

AMERICAN SENTINEL

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 1.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY, 1886.

NUMBER 7.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

IN the gloomy years that followed the Revolution, the Episcopal Church continued prostrate, and felt the loss of her establishment most severely. Then did it seem as if nothing short of her utter ruin would satisfy the resentment of her enemies. She had, indeed, in the day of her power, been exclusive, domineering, and persecuting; her own sins had brought upon her this severe visitation. From her case, as well as from all past experience, persecuting churches should learn that a church that oppresses will one day be herself oppressed, and most likely by those on whose neck she had placed her foot.—*Baird.*

IN the Canonsburg Woman's Christian Temperance Union National Reform Convention, Rev. D. S. Littell, of Cloakey, Pa., delivered an address on "The Relation of Civil Government to Christ," in which, says the report:—

"He ably argued that it was the duty of civil government to enforce the will of Christ so far as that will has reference to the outward conduct of the individual. So far as that will pertains to the heart and inner feelings, it is the business of the Church to see to its enforcement, the Church and the State being Christ's two arms for carrying out his will."—*Christian Statesman June 3, 1886, p 7.*

Now baptism is an essential part of the outward conduct of the individual in performing the will of Christ. Therefore, according to this able argument, it is the duty of civil government to enforce baptism. Will these worthy missionaries be as generous in this matter as was their great prototype, Constantine, who gave a white garment and twenty pieces of gold to every convert? or will they employ the converting power of Charlemagne, and "wipe out" all who will not be so "Christianized."

Again the Lord's Supper is a part of the will of Christ that "has reference to the outward conduct of the individual." Therefore, it is the duty of the civil government to enforce the observance of the Lord's Supper! In this, will the National Reform hierarchy follow the example of its papal predecessors? If not, why not? If the success of Mr. Littell's "ably argued" doctrine would not be the union of Church and State, can anybody tell what would be such a union?

A Characteristic Expression.

"REV. M. A. GAULT," a constant contributor to the *Christian Statesman*, speaks as follows in that paper:—

"The individual may confess Christ through motives of hypocrisy, but not so of the nation. Such a confession in its Constitution can only be made through the prevailing sentiment of the nation. And, therefore, as true conversion in the individual, so this amendment in our National Constitution includes the triumph of every moral reform."

This is, in every respect, a most singular expression, but just such as we might expect from the "National Reformers." It is the very opposite of everything that is reasonable on the subject. Even the confessions of "Reformers" themselves show its inconsistency. There may be many reasons for people voting for the amendment who have no conscientious regard for Christianity. Dr. Browne, in the Pittsburg National Convention of 1874, spoke as follows:—

"There is no more persistent man alive than the typical representative American office-seeker. Of that class, the most of those who have not yet found whether they are for Christ or not, or who are openly decriing this movement, are ready to be its firm friends as soon as they acquire wisdom to discern the signs of the times, and are assured of its speedy success. They may pull back now at the hind axle, or scotch the wheels of the car of progress; but when they see it move, they will quickly jump in to get front seats, and avow that they always thought it was a good thing." etc.

Yes, any prospect or promise of success will insure their hearty co-operation, in there is to them any hope of selfish gain in the way of office. This will be the necessary result of the success of this boasted "reform;" it will attract all the old political hacks to its side, with the understanding that they must profess their adherence to Christianity in order to have any show for office. This result we have pointed out from the beginning of the movement; it will serve to set a premium upon hypocrisy, for the greatest demagogue will, under such circumstances, make the strongest profession and the longest prayers. And it must be remembered that the vote of each one of these time-serving hypocrites would have the same weight and influence toward "Christianizing" our nation that the vote of Rev. Mr. Gault himself would have. And yet he dares to assert that the religious profession of the nation would be free from the uncertainties or the liability to hypocrisy that attends an individual profession!

In the same convention in which Dr. Browne outlined the course of office-seekers in relation

to the proposed amendment, Dr. Hays spoke to the same point. He said, when the masses begin to move, "hundreds of politicians who would not for the world commit themselves to it now, will bawl themselves hoarse in applause, and swear they knew it would be so, and were on that side from the beginning."

Thus do the "Reformers" themselves recognize the fact that the ambitious, the selfish, the hypocritical politicians will give their adherence to their movement for the sake of worldly gain. And yet again they will assert that in carrying this amendment into effect there will be none of the "motives of hypocrisy" which may attend individual confessions of Christianity! We can hardly give them credit for being deceived in a matter so plainly to be seen by all.

The Lansing, Mich. *State Republican* gave a very truthful representation of the case when 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; . . . such an amendment would be likely to receive an affirmative vote which would by no means indicate the true sentiment of the people. . . . 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."

The editor of the *Cincinnati Gazette* is a Christian, and a man of acknowledged ability. In speaking on the subject of the amendment he said:—

"The Government will continue to be administered by men of ordinary passions, such as are elected by the average intelligence and virtue, and the average ignorance and corruption of the voting population. Viciousness, and ignorance, and corruption will continue to be powers in the body politic the same as before, and these will continue to elect legislators, executives, and judges of their own sort."

And such will be the millennium of the National Reformers. No thoughtful and candid person will deny that these statements are reasonable and just, and they are also justified by the admissions of Doctors Browne and Hays.

Again, the absurdity of the remarks of Mr. Gault is shown in this: The majority of the voters of the United States is composed of people who are irreligious or indifferent to religion.

Of this latter class are multitudes who attend meetings, show *respect* to Christianity, but have no personal, heart-felt interest in it. Many of these would no doubt vote for the amendment. If, then, the amendment were adopted it would not be by a vote indicative of the "prevailing sentiment of the nation." But in order that this national confession of Christ should be free from the worldly motives which may taint the individual confession, as Mr. Gault claims that it would be, there must not be merely a "prevailing sentiment," but a *universal sentiment* of adherence to pure Christianity; but none but the wildest dreamer expects that such a state will ever mark our national politics. An individual confession of Christ must be single-minded; if the motives of the heart are mixed, partly for Christ and partly for Baal, the confession is worthless. How, then, can a national confession of Christianity be more certainly and necessarily pure than an individual confession, while a large proportion of the individuals composing the nation are irreligious? And not only so, but according to Mr. Gault's own statement, the confession of that part of the individuals professing religion may be tainted with "motives of hypocrisy," yet the religion of the nation, in the aggregate, would be high above all hypocritical motives. And therefore it is an accepted fact, according to the philosophy of these reformers, that the religion of the nation would be necessarily higher and purer than the religion of the individuals composing the nation! Yea, more; though only a part of the nation is religious at all, the religion of the whole nation would be purer than that of the religious part of the nation. Just where this super-abundance of pure national religion would be lodged is not easy to see. If it were in the hearts of the people as individuals, then individual confessions of Christ would be as free from "motives of hypocrisy" as the national confession would be; but "Rev. Mr. Gault" says they are not. Here is abundant room for Mr. Gault to "rise and explain."

