

# THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MARCH, 1887.

NUMBER 3.

## The American Sentinel.

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

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

### The National Reform Gospel.

NATIONAL Reform Secretary J. H. Leiper says:—

"We preach exactly the same gospel to the body politic—that moral individual we call the nation—[that we do to the demoralized individual person]."—*Christian Statesman*, June 18, 1885.

The gospel which Christ sends by his minister to the "demoralized individual" person is this: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And this: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

Now if the National Reformers propose to preach to the body politic the gospel of Christ, and if that body politic is going to obey that gospel—if it is going to observe what Christ has commanded—then that body politic must be baptized; and the National Reformers will have to baptize it. We should like for Mr. Secretary Leiper to tell "exactly" how that thing can be accomplished.

If the National Reformers will say that the body politic needs not to be baptized, then it follows that the gospel which they preach to the body politic is not the gospel of Christ. And in that case, this being "exactly the same gospel" that they preach to the demoralized individual, it follows that the gospel which they preach either to the individual or to the body politic is not the gospel of Christ. We are persuaded that the conclusion is the literal truth of the matter, and of this persuasion we must remain until the National Reformers tell us how the body politic shall or can be baptized.

THE morality as derived from religion which the State needs will be best supplied by the confinement of its agency to things temporal and the entire omission on its part of any attempt to administer things spiritual. The State can do religion no favor so great as to have nothing to do with it, and itself no favor so great as to let religion alone. The moment the two are put in alliance with each other both are injured.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D.*

### "Foundation in Usage."

THE *Christian Statesman* of Nov. 11, 1886, contains the first part of an article, by "the Rev. John M'Naugher," entitled, "The State and the Sabbath." Its opening remarks we wish to notice. It opens thus:—

"In advocating that the body politic should officially acknowledge the Lord's day and secure it against secular uses, one cannot be charged with being a flighty theorist. That doctrine is time-honored and has been in actual operation for fifteen centuries. Ever since the issuing of Constantine's memorable edict, A. D. 321, the Sabbath as a weekly rest-day has been a fixture in the common law of the civilized world."

This reference to the action of Constantine, in this relation, is certainly significant, and very fitting. It is conceded by all that Constantine was the first to attempt to unite the Christian religion with the "body politic;" it is a fact of history that by him was laid the foundation for all the ecclesiastical usurpations of the Roman Papal system, and that his patronage of the church has been a curse to the cause of Christianity, the influence of which is felt even to the present time.

Let us first examine Constantine's "memorable decree," and we will then consider its import, and the relation that this notable emperor sustained to the Christian religion at the time of his issuing this decree. The following is the decree, of date March 7, 321:—

"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture, because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven."

Not only by this writer in the *Statesman*, but by a multitude of religious teachers of the present day, this decree of Constantine is recognized as the foundation of all "Sabbath" or "Lord's day" legislation; as the first recognition by the "body politic" of the usages or institutions of Christianity. But nothing can be more easily shown than that this decree was not made in the interest of Christianity; that it did not respect the Sabbath or Lord's day; and that it was not issued by a Christian ruler.

The reader will notice that the decree was partial; that it related only to certain classes, leaving other classes to still pursue their usual avocations; and that it was respecting "the venerable day of the sun." Now we appeal with confidence to every student and reader of the Bible, that in all the Scriptures there is no such day or institution known as "the

venerable day of the sun." And we affirm that, in this decree, Constantine not only did not mention any Christian institution, but he had no reference to any Christian institution.

On this point let such a reputable writer as Dr. Schaff testify:—

"He enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though not as *dies Domini* [Lord's day], but as *dies solis* [day of the sun], in conformity to his worship of Apollo, and in company with an ordinance for the regular consulting of the *haruspex* (321)."—*History of the Christian Church*, vol. 2.

The edict of the sun's day was issued March 7; that for consulting the *haruspex* was issued the day following, March 8. This edict of March 8 concerned the inspection of the entrails of beasts as a means of foretelling future events. It was a heathen practice, and the decree was a heathen edict, made by a heathen ruler. This of itself is sufficient to show in what light we must regard his edict for honoring "the venerable day of the sun."

Dr. Schaff says that Constantine issued his sun's day decree "in conformity to his worship of Apollo." Who was Apollo, and what relation did his worship bear to reverencing "the day of the sun"? Webster says: "A deity among the Greeks and Romans, and worshiped under the name of *Phœbus*, the sun."

On this point Gibbon furnishes decisive evidence:—

"The devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry. . . . The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelary deity. . . . The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine."—*Decline and Fall*, vol. 2, chap. 20.

And again, a note on the same page says:—

"The panegyric of Eumenius, which was pronounced a few months before the Italian war, abounds with the most unexceptionable evidence of the Pagan superstition of Constantine, and of his particular veneration for Apollo, or the sun."

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says:—

"The notion of conversion in the sense of a real acceptance of the new religion, and a thorough rejection of the old, is inconsistent with the hesitating attitude in which he stood towards both. Much of this may indeed be due to motives of political expediency, but there is a good deal that cannot be so explained. Paganism must still have been an operative belief with the man who, down almost to the close of his life, retained so many heathen

superstitions. He was at best only half-heathen, half Christian, who could seek to combine the worship of Christ with the worship of Apollo, having the name of the one and the figure of the other impressed upon his coins."—*Art. Constantine*.

Of the religion of Constantine, and of the sun god, Dr. Schaff thus speaks:—

"At first, Constantine, like his father, in the spirit of the Neo-Platonic syncretism of dying heathendom, revered all the gods as mysterious powers; especially Apollo, the god of the sun, to whom, in the year 308, he presented munificent gifts. Nay, so late as the year 321 he enjoined regular consultation of the soothsayers in public misfortunes, according to ancient heathen usage; even later, he placed his new residence, Byzantium, under the protection of the God of the martyrs and the heathen goddess of fortune; and down to the end of his life he retained the title and dignity of a *Pontifex Maximus*, or high priest of the heathen hierarchy. His coins bore on the one side the letters of the name of Christ, on the other the figure of the sun-god, and the inscription, *Sol invictus*."—*Church History, vol. 2*.

Once more we hear Dr. Schaff in regard to the life and character of Constantine:—

"When at last on his death bed he submitted to baptism, with the remark, 'Now let us cast away all duplicity,' he honestly admitted the conflict of two antagonistic principles which swayed his private character and public life."—*Church History, vol. 2*.

