

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY, 1887.

NUMBER 2.

The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

THE *Independent* says: "If the religious views of infidels or some form of paganism were to be taught by the State, and believers in the religion of the Bible were to be taxed to pay the expenses thereof, these believers would complain bitterly and justly. The principle, however, is the same, no matter what religious views are incorporated into a system of popular education at the public expense. It is no better and no worse when applied to the religion of the Bible than it would be if applied to any other form of religious belief. The fact that the majority of the people, so far as they have any religion, believe in Christianity, and would have that taught by the State, if any religion is to be thus taught, does not alter the case at all. The rights of the minority not thus believing are just as sacred to them as those of the majority."

MR. GAULT, in the *Christian Statesman* of December 30, 1886, seems to think he has settled a vexed question. He refers to Deut. 1: 13, where Moses said to the people, "Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you." We referred to the same transaction (Num. 11: 16, 17) in speaking of this subject. But the question with us is: Who gave Moses authority to make rulers for the tribes? And would these wise men have had any authority to act if Moses had not put them into office? The President of the United States has the power to appoint a great many officers, and it is quite customary for the people to present names to him that he may appoint the men of their selection. He may or he may not appoint the ones they select; but in any case, their selection does not make these men officers. They must be appointed by authority. But when the people elect their officers, the President has no more to say on the subject than Mr. Gault has. There was no election, in any proper sense of the term, in the transaction referred to in Num. 11, or Deut. 1.

But let us go back of that. The people elect our President, and thereby give him the appointing power. But *who elected Moses?* Who gave him such power over the tribes and over their judges? Will Mr. Gault please to meet the question, and not longer evade it?

"National Reform" Principles Exemplified.

THERE is no place on earth where the principles of the "National Reform Association" are more clearly exemplified than they are in the Territory of Utah. It is as useless for the Reformers to deny the likeness as it is to deny that their movement contemplates a complete union of Church and State. Over against their constant disclaimers of a desire to inaugurate such a union, every feature of a practical union of Church and State is found embodied in their demands for changes in our Government. And it is a noticeable fact that all classes, except the self-styled Reformers themselves, no matter what their belief may be in respect to matters of the Government and of Christianity, are fully agreed that a union of Church and State will be the unavoidable result of their movement.

What is the actual condition in Utah? And, What are the actual demands of the National Reformers? Answers to these questions will cover the entire subject under consideration, and we will proceed to answer them by quotations from the pages of the organs of the Association.

The *Christian Nation* of Jan. 13, 1886, quoted the words of a man who had spent some time in Utah studying the situation. He said:—

"The Territorial Government of Utah is now and has been from the beginning, dominated by the Mormon Church. Twenty-five years before our forefathers were called upon to proclaim liberty, they eradicated the evil of a union between Church and State. Thomas Jefferson, as you know, was the great apostle of this reform, and it as much as anything else prepared us for a republican form of government; but, for the last forty years, there has existed in Utah an ecclesiastical rule more flagrant than anything Jefferson was ever called upon to consider. The Mormon organization does not pretend to be merely a church, but the kingdom of God on earth—i. e., it is a sort of theocratic government."

In this description of things in Utah, three points are made prominent: 1. The Mormon Church dominates the civil Government, and this is fitly represented as a union of Church and State. 2. Thomas Jefferson was opposed to this state of things, it being contrary to republican government. 3. The Mormon organization does not pretend to be merely a church, but the kingdom of God on earth. The first and third points present the peculiar characteristics of Mormonism, and we shall now show that what these embrace is demanded by the Reformers, in our Government.

We shall not preserve the order laid down, but notice,

First, The National Reformers claim that

this Government or nation will be the kingdom of Christ when the Religious Amendment is adopted. In the Pittsburg Convention, in 1874, Dr. Browne, speaking of the present and future position of office-seekers in respect to their movement, said:—

"When our Master comes into his kingdom in our beloved land, they will be candidates for the foremost positions, and scramble with the mother of Zebedee's children for the right or left hand places in the kingdom."

This language is unmistakable, and is in entire harmony with the general tenor of their teachings. Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, in the *Statesman* of March 21, 1884, said:—

"If our nation will accept God as the source of all authority, Christ Jesus as the nation's king, and his law as of supreme authority over them, its creed is orthodox."

It is well known that the National Reformers have captured bodily the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The highest officers of the Union are vice-presidents of the Reform Association, and labor zealously in its interest. Mrs. Woodbridge, in an address to the Knights of Labor, in Cleveland, urged upon the Knights the claim of the National Reform cause, closing with the following words:—

"Thus would the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union join hands with the Knights of Labor in placing this Government upon the shoulders of Him who is Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, and in crowning Christ, our Lord, as the Ruler of nations."

In the *Statesman* of May 27, 1886, that superlatively zealous National Reformer, "Rev. M. A. Gault," addressing an objecting minister, said:—

"Strange to tell, you are harder to reconcile to the enthronement of Christ in the nation, than even the Unitarians."

The pamphlet report of the Pittsburg Convention is prefaced with an article by Dr. McAllister, the general secretary of the Association, the closing words of which are as follows:—

"This edition of the report is sent forth with the prayer that He whose honor this movement seeks to promote, . . . will carry forward the glorious work until our beloved nation shall become one of the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

The first quotation given from the *Nation* says that "the Mormon organization does not pretend to be merely a church, but the kingdom of God upon the earth." And the analogy between this and the claim of the Reformers is complete. They constantly affirm that it is not their intention to *legalize a church*, but to bring Christ into his kingdom, to put the Government upon his shoulders, to enthrone

him, to crown him, in this nation. In this respect the theory of the Mormons and of the National Reformers is identical. The theory is absurd, for the Scriptures give no intimation that Christ will be brought into his kingdom, enthroned, or crowned, in any such manner. The theory is peculiar to the Reformed Presbyterians and the Mormons; and the latter apparently borrowed it from the former.

Secondly, The Mormon Church dominates the civil Government, and this is, practically, a union of Church and State. But this is exactly what the Reformers demand in the whole nation. Rev. J. M. Foster, in the *Statesman* of March, 1884, said:—

“According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church.”

If this does not mean that the State, the civil power, is to be subordinated to the church, then no language could be framed to express such an idea. And this is not a *lapsus linguæ*, an unconsidered expression, for “Secretary Leiper,” a valiant defender of National Reform, undertook to vindicate Mr. Foster in the following language:—

“J. H. W. stumbles at an utterance of Rev. J. M. Foster in *Christian Statesman*, of March, 1884: ‘According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church.’ This statement J. H. W. emphatically denies. As a believer in the Bible, how will he undertake to expound Isa. 49: 23 and 60: 12, in accord with his views of the relation of Church and State?”