It is also in order for these professed National Reformers to point to a national confession of Christianity, from the time of Constantine to the present, which has been worthy of our deep respect because of its purity or freedom from motives of hypocrisy. While Christianity was separate from the State, and while Christians were oppressed and persecuted by the State, then were they devoted and consecrated, and Christianity proved its heavenly origin in the lives of its adherents. But when it was allied to the State and received State patronage, then the church became corrupt, and her highest offices were soon filled by worldly, designing men who confessed Christ "through motives of hypocrisy." As before remarked, the legitimate result of uniting the Church to the State is putting a premium on hypocrisy; it is inviting selfish office-seekers and wily politicians to make a profession of religion a material part of their "stock in trade." All the errors and wrongs and persecutions of the papal system are traceable to the union of the secular and ecclesiastical power. We see its evils everywhere in the Greek Church. The highest form of national religion is found in England, and there we see that "livings" are sold like rail-

road stocks; openly irreligious men, who care only for games and sports, hold responsible places in the church, and "sub-let" the work of the gospel at enormous profits! Such a thing is possible only where there is "national religion."

We must express our surprise that men of education and fair intelligence will utter such absurdities and sophistries as are everywhere found in the literature of the "National Reform" people. They seem to be actually intoxicated with the hope of worldly aggrandizement through a change in the structure of our Government. They show themselves utterly at fault in treating of State matters. If anything were needed to prove that it is not wise to intrust the reins of civil power to the hands of ecclesiastics, as such, they furnish the proof in the crudity of their views in questions of national politics. It would be well for the cause of religion if they would cease to electioneer for civil power, and give themselves to the ministry of the word. And it will be well for the nation, well for our civil and religious liberties, if the people shall receive the warning, and reject all overtures for such a corrupting alliance, which cannot fail to degrade religion, and to deprive some classes of equal rights and privileges in the Government.

J. H. W.

National Reform and the Chinese.

EVER since Congress passed the Chinese Restriction Act, the *Christian Statesman* has been in great tribulation, because of the great wrong committed by the nation in that piece of legislation. Now in this article we propose no discussion of the righteousness or unrighteousness of that act of Congress, or whether it was just or unjust in itself. Our controversy is with the *Christian Statesman*, on its own published propositions, all of which are editorial utterances, and therefore stand as authoritative principles of National Reform.

By act of Congress the importation, or emigration, of Chinese laborers was prohibited for a period of ten years. This act the *Christian Statesman* denounced at the time. In its issue of Sept. 25, 1884, among "the gravest of moral evils, evils which threaten the very life of the nation," "*injustice to the Chinese*" is named. In its issue of Oct. 23, 1884, it says that "the unchristian Chinese policy of the two great parties is part of the indictment which the better conscience of the country is charging upon them." Again, in its issue of Oct. 2, 1884, we read:—

"The two leading political parties have vied with each other in displaying their readiness to exclude the Chinamen from our shores, and have declared for the policy of exclusion, in their respective platforms. This policy, on the other hand, is felt by large numbers of Christian men to be *in violation of the natural rights of men*, as well as *contrary to the spirit and teachings of the religion of Jesus*, and increases the dissatisfaction with which, on other grounds, these parties and their platforms are regarded."

But what do the *Statesman* and the National Reform Party propose instead of this? We read:—

"We may not shut the door in the face of any one who wishes to come and dwell with

us. No nation has the right to do this, even for the preservation of religious character." "Make all men welcome to our shores, but give all men to understand that this is a Christian nation; and that believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all right means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. . . . *Enforce upon all that come among us the laws of Christian morality.*"

Let us analyze this position and see wherein it differs from the position of the political parties which it condemns. By the term "laws of Christian morality," the *Statesman* means the ten commandments. With this definition then it says, "Enforce upon all that come among us the ten commandments." Now "enforce," according to Webster, means "to force; to constrain; to compel; to execute with vigor." Therefore the *Statesman* says: "*Force, compel, all that come among us to keep the ten commandments.*" "*Execute with vigor the ten commandments upon all that come among us.*" But the second commandment forbids men to make, to bow down to, or to serve, graven images; and this bears with particular force against the Chinese, for they do make and worship graven images; so that it may fairly be said that of all the Chinese who should ever desire to come to this country, they would be, without exception, idolaters. Now when, by constitutional amendment, this shall have been declared a Christian nation, and notice shall have thus been given that all who come here will be compelled to keep the ten commandments, will that be a sufficient argument to induce the Chinese to abandon their idols that they may come here? Allowing all the wondrous efficacy that has been ascribed to National Reform, such could hardly be expected of it, for the Chinese are just as sincere in their worship, idolatrous as it is, as are the National Reformers in theirs; and it certainly will require something more than an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to convince them that their worship is wrong. So it is easy enough to tell what the Chinese will do when the time comes that they shall have to choose whether they will abandon their worship or come to the United States. With such an alternative, they will never come to this country. Therefore the success of the National Reform policy will just as absolutely exclude the Chinese from this country as does the act of Congress which is now in force, and which is so unsparingly denounced by that party.

Now to show that the force that is given to their expressions, by the definitions before given, is not more than they intend, we give some more of their words on this subject. In the *San Francisco Chronicle* of September 24, 1884, appeared an account of a Chinese procession in that city, in honor of their god How Wong. In the *Christian Statesman* of October 30, 1884, under the caption, "Idolatry Publicly Tolerated," the account is copied in full, and then commented on as follows:—

"The remedy lies, not in the exclusion of the Chinese from our shores, where they have from God a perfect right to come, but in the legal prohibition of their public idolatry, which they have from God no right to practice, and which *no Christian Government ought to tolerate* on its soil." "Odious it is, offensive to Christian sen-

sibilities, provoking the anger of Heaven against the nation which tolerates it. But . . . the American people generally would doubtless be shocked by the suggestion that such open idolatry *should be suppressed by law*. But if this is, as claimed, a Christian nation, and if Jehovah is our God, why should the suggestion be considered as strange or impracticable?"

It is plain, therefore, by their own declarations, that the Chinese cannot come to this country and bring their worship with them, and that, as we have seen, works the exclusion of the Chinese as effectually as any other means that could be employed. And all this must be done, the *Statesman* says, to "maintain our Christian character;" and this, too, after stating explicitly, as above, that "no nation has the right to do this even for the preservation of religious character." The *Statesman* may talk of the servility of political parties all it pleases, but if there ever was a political party that exceeded the National Reform Party in hollow pretense, or sham principle, we should like the *Statesman* to point it out.

There is another phase of this question. Suppose that while the United States refuses to "tolerate" the worship of the Chinese, they should refuse to "tolerate," in their country, the worship of the Christians. Suppose that when this nation has "suppressed by law" the worship of the Chinese, they should retaliate and suppress by law the worship of the Christians. What could this nation do? Remonstrance would come with very poor grace from the nation that first committed the intolerance. And so the sword of National Reform would cut both ways; it would not only shut the Chinese out of this country, but would shut Christianity out of China.

