Constitution), but to a dread by the people of the influence of ecclesiastical power in matters of Government; a dread which their ancestors brought with them from the parent country, and which, unhappily for human infirmity, their own conduct, after their emigration, had not, in any just degree, tended to diminish. It was also obvious, *from the numerous and powerful sects existing in the United States, that there would be perpetual temptations to struggles for ascendency in the National councils*, if any one might thereby hope to found a permanent and exclusive national establishment of its own; and religious persecutions might thus be introduced, to an extent utterly subversive of the true interests and good order of the Republic. The most effectual mode of suppressing the evil in the view of the people, was, to strike down the temptations to its introduction."

MANY express sympathy with the position of the SENTINEL, who yet consider that our work is of little use because the effort to secure a Religious Amendment to our national Constitution will never amount to anything. That is because they do not know the strength of the National Association which is laboring to secure it. They will wake up to their mistake not many years hence.

"LET those who imagine that a nation can be made Christian by incorporating the letter of a Christian creed into its Constitution, remember the lessons of history. The worst despotisms that have ever cursed the world, were administered in the name, and by the assumed authority, of God."—*N. Y. Tribune.*

Bold and Base Avowal.

WITH the self-styled National Reformers the name of "Rev. Dr. Jonathan Edwards," of Illinois, stands very high. And we ask no better evidence that it will not do to intrust civil authority to the hands of ecclesiastics, than the fact that the most eminent professors of Christianity, even those to whom their fellows look up with reverence, often assume the most overbearing demeanor when asserting what they claim as their special prerogatives. We would not be misunderstood in this expression. We would as readily trust to their hands the exercise of the functions of government as to the hands of any others, as long as they will confine their actions to the sphere for which civil Governments exist. It is only when they assert their right to enforce their theological ideas that they are self-asserting and arrogant.

Dr. Edwards delivered an address at the National Convention of the "Reformers," held in New York in 1873. In this address are a number of things worthy of notice; but one portion of it, which we now consider, is particularly offensive to all who have any regard for the rights of our common humanity, as it is contrary to the spirit of Christianity as taught by Christ and his apostles.

First, we will notice an error into which all these reformers run by confounding civil with religious rights and privileges. In fact, they draw no line between them, as we have before shown. As the Government deals with us in civil matters, so would they deal with their opponents in matters of religion. Thus he speaks:—

"We may not buy a lot among the fine houses of Broadway, or the fashionable avenues of New York, and there set up and operate a foundry, a tin shop, a bone-boiling establishment, or a soap chandlery. If we try it we shall find both ourselves and our business treated as a nuisance. People do not like the smoke, the noise, the fumes of such establishments. The majority are against you, and in this country and in all republics majorities govern. To be in a minority involves more or less of inconvenience. In business, in politics, in fashion, in morals, and in religion, whoever differs materially from the majority will certainly be made to feel it more or less in due time."

Were the blasphemer and the hardened scoffer to place our religious rights and privileges on a level with the right to erect a tin shop or a foundry in a certain locality, or were such an one to class our religion with worldly business, with politics, or the fashions, we should not be so greatly surprised. After reading further from Dr. Edwards we can better measure the height and breadth of *his* religion; and some, perhaps, will even give him credit for consistency in making religion no more sacred than "a bone-boiling establishment or a soap chandlery," that is, judging by the religion which he represents in his utterances. We do not hesitate to say that if the Government should deny us the right to boil bones or make soap *anywhere*, we should acquiesce and seek some other business. But if the same Government should insist that we deny the faith we hold and abstain from the practice of the religion we profess, we should dissent in the most emphatic terms. We would not yield our religious faith and practice for all the majorities the world can produce; we would not accept another in its stead, either in theory or practice, at the demand of the strongest Government or the most relentless tyrant. This is our declaration, and that of every genuine Christian in the land. We only ask for grace to maintain it.

Would Dr. Edwards yield *his* religion to the will of the majority, even as he now yields in many secular matters? Oh, no. That is no part of his scheme. It is not *his religion* of which he speaks when he subordinates religion to the will of majorities. It is *somebody else's* religion; somebody's religion which does not agree with his; it is somebody's religion which he cannot control without the aid of the civil power!

But this is only the prelude to the avowal to which we specially call attention. In classifying those whom he considers enemies to their cause, he speaks as follows:—

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

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

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

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

"These all are, for the occasion, and as far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. *They must be counted together*, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first-named is the leader in the discontent and the outcry—the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph.

The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party."

Every one who has any knowledge of the Seventh-day Baptists, either in regard to their *history* or to their *principles*, must set down the above utterances of Dr. Edwards as not only uncharitable but unchristian. They were the conservators of religious freedom at a time when there was much danger of a permanent union of Church and State in New England. More than to all others, we verily believe, it was to those of that faith that Rhode Island owed her liberality to all sects of Christians, so far in advance of the other colonies at an early day. The Seventh-day Baptists of Rhode Island and the Baptists of Virginia left to this country a legacy of the principles of both civil and religious liberty, for which we have reason to be thankful even at the present day.

But the ill-will—we might in truth say the malice—of Dr. Edwards towards them arises from the "accident of [their] differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy." We doubt the propriety of calling that an "accident" which grows out of conviction and intention. It is not our desire to enter into a discussion of the subject thus laid open by the National Reformers in their statement of the objects of their movement; but this affords us an excellent opportunity to show the spirit of this professed reform, and what we may expect at their hands if they ever get control of our Government. Dr. Edwards admits that the Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity; and we affirm that he would be unable to find in their faith an item which is not considered orthodox by large bodies of Christians in the land, except in the case of the "accident" mentioned. Our readers may query, as we do in all seriousness, if the fact of their observing the original day of the Sabbath—the identical day which all concede was embodied in the fourth commandment of the decalogue—is a good and sufficient reason for classing them with atheists.

There is not a single point of religious belief upon which there is entire uniformity of faith among the churches; why, then, should a difference on this point be singled out and branded as atheism? The National Reformers affiliate with the Unitarians, who differ with them materially on the nature and divinity of Christ. They speak well of the Catholics, expecting yet to work together with them in their pretended reform, though the Catholics do not recognize them as being any part of the Church of Christ, and they openly and habitually deny in faith and practice the second commandment, which forbids adoration of images. These appear to be immaterial errors, while the observance of the seventh day of the week is branded as atheism, though the observers are confessed to be orthodox in every other respect!

