

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MAY, 1887.

NUMBER 5.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

OAKLAND, CAL.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

IN the *Christian Statesman*, January 20, was published an article by Dr. T. K. Davis on "Using the Ballot for the Glory of God," in which he inquires, "Could any method of confessing and honoring Christ be more significant and emphatic than to vote for him?" And the italics are his. This article the *Statesman* says "ought to waken earnest reflection in multitudes of Christian minds." We think it ought; especially in view of the National Reform efforts to make this the popular method of "confessing and honoring Christ."

IN the *Christian Nation*, February 9, 1887, Rev. W. J. Coleman says that Senator Sherman is credited with favoring an appropriation of one hundred millions of dollars for coast defenses, and then remarks as follows:—

"The hundred million which the Senator would expend on earth-works and great guns, if put at interest, would yield as much every year as all the Christians in the United States give to foreign missions. And why would not that be a wiser way to expend it? It would soften our hearts at home until we would not want to fight, and it would raise our reputation abroad so that our neighbors would not want to fight us."

What a wonderful efficacy there must be in National Reform prescriptions. Why don't some of these Reformers persuade the European nations to adopt this method of raising their reputation? It would be a splendid missionary triumph if they only could do it.

THE SENTINEL frequently receives letters from people who want it to advocate this, that, or the other reform. Now we heartily sympathize with all true reformers. We know that intemperance is a horrible curse, that the devil has agents circulating vile literature in every place possible, and that unnamable vice is stalking through the land. But there are thousands of good people who by voice and pen are working with might and main to check these evils, while the AMERICAN SENTINEL is the only paper in existence whose sole object is to combat a rapidly-growing movement which, if successful, would make us a nation of slaves, not simply slaves in body, but what is far worse, slaves in conscience. And so while we bid all true reformers God-speed, we must confine ourselves to exposing the sophistries of those who under the name of reform would rob us of all our liberties.

Is Christ King of the Nations?

IN the February number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL we published an article entitled, "National Reform Principles Exemplified," in which it was proved, by quotations from the publications of the "Reformers," that their professed intention is to "enthroned Christ," to "bring him into his kingdom," to "accept him as the nation's king," to make this Republic "one of the kingdoms of our Lord," etc. They assert that Christ is, by virtue of his office, king of the nations, but that this nation is depriving him of his right, in not acknowledging, in the Constitution, his kingship and sovereignty. They affirm that he is constituted king of the nations by virtue of his mediatorial office. This we emphatically deny. Here the issue is squarely joined. Their error is strenuously held and taught by the Covenanters; it is fundamental with the National Reformers—the corner-stone of their system.

They endeavor to uphold their error by fallacious reasonings and by erroneous interpretations of prophecy. We will notice these points.

1. Fallacies in reasoning. In an article in the *Christian Nation*, September 15, 1886, are the following words:—

"It is objected that Christ is anointed king of Zion; he is the organic Head of the church, only; how then can he, as mediator, be king of nations? This, to some, seems to be an unsolvable problem. We will, however, refer the reader to the reign of Solomon for a solution (see 1 Kings 4:20-25). While Solomon was the proper organic head of the kings of Israel alone, yet it is recorded that 'he reigned over all kingdoms from the river unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt; they brought presents and served Solomon all the days of his life.' If Solomon could rule in a twofold capacity as king of Zion and king of nations, unquestionably Christ Jesus is competent to exercise dominion in the same manner."

The fatal defect in this reasoning is, that there is not the shadow of a likeness between the reign of Solomon and the present reign of Christ. The writer starts out to meet the query, How can Christ be both mediator and king of nations? and proposes to answer it by referring to the reign of Solomon, who never was mediator at all! He solves nothing; he does not touch the question. Uzziah, a king on the throne of Solomon, once essayed to act as priest, and the Lord smote him with leprosy (2 Chron. 26:16-21); and so would he have smitten Solomon if he had attempted to intrude upon the office of the priests, for that was given to the family of Aaron, and

the penalty of death was threatened against anyone who trespassed upon it. Num. 3:10. So inconclusive are their reasonings.

Another article in the *Nation*, which is highly commended by the editor, speaks of Christ as follows:—

"He is not divided; he is at once a prophet, a priest, and a king. The prophet is a king, and speaks with authority. On the cross Christ is a king, accepts an address as a king—'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom'—and answers as a king—'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.'"

This is equally faulty, as to its reasoning and to the facts. Christ was filling the office of prophet on earth, but not of priest or king. Paul, to the Hebrews, makes an intended argument on the priesthood of Christ, and sums up as follows:—

"Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the Heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law; who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." Heb. 8:1-5.

He has before declared that Christ was not a priest after the order of Aaron, but of Melchizedek, and, according to the flesh, he was of the same tribe as Uzziah, who was smitten of the Lord for essaying to act as priest, "of which tribe," says Paul, "no man gave attendance at the altar."

The points in the apostle's summary are these: (1) Christ's priesthood is in Heaven, in a sanctuary not made by man. (2) He was not of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah. (3) Therefore, he could not be a priest on earth; he could not officiate in the sanctuary where earthly priests officiated. (4) The earthly sanctuary and service were but an example and shadow of heavenly things. As is said again in chap. 9:24: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." The earthly priests, service, and sanctuary were types; if Christ had officiated as a priest on earth, he must have acted as a type of his own work in Heaven! But argument on this point is not necessary; the words of Paul are plain, and must be decisive. Christ was not, and could not be, a priest on earth.

Neither was he a king on earth. His

kingship or reign was always spoken of prospectively. The very petition relied upon by the writer quoted above, disproves his point; "Lord, remember me *when thou comest into thy kingdom.*" If he were reigning a king at that time—if he had already come into his kingdom—then the language of the petition was very inappropriate. He was born of the lineage of David, but he has not yet taken his throne and his kingdom. Let us examine the Scriptures on this point.

In Luke 19 it is recorded that Jesus "spoke a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear." He represented himself thus: "A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. . . . And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom," then he reckoned with his servants, and destroyed his enemies.

Of course the "far country" into which he went to receive his kingdom, is Heaven. He receives it from the hand of his Father. The kingdom is on the earth; here he commits the talents to his servants; here his citizens reject his authority; here he will come to reckon with his servants; here he will destroy his enemies. Here he had to come to take "on him the seed of Abraham," and to be born heir to David's throne. But the gift he receives in Heaven, and has not received it yet. Certainly he did not have it on the cross nor in the grave.