Now let us draw a comparison between the action of Congress which the *Statesman* condemns, and the action of the nation which it would approve.

IT CONDEMNS	IT APPROVES
An act of Congress which excludes the Chinese.	An Amendment to the Constitution, the effect of which will be the same.
An act which excludes the Chinese for <i>ten years</i> .	An act which would exclude them for <i>all time</i> .
An act of Congress which might be repealed by any subsequent Congress.	An act, the effect of which would be the same, and which could not possibly be effected by less than three-fourths of the whole nation.
An act which excludes only one class of Chinese—laborers.	An act which will exclude all classes of Chinese but one—Christian Chinese.
An act which excludes only one class of one nation for ten years.	An act which, with one exception—Christians—excludes <i>all classes of all nations for all time</i> .

Therefore if the action of Congress and the political parties are by the National Reform Party to be condemned seven times, surely the National Reform Party itself must be condemned seventy times seven.

A. T. J.

"PROPERLY speaking, there is no such thing as 'religion of State.' What we mean by that phrase is the religion of some individual or set of individuals, taught and enforced by the State. The State can have no religious opinions; and if it undertakes to enforce the teaching of such opinions, they must be the opinions of some natural person or class of persons."—*Supreme Court of Ohio*.

"Who so diggeth a pit shall fall therein."

National Reform Opposed to the Bible.

WHEN we use the term "National Reform," it is understood that we refer to the theories advanced by the Party which is endeavoring to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States. A true reform could not, of course, be opposed to the Bible; but the so-called "National Reform" movement is in no sense a reform, and that because it is opposed to the Bible. We use the term because it has been assumed by the Party, and not because we regard the movement as a reform.

The great point which the leaders of that Party aim to make is that Jesus is now the literal ruler and Governor of nations; that, for instance, the President of the United States is only the nominal head of this Government, but that Jesus Christ is the real head—the king—and that therefore his sovereignty should be formally acknowledged. If they were not infatuated they could certainly see the absurdity of speaking of the king of a republic, even if they could not see how antagonistic their position is to the truth of the Bible. We believe, however, that those who have not become intoxicated with the wine of National Reform error, can readily see the following points:—

When God had created the earth, he said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1: 26-28.

In this work of creation the Son was associated with the Father, and was the active agent, for by him the worlds were made (Heb. 1: 2), and John says, "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." John 1: 3. Therefore it was the Son, as well as the Father, who gave the dominion of the earth to man.

With the narrative in Genesis agree the following words of the psalmist: "The Heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's; but the earth hath he given to the children of men." Ps. 115: 16. From these two texts nothing can be plainer than that the dominion of this world has been intrusted to men.

Let no one imagine that we would intimate that God has nothing to do with this earth. We do not so believe, and the texts that we have quoted do not so teach. The greater includes the less, and the statement that the heavens are the Lord's, is equivalent to saying that God rules over all, as it is stated in Ps. 103: 19: "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." Therefore "the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein." Ps. 24: 1. But, while these texts recognize God's right to all things, as Creator, they do not conflict with the statement, "the earth hath he given to the children of men."

For what purpose has he given it to the children of men? That they may govern it, even as stated in Gen. 1: 26, 27. This is shown in Rom. 13: 1-4, where it is stated that the powers that be are ordained of God, and that rulers are appointed to bear the sword of justice. The expression, "the powers that be are ordained of God," refers to authority in general, rather than to particular Governments. And this should be sufficient to show that, although God rules the entire universe, he is not the head of any earthly Government. If he were, then there would be but one correct form of Government, and the officers of that Government would be appointed directly by Him, as in the case of the ancient Jewish Government. But no one can claim that of the various nations of earth, one is ordained of God, to the exclusion of the others.

Take for instance, Russia, Germany, England, and the United States. Here we have four Governments, all differing in their structure. Which of them is ordained of God? All of them. They are all for the purpose of preserving order, and of guarding the rights of each individual against the encroachments of others. This is all that earthly Governments are ordained to do. The whole of the law against the violation of which they can execute wrath is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and this they can enforce only so far as concerns outward acts. They cannot compel a man to love his neighbor in his heart, but they can see that he does his neighbor no personal wrong, and when they do this, they are carrying out that for which they were appointed. And in thus executing justice between man and man the ruler is ordained of God, whether he is born to the throne, or whether he is elected by the people, or appointed by a few. The Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Germany, the Queen of England, and the President of the United States, are all equally ordained of God as ministers of justice; not because God is personally at the head of any one of these Governments, but because he has ordained that men shall be under authority, and the individuals above referred to are in authority in their respective Governments. In the discharge of their duty, they are each personally responsible to God, just the same as the humblest peasant.

But, although man was given dominion over the earth and all that it contains, all things are not now under him. Adam was overcome by the tempter, and so forfeited his dominion. He has not now perfect dominion over the earth, because it does not yield to him the increase that it formerly did; and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea are not passively subject to his control. What man forfeited, he has no power to regain. And so, since we do not now see all things put under him, Paul says that "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Heb. 2: 9. Not only did Christ taste death in order to restore to man his forfeited life, but he also bore the curse of the earth (compare Gen. 3: 17, 18 and Matt. 27: 29), that he might redeem it, and restore to man the possession that he lost.

Since Christ alone could redeem the lost dominion, and has paid the price, it is to him that it is to come. Says the prophet, "And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." Micah 4:8. And so Paul directs the minds of the disciples forward to the time of "the redemption of the purchased possession." Eph. 1:14. And when that time shall come, and the kingdom shall be given to Him "whose right it is," those who have suffered with Christ shall also reign with him. 2 Tim. 2:12; Rom. 8:17.

But it is not within the power of men to restore the kingdom to Christ. Here is where the would-be National Reformers make their fatal blunder. They say, "We must gain the world for Christ, and place him in his rightful position as Sovereign." But God says to the Son, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Ps. 2:8. When some of the people "thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear," Christ told them that he was as one going into a far country "to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." Luke 19:11, 12. And Daniel, in the prophetic vision, saw the giving of the kingdom to Christ by the Father, and has described it in the following language: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. 7:13, 14.

Add to the above the following prophetic account of the time and circumstances of the giving of the kingdoms of this world to Christ, and the utter folly of the claims of the Amendmentists will be apparent:—

"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshiped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth." Rev. 11:15-19.

Here we see that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, only when the time comes that the dead shall be judged, and when the corrupt of earth shall be destroyed. Compare Ps. 2:8, 9 and Rev. 19:11-21.