Yes, we emphatically deny the statement, even as we deny that marriage is a Christian institution. There are some things in the government and providence of God which are as truly for the non-believer as for the believer. If the National Reformers had their way the sun would shine and the rain would fall only upon the Reformed Presbyterian Church! But that is not God’s method. But the point is, that Mr. Leiper indorses Mr. Foster’s statement, and emphatically repudiates our “views of the relation of Church and State.” In the *Christian Nation* of July 14, 1886, we find the following strong language:—

“A civil recognition of the church is often represented as inconsistent with her independence and freedom, whereas it is absolutely necessary to that freedom. No true friend of Christ would accept State favor at the expense of independence. The church exists as the Lord has ordained, and the [civil] ruler in an official recognition accepts it as it is, and its great charter, the word, is pleadable before any Legislature or in any court. Otherwise, if the church is only known as a voluntary association, it is bound down to the specific regulations that determine the order of procedure. In the United States, whose Federal Constitution knows no Bible, no Christ, no God, the church has no reason to boast of freedom of action in her own department, and is exposed to prosecution and penalties, when insubordinate members choose to appeal to the civil courts against that discipline which they had vowed to accept.”

Here again we demur to the doctrine. The church is properly a voluntary association; and it has no right to transcend the duties which lie between man and man, or to so deprive its members of their rights as to become subject to “prosecution and penalties.” It is only in such a Government as the National Reformers seek to establish that the

civil power can interfere in questions of doctrines and ordinances; but in questions of individual rights it ought to interfere, for the Bible gives no church or officer authority to lord it over God’s heritage. But our gentle Reformers are by no means satisfied with the measure of power conferred upon them in the gospel. They must, forsooth, usurp authority over the Government which protects them.

The *Statesman* of December 9, 1886, publishes extracts from what it calls “a noteworthy thanksgiving sermon,” in which are the following words:—

“It used to be the law in New England that no man could vote who was not a professing Christian, a member of the church of Christ. An absurd and pernicious law, doubtless, with men what they are. Yet the law is an almost pathetic memorial of the grand design of the Pilgrim Puritans to establish a theocracy in the New World, to which they had fled from the corruptions and persecutions of the Old—a State which should be governed by those and those only who were governed by God. It is also a striking prophecy of that prime necessity of good citizenship, a heart-felt submission and allegiance to the authority of God, which will inevitably result in an effort to realize in society divine ideals of love and justice.”

But the Reformers themselves do not admit even the half-hearted disclaimer here used. Thus Hon. Mr. Patterson, of Pennsylvania, in his speech in the Pittsburg Convention, 1874, said:—

“And this religion, as understood by Protestants, tending, by its effects, to make every man submitting to its influence a better husband, parent, child, neighbor, citizen, and magistrate, was by the people (of Massachusetts) established as a fundamental and essential part of their Constitution; and ought, we claim, to be likewise established by the people of the United States, as a fundamental and essential part of their Constitution.”

That is to say, that as professed Christians only could vote or exercise the rights of citizenship in Massachusetts, so it should be in all the United States. Remember, it was under this very Christian arrangement in Massachusetts that dissenters were banished, whipped, and put to death! Lest the reader should think that we draw too strong conclusions from these several statements, we quote again from the *Christian Nation* of September 15, 1886:—

“Of course, a Government organized on a basis embracing Christianity, could not, with propriety, intrust those with office who are hostile to its characteristic faith. And none of this class have any right to claim that they shall be equally eligible to office with those who are *bona fide* citizens.”

Here it is in full. None are *bona fide* citizens unless they are in harmony with the “characteristic faith,” or religion of the Government! Under their benign rule, which, they often boast, will “secure the rights of all classes,” the dissenter will not be a *bona fide* citizen, and will have no right to claim equal rights with the patriotic Reformed Presbyterian! no right to claim eligibility to office. And there is no Church and State in this; oh, no! “Will you walk into my parlor?”

Once more: President Brunot, in his Pittsburg address, said it was their purpose to acknowledge the Bible as the supreme rule of the conduct of the nation. In the *Christian*

Nation of February 24, 1886, are the following words:—

“Respect for the Bible means respect for the church, for the preaching of the gospel, and for all the means of grace.”

We might multiply quotations to show that they expect to have “the church” occupy a controlling position in their new manner of government, but space forbids. And, as far as the purpose of this article is concerned, it is not needed, for we have fully shown all that we claimed of the complete likeness of the system of the Mormons and of the National Reformers. Both claim that their system, when carried out, is the kingdom of Christ on earth. Both claim that it is the duty of the civil Government to care for, to uphold, and to enforce the teachings of the church. Both claim that the civil offices should be filled by members of the church, and that dissenters have no right to hold office. And this state of things, in the description of Utah as quoted from the *Nation*, is represented as a union of Church and State. But how will the Reformers avoid the conclusion that the same state of things in the whole country will be a national union of Church and State?

It was this very thing that Thomas Jefferson opposed as inimical to a republican Government. It was against this that the framers of our Constitution wisely guarded in the Sixth Article and the First Amendment. It is well known that Thomas Jefferson, more than any other man, is blamed for the secular character, or, what the Reformers claim, the godless character of our Government. Thomas Jefferson was not a religionist; but he was a firm friend of civil and religious liberty, and we hope that the people of the United States may be aroused to the fact that our liberties, both civil and religious, are in danger from the efforts now being made to subordinate this civil Government to the will of the church. It is just as dangerous to republicanism now as it was in the days of Jefferson; just as dangerous to individual rights as it was two centuries ago in Massachusetts; just as dangerous in Pennsylvania, Ohio, or Tennessee, as it is in Utah. And let us not be deceived with the idea that the days of religious persecution have passed away, never to return. Religious bigotry and intolerance are manifest in every part of our land. Were it not so, the cause of “National Reform” or of the Religious Amendment of the Constitution, would not flourish as it does, and become popular as it is very fast becoming. Dr. Howard Crosby well said: “The moment you put religion into the hands of the Government, you do what Constantine did, and will bring about the dark ruin of the tenth century.”

J. H. W.

THE same cause which restrained the vigor, polluted the character of the church; for, being unable immediately to repress by its own spiritual weapons the violent animosities of its ministers, and impatient of the gradual influence of time and reason, in a dark and disastrous moment it had recourse to that temporal sword which was not intended for its service, and which it has never yet employed without disgrace or with impunity.—*Waddington.*

The National Reform Doctrine of Majorities.

LAST October, at the Wichita, Kansas, Reform Convention, Rev. J. M. Armour, of Sterling, Kansas, delivered an address, in which he inveighed against the idea of "government of the people, by the people, for the people," and maintained that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," in the following manner:—

"If government be of man,—if it be the mere will of the people,—why should I stand in awe of it? I do not. I cannot look with awe and reverence upon the decisions and mandates of neighbor Jones, for I know that he is not the source of law to me; he is but my equal. Now if he and Smith agree to say what I shall do, must I recognize in Jones and Smith my rightful rulers? the government that I ought to respect and obey? Nay; if Jones and Smith and Brown agree to lay down the law for me, I am still unsubdued. I still assert my right. . . . Nay, let millions of men, each of them my equal, command what is wrong or what is right, and their commands can never inspire in me profound reverence. Their will cannot be law to me. . . . It is but the Jones, Smith, and Brown power at best. Multiply it by the millions, it is the Jones, Smith, and Brown power still. *Its will is not law.* It has no authority but what belongs to brute force. Neither God nor my conscience bind me to obey the will of a million any more than one of my neighbors."—*Christian Statesman, Dec. 13, 1883.*

The same doctrine was held in the Cleveland National Convention. Rev. A. M. Milligan said:—

"Nor is the consent of the majority sufficient. One man cannot consent for another. Three-fourths of the people cannot consent for the remaining fourth. Forty-nine million, nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine people cannot consent for the fifty-millionth man."

