

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1887.

NUMBER 1.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

THE Protestant doctrine touching the right of private judgment, is not that opposite doctrines may both be true, but it is that there is on the face of the earth no visible body to whose decrees men are bound to submit their private judgment on points of faith.—*Macaulay*.

National Reform in the South.

THE *Christian Statesman* says that recently National Reform “Secretary” Weir “has met with a cordial welcome for the sake of his cause,” in Maryland and Virginia, and thereby “has been convinced that the work ought to be carried at once into the Southern States.” The *Statesman* and Mr. Weir are both way behind the times. If they had carefully read the SENTINEL they would have learned that National Reform has already begun—more than a year ago—in the Southern States. Both in Arkansas and in Tennessee, quite a goodly number of people have been fined and imprisoned, within the past year, for worshipping God according to the dictates of their own consciences. But if Secretary Weir or some other leading National Reformer should go down there, we have no doubt that the good work could, by organization, be greatly promoted, and their ebullient zeal made much more effective in rooting out heresy. For the information of whoever of the “Secretaries” shall go to the South, we would state that he will certainly find at Springville, Arkansas; Paris, Tennessee; and Atalla, Alabama, a cordial welcome for the sake of his cause. He would do well to make these places his headquarters. At Paris there are now honest Christian men lying in prison for conscience’ sake; in Springville the same thing has been; and in Atalla there is an earnest desire on the part of certain persons that it shall be. Also in Worcester, Massachusetts, there are men who are soon to be compelled to stand trial for conscience’ sake; we would direct the National Reformers to that city as a promising field. We would advise all the “District Secretaries” to become subscribers, and regular readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. They can thus keep well informed in regard to all the particularly good openings for the display of their activities for National Reform.

The “American Sentinel,” Volume 2.

THE first volume of the AMERICAN SENTINEL met with as great favor as could be expected, or even desired. True, its circulation was not nearly as large as it should have been, but was as large as could reasonably be expected under the circumstances. It has had a great many intelligent and appreciative readers; and many have confessed themselves enlightened upon the subject of which it treats, and have become aroused to the importance of the subject, and to the danger which impends over our beloved country from the strenuous efforts which are being made to unite Church and State in this land.

Volume Two is commenced under more favorable auspices. Friends have been raised up who are pledged to aid in extending its circulation. We have reason to confidently look for a largely increased subscription list for 1887.

The progress of the National Reform party, and the course of the *Christian Statesman*, the organ of that party, we have carefully watched for about a score of years. We have marked every phase of the agitation of the question of a Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and closely studied the arguments by which that party seeks to accomplish its ends. That many of those people think they are laboring for the glory of God, and for the upbuilding of the kingdom of Christ, does not turn their sophistries into truths, nor lessen the danger which their movement threatens. The ultimate action of the Inquisition—the burning of heretics—was named an “act of faith.” The Saviour forewarned his followers that the time would come when “whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.” John 16 2. Zeal for the church and for the cause of God, led Saul to persecute the Christians; but that did not remove the guilt of the persecutors, nor lighten the stones by which Stephen was put to death.

Considering the magnitude and the rapid growth of the Religious Amendment movement, it is surprising that so little attention has been paid to it by the secular press. The public press ought always to be the advocate of the people’s rights—the vigilant guardian of our liberties. Some of the newspapers have highly commended the SENTINEL, while others have expressed their surprise that anybody considered the movement worthy of so much notice. We fear that the majority of the papers will utterly ignore this subject until our dearest liberties are subverted, and the way is opened for the scenes which marked

“the dark ages” of European history to be re-enacted in America.

While we have followed the Amendmentists in the announcements of their purposes, in their platform, their published speeches, their sermons, editorials, etc., they have studiously avoided meeting our arguments, concealing them from their readers. They only meet us with repeated sneers at, what they are pleased to term, our ignorance of the Bible, of history, of the principles of civil government, and even of their own intentions. It may be gratifying to their self-complacency to hide themselves behind slurs and insinuations; but the popularity of their cause will not always prove a shield for their course.

They have declared, with great assurance, that they have not given us much notice because our arguments “do not meet the question.” But we appeal to the readers, both theirs and ours: What is the point which we have to meet? Where shall it be found? We propose to briefly re-examine some of the positions which they have taken before the public, and if we do not both touch the question, and fully meet it, we invite them, one and all, to point out our failure.

The National Reform Convention held in Pittsburg, Pa., Feb. 4, 5, 1874, was the largest of the kind that was ever held, and the *Statesman* says the report of its proceedings is “more full of life than either of the others.” Hon. Felix R. Brunot, president of the National Association, was chosen president of this convention. On taking the chair, President Brunot delivered an address, in which he quoted verbatim from the published principles of the Association, as follows:—

“We propose ‘such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States (or its preamble) as will suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the author of the nation’s existence and the ultimate source of its authority, Jesus Christ as its ruler, and the Bible as the supreme rule of its conduct, and thus indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.’”

This paragraph expresses the very “sum and substance” of the aims and designs of the Religious Amendment party. A more clear and explicit expression of the object of that party could not be made. As we will further show, in another article, this is the point of their movement.

Now we inquire: Have we mistaken “the point” aimed at by the Religious Amendmentists? Surely we have not. President Brunot, speaking for the Association and the convention, says, “We propose”—and then follows

this declaration of their aims. Have we failed to "meet" this point, as they have said? The leading article of the first number of the SENTINEL was mostly devoted to an examination of this very paragraph. And in every number we have taken up the speeches and writings of the leading advocates of that Amendment, and pointed out the sophistries of their reasonings and the dangerous tendency of their doctrines. Failed to meet the question, indeed!

The correct way to judge measures is by their consequences. The plan of these "Reformers" may seem plausible; but we must look beyond present appearances, and inquire what effect this Amendment would have on the administration of our Government. This is a question of interest to every citizen, and in answering it we shall deal only with evident facts,—so evident that none can possibly deny them.

1. To place the laws, institutions, and usages of Christianity on a legal basis is to make them matters of legal enforcement. And as no law can exist or be enforced without a penalty, so Christianity, or what they may be pleased to recognize as Christianity, would then be enforced by civil penalties. Anything less than this would not place the laws of Christianity on a legal basis in the law of the land.

2. A person can be convicted of a misdemeanor only before a court of justice, and the court is necessarily constituted the judge or exponent of the law. And, therefore, under the proposed Religious Amendment, the court would have to decide what is or what is not Christian law, institution, or usage.

3. But the Amendmentists do not intend that such questions shall be decided by civil courts. May it not be, then, that they will do something to relieve this matter of its odious appearance? Let us see. A writer in the *Christian Statesman* says:—

"We will not allow the civil Government to decide between them [the churches] and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws."