In this brief survey we have learned concern-

ing Christ's sovereignty, (1) That he is not now ruler of this world; the dominion given to man in the beginning, has been forfeited, and Satan having usurped the authority is "god of this world." (2) Man has no power to recover the lost dominion; Christ alone has the power, and he has paid the price. The controversy therefore, is between Christ and Satan. (3) We are now only waiting "the redemption of the purchased possession," when the kingdoms of this world shall be given to Christ, and he will reign forever as actual sovereign of this world. (4) He has now gone to receive the kingdom, and to return. (5) The Father has promised "the uttermost parts of the earth" to Christ for a possession, and he alone has power to bestow the gift. (6) Men do not win the kingdom to Christ and then place him on the throne, but on the contrary, when Christ comes on the throne of his glory, having received the kingdom, he will call the righteous to come and share it with him. Matt. 25:31-34. And (7) this will be only at the end of the world, when the dead shall be judged, and the wicked destroyed.

It has been before shown that the so-called National Reform theory is absurd; we think this shows that it is unscriptural. That is the reason for its absurdity, for whatever is unscriptural must be absurd. When we consider God's great plan of salvation, and the infinite price that has been paid for the redemption of the earth, and of man, that he may be assisted to a place in the kingdom of God, it seems little less than blasphemous presumption for the puny creatures to arrogate to themselves the task of placing the Creator on his own throne!

E. J. W.

Design of the Proposed Amendment.

In June, 1873, Rev. Wm. Ballentine, then pastor of the Associate Congregation of Bloomfield, Ohio, delivered a lecture before the Associate Synod, on National Reform. A few weeks afterward, Dr. Wishart published a reply in the *United Presbyterian*, of Pittsburg, and to these strictures Mr. Ballentine replied in a pamphlet, being denied admission to the columns of the *United Presbyterian*. With this explanation, we invite the reader's attention to the following extract from Mr. Ballentine's pamphlet. It shows in a clear light how the proposed amendment, if adopted, will lower the Scriptures to the level of ordinary civil affairs:—

"The ambiguity of the language in which the second proposed amendment is couched, viz., 'That the Lord Jesus Christ is Governor among the nations,' is a valid objection to its insertion in a civil instrument of government. It is susceptible of a two fold interpretation. We can understand it in what we believe to be the true theological sense, that Jesus Christ as King and Head of Zion, is Ruler among the nations, and in, 'Jacob ruleth to the ends of the earth.' But in this sense it is purely a matter of faith, and has no more claim for insertion in the Constitution than any other doctrine in our religious profession. But it is also susceptible of being understood in what we believe to be a heterodox sense, and in this sense it seems to be understood by its advocates, viz.: That Jesus Christ, in some sense, as the civil head of nations, ruleth among them. Understanding it

in this sense, we cannot advocate its insertion, being theologically wrong. Neither in the former sense can we advocate its insertion, it being purely a matter of faith, having no more authority for its insertion than the perseverance of the saints, predestination, or any doctrine of faith set forth in the Westminster standards. In regard to the third amendment, 'That his revealed will is of Supreme authority,' we believe it to be too indefinite to secure the end intended. If it is simply regarded as a statement of truth, without the force and sanction of law, it will not secure respect for the authority of Scripture from those who have not their understandings opened to understand the truth of God. If, on the other hand, we regard it as having the force and sanction of law, we make the Scriptures of divine truth the formal rule of the magistracy, and so constitute civil rulers the judges and interpreters of Scripture. From this, as a church, we have always demurred, and we still see no reason why we should change our ground.

"It will probably be denied by some, that the third amendment, which we have opposed, is designed to make the Scriptures the formal rule of the civil magistrate. If this be not the design of some of their leaders, we fail to comprehend the import and force of plain English. We will give some extracts from the *Christian Statesman* that will speak for themselves. In its issue of May 15, 1868, we have a prize offered by the Reformed Presbyterian congregations of Pittsburg and Allegheny, Pa., for the best manuscript on several topics, and among others for this: "*The Bible as the supreme law in civil matters.*" This may be viewed as too abstract to prove anything. Let us, then, hear the concrete or the application. In its issue of December 15, 1868, in reply to the inquiries of Mr. J. McFarland about the efficiency of said amendments to arrest the commission of frauds in Philadelphia and New York, and the demoralization in politics, the editor answers: 'Precisely in this way: The amendment which we propose will be, when it is adopted, a deliberate and solemn utterance of the national will. The people, in their sovereign capacity, will declare: "We recognize Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government; the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler among nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority." Once enacted into the Constitution, this language has the force of law. It makes all the requisitions of the Bible concerning civil government "supreme law," and, among others, this: "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Congress would at once be legally bound to make laws purging national offices of immoral and irreligious men. No Sabbath breaker or profane swearer, no man known to be guilty of drunkenness or licentiousness, could legally hold office or vote after the passage of this amendment!'

"The editor of the *Christian Statesman* surely understands the fundamental principles of this movement. He has been one of its inaugurators. What, then, is the import of the above extract? Does it not teach that whenever the amendments are adopted, that they have the force of law—that the requisitions of the

Bible concerning civil governments are a 'supreme law'—that Congress must enforce it in purging national office? If this would not be making the Bible the formal rule of Congress, we think language cannot express it. The evidences on this point throughout the columns of the *Christian Statesman*, like the 'possessed,' hath their name 'Legion,' for they are many. In the issue of June 1, 1869, the editor again, writing under the caption, 'Sufficiency of the Proposed Amendment,' uses the following language: 'The design of the pending movement of National Reform is not to secure mention of God in the National Constitution merely because such mention would be decent and becoming. It is not, in the view of its most earnest supporters, to express a sentiment which the nation already feels, and to exhibit a Christian character which, as a nation, we already possess. The necessity for the reform lies far deeper than such arguments would imply. The success of our cause would have a far more momentous effect. Our labors are an attempt to bring this nation into subjection to God, and the conviction that we are not, as a nation, in allegiance to the King of nations, but in rebellion against him, and so in imminent danger of destruction, is the real impulse of the movement.'

"Does this extract not clearly show that it is not the design of the 'earnest supporters' of this movement to give expression to the Christian character of the nation, by simply acknowledging God. This would be 'decent and becoming,' but it would be too tame. Something deeper, more radical, is aimed at. The design is pointedly declared 'to bring this nation into subjection to God,' by giving to the amendments, as was observed in the former extract, 'the force of law,' and expurgating all the departments of government. One of the amendments the editor expresses in the following language: 'That the Holy Scriptures, as a revelation of Christ's will, are the supreme law of nations.' Giving the Scriptures, which are here declared to be the 'supreme law of nations,' the 'force of law,' is surely making them the 'formal rule' of civil government. If it is not, what words could express it more clearly?"