It is also proved by the prophet Daniel that he had to go into the presence of his Father to receive the kingdom. This opens the second point.

2. They misinterpret the prophecies. Dan. 7:13, 14, reads:—

"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away."

This proves that he shall receive his dominion at the throne of the Ancient of days, in Heaven. But that scene is laid after, not before, his resurrection and ascension. By referring to verses 9, 10, it is seen that this part of the vision of Daniel is fulfilled in the time of the Judgment: "The Judgment was set, and the books were opened." And with this agree the words of Rev. 11:15-18. The announcement of verse 15,—*"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever,"*—is much quoted by National Reformers, but they utterly ignore the fact that it is made under the seventh trumpet, which closes up this dispensation. In this chronology of this trumpet, expositors are well agreed. It is also located by verse 18: "And the nations were angry, *and thy wrath is come,* and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name,

small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth." There can be no question about the Judgment; it is not a past event. When he will give reward, Jesus himself informs us: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27. And again: "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:14.

In Rev. 11:18 the expression is used, "and thy wrath is come." This leads us to quote again from a writer in the *Christian Nation* of March 10, 1886. He said:—

"The careless reader of the word of God seems to see two opposite and irreconcilable representations of the divine character. On the one hand, severe holiness, exact justice, supreme law, resistless wrath; on the other hand, winning patience, tender mercy, infinite love, boundless grace. Even the Saviour has a twofold character—himself a paradox, whose most startling contradiction is *the wrath of the Lamb.*"

The writer of the above has proved himself a very careless reader of the word. The careful reader of the book of Revelation knows that it is given in lines or series of symbols, each and all culminating in one point, the Judgment, the coming of Christ, and the end of this world. Turning to Rev. 6:14-17 we read:—

"And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captians, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great *day of his wrath is come;* and who shall be able to stand?"

Here we see the condition of things on the earth when the day of the wrath of the Lamb comes. To claim that the day of his wrath comes during his priesthood and mediation is the sheerest absurdity; it is a gross perversion of the Scriptures. But it seems that no absurdity is too great to be set forth by these model Reformers. Paul's words of hope and promise to the Thessalonians also locate this day of wrath: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled [to recompense] rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction," etc. 2 Thess. 1:6-9.

No truth is more clearly taught than this, that Christ will come to reward his saints and to punish his enemies. But the "day of his wrath" does not come—he will not appear to take vengeance on his foes—while he is mediator or intercessor. There is no paradox in the case. It is simply a question of *time*, as to when he fulfills the several offices assigned to him by his Father. To forward their illusive theories and schemes, the National Re-

formers present the work of Christ, and even himself, as a paradox—a "most startling contradiction"—when the contradiction is all their own.

We must trace a little further the gift of the nations to Christ. See Ps. 2:7-9. It says:—

"Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

He does not convert them; he breaks them and dashes them in pieces. How is this? He does not receive the gift until the Judgment, until his mediation is closed, when "the day of salvation" is ended, and the "day of his wrath is come." That we are not mistaken in this view is further and fully proved by the following scriptures:—

"The Lord [Jehovah] said unto my Lord [Adonai], Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Ps. 110:1. He sits at his Father's right hand—he is sitting there now—as priest or mediator, and will continue to sit there until the time comes to take authority over the nations, to put off the robes of his priesthood, and to "put on the garments of vengeance." Isa. 59:17. See Paul's comment on this: "But this man [Christ], after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; *from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.*" Heb. 10:12, 13. That is, till his foes be put under his feet; till the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth shall be given to him; until the kingdoms of this world are become his. But, mark; while he is sitting on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, a priest or mediator, he is *expecting* till his foes are made his footstool. He is looking forward to the fulfillment of the promise of the Father, to give him the kingdom and the dominion under the whole heaven.

We think none can fail to see the harmony of the testimony on this point. The nations are not yet given to Christ, and he will never receive the sovereignty by the votes of men; he cannot be "enthroned" by legislative enactments.

The proof in this article is complete in itself, yet there is much to be said in confirmation of this view, and we will resume it next month. J. H. W.

The Logic of It.

THE National Reformers insist that the law must give the people the rest of the Sabbath. And not only give it to them, but compel them to take it. By the authority of civil law they must take the Sabbath rest whether or not they wish it. But in commenting on the meeting of locomotive engineers, held on a Sunday, the *Statesman* said:—

"Have they yet to learn that the Sabbath cannot be had for rest, unless we keep it sacred for worship?"

By putting "this and that together," we shall learn that it is the intention of our model Reformers to give us a legal or compulsory Sab-

bath rest, "sacred for worship." This is the plain evident meaning of the language. They will compel all classes to take a Sabbath rest, but they cannot have it for rest "unless they keep it sacred for worship." Hence, they will compel all to keep a day "sacred for worship." This is the inevitable logic of their position. They may, indeed, make a law to compel all classes to rest from labor on a certain day, and they may make a law that all shall attend places of worship on that day. But, alas, they cannot make them worship. They may enforce some "form of godliness," but "the power thereof" is beyond human legislation. They may compel men to act the hypocrite, but they cannot compel them to be devotional or worshipful. But we are fully aware that nothing is too wild for such theorists to attempt.

National Reform Interpretations of Scripture.

As the leaders of the National Reform propose to make themselves the interpreters of Scripture "on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points," under the Government of the United States, it becomes important to the American people to know somewhat about the National Reform manner and method of interpretation. As the people of this nation are asked to amend their Constitution so as to open the way for these men to make themselves the national interpreters of Scripture, the people ought to know what qualifications these self-nominated candidates possess for the high dignity to which their laboring souls aspire. That we may do our part toward enlightening the people on this subject, we propose, as far as possible, to give examples of National Reform interpretations of Scripture.

The Scriptures clearly enjoin the obligation of subjection to civil government, of obedience to civil authorities: "To be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates," and to pray "for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life." In Romans 13:1-10 this duty is set forth at greater length than in any other one place in the Bible. The first verse reads thus: "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." In the *Christian Statesman*, June 5, 1884, there is quite an extended comment—more than a page—upon this text, written by Rev. David Gregg—the same who was lately installed as pastor of the Park Street Church, Boston. Mr. Gregg interprets this verse as follows:—

"The authorities that be are ordained of God.' 'There is no authority but of God.' All authorities that are not of God and are not in allegiance to him are usurpers. This is a self-evident truth, *i. e.*, if it be a fact that 'there is no authority but of God.'"