Much, very much, historical evidence may be added to show the character of Constantine, of whom the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says: "Tested by character, indeed, he stands among the lowest of all those to whom the epithet [great] has in ancient or modern times been applied."

But this is the man who gave to the world the legacy of Church and State; who caused the State to "serve the interests of the Church;" and who lent the strength of his empire to "maintain and enforce the true religion;" to whose action the *Statesman* so approvingly refers as a warrant for and example of "Sabbath legislation." But never was a more groundless claim set up than that of ascribing to Constantine the issuing of an edict in favor of the Sabbath. His edict was heathenish—that, and that only, as all reliable history attests.

What was the effect of his patronizing or serving the interests of the church? He elevated the bishops to the dignity of civil magistrates, especially the bishop of Rome, whom he invested with the primacy. An early historian said:—

"Constantine likewise enacted a law favoring the clergy, permitting judgment to be passed by the bishops when litigants preferred appealing to them rather than to the secular courts; he enacted that their decree should be valid, and as far superior to that of other judges as if pronounced by the emperor himself; that the governor and military officers should see to the execution of these decrees; and that sentence, when passed by them, should be irreversible."—*Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History*.

To such a state of things our National Reformers aspire, when the "final decision" shall be with "the churches and the clergy."

But what was the effect of the State thus "serving the interests of the church," and "upholding and maintaining the true religion"? With all reliable writers there is but

one decision on this point. We can only give sample statements:—

"Passing rapidly from a state of distress and persecution to the summit of prosperity, the church degenerated as rapidly from her ancient purity, and forfeited the respect of future ages in the same proportion as she received the blind veneration of her own. Covetousness, especially, became almost a characteristic vice."—*Hallam, Middle Ages*.

"This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer, Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishop drew great revenues from his farms; . . . the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions. . . . The bishopric of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud."—*Eugene Lawrence, Historical Studies, art. Bishops of Rome*.

Want of space forbids our further pursuing this line of evidence. We will give a brief summary of the acts of the life of Constantine which seem to have a bearing on his inconsistent position as a pagan and a professed Christian.

A. D. 312, professed to have a vision of the cross. There is, however, no evidence that he ever spoke of such a thing before the year 322.

313, issued the edict of Milan, stopping persecution on account of religion.

321, March 7, issued a decree that certain classes abstain from labor on "the venerable day of the sun." This was afterwards, by his obsequious bishops, adopted as "the chief festival of the church." See Catechisms of the Catholic Church.

321, March 8, issued a decree for consulting haruspices—a practice purely pagan.

323, according to the opinion of Mosheim, made a profession of Christianity. Other writers give a later date.

324, murdered Licinius, in violation of his solemn oath.

325, convened the council of Nice, and presided over its deliberations.

325, after the council, revoked the edict of Milan, and copied the penal regulations under which Diocletian had persecuted the Christians, and employed them in persecuting those who did not accept the Catholic faith.

326, murdered his son Crispus, and his nephew Licinius, and a great number of their friends.

330, May 11, dedicated Constantinople to the virgin Mary.

337, near the close of his life was baptized into the Christian faith.

Some have endeavored to shield his character as a Christian by placing his conversion subsequent to his atrocious murders in 326; but in so doing they remove it still farther from the date of his Sunday edict, and have him presiding over the council of Nice before

he professed Christianity. It is a "mixed case" do the best they can.

They who can confidently decide that Constantine was a genuine Christian at *any time* in his life—anything but a crafty politician and a selfish ruler—must be able to adjust the balances very accurately to show where Christianity predominates over paganism! We believe that paganism may exist and flourish with any amount of *profession* of Christianity; but we do not believe that Christianity can exist with both the *profession* and *practice* of paganism. For this reason we cannot admit that Constantine ever was a Christian.

Our writer in the *Statesman* says:—

"Our affirmation, therefore, that the State sustains a protective relation to the Sabbath, cannot be made light of as a novelty. It has a foundation in usage even though this has been and is lamentably defective."

He well says that that for which they are laboring "has a foundation in usage," and in nothing higher. And the origin of this usage is traced to Constantine, whose legacy to the church has been a standing curse to the cause of Christianity for fifteen hundred years.

J. H. W.

#### A Substitute for the Church.

THE *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 16, 1886, after considering the manner in which the Labor Party in Philadelphia was captured by Socialists said:—

"These proceedings, taken in connection with the utterances of Henry George and his supporters in the campaign, the intercession of the Knights of Labor in convention at Richmond for the condemned Anarchists at Chicago, the efforts which have been made to secure for them a new trial, and the stay of proceedings granted by the Supreme Court which reprieves them for five months, are ominous signs of the impending social struggle. They render more timely and significant too the religious declarations in the platforms of the Prohibition party, and the efforts which are to be made to secure such acknowledgments by all existing parties. The party which will make and adhere to a simple and hearty acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the actual ruler of nations, and of the supreme authority of his moral laws, will, by virtue of that very fact, become the leading party in the struggle which is even now upon us. There are multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform and who will be powerfully attracted toward any party which declares for a fearless and uniform application of the law of God to civil affairs."

We agree with the *Statesman* that these are ominous signs of the impending social struggle. We do not think that the danger to which this country is subject from the Socialistic element can be overestimated. But we cannot see how this danger is to be averted by the formation of a political party whose platform shall contain religious declarations. There is no condition of affairs which the *Statesman*, or any lover of order, may desire to see, which cannot be brought about by the simple influence of the gospel, if it can be brought about at all; that is to say, if the spread of Socialistic ideas is prevented at all, it must be through the gospel, which is directly opposed to Socialism. Just to the extent that the gospel is accepted, the spread of Socialism will be hindered. The *Statesman*

admits this when it says, "There are multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform and who will be powerfully attracted to any party that declares for the fearless and uniform application of the law of God to civil affairs."