"Further on, having noticed the omission of any express recognition of the Sabbath, the moral qualification of rulers—the duty of the State—the religious instruction of her children and the relations of Church and State—he adds: 'All these questions are subordinate to, and are included in, the ruling question, Shall the word of God be recognized as a law to this nation? When it shall be so recognized then the question will arise, What does the law of God require us to do?' This, we think, is all perfectly plain, and the editor, from his premises, perfectly logical. The recognition of the Bible, as proposed, is all that is necessary. Grant this, and all other questions about what it teaches will then devolve upon Congress to apprehend and enforce. Having become the law of the land, it must be interpreted by Judge Story and other commentators, and their interpretations enforced by the Judicial Department of Government. The knotty points in theology, especially the Headship question and the doctrine of the Trinity, having found a place

in the Constitution, will all be cleared up in a legal way. The difficulties between Seceders and Covenanters and United Presbyterians will all be happily adjusted by those 'learned in the law.' Immorality will cease and iniquity will hide its head. Happy consummation!! Devoutly to be wished!!"

The National Reform Movement an Absurdity.

In the discussion of the National Reform theory of the personality of the State, in our June issue, we showed conclusively that the theory is absurd; and that in the endeavor to escape the absurd consequences of their position, the National Reform Party resort to a fallacy which involves them in the inconsistency of holding beings subject to that to which, according to the theory, they cannot be subject. But we say again that we see no ground for hope that that party will ever abandon either the fallacy or the absurdity. For, as the theory is absurd, and as they affirm that the theory is fundamental to this whole movement, it is evident that absurdity is inherent in the whole National Reform system. That is not only the logic of the question, but it is strictly in accordance with all the facts in the case.

The absurdity of the view that the State is a person distinct from the individuals that compose it, is made more apparent when we consider the obligations of a nation, or State, as such. Doctor Sloane in a speech on this subject in the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, instanced the fact that "Great Britain, France, Italy, and our own country owe enormous debts." But we would inquire of the National Reform Party, Does this personality, which you call the State, of Great Britain, France, Italy, or the United States, owe this debt distinct from the people? and will it pay it distinct from the people? When Germany laid upon France the war indemnity of five milliards of francs, was it laid upon a "personality" distinct from the individuals that compose the nation? and when it was paid was it paid by such a distinct personality? To the minds of all reasonable men, to ask these questions is to answer them. These National Reform religio-political economists know as well as anybody does, that of the war indemnity exacted from France by Germany, every franc came from the people who compose the State, and not from some hypothetical "individual personality" distinct from the people. They know full well that every dollar of the national debt of our own country that has ever been paid has been paid by the people of the United States, and not a cent of it by any such theoretical absurdity as the National Reform Party defines to be the State.

Does the National Reform Party mean to say that, when it gets its iniquity framed by a law, and has thus perfected its idea of the personality of a State, it will have the State a personality so entirely distinct and separate from that of the people, that the State will pay the national debt without any help on the part of the people? No. That party itself, we do them the justice to suppose, would pronounce the idea preposterous. And so do we. But if it be so, where is the sense of all their argu-

ment about the personality of the State as distinct from the personality of the people who compose the State? If the State has a personality, an individuality of its own, and a soul of its own as distinct from that of any or all of the people who compose it, as is that of General Sherman or Mr. Blaine, then why can't it pay its debts distinct from the people, as General Sherman or Mr. Blaine pays his? The very idea is absurd.

Again, Prof. O. N. Stoddard, in the Cincinnati Convention, said:—

"If the character and liabilities of the State are not distinct from those of its individual members, then the State is punished hereafter in the persons of its subjects."

We would like Professor Stoddard or any other of the National Reformers to show where a State has ever been or ever can be punished, either here or hereafter, except in the persons of its subjects. When France was punished for its ill-advised declaration of war upon Germany, did the punishment fall upon the State distinct from the persons of its subjects? When Rome was punished for the fearfulness of her iniquities—when from the Rhine and the Danube to the deserts of Africa, and from the Black Sea and the Hellespont to the wall of Antoninus and the Atlantic Ocean, the whole empire was swept by the successive and devastating waves of savage barbarism—did these terrors afflict some such figment of a State as is conjured up by the National Reform brain? Did they not rather fall upon every age, sex, and condition of the individuals that composed the State? Again we say that but to ask the question is to answer it. But it demonstrates to all reasonable men the wild absurdity of the National Reform theory of the personality of a State. There is not, and there cannot be, any such personality of a State. And we are certain that no such thing would ever be seriously advocated in this country, were it not essential to the success of a scheme of religious bigotry and priestly despotism, whose most perfect likeness is that of the papacy.

Webster defines a State to be:—

"A political body, or *body politic*; the whole body of people united under one Government, whatever may be the form of the Government."

Chief Justice Chase defined a State as follows:—

"It describes sometimes a people or community of individuals united more or less closely in political relations, inhabiting temporarily or permanently the same country; often it denotes only the country or territorial region inhabited by such a community; not unfrequently it is applied to the Government under which the people live; at other times it represents the combined idea of people, territory, and Government. It is not difficult to see that in all these senses the primary conception is that of a people or community. The people in whatever territory dwelling, . . . constitute the State."—*Great Decisions by Great Judges*, p. 641.

Bouvier says that a State is,—

"A sufficient body of persons united together in one community for the defense of their rights and to do right and justice to foreigners. In this sense the State means the whole people united into one *body-politic*." "As to the persons who compose the *body-politic*, or associate themselves, they take collectively the name of 'people or nation.'"—*Law Dictionary*.

A body-politic is:—

"The collective body of a nation or State, as politically organized, or as exercising political functions; also a corporation."—*Webster*.

All this is in perfect harmony with the Scriptures. When God speaks of a nation he speaks of "the whole body of people" who form the nation. When he speaks to a State he speaks to "the people who constitute the State." When he inflicts judgments upon a State, those judgments fall upon the people who compose the State. To prove this we need no better illustration than the text which, in this connection, is doubtless more used than any other by the National Reform Party. It is this: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from *their* evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto *them*. And at what instant I speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit *them*." Jer. 18 : 7-10.

Thus it is *the people* who do the evil, and it is "unto *them*" that God pronounces to do evil; and when they "turn from *their* evil," then he turns from the evil he pronounced "to do unto *them*." In this same connection the Lord makes his own application of the principle which he has just laid down. Immediately following the text quoted, he says: "Now therefore go to, speak to *the men of Judah*, and to *the inhabitants of Jerusalem*, saying, Thus saith the Lord; Behold I frame evil against you, and devise a device against you: return ye now *every one* from his evil way, and make your ways and your doings good." Verse 11. Here God "framed evil" against the house of Israel, against the nation of the Jews, against the State of Judah, and the way to avert it was for the "men of Judah," and "the inhabitants of Jerusalem" "*every one*" to turn from his evil way. It would be impossible to more plainly show that, in the mind of God, and in the contemplation of the word of God, a State or nation is the people who compose it; that it is they individually who sin; and that it is to them individually, "every one," to whom the Lord speaks.

When the Lord pronounced judgment against Babylon, it was thus: "A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon, and upon her princes, and upon her wise men. A sword is upon the liars; and they shall dote; a sword is upon her mighty men and they shall be dismayed. A sword is upon her horses, and upon her chariots, and upon *all the mingled people* that are in the midst of her." "The violence done to me and to my flesh be upon Babylon, shall the inhabitant of Zion say; and my blood upon *the inhabitants of Chaldea*, shall Jerusalem say." Jer. 50 : 35-37; 51 : 35.