We take up two declarations of these reformers, namely, that the Bible shall be recognized as the supreme rule of conduct in the nation, and that the ten commandments shall be acknowledged as the rule of morality in our Government. Is it a fact that the practice of the Seventh-day Baptists in observing the seventh day is such a wide and manifest departure from the Bible and the ten commandments, that they may with reason be called atheists? Every school-boy who is taught in the Bible knows that it says that "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." So far it is according to the Bible. And every school-boy knows that the commandment says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Thus it is "according to the commandment."

ADMISSIONS OF THEIR OPPONENTS.

Now it is by all conceded that "the mass of Christians" do not keep that seventh day which is spoken of in Gen. 2 and Ex. 20. Without entering at all into the controversy as to the correctness or lawfulness of the change from that day to another, we are compelled to inquire: Is the change so clearly laid down in the Scriptures, or another day so clearly enjoined, that a person must be an atheist to deny that change? We will draw the answer to this question from the most orthodox authorities, without offering any opinion of our own, or giving any coloring either way to the testimony.

1. Dr. Buck's Theological Dictionary says: "It must be confessed that there is no law in the New Testament concerning the first day."

2. The Encyclopedia of McClintock & Strong uses the same language.

3. The Augsburg Confession says: "We find not the same commanded by any apostolical law."

4. Dr. Heylyn, of England, in his History of the Sabbath, says: "For three hundred years there was neither law to bind them [the churches] to it, nor any rest from worldly labor required upon it."

5. Dr. Scott's Commentary says: "The change from the seventh to the first appears to have been gradually and silently introduced, by example rather than precept."

6. The *Christian Union*, answering a question on the subject, said: "The Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, not by any positive authority, but by a gradual process."

7. The *Inter-Ocean*, also answering a question, said: "The change of the day of worship from the Sabbath, or the last day of the week, to Sunday, the first day of the week, was done by the early Christians; but the work was so gradual that it is almost impossible to tell when the one left off and the other began. It was not until after the Reformation that the change was confirmed by any legal enactment. In the first ages after Christ it does not appear that the Christians abstained from their regular business upon that day, but they were accustomed to meet early in the day, and indulged in singing and some other religious services. It was not until the beginning of the third century that it became customary for Christians to abstain from their worldly business and occupation on that day."

8. Dr. C. S. Robinson, in the *Sunday School Times*, said: "It is not wise to base the entire Sabbath [Sunday] argument on the fourth precept of the decalogue. . . . We shall become perplexed if we attempt to rest our case on simple legal enactment. Our safety in such discussions consists in our fastening attention upon the gracious and benevolent character of the divine institution." But, query. Is not that an evasion? Doubtless the Seventh-day Baptists would not disagree with him upon the "benevolent character of the divine institution," but they would ask him to open the Bible and show them what *is* "the divine institution."

9. The *Christian at Work* says: "Some plant the observance of the Sabbath [Sunday] squarely on the fourth commandment, which was an explicit injunction to observe Saturday, and no other day, as 'a holy day to the Lord.' So some have tried to build the observance of Sunday upon apostolic command, whereas the apostles gave no command upon the matter. . . . The truth is, so soon as we appeal to the *litera scripta* [plain text] of the Bible, the Sabbatarians have the best of the argument."

It is true that others claim more than this in the behalf of the first day; but it only serves to show that the subject of a change is so obscure that they cannot at all agree among themselves! We could greatly multiply testimonies like the above, but these are quite sufficient for our purpose, showing as clearly as can be shown that the Seventh-day Baptists, in their observance of the seventh day, do not walk contrary to any fact or precept of the Bible, but rather have the *litera scripta* of the commandment on their side, and thus, on Biblical grounds, "have the best of the argument." And yet for the accident of clinging to the exact language of the Bible, and thereby disagreeing with these *model reformers*, they are boldly branded as atheists!

Now comes in a most interesting query: When the Constitution is religiously amended, what shall be done with these people who presume to disregard "the traditions of the elders," who are so perversely atheistical as to stand upon the *litera scripta* of the decalogue? Dr. Edwards has given us definite information on this subject. He speaks thus for the body, for it has published his address to the world, and others of their number have spoken much in the same strain. He said:—

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. He not only rejects and opposes my faith, but he aims to overthrow every institution, and to dissolve every relationship growing out of my faith. He would destroy the very foundations, pull down everything, and build up nothing. But he shall be tolerated. He may live and go free, hold his lands and enjoy his home; he may even vote; but for any higher, more advanced citizenship he is, as I hold, utterly disqualified."

The reader must remember that this language is applied to the Jew and the Seventh-day Baptist. They and atheists are "one party." They are all "counted together." They must "be treated as one party." And how very gracious these "mild-mannered" reformers are! The poor Seventh-day Baptist may be tolerated as a lunatic or conspirator may be tolerated. He may even "live and go free, and hold his lands and enjoy his home," if he "*does not rave.*" Let him hold his peace;

let him hide his knowledge of the *litera scripta* of the ten commandments, for woe be to him if he crosses the track of "*my faith*"!

We grow more and more distrustful of humanity when we read the literature of that people, and see their unblushing effrontery in declaring that a Religious Amendment to the National Constitution is necessary "to secure the rights of all classes." Can they possibly think that the people are so blind that they cannot perceive the deception which is being practiced? that they cannot discover the enemy of equal rights lurking under these specious pretenses? We pity those who cannot see this. We must blame those who *will not* see the danger impending, or who are in any wise instrumental in precipitating such a calamity upon our country. They are not asking for protection, for this they now have most fully; *they are seeking for power.* And their own avowals prove that if ever they get the power they seek, this land will cease to be "the land of the free." J. H. W.

A Lesson from Ezra.

WHILE the so-called "National Reformers" continually deny that their movement has any likeness to a proposed union of Church and State, they do not deny that they want to make such changes in our national Constitution as will place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. It is true that they insert the words "of our Government," after "usages;" but as our Government has no Christian usages, all understand that the usages of the Christian church are referred to. The design of the National Reform party is, then, to so change the Constitution that Christian usages may be enforced by civil law. It is not necessary for us to call it a union of Church and State; we will simply remember that the avowed purpose is to make it possible to compel people to follow certain Christian usages, and this by the power of the law of the land.