There stands the plain declaration of the word of God that "there is no power but of God." At this Mr. Gregg gravely observes that all powers that are *not* of God are usurpers, and that this is a self-evident truth, *i. e.*, if it be a fact that there is no power but of

God. Well it certainly is a fact, for the word of God says it. Therefore, it being a fact that there is *no* power but of God, then how *can* there be any powers that are not of God? As the powers that be are ordained of God, and as there is no power but of God, it is impossible that there can be *any* power but of God. Therefore Mr. Gregg's comment amounts to just this and no more: All powers that are not powers are usurpers. We think it altogether likely that that is "self-evident."

But, more than this, the National Reformers will not admit that the powers that be are ordained of God. Although the Scripture says as plainly as language can say anything that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" and although the whole Bible bears out the plain truth and sense of the statement, the National Reformers "interpret" it to mean, the powers that *ought* to be are ordained of God. And as the National Reform power is what ought to be, it follows that National Reform is ordained of God, and when it shall secure that power it will be exercised by a right absolutely divine. That such is the National Reform interpretation is shown by Dr. Gregg's own words. In telling what Paul was doing in writing the words of Romans 13:1-10, he says:—

"He was giving us God's ideal of civil government. He was holding up a picture of what civil government *ought* to be. He was teaching Christians *what they should strive to make Governments.*"

And again:—

The object was "to furnish then, as now, a standard by which to try existing Governments. It gives us God's ideal of civil government. If Governments conform to this divine ideal, then we are bound to recognize them as divine ordinances, and to give them conscientious support and homage, but if they do not, *we are bound to inaugurate* moral reforms and *revolutions* which will conform them to God's ideal."

By this style of interpretation, therefore, we are to understand that when the Lord speaks of the powers that be, he means the powers "that ought to be." When the word of God directs every soul to be subject to the higher powers, it means that every soul shall erect a tribunal and sit in judgment upon those powers. When God directs that we shall not resist the power but shall be subject for conscience' sake, he means that we "are bound to inaugurate revolutions." Where the Scripture sets forth the duty to be law-abiding citizens, leading quiet and peaceable lives, the National Reform interpretation of it demands that men, Christians too, shall be revolutionists, with their eyes constantly on the Government, weighing it in the National Reform balances, and watching for opportunities to inaugurate revolutions. In short, whereas the Scripture directs that men shall be Christians and law-abiding citizens, the National Reform interpretation of the Scripture demands that they shall be scheming politicians and revolutionists. Now could any interpretation possibly be further from the truth of the Scripture, or more directly opposed to the text under consideration? But we are not surprised at it; indeed we do not see how it

could be otherwise, in view of the fact that the National Reform conception of the Saviour of the world is that he is a "divine politician." With such views of Christ, it would be impossible to hold any other views of the duty of the followers of Christ than such as are expressed in the above interpretations.

A. T. J.

The Powers that Be Are Ordained of God.

WE stated above that the whole Bible bears out the plain truth and the obvious sense of the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God." We have not space to present all the texts that might be given in direct proof of it, but we shall give enough to show that Paul when he wrote this declaration was only doing as was his wont, reasoning out of the Scriptures.

Everybody knows that Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon, and that he was a heathen. Yet God spake by his prophet directly to Nebuchadnezzar, and said, "Thou, O King, art a king of kings; for *the God of Heaven hath given thee a kingdom*, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and *hath made thee ruler* over them all." Dan. 2:37, 38. Through the prophet Jeremiah, the Lord sent yokes and bonds to the kingdoms of Edom, and Moab, and Ammon, and Tyre, and Sidon, by the messengers that came from these kings to Jerusalem, and with them also he sent this message: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Thus shall ye say unto your masters; I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and *have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me*. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; . . . and all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come; and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him. And it shall come to pass, that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the sword and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand." Jer. 27:4-8.

Now as Nebuchadnezzar was a heathen, and as his kingdom was a heathen kingdom, we can hardly think that even the National Reformers would pronounce his authority to be exactly "God's ideal of civil government." Yet there can be no shadow of doubt that the power possessed by Nebuchadnezzar and exercised by him over all the kingdoms and peoples round about, was a power that was ordained of God, for the word of God says so, and said so to him. In the time of Nebuchadnezzar the power that was ordained of God. Nor was it only in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. The word of the Lord by Jeremiah asserted not only that this power was

given to him, but to "his son and his son's son" as well; and this succession covered the whole period of the kingdom of Babylon from Nebuchadnezzar to its fall. Therefore the proof is positive that the power of the Empire of Babylon was ordained of God.

The grandson of Nebuchadnezzar—Belshazzar—in the midst of the riotous feast of Tamuz, was told by the prophet of the Lord, "God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it;" and, "Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." The commander who led the forces of the Medes and Persians was Cyrus the Persian. And of him the Lord had said: "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure." Isa. 45:1; 44:28. When Babylon fell, the rule of the Medo-Persian Empire fell first to Darius the Mede, instead of to Cyrus. And the angel Gabriel said to Daniel, "I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him." Dan. 11:1. Therefore the word of God is clear that the power of the Medo-Persian government was ordained of God.

But not to multiply instances by noting them in detail, we will quote the scripture that sums up the whole subject in few words: "Blessed be the name of God forever and ever; for wisdom and might are his; and he changeth the times and the seasons; *he removeth kings, and setteth up kings.*" Dan. 2:20, 21. "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." Dan. 4:25. These texts assuredly demonstrate the principle declared by Paul in Rom. 13:1, that "there is no power but of God;" and that "the powers that be are ordained of God." But if these texts should not be enough to demonstrate it, then we may add the crucial text of all Scripture. When Christ stood before Pilate, "Then saith Pilate unto him, Speakest thou not unto me? Knowest thou not that *I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?* Jesus answered, *Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.*" John 19:10, 11.