But we see no hope of relief in this proposition. No matter what is the court or tribunal which shall determine questions of Christian institution or usage, the fact would remain that matters of Christian faith and practice would be removed from the domain of individual conscience, and placed in the hands of a legal body, whose duty or privilege it should be to decide what is and what is not Christian faith and practice,—what we may and what we may not believe and practice as professed Christians! For, remember, whatever they decide is Christian institution or usage, is to be placed on a legal basis in the law of the land.

4. There are many different forms of religion in the land; and inasmuch as all creeds and faiths cannot possibly be embraced in the same legal enactment, it will become the duty of the law-makers to decide which shall be enforced as the true religion! It then needs no extended argument to show that *somebody's religious rights* will be trampled under foot. And it would not make any difference how small the minority whose consciences were ignored, and who were made to conform to

somebody else's religion which themselves did not believe, it would still be *religious oppression*, and a subversion of the dearest principles of our Government.

5. It is quite useless for the advocates of the proposed Religious Amendment to deny that their movement tends to a union of Church and State, for they expressly declare that "the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interest of the Church." (See *Christian Statesman* of March, 1884.) In the same article it was declared to be "the duty of the State, as such, to enter into alliance with the Church of Christ, and to profess, adhere to, defend, and maintain, the true religion." And they complacently talk of what the churches will and will not suffer the civil Government to do in carrying out the Religious Amendment. Now if placing Christian usages on a legal basis, and subordinating the civil State to the will and interests of the Church, is not a union of Church and State, then we shall be pleased to be informed what would be such a union. Such a state of things once existed under the Roman emperors and popes, and it is universally regarded as a union of Church and State. And so it would be here.

6. Not only religionists, but non-religionists, have rights. Not only will minorities in religion be compelled to observe religious usages which they do not believe, but non-religionists will also be compelled to observe "Christian laws, institutions, and usages," without any religious conviction whatever. These model "Reformers" do not pretend that they can make men Christians by legal enactment; they only intend to compel them by law to act as if they were Christians!

7. Under the proposed Amendment, and in such a Government as they contemplate, only professed Christians can be eligible to office. They have already announced that in their system of government every consistent infidel will be disfranchised, and Christians alone, or they who conform to Christian usages, can be permitted to hold office. It needs no great insight into politics and human nature to foresee that every persistent office-seeker will then become a member of the church—the most popular one, of course—as the surest stepping-stone to office. And in this manner these model Reformers propose to turn our republic into the kingdom of Christ!

8. But one more point we will notice. The National Reformers profess the intention to retain the republican features of our Government; the officers will be elected by the majority, and the administration of the Government will be shaped according to the will of the majority. But the will of the majority is constantly changing, as parties rise and fall. As there are now party politics, so then there will be party religions. To suppose otherwise, is to suppose that human nature is suddenly to be entirely transformed. The majority, wherever that majority may be found, will always have it in their power to determine what religion shall be enforced at any given time. And the religion of the nation will be put in the market at every general election. Religious questions will then be canvassed, not

only in the churches and in the civil courts, but on the stump, on the streets, and in the saloons. Candidates will be put up on this and that religious issue. And what would be the consequence? Religion itself would become contemptible in the eyes of the masses, and a reaction would take place, fatal to the cause of Christianity in our country, or else a *religious tribunal of last resort* would be demanded—a second papal system, modeled after that of Rome.

This is but a digest of these subjects as they have been presented in the first volume of the SENTINEL, and we repeat our appeal to the reader: Have we not herein met the very point, the vital question at issue? We invite, we earnestly urge, our opposers to point out any particular wherein we err in our conclusions. Please to show that what we have indicated as conclusions, are not relevant. We affirm that what we have indicated as the results of that Amendment being adopted, are not only possible, but inevitable.

American citizens, sons of the patriots of 1776 and 1787, our appeal is unto you. Do not be deluded by the siren song of "assured peace in the land." Strife and contention, religious intolerance and persecution, are as sure to follow the adoption of a Religious Amendment to our National Constitution as effect follows cause. It is in your power now to avert it. But if you let the warning pass unheeded; if you suffer the flood-gates of bigotry and intolerance, of misguided religious zeal, to be opened in this land, be assured that no hand can stay the flood until desolation and ruin are left in its track. J. H. W.

Civil Government and the Mediator.

THE grand error, perhaps, of National Reform is in its persistently hugging the fabulous and shadowy being it calls a "moral person." But let us admit (for the argument) that the State is a moral person, as National Reformers say. It will be admitted that no unfallen being or person approaches God through a Mediator. Adam and Eve did not before the fall. Holy angels do not now. The question then arises, Is civil government, if a "moral person," a fallen person? Civil government was instituted after man's fall and was intended for the benefit of believers and unbelievers, and differed in this respect from the church, which was intended by its founder to be made up only of believers. There has been no change made in the constitution of civil government since it was instituted. If then it is a fallen person, it must have been created so by a holy and righteous God; which is a conclusion too dishonoring to God to be entertained for a moment. Civil government then not having fallen from "its first estate," needs no Mediator, and has no atonement, as one writer in the name of National Reform admits. It worships God in obeying his commands, and that without a Mediator.

We notice a few scriptures. National Reform says, "Christ as Mediator represents the Godhead in the government of the world." That is for National Reformers to prove. It seems monstrous to hold that God can surrender, or delegate his essential kingdom to

another. We are, according to this astounding idea, to understand that when Christ declares a sparrow shall not fall to the ground without the permission of our heavenly Father, the reference is to the mediatorial kingdom instead of God's kingdom of providence, or his essential kingdom; that when our Saviour taught his disciples to pray to their heavenly Father for daily bread, the Mediator was meant. Will some ardent National Reformer cite us to a single passage of Scripture that asserts that Christ as Mediator ever furnished a mouthful of food for his people *except by a miracle*? His whole work upon the hearts of men is supernatural. Christ as Mediator does not interfere with the essential government of the Godhead in his natural and providential dealing with mankind, except as the interests of his church require. Saint and sinner eat of the grain from the same field, warmed by God's sun, fertilized by his rains, and the only difference is, the saints through mediatorial intercession receive a supernatural blessing with it.

National Reformers cite Matt. 28 : 18, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." They set up a man of straw; no one denies the *power* of the Mediator. But the question is as to the *exercise* of that power. We hold to the declaration that the exercise of the mediatorial power is subservient to the interests of the church. The mediatorial power is infinite, but its exercise is just equal to the need of the children of God. The *grace* of the Mediator is infinite, but its exercise is limited to the perfect welfare of the elect. So it is we apprehend in regard to the *power* of the Mediator; it is limited in its exercise to the needs of the elect. If we are charged with impiety in holding to the latter, National Reformers are liable to the same charge in reference to the former.