Since the advocates of this state of affairs are fond of referring to the Bible for precedents for their proposed scheme; and since they imagine that they are following in the footsteps of the ancient worthies, we invite them to a brief consideration of the course which was pursued by one excellent man of old, "a ruler in Israel."

Ezra was undoubtedly a man of God. He was a man of stern integrity and of the most sincere piety. Moreover, he was a statesman, well versed in the ways of courts, and was also a brave soldier, and a skilled leader of men. When, after long delay, and much discouragement, the Jews were confirmed in the privileges granted them by Cyrus, king of Persia, Ezra was the one to whom the work of restoring Jerusalem was intrusted. The Jews had been captives in a foreign land, but God had worked upon the hearts of the heathen king, so that they were allowed to return to their own land and re-establish the worship of Jehovah.

With quite a train of followers, Ezra set out for his own country. But the way was long and dangerous, and there were many even of the subjects of the king of Persia, who wished only evil to the Jews and their work. Here was the time, if ever, for Ezra to invoke the aid of the king, and secure a company of soldiers to protect him and his companions. But he did no such thing. After getting his people together, he halted at the river of Ahava (Ezra 8:15–18), and sent for the priests of the Lord. As soon as the priest had arrived, Ezra proceeded as follows:—

"Then I proclaimed a fast there, at the river of Ahava, that we might afflict ourselves before our God, to seek of him a right way for us, and for our little ones, and for all our substance. For I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him; but his power and his wrath are against all them that forsake him. So we fasted and besought our God for this; and he was intreated of us." Ezra 8:21–23.

The result is told in the following words:—

"Then we departed from the river of Ahava, on the twelfth day of the first month, to go unto Jerusalem; and the hand of our God was upon us, and he delivered us from the hand of the enemy, and of such as lay in wait by the way." Verse 31.

This is our text. The application is plain. Ezra says: "I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him." Ezra felt that if he should ask the king for protection, it would be virtually a denial of his faith. The Jews had told the heathen of the power of Jehovah, no doubt quoting the words of Moses: "There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky. The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." And now if Ezra should ask kingly protection, the heathen would say, Where is your God? If he is so powerful, why do you not depend upon him, instead of seeking the protection of an earthly monarch? Such questions would have been well put. Ezra knew it; he knew that to ask for protection from the king would be to proclaim the weakness of Israel.

The same principles will apply to-day. The Christian religion is from God. Christ, its founder, said that he spoke only the words of God. He said also, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." John 18:36. If Christians in the nineteenth century, contrary to the precept and example of their leader, appeal to force, they simply proclaim their lack of faith in God. The National Reformers will, it is true, disclaim any design to appeal to force in support of Christianity; but laws are for nothing, if they are not to be enforced. No custom is made legal, unless it is desired to enforce that custom. To "enforce" means to support by force. And therefore when Christian usages are placed on a legal basis in the fundamental law of the land, it is nothing else than an appeal to force of arms, if necessary, to support those usages when they are violated. But such an appeal to force would be a virtual proclamation that God had departed from those making the appeal. It would be a confession of one of two things: Either that the ones making the appeal had no faith in God's power to care for his own cause, or else that the customs in whose support civil authority was invoked, did not have the support of divine authority.

It is just as plain now as it was in the days of Ezra, that religion is lowered in the eyes of the world, when civil power is invoked in its behalf. To place Christian institutions on a legal basis in the law of the land, would be to put them on a level with human institutions. Therefore it is in the interest of religion that we oppose this proposed Constitutional Amendment. As Christians we do not want to see any institution or usage that is really Christian, and which therefore bears the divine impress, sunk to the level of "a police regulation." Christian institutions have the support of God, and therefore do not need the support of the State; and if the institutions which it is proposed to enforce are not really Christian, then certainly Christians should condemn the movement. E. J. W.

Morality and Religion.

THE Christian religion, as we have said on this subject, is *a remedial system.* If man had not sinned, such a system would not have existed. Man would then have been justified by his obedience. The commandments of God contain the whole duty of man. Eccl. 12:13, 14. His law is perfect. Ps. 9:7. His commandments are righteousness. Ps. 119:172. Hence, if man had not sinned he would have done his whole duty; he would have been perfect and righteous in complete obedience to a perfect and righteous law. He could not have been condemned, because all his actions would have been right. And thus it is written, "The doers of the law shall be justified." Rom. 2:13.

And we have said the law, in every part, grew out of the will of God alone; it arose from no contingency connected with man's probation. It is original obligation, all its relations existing by virtue of creation. And as it is perfect, and contains the whole duty of man, it is a complete summary of all morality. From the day that man first owed allegiance to his Creator, and duties to his fellow-creatures, no new morality has arisen either in principle or in precept. There is no just reason for the expression which we have often heard, "The moral laws of the gospel." If any morality exists by virtue of the gospel, that fact would prove that the moral law previously existing was imperfect; that it did not contain all morality, and therefore did not contain the whole duty of moral agents. The necessity for the gospel originated in man's transgression; but man's transgression could not possibly give rise to moral obligation. It did create a necessity for a system of redemption, of restoration, but all the laws of such a system are—what theologians correctly term—*positive* laws, in distinction from *moral.*

This is a truth of which sight is too often lost, though the distinction itself is almost uni-

versally recognized. Many seem to consider that the institutions of the gospel are twofold, both moral and positive. But that is an error, as we have shown. The gospel *enforces all* morality, but it *originates none.* A Government, in declaring an amnesty or offering pardon to those who have been in rebellion, either expresses or implies the condition that they must cease their rebellion and return to the support of, and obedience to, the Constitution of the Government. But the amnesty or pardon does not originate the Constitution or add a particle to its force and obligation. Both Christ and his apostles enforced the law of God, and constantly referred to the Scriptures, the word of God, as authority for their teachings. But they never announced that they were authorized to give power and efficiency to the law, nor to annul one precept of the law and erect another in its stead, or to add any new morality to that which existed before. They taught repentance and the remission of sins. Theirs was purely a "ministry of reconciliation." Of course we speak now of "the moral law" only, not of the types and ordinances of past dispensations. These were temporary, and were adopted for a development of the gospel or remedial system. Not one of them existed originally by virtue of the work of creation, as did the ten commandments; not one of them ever would have existed if man had not sinned.