The acceptance of the gospel is necessarily an acceptance of the entire Bible, the moral law included, for the apostle Peter, speaking of the word of God, says: "This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Peter 1: 25. The sole business of the church is to teach the gospel; therefore it is the church's duty to declare for the "fearless and uniform application of the law of God," not only to civil affairs but to every affair in life. Thus the Lord, speaking to the church through the prophet Isaiah said: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." Isaiah 58: 1. The church was established for the express purpose of "holding forth the word of life" and teaching obedience to the law of God, at the same time that it announces pardon for sins already committed. If it does its duty it teaches men how to regulate their conduct toward one another, by announcing Christ's summary of the second table of the decalogue: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

The church is not only the body that is appointed to teach the application of the law of God to human affairs, but it is the only power to which this duty has been committed. Moreover, it is the best adapted for the carrying on of this work, because it addresses itself to the individual, and not to mankind as a whole. If it were possible to entirely convert men from Socialistic ideas, then the church, dealing as it does with individuals, would present the most feasible plan of work. For if each Socialist were converted, Socialism would be at an end. We do not wish to be understood as claiming that the church should be expected to convert all men, for the Bible expressly declares that but few will find the narrow way leading to life. But we do say that as far as any progress is made in bringing men to the acceptance of the law of God, it must be made by the church. A political party with a religious platform would simply be trying to do the work which the church is set to do. The *Statesman* says that such a party would draw multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform. If that be true, why are they not drawn to the church? The answer is simply because they do not care for the law of God, but for their own selfish aims. If therefore they were drawn to such a political party it would be because they could gain political preferment.

We should think that for professed Christians to announce that the work which should be done by the church can be done only by political parties would be a humiliating confession. When the church itself applies to the civil power for aid, it acknowledges that it has lost its own power; the spirit of the gospel has departed from it, and the salt has lost its savor. They may seem to get what they desire, namely, the peace of the millennium,

but it will be only the shell with a blasted kernel inside. If the church has lost its power to convert men, of what use will a "religious" party be? "If the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" E. J. W.

### An Image of the Papacy.

In the Pittsburg National Reform Convention of 1885, President Brunot said:—

"The First Amendment of the Constitution which provides that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' was never intended to de-Christianize the nation, as some now hold, but, on the contrary, was meant to keep it Christian and free. First, by guarding against the establishment of a church or sect; and second, against restrictive legislation in case the power to enact laws should fall into the hands of the enemies of all religion."—*Christian Statesman*, April 30, 1885.

Very good. It is plain therefore that any interference or change in that amendment would tend to de-Christianize the nation, and to prevent its being free. As that amendment guards against the establishment of a church, to change the amendment would open the way for the establishment of a church. As that amendment guards against restrictive legislation by the enemies of all religion, should they have the power to legislate so, to change the amendment would open the way for the enemies of all religion to restrict or abolish the practice of the Christian religion in this nation.

But to change that amendment and so to open the way for these evils, is precisely what that association, of which Mr. Brunot is president, proposes to do. Thus says "Secretary" W. J. Coleman:—

"The first sentence of Article I of Amendments reads: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' This would be made consistent with the proposed [National Reform] amendment by substituting the words 'a church' for 'religion,' making it read, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of a church.' This is what the Reform Association believes should be the rule in a rightly constituted State. There should be religion, but no church."—*Statesman*, November 1, 1883.

By their own words, then, it is clearly the purpose of the National Reform Association to reverse the First Amendment of the United States Constitution so as to allow Congress to make laws respecting an establishment of religion, and prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Therefore it stands proven that the work of the National Reform Association is to open the way for "the establishment of a church or sect," and for the destruction of the freedom of this nation.

For (1), The State recognition of Christianity in law—both Constitutional and statutory—and the making of laws respecting and enforcing the principles of that religion, is that which the National Reform Association proposes to accomplish. But that is precisely what Constantine did in the fourth century, and out of it grew the Papacy. And just as surely as the National Reformers succeed in doing with Christianity in this nation, what Constantine did with it in the Roman State,

so surely will it follow that out of their action will grow the living image of the Papacy. Nothing can prevent it, because—

(2) In the day when, by their proposed change in the First Amendment of the Constitution, the National Reformers put it into the power and make it the province of Congress to make laws respecting religion, or prohibiting its free exercise; that very day they open wide the gates and give free course to the enemies of all religion, and to the enemies of Christianity in particular, just as soon as they can secure the power to make laws restricting or even prohibiting the free exercise of the Christian religion.

And when the way is thus opened for the enemies of the Christian religion to oppress it, as soon as they can secure the power, everybody knows that they will secure the power at the earliest possible moment. Everybody also knows that the enemies of Christianity have no compunctions of conscience in the matter, and that they will leave no means unemployed, that they will stop at nothing, to secure the coveted power. Therefore, if the National Reformers will maintain their cause in the conflict which they shall thus have opened, they will have to do it upon the field which they themselves have chosen—the field of politics—and with the weapons which their enemies shall choose. They will have to meet political power with political power; they will have to meet force with force; bribery with bribery; intrigue with intrigue; chicanery with chicanery; hypocrisy with hypocrisy. This they will be compelled to do or else lose all they shall have gained, as soon as they shall have gained it.

This is precisely the course through which the Papacy was developed. And the long and constant practice of these bad methods, which the bishop of Rome was compelled to employ if the Christianity which he represented was to hold its position against its enemies and the ambitious rivals of its power—the practice of these bad methods it was which made the Papacy what it is—"the very masterpiece of human wisdom," and the most complete of all contrivances that have ever been "devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind." And if the National Reformers succeed in securing the changes in our Constitution which they propose; then by the practice of these bad methods which they will be compelled to employ to successfully cope with the enemies of the Christian religion, there will be developed in free America a perfect likeness of the Papacy.

On the other hand, having secured those changes in the Constitution; having empowered Congress to make laws respecting religion; and having entered upon this political contest to determine what kind of a Congress it shall be which shall make the laws respecting religion; then if the National Reformers do not employ the like methods with their political opponents, they will be defeated, the seats in Congress will be filled with the enemies of religion, and so the Christian religion in free America, its happiest home on earth, will be sold into the hands of its bitterest enemies, waiting to destroy.

In the one case, free Christianity will be enslaved, in the other, her beautiful form will be marred and her fair name dishonored; and in either case the unkindest thrust of all will be by the traitorous hand of National Reform. For a traitorous hand it is, because, under the First Amendment of the Constitution, *as it is*, Christianity is forever safe from all her enemies, and forever free, in free America. With the First Amendment of the United States Constitution as it is, the presidential chair and every seat in Congress might be filled with the worst infidels and the most bitter enemies of Christianity that are in the land, and Christianity could not be molested or disturbed in the least degree. But with that amendment changed as the National Reformers propose to change it, then in the filling of the presidential chair and of each seat in Congress, Christianity would have just cause for fear, because there would be no means of knowing whether those who gain the seats were really her friends or her enemies; and with a bare majority of the enemies of Christianity in Congressional seats, every Christian in the land would be in danger of losing the dearest rights known to man. Traitorous, therefore, would be the hand of any but an avowed enemy of Christianity, that would attempt to break down this safeguard of Christianity in the United States; but to sweep away this safeguard is what the National Reform Association, under the guise of the Christian name, declares that it is its purpose to do, and therefore most traitorous is the hand of National Reform.