Matt. 28 : 18 is cited, but this does not refer to the government of the world in the exercise of "all power" but to the needs of his church *baptizing and teaching*. It refers undoubtedly to Christ's spiritual kingdom. We believe the National Reformers make a gross misapplication of the text. The work that Christ put upon his disciples was a mighty one. From the human standpoint the means to the end were insignificant and foolish. Hence Christ, to help their wavering faith, prefaced his command by telling them, all power in earth and heaven was given unto him. "Go ye therefore," said he, without fear and doubting, "and disciple all nations," "and, lo, I am with you alway." The reference is undoubtedly to the exercise of Christ's power in establishing his spiritual kingdom. This will be clear when we compare Rev. 2 : 26 with the text cited. This passage *gives the same power precisely* into the hands of *believers*. If the passage cited by the National Reformers gives Christ, as Mediator, rule over civil governments, or "the nations," then in that case he is to have rivals to his supremacy, for Rev. 2 : 26 puts the *same power* into the hands of *believers*. "To him ["that overcometh"] will I give power over the nations." We have had these passages examined by a critical and learned expositor, and he tells us the original word is the same in both places.

One passage more, Col. 2 : 9, 10. These verses have no reference whatever by any kind of twisting to civil government. National Reformers, to make this citation available, must show that civil governments are included in the words, "principalities and powers." This no man can do; because the apostle settles it beyond all controversy the other way. In the fifteenth verse it is said, having "*spoiled* principalities and powers;" and if civil government is included, then the apostle was mistaken, for civil government yet lives *unspoiled*, for National Reformers to quarrel over with the rest of the world. The allusion is doubtless the same the apostle makes in Eph. 6 : 12, to spiritual powers: "For we wrestle not against *flesh* and *blood*, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness," etc. The exposition that National Reformers give would make the Mediator "spoil" an institution of which National Reform declares him the head. He is absurdly made by them to overwhelm his own kingdom. They seem determined to "take him by force and make him King." We are profoundly persuaded that the crown National Reform holds in its hand is a crown of thorns.

ORIENT.

Both Sides.

From the Rev. Robert White, of Steubenville, Ohio, we have the following communication under the heading, "Hear the Other Side," which in harmony with his request we gladly give place in the SENTINEL:—

"Through your kindness I have received the AMERICAN SENTINEL for January, February, March, October, and November, 1886. I have given them careful perusal, and have also noted some things to which, with your permission, I would like to reply in your columns.

"As your aim and mine is only to know and to do what is right, and as it is not victory for its own sake, but for truth's sake that we are (or ought to be) striving for, I feel sure you will cheerfully accord me the privilege of correcting what I regard as misstatements made (no doubt honestly) by you of the sentiments, purposes, and position of the National Reform Association. This, and not the 'Religious Amendment party,' or the 'God-in-the-Constitution' party, is our correct designation. These and all similar titles we disown and disclaim. Whatever may be the design of those who employ them, they convey a wrong, because a one-sided and imperfect, notion of the object of the National Reform Association.

"Before, however, proceeding to the correction of what I consider misinterpretations and misapprehensions of the declarations and views of the advocates of National Reform, I desire to enter my protest against the very serious charges you lay at their door. Although you pay a not undeserved tribute to the respectability, learning, piety, and patriotism of its published list of officers, over and over again you affirm that our professed object is one thing while our real object is another and a totally different thing (p. 76). You assert that we are laboring to subvert the Constitution of our country (p. 78), and to overthrow all that was done by the Revolutionary fathers (p. 81); that we propose to put in practice persecution for conscience' sake (pp. 78, 84); that we are seeking our own aggrandizement (p. 86); that we are actuated by ambition (p. 76); and that our repeated re-affir-

mations or denials that we do not contemplate in any sense a union of Church and State is a mere blind (p. 19), a display of effrontery (p. 81), an exhibition of duplicity (p. 74), and a piece of Jesuitical casuistry to hide our real intention (p. 19). You also say that 'we do not see how we can expect anything else of that party. Its cause is worthy only of Jesuitism and the Inquisition, and can only be justified by such casuistry as a Jesuit might envy' (p. 20).

"Do you really think, Messrs. Editors, that this is an honorable mode of warfare? Is it necessary to the success of your cause? If it is, then verily it must be a bad one. When such questionable measures have to be employed to defend it, it is 'condemned already.' If you think the advocates of National Reform are mistaken or misguided, have a zeal that is not according to knowledge, and do not perceive the natural and necessary consequences of their movement, you have an undaunted right to say so, and also to try to prove what you say. But to hold them up to public reprobation as deliberate and intentional deceivers is, to say the least, very unfair. Insinuation, defamation, and aspersion of motives are not arguments. Let us reason together, but because we differ, let us not descend to vituperation.

"A great deal of what you have written against the National Reform Association arises from a misreading (how to account for it I do not know) of the constitution of the Association. In almost every paper you sent me (and I suppose the same is true of those I have not received), you say that the object of the National Reform Association, in the Amendment to our National Constitution they wish incorporated in that instrument, is 'to legalize the laws and institutions of Christianity, or of that which they may claim is Christianity;' or 'to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis' (pp. 1, 3, 4). How foreign this is to our purpose will be seen almost at a glance by comparing your way of putting it with the language of the constitution of the National Reform Association. As many of your readers may never have seen it, and as it is of itself a sufficient reply to much that has appeared in the SENTINEL, I ask as a matter of justice, and that your readers may have an opportunity of judging for themselves, that you publish it in full. The readers of the SENTINEL will do themselves a favor by referring to it as often as may be necessary.

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.

"Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations, and that the revealed Will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs;

"Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men, with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established;

"Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath Laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath, Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion;

"Viewing with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and the disregard of moral and religious character in those who are exalted to high places in the nation;

"Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government;

"We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves under the following ARTICLES, and pledge ourselves to God, and to one another, to labor, through wise and lawful means, for the ends herein set forth:—

ARTICLE I.

"This Society shall be called the "NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION."

ARTICLE II.