Again Mr. Armour said:—

"Any command by whomsoever issued, that has not the sanction and approval of God, is not only not binding upon those to whom it is addressed, but they to whom such command comes are solemnly bound to disobey and resist it. . . . So all men owe it to themselves to obey no command but such as, traced to its source, has a divine sanction."

From these plain and forcible declarations, it would naturally be supposed that the National Reform party expect that the Religious Amendment will be adopted so entirely unanimously that there will not be one single dissenting voice. Because by the foregoing they plainly allow that if there shall be the fifty-millionth man who holds their work or their laws to be not of God, that "fifty-millionth man" is not bound to obey, but "solemnly bound to disobey and resist" the authority of their Government under the Religious Amendment. And the unanimous voice of the other "forty-nine million, nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine" "cannot consent for" him.

But if the National Reform party means this, where then is the efficacy of their movement? "Aye! there's the rub;" they don't mean it; for proof of which, now see

THE OTHER SIDE.

"So long as Christians are in the majority, they have a right to maintain a Christian

character in their Government." Please observe, "their (?) Government." See *Christian Statesman*, November 1, 1883, editorial.

Again:—

"This Amendment of the Constitution means that a majority of the people of this land shall first believe the principles we seek to have embodied there; and so believe them that their views shall crystallize into the form of law, and that in its most potent form." Please observe, "most potent." See *Statesman*, December 20, 1883, page 1.

Again:—

"How is the Amendment to be carried out practically? . . . A majority must decide."—*Id.*, Feb. 21, 1884.

So, then, if the Government be purely civil and secular, it is only the Jones, Smith, and Brown power at best, though it be multiplied by "millions." But if it call itself Christian and religious, it is instantly clothed with "divine right." Neither God nor conscience binds us to "obey the will of a million any more than one," unless that "million" call itself Christian. "The consent of the majority is not sufficient," provided that majority shall not call itself Christian. "Any command, by whomsoever issued, that has not the sanction and approval of God, is to be solemnly disobeyed and resisted," unless said command should be issued by a power calling itself Christian. But if the power choose to call itself Christian, though every act be the opposite of Christian principle; though it transcend by a "higher law" the sum of all Christian duty, yet if it only call itself Christian, then if it be a majority it "must decide," and exact obedience to its "views" by the "most potent form of law."

How ingenuous! How magnanimous! How eminently Christian! How pre-eminently charitable the National Reform party is, to be sure!!

A. T. J.

The Legacy from Our Fathers.

ONE of the stock arguments of the National Reformers in favor of their movement is that loyalty to the memory of our forefathers demands it. One of the reasons given in the preamble of their constitution is, "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." And "the legacy which we have received from our fathers" is a common method of commending those "Christian institutions" which they wish to enforce by civil law. We wish to notice a few things in the early history of our country to see how strong this argument really is.

One of the institutions which we received as a legacy from our fathers was slavery. All are acquainted with the fact that in the colonies, both North and South, slavery was practiced. In McMaster's "History of the People of the United States" we read the following:—

"If the infamy of holding slaves belongs to the South, the greater infamy of supplying slaves must be shared by England and the North. While the States were yet colonies, to buy negroes and sell them into slavery had become a source of profit to the inhabitants of many New England towns. Scarce a year passed by but numbers of slavers went out from

Boston, from Medford, from Salem, from Providence, from Newport, from Bristol, in Rhode Island. The trade was of a threefold kind: Molasses brought from Jamaica was turned to rum; the rum dispatched to Africa bought negroes; the negroes, carried to Jamaica or the Southern ports, were exchanged for molasses, which, in turn, taken back to New England, was quickly made into rum."—*Chap. 7, par. 15.*

It cost the nation millions of dollars and thousands of lives to get rid of this legacy, yet Mr. Gault, speaking of the National Reform Association, is willing to have another revolution equally bloody, if necessary to secure their ends.

But slavery will hardly be called a Christian institution, hence it cannot be what they refer to in their constitution. We must remember, however, that it was engaged in by the Christian men who settled this country; and even they could not give it a Christian character. Let us look, then, at some of the acts which they did in the name of and for Christianity. In the "Encyclopedia Britannica," art. "Quakers," we read the following:—

"The earliest appearance of Quakers in America is a remarkable one. In July, 1656, two women Quakers, Mary Fisher and Ann Austin, arrived at Boston. Under the general law against heresy their books were burnt by the hangman, they were searched for signs of witchcraft, they were imprisoned for five weeks and then sent away. During the same year eight others were sent back to England.

"In 1657 and 1658 laws were passed to prevent the introduction of Quakers into Massachusetts, and it was enacted that on the first conviction one ear should be cut off, on the second the remaining ear, and that on the third conviction the tongue should be bored with a hot iron. Fines were laid upon all who entertained Quakers or were present at their meetings. Thereupon the Quakers, who were perhaps not without the obstinacy of which Marcus Antoninus complained in the early Christians, rushed to Massachusetts as if invited, and the result was that the general court of the colony banished them on pain of death, and four Quakers, three men and one woman, were hung for refusing to depart from the jurisdiction, or obstinately returning within it. That the Quakers were irritating cannot be denied; some of them appear to have publicly mocked the institutions and the rulers of the colony, and to have interrupted public worship; and some of their men and women too acted with fanaticism and disorder. But even such conduct furnishes but a poor apology for inflicting stripes and death on men and women. The particulars of the proceedings of Governor Endicott and the magistrates of New England as given in Besse are startling to read. On the restoration of Charles II. a memorial was presented to him by the Quakers in England, stating the persecutions which their fellow members had undergone in New England. Even the careless Charles was moved to issue an order to the colony which effectually stopped the hanging of Quakers for their religion, though it by no means put an end to the persecution of the body in New England."

In McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, art. "Baptists," we find the following as a further illustration of how the Puritan Fathers put the stamp of Christianity on this country:—

"Massachusetts issued laws against them in 1644, imprisoned several Baptists in 1651, and banished others in 1669. In 1680 the doors of a Baptist meeting-house were nailed

up. In New York laws were issued against them in 1662, in Virginia in 1664. With the beginning of the eighteenth century the persecution greatly abated. They were released from tithes in 1727 in Massachusetts, in 1729 in New Hampshire and Connecticut, but not before 1785 in Virginia. The spread of their principles was greatly hindered by these persecutions."