The demonstration is complete, therefore, that the words of Rom. 13:1, are a statement of *fact* and not of *theory*; that "the powers that be *are* ordained of God;" and that "there is no power but of God." As the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will; when he has given the power to whom he will, whether to Babylon, to Medo-Persia, to Grecia, to Rome, to England, or to the United States; whether that will be direct or permissive, who shall say that that power is not of him? and who shall say that that is not the power that ought to be? And to such powers Christians are taught to be respectful, quiet, peaceable, obedient subjects, and not revolutionists. The following from Macaulay is to the point:—

"The powers which the apostle . . . pro-

nounces to be ordained of God, are not the powers that can be traced back to a legitimate origin, but the powers *that be*. When Jesus was asked whether the chosen people might lawfully give tribute to Cæsar, he replied by asking the questioners, not whether Cæsar could make out a pedigree derived from the old royal house of Judah, but whether the coin which they scrupled to pay into Cæsar's treasury came from Cæsar's mint, in other words, whether Cæsar actually possessed the authority and performed the functions of a ruler.

"It is generally held, with much appearance of reason, that the most trustworthy comment on the text of the Gospels and Epistles is to be found in the practice of the primitive Christians, when that practice can be satisfactorily ascertained; and it so happened that the times during which the church is universally acknowledged to have been in the highest state of purity were times of frequent and violent political change. One at least of the apostles appears to have lived to see four emperors pulled down in a little more than a year. Of the martyrs of the third century a great proportion must have been able to remember ten or twelve revolutions. Those martyrs must have had occasion often to consider what was their duty towards a prince just raised to power by a successful insurrection. That they were, one and all, deterred by the fear of punishment from doing what they thought right, is an imputation which no candid infidel would throw on them. Yet, if there be any proposition which can with perfect confidence be affirmed touching the early Christians, it is this, that they never once refused obedience to any actual ruler on account of the illegitimacy of his title. At one time, indeed, the supreme power was claimed by twenty or thirty competitors. Every province from Britain to Egypt had its own Augustus. . . . Yet it does not appear that, in any place, the faithful had any scruple about submitting to the person who, in that place, exercised the imperial functions. While the Christian of Rome obeyed Aurelian, the Christian of Lyons obeyed Tetricus, and the Christian of Palmyra obeyed Zenobia. 'Day and night'—such were the words which the great Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, addressed to the representative of Valerian and Gallienus—'day and night do we Christians pray to the one true God for the safety of our emperors.'"—*History of England, chap. 14.*

These, however, were law-abiding subjects and citizens, and not National Reform revolutionists.

A. T. J.

National Reform Principles Despotic.

WE have received an address which a gentleman of Quincy, Mass., has addressed to the Legislature of that State. The writer strongly objects to making the Sunday laws any less strict, or to making concessions in favor of any, and says:—

"The greatest good to the greatest number of our citizens, demands that the Sunday laws shall remain unchanged. They may be slightly oppressive in some respects, but the Legislature which is capable of pruning them just enough to make them perfect, and stopping at that point, has, in my humble opinion, yet to be elected. Better let well enough alone."

This is the idea that underlies all National Reform would-be legislation,—the idea that laws are simply for the majority, that if the majority are satisfied it matters not if a few are oppressed. Such an idea of law is in

harmony with despotism, but not with a republican, or any other just form of government. A despotism is simply the rule of the majority, only the majority of strength is lodged in one man. But the principle is the same, no matter whether the majority of strength be lodged in one man, or whether the numerical majority has the majority of strength. Five hundred men have no more right to unite to oppress one man, than one man has to oppress five hundred men.

It is not true that a just law is ever oppressive to a few. A law that does injustice to one man, is an unjust law. We heartily agree with President Cleveland, who, in a recent interview on the land laws, said:—

"If by any construction of a law, seeming injustice is done to the humblest farmer in the furthest corner of the land, then that law ought to be changed, and changed at once."

If a law oppresses a single honest man, it has in it the elements of oppression, and so is an unjust and oppressive law. Just laws cannot by any possibility be made to oppress an upright man. This is the principle upon which our laws are framed. It is a legal maxim that it is better to let a guilty man escape than to punish an innocent man. This does not imply that a just law will sanction the escape of a guilty man, but it simply recognizes the fact that men are fallible, and are liable to improperly execute even a just law; and therefore it provides that the failure, if there be any failure, shall lean to the side of mercy.

The fact that National Reformers claim that majorities should have their way, even though it might oppress some citizens, shows that if they should gain control oppression would certainly follow. Let us beware of a despotism, whatever form it may assume.

E. J. W.

Personal Liberty.

THE editor of the *Christian Union*, Dr. Lyman Abbott, is writing in his paper a series of "Letters to Workingmen," in which he is discussing the labor problem. In the issue of March 10, he considers the principle of strikes and boycotts, and among other illustrations he gives the following:—

"My friend Michael S. owns a horse and cart. He goes out to work with his horse and cart, and for a day's work receives \$3.50. He is a capital workman, and is always in great demand. . . . His horse and his cart are his own. I have no right to tell him where or how he can use them. If he should choose now to get a Pole to help him load his cart, and I should not like Poles, and should say to him, 'Mr. S. you must not have a Pole to help you; you must have an American or an Irishman,' I should expect the same answer from him, 'Mind your own business. This is my horse and cart,' he would say, 'and I am one free man, and this Pole is another free man, and if he chooses to help me, and I choose to have him help me, it is none of your business.' And it would clearly be none of my business. And it would not dignify or materially improve my impertinence, if I should go round our village and stir up the people to demand of Mr. S. that he only use his horse and cart so many hours a day, or get only Irishmen or Americans as helpers.

I might perhaps succeed in making life so uncomfortable for Mr. S. that he would yield. But if he did, it is palpably clear that he would yield to an impertinence and an injustice.

"There is also in our village a steam saw-mill. The men who own it have built it up by hard work, thrift, and economy. They have acquired it just as Michael S. has acquired his horse and cart, by honest industry. It is theirs, honestly theirs. Suppose I should undertake to tell them how many hours they may work their mill, and whether they may employ a Pole in it; this would be no less an impertinence. I have a little garden, and I sometimes work in it with garden tools which I have bought with my own money. It is nobody's business but my own when or how I work, or what I do with my tools. And it is nobody's business but their own when or how my friend Michael S. works with his horse and cart, or my friends, the owners of the steam-mill, work with their steam-mill, or whom they get to help them."

This is sound doctrine, and nobody can gainsay it. That every man is of right master of his own actions, so long as he does no injury to his fellow-men, is self-evident. This is in harmony with our famous declaration of human rights: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." And this was but the enunciation of the Golden Rule, the divine law which says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." That means that in every transaction with a fellow-man you should "put yourself in his place." I love liberty, and do not like to be dictated to arbitrarily; therefore I must allow others the same freedom by not presuming to interfere in their affairs.