"The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the Government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

"After reading this constitution law, can any one truthfully affirm that the aim of the National Reform Association is 'to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis'? It distinctly specifies 'the Christian laws, usages, and institutions of our Government'—these and no more. Between the statement of the SENTINEL, 'to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental laws of the land,' and the one in the constitution of the National Reform Association, 'to place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government' on such a basis, there is a world-wide difference. The former embraces all the doctrines, rules, and principles of Christianity; the latter only such 'moral laws of the Christian religion' as are necessarily involved in the practical administration of our Government. The chief of these are mentioned in the constitution of the Association, and the undeniable fact 'that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government,' is asserted. The SENTINEL's version of our aims and purposes is as wide of the mark as it possibly can be. To any such scheme as that attributed by the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to the friends of National Reform, the latter are as much opposed (and as honestly) as are or can be the former. The AMERICAN SENTINEL, therefore, is wasting its ammunition, firing at a specter of its own creating, fighting a ghost of its own imagining.

"As this communication is already perhaps too long, I reserve, with your permission, further criticisms to a future article.

"ROBERT WHITE.

"Steubenville, Ohio."

We have no desire to present a one-sided view, and shall always be glad to publish views of the other side when they are presented in as temperate and candid a manner as are the above. Indeed this has been our course from the first.

Mr. White refers to several expressions which he has found in different numbers of the SENTINEL, and asks if we "really think that this is an honorable mode of warfare?" We can answer that if the expressions had been used with no direct or dependent connection, if they had been printed as a series of expletives with no explanation, we should not consider such to be an honorable mode of warfare. But when in every instance the expressions are simply and only the logical deduction from the propositions of the National Reformers themselves, then we are prepared to say without hesitancy that such is an honorable mode of warfare.

It is an honorable mode of warfare to trace every proposition to its logical conclusion; and if sound logic demonstrates that while the professed object of National Reform is one thing, the real object is a totally different thing; if the logic of the thing shows that

it is subversive of the constitution; if not only logical conclusions, but their own words, show that the practice of persecution for conscience will be the outcome of the success of National Reformers; if sound logic develops casuistry and even Jesuitical casuistry; then we say that in all this there is nothing but an honorable mode of warfare.

Mr. White speaks of our "insinuations," &c. Now Webster's Unabridged says that to insinuate is "to hint; to suggest by remote allusion." So far as we know we have insinuated nothing. What we have had to say we have said openly and plainly. And if what we have said appears to him as "insinuations," then we should be glad for him to tell us how we can speak plainly and directly.

We wish Mr. White had spent his time in showing that our reasoning is not logical, and that our expressions are not the plain statements of logical conclusions from the propositions of National Reformers, instead of complaining of the expressions themselves. If our reasoning is not sound, if our conclusions are not logical, it ought to be easy enough for the principals in the movement to show it. There are certainly enough professors, and Doctors of Divinity, and Doctors of Laws, pledged to National Reform, to furnish some one to point out wherein we have reasoned wrongly, or where we have missed the point in our arguments on the propositions of the National Reformers. Besides this, if in our arguments we have so constantly missed the point of National Reform, how does it happen that our efforts hurt the National Reformers so much? If they are not hit, how does it happen that they are hurt? And if the real point of National Reform is missed, how does it happen that the National Reformers are hit?

If the reader will look over the numbers of the SENTINEL, he will find copious extracts from the writings of National Reformers. We have endeavored to represent them fairly, and in order to do this, have uniformly quoted their own language. If we have misconstrued the sentiments, the purpose, and the position of the National Reform Association, it can only have been because its advocates have not meant what they said. In noticing the strictures of Mr. White, we shall simply quote a few statements made by National Reformers. And here we would say that we have never yet used the expression "God-in-the-Constitution" party. We have referred to the National Reform Association as the "Religious Amendment party," and we think justly, although they may disclaim that distinctive title. To show that this is so, we quote from a speech made by Professor Blanchard in the National Reform Convention held in Pittsburg in 1874. He said:—

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and, of course, Congress establishes a standard for money, weight, and measure. So Congress must establish a standard religion or admit anything called religion."

In the same convention President Brunot said:—

"The American people must say that the Bible is the word of God, and that Christianity is the religion of this country."

In March, 1884, Rev. J. M. Foster, writing

in the *Christian Statesman*, concerning the model State, said:—

"According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere existed for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church." And again: "The expenses of the church in carrying on her aggressive work it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury."

Rev. R. M. Somerville, in the *Christian Nation* of July 14, 1886, declared that it is right to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed.

The National Reform Association has for its avowed object the securing of such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will indicate that this is a Christian Nation. And when that Amendment shall have been secured, Congress must, according to Professor Blanchard, establish a standard religion. If, then, the Amendment which they desire is not a Religious Amendment, language does not mean anything. Moreover, Christianity cannot be separated from religion, for it *is* religion. A Christian man is a religious man, and a Christian nation must be a religious nation; therefore we say again, that if the Constitution is so amended that this Nation shall seem to be a Christian Nation, the Amendment which secures that object will be a Religious Amendment. Although National Reformers repudiate the title of "Religious Amendment party," their own writers proclaim the fact that they do want a religious test for citizenship. We do not see, therefore, how the emphatic declarations, made again and again by National Reformers, that they do not want a *Religious* Amendment to the Constitution, nor anything like a union of Church and State, can be considered as anything else than a "blind," or a manifestation of Jesuitical casuistry.

In view of the above quotations, we think we are justified in calling the National Reformers the "Religious Amendment party." In fact, we always wince whenever we write "National Reformers" and "National Reform Association," for we cannot regard their movement as a reform in any particular. It is true that many advocates of this movement are highly respectable and learned and pious, and we cannot believe that they realize what will be the result of their proposed Amendment. But we cannot allow that they are patriotic, even though they are honest in their purpose, for patriotism seeks only the welfare of the country, and the success of their movement would be the greatest calamity which this Nation ever suffered. We are obliged, however, to discredit the piety of many who stand high in the National Reform councils, and the reason for this will shortly appear.

Now a few words concerning the constitution of the National Reform Association. According to that its idea is to place "all Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." If they purpose to follow the letter of their constitution, they might as well stop at once, for in our Government there are no Christian laws or institutions. "Christian laws" are precepts

regulating the practice of the Christian religion. Christian institutions are those ordinances which Christ has placed in the church, such as baptism and the Lord's supper. To the claim that it is desired to regulate marriage laws, judicial oaths, and the observance of the Sabbath, we submit that these are not Christian institutions. The moral law of ten commandments antedates Christianity and is obligatory on all mankind. For the observance or non-observance of its precepts, Jew and Gentile, Pagan and Christian, will alike have to give an account to God. That part of the law which relates especially to man's duty to his fellows and tends to secure harmony and good order in society, human Governments are empowered to enforce, and that without regard to the form of religion that may be professed. The Czar of Russia, the Shah of Persia, the emperors of China and Japan, the queen of England, and the President of the United States are alike ministers of God to execute wrath upon those who trample upon the rights of their neighbors. And it is a fact that in many heathen countries the rights of citizens have been as well maintained as in some so-called Christian nations. It is also a fact that there is no such thing as Christianity in marriage. Marriage was instituted in Eden for the whole race, and the marriage of the Jew is just as sacred as that of the Protestant. The regulation of marriage is within the province of every nation, whether it is Christian or Pagan.