In Bancroft's "History of the United States," we find an account of the struggle which Roger Williams and the Baptists had for religious liberty. Since the National Reformers are desirous of having this country sustain the same relation to religion which it did then, we quote quite largely from those chapters. In the following paragraphs the reader will find a very correct picture of the result of National Reform principles:—

"A fugitive from English persecution, he had revolved the nature of intolerance, and had arrived at its only effectual remedy, the sanctity of conscience. In soul matters, he would have no weapons but soul weapons. The civil magistrate should restrain crime, but never control opinion; should punish guilt, but never violate inward freedom. The principle contained within itself an entire reformation of theological jurisprudence; it would blot from the statute-book the felony of non-conformity; would quench the fires that persecution had so long kept burning; would repeal every law compelling attendance on public worship; would abolish tithes and all forced contributions to the maintenance of religion; would give an equal protection to every form of religious faith; and never suffer the force of the Government to be employed against the dissenter's meeting-house, the Jewish synagogue, or the Roman cathedral. In the unwavering assertion of his views, he never changed his position; the sanctity of conscience was the great tenet, which, with all its consequences, he defended, as he first trod the shores of New England; and, in his extreme old age, it was the last pulsation of his heart. The doctrine was a logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, as well of justification by faith alone as of the equality of all believers; and it was sure to be one day accepted by the whole Protestant world. But it placed the young emigrant in direct opposition to the system of the founders of Massachusetts, who were bent on making the State a united body of believers."

"The Government avoided an explicit rupture with the Church of England; Williams would hold no communion with it on account of its intolerance; 'for,' said he, 'the doctrine of persecution for cause of conscience is most evidently and lamentably contrary to the doctrine of Christ Jesus.' The magistrates insisted on the presence of every man at public worship; Williams reprobated the law; the worst statute in the English code was that which did but enforce attendance upon the parish church. To compel men to unite with those of a different creed, he regarded as an open violation of their natural rights; to drag to public worship the irreligious and the unwilling seemed only like requiring hypocrisy. 'An unbelieving soul is dead in sin,' such was his argument; and to force the indifferent from one worship to another 'was like shifting a dead man into several changes of apparel.' 'No one should be bound to worship, or,' he added, 'to maintain a worship, against his own consent.' 'What!' exclaimed his antagonists, amazed at his tenets; 'is not the laborer worthy of his hire?' 'Yes,' replied he, 'from them that hire him.'

"The magistrates were selected exclusively from the members of the church; with equal propriety, reasoned Williams, might 'a doctor

of physick or a pilot' be selected according to his skill in theology and his standing in the church."—*Chap. 3, par. 54, 70, 71.*

"Anabaptism was to the establishment a dangerous rival. When Clarke, the pure and tolerant Baptist of Rhode Island, one of the happy few who have connected their name with the liberty and happiness of a commonwealth, began to preach to a small audience in Lynn, he was seized by the civil officers. Being compelled to attend public worship with the congregation of the town, he expressed his aversion by a harmless indecorum, which would have been without excuse, had his presence been voluntary. He and his companions were tried, and condemned to pay a fine of twenty or thirty pounds; and Holmes, who refused to pay his fine, was whipped unmercifully.

"Since a particular form of worship had become a part of the civil establishment, irreligion was now to be punished as a civil offense. The State was a model of Christ's kingdom on earth; treason against the civil Government was treason against Christ; and reciprocally, as the gospel had the right paramount, blasphemy, or what a jury should call blasphemy, was the highest offense in the catalogue of crimes. To deny any book of the Old or New Testament to be the written and infallible word of God was punishable by fine or by stripes, and in case of obstinacy, by exile or death. Absence from 'the ministry of the word' was punished by a fine.

"By degrees the spirit of the establishment began to subvert the fundamental principles of independency. The liberty of prophesying was refused, except the approbation of four elders, or of a county court, had been obtained. Remonstrance was useless. The union of Church and State was fast corrupting both: it mingled base ambition with the former; it gave a false direction to the legislation of the latter. And in 1638 the general court claimed for itself, for the counsel, and for any two organic churches, the right of silencing any person who was not as yet ordained. The creation of a national, uncompromising church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which had disgraced their English persecutors; and Laud was justified by the men whom he had wronged."—*Chap. 10, par. 78-80.*

Many more quotations might be made, but these are sufficient. Let it be remembered that the men who practiced these cruelties were Christian men urged on by Christian ministers. These men were no worse than are the men who to-day occupy similar positions. Their action was simply the natural result of the idea that the State was "a model of Christ's kingdom on earth." And this, let it be remembered, is the position taken by National Reformers. Whoever wishes to know the result of the success of the National Reform Association, has only to read the history of the Salem Witchcraft and of the persecutions of the dissenting Baptists and Quakers. Those are the only "Christian features" which our forefathers gave to the Government. We do not wish to disparage the men who settled this country; they lived up to the light which they had. They had themselves suffered oppression for their religious convictions, and had never known such a thing as religious toleration, consequently it took them some time to accord to others that freedom which they demanded for themselves.

But we are happy to say that these "Christian features" were not permanently stamped upon our Government. By the time that the

ship of State was fairly launched, men had learned more of the principles of religious toleration. The Declaration of Independence recognized the fact that all men had equal rights, and the Constitution of the United States declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" and that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust, under the United States."

This Constitution comprises all that we have received from our forefathers. We believe it to be the best Constitution ever formed by man, because it carefully guards the rights of all, and leaves the conscience of everyone free. It is this Constitution which makes the United States the best country in the world for the spread of the gospel. And because it allows perfect freedom for the preaching of the gospel from the Bible alone, we are desirous of having it kept as it is, and we cannot countenance those men who, having far more light than the Puritan Fathers had, would revive in this country the practice of the Dark Ages.

E. J. W.

"Are Our Politics to Be Purified."

This is a question asked by the National Reform party. We, too, may ask the same question. The Reform party place great reliance upon the success of their movement for the accomplishment of this (much-to-be-desired, indeed!) result. Dr. Merrick in his address at the Cleveland National Reform Convention, said:—

"Where, then, is the antidote [for corrupt politics] to be found? Unhesitatingly I answer, In the religion of Jesus Christ. . . . How can it fail to purify our politics if Christianity be allowed its legitimate place in our Government?"—*Christian Statesman, Dec. 20, 1883.*

Dr. McAllister, also, in the same convention, said:—

"Finally, the proposed Amendment will draw to the administration of the Government such men as the law of God requires,—not the reckless, the unprincipled, the profane, but able men, who fear God and hate covetousness."—*Ibid., Dec. 27, 1883.*

This thing has been tried several times, and always with the same result, namely, to make corruption more corrupt. Given, human nature what it is, and make profession of religion a qualification for governmental favor, or political preference, and the inevitable result will always be that thousands will profess the required religion expressly to obtain political preferment, and *for no other reason*; and so to *dishonest ambition* is added *deliberate hypocrisy*.

The first to employ this method was he to whom can be traced almost every ill that Christianity has suffered (this last one being by no means the least),—Constantine. He made the bishop of Rome a prince of the empire, and clothed the inferior bishops with such power that they not only *ruled* as princes, but imitated the princes in pride, luxury, worldly pomp, and hateful haughtiness,—imitated the princes in these, and imitated the emperor in persecuting with relentless vigor all who differed with them in faith. And the

bishop of Rome, above all in rank, held the supremacy also in pride, arrogance, and profusion of luxury, to such a degree that one of the most eminent of the heathen writers exclaimed, either in envy or indignation, "Make me bishop of Rome and I will be a Christian."