If I have hired myself to another man, I have the liberty to leave his employ if I do not like the work or the wages. But here is B., who is satisfied with both the work and the wages. Now if I say to him, "I am dissatisfied, and am going to leave, and therefore you must leave too," all right-minded people can see that it would be insufferable impertinence on my part, which B., if he has the spirit of a man, will resent or ignore. If I bring influences to bear which he cannot resist, and force him to leave, I make him my slave. In so doing I violate the fundamental principles of all morality; for I certainly do to him what I would not like to have him do to me, thus showing that I do not love my neighbor as myself; and "he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

THE RIGHT TO REST.

Dr. Abbott says: "I have a little garden, and I sometimes work in it with garden tools which I have bought with my own money. It is nobody's business but my own how or when I work, or what I do with my own tools." Now suppose we make a little broader application of the principles above laid down. Dr. Abbott's neighbor across the street has a garden also, in which he works when occasion demands. Some fine summer morning while Dr. A. is working in his garden, neighbor C.

comes over, and says: "Dr. Abbott, you must not work in your garden to-day." "Why not?" "Because I am going to take a holiday to-day," says C. "Very well," says the Doctor, "go ahead, and have your holiday; I have no objection; but I don't feel as though I could afford a holiday to-day, for I took one yesterday; therefore I shall continue work." Everybody will say that Dr. A. does just right, and most people will say that if neighbor C. should insist on his laying off for the day, the Doctor would be justified in politely signifying to him that he better mind his own business.

The case would be none the less absurd if Mr. C. should come over to Dr. A.'s garden, and say: "Doctor, I want you to stop work to-day, for I have worked very hard for several days past, and I feel as though it would be an injury to my physical system if I should work to-day. It is a law of nature that man should have regular periods of rest, and I am going to take mine to-day, and so you must rest too." Dr. A. would say: "I rested all day yesterday, and feel perfectly refreshed. My system is in good condition, and does not at present require rest; if you need rest, I would certainly advise you to take it at once; my corn needs attention, and it would be wrong for me to neglect it, when I can attend to it as well as not; but I will not lay a straw in the way of your resting; go right home and rest."

Will not everybody say that C.'s request is very unreasonable, and that if he should insist upon it, and should force Dr. A. to leave his quiet work in his garden, he would be acting most unjustly? None could say otherwise; for Dr. A.'s working does not in the least interfere with Mr. C.'s resting.

The reader sees by this time that we are not discussing the labor problem, in the generally accepted sense of that term; and yet the principles which apply in the matter of strikes and boycotts, apply equally to the matter of Sunday rest or labor. If I choose to rest on Sunday I have that privilege, but I have no right to say that somebody else must rest just because I do. If my neighbors choose to work in their shops or gardens on Sunday, they do not hinder me from resting. In like manner if I choose to rest on Saturday, I have no right to request or demand that others shall likewise rest, unless they feel free to do so.

We know that the plea is constantly being made that observers of Sunday must be protected in their right to rest. We readily agree. No man on earth, nor any company of men, has the right to say that another man shall work on Sunday. To do so would be a gross interference with his rights. But, by the same rule, no man, or set of men, has the right to say that another man shall not work on Sunday. A man may say, "You shall not work for me on Sunday;" a corporation may say, "You shall not work for us on Sunday;" and they have the right to say so to any man any day in the week. But when they undertake to say, "You shall not work for yourself, or for some other man if he wishes to hire you," they are going beyond their rights.

THE RIGHT OF CONSCIENCE.

But the case is put as a matter of conscience. Thus, A. says, "My conscience requires me to rest on Sunday, and it offends and grieves me sorely to see others working on that day. To be sure, it doesn't hinder me from resting, but it disturbs my peace of mind." Well, suppose we interview your neighbor who thus disturbs your peace of mind. B. says, "My conscience and my understanding of the Bible demand that I should rest on Saturday, and consequently labor on Sunday. It grieves me sorely to see neighbor A. working as I am going to church, and my worship is often disturbed by the rattling of his heavy wagon, or the sound of his hammer." Now is there any principle which can be invoked to uphold the State in compelling B. to rest on Sunday, so that A.'s feelings shall not be ruffled, while it allows A. to go his way on Saturday, regardless of the feelings of B.? We have never heard of any, except that ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people want to rest on Sunday, while only about one one-hundredth of the people care to rest on Saturday. But this is the principle that the wishes of the majority must be gratified regardless of the wishes, or even the rights, of the minority. It is the principle of tyrants,—the principle that might makes right. It is the principle which protects the lion from the lamb; which grants concessions to the rich, who can take care of themselves, at the expense of the poor, who have not power to protest. It is the principle which directly contravenes the divine command: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." "This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish."

But it is urged that Sunday is the day divinely appointed for rest, and that, therefore, the State in enforcing its observance, is compelling men simply to do what is right, and what they ought to do voluntarily. Well, suppose that men really ought to keep Sunday; here are some honest, conscientious men who cannot see it so; they read their Bibles carefully, and can see no command for Sunday observance, but think that they are plainly commanded to observe the seventh day. They cannot rest on Sunday without working on Saturday, and their conscience will not allow them to do that. If now the State steps in and says that they must, because it is right, the State becomes conscience for them, and Paul's declaration, "To his own Master he standeth or falleth," is ignored. And if the man submits in this, he becomes the worst kind of a slave. One may by force of circumstances yield his bodily strength to another, and still be a free man, but he who submits his conscience to another, parts with his manhood. We think no one who has a mind capable of deciding a case upon its merits, can deny the simple principles which are here laid down. They are in harmony with the law of God and our own charter of liberty; and therefore they who seek to compel even a single individual to violate his conscience, proclaim themselves the enemies both of God and of man.

For What Are the Powers That Be, Ordained?

HAVING shown, in another place, that the powers that be are ordained of God, the question comes up for consideration, For what are these powers ordained? The National Reform theory claims that because the powers "that ought to be" are ordained to God, it follows that those powers would be ordained to minister in all things pertaining to God and man. But such an interpretation is just as far from the truth as is the average National Reform interpretation.