To present other instances from Scripture would only be superfluous; the whole Bible is consistent herewith, and but confirms the correctness of the definitions given, and the truth of the position which we maintain, that the idea of a State having a personality, a will, a soul, and a moral responsibility of its own distinct from the individuals that compose it, is

absurd. If a nation be wicked it is because the individuals who compose it are wicked; if it be righteous it is because the *people*, in their own individual moral relation to God, are righteous. When God exclaimed, "Ah, sinful nation"! it was because the *people* were "laden with iniquity." Isa. 1 : 4.

Thus it is clearly shown that the National Reform theory of a State is not only opposed to reason and common sense, but to established and authoritative definitions, and the word of God, as well.

There is, however, in connection with a State, a body-politic, or a corporation, the merest shadow of that which the National Reform Party pushes to such absurd conclusions. It is this: All bodies-politic, whether they be States, banks, railroads, or corporations of whatever kind, are, by a legal fiction and "for the advancement of justice," given a personality, but this personality "has no existence *except in a figure*." The definition is this:—

"A corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and *existing only in contemplation of law*. In certain respects and for certain purposes, corporations are deemed 'persons.' . . . But a corporation *cannot be deemed a moral agent*, and, like a natural person, be subjected to personal suffering. Malice and willfulness cannot be predicated of a corporation, though they may be of its members."—*Boone's Law of Corporations*.

Such, and such only, is the true doctrine of the personality of a State. And yet this "invisible," "intangible," "artificial" thing, this legal fiction, is the fundamental proposition upon which rests the whole National Reform movement! It is this sheer abstraction which that Party proposes to push to such enormous conclusions—conclusions that are fatal to liberty, both civil and religious. Could anything possibly be more absurd?

Professor Pomeroy, the eminent law writer, says:—

"The State, as separated from the individuals who compose it, has no existence except in a figure; and to predicate religious responsibility of this abstraction *is an absurdity*."

To predicate religious responsibility of this abstraction, is exactly what the National Reform Party does; therefore the demonstration is complete, by every principle of logic and of law, that the National Reform movement is an absurdity.

And that all may understand precisely what this demonstration amounts to, we append Webster's unabridged definition of an absurdity:—

"ABSURDITY—The quality of being absurd or inconsistent with obvious truth, reason, or sound judgment." "ABSURD—Opposed to manifest truth; inconsistent with reason or the plain dictates of common sense; logically contradictory."

That is what we mean in this connection, and that is exactly what the National Reform movement is. A. T. J.

MANY a dark chapter in history confirms the truth of the following remark:—

The experience of many ages proves that men may be ready to fight to the death and to persecute without pity for a religion whose creed they do not understand, and whose precepts they habitually disobey.—*Macaulay*.

State Theology.

THE term *State* means any distinct and independent body of persons occupying a given territory and united together under some form of civil government. The governmental organization of a State for the purpose of enacting and administering law, is practically the State itself. It is such as the agent of its legal operations. By the term *theology* is meant the science of God, embracing what is assumed to be known in regard to him and consisting subjectively in human beliefs with reference to the Supreme Being. What men thus believe is their theology; and if they believe in the doctrine of God at all, the natural sequel is some form of religious worship. The combination of the ideas indicated by these terms gives a *State theology*, or a government in which the State asserts a legal doctrine or creed in regard to God, and stamps the same with its own authority. The State, then, is a theological State. Its opinions, whether in respect to God himself or the duty and mode of religious worship, form a part of its laws; and this distinguishes them from *individual* beliefs or convictions that rest merely on private judgment, and hence admit of no coercive enforcement.

The natural and, as the most ample experience shows, the sure result of State theology is either such an identification of Church and State that the two are practically the same thing, or such an intimate legal union of the two that they mutually act through each other. In the one case the State is the Church and the Church is the State; and in the other, though formally distinct as organisms, they are, nevertheless, blended in a common set of functions in respect to religion. In both cases we have the union of ecclesiastical and civil powers, and in both we have religion with the sanction of the human law impressed upon it.

Every State theology must necessarily have some *specific* character; and as to what it shall be—whether pagan or Christian, and, if the latter, whether Catholic or Protestant—the State itself must be the judge. Its opinion on this subject it expresses through the edict of a king or the vote of a legislative assembly. It does the work of a theological professor, adding thereto the power of the civil arm. It teaches by command. Its dogmas are laws. All the reasons which demand or justify a State theology at all equally demand that it should be put into effective action. If it be the right and duty of the State to have a theology, then it is its duty to be governed by it and to govern the people by it. The least that it can do is to devise the ways and means of asserting, perpetuating, and enforcing it. If it is worth anything it deserves this tribute. State patronage, State disabilities or penalties for dissenters, and State administration are the logical corollaries. To this there can be no just objection, since if the State *ought* to have a theology, then it ought to use the necessary means to maintain and administer it. It should see to it that not only the children in the public schools, but also the adult population—indeed, all the people—enjoy the benefits thereof. That would be a very queer theology which the State first adopts and legalizes and then leaves to

shirk for itself. We hold it to be the duty of the State to sustain its own theology, provided always that theology comes within its proper sphere.

This, moreover, would be practically an easy task if all the people thought exactly alike, and their common thoughts were faithfully represented by the theology of the State. Such, however, does not happen to be the case. What, then, shall be done with those who dissent from this theology, and decline to conform to its requirements? This question the State must answer, and generally does so answer as to involve the principle of proscription or persecution. It is a fact wide as the world and spread all over the records of history, that State theologies have with great uniformity been persecuting theologies. Christ and his apostles and their followers were persecuted by the State theology of the Jews. Pagan Rome had such a theology, and for three bloody centuries she wielded its power against the Christians. Constantine established Christianity as a State theology and made it a persecuting power. The State theology of the Roman Catholic and that of the Protestant show the same record. State theology drove the Puritans out of England and murdered the Huguenots in France. It made our Puritan fathers persecutors. Mohammedanism as a State theology and Paganism as such are marked by the same feature. The missionary efforts of modern times to propagate Christianity among the heathen meet with one of their most formidable obstacles in State theologies, and the same was true of like efforts in the apostolic age. It is a general fact that the moment theology allies itself with the State and commands its powers it becomes persecuting in respect to all who dissent from it, and that, too, whether it be pagan or Christian, Catholic or Protestant. History paints this fact in lurid colors.