Nor were the governmental favors of Constantine confined to the bishops; they extended to all orders; and by the promise of a white garment, and twenty pieces of gold to every convert, there was secured in a single year the baptism of no fewer than twelve thousand men, besides a proportionate number of women and children. See Gibbon, "Decline and Fall of Rome," chap. 20, par. 17. And the inevitable consequence was that "formalism succeeded faith, and religion fled from a station among the rulers of Christendom to find shelter in her native scenes among the suffering and the poor." Was politics purified there? No! religion was corrupted and faith debased; and amidst and by it all, were taken the widest and most rapid strides of the Church of Rome toward that fearful height of power and depth of degradation which was the astonishment and the shame of the world.

Another notable instance was Louis XIV. of France. The early part of his reign was a time of much license; "but in his old age he became religious; and he determined that his subjects should be religious too. He shrugged his shoulders and knitted his brows if he observed at his levee, or near his dinner table, any gentleman who neglected the duties enjoined by the church. He rewarded piety with blue ribands, pensions, invitations to Marlé, governments, and regiments. Forthwith Versailles became in everything but dress, a convent. The pulpits and confessionals were surrounded by swords and embroidery. The marshals were much in prayer; and there was hardly one among the dukes and peers who did not carry good little books in his pocket, fast during lent, and communicate at Easter. Madame de Maintenon, who had a great share in the blessed work, boasted that devotion had become quite the fashion."

And was politics purified? With a vengeance! We read on: "A fashion indeed it was; and like a fashion it passed away. No sooner had the old king been carried to St. Denis than the whole court unmasked. Every man hastened to indemnify himself, by the excess of licentiousness and impudence, for years of mortification. The same persons who, a few months before, with meek voices and demure looks, had consulted divines about the state of their souls, now surrounded the midnight table, where, amidst the bounding of champagne corks, a drunken prince, enthroned between Dubois and Madame de Parabere, hiccupped out atheistical arguments and obscene jests. The early part of the reign of Louis XIV. had been a time of license; but the most dissolute men of that generation would have blushed at the orgies of the Regency."—*Macaulay's Essay on Leigh Hunt.*

But undoubtedly the most notable instance of all is that of the Puritan rule, of the Commonwealth of England. "It was solemnly resolved by Parliament 'that no person shall

be employed but such as the House shall be satisfied of his real godliness.' The pious assembly had a Bible lying on the table for reference. . . . To know whether a man was really godly was impossible. But it was easy to know whether he had a plain dress, lank hair, no starch in his linen, no gay furniture in his house; whether he talked through his nose, and showed the whites of his eyes; whether he named his children Assurance, Tribulation, and Maher-shalal-hash-baz; whether he avoided Spring Garden when in town, and abstained from hunting and hawking when in the country; whether he expounded hard scriptures to his troops of dragoons, and talked in a committee of ways and means about seeking the Lord. These were tests which could easily be applied. The misfortune was that they proved nothing. Such as they were, they were employed by the dominant party. And the consequence was that a crowd of impostors, in every walk of life, began to mimic and to caricature what were then regarded as the outward signs of sanctity."—*Ibid.*

Thus has it ever been, and thus will it ever be, where Governments, as such, attempt to propagate a religion. The only means which it is possible for Governments to employ are "reward and punishment; powerful means indeed for influencing the exterior act, but altogether impotent for the purpose of touching the heart. A public functionary who is told that he will be promoted if he is a devout Catholic, and turned out of his place if he is not, will probably go to mass every morning, exclude meat from his table on Fridays, shrive himself regularly, and perhaps let his superiors know that he wears a hair shirt next his skin. Under a Puritan [or a National Reform also we may say] Government, a person who is apprised that piety is essential to thriving in the world [see *Christian Statesman* of Nov. 21, Dec. 21 and 27, 1883, and Feb. 21, 1884, particularly, but in fact almost any number], will be strict in the observance of the Sunday, or, as he will call it, Sabbath; and will avoid a theater as if it were plague-stricken. Such a show of religion as this the hope of gain and the fear of loss will produce, at a week's notice, in any abundance which a Government may require. But under this show, sensuality, ambition, avarice, and hatred retain unimpaired power, and the seeming convert has only added to the vices of a man of the world all the still darker vices which are engendered by the constant practice of dissimulation. The truth cannot be long concealed. The public discovers that the grave persons who are proposed to it as patterns, are more utterly destitute of moral principle and of moral sensibility than avowed libertines. It sees that these Pharisees are further removed from real goodness than publicans and harlots. And, as usual, it rushes to the extreme opposite to that which it quits. It considers a high religious profession as a sure mark of meanness and depravity. On the very first day on which the restraint of fear is taken away, and on which men can venture to say what they think, a frightful peal of blasphemy and ribaldry proclaims that the short-sighted policy which aimed at making a nation of saints has made a nation of scoffers."—*Ibid.*

Yet in the very face of these plainest dictates of pure reason, and these most forcible lessons of history, and in utter defiance of all the teaching of universal history itself, the National Reform party, with that persistence which is born of the blindness of bigoted zeal, is working, and will continue to work, with might and main, to bring upon this dear land all this fearful train of disorders. Their movement reminds us of nothing so much as of these quack medicines that are so abundant, warranted to cure every ill that is known to the human body; while at the same time they will create a thousand ills that the human system has never known before. As with these, so with the National Reform; it is warranted to cure all the ills of the body politic, while, as anyone with half an eye can see, it bears in its hands a perfect Pandora's box, wide open, to inflict its innumerable evils upon our country; and, as they will learn when it is too late, they will have no power to retain even hope. She herself will have flown away, and nothing remain but utter, irretrievable, awful ruin. A. T. J.

Governmental Jurisdiction.

JURISDICTION is a law term used to denote the idea of governmental authority over persons and things within the scope of its action. No such authority is absolutely universal as to the persons subject to it, or as to the matters which it embraces. Many things are so entirely private in their nature or so little concern the general public that they are by universal consent left exclusively to individual choice, without any attempt to regulate them by law. Governments exist for particular purposes, which by no means include the entire bulk of human affairs.

How, then, is it with religion considered as a faith or a worship, as a spiritual exercise or a social expression thereof? Does it come within the rightful jurisdiction of human Government? Does it properly belong to any such Government to regulate, administer, propagate, or in any way take charge of the religion of the people? The answer given by history is that most of the Governments of the world have assumed that religion lies within the scope of their regulating and administrative agency. The legislation consequent upon the assumption, whether more or less liberal, or more or less oppressive, will be according to the general civilization of the people. Pains and penalties, discriminations on religious grounds, special immunities granted or denied on these grounds, compulsory taxation for the support and propagation of religion, the appointment and control of religious teachers, religious tests as qualifications for civil office or to testify in a court of justice—these are among the things which the assumption carries along with it, and by which it makes itself operative. The principle is the same in all cases, varying only in the extent to which it is applied.

