

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JUNE, 1887.

NUMBER 6.

The American Sentinel.

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

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } - - - - - EDITORS.
J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

JUST so soon as the State presumes to pass a defining and discriminating judgment on spiritual things, it exercises powers which are foreign to itself, and thus passes out of its legitimate sphere of action.—*Schuettle*.

SOME will say, “Well, if the National Reform Association is supported by such eminent men and women, it cannot be a bad thing, so no matter how strong it is.” That is a very uncertain way of judging. Members and names are a good index of the strength of a party, but they are no real index as to the character of its principles. It is a well-known fact that the institution of slavery had as able, and no doubt as pious, men for its zealous supporters as could be found fighting for its overthrow; and many of the eminent and eloquent ladies of the W. C. T. U. were most earnest advocates of that institution. If they were mistaken then, it is not out of the range of possibilities that they are mistaken now. It has passed into a proverb, that “great men are not always wise;” and when we see learned judges of the same court, giving decisions upon the same point, which directly conflict, we are warranted in concluding that wise men are not always infallible in their judgment. The only way to judge of anything is by its principles. Judged in this way, so-called National Reform is found to be a thing that is dangerous just in proportion as it has strength. We are very certain that a great many of the honorable men whose names appear as vice-presidents of that association, have given it the support of their names and influence on the strength of what working National Reformers have claimed for their movement, without closely examining its principles to see their tendency. For we are obliged to say that no man eminent for learning or soundness of judgment (we cannot say as to piety) is an active worker in the National Reform cause. This makes the situation the worse, for if the movement should succeed, these who are foremost as agitators would come to the front as legislators, while the learned men who are now silent partners, would still retain the back seats.

Religion in the Public Schools.

DR. WM. M. TAYLOR said: “It looks very pious to say that we should have religion taught in our schools; but it is terribly short-sighted, and exceedingly unstatesmanlike.” The more the subject is examined, the more clearly will it be seen that this remark is just. We are every day admonished, especially in religious concerns, that it will not do to trust to appearances. Paul said his countrymen had a zeal toward God, but not according to knowledge. The truth, Christianity, has had no greater obstacle to its success than the blind zeal of misguided friends. Zeal, earnestness, are the criteria of merit with some people. But loud harangues and long prayers are no proof of Christian standing. Fanaticism and self-confidence are always zealous, and never disturbed with doubts. Self-complacency is almost synonymous with pleasurable feeling, and many mistake *good feeling* for *strong faith*, though they may be as far apart as two things can possibly be.

To shut the Bible and religious instruction out of the public schools seems, to some people, to be a sacrilegious proceeding; but to maintain them in the public schools is not only very difficult, but very hazardous. So short-sighted, so illiberal and unjust, are the self-styled “National Reformers,” that they accuse all of pandering to “the demands of liberalism,” or even of favoring atheism, who do not assent to their propositions, and especially if they do not favor the introduction of the Bible and religion into the public schools. Our feelings—we might say our prejudices—were once all enlisted on that side of the question. We changed only when we became thoroughly convinced that the plan is altogether impracticable. To carry it out, one of two conditions is necessary: 1. The people must be all of one mind; of one religious belief. But, practically, this is out of the question. Communities of that kind will be so small and so rarely found, if ever, that they cannot be taken into account in providing for general action. 2. One part or class in the community or the State must *enforce* the teaching of their religious opinions or convictions at the sacrifice of those of other classes. But this is outrageous and inquisitorial, as all must concede, as all will concede at once, except those who are actuated by selfish motives, and have no regard for the golden rule.

This view of the case is no new thing, gotten up to meet the necessities of the present occasion. It contains the very essence and spirit of the Reformation; not of the sham National

Reform of this day, but of the genuine Reformation of three centuries ago. In it is embodied all human rights of conscience and religious liberty. Horace Mann was one of the noblest educators that Massachusetts ever produced. He was a Christian of unquestioned integrity. In his Twelfth Report on the Schools in Massachusetts he used the following language:—

“But if a man is taxed to support a school where religious doctrines are inculcated which he believes to be false and which he believes that God condemns, then he is excluded from the school by the divine law, at the same time he is compelled to support it by the human law. This is a double wrong. It is politically wrong, because, if such a man educates his children at all, he must educate them elsewhere, and thus pay two taxes, while some of his neighbors pay less than their due proportion of one; and it is religiously wrong, because he is constrained by human power to promote what he believes the divine Power forbids. The principle involved in such a cause is pregnant with all tyrannical consequences. It is broad enough to sustain any claim of ecclesiastical domination ever made in the darkest ages of the world.”