The law of God is very brief in its terms, but universal in its application. There is not a relation in life, except those which grow out of sin, which it leaves untouched. In few words, it guards our rights in respect to *life, chastity, property*, and *reputation.* Examining these four precepts, we find that they cover all the rights which our fellow-creatures can invade, and all the duties which we owe to them. If these are obeyed in the spirit of love, which is the spirit of the law, we then observe the golden rule; we do to our neighbor just what we would that our neighbor should do to us. And thus it is seen that *there is nothing religious in the golden rule.* It relates only to duties between man and man, and surely we are not required to worship one another! It is not at all peculiar to the gospel; the Saviour said, "For this is the law and the prophets." It needs not a word to convince any one that it would have existed as perpetual duty if man had not fallen —if there never had been any such a system as the gospel. And so we might proceed, step by step, to show that not a single item of morality that ever was taught is peculiar to the gospel.

To break any of these commandments which relate to our duty to our neighbor is to infringe upon the rights of our neighbor; and, therefore, it is perfectly proper for the civil Government to punish for the violation of them. The very object of Government is the preservation of rights, or the protection of its citizens.

But it is not the office of civil Government to declare that a man shall worship God, or to decide in what manner he shall worship, if he chooses to worship at all. And herein is shown the inconsistency of the National Reformers. They declare that the ten commandments shall be enforced if the amendment shall be secured. And they say that there is nothing in their movement which can or will hinder the Catholics working with them. And yet they well know that the Catholics, in their worship, violate both the letter and the spirit of the second commandment. In the enumeration of religious errors which these reformers say ought to be suppressed, we have never known them to mention this item of false worship. They denounce the false worship of the Chinese as dangerous to our Christianity, but say not a word against the worship of "Mary." Why is this? It may be that the Catholics are too numerous to be meddled with, and it may be that they count on the aid of the Catholics to secure the amendment, knowing that such an amendment perfectly coincides with the Catholic faith in regard to the relation which the Church sustains to the Government.

We have little hope, if any, that we shall succeed in causing the amendmentists to recognize the difference between morality and religion—between those things which civil Government may and may not enforce or regulate. It is not to the interest of their cause to do justice to their readers in laying down the true principles of Government. As a specimen of their method of treating these subjects, we copy the following from the *Statesman* of April 1, 1886:—

"Our Government does not trespass on liberty of conscience when it provides that the moral law of which Christ is the author shall decide all questions in our national life."

Who can tell what they mean by the above? To what moral law do they refer? Is it to be found in the Old or the New Testament? There is a moral law in the Old Testament, namely, the ten commandments, but in that there is not one *Christian* feature. The Jew accepts it heartily; if it were adopted as the Constitution of our Government, it would shut out neither the Jew nor the Mohammedan. That would not make us a "Christian nation." And we confidently repeat our affirmation that the gospel of Christ does not originate one jot of morality. There is not a particle of morality in the New Testament which it does not derive from the Old. The gospel is purely and only a remedial system—not at all a moral system.

The *Statesman* was once pressed on this very point. The question was propounded to it if, when they asked to have "all Christian laws, usages, and institutions placed on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land," it included baptism and the Lord's Supper. It enumerated its points as follows:—

"Among these are the laws which regulate marriage, and those which forbid and punish blasphemy, the offering of prayer in our National and State Legislatures, the maintenance of religious worship and instruction in our asylums, reformatories, and jails, the observance of public thanksgivings and fasts, the use of the oath in courts of justice, and many others. All these, as well as the laws which guard the Sabbath, we desire to maintain. All these, moreover, are proper to the State, and cannot, in any candid mind, be confounded with baptism and the Lord's Supper."

True, they cannot; and why not? Simply because baptism and the Lord's Supper are "Christian institutions," *and the other things enumerated are not!* If anything is wanted to convict them of deception, they have furnished it above. A certain advocate o. the Religious Amendment, who was also an officer of the Association, when asked what effect their legislation would have upon the rights of the Jews, said:—

"We are not a Jewish, but a Christian nation; therefore our legislation must be conformed to the institutions and spirit of Christianity."

If these people do not intend to deceive, why do they not speak in plain terms, and tell us just what they mean? The Jews had laws regulating marriage, punishing blasphemy, for false oaths, providing for religious worship, thanksgivings, fasts, and guarding the Sabbath. And, moreover, as regards prayer in our legislatures, something less than thirty years ago, when there had been a long and bitter strife in our National House of Representatives over the election of a Speaker, a Jewish Rabbi was invited to act as chaplain one morning, and that day the strife ended in a peaceable election!

To legislate for Christians as distinguished from Jews, and to recognize Jesus Christ as ruler, and his laws as the laws of the land, it is necessary to place on a legal basis that which is peculiar to Christianity in distinction from Judaism. But in the above enumeration by the *Statesman* there is not a single point of that character. Indeed, if they drop out baptism and the Lord's Supper, it will puzzle them to find any "Christian institutions" at all! It is very true that "in any candid mind" these stand apart from the objects which they profess to seek; but "in any candid mind" they must necessarily be included in the enumeration of "all Christian institutions." But we are fearful that we have not candid minds to deal with in refuting the fallacies of the National Reform Association.

This distinction will be noticed further. We close this article with the affirmation, and we can maintain it, too, that no Christian institution is properly a subject of human legislation and enforcement. As was said before, infidels have no rights in the Christian church, and therefore infidels have no right or privilege to observe Christian institutions; they belong to Christians only. When enforced by civil authority, they are perverted and abused.

J. H. W

"Influence of the Union."

UNDER this head, Baptist Noel, the English author, in his book on the Union of Church and State, speaking of the excommunication of dissenters, says:—

"Without the aid of the union, these canonical fulminations would be simply ridiculous; but when solemnly promulgated by a synod of the State-paid clergy as the doctrine of the national church, they attach the stigma of schism to dissenters in the minds of myriads. Under the shelter of these canons, bishops proclaim them in their charges to be schismatics, clergymen echo it from their pulpits, and even liberal men in the establishment are afraid openly to deny it. By aid of the union, the establishment, rising above all competition, can loftily look down upon all other churches as sectaries. 'This is not a mere State church,'

says the excellent bishop of Calcutta, '*but the religion of Christ our Lord* as established by his providence and grace in Great Britain in the second century, . . . *the Christian religion* wisely and mildly established by a Christian Government. Much less is our church a sectarian body, as some would call it; that is a small number of persons who have cut themselves off from the mass of Christians by certain peculiarities; but the national church of the Government, nobles, and people of our religious country.'