It seems not a little strange that a principle fraught with so much evil and so essentially false, as well as absurd, should have lasted so long and spread so extensively among the nations of the earth, and that even now the

discovery of its falseness should be limited to so small a portion of the human family. Its victims usually perceive the wrong when they feel its burden; yet it has often happened, as was the case with our Puritan Fathers, that they no sooner cease to be victims than they are ready to become oppressors—forgetting, “as victors, the lessons which as victims they had learned.” One would think that so simple a proposition as that which affirms the existence and inalienable character of the rights of a religious conscience as above and beyond all human authority ought to have been among the earliest and most widely-extended discoveries of the race. The fact, however, is sadly the reverse. Of all the forms of wrong which men have suffered from each other, none have been less reasonable or more merciless and unrelenting than those of religious zeal armed with the civil power. There is no darker chapter in the history of Governments than that which chronicles their misdeeds in the attempt to administer and propagate religion. The attempt is essentially a horrible human tyranny begun, and every step of the process is that tyranny continued.

The doctrine of a *personal* God, related to men as their Creator and Preserver, being received into the mind as the *objective* basis of religion, naturally connects itself with the idea of this God as a supreme *lawgiver*, to whose authority we are directly subject and from whose administrative control no power can release us. His will, no matter how ascertained, is the final law. Peter and John were simply true to universal thought when they said: “We ought to obey God rather than men.” Daniel was true to the same thought when he disregarded the edict of a king rather than violate that of his God. The martyrs who took joyfully the spoiling of their goods and cheerfully died at the stake for what they regarded as obedience to God were true to the doctrine that God, and not man, is the supreme ruler, and that the authority of the latter—whether that of the parent, the magistrate, the legislative assembly, or the king—when in conflict with that of the former, is not for a moment to be regarded. No human law can outlaw the law of God. There is but one supreme authority in the universe, and this is exclusively vested in God himself. No one disputes this proposition who believes in the existence of a personal God. It is one of the first truths of all religion.

Now, as to the question whether there is such a God, thus related to each individual man, and, if so, as to what are his laws and what duties he requires us to perform; and as to the further question whether this God has made a supernatural revelation of his will to men, and, if so, as to what that revelation contains—as to these questions no human being, unless directly inspired by God himself, can authoritatively judge for another. What others think may be a source of light, and, in this sense, of value; but it is no rule to the individual, unless he thinks the same thing. He must adopt their thoughts before they can become his rule; and in doing so it is not possible for him to disown his own reason or

his own conscience. These faculties form his best light, and necessarily imply a negation of the authority of any other human being to govern his thoughts, or the right of any human power forcibly to interfere with their peaceable exercise. God has established no ecclesiastical bureau in any earthly Government to take the religious charge of the individual reason and conscience, to supersede their personal functions, and dispense truth and piety to men according to order. All such bureaus, whether managed by kings or popes, invade a province exclusively occupied by the divine Government, and, hence, insult the Majesty of Heaven while they outrage the rights of earth. Each individual soul must and does think for itself upon its own direct responsibility to the King of kings; and that, too, no matter how ignorant or how much superstition may have warped the understanding. What it thinks is necessarily a law whose jurisdiction no merely human opinion or authority can either displace or destroy. It is sovereign for the individual.

Moreover, religion consists essentially in *voluntary* homage and obedience rendered to God by a rational and accountable being. Its spiritual phenomena belong to a realm to which no human authority can extend. Such authority may punish their outward expression or the want of such expression; but the seat of religion lies beyond its agency. No parent can lash his child into piety and no king can make his subjects devout toward God by commanding them to be so. Religion was never forced into any soul, or forced out of it. Whoever worships and obeys God, worships and obeys the God of whom he thinks, and in whose existence he believes. He does so under the inner guidance of his own reason and conscience, and not under the authority of the reason and conscience of another. This is the immutable law of his own being, as well as of the character of the service rendered.

It follows, then, from the very nature of religion, as a matter between the soul and its God, from the absolute and supreme authority of God and from the necessary supremacy of the individual reason and conscience in determining the religious question between God and the soul, that civil Governments cannot extend their agency to the administration or regulation of religion without committing a trespass upon the rights of God and man at the same time. They cannot make its laws, since here God himself is the sole lawgiver. They cannot add to its sanctions or modify or cancel its claims. They cannot coerce men into piety, since the service itself admits of no coercion. They cannot destroy the authority of the individual reason and conscience, since this authority is indestructible by any human power. Each soul, as to its faith, its thoughts and affections, and the obligations which bind it to God, is as free from the rightful control of human authority as it could be if no such authority existed. And this is what is meant by religious freedom—freedom not from God's authority, but from man's authority, so that each one is left to follow the dictates of his own conscience.

This statement needs to be qualified by the

remark that no one, as a member of civil society, has a right so to exercise his religious liberty as to make himself a trespasser upon the rights of others, or act in a manner inconsistent with the good order and safety of that society. While free to think what he pleases, and equally free peaceably to express and propagate his opinions, he is not free to commit acts which society cannot, in consistency with its own welfare, permit to be done with impunity, for any reasons. It is the province of just and enlightened legislation to fix the limits within which individual liberty must move, and beyond which it must yield to the general good. It is possible to err here; yet without such limits fixed somewhere the community would be at the mercy of every man's superstition, and each would be licensed to do what he pleased under the color of religion. Society cannot, as an organism regulated by law, exist upon any such principle. A penal code to protect the rights of men by preventing crime is, hence, not repealed by the doctrine of religious liberty.

Restraining, then, the outward exercise of this liberty within the limits established by sound reason and impartial justice, human Governments have but a single additional duty to perform; and this is to *protect* it. Protection here does not mean patronage, or support, or regulation of religion in any way; but it does mean that no one, no matter who he is, or what may be his religion, or whether he belongs to the majority or the minority or stands absolutely alone, shall be interfered with when peaceably worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience or when peaceably imparting his religious convictions to others, and that no one shall be compelled by law to perform any religious duty or be subject to any disability on the ground of non-performance, or be required by compulsory taxation to contribute to the maintenance or propagation of any religious system. It does mean that, within the limits demanded by the rights of others, each individual shall be left absolutely free as to his religion and as to its social expression, being protected in his person against oppression and in his property against religious exactions. It does mean such a complete, universal, and impartial equality before the laws as excludes all discriminations among citizens on religious grounds, and permits every one to judge for himself as to what religion he shall adopt, or whether he shall adopt any, and then as to what he shall do or omit to do within the bounds of decency and social order. Protection is the one word that defines the whole duty of civil Government in respect to the religion of its citizens. This is all they need, all to which they are entitled, and the utmost that a just Government can consistently render.—*S. T. Spear, D. D.*

WESTERN civilization utterly repudiates this idea [of paternal Government], denies the existence of any analogy between the family and the State, and seeks to make *men* and not *children* of the people.—*Pres. George Washburn.*

“Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world.” John 18 : 36.

History Repeating Itself.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL aims to be true to its name, and to call attention to the dangers threatening our country. And though the chief danger, and that in which all other dangers culminate, lies in National Reform, yet it is both interesting and profitable to take other views of the political horizon than that which lies directly in the line of vision toward National Reform. The following we think is worthy the serious consideration of every thoughtful person.