One or the other of these evils will inevitably follow the success of National Reform in its designs upon the United States Constitution. The certain consequence will be either that Christianity will be delivered into the hands of open infidelity and atheism, or else there will be developed a new form of the Papacy to meet, and successfully contend with, the open enemies of Christianity. As to which of these forms of evil would be the worst we can form no opinion. Of the former we have an illustration in the French Revolution; of the latter we have an illustration in the Inquisition, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, and the Crusade against the Albigenses.

Yet, although we can form no opinion as to which would be the worst, we *can* form an opinion as to which form would rule—and ruin. We are fully persuaded that it would be the image of the Papacy. We are assured of this because we are satisfied that the National Reform Association, on its own part, would prove itself fully equal to the task of outdoing the open enemies of Christianity in all the political methods they might employ; and this assurance is made doubly sure, by the confessed fact that National Reform will be in close alliance with the Papacy itself. Read this:—

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."—*Christian Statesman*, December 11, 1884.

And this:—

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for the time is 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."—*Rev. S. P. Scovel*, *Christian Statesman*, August 31, 1881.

And the National Reform Association, inspired and supported by the Papacy can out-do political atheism in all the politically atheistic methods that they can employ. The Roman Church has had sixteen hundred years' practice "in resisting the progress of political atheism," and there is not a political method known to the human race, of which she is not the consummate mistress. In her presence all the political atheists in Christendom must hide their diminished heads. This is why we are certain that the success of National Reform will be to develop a new form of the Papacy. For with this alliance with Rome which the National Reformers are so anxious to complete—so anxious, indeed, that they will make repeated advances and suffer repeated rebuffs—when, under their reformed Constitution, the political conflict comes on between National Reform and the enemies of all religion, the "Reformers" will be thoroughly furnished unto all bad works. If bribery is demanded, Rome can furnish scores of eminent examples among the Popes, and ages of practice among all classes from kings and emperors to peasants and beggars. If mob violence or military force becomes necessary to the success of a candidate for office, Rome is likewise an adept in this, as the election of Pope Damasus and of many of his successors abundantly proves. If intrigue, treachery, fraud, and the most secret and deceptive wire-working are required, there are the Jesuits, whom Leo XIII. has lately restored to all their rights and privileges, and has thus prepared this strong support to National Reform.

We might follow these lines and extend these illustrations to almost any required length, but these points are sufficient to show to all thinking men that out of the success of National Reform there can come no good thing, but only evil, and that continually and continually increasing. If any of the National Reformers object to the points which we have here made, let them not blame us, let them call to account the president of their Association, and their district secretary, W. J. Coleman, whose statements, fairly quoted, we have only traced to their logical and inevitable consequences. If either President Brunot's or Secretary Coleman's statement in regard to the First Amendment are not correct, let the National Reformers call *him* to account and correct *him* not us. We have only reasoned upon the premises laid down by these leading officials of the National Reform Association; if the premises are not true, that is their fault, not ours—let them correct the premises and we will revise our conclusions. But if the premises *are* true, and we believe they *are*, then the demonstration is complete that the success of National Reform will assure in this nation the development of a *living image of the Papacy*. A. T. J.

"Trust in the Lord, and do good."

### Civil Laws and Religion.

THE question of the true relation of civil law to matters of religion is generally regarded as a most intricate one; and yet in this country it has, practically, been exceedingly simple, the rule generally adhered to being to legislate only upon matters relating to the manners and conduct of men as social beings, leaving purely religious questions, such as the recognition of God as an object of worship, and right feeling toward him, to be settled by the Judge of all the earth.

This is certainly the only safe and practicable rule possible among finite beings; for, to go farther than this, and at the same time do right in each case, would require infinite wisdom; or, at least, ability to read the thoughts and intents of the heart and properly weigh the motives of all men. This, God alone can do; and since he alone can determine the magnitude of an offense against himself, he alone should pass judgment and mete out punishment in all such cases.

It is absolutely necessary that there should be laws regulating the relations of man to man, and that these laws should be enforced at a time and in a manner that will give that protection to life and property which they are designed to afford; and God has himself recognized this fact by ordaining civil government among men; but we have not the slightest intimation in the Scriptures that it is proper for human governments to legislate upon religious questions. Of the powers of civil rulers the apostle Paul says:—

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." Rom. 13 : 1, 5-7.

But it may be urged that in this the apostle condemns the action of Peter and John (Acts 4 : 19, 20), who when commanded by the officers not to speak any more in the name of Jesus answered: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." This would indeed be in conflict with the text before quoted if both were upon the same subject; but they are not; Paul is treating of obedience in civil affairs, and the utterances of Peter and John have to do entirely with matters of religion.

The law of which Paul was speaking was, as appears from Rom. 13 : 9, that part of the decalogue which defines our duty to our fellow-men; and to it he says that we "must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." This law, says the apostle, as said also the Saviour, "is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and he adds, "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." That is, he who loves his neighbor will deal justly with him in

all things; while he who will not do this from love must do it through fear of magistrates. And Peter and John were not alone in teaching that civil rulers have no proper jurisdiction in matters of religious duty, for Paul himself says: "Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Rom. 14:10-12.

Thus does the apostle make a plain distinction between social or civil affairs and religious duties; and in this he only follows the example of Christ, who when asked, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not?" answered, "Shew me the tribute money." "And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

The trouble with some people is that by making civil rulers the conservators of religion, they claim for Cæsar the things that belong to God, and thus make their ordination confer upon them powers that neither Christ nor the apostles ever recognized, and which they most explicitly disavowed. But if it were true that God has clothed civil governments with authority to define, decree, and enforce religion, then it would also be true that all who oppose them in the exercise of this God-given power resist the ordinance of God, "and they that resist" the powers that are ordained of God, says the apostle, "shall receive to themselves damnation."

But for reasons already stated, we know that this ordination must be confined to a just administration of civil affairs; for if we allow that it extends to matters of religion, either of faith or practice, we are led to such absurd and revolting conclusions as that all the so-called martyrs, instead of being saints of God, unjustly condemned by wicked men, were in fact criminals worthy of death; and that that which they suffered was only the wrath of God visited upon them by his divinely-appointed agents—the minions of the Inquisition!!