"This doctrine, originated and sustained by the union, besides being in the highest degree unjust to dissenters, inflicts upon them many injuries.

"Persons thus trained from childhood to look upon dissenters as schismatics, whom they should, according to the apostle's command, avoid (Rom. 16 : 17), are afraid to hear the gospel from their lips. Were a dissenting minister to open a chapel for worship in any large village where there is a moral and benevolent rector, whose doctrine is unsound and whose life is worldly, few among the villagers would dare to hear the schismatic. Were the two ministers upon the footing of legal equality, as in a village of the United States, the multitude would flock to hear the gospel; but here where the State maintains the worldly pastor and frowns upon the evangelist, his doctrine is suspected, his person is despised, and he cannot gather a congregation. A similar spirit has hitherto impeded the evangelic labors of dissenters in every city of the kingdom."

And so it will ever be wherever the church is placed under the patronage of the State. It is sure to result in a loss of spirituality in the body of professors.

Persecution or Nothing.

THE National Reform Party has by resolution affirmed, and even re-affirmed, that their work does not tend in the least degree to a union of Church and State; that it does not threaten the liberty of any people, but that, on the contrary, it will furnish the strongest safeguard to the liberties, both civil and religious, of all citizens; but their actions contradict their words. And not only so, their words contradict themselves. This can be clearly seen by any one who will read the publications of the National Reform Association. The fact of the matter is, that under their National Reformed Constitution there would be no real liberty at all, either civil or religious. The *Christian Statesman* says:—

"Enforce upon all that come among us, the laws of Christian morality."

To *enforce* is *to force;* to constrain; *to compel;* this then, being interpreted, means, force all, compel all,—infidels, atheists, Jews, heathen,—to keep the laws of "Christian morality." Says Rev. W. J. Coleman, one of the secretaries of the Association:—

"The existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel."

They propose first to force all to keep the laws which they shall establish as being those of Christian morality; then those who will not be forced, will be disfranchised. And then what? Oh, the gradation is easy. Rev. E. B. Graham says:—

"If the opponents of the Bible [that is, the National Reform views 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 atheistic ideas, and then, if they can stand it, stay there till they die."

That is pretty heavy, but there is one more step that could be taken, and it *is* taken. Rev. Jonathan Edwards says:—

"Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon."

The "true inwardness" of this last can be the more readily appreciated when it is understood that this reverend gentleman defines atheism to be whatever opposes National Reform.

The liberty, then, which the National Reformers propose to guarantee to every man is the liberty to do as *they* say, and the liberty to conform to what *they* shall establish as Christianity and morality. And *that* is a kind of liberty that is strictly compatible with absolute tyranny. Such liberty as that the papacy at the height of its power was willing and anxious to grant. Indeed, of that kind of liberty the Inquisition was the best conservator that the world has ever seen.

And when we read these things, and many others of like import, in the National Reform literature, and, in view of them, express our fears that religious intolerance and persecution will be the inevitable consequence of the success of the National Reform movement, they seem to think it passing strange. To them it seems only "folly and fanaticism" that anybody should harbor any such fears. Then they come cooing like a dove: "Why you need have no fears at all; we would not hurt a hair of your heads." But the sentiments expressed in the above quotations are spoken with too much earnestness, and are received with too much favor in the National Reform Conventions, for us to allow any weight whatever to such honeyed phrases as that, we need have no fears, and, they would not hurt a hair of our heads. But even if we had all pleasant words and fair speeches on their part, and had none of these plain and forcible expressions of their real sentiments and feelings, we should be none the less assured that intolerance and persecution would be the result of the success of the National Reform Party. First, because all history proves that such a thing is to be dreaded; and, secondly, because such a result is inseparable from the success of such a movement.

We repeat: *Intolerance and persecution are inseparable from the success of such a movement as is represented in the National Reform Association.* Their purpose is to place what they decide to be Christian laws, institutions, and usages, upon an undeniable *legal* basis in the fundamental law of the land. Such Christianity thereby becomes the law of the land; and the only point upon which turns the question of persecution or no persecution is, Will the law be enforced? If the law shall not be enforced, then their movement will be a failure; for, so far as any real, practical results are concerned, the whole matter would stand just as it does at present, and the present order of things is the cause of their sorest lamentations. But if the law shall be enforced, then there is persecution, for compulsory conformity to religious opinions is persecution. So the sum of the matter is this: If the laws which they shall establish shall not be enforced, their movement will be a failure. If those laws shall be enforced, then there will be persecution. And that the principles which they advocate will be enforced, if they obtain the power, is just as certain as that human nature is what it is, or that two and two make four. A. T. J.

A Cool Calculation.

AT the National Convention of the National Reform Association held in Cincinnati in 1872, Mr. Abbot, editor of the *Index*, a man opposed to Christianity, was permitted to present a protest against the movement. While there were some things in his address with which we cannot agree, we believe his words of warning were not too strong, but they faithfully portrayed the danger that lurks in the amendment movement. He said:—

"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."

The Convention played a shrewd game when it put forward "Rev. A. D. Mayo" to reply to Mr. Abbot, for Mr. Mayo can speak more words to less purpose, and better cover with sophistry the most evident truth, than any other man in the Convention. This is his characteristic. In his reply he said:—

"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. . . . As a citizen of Ohio he is exposed to all the danger of disfranchisement and persecution to which he would be exposed if this amendment was made." Etc., etc.

Now Mr. Mayo and his associates in that Convention knew that his speech was sheer deception, from first to last. More than a year before that time the *Statesman* said that their movement contemplated "practical ends," because under their proposed change of the Government no one would be permitted to hold office who traveled on the first day of the week! And they have loudly deplored the fact that an infidel has been elected Governor of Ohio. Now if, as they claim, no man who violates the precepts of the Bible could hold office under the amended Constitution, would there be such a parallel between it and the Constitution of Ohio as Mr. Mayo claimed? There would not; nor do they intend to have it so. We repeat, that Mr. Mayo's speech was a deception, and they knew it was.