Here is a plain statement of the case in few words; an argument which cannot be successfully met. It was a very good idea of Rev. Dr. Tiffany, that “when our Lord said, ‘Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s,’ he drew a sharp line between the two;” and, “*Caesar can only give what is his own.*” The Doctor touched an important point in the following remarks:—

“The reason why so many of the people of the church act no better than the world’s people is that so much of that divine institution of teaching religion has been taken out of the family and put into the hands of Sunday-school teachers. It is, I think, one of the crying evils of the time, not that we have Sunday-schools, but that so much of the function of the family is delegated to them. And when you say that the State shall teach religion you cut the sinews of the church. The divine institution of the church which Christ himself appointed is not in mere teaching, in a series of doctrines, but in the atmosphere of prayer and devotion which it creates, with the authority of the Master in the institution founded by him for that purpose. The church is an institution not merely to state a fact, but to environ us with an atmosphere. When my brother says he cannot send his child to a public school because religion is not taught there, why I would as soon say that I could not send my boy to a restaurant for a beefsteak because they do not give him a chapter of the Bible while he is there. This is a perfectly illogical conclusion from the premises and it is a perfectly impracticable plan in our circumstances. It is a mistake to put the teaching of religion in the hands of the State and

not keep it where Christ has put it, in the hands of the church."

This, we believe, is solid truth. The more the State is intrusted with the work that God has committed to the church, the weaker the church becomes in vital power; and soon the State becomes a dictator to the church in regard to both its teachings and its methods.

And, with such a state of things as is demanded by the National Reformers, it is impossible for the State to be less than a dictator in religious matters. Thus Mr. Gault, in the *Christian Statesman*, marks out the duty of our Government as follows:—

"Our remedy for all these malific influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it."

To appreciate the above, the reader must consider that Mr. Gault is a very loose writer, making no distinction between the moral law and religious tenets. We have said, and we repeat, that the State will teach, not the Bible, but "somebody's construction of the Bible;" and then it must "lay its hand" on the construction of all others! And the construction which it will teach will be that of those who happen to be in authority at the time when the scheme takes effect. Now, of course, when the political complexion of the nation changes, when another class of rulers comes into power, a religion of another type may become the standard, "with God's authority behind it," according to the stereotyped phrase.

In view of the fact that the religion and the church having the most *political influence* in the country is the Roman Catholic, and that, while the National Reformers profess great abhorrence of the Romish religion, they are willing to work with the Catholics *on their own terms* in favor of establishing a national religion, the following remarks of Dr. Howard Crosby are well worthy of consideration:—

"How are we going to take the first step as to the character of the religious instruction that is to be given to the children of the land? Are we to find a sort of average that all will agree upon? Where is the average that all will agree upon? There are in this country between one-fourth and one-fifth of the whole population who have not the slightest sympathy with the forms of religion represented in this room to-night. Are we to leave them all out entirely and say to them, You are a minority and we have nothing to do with you; we are the majority and we are going to rule? Gentlemen, if the State is to furnish religious instruction, there is another thing that it will have to furnish, and that is the Inquisition. That will be the legitimate outcome of religious instruction by the State. It will be the logical issue to which you must come. If the State is going to teach religion, it will have to compel the people to receive that religion, and in order to do that it will have to have the strong arm of the Inquisition. But not only that. In your attempt to find out what sort of religion you are going to have taught in your schools and what kind of teachers you are to get to instruct, you have got to deny and destroy the foundation of American independence, which is our boast, and the boast of our fathers, which brought us, under God, through the Revolution. The foundation of it all before God is individual independence and mutual equality. Every man on this continent

stands exactly on the same platform with his neighbor, and no mere majority clothes any man in that majority with power to say, You must be taught my religion."

The thoughtful reader may wonder how the Reformers will meet all these arguments. In truth they do not meet them; they affirm and re-affirm their figments, and, as Dr. Taylor says, they put forth propositions which *seem* to be pious, but are very short-sighted and unpracticable. Let them say what they will, they never can disguise the fact that their scheme, if successful, would result in continual contentions and religious disputes, until one party had proved itself conqueror in a struggle which would leave genuine piety trailing in the dust.

To delegate the teaching of religion to the State is as great an incongruity as to turn a church meeting into a political caucus; and, in truth, the latter will follow the former, for the Reformers have already decided that, in their millennium, the final decisions of *civil*, as well as ecclesiastical, questions will be made by the church. According to their plan, as has often been shown, the church will be the dominant power. And yet, it must be trampled in its religious activities by being bound to the civil power. Such an alliance must prove unprofitable to both the State and the church.

Dr. Spear, in his work on "Religion and the State," has given us most excellent thoughts on this subject. Instance the following:—

"One would think that so simple a proposition as that which affirms the existence and inalienable character of the rights of a religious conscience as above and beyond all human authority, ought to have been among the earliest and most widely-extended discoveries of the race. The fact, however, is sadly the reverse. Of all the forms of wrong which men have suffered from each other, none have been less reasonable or more merciless and unrelenting than those of religious zeal armed with the civil power. There is no darker chapter in the history of Governments than that which chronicles their misdeeds in the attempt to administer and propagate religion. The attempt is a horrible human tyranny begun, and every step of the process is that tyranny continued."

Dr. Spear