But this is not all. If by any means it were made to appear that the State is divinely authorized to exact any recognition of God, or to require a single act of worship to him, then it would necessarily follow that it could in like manner prescribe not only the practice but also the faith of all its subjects. And if any government had divine authority to do this, all would have; hence while Protestantism in one or other of its forms might be the God-ordained religion of this country, Roman Catholicism would be the equally God-ordained religion of some of the countries of Europe. And worse yet, if possible, in countries having heathen rulers it would be the bounden duty of every citizen to be a worshiper of idols! Such are some of the absurdities which adhere naturally to the National Reform idea that civil rulers are ordained of God as establishers and conservators of religion.

C. P. BOLLMAN.

### Ethics of Sunday Legislation.

IN quite a number of the States there is at present considerable stir over the passage of Sunday laws. This is directly in the line of National Reform work, and is a danger to American liberty, of which the AMERICAN SENTINEL, as a watchful guardian, must give warning. There are very many people who are opposed to the work of so-called National Reform, who would heartily support a law enforcing Sunday observance, not perceiving that the very argument against National Reform in general is equally valid against this particular phase of that work. We purpose to note a few features of Sunday legislation, and how it will work injustice to a large class of citizens.

There are two grounds upon which Sunday legislation is based: one the civil, and the other the religious; and the two are antagonistic, although both are often held by the same individual. On one side it is claimed that Sunday should be enforced, not as a religious institution, but as a civil holiday, and that Sunday laws are to be regarded as police regulations. Others plead for laws enforcing Sunday rest, on the ground that Sunday is the "Christian Sabbath." But upon whichever ground Sunday legislation is urged, such legislation is entirely inconsistent with perfect civil and religious liberty. If it be urged that man's physical nature requires rest on one day in seven, and that the Government should set apart Sunday as a civil holiday, and restrain people from working thereon, it comes directly in conflict with all usage in respect to holidays, and cannot be consistently sustained by sound reason. There are quite a number of days that are set apart as national holidays, yet on none of them are people forcibly restrained from labor if they choose to work. This very fact shows the absurdity of the claim that Sunday legislation is not religious legislation, for no advocate of Sunday laws would be content for a moment with a law placing the day on a level with other holidays.

Again, the absurdity of the idea of enforcing Sunday observance because of man's physical need for rest is equally evident. For example: It is just as certain that man's physical nature requires a certain amount of sleep in every twenty-four hours as it is that his physical nature requires rest one day in seven. It is an undeniable truth that thousands of people do not take regular rest, and that they suffer physically because of the lack of a proper amount of sleep. Now if it be granted that a State has a right to enforce Sunday observance because people need the physical rest, then it necessarily follows that the State has a right to enact that everybody shall take a given amount of rest in each twenty-four hours. And on that ground we might expect the Government to compel people to go to bed every night at ten o'clock, and to prescribe the hour when they should arise. It is certain that no one can maintain Sunday legislation from a civil standpoint, and it is equally certain that no one really has this in view.

It must be, then, that it is as the "Christian Sabbath" that the plea is made for en-

forced Sunday observance. But when it is put upon this ground, we have the State legislating on matters of religion, and thus stepping outside of its sphere. Indeed, Sunday legislation stands for union of Church and State. For if the State can legislate in behalf of one Christian institution, it may with equal propriety legislate in behalf of all of them. If it can enforce the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," it has also a right to enforce Christian baptism. But the right to enforce any religious tenet depends upon the right to decide upon matters of faith, for before the State legislates in behalf of any practice, it must first decide that that practice is correct. Indeed, such decision is implied in the very act of passing the law. Therefore we say, if the State can enforce the observance of the Christian Sabbath, it may also enforce baptism, and may determine what Christian baptism is, whether sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. It may also with equal propriety enforce the sacrament of the Lord's Supper on all within its jurisdiction, and can determine how it shall be celebrated, whether in one kind or in both. And this is union of Church and State, as much as has ever existed in any age or in any nation. So we say that all, no matter what their religious belief, who are opposed to the union of Church and State, must be opposed to the enactment of Sunday laws.

But whether the observance of Sunday be enforced from a civil or from a religious standpoint, it cannot fail to be unjust and oppressive to a large class of law-abiding citizens. We refer to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week. We know that it is commonly urged that Sunday laws do not interfere with the rights of any Sabbatarian, because they leave him perfectly free to carry out his conscientious convictions by resting on the seventh day of the week. But if it is man's religious *duty* to rest on one day in seven, which all advocates of Sunday laws allow, then it is also his religious *privilege* to labor on six days in seven. Now if a man conscientiously believes that the word of God demands that he shall rest upon the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and the State compels him also to rest upon the first day of the week, it is certain that his religious privileges are interfered with.

Again, if rigid Sunday laws are enacted, and a man is punished for laboring on Sunday after having conscientiously kept Saturday, such punishment is nothing less than persecution for conscience' sake. His punishment is really as much for his observance of the seventh day as it is for laboring on the first day. Thus: Necessity compels him to labor six days in the week for the support of his family; and the divine command certainly gives him the privilege of working six days, if it does not really command it. But his conscience imperatively forbids him to labor on Saturday, the seventh day of the week, therefore necessity and religion compel him to labor on the first day of the week. That is to say, his labor on the first day of the week is made necessary by his conscientious observance of the seventh day of the week. So then if he is punished for his first day labor, he is equally punished for his seventh day rest; and so it becomes

clear that the enactment of Sunday laws, and the execution of penalties for the violation thereof, is simply persecution for conscience' sake.

We are not now concerned as to whether Sunday is or is not the Christian Sabbath; in either case the argument is the same. Neither if we take it for granted that Sunday is the rest-day enjoined by divine command, is there, as some claim, any analogy between the punishment by civil authority, of a man who quietly labors on that day, and the punishment of the polygamist, even allowing that the polygamist is conscientious in his practice; for polygamy is the violation of the seventh commandment, which is contained in the second table of the decalogue, defining the relations of men with one another, and is thus a proper subject for civil legislation. But the keeping of the Sabbath is enjoined by the fourth commandment, which is a part of the first table of the decalogue, defining man's duty to God, and is not a proper matter for civil legislation. The polygamist and the adulterer, for a polygamist is an adulterer, sins not alone against God, but against society in general, and some person or persons in particular. Like the thief, he takes that which belongs to some one else, and to which he has no right. But the man who pursues his own lawful occupation on the first day of the week, interferes with no one's rights or privileges. He deprives no conscientious observer of that day, of his Sabbath, even if he observes no day whatever; so long as he does not disturb the rest and worship of anyone else, he is answerable alone to God.