In 1857 Lord Macaulay writing of the American Republic used these words:—

"The day will come when, in the State of New York, a multitude of people, not one of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a Legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a Legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith; on the other is a demagogue, canting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in carriages, while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessaries. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by the workingman who hears his children crying for more bread? I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such seasons of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning. Either some Cæsar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth, with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country and by your own institutions."

With that please read the following editorial note from the *Argonaut* (S. F.), of November 6, 1886.—

"Mr. Henry George has not carried New York, and has not become its mayor, but this is what has been done: An impecunious adventurer, who has no property, pays no taxes, has no residence or citizenship anywhere—so far as we know—takes his grip-sack in his hand and moves to the great American metropolis, and, gathering around him all there is of poverty, ignorance, discontent, and crime, proclaims himself a candidate for mayor; without party, or press, or money, he organizes discontent, and, becoming its leader, he marshals a band of men who have little to lose and much to gain, and marches them to the ballot-box to obtain control of the government of a city containing more than a million of people and more than a thousand millions of aggregated wealth. That he does not succeed may be a matter of congratulation; that he came within a few thousand votes of his successful opponent, seems to us an incident of great significance, that carries with it the suggestion of danger. In saying this it is not necessary to deny to Mr. Henry George great ability and thorough integrity of purpose. We may not call him crank or impracticable theorist; but the danger lies in the fact that the class of discontents is so numerous, and that it can be brought together for a political purpose, and become subordinate to party discipline, and wielded for political use. When one reflects in this direction, he can but question whether the unlimited exercise of the elective franchise ought not to be taken from an alien immigrating class, in order that the ranks of this dangerous and restless element may be prevented from further enlargement."

Then in connection with these two extracts

the following from an editorial in the November *Century* is interesting and strongly suggestive. Under the heading of "The Congressional Balance-sheet" is given a striking illustration of the incapability, if not the failure, of Congress as a legislative body. The editor says:—

"The reader may perhaps desire an explanation of this failure of our national Legislative. Let him then go to Washington while the two Houses are in session. Let him sit in the gallery of the Senate, provided an 'executive session' does not turn him out; let him scan the faces of the Senators, reflect upon their previous records, and consider how many of them came to occupy their present positions.

"Let him then go and sit for a time in the gallery of the House of Representatives, and watch that national bear-garden. Let him enjoy the usual scene—one purple-faced Representative sawing the air in the progress of what is technically called an 'oration,' a dozen or more highly-amused colleagues surrounding him; the rest of the members talking at the top of their voices, clapping their hands for pages, writing, reading, telling funny stories and laughing uproariously at them, making social calls from desk to desk, doing anything and everything except the business for which they are paid.

"Let him try to estimate the rapidity with which a plain business man, finding his clerks engaged in such a scene during business hours, would make a 'clean sweep' of them. He will no longer ask an explanation of the congressional balance-sheet. What better result could be expected from two Houses, each in its own way controlled by influences antagonistic to intelligent legislation? Congress is no longer a legislative body. Its degeneration is now admitted. It consists now of a plutocracy at one end, and a mobocracy at the other. The two chronic perils of a democracy have a firm grip on the Congress of the United States.

"Here is no question of comparative guilt or responsibility. Each House is as bad in its way as the other. Nor is there any partisan question involved. The course of Congress has for years been downhill. Able and sincere men are still to be found in both Houses, yet each successive Congress is, on the whole, worse than its predecessors; not because Democrats or Republicans control it, but because it is two years further on the road. . .

"The Congress of the United States has become the most incapable legislative body of the constitutional world. So far as the Senate is concerned, its case is hopeless; the only remedy is outside of it, in the regeneration of the constituencies which elect the Senators. The case of the House is somewhat different; its failure may be redeemed by reform within itself."

But the prospect of a cure by this prescription is as hopeless as is the case for which it is given. "The only remedy for the Senate" is said to be in the regeneration of the constituencies which elect the Senators. But the constituencies are as corrupt as is the Senate. Else how is it that the Senate is so bad? The House it is said "may be redeemed by reform within itself." It *might* be it is true. But will it be? Is there hope of reform from such a source? To think so is like expecting a man to lift himself by the straps of his boots. In the last resort therefore we see only that the whole case, as the editor says of that of the Senate, is hopeless.

In view of these things stated by the *Argonaut* and the *Century*, Lord Macaulay's words are remarkable. And when we view the de-

structive violence of the participants in the almost perpetual strikes, their secret and sometimes open sympathy with Anarchists, and their always open advocacy of Socialism, which can only end in anarchy, it appears as though the American "Huns and Vandals" mentioned by Macaulay are almost ready to burst upon the nation. And though Macaulay places the time of plunder in "the twentieth century;" and though there remain but thirteen years before the twentieth century comes; yet we very much doubt whether the nineteenth century instead of the twentieth will not see this time of ruin so clearly pictured by this justly eminent writer and thinker. For when the Hun and the Vandal came upon Rome there was no Cæsar, and the time of the American Huns and Vandals seems too near to hope for a Cæsar here.

Yet there is one more step that may be taken before ruin is reached. That is, let the whole body—representatives and constituencies—become permeated with the vileness of an apostate church; let religious hypocrisy be added to political chicanery and legislative incompetency, then will be reached the condition in which Rome stood at the time to which Macaulay refers, and having reached it, a dreadful fall awaits this nation, as surely as red-handed ruin fell upon Rome. And that there may not be a single color lacking in the lurid picture, National Reform presents itself, and in it the embodiment of the last element of corruption needed to fill up the cup of iniquity, as Rome's was filled when ruin overtook her. History *does* repeat itself. And if any just lesson may be drawn from history, it seems that this one must be that ruin stands at the doors of our nation to-day; and the National Reform party has its hand upon the latch ready to open the door and let her in.

A. T. J.

NEW HISTORICAL ATLAS
AND GENERAL HISTORY.

BY ROBERT H. LABBERTON.

AS A CLASS TEXT-BOOK it is superior to any other in Unity, Brevity, Clearness, Logical Arrangement, and Suggestiveness.

AS A REFERENCE BOOK it should be in the Library of every school-room in the country; every Student of History should possess a copy.

In your Reading Circle or at home when you wish to consult an Atlas you need a map for a particular date. Your modern Atlas will not give it. This is the only Atlas which has a map for every period.

A MAP for any particular date can instantly be found by anyone, each map having ever it in figures, the year or period it covers.

It is the only Atlas in which each nationality has, and always retains, its own distinctive color; hence every period has a map, and they are progressive, forming in themselves a panorama of events effective in the highest degree.

NEW MAPS OF ANCIENT EMPIRES.

It contains, now made for the first time, maps of the Chaldean, Elamitic, Egyptian, Kossean, Armenian, Hittite, and Assyrian Empires.

The text is brief, suggestive, fascinating, but gives in an attractive form the leading events in the history of the world (not a bundle of particular histories), free from unnecessary details. It has an index.