Mr. White uses the expression "moral laws of the Christian religion." This is simply an absurdity. The Christian religion has no moral laws. The moral law is of primary and universal obligation. It covers every conceivable act or thought. If the moral law had never been broken there would be no necessity for the Christian religion, but since it has been violated, Christianity is the means devised to bring man back to obedience to it. We cannot refrain from saying, what we believe to be the truth, that if those who call themselves National Reformers had a just conception of the true object of the Christian religion, and of the Spirit which actuated its Founder, they would cease their efforts to tamper with the Constitution of the United States. Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and steadfastly resisted all human efforts to make him king. When two of his disciples wished to call down fire upon some who did not acknowledge his divinity, he rebuked them, saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." And when Peter drew his sword in defense of the Master, he was sternly rebuked.

Mr. White is grieved because the SENTINEL attributes to National Reformers the purpose to put in practice persecution for conscience' sake. Let National Reformers answer for themselves on this point. Rev. Jonathan Edwards, one of the vice-presidents of the Association, says: "Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon." And the same man classes deists, Jews, Seventh-day Baptists, and, in fact, all who deny the claims of the National Reform Association, as atheists.

And now remembering that opposition to the so-called National Reform movement is counted as infidelity and atheism, we quote the following from another vice-president, Rev. E. B. Graham. He says:—

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

This is the fate to which at least one National Reformer would consign, not only those who deny the existence of God, but also those who, believing in God and Christ and the Bible, are content to rely upon the aid of the Spirit of God alone in their efforts to spread the gospel, and who refuse to invoke civil aid in that work, or to yield their consciences to the will of any human power. Again we quote from the pen of Rev. M. A. Gault, one of the leading lights of the National Reform Association. He says:—

"Whether the Constitution will be set right on the question of the moral supremacy of God's law in Government without a bloody revolution, will depend entirely on the strength and resistance of the forces of antichrist."

That is to say that National Reformers are ready to shed blood if need be in order to enforce their ideas of Christian morality upon the people. If this does not mean persecution for conscience' sake, then such a thing never existed. It may be that we have been mistaken in charging duplicity and Jesuitical casuistry upon National Reformers who claim that they desire no union of Church and State, and that the success of their movement cannot result in persecution; but if so, then we are forced to attribute to them a degree of ignorance which is inconceivable.

Once more: The *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884, stated its desire to join hands with Roman Catholics in carrying forward the work of National Reform. And in the *Statesman* of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, speaking of this desire to secure the co-operation of Roman Catholics, said:—

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches, as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation."

Now when we remember what the Catholic Church has been and has done in the past, and that it is the church's boast that Rome never changes, and that in the encyclical letter published by Pope Leo XIII. only a little over a year ago, every act of every Pope was endorsed, certainly every one who is not willingly blind must see that when National Reformers co-operate with the Catholic Church on its own terms, and when by such co-operation they have secured the power which they desire, persecution will follow as a matter of course. The idea that in matters of religion the minority must submit to the majority is of long standing with Roman Catholics, and is openly avowed by National

Reformers. But minorities do not always submit willingly, and if that idea is carried out, force must be used.

But space forbids our making further quotations. We submit to Mr. White that it is strictly an honorable mode of warfare to condemn an opponent out of his own mouth. We have made no statements concerning National Reformers which the facts will not warrant. While we cannot believe that all self-styled National Reformers are actuated by sincere motives, we do believe that many of them are honest at heart and desire only the truth, but are deceived as to the real object and the necessary result of the National Reform Association. In this latter class we gladly place our correspondent. And as our desire is to reclaim those who have fallen into error, as well as to bring the real truth before all, we hold our columns open to any one who is competent and authorized to speak for the National Reform Association, who shall wish to make a statement as to its nature and object.

E. J. W.

The Arkansas "Extravagance."

IN the October SENTINEL, we commented upon an editorial, and an article, both from the *Christian Cynosure*. The article, copied entire from the columns of the *Cynosure*, was written to that paper by Elder R. M. Kilgore, from Arkansas, giving an account of the persecution of some Seventh-day Adventists in that State for working on Sunday after having conscientiously kept what they believed to be the Sabbath. The *Cynosure* correspondent gave a number of names and facts such as clearly showed the meanest kind of persecution.

It seems that the *Cynosure* got hold of a copy of the SENTINEL containing the matter mentioned above, and from the way in which it refers to us it would appear that the *Cynosure* does not recognize its own article, but attributes the thing all to the SENTINEL. In the *Cynosure* of November 25, 1886, in a short editorial we find the following:—

"The AMERICAN SENTINEL, of Oakland, California, comes to us with a long reply to an editorial of this paper, in which the writer gives a long list of fines and imprisonments of Seventh-day Adventists for work on Sunday. One man is said to have been sent to jail from Springdale, Ark., for 'digging potatoes for his table on Sunday.' This and other parts of the article wear an aspect of extravagance, so that we must wait for confirmation of the facts before commenting on them."

More than half of our "long reply" and all of that part of it that "gives a long list of fines and imprisonments" was the aforementioned article from the columns of the *Cynosure* itself. As it appears to the *Cynosure* to be so extravagant, we would mildly inquire whether it is the habit of that paper to print accounts that are so extravagant that they cannot be believed without confirmation? We might ask too what the *Cynosure* would count a "confirmation"? The account which we copied from the *Cynosure* is already a matter of public record in Arkansas even to the Supreme Court. In Tennessee also there are similar facts that are likewise a matter of public record. Does the *Cynosure* demand another

batch of these persecuting prosecutions to confirm the statements printed in its own columns? It seems to us that the *Cynosure* is exceedingly hard to convince.

As for commenting on the matter the *Cynosure* did that vigorously, and very properly condemned the persecuting proceedings, and asked that the names and the jails should be published at once, *while as yet it was a mere matter of report*; but since the facts have been given, and the names and the jails have been published in its own columns, not a word has the *Cynosure* had to say on the subject. And when we published the *Cynosure's* report in full, and commented on it in our columns, that paper turns upon us, and accuses its own article of wearing "an aspect of extravagance," and demands "confirmation" of its own published report before "commenting on" it.