The powers that be are ordained of God *in things that pertain to civil government and in that alone*. The magistrate is "the minister of God" solely in things civil and in nothing else. And men are to be subject to the higher powers in things civil, and in nothing else, for those powers have to do with things civil and nothing else. It is admitted by the National Reformers that Romans 13:1-10 treats "of civil government and of civil duties." Now the definition of *civil* according to Webster is, "*Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens or to the State.*" Civil government, therefore, pertaining solely to the citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens or to the State, in the very nature of the case can have nothing at all to do with the relations of the citizens to God. And as the National Reform definition of *religion* is, "Man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God," this is to say that civil government can, of right, have nothing whatever to do with religion. That these propositions are correct, we have decisive proof in two notable instances.

We have shown that the power of Nebuchadnezzar was ordained of God. Now this same Nebuchadnezzar took upon himself to play the *role* of the grand National Reformer of his day. It was not enough that he should be ordained of God to rule in the relations of men with their fellow-men or with the State, but he must take it upon himself to rule in men's relations to God. It was not enough that his power was ordained of God in things civil, but he must exercise his power in things religious. It was not enough that he should rule men's bodies, he must rule their consciences as well. He would compel men to worship the god that he should choose and as he chose. Accordingly he made a colossal image, and set it up in the plain of Dura, not far from Babylon, and then sent and gathered together "the princes, the governors, and captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers" to the dedication of the image. Then when all were assembled, he published an edict by a loud-voiced herald, that at a signal sounded by all the musical instruments together, everybody should fall down and worship the great golden image, and this under penalty, upon whosoever refused, of being pitched into a fiery furnace.

But in the crowd there happened to be three "political atheists"—Jews they were then called—who chose to worship God accord-

ing to the dictates of their own consciences, and so refused to obey the law. They were called up and asked about it, but they persisted in their opposition to National Reform, and said plainly, "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." But according to President Seelye's National Reform principle, the State, *i. e.*, Nebuchadnezzar, was both "courageous" and "wise," and therefore did "not falter," and into the burning fiery furnace intensely heated the "political atheists" were thrust.

NO POWER OVER CONSCIENCE.

Then King Nebuchadnezzar "rose up in haste" and cried to his counselors, "Did not we cast *three* men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O King. He answered and said, Lo, I see *four* men *loose*, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." Then the king called to the men to come out, and they did so, untouched by the fire. "Then Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, *except their own God.*" Thus God not only brought Nebuchadnezzar to the kingdom and ordained him a power over all the kingdoms and nations round about, but he also demonstrated to him that although his power was ordained of God, that power was not ordained in things pertaining to God. The Lord showed him that although God had given him power over all kingdoms and nations, he had not given him power over the worship, the faith, or the conscience of a single individual in any nation.

The Lord not only showed this to Nebuchadnezzar, but by having it recorded in his word he has shown it to all people to whom that word shall come. And it is one of the most surprising things, that in the end of this nineteenth century, in this land of Bibles and consequent light and liberty, there should arise a set of men who will go about to put in practice in this Government the principles of the heathen Nebuchadnezzar. There might be allowed some excuse for a poor, blind heathen doing such a thing twenty-four hundred and sixty-seven years ago; but what shadow of excuse can there possibly be for men who will do it now, with the Bible in their hands, and in the face of a miracle of God wrought expressly to show the iniquity of it?

Nor is this case of Nebuchadnezzar the only instance in which God has shown to men that although the powers that be are ordained of God, they are ordained only in things pertaining to men, in their relations to their fellow-men as citizens, and to the State. Under Darius, the Mede, whose power was ordained of God, some envious officials grew so jealous of the prime minister, that they determined to get him out of the way. But in all their searching and spying they utterly failed to

find any fault at all in him. "Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God." But there was no State law by which they could interfere with his rights of conscience or his liberty of worship. So like the true National Reformers they were, they set to work to "inaugurate a revolution." They pretended to be greatly interested in the honor of the king, and the good of the State. Darius, suspecting nothing, but supposing their representations were made in good faith, fell into the trap, and enacted the law which they had framed. At their solicitation he established a statute, and signed a decree that nobody should ask any petition of either God or man, save of the king, for thirty days; and that, too, under the dreadful penalty of being made food for lions.

But Daniel knew that the power of Medo-Persia was not ordained to any such work as that, and when he "knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and, his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." Then those men found Daniel praying, as was a foregone certainty, and rushed to the king with the report. Suddenly the eyes of Darius were opened; he saw that he had been trapped, and took shame to himself that he had allowed himself to be so terribly hoodwinked, and immediately began to try to deliver Daniel out of their persecuting hands. "And he labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him," but there was no remedy; the thing was law and the law had to take its course, for it could not be changed, and consequently to the lions Daniel had to go. But so far as Daniel was concerned the result in this instance was the same as the other, for when Darius hastened to the den in the morning and called out to him, Daniel answered him cheerfully and said, "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as before him *innocency was found in me*; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt."

DON'T TRUST THEM.

Now the same evil principle illustrated in this case, is being practiced in the United States to-day. And it is being worked in the same way precisely. Preachers professing great interest in the workingman, or great regard for the safety of the State, will go to the Legislature with a petition, and get some one of their kind to introduce a bill, for the enactment of a rigorous Sunday law, or for the repeal of a protective clause in an already rigorous law, and all this professedly as a "police regulation" or "in the interests of prohibition," or anything else but what it really is. And by pious pretensions, honeyed phrases, and fair speeches, they conceal their real purpose, succeed in hoodwinking the Legislature, and secure the passage of their innocent appearing bill. But as soon as their will has been made law, their interest in the "workingman," or in "prohibition," etc., sud-

denly ceases, and the whole tide of inquisition, prosecution, and persecution, is turned against a few innocent people who choose to worship God on Saturday instead of on Sunday. This thing was actually accomplished two years ago in Arkansas, and in all the working of the Sunday law so secured, we have not been able to learn of a single case in which the person prosecuted was not a Seventh-day Adventist or a Seventh-day Baptist. By the efforts of the lawyers of that State, and the earnest leadership of Senator Crockett, the Legislature has remedied the iniquitous statute.

Nor is this evil spirit confined to Arkansas. In California the present year, the same scheme was tried on the Legislature, but it failed. The same thing was tried in the Legislature of Minnesota, about the same time as in California, and there too, at almost the last moment, the real intent of the thing was discovered, and the scheme frustrated. In Texas, also, and other States, it has been attempted, and all within the present year, but so far we believe all have failed, because the evil was discovered before it was too late. And what those men did in the law of Medo-Persia, and what these parties have done, and have tried to do in the laws of these States, that is precisely what the National Reform party is aiming to do in the Constitution and laws of the Nation.