Again, Sunday legislation virtually places a premium upon crime. This may seem a bold and unwarranted statement, but we can easily show its truthfulness. I have before me the bill which it is purposed to have passed by the present California Legislature. It provides that every person that shall sell goods, keep open any store or other place of business, or shall sell or give away to be drunk any spirituous, vinous, malt, or other intoxicating liquors, on the first day of the week, or who shall engage in any riot, fighting, horse-racing, gambling, or other public sport, exercises, or shows, or any person who shall keep open any place where such sports, exercises, or shows, are carried on, shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor. It will be seen that gambling, rioting, fighting, and the selling of intoxicating liquor, are placed on a level with the keeping open of stores to sell goods. The sale of goods at proper times is not only legitimate, but it is absolutely necessary. It is wrong only when engaged in upon the day divinely set apart for rest. Now to pass a law forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors upon Sunday, saying nothing about its sale upon other days, puts that business on a level with legitimate industry, and virtually says that the sale of intoxicating liquors is all right upon any day but Sunday.

As a matter of fact, liquor selling is an unmitigated evil; it does nobody any good, but does untold harm. The only one whom it enriches is the man who sells it. It is a drain upon all classes of citizens. The man who

drinks spends his money without receiving an equivalent; his family is robbed of that which rightfully belongs to them; and the man who abstains entirely is taxed in order that the paupers, insane people, and criminals, that are made by the sale of intoxicating liquor may be provided for. And now for the State to enact a law enforcing the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," and declaring that the carrying on of the business of liquor selling is a violation of the "Christian Sabbath," and therefore punishable by a fine, is simply to place the infamous traffic on a level with the dry-goods or grocery business, and to say that it is all right to engage in it on any day but Sunday.

That this is putting a premium upon crime, may be made still more apparent. Suppose the State should enact a law to the effect that anyone who should steal or commit a murder upon the first day of the week, should be deemed guilty of felony and should be punished, everybody would cry out against such a law. They would say that stealing and murder are in themselves criminal, and that the perpetration of those crimes on the first day of the week does not add to the criminality of the act. They would justly claim that such legislation virtually made murder and theft legitimate acts if committed on any other day than Sunday, thus putting a premium upon crime. The case is the same with Sunday laws wherever they exist or are proposed. By specifying gambling, the selling of intoxicating liquor, etc., they virtually place such occupations in the list of legitimate employments when pursued on any other day. And so we say that Sunday legislation is not only contrary to religious liberty, but it is also against the interests of true morality.

Next month we purpose to take up this matter still further and demonstrate these propositions by actual facts. E. J. W.

### Secretary Gault and the Scripture Again.

SECRETARY GAULT said that under "the model of government which Christ gave to Israel" "all their rulers were elected by the people." We asked him for one instance of it, and he refers us to Deut. 1:13, and quotes: "Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you." But he does not quote enough. In that place Moses is rehearsing what had been done long before. The whole connection is this: "I spake unto you at that time, saying, I am not able to bear you myself alone; . . . how can I myself alone bear your cumbrance, and your burden, and your strife? Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you. And ye answered me, and said, The thing which thou hast spoken is good for us to do. So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes." Deut. 1:9-15.

Now at whose direction was this done?

Mr. Gault says that it was under "the model of government which Christ gave to Israel." We can easily learn whether it was or not. Moses says, "At that time." At what time? Turn to Ex. 18:13-26. As Moses sat to judge the people, he was occupied all day from morning till evening in hearing and deciding the cases of the people who came. "And Moses's father-in-law said unto him, The thing that thou doest is not good. Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou, and this people that is with thee; for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone. Harken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel, . . . thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens; and let them judge the people at all seasons; and it shall be, that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge; so shall it be easier for thyself, and they shall bear the burden with thee. . . . So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said."

There can be no shadow of doubt therefore that the rulers referred to by Moses in the text cited by Mr. Gault, were those who were appointed at the suggestion of Moses's father-in-law, who was Jethro, a Midianite. Does Mr. Gault mean to say that this piece of advice given by Jethro was the model of government which Christ gave to Israel? If not, and most assuredly it was not, then what is his argument and citation of that scripture good for? It is good for nothing, but to show his utter and inexcusable ignorance of the true bearing of scripture. Of all men who have ever put themselves into print, the one who makes the most brilliant success of getting on the wrong side of every question that he touches, and every time that he touches it, is undoubtedly the "Rev." M. A. Gault, district secretary of the National Reform Association. A. T. J.

### Will They Unite?

A CLERGYMAN, the pastor of a Presbyterian Church, sends us the following appreciative letter:—

"BERWICK, PENN., Jan. 27, 1887.

"AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.—*Gentlemen:* This afternoon I found the AMERICAN SENTINEL for December, 1886, and part of a copy of the *Signs of the Times*. In the former are several articles which I have read with intense interest; among which are, 'Is It Blindness or Duplicity?' 'Infidel Views of the Logic of Christianity,' 'The American Hierarchy,' and 'The American Papacy.'

"In one thing you must be mistaken, viz., that 'whenever the Roman Catholics are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we [Protestants of the Presbyterian denomination] will gladly join hands with them.'

"Oh, but you reply, the *Christian Statesman* said so in an editorial December 11, 1884. Well, that does not make it true. And what is more to the purpose, the thing cannot possibly ever take place. To entertain the thought for a moment is the very romance of madness. Certain persons may have expressed themselves in these very words to that effect. But

that the mass of Protestant Christians have any wish so monstrous and idiotic, yes, impossible, I will not and cannot believe, the Rev. S. F. Scovel, and others, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

"But go ahead, write, protest, show all the facts upon the subject.

"I believe you are honest, sincere, in dead earnest, and if you can show me how to guide my way better than in the past, I will take it well.

"I am, gentleman, with respect, yours,  
"JAMES DICKSON."