As the editor of the *Cynosure* seems not to be acquainted with the matter he printed in his own paper, we will give him some references. Please look at the *Cynosure* of July 29, 1886, editorial page, and the editor's comment, and call for names and jails will there be found; then look at its correspondents' columns in the *Cynosure* of August 12, 1886, and there will be found the names of the persons, places, and jails, and with these the "long list of fines and imprisonments" and the facts, which seem to the editor of the *Cynosure* to wear so much of "an aspect of extravagance." We hope the editor of the *Cynosure* will examine the articles referred to, for we very much desire to see what comments he will make upon the facts.

If the *Cynosure* must still wait for more confirmation, we know not how it can be satisfied except by repetition of the persecution; but to report such repetition would be only adding more extravagance to that which already has appeared. We agree with the *Cynosure* that the facts of this persecution do wear an aspect of extravagance. In fact we know not how the matter could be more extravagant without bordering very closely upon the manners and methods of the Romish Inquisition. Yet as the outcome of the National Reform movement will be to make such extravagance National, and as the *Cynosure* is heartily in favor of National Reform, there appears no ground of hope that we shall ever see in the columns of the *Christian Cynosure* any just comments upon such persecuting extravagance.

A. T. J.

The Situation of the Present as Related to the Past.

IN reading the lives of John and Charles Wesley, one is astonished at the unreasonable prejudice manifested against the labors of these men. They were frequently set upon by mobs, and miserably abused when they had committed no offense except preaching plain Bible truths without conforming to all the burdensome ritual of the Established Church. But any attempt at a description of the opposition they had to meet would be out of place in this short article. The point which I wish to notice is the opinion that was entertained by the reformers of those times regarding ministers

meddling themselves much in matters of civil government.

Dr. Whitehead was a personal friend of John Wesley, and one of three to whom Mr. Wesley willed all his manuscript. From this manuscript the Doctor wrote the authorized lives of the Wesleys. In this book he expresses the sentiment of his fellow-laborers. In this work he publishes an account of a Methodist minister named Westall, preaching at Cambourn, England, in the year 1751. The services were held in the house of one Mr. Harris. In the midst of the discourse he was assaulted by a mob and forcibly taken from the house. This was on Sunday. He was held by them until the following Tuesday, at which time the Rev. Dr. Borlase issued his *mittimus*, by virtue of which Westall was to be committed to the house of correction at Bodmin as a vagrant. He was kept in charge at that place until the next quarter, when the justices met and decided the action illegal. This circumstance caused Mr. Whitehead to remark as follows:—

"How seldom have we seen clergymen in the commission of the peace, but they have neglected the duties of their profession, and grossly abused the power committed to them! Our Lord declared his kingdom was not of this world, and when his ministers, of any denomination, obtain dominion and authority over the temporal things of others, or acquire any share in the civil government, it seems as if a curse attended everything they do. They mar whatever they meddle with, and occasion infinite confusion and mischief."

It will be seen from the above expression of sentiment that the early Methodists were far from favoring the meddling of ministers with the civil government. As they sought God in earnest prayer for divine aid, they could realize something of the inconsistency of a church professing to follow the meek and lowly Saviour, and yet at the same time endeavoring to force every one to worship God just as they did. In their condition they could measure the enormity of the crime attached to the persecution of the righteous, because they chanced to be on the side of the few. These representative pioneers could then pass sweeping condemnation upon the very things now so earnestly sought after by their professed followers.

It is to be supposed that there are honest, God-fearing people not on the popular side of some of the theological problems of our times. What shall these expect from the reverend magistrates when all Christian laws, institutions, and usages (as they shall interpret them) shall be placed on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the nation? Will any one have an occasion to complain of these clerical officials then as Dr. Whitehead and Wesley remonstrated against them in their day? Are men so much better now than they were then that they make to us a great blessing out of what proved to be such a curse then? If mankind has improved so much since Wesley's time that there is no danger of civil power being prostituted for partisan purposes, we would then suppose that the people are so far enlightened that they could become religious without the aid of a theocracy to coerce them into the service of the Lord.

WM. COVERT.

Our One Hundred Thousand Rulers.

[It will be noticed that the following article is on the same subject as one already printed in the December number of the SENTINEL. The writer of that article was absent from the office when he wrote it, and this article was written several days before that one reached the office. Consequently this article was laid over, and that one was printed. This is not printed now because we think that justice was not done in the other, but because it was already written and because it treats the subject so differently that really there is no repetition.]

In the SENTINEL for June we inserted the following: "The National Reform party proposes to make Christ king of the United States, and yet they maintain that the Government must still remain a republic! Will the *Christian Statesman* or some other one of the advocates of this 'reform' tell us how this thing can be?" Rev. M. A. Gault found this item in the SENTINEL, and in it he found something with which he could make his voice to clash, and so, in the *Christian Statesman* of October 14, he has undertaken to tell us just how this thing can be, and this is how he does it:—

"If you would study your Bible more before you spring into the arena to champion the anti-National Reform cause, you would know that the model of Government which Christ gave to Israel was much more republican than that of the United States. All their rulers were elected by the people, while there are one hundred thousand of ours in whose election the people have no voice."

Mark it, reader, in the "model of government which Christ gave to Israel," "all their rulers were elected by the people." We know not exactly what time it is to which Mr. Gault refers as the one when Christ gave to Israel their "model of Government." We do not know whether he refers to the time when Moses was chosen; or when the seventy elders were chosen; or when the judges were chosen; or when Saul was chosen; and so not knowing to which time it is that he refers we shall have to notice all four of these, and of course the first one to which we come where the rulers were elected by the people, that must be the time, and that the "model of Government" received from Christ, to which Mr. Gault refers.

If the gentleman refers to the "model of government" that was instituted when Moses was chosen, then we should like very much for him to tell us about how many, if any, of "the people" were at the burning bush when Moses was elected. Exodus 3.

If Mr. Gault refers to the "model of government" instituted at the time the seventy elders were chosen, then we would refer him to the following scripture: "And the Lord [not the people] said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them; and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with them there; and I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them. . . . And Moses went out, and told the people the words of the Lord, and gathered the seventy men of the elders of the people,

and set them round about the tabernacle. And the Lord came down in the cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the Spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders; and it came to pass, that, when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease." Num. 11 : 16, 17, 24, 25. And in view of this we wish he would tell us exactly what part "the people" bore in the election of the seventy elders.

If our critic refers to the "model of Government" in which the judges ruled, then we would call his attention to Judges 2 : 16-18: "The Lord raised up judges. . . . And when the Lord raised them up judges, then the Lord was with the judge, and delivered them out of the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge." And in view of this scripture will he tell us exactly what part "the people" bore in the election of a judge whom the Lord raised up?