If the Legislatures of the States, or the national Legislature, will guard against persecution, let them beware of all preachers, people, parties, or associations, who try to secure the enactment of Sunday laws, or the repeal of exemption clauses in Sunday laws already enacted.

Nor is it only in the cases of Darius and Nebuchadnezzar that God has shown that civil government is not ordained of God in things pertaining to God, but only in things pertaining to the citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens and to the State. Christ laid down the principle that severs forever the connection between the State and religion, and which shows conclusively that the powers that be are ordained of God only in things civil, and have nothing whatever to do with any man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. Certain of the Pharisees came to Jesus and asked:—

"Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show 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."

With that read the following from Paul's words in Romans 13:1-10, and compare the italicized words:—

"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. . . . 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."

CIVIL GOVERNMENT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE FIRST TABLE OF THE LAW.

Now what man can read these two passages of Scripture together, and honestly or truthfully say other than that Paul had in view the word of Christ, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's? and that Romans 13:1-10 is an inspired comment upon the words of Christ, showing not only that the powers that be are ordained of God, but also showing in what they are ordained of God?—No one, assuredly. This is made even clearer still by the fact that Paul in referring to the duties that devolve upon men under the powers that be, makes not a single reference to any of the first four commandments; but says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," thus referring solely to the second table of the law, and showing conclusively that the powers that be are ordained of God in things civil,—in things pertaining to the relations of man with his fellow-man,—and in those things alone.

As in this divine record of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no reference whatever to the first table of the law, it therefore follows that the powers that be, although ordained of God, have nothing whatever to do with the first table of the law of God. Again, as the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man, and as in God's own enumeration of the duty that men owe to the powers that be there is no mention of any of the things contained in the first table of the law, it follows that none of the duties contained in the first table of the law of God, do men owe to the powers that be. That is to say again that the powers that be, although ordained of God, are not ordained of God in anything pertaining to a single duty enjoined in any one of the first four of the ten commandments. These are duties that men owe to God, and with them the powers that be can of right have nothing to do, because Christ has commanded to render unto God—not to Cæsar, nor by Cæsar—that which is God's.

Therefore the proof is conclusive, and the truth absolute, that the National Reform ideas of civil government are utterly at fault, and that their interpretations of Scripture on the subject of civil government are only perversions of Scripture.

A. T. J.

BIBLE SANCTIFICATION: A CONTRAST OF TRUE AND FALSE THEORIES.

By Mrs. E. G. WHITE.

This is a pamphlet of only 84 pages, but its value is not to be judged by its size. It is just what its title indicates: a faithful presentation of Bible truth on this important subject, and an exposure of the false theories prevailing in regard to it. Every believer in Bible truth should read it. Buy it, read it, and lend it to your neighbor. Price, 10 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

CHRIST IN THE GOSPELS,

—OR—

The Life of our Lord in the Words of the Evangelists,

By JAMES P. CADMAN, A. M.

Is, as its Name Indicates, a Compilation in which the four Narratives of

THE LIFE OF CHRIST

ARE WOVEN INTO ONE CONNECTED STORY, MAKING A COMPLETE HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS IN THE EXACT LANGUAGE OF THE SCRIPTURES.

THE text is that of the Revised Version, and while every word in the four Gospels appears, the work is so arranged that the reader can tell at a glance the words used in each Gospel. Those who have tried to gather all the facts concerning some miracle, or other event, and at the same time properly locate and credit the various parts of the narrative, will appreciate this book, which is the very best of its kind and gives evidence of an immense amount of careful and painstaking labor.

The book is fully indexed so that any text or subject can be readily found; and the maps, notes, and diagrams which it contains are alone well worth the price of the volume. The following partial (less than half) TABLE OF CONTENTS will give an idea of the scope of the work:—

Index to chapter and verses; Life of Our Lord (333 pages); Index of persons, places, and subjects, with dictionary of proper names; Explanation of maps and diagrams; Map of the pathway of Jesus; Diagrams illustrating the principal events of crucifixion week.

This work is invaluable, and all who love the Bible should have a copy. It contains 394 pages, is well printed on good paper, and is neatly and substantially bound in cloth.

Price, post-paid, - - - - - \$1.50
With gilt edges, - - - - - 2.00
Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

THE SABBATH QUESTION.

ASSORTED PACKAGE No. 1, PRICE, 10c.

Which Day Do You Keep, and Why—Who Changed the Sabbath—The Sabbath in the New Testament—Elihu on the Sabbath—God's Memorial—Sunday Not the Sabbath—Why Not Found Out Before—One Hundred Bible Facts about the Sabbath.

ASSORTED PACKAGE No. 2, PRICE, 25c.

This package contains all the tracts in package No. 1, and the following in addition:—

Seven Reasons for Sunday-keeping Examined—The Ten Commandments Not Abolished—The Seventh Part of Time—The Definite Seventh Day—Perfection of the Ten Commandments—Address to the Baptists—The Sunday Law.

OTHER WORKS ON THE SABBATH.

The Truth Found.—A comprehensive exposition of the nature and obligation of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. 64 pp.10c

Sunday Seventh-day Examined.—A critical examination of the claim that Sunday is the true seventh day of the fourth commandment. 88 pp.10c

Brown's Review of Gilfillan on the Sabbath Question. 64 pp.10c

Appeal to the Baptists.—An address from the Seventh-day Baptists to their first-day Baptist brethren, urging a restoration of the Bible Sabbath from the standpoint of Baptist principles of argument and interpretation. 48 pp. 10c

Indication of the True Sabbath.—By a former missionary of the Presbyterian Church (Morton), 68 pp.10c

Morality of the Sabbath.—Showing that the Sabbath commandment, being found in the midst of the nine acknowledged moral precepts, is, like the others, moral in its nature. 96 pp.15c

Testimony of the Fathers of the first three centuries concerning the Sabbath and first-day. A candid examination of both sides of the question. 112 pp.15c

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

THE ATONEMENT.

AN EXAMINATION OF

A REMEDIAL SYSTEM, IN THE LIGHT OF NATURE AND OF REVELATION.

By Eld. J. H. WAGGONER.

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND GREATLY ENLARGED.