And Mr. Mayo ridiculed Mr. Abbot's apprehensions of war, and of any trouble whatever growing out of their remodeling the Government. And the advocates of the amendment, including the conductors of the *Statesman*, have always treated the fears of their opponents with ridicule. And yet they look upon the very troubles that others predict, and even war

itself, as possibilities which may grow out of their movement. Thus we show that their pathway is marked with deception from beginning to end. For proof see the following from the pen of one of the Secretaries of the Association, Rev. M. A. Gault, published in the *Statesman* of April 1, 1886:—

"It cost us all our civil war to blot slavery out of our Constitution, and it may cost us another war to blot out its infidelity."

Slavery was an institution; it was bounded by State lines and upheld by State laws. It concerned man's conduct toward and treatment of his fellow-man. It was, therefore, a matter proper to be dealt with by the Government. But who can see even an approach to a parallel, in any of these respects, between slavery and infidelity? Infidelity is not bounded by any civil or geographical lines. It is in every community. It exists side by side with Christianity in thousands of households. It is held by the undisputed right of private judgment—undisputed in every land having any just claim to being civilized. It is held by tens of thousands of American citizens, each one having the same interest in the Constitution, and in the proper administration of the Government, and the same right to the protection of the Government, that the conductors of the *Statesman* have.

Were not these people growing almost insane on this subject they would never hint such a thing as they have here spoken. They must be aware that to take the first step toward inaugurating a war, a civil war, against infidelity in any shape or manner, would be to invite the application of a torch to every church building in the land. They must know that that would not be a war of States or sections. It would be a most deadly strife in every school district, in every neighborhood throughout our wide domain. That is not the speech of Christians; it is the wild talk of religious bigots. And we greatly fear that they will yet bring upon our country the terrible calamity of which they so coolly speak. Reports show that they are making many converts to their schemes in the churches, in the theological schools, in the colleges—everywhere that it is possible to reach those who may exert a controlling influence upon society.

Let not the people be deceived by the idea that their movement is not taking root in the country. The danger is great, and it is imminent. May the warning be heeded in time.

J. H. W.

National Religion.

SOME years ago the New York *Independent* published the following article on the effort which is being made to unite the Church with the State. The words have not lost any of their force:—

"The fathers who framed the Constitution of the United States, wisely dissevered it, and the Government created by it, from all organic connection with the religion of the people. They contented themselves with simply declaring that 'Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;' and that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.' The melancholy history of the past had instructed them, as it ought to instruct all, that the absolute severance of the State from all organic connection with religion, is the only ground of safety to the civil and religious liberty of the people. Though not atheists, they had the wisdom to frame a Government whose fundamental law left religion to the inalienable rights of the individual conscience, and made all religious proscription or persecution constitutionally impossible.

"The resolutions of the late Pittsburg Convention proceed upon a very different theory in the construction of civil government. We ask the attention of our readers to the fourth one of the series: '*Resolved*, That, in order to maintain and give permanency to the *Christian features* which have marked this nation from its origin, it is necessary to give them *authoritative sanction in our organic law.*' This more than surprises us. Do the members of this convention really mean what they say? Does Judge Strong, of Pennsylvania, design to place himself on this ground? Or was the resolution hastily adopted, without due reflection? If we understand the import of their words, these gentlemen propose that Christianity shall be authoritatively incorporated into the 'organic law' of this country; and this is just the principle of all the religious despotisms which have cursed mankind and corrupted religion in centuries past. It is in *kind* the very doctrine adopted by the pope of Rome and all his cardinals. These 'Christian features,' referred to by the convention, are simply the *religious beliefs* and *practices* of that portion of the American people known as *Christians*. They can be nothing else. They certainly are not the 'features' of infidels or Jews. Now, observe that these beliefs and practices are, according to the theory of the convention, to be maintained and made permanent. In what way? Not by preaching Christianity as Christ and the apostles did; not by the circulation of tracts, and the distribution of the Bible among the people; not by the influence of holy lives and individual conversions to the truth; but by giving '*them authoritative sanction in our organic law.*' This means, if it means anything, that Christianity, as *somebody* understands it, is to be incorporated into the structure of the National Government and become an integral part of the Constitution. An 'authoritative sanction in our organic law' can mean nothing less.

"Now, we take the liberty of saying, that no such method as the one proposed, is at all necessary 'to maintain and give permanency to the Christian features which have marked this nation from its origin.' Ever since the organization of this Government, now nearly one hundred years ago, Christianity has lived and prospered in this country without 'any authoritative sanction in our organic law;' and we see no reason for supposing that it cannot continue to do so for all time. It asks no such service at the hands of the State; and, moreover, the history of all such experiments shows that the State cannot extend the service without doing more harm than good. We hence believe that in this respect the framers of the Constitution were much wiser than the members of the recent Pittsburg Convention. The thing is just right as it is—right for the Government, right for religion, and right for the free and untrammeled exercise of human liberty; and, as we have no doubt, the large majority of the American people are of the opinion that it is best to keep it right. We are in favor of reforms, but not those that go *backward*, and lead toward the despotisms of the Dark Ages. The doctrine of these gentlemen is impracticable in this country, and wholly undesired, even if it were practicable; and we hence advise them to apply their efforts and resources to some more legitimate object. The proposition itself, upon its very face, supplies its own answer when presented to the American mind. We are opposed to the whole idea from beginning to end, in every possible form and stage of its application."

Church and State In America.

IN a work entitled "Religion in America," written nearly half a century ago, we find some interesting facts concerning the union of Church and State in the United States a couple of centuries ago. It was written by a Presbyterian clergyman especially for the information of Europeans. We wish we had room for longer extracts than we are able to give in this number. Of the evils resulting from the union in New England, the author says:—

"It gave rise to internal difficulties of the gravest nature with such of the colonists as were not disposed to agree to all the measures by which it was carried out, and led to the adoption of the harshest proceedings against those persons. One of the first cases of this kind was that of Roger Williams, in 1633–35, and it shook the colony to its center. That remarkable man had been educated for the English bar under the patronage of Sir Edward Coke; but influenced by the conviction that he was called to the ministry, he took orders in the Established Church. Expelled from that church by the bishops, on account of his Puritanical principles, he came to Boston in 1631.

"Taught by persecution to examine how far human Governments are authorized to legislate for the human mind, and to bind its faculties by their decisions, Williams soon perceived that a course was pursued in America which he could not but condemn as repugnant to the rights of conscience. Regarding all intolerance as sinful, he maintained that 'the doctrine of persecution for cause of conscience is most evidently and lamentably contrary to the doctrine of Jesus Christ.' The law required the attendance of every man at public worship; Williams pronounced this to be wrong, for to drag the unwilling to public worship looked like requiring hypocrisy. Not less did he oppose the law that taxed all men for the support of a system of religious worship which some might dislike and conscientiously disapprove. 'What!' exclaimed his antagonists, 'is not the laborer worthy of his hire?' 'Yes,' he replied, 'from them that hire him.' Public functionaries were to be taken only from among members of the church. Williams argued that, with like propriety, 'a doctor of physic, or a pilot' might be selected according to his skill in theology and his standing in the church.—[*Bancroft.*] In

the end, Roger Williams was banished from the colony, and having retired to Narragansett Bay, there he became a Baptist, and founded what is now the State of Rhode Island. Absolute religious liberty was established there from the first.

"The next case occurred in 1637, and ended in the expulsion of Wheelwright, Anne Hutchinson, and Aspinwall, who, although they held some very extravagant notions on certain points, would have been harmless persons had the only weapon employed against them been truth.

"Testimony to the like effect is borne by the history of the colony in subsequent years. 'Since a particular form of worship had become a part of the civil establishment, irreligion was now to be punished as a civil offense. The State was a model of Christ's kingdom on earth; treason against the civil Government was treason against Christ; and reciprocally, as the gospel had the right paramount, blasphemy, or whatever a jury might call blasphemy, was the highest offense in the catalogue of crimes. To deny any book of the Old or New Testament to be the written and infallible word of God, was punished by fine or by stripes, and in case of obstinacy, by exile or death. Absence from the ministry of the word was punished by fine.' —[*Bancroft.*] Everything indicated that this union between Church and State was operating in such a manner as rapidly to undermine the rights and principles of both. The Anabaptists were treated in some cases with great harshness, and when, in 1651, the Quakers made an attempt to establish themselves in the colony, they were expelled, and prohibited from returning upon pain of death,—a penalty actually inflicted on four of them who returned in contravention of this enactment."

A Constant Menace.

HAVING survived the perils of internal war, and promising to pass safely through the trials and agitations resultant from it, our country is endangered by the constant menace of a class of restless agitators, a portion of whom are sincere in their desire to accomplish good results, and the remainder hypocritical and wholly selfish, while all are fanatical. The leaders of this class sometimes appear in one guise, and then in another—sometimes under the political, and then under the religious, banner, but always under the flag of fanaticism. Their grasp is upon the pillars of the temple, and should it fall, theirs will have been the responsibility. Whatever form their irrepressibility may take, its object is always inimical to the spirit of our free institutions. The most noteworthy movement of this class that has recently been made, is the attempt to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would require all who acknowledged its supremacy to believe in the Christian religion. Aside from most unjustly expatriating our large and respectable number of Jewish citizens, there would be little objectionable in this, save the principle of its incorporation into the fundamental law of the land. However slight, it is the entering wedge of Church and State. If we may cut off ever so few persons from the right of citizenship on account of difference of religious belief, then with equal justice and propriety may a majority at any time dictate the adoption of still further articles of belief, until our Constitution is but the textbook of a sect beneath whose tyrannical sway all liberty of religious opinion will be crushed. "Honor the Lord," is the rallying cry of these crusaders. That has been the cry of all perpetrators of acts of cruelty, injustice, and oppression, from time immemorial. It was the cry of the Spanish Inquisitors and the English and German torturers of reformers. It brought Cranmer to the stake, incited the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve, and caused witches to be burned by the Puritans. The people of enlightened America, we believe, have learned to know that a nation stands most honored in the sight of Heaven, when all of its children are left free to exercise the full right of conscience, and to worship God as they shall see fit, silently in their own hearts, or with impressive form.—*Champlain Journal.*

Juvenile Smokers.

A BRITISH physician, observing the large number of boys under fifteen years of age on the streets with cigars and pipes in their mouths, was prompted to examine the health of this class of smokers, and for that purpose selected thirty-eight boys between the ages of nine and fifteen. In twenty-two of these cases he found various disorders of the circulation and digestion, palpitation of the heart, and more or less marked taste for strong drink. In twelve there was frequent bleeding of the nose, and twelve had slight ulceration of the mouth, caused by tobacco. The doctor treated them for the ailments, but with little effect. The habit of smoking was discontinued, when health and strength were soon restored. The effect of tobacco in creating a taste for strong drink is unquestionably very great. If the testimony of some tobacco users and medical men is of any weight, one of the most radical methods of keeping the young from being led to intemperate drinking is to deny them tobacco. It is the opinion of many medical men that the rising generation is in more danger from tobacco than from alcohol.—*Sel.*

His Last Cigar.

MR. GOODFELLOW is a well-known Sunday-school superintendent in a flourishing city in one of our prairie States. He is head and front of the temperance movement in his town, and an uncompromising enemy of tobacco; nevertheless, within the memory of many living witnesses, he used to love a good cigar as well as any one. He tells how he was finally cured:—

"On leaving my office one evening, in accord with my usual custom, I lighted a fragrant cigar, which I proposed to enjoy as I pursued my homeward way. I had advanced but a few steps when I saw sitting on the curb, puffing away at the stump of a villainous cigar, a youngster whom I recognized as a member of my Sunday-school. A quick disgust filled my soul, and words of reproof rose to my lips; but how could I utter them with the weed between my teeth. The disability was not nearly so apparent in its physical as in its moral aspect. Clearly the cigar must be gotten from sight, or my lips remain sealed, and the boy left to follow the bent of an evil inclination, and doubtless become a victim of a pernicious habit. Quick as thought I whipped the cigar from my mouth, and held it behind my back, while I administered a merited reproof and timely warning. The boy threw away his stump, and promised not to try another, and I backed around the corner, fearing to turn lest my own sin should be discovered, and my influence destroyed. When fairly out of sight, I threw my cigar into the gutter, inwardly vowing before God never again to touch the weed; and I never have."

How many fathers are ready to make a like sacrifice for the sake of their sons? How many teachers, that they may consistently warn their pupils of evil likely to follow in the wake of this habit? How many pastors, that they may present themselves undefiled in the sight of the youth of their charges, and lead them in the ways of purity and true temperance?—*Church and Home.*

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., MAY, 1886.