Or if perchance the reverend gentleman refers to none of these, but means that "model of Government" which was established when a king was chosen, then we ask him to read the following: "Now the Lord had told Samuel in his ear a day before Saul came, saying, To-morrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over my people Israel. . . . And when Samuel saw Saul, the Lord said unto him, Behold the man whom I spake to thee of! this same shall reign over my people." "Then Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, and kissed him, and said, Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over his inheritance?" 1 Sam. 9 : 15-17; 10 : 1. But Saul was finally rejected, not by the people, but by the Lord, and again Mr. Gault may read: "The Lord said unto Samuel, How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel? fill thine horn with oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Bethlehemite; for I have provided me a king from among his sons." And when after all the other sons of Jesse had passed by, and David was sent for, when he came, "the Lord said, Arise, anoint him; for this is he. Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the Spirit of the Lord came upon Daniel from that day forward." 1 Sam. 16 : 1, 12, 13. And to David God said: "When thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. . . . And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." 2 Sam. 7 : 12-16.

Now as Mr. Gault conveys the idea that he has studied the Bible a great deal, it certainly is not asking too much of him to request that he tell us about how many of "the people" cast their ballots when Saul or David was elected king of Israel.

Here, then, in these four forms of Government—that under Moses and Joshua, the seventy elders, the judges, and the kings—are all wherein there is any possibility of finding a "model of Government which Christ gave

to Israel," and the plain Scripture, the plain matter of fact, is, that in not a single one of them is there a shadow or a hint of such a thing as that "all," or any, of "their rulers were elected by the people." So much for Mr. Gault's study of the Bible and of the "model of Government which Christ gave to Israel."

Now just a word upon his study(?) of our own Government. He says that in our Government, in this Government of the United States, "there are one hundred thousand rulers in whose election the people have no choice." If this were to come from anybody but a leading National Reformer, we should call it a most astounding statement. But as these are the men who are to be made the interpreters of the Scriptures on all points civil, ecclesiastical, and moral, and whose decision is to be final, when one of them speaks *ex cathedra*, it becomes us, to whom there belongs no right of interpretation nor decision on any subject moral or civil, to be very meek about how we shall handle it. Therefore we shall be very careful in our examination of this oracular utterance.

No doubt it will be a piece of very interesting news to the American people to learn that they have in this Government "one hundred thousand rulers" at all; much more when it is declared that this is only the number of those "in whose election the people have no voice;" and that consequently there are in the United States "one hundred thousand rulers" beside those who are elected by the people! Now we have looked this thing over somewhat, and we know that from the President of the United States down through the governors of States, to the constable of a precinct, they are all "rulers," as we presume Mr. Gault would call them, in whose election the people *do* have a voice. To go outside of the list of these, then, the only other place under the Government where we find "rulers" is among officers of the army and navy, for there we know there are some who rule with an iron hand. But they have nothing to do with us, they are not rulers "of ours;" besides there are not one hundred thousand persons in the army and navy together, officers, soldiers, and marines. So assuredly these cannot be the "rulers" whom our critic has in mind.

We cannot imagine, therefore, to what class of our rulers it can be to which Mr. Gault refers by such a vast number "in whose election the people have no voice," unless it be to the *appointees of the civil service!* that is, the postmasters, registers, and receivers of land offices, internal revenue collectors, etc., etc., and all their clerks! These we believe now amount to just about a hundred thousand; and these "rulers" are all appointed. In regard to these Mr. Gault is correct in saying that in their "election the people have no voice." And as these are the only "rulers" "of ours" in whose "election the people have no voice," we are absolutely driven to the conclusion that these *are* the "rulers" to whom our eminent critic undoubtedly refers.

But the idea of applying the title of "rulers" to postmasters, registers of land offices, revenue collectors, and such like! The idea of

calling a lot of servants, "rulers"! Well, well, no number of exclamation points could express our astonishment, and we are utterly at a loss for language to fitly characterize such a conception of Government, and of rulers; especially when it is coupled with the ambition to make itself the sole interpreter in all affairs of Government.

And it is such men as Mr. M. A. Gault whom the National Reform party proposes to make the National interpreters of Scripture "on moral and civil as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points;" men whose interpretations the most casual reader can see are utterly at variance with every portion of Scripture on the subject; and whose ideas of Government are so crude as to suppose that a lot of Government clerks are rulers of the people. It is such men as this, and men of such ideas of Scripture and of Government as are these, into whose hands the American people are coolly asked to put, by Constitutional Amendment, the direction of all the affairs of religion and Government. It is such men as these whom we are asked to make the supreme arbiters of the Nation, and whose decision will be "final." And the worst of it all is, that from what we see actually occurring in the Nation at this very time, we are not prepared to say but that the American people are going to do just this thing. But let them know of a surety that in the day when the affairs of this Nation are put into the ambitious hands of the National Reformers, in that day the American people will bind the fair form of Liberty in fetters more absolute than any she has ever borne outside of the bitter rule of the Papal Inquisition.

A. T. J.

OUR COUNTRY—THE MARVEL OF NATIONS.

ITS PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE, AND WHAT THE SCRIPTURES SAY OF IT.

By U. SMITH.

AUTHOR OF "SMITH'S PARLIAMENTARY RULES," ETC., ETC.

This is a new and popular work on a subject of the deepest interest to all American citizens. It takes a brief but comprehensive view of our Government from a *Historical, Political, and Religious Standpoint*.

The Sunday Question, Modern Spiritualism, and National Reform

ARE PROMINENT AMONG THE TOPICS ABLY DISCUSSED IN THIS WORK.

THE MARVEL OF NATIONS is a work of 300 pages. It contains a steel plate of the author, and over forty illustrations. It is printed in clear type, and bound in cloth; price, \$1.00.

COMBINATION OFFER.—Arrangements have been made whereby those who desire can receive a copy of this Popular Book, and the *American Sentinel*, one year, post-paid, for only \$1.25.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

HEALDSBURG COLLEGE.

A POPULAR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION,

ESTABLISHED IN 1882.

FOUR YEARS OF GREAT PROSPERITY.

FOUNDED AND MANAGED UPON SOUND PRINCIPLES.

THOROUGH INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTS OF LEARNING

IN ALL THE GRADES AND THROUGH THE

CLASSICAL COURSE.

FACULTY CONSISTS OF FIFTEEN INSTRUCTORS OF EXPERIENCE.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES.

1. Instruction in the various trades, with two hours per day spent in active work.

2. Methods in the Class Room are such as to secure the *best kind of mental discipline*.

3. A rigid parental discipline to cultivate high moral character.

4. Expenses within the reach of all. Twenty dollars per month covers all expense of tuition, board, lodging, washing, lights, fuel, etc.