Labberton's New Historical Atlas and General History is indispensable to Libraries, Reading Circles, School Officers, Teachers, Students, etc. It contains 198 Maps, printed in colors, 20 Genealogical Charts, and is complete in one volume, 4to. Cloth, 312 pages. Sent by Mail or Express, prepaid, for \$2.50.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH?

A TRACT of 24 pages, which fully answers this question, and shows how Sunday displaced the Bible Sabbath. Extracts given from Catholic writers. Price, 3 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY, 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.

THOSE who are clamoring for a kingdom of Christ on earth, which shall at the same time be a republic, might see a picture of themselves and learn something, if they would, from the following words by A. F. Schaufler, D. D., in the *Sunday School Times* of January 8:—

"Some people in our days demur to the justice and sovereignty of God, and want him rather to dance attendance on the whims of sinful men. It would please them to have the universe governed by the votes of men, rather than by the fiat of the Almighty. But the kingdom of God is an absolute monarchy, and not a republic. Had it been a republic, it would have gone to pieces long ago."

MANY have made inquiries concerning bound volumes of the SENTINEL. We are happy to say that we can now fill orders for any quantity of the first volume, bound in manilla or cloth, with index. The bound volume is neat and handy, and will be of great value as a book of reference, or a text-book for those who wish to understand the folly and iniquity of the so-called National Reform movement. Price, in manilla covers, 60 cents; in cloth, \$1.00. Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

A PATERNAL Government, under exceptional circumstances, may for a time secure a certain amount of material prosperity and even of moral and intellectual development, but in general this system must develop a type of character where the virtues of childhood are not only exaggerated at the expense of those which are the glory of manhood, but are liable also to be extinguished by the vices of a manhood uncontrolled by reason or conscience.—*Pres. George Washburn.*

THE most fatal consequence which has in any age resulted from the connection between Church and State, is the application of the penalties of the one to the disorders of the other,—the correction of spiritual offenses by temporal chastisements. . . . And since its wickedness and its folly have been exposed and acknowledged, there can now be no circumstances under which a wise Government would employ such interference, or an enlightened priesthood desire it.—*Waddington.*

REFORM LOGIC.—In the *Christian Nation*, a certain minister, in an article headed, "Ours a Christian Nation," amongst other proofs (?) offers the following:—

"There is not an anti-Christian law on our statute books; that is, not a law opposed to Christianity."

And there is not a law on our statute books opposed to Mohammedanism; does that make ours a Mohammedan nation? There is not a

law against Buddhism; not a law against infidelity. Therefore—what kind of a nation are we? A law against any of these would be an infringement of human rights, and therefore an outrage. Ours is a civil Government—just as it ought to be. To make it a religious Government—to unite it with ecclesiasticism—is simply Church and State, and any denial of it is a subterfuge.

The Truth Confessed.

THE National Reformers persistently talk about the "Christian Sabbath," and the "Christian law of marriage," and one of their most prominent "Secretaries" said, in the *Statesman*, that "the race is indebted to the religion of Christ for the pure blessing of the family." The gospel is of infinite worth to the fallen race, but we do not believe it is honored or advanced by destroying its relations. To deny original obligations and original institutions is to neutralize the gospel, for the gospel is purely remedial, and to merge every obligation and institution into the gospel is to make it elementary and not remedial.

But the truth will out sometimes. In the *Christian Nation* of December 22, 1886, in the Sunday-school Notes by Rev. W. J. Coleman, himself a zealous "Reformer," are the following words:—

"Marriage and the Sabbath, these are the two gifts of God to Paradise, which have survived the fall. How sadly sin has marred them both, yet they bear the aroma of the Eden whence they came, and hold inclosed within them the greater part of the happiness yet engaged [enjoyed?] in this world."

True, every word. But that which was given in Paradise and has "survived the fall," cannot be of Christian origin, or be any part of Christianity. Both these institutions are contained in the moral law, the violation of which made the gospel necessary. We have several times called attention to the fact that the Reformers generally ignore the proper distinction between *morality* and *religion*. The above declaration of Mr. Coleman looks toward a recognition of that distinction. We are constrained to believe that these people have no *system* of Bible ethics, but indulge in random talk to suit their fancy and the occasion.

We repeat what we have said before, "The gospel enforces all morality, but it originates none." Pardon recognizes the obligation or binding power of the law, but it does not annul law, or give authority to law. The ministry of the gospel is a "ministry of reconciliation." That, and that only. Whenever our model reformers prove that the Sabbath and marriage are of Christian origin, and did not exist in Paradise before the fall of man, then we will unite with them in talking about a "Christian Sabbath," if any such can be found, and we will accept marriage as a Christian institution, and acknowledge that the blessing of the family is peculiar to the gospel—but not till then. J. H. W.

"I CHARGE thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word."—*Paul to Timothy.*

Renewals of Subscriptions.

A NUMBER of subscriptions to this paper expire in February, 1887, also in March, 1887. The address label will tell the exact date to which your time is paid. Our terms are cash in advance and we hope that none of our readers will allow their name to be dropped from our mailing list. Please renew early so as to avoid the possibility of missing any issue of the SENTINEL. The price is only 50 cents per year, less than one cent a week. Who cannot raise that small sum to aid a noble cause? If you will send us two *new* subscribers at 50 cents each, we will send you the AMERICAN SENTINEL one year free.

The True Educator.

"THE students in the industrial department of the South Lancaster Academy print the *True Educator* as a part of their school work, and it is one of the neatest papers which comes to our desk. Fortunate that parent whose child has such facilities in connection with his studies."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The *True Educator* is certainly a credit to its editor and to the Academy. Shall try to send something for its columns."—*John C. Rolfe, Ph. D., Cincinnati, O.*, late instructor in Greek, Cornell University.

"The three great educational monthly periodicals of this time are the *True Educator*, South Lancaster, Mass., the *American Teacher*, Boston, Mass., and the *Western School Journal*, Topeka, Kansas."—*Tonganozie (Kansas) News.*

We have made arrangements with the publishers of the above-mentioned sixteen-page journal, whereby we can now offer the *True Educator* (regular price 75 cents) and the AMERICAN SENTINEL (price 50 cents) for \$1.00. Address PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

Combination Offer.

MANY people, in all parts of the country, are deeply interested in the investigation of the Sabbath question. To aid such we make the following combination offer to both old and new subscribers to this paper. For \$1.50 we will send the AMERICAN SENTINEL one year, and the "History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week," post-paid, to any address. This book contains a mine of information. Every text of Scripture concerning the Sabbath is commented on at length. Should be read by everybody. 528 pages. Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH

AND FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

BY ELD. J. N. ANDREWS.

THIS WORK CONTAINS A MINE OF INFORMATION.

THE Bible record of the Sabbath; the secular history concerning it; the successive steps by which the change to the first day was made, and the work of restoration, are given in detail.

Every text of Scripture concerning the Sabbath is commented on at length; and the complete Testimony of the Fathers in regard to the Sabbath and first day is given. The comparative merits of the seventh and the first-day Sabbaths are fully shown. A copious index enables the reader to find any text, or the statement of any historian.

Should be read by everybody. 528 pp. Price, \$1.25.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

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 subscription, post-

paid - - - - - 2a.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.