THIS work is a critical and exhaustive treatise on the plan of salvation as revealed in the Scriptures, showing its harmony with the principles of justice and mercy, its consistency with reason, and its final results as affecting the destiny of the human race. 368 pp.; cloth, \$1.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

MISCELLANEOUS TRACTS.

ASSORTED PACKAGE No. 6. PRICE, 25c.

The Plan of Redemption—The Sufferings of Christ—The Sanctuary of the Bible—Scripture References—The Spirit of Prophecy—Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion—Samuel and the Witch of Endor—The End of the Wicked—The Two Thrones.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, APRIL, 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.

THE National Convention for National Reform meets in Chicago, May 11, 12. The SENTINEL will be represented there and our June issue will have a full report of the most important of the proceedings.

NATIONAL REFORM has bestowed upon the Saviour a new title. He is now "The divine politician." Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, is said to be "full of names of blasphemy," and this, her youngest daughter, is fast following in the steps of the mother.

THE National Reformers are determined to have the nation a moral person, even though they have to create it such. In the Cincinnati Convention, 1872, Prof. J. R. W. Sloane said of a nation, that its "true figure is that of a colossal man," having "consciousness," "will," "purpose," and "a soul." "District Secretary" Rev. J. M. Foster, carries forward the conception after this sort:—

"The executive department of Government is the *head*, the judicial the *arms*, and the legislative the *legs*, through which this sovereign body exercises its will."—*Christian Statesman*, July 24, 1884.

We are waiting to see who of them will complete the absurd idea. There is here an excellent opportunity for the Rev. M. A. Gault to display the creative power of his sublime genius.

SAID Rev. D. McAllister, in the New York Convention, 1873:—

"Had Mohammedans settled this country, they would have incorporated Mohammedanism into its civil and political institutions. Had pagans come here at first, and continued in the ascendancy, the political body formed and developed would have taken on distinctively pagan features."

He then went on to argue that as the country was settled by Christians the body politic should take on distinctively Christian features, and incorporate Christianity into its political institutions. That is to say that Christians should act upon the same principles that Mohammedans and Pagans do; and that Christianity should be no more liberal and enlightened than is Mohammedanism or Paganism; and shows the model upon which a National Reform Government would be formed, and the principles by which it would be actuated.

THE librarian of a "Henry George Club" in Cincinnati, Ohio, writes us that we may be sure that anyone who writes under that heading is "opposed to the union of Church and State—particularly under our present social conditions." He thinks, however, that we are

wasting our time fighting an "improbable bugaboo," while a far deeper social wrong, viz., land monopoly, exists, and that, "under a *proper social system*, the evil that you so much dread would amount to nothing, *even if it did take place*."

Our friend may be very sure that it will take place, when so many people are ignorant as to the progress it has already made, and are indifferent as to whether it does or not. And when it does come, he will find that a "proper social system" will be just the thing that cannot possibly exist in connection with it. A proper social system would keep National Reform pretensions from becoming actual facts.

In the Pittsburg Convention, 1874, National Reform President Brunot said:—

"Where States undertake by statute laws to compel men's consciences in their relation to God, there is a condition of affairs indicated as a 'union of Church and State.'"

It would be impossible to compel men's consciences in any other relation than their relation to God; because conscience has to do alone with man's relation to God. Yet to have the State by statute laws to compel men's consciences is precisely what the National Reformers propose to do. PROOF: Rev. David Gregg in the *Christian Statesman*, June 5, 1884, said of "civil government:—

"It has the right to be, and the right to command the consciences of men."

Therefore, by their own premises, the conclusion inevitably follows that under a National Reform Government there would be "a condition of affairs indicated as a union of Church and State," and they can't disprove it.

In the last *Statesman*, Mr. Gault, of the National Reform Association, reports from Gridley, Illinois, where he lectured to a fair audience in the M. E. church. He says: "An Advent brother was much aroused, and wanted the church to answer my arguments for the change of the Sabbath, but the pastor refused. I assured the brother that we never designed to prohibit him from keeping his Sabbath, and only asked that he might not disturb us on ours."

For cool, calculating selfishness under the guise of a desire for justice, that takes the lead. The National Reform Association, through Mr. Gault, says to the observer of the seventh day: "We do not intend to force you to labor on your Sabbath, but in the interest of justice and good order, we intend to entreat you with the strong arm of the law, not to disturb us on ours." But do they propose to reciprocate, and not disturb the seventh-day keeper on "his" Sabbath? Oh, no! Why not? Because *we* are National Reformers; *we* are the people; *we* are in the majority, and no man has any business to differ with us. National Reform laws are intended only to protect the strong majority from the annoyance of the weak minority; according to National Reformers, those who are few and weak cannot have any rights. It is by such logic as this that they evade the charge of infringing upon the rights of people.

Is it possible that the thinking people of this land can be deceived so as to think that a party which has selfishness as its foundation and superstructure, is a Christian Association?

AND now we have the climax to the National Reform argument for a change in the Constitution of the United States; Mr. John Alexander, of Philadelphia, sometime president of the National Reform Association, has been unburdening himself to a correspondent of the *Universalist*, to whom he affirms that our Constitution "is not in harmony with the State constitutions, which do confess God and his law"! That is equivalent to charging the United States Constitution with being unconstitutional, because some State constitutions have not been framed in harmony with it. Which is the larger, the State of Pennsylvania, or the United States? His argument is on a par with the objection to the Bible, because it does not agree with the latest developments of modern science. But Mr. Alexander's pathetic plaint is valuable to this extent: It is an admission from National Reformers themselves, that those States which frame laws in favor of religious tenets, and which persecute conscientious dissenters from those tenets, are acting unconstitutionally.

No DOUBT there are many who think that the SENTINEL has set out on a fool's errand, and that the National Reform party is no more formidable an opponent than were those which Don Quixote so valiantly assailed. The editor of one of the leading journals in a capital city in an Eastern State, recently wrote upon this subject and said that all the religious journals are opposed to it. Those who really love liberty cannot too soon disabuse their minds of such ideas. A movement, which numbers among its officers and supporters some of the leading clergymen, college presidents, and jurists in the land, which has the support of the National W. C. T. U., and some of whose principles the Knights of Labor and even Socialists are beginning to endorse, is not a "bugaboo." Nothing is to be gained, but everything to be lost, by under-rating the strength of an opponent.

I EXHORT that prayers be made for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.—*Paul*.

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 - - - - - 2s.

Specimen copies free.
Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.