We heartily believe that our reverend brother is as earnest and sincere as we are. If all professed Protestants were like him, no doubt it would be an impossibility to unite with Catholics. But, unfortunately, instead of looking toward the light, as he is, they are looking away from it. We assure our friend that while any sort of a union between Catholics and Protestants is indeed "monstrous," the thought that it will ere long be an accomplished fact is neither "idiotic" nor "the romance of madness." To believe it requires no faith whatever; one has only to observe the signs of the times.

We do not base this belief on a single statement of the *Christian Statesman*, nor indeed upon any statement of that paper, professing a willingness for such union. As a matter of fact, however, that paper is editorially committed to just such a union. These statements in the *Christian Statesman* are, however, only the natural result of the teachings of National Reform. As we have abundantly shown, the principles of National Reform are identical with those of the Papacy. Both believe that the State should support the church. Both believe in the persecution of heretics—those who think and act for themselves contrary to the "established" religion; and both hold in the main to the same points of doctrine. Having these points of similarity, and working for the same object, it is the most natural thing in the world that the two bodies should unite their interests.

When all National Reformers see, what their leaders already see, that they cannot accomplish their purpose without the aid of Catholics, an alliance with that church will be speedily effected.

The name of Dr. A. A. Hodge, of Princeton, is an honored one among Presbyterians. He was not "idiotic," nor one who indulged in the "romance of madness," but was a clear-headed, deliberate man, who knew what he was about. In an article in the *Princeton Review* for January, 1887, he said:—

"All we have to do is for Catholics and Protestants—disciples of a common Master—to come to a common understanding with respect to a common basis of what is received as general Christianity, a practical quantity of truth belonging equally to both sides, to be recognized in general legislation, and especially in the literature and teaching of our public schools. The difficulties lie in the mutual ignorance and prejudice of both parties, and fully as much on the side of the Protestants as of the Catholics."

The article in which these words occur, which declare that Catholics have an equal amount of truth with Protestants, and that they should unite their interests, is quoted by the *Occident*, of San Francisco (Presbyterian),

whose editor calls it "a dying legacy of this able and lamented minister," and says that "these suggestions are worthy of earnest consideration." We know of few prominent religious journals which have not expressed similar sentiments.

It is a fact that must be patent to anyone who is conversant with current religious news, that among Protestants the Catholic Church is being regarded with more and more favor. There is a feeling that the Catholic Church has changed, or that at any rate it has been misjudged. That church is now counted as a branch of the Christian Church, having its specific work to do, just as the Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, etc. The barriers between Catholics and professed Protestants are continually being broken down; and when it is found that certain legislation in behalf of "religion" cannot be brought about without the co-operation of Catholics, Protestants will not only accept their aid, but will sue for it. We could give instances where this has already been done.

Let our brother remember one thing: The Catholic Church will not change its characteristics, nor abate one iota of its arrogance; and when National Reform, with the aid of the Catholic vote, shall have succeeded, Roman Catholic principles will predominate, and we shall have in this country an American Papacy, with all that that implies. E. J. W.

In the *New York Independent* of January 6, President Washburn, of Robert College, Constantinople, has an article on "Eastern and Western Civilization," in which occur the following paragraphs, which we commend to the careful consideration of National Reformers, who hold that civil government should be paternal:—

"The idea of Eastern civilization is 'paternal government.' The people are children, not of a modern father, but of the Old World father, who was the irresponsible master of his family.

"Western civilization utterly repudiates this idea, denies the existence of any analogy between the family and the State, and seeks to make men and not children of the people.

"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."

#### 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."—*Tonganorie (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.

## THE GREAT CONTROVERSY BETWEEN CHRIST AND SATAN

DURING THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

By MRS. E. G. WHITE.

Author of "*The Life of Christ*," "*Sketches from the Life of Paul*," "*Bible Sanctification*," and *Other Popular Works*.

THIS volume presents the most wonderful and intensely interesting history that has ever been written of the great conflict between Christianity and the Powers of Darkness, as illustrated in the lives of Christian martyrs and reformers on the one hand, and wicked men and persecuting powers on the other. Beginning with our Lord's great prophecy given while viewing Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, this book outlines the history of the whole dispensation down to the time when "Sin and sinners are no more; God's entire universe is clean; and the great controversy is forever ended."

Below we give a brief synopsis of the subjects considered—Destruction of Jerusalem; Persecutions in the First Centuries; The Roman Church; The Waldenses; Early Reformers; Luther's Separation from Rome; Luther before the Diet; Progress of the Reformation; Protest of the Princes; Later Reformers; The Two Witnesses; God Honors the Humble; William Miller and His Work; The First, Second, and Third Angels' Messages; The Tarrying Time; The Midnight Cry; The Sanctuary and 2300 Days; An Open and a Shut Door; Modern Revivals; The Investigative Judgment; Origin of Evil; Enmity between Man and Satan; Agency of Evil Spirits; The Snares of Satan; The First Great Deception; Ancient and Modern Spiritualism; Character and Aims of the Papacy; The Coming Conflict; The Scriptures a Safeguard; The Loud Cry of Rev. 18; The Time of Trouble; God's People Delivered; Desolation of the Earth; The Controversy Ended.

The period of history covered by this volume, is one of the deepest interest to all classes of readers. The style of the author is clear, forcible, and often sublime, and, although simple enough in its statements to be understood and appreciated by a child, its eloquence calls forth the admiration of all.

The demand for this popular book is so great that we have had to print *eight editions* of it, and as we have hundreds of agents in the field canvassing we expect to sell many thousand copies of this valuable book during the next few months. If there is no agent in your town please send us your address and we will send you descriptive circulars or have an agent call upon you.

The "Great Controversy" contains over 500 pages; 21 full page illustrations and Steel Portrait of the Author; printed and bound in the very best style.

*Active Agents Wanted in Every Town and County  
in the United States.*

For Terms and Territory, Address,  
PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers,  
12th and Castro Streets, Oakland, Cal.

## OUR COUNTRY—THE MARVEL OF NATIONS.

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

By U. S. 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.

## DIPHTHERIA:

ITS CAUSES, PREVENTION, AND PROPER TREATMENT.

By J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

THE increasing prevalence of this devastating disease, and its alarming fatality in so many cases, renders the subject of its Nature and Treatment one of the greatest importance.