Spring Term begins Monday, January 3, 1887.

S. BROWNSBERGER, A. M., President.

Healdsburg, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1887.

NOTE.—No papers are sent by the publishers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to people who have not subscribed for it. If the SENTINEL comes to one who has not subscribed for it, he may know that it is sent him by some friend, and that he will not be called upon by the publishers to pay for the same.

SECTION VII of the constitution of Kansas reads as follows:—

"The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, shall never be infringed; nor shall any person be compelled to attend or to support any form of worship; nor shall control of, or interference with, the right of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship."

And yet Mr. M. A. Gault, speaking with direct reference to this section, calls the Kansas constitution a "rickety constitution." See *Christian Statesman*, October 22, 1885.

"SECRETARY" GAULT says:—

"An ungodly world has ever frowned contempt upon ministers of the gospel who take an active part in the politics of the day. The devil only asked of the Saviour that he would withdraw from politics and let him manage the governments of the world."

Webster defines blasphemous as "wickedly calumnious," and under this definition we think we are just in saying that the above paragraph is blasphemous; for it is false and libelous, and could have been written by no one except a "National Reformer," or an avowed infidel. If Mr. Gault has ever read the Bible he must know that our Saviour never had anything to do with politics. He must know also that the devil tried to draw our Saviour into politics, and as an inducement offered him "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them," but the offer was rejected with scorn. Yet Mr. Gault is the man who advises SENTINEL writers to study the Bible, and is one of the men to whom, when "National Reform" shall have succeeded, the courts must look for the interpretation of the Bible. All true Christians should pray to be spared the sight.

We would inform Mr. Gault that the Saviour could have entered into politics only at the expense of falling down and worshiping Satan. This proposition is still open to the ministers of Christ, and they cannot mingle in politics without to a greater or less extent accepting it.

THE *Christian Nation* puts the whole thing in a nut-shell, when it says:—

"There seems to us to be a feeling throughout the rank and file of our workers for National Reform something like this: Secure the respect of men for our cause first, and then work as much as possible without losing that respect."

It would be impossible to make a clearer or better analysis of the methods of National Reform. The *Nation* calls upon them to get down from their "loftiness," but we are quite sure that they will not do it. Their movement is essentially of this world, and is dependent solely upon worldly influences, worldly meth-

ods, and the political preferences of men ambitious of worldly power; therefore, the first and last consideration *must* be to secure the respect of men. For the National Reform workers to get down from such "loftiness" would be the certain destruction of their cause.

Wendell Phillips said: "No reform, moral or intellectual, ever came down from the upper classes of society. Each and all came up from the protest of martyr and victim." This very characteristic, and the essential one, of National Reform, of working exclusively amongst "the upper classes of society," of courting the respect of the "respectable classes," shows that it lacks the element of a true reform. It begins in the wrong place; it uses the wrong methods of true reform. By Mr. Phillips' statement—and it is the truth—"National Reform" is the reverse of true-reform, and therefore is not reform at all.

Our Questions Answered.

IN several different issues of the SENTINEL we have inserted for the special benefit of Mr. M. A. Gault a "clashing voices" exercise. So far we have no evidence that the reverend gentleman has applied his genius to the explication of any one of them. Now we have an exercise to which we would call the *particularly* special attention of Rev. M. A. Gault, District Secretary of the National Reform Association.

This which we now insert is not exactly a clashing voices exercise. We rather think that it would be more to the credit of Mr. Gault if it were. The voices are entirely too much alike to appear well. We happen to have in this office a copy of the *St. Louis Republican* of Sunday, August 1, 1886, in which there is an article written by Mr. George Yule, of St. Louis, under the heading, "Christians against Christ." The last words of Mr. Yule's article are as follows:—

"In conclusion I would remark that it is absolutely suicidal for the pastor of the First Christian Church to continue fooling, like a giddy little boy, in front of the ponderous wheels of the Juggernaut of Truth. *It may be an exhilarating thing for him to stand upon his head and turn hand-springs before the public upon the serious Sunday question; but as his true friend, we beg of him, we plead with him, we implore him, to keep out from under those wheels.*"

Now with the last sentence of this, please "read, compare, and inwardly digest" the following written by the Rev. M. A. Gault in the *Christian Statesman* of October 14, 1886, page 4, first column.

"*It may be exhilarating for the editor of the SENTINEL to stand on his head and turn hand-springs before the public upon so serious and important a question; but as his true friend, we beg of him, we implore him, to keep out from under the wheels of the National Reform movement.*"

We say again that these voices are entirely too much alike to appear well for Mr. Gault. A comparison of these two quotations casts a good deal of a shadow upon Mr. M. A. Gault's literary honesty. And, lest some one should think that we are indulging in "insinuations," we would say that as a matter of fact Mr.

Gault's words appear to be a downright plagiarism. For about his words in the *Statesman* there is not a sign of quotation marks nor of credit. The words appear in the *Statesman* as wholly his own. If the words are his own, then a comparison with those of Mr. Yule reveals a psychological phenomenon that is truly wonderful.

In our December issue we printed an article under the heading, "Is It Ignorance or Duplicity?" in reply to Mr. Gault's "counterblast to" the SENTINEL. And in view of that article and the evidence here presented, we think there can be no doubt as to how our question should be answered. Our columns are open. Will Mr. Gault rise and explain?

A. T. J.

National Reform and Romanism.

NATIONAL REFORM says:—

"The churches and pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical, points; and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the final decisions will be developed there."—*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 21, 1884.

It was in this way that Rome placed herself in the position of sole interpreter of the Scriptures on all points. Whenever a conflict of opinion occurred, it was brought immediately to the notice of the church, and she must decide as to what was the Scripture in the case, and which one of the disputants was in the right, and her decision was final; consequently no opinion could be held, and no duty practiced, which she chose to declare unscriptural. Therefore, if the Scriptures were to be interpreted alone by her, and conduct was to be regulated alone by her decisions, it is manifest that the more the people read the Scriptures, the more was she annoyed by new controversies, and by the necessity of rendering new decisions; and then *why should she not prohibit* the laity from reading the Scriptures? Besides, where was the use of the laity reading the Scriptures anyhow, when none but the clergy could interpret?

When the National Reformers shall have succeeded, will they prohibit our reading and interpreting the Scriptures? If not, why not? Would it not be vastly better to do so at once than to be kept in a constant whirl of "interpretations" and decisions? Then they could regulate the faith and practice of their so-called Christian government by bulls issued, as occasion required, "*in Domino salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.*" This would save them a vast deal of labor, and doubtless would work just as well.

A. T. J.

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 St., OAKLAND, CAL.