Nor is there anything strange or unnatural in such a fact. It results from the very nature of the case. The theology of the State is a part of its organic or statute law, and, of course, it should be sustained by its authority and power. Heresy is, hence, a *crime*, as really as murder, and as such it should be punished. So the State reasons, and that, too, correctly, provided we accept the doctrine of State theology. Catholic States and Protestant States have reasoned in this way. What we call religious persecution, State theology calls punishment to prevent crime. What we call religious liberty, it calls a dangerous exercise of private judgment. Saul of Tarsus was a conscientious persecutor, regarding himself as doing God service; and it is but just to say that State theologies have generally been conscientious in their deeds of murder and blood. They have not looked upon themselves as ruffians and outlaws, but rather as the conservators of the divine honor and the true interests of souls. The thoughts of an after and a wiser age were not their thoughts when they trampled the religious rights of men into the dust and shocked Heaven, if not earth, with their cruelties. Religious zeal misdirected is a terrible passion; and all State theologies, because administered by men, are apt to have this zeal.

We present, then, the disabilities, the perse-

cutions, and the martyrdoms, which are so conspicuous in the history of State theology, as more than suggesting that there must be some radical mistake in the doctrine itself. A doctrine that can by perversion turn the mild and genial religion of Jesus into a flaming persecutor, and make it a ferocious enemy to religious liberty as vested by God in individual souls; a doctrine that undertakes to adjudicate upon questions lying exclusively between the soul and its Maker; a doctrine that substitutes carnal for spiritual weapons; a doctrine that resorts to the law of force, where nothing is pertinent except the peaceful persuasion of argument and the gentle and loving voice of entreaty; a doctrine that in practical execution becomes an abominable despotism exercised over the bodies and attempted over the souls of men—yes, such a doctrine has written upon its face in letters of light the glaring evidence of being essentially and fundamentally wrong. Judging it by its fruits, we find it difficult to use terms sufficiently intense to describe the degree of that wrong. Its pervading principle is hostile alike to God and man, although it professes to be the servant of both.

It is, moreover, a significant fact of history that Christianity has always prospered most in the true sense when it has had least to do with the State and the State has had least to do with it. For the first three centuries it was the theology of individual conviction, resting simply on its own evidence, holding no other relation to the State than that of a persecuted religion, and doing its entire work by the use of spiritual means; and then it was that it spread itself among the nations of the earth with a purity and power that have never since been exceeded. Then it was that venerable and pompous systems of Paganism yielded to the resistless energy of its moral march. Afterward it became a State theology; and then, in the hands of the State, it was not only corrupted and half-paganized, but at once assumed, and for centuries maintained, the character of a persecuting religion. All the persecutions of the Romish Church, and, indeed, all the persecutions that have existed in the name of Christianity, have had their basis in State theology. If God should be pleased to constitute a theocracy on earth, and by inspiring it guarantee its infallibility, then it would be the duty of men to bow to its authority; but until we have this fact established by appropriate evidence, the conclusion drawn from history is that the State should confine itself exclusively to things temporal, and leave theology to the individual convictions and private judgments of men. This is certainly the truth in respect to Christianity.—*From "Religion and the State," by Samuel T. Spear, D. D.*

The State, as a political organization, has never been trusted by the Divine Founder of Christianity with the duty of its propagation. He never said to the State: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel," or "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." He said these things to his apostles, and to those who through them should believe on his name. The apostleship of his word he located in his disciples and followers, and not in kings, governors nor legislative assemblies.

Publishers' Column.

OUR GENERAL AGENTS.

Australia—International Tract Society, *Bible Echo* Office, Rae and Scotchmer Sts., North Fitzroy, Victoria, Australia.
 British Guiana.—Joseph R. Brathwaite, 152 Church St., Georgetown, and Thos. E. Amsterdam, 10 Church St., New Amsterdam, B. G., S. A.
 California Tract Society—1067 Castro St., Oakland, Cal.
 Canada Tract Society—South Stukely, P. Q.
 Colorado Tract Society—441 Jay Street, Denver, Colo.
 Dakota Tract Society—Vilas, Miner Co., Dak.
 District of Columbia.—International Tract Society, 1831 Vermont Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.
 England—*The Present Truth*, 72 Heneage St., Grimsby, Eng.
 Florida Tract Society—Miss Lysle Reynolds, Secretary, Box 232, Jacksonville, Fla.
 Hawaiian Islands—International Tract Society, Honolulu, H. I.
 Idaho—Elder D. T. Fero, Boise City, Idaho.
 Illinois Tract Society—3652 Vincennes Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Indiana Tract Society—No. 32 Cherry St., Indianapolis, Ind.
 Iowa Tract Society—1815 E. Sycamore St., Des Moines, Iowa.
 Kansas Tract Society—Box 160, Ottawa, Franklin Co., Kan.
 Kentucky Tract Society—West Clifty, Grayson Co., Ky.
 Louisiana—International Tract Society, Pitt Street, between Valmont and Leontine Streets, New Orleans, La.
 Maine Tract Society—118 Pearl St., Portland, Me.
 Michigan Tract Society—Battle Creek, Mich.
 Minnesota Tract Society—2820 Nicollet Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.
 Missouri Tract Society—321 Lamine Ave., Sedalia, Mo.
 Montana—Walter Harper, Butte City, Mont., Box 368.
 Nebraska Tract Society—Fremont, Dodge Co., Neb.
 New England—N. E. Tract Society, South Lancaster, Mass.
 New Mexico—John McMurchy, White Oaks, Lincoln County, N. M.
 New York Tract Society—Box 113, Rome, N. Y.
 New Zealand—Edward Hare, Upper Queen Street (Turner Street), Auckland, N. Z.
 North Pacific—N. P. Tract Society, Box 13, East Portland, Oregon.
 Norway—*Sundhedsbladet*, Christiania, Norway.
 Ohio Tract Society—259 Adams St., Toledo, Ohio.
 Pennsylvania Tract Society—No. 5 Madison St., Wellsville, N. Y.
 Switzerland—Elder W. C. White, 48 Weiherweg, Basel, Switzerland.
 Tennessee Tract Society—Springville, Henry Co., Tenn.
 Texas Tract Society—Mrs. Lee Gregory, Secretary, Denton, Tex.
 Upper Columbia—U. C. Tract Society, Walla Walla, W. T.
 Vancouver Island—Bernard Robb, Victoria, B. C.
 Vermont—Lizzie A. Stone, South Lancaster, Mass.
 Virginia Tract Society—New Market, Shenandoah Co., Va.
 Wisconsin Tract Society—1029 Jenifer St., Madison, Wis.
 Wyoming—J. T. Trees, Tie Siding, Albany Co., Wyo.

All of the above Agencies are authorized to receive subscriptions to the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, *American Sentinel*, and *Pacific Health Journal and Temperance Advocate*. Catalogues of our books, pamphlets, and tracts, in English and the various foreign languages, can be obtained from them. Write to the agency nearest you.

PLEASE examine the little *yellow label* on your paper, and if the *date* opposite your name reads June 86, or July 86, then your time is out; please renew at once. Terms: Single subscription 50 cts. per year; five copies to one name and address, \$2.00; ten or more copies, 35 cts. each; thirty or more copies, to one address, 30 cts. each.