This work gives a concise account of the Nature, Cause and Modes of Prevention, and also

THE MOST SUCCESSFUL METHODS OF TREATMENT

Of this prevalent and fatal malady. It should be in every household, as its instructions, if faithfully carried out, will save many a precious life. Price, in board covers, 25 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

# The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MARCH, 1887.

THE Boston *Pilot* (Catholic) says: "No good government can exist without religion." That is straight National Reform doctrine, and every National Reformer would say amen to it. But the *Pilot* continues: "And there can be no religion without an Inquisition, which is wisely designed for the promotion and protection of the true faith." If the first proposition is true, the second must also be true; and no one who accepts the first can dissent from the second. If there is national religion, there must be an Inquisition, or its equivalent, and punishment for heresy. National Reform contends for national religion; hence a National Reform government will of necessity persecute.

For the last three months a large number of people have been receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL through the courtesy of friends. We should be greatly pleased to have these persons become subscribers on their own account. Many of the best minds in the country are convinced that there is urgent need of just such work as is being done by the SENTINEL, and it is the only paper in the United States that is doing the work. Let all who feel that a union of Church and State would be a calamity, rally to the support of the journal that is doing battle for liberty of conscience and for civil rights. We confidently look for a large increase in our regular subscription list.

SPEAKING of Japan, the *Christian Statesman* says: "Open opposition to Christianity has ceased; the peril is of another sort—that she will accept the form of Christianity without knowing its power." It would seem that the *Statesman* should find no fault with that, as it is just what the National Reformers propose to have done in this country. Here they even profess to believe that its accomplishment will usher in the millennium. However the climate may make some difference; and possibly something more than an act of Congress or an imperial decree is needed to convert the natives of Japan—and it is possible that the sequel may show that something more is needed to convert people here.

MANY who read this number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL have been enjoying its visits for a year. Do you want it continued? Then do not delay your renewal. We do not believe that anyone who has read the SENTINEL for a whole year, would willingly forego the pleasure and profit for the future; but some may not realize that their subscription has expired. Please examine the label on your paper, and if it reads March, '87, send in your renewal at once, and thus save us the trouble of taking your name off our list and then putting it on again. Remember that your personal assurance, with the cash, is the only means we have of knowing whether you appreciate the paper, and how much.

"STATESMANSHIP cannot save the country. Christ's refusal to be made a king, and his rejection of Satan's offer of the world's scepter, ought to teach those who seek to save the world, that moral means are necessary to moral ends. Christ saw that the world could not be saved by legislation, and that only by his being lifted up could all men be drawn unto him. He saw that he could not save the world without sacrificing for it; no more can we. The saving power of the church is its sacrificing power."—*Rev. Josiah Strong*. Common sense sentiments like these cannot be given too great prominence. National Reformers stand sadly in need of them.

LET it never be forgotten by any lover of civil or religious liberty that were the Constitution of the United States to be amended as the National Reform Association demands that it shall be, it would necessarily follow that the Christian religion, which would then be the State religion, would have to be defined by law. And it would naturally follow also that the courts would be called upon to decide *what is Christian, and who are Christians*. For the proposed régime "would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel," and all will be considered as infidels who chance to differ with the National Reform idea of Christianity, even in a single particular.

### The Case Well Stated.

THE following letter to one of the workers in the office of the SENTINEL, shows that thinking people realize that the work of the National Reform party seriously threatens the liberty of this country, and makes such a paper as the SENTINEL a necessity:—

LOUISVILLE, KY., Jan. 21, 1887.

"DEAR SIR: Yours of the 2d, and the January number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL are received. I have carefully read and considered both, and would say that I fully indorse the sentiments of the SENTINEL, as being the only safe doctrine for the people of this nation and the only safe-guard for religious liberty.

"Our fathers wisely provided in the Constitution that: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' They were quickened in their wisdom by the times in which they lived (a fact which their children seem to have forgotten), and this with the knowledge of the certain fact that history will repeat itself. If the National Reform party could but substitute their proposed amendment for this wise and beneficent provision, the end of the present century would find religious persecution substituted for religious freedom.

"A State which prescribes religion, prescribes conscience, or a moral sense of duty to God, and here is the end of practical piety, the country's peace, and the people's freedom. If the omnipotence of God is not sufficient to demand acknowledgment of himself, as the author of the nation's existence, and of Jesus 'Christ as its ruler,' and the Bible as the supreme rule of its conduct, then that religion is a mockery, which proposes a constitutional amendment to supply the imperfections of Deity.

"It is suggested by the amendment to make this 'a Christian nation.' It would hardly be adopted before the question would arise as to who are Christians—and this

would result in a fight more bitter than will ever be made to secure the adoption of the proposed amendment—if it ever should be adopted. There is but one conclusion to the National Reform party. They seem to have forgotten the history of every country in the world, and they also seem to have forgotten the causes that lead to the enactment of the constitutional provision before quoted. No king, prince, or potentate ever committed as many depredations upon human rights as have professed Christians under the guise of saving souls. To escape such, our ancestors came to this land of freedom. Yours respectfully,

JAMES T. MILBURN.

THE remark recently made by a writer in the *Christian Statesman* that "a Christian is one who in theory is obedient to Christ," seems to throw considerable light upon the National Reform idea of Christianity, and explains how this can be made a Christian nation by constitutional amendment. If obedience in theory is all that is required, Congress can of course furnish it in any quantity desired.

THE following suggestion by the *Catholic Review*, we find adopted into the editorial columns of the *Christian Statesman*. It is an important item in the steadily growing Sunday movement:—

"The time is near at hand when those who have so warmly advocated eight hours as a workman's day, will find it necessary to agitate for six days as a workman's week. If the labor organizations are really anxious for an issue on which they can have the help of the vast majority of the American people, let them take up this of Sunday labor. They will find enormous obstacles to contend with in the wide-spread avarice of the non-Catholic workmen as well as of the capitalists. If the limit of a day's labor to eight hours is calculated to restrain the over-production to which they object, the cessation of Sunday labor, which is now carried on to an extent enormously in excess of what the general public is disposed to believe, would exercise a still further restraint in this direction. If the labor associations are sincere in their professions, they will find that temperance—if not total abstinence—on all days of the week, and the Christian observance of the Lord's day, will tend greatly to diminish many of the evils of which they justly complain."

We have not the least doubt that this thing will be done soon. We fully expect soon to see the labor organizations throughout the country, busily agitating for "six days as a workman's week," and the churches and preachers, both Roman Catholic and Protestant Catholic, all loudly cheering on the agitation. The *Christian Statesman* may congratulate itself for that will be a mighty re-enforcement to National Reform.

## 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 - - - - - 75 cents.

Specimen copies free.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.