WHEN the *Statesman* gave so large a notice of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we hoped that it would continue its friendly offices; but its editor and correspondents seem to be attending a perpetual "mum social." We incline to the opinion that it is their wisdom to hold their peace (Job 13:5) in regard to our exposure of their fallacies and sophistry. We are confident that they can make no good defense when their positions are assailed by a correct line of argument. And we would be pleased if we could hope that they would come to realize this fact, and cease their efforts to undermine the foundations of our Government.

READ carefully the article on "National Religion" from the New York *Independent*. It is solid truth; and regard for the interests of both the Church and the State should lead all to counteract, as far as possible, the movement which will subvert our Government if it should be successful.

THERE is an idea worthy of consideration in the reason given by Judge Story for the prohibition of a Government religion in our National Constitution. See quotation on the first page of this paper. And the reason holds good to-day, and the safeguard is more needed now than it was then.

THE "Reformers" refer to God's Government for Israel, and the kingdom of Christ, as if that which they seek were in harmony with the former, and is the bringing in of the latter. We purpose to show that they err in both respects. Their movement is merely a human device to compass selfish ends. There is nothing in the Scriptures to justify it.

The Price of Liberty.

HALF a century ago, this motto was in constant use: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The idea was deeply fixed in the minds of the American people that vigilance must guard and wisdom preserve that boon which their valor had won. But scarcely a century has elapsed since our fathers suffered the almost incredible hardships of the Revolution, and the generation that now has the welfare of the country in charge is forgetting the lessons of 1776, and has grown into the idea that liberty is an assured thing to this people and to their posterity, and that it no longer needs to be guarded with ever watchful care.

If attention is given to the subject, it will be found that in nothing else were encroachments upon our liberties so much dreaded by our forefathers as in the union of Church and State. They brought with them to this land a lively sense of danger in this respect. Their own experience and observation had taught them the lesson. And the action of the puritanical party in New England had strengthened their conviction that any approach to such a union was fraught with danger to somebody's civil and religious rights. The framers of our Government guarded against this danger in the body of the Constitution, and strengthened the safeguard in the First Amendment. They faithfully discharged their duty to us; now it remains for us to faithfully preserve the blessing we have received of them.

One of the worst features of our times is, that a large and influential and growing association is now putting forth the most strenuous efforts to entirely change the whole structure of our Government in this respect, and the people are not alarmed. In every direction they are gathering adherents among those who are best calculated to exert a strong influence over their fellow-men; their plans are well laid, and pursued with the most persistent vigor; but when the danger is pointed out, those who ought to have the liveliest interest in the matter, treat it as a joke, and ridicule the idea that such a thing can ever be accomplished in this "land of freedom." Whether it remains a land of freedom depends upon our vigilance and faithfulness to our highest interests.

Difficult to Learn.

DR. SPEAR, of Brooklyn, N. Y., wrote an excellent book with the title of "Religion and the State." We shall take occasion to quote from it in the future. On the exercise of individual conscience, he says:—

"There ought to be room in this world for *all* the consciences in it, without any encroachment upon the rights of each other; and there would be if *all* men, in their relations to each other, would be content to exercise their *own* rights of conscience in a reasonable manner. This would leave every man to determine the religious question for himself, and, as the necessary consequence, relieve every man from all impositions, burdens, taxes, or disabilities arising from the determination of the question by others. Though the rule is a simple one, it is, nevertheless, one of the most difficult things for bigotry to learn. The only way to learn it effectually is not to be a bigot."

The Doctor's recipe is excellent, but scarcely practicable in all cases. It is somewhat as if one should say that the best antidote for a fever is not to have a fever! Unfortunately, there is a class of persons who *are* bigots, and how are they to learn this useful lesson? We might pity them and let them alone; but, unfortunately again, bigotry seems to be contagious in some localities. Well, we promise to do all in our power to prevent its spread by letting the light into its lurking places. It flourished best in the "Dark Ages," and we do not wish for their return.

THE Lancaster (Cal.) *Weekly News*, speaking of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and of the efforts now being put forth to change the form of our Government, says:—

"When it is further considered that there is no poison so easily instilled into the public mind as that which is insidiously administered under the sugar-coating of double-distilled piety, it must be confessed that it is well that an alert sentinel should be put on guard before any considerable breach is made in the 'outer wall' which protects our civil and religious liberties. And we will say this for the *Sentinel*, that its articles are ably and carefully concocted, without offensiveness toward the orthodox or 'unco gude,' and they should be read by every one who is a Christian or pretends to be one. He who is not may also find pleasure and profit in them. Its price is only 50 cents a year, and we commend the journal to public favor."

We shall never give offense to the orthodox; for we profess to be orthodox also, fully "believing all things written in the law and the prophets." And this is the strongest reason why we oppose the Religious Amendment of our Constitution: Such alliances with earthly powers always have been detrimental to pure Christianity, and they cannot fail to be wherever they are made. We do not wish to see the standard of religion brought any nearer to a point of worldliness than it is now.

THE question has been raised as to how the religious sentiment of the coming generation will be kept up if our country is made "a Christian nation" according to the views of the "Reformers." There can be no difficulty whatever. Non-professors or non-church-members will not be eligible to office, and therefore every man will surely become a church-member by the time he becomes eligible to office. Infidelity will be at a great discount under such an arrangement. There might be some necessity for preaching to the women if they should prove so indifferent as to be willing to be out of the fashion. But that difficulty might also be removed by adopting "female suffrage," and making them eligible to office. Then "the offense of the cross" will have effectually ceased, and the millennium will be a fixed fact. Delightful prospect!

DIPHTHERIA.—The Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., have for sale an excellent little book on the treatment of diphtheria. It has proved a priceless boon to many households who have followed its directions when this terrible scourge found its way into their families. It is an act of humanity to advise our readers of the existence of this treatise. Price, in board covers, 25 cents. Address as above.

"THE movement looking to the amendment of our National Constitution, so as to put our Government upon an acknowledged Christian basis, is fast growing in popularity. The pulpit, the press, and the platform—the great engines of every reform—are pushing forward its interests. Meetings for its discussion are multiplying over the land."—*United Presbyterian.*

REV. ROBERT BAIRD said: "The putting of witches to death in Massachusetts was a legitimate result of the attempt to build up a sort of theocracy, having for its basis the civil institutions of the Jewish commonwealth."

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, postpaid - - - - - - - - - 2s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.