The work of the White Cross Army is calling the attention of parents everywhere to the necessity of instructing their children respecting the dangers of vice and impurity, and giving them such information at a proper age as will be conducive to purity of morals. Doctor Kellogg's recent work, "Man, the Masterpiece," is intended by the author to give to boys and young men exactly the information they need to make the most of themselves. The work has been out of press less than three months, but several thousand copies have already been sold, and the sale is increasing rapidly. Agents are wanted in all the Western States. Descriptive circulars giving terms to agents may be obtained by addressing 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 85c., post free.

Address,

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

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CAL., JULY, 1886.

A GENTLEMAN who has himself done good work in opposing the so-called "National Reform" movement, writes to know how we stand in regard to the Bible,—whether or not we accept its teachings. We have assured him that we most sincerely believe the Bible, and that without any mental reservations or "liberal" constructions. It is because we do believe the Bible that we oppose any union of Church and State, which a religious amendment to the Constitution would bring about. We do not want to see its pure doctrines brought down on a level with police regulations, or the offices of the church bought and sold, or hypocritical demagogues placed over the interests of the church. Pure and undefiled religion does not find congenial soil in a State church.

"THE powers that be are ordained of God," simply because they are existing powers, and God has ordained that men shall be subject to authority. Any government, even though it be very poor, and the ruler a base person, is better than no government at all. The first duty of the individual is to learn to obey. If he learns how to obey in the family and in the State, he can the more readily learn to obey God. Therefore it is that the man who resists authority resists God. But this by no means indicates that men should yield to the power when it makes laws that interfere with his duty to God; for then, instead of teaching its subjects obedience to God, it is teaching disobedience. Obedience to God cannot be learned by obedience to the State when the State openly teaches disobedience to God. In such a case disobedience (to the State) becomes a virtue. The less can never exceed the greater, therefore the "Higher Power" has the first claim on a man's allegiance.

IN our March number we noticed the fact that certain Christians of Tennessee and Arkansas who keep the seventh-day, had been indicted for working on Sunday. We there stated that the indictments in Tennessee were quashed on technical grounds. They were afterward revived, however, and both there and in Arkansas these Christians were found guilty of working on Sunday and were fined. The cases were appealed to the Supreme Court of each State respectively, and just as we go to press we learn that both Supreme Courts have sustained the action of the lower Courts. The particulars of the Arkansas cases have not yet been learned; but there are three in Tennessee, who are each sentenced to a fine of \$20 and costs, or to an imprisonment of one day for each 25 cents. As these men will not voluntarily aid an iniquitous cause, they will be compelled to lie in jail nearly three months for not keeping Sunday. And this is "Christian" America! "If they do these things in a green tree what will they do in the dry?" If these things are done in the present order of things, what would not be done with a religious amendment to the Constitution of the Nation.

Results of Churchly Ambition.

IN his "History of the Popes," Ranke, in speaking of the fifteenth century, when, as a consequence of the policy of Gregory VII., "the Church" had become supreme, and the State was only its vassal, says:—

"But the orders also had fallen into the extreme of worldliness. What intrigues were set on foot among them for securing the higher appointments! what eagerness was displayed at elections to be rid of a rival, or of a voter believed unfavorable! The latter were sent out of the way as preachers or as inspectors of remote parishes; against the former, they did not scruple to employ the sword, or even the dagger, and many were destroyed by poison. Meanwhile the comforts men seek from religion became mere matter of sale; the mendicant friars, employed at miserably low wages, caught eagerly at all contingent means of making profit."

What caused this state of things? We claim that it was the legitimate result of the union of Church and State. It was not because people in those days were naturally any worse than people are now. Human nature is ever the same; and if the Amendmentists should succeed in their design of making "the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the Church," then the crimes that were committed in the name of Christianity in the time of Alexander VI., will be repeated. It cannot be otherwise when church positions are made the object of political ambition. Ambition is no respecter of place; it will as readily work ruin in the Church as outside of it. "By that sin fell the angels."

A National Reform Axiom.

THE *Statesman* of August 25, 1881, said:—

"The remedial dispensation in the hands of Jesus Christ is adapted to social as well as to individual maladies. To be a complete Saviour, he must be the Saviour of society as well as individual men, for social relations are an inseparable part of human nature. Unless he saves the family and the commonwealth, he does not save the race."

We suppose the party which the *Statesman* represents will never get rid of the idea that the Government is an entity, something distinct from the people who compose it. If it should give up that absurdity, it would cease to exist. But if the Government is a personality, independent of the people, it logically follows that society is a personality in no wise connected with the people who compose it, and that the family is also a person entirely distinct from the individual members of the family. In the above quotation, the *Statesman* is consistent with its own peculiar absurdity. Now then, allowing its claim for the personality of the family, of society, and of the State, and allowing that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of these hypothetical persons, as well as of beings of flesh and blood, we reach the following logical absurdities: (1) The family may be saved and one or more members of it lost; (2) Any given society may be saved, yet any number of men composing it may be lost; or, (3) The commonwealth may be saved, and some of the citizens lost. And this being admitted, as it must be if the "National Reform" theory be true, we conclude, (4) That any family, society,

or State may be saved, and at the same time a majority or even all of the individuals composing that family, society, or State, may be lost! National Reform philosophy has evolved a new axiom, namely, "The whole is distinct from any of its parts." This is, of course, not a self-evident truth, but a self-evident absurdity, and is, therefore, characteristic of National Reform. Truly, the beauty of the "National Reform" theory is the multiplicity of conclusions at which it allows one logically to arrive.

The Inevitable Result.

THE "National Reform" people disclaim any design to persecute when they shall have secured their coveted Religious Amendment. "Persecution" is too harsh a word for their ears. Very well, let us come at the matter gradually. They cannot deny that if some form of religion is incorporated into the laws of the Government, those laws must enforce conformity to that form of religion. Now when some refuse to obey those laws and adopt that religion, what will the makers of the laws do? In harmony with the sentiments which we give most of them the credit of holding at present, they will at first use mild measures to induce the unwilling to obey. And if these measures do not succeed, what then? The laws must be enforced, and consequently more stringent measures must be adopted. And if some still refuse obedience, what then? Let Gibbon answer:—

"It is incumbent on the authors of persecution previously to reflect whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. They excite the flame which they strive to extinguish; and it soon becomes necessary to chastise the contumacy, as well as the crime, of the offender. The fine which he is unable or unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severities of the law; and his contempt of lighter penalties suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment."—*Decline and Fall*, chap. 37, par. 23.

A CORRESPONDENT of one of our prominent journals, writing from England, says:—

"I saw recently twenty women standing at a bar, all drinking. I have seen drunken women clinging to lamp-posts, and one lying drunk at full length in Hyde Park. The half-holiday system which prevails quite generally is proving a curse. To obtain Saturday afternoon for recreation, the working people begin labor at six o'clock, an hour earlier than Americans. So great is the debauch of Saturday and Sunday that few works are started in full till Tuesday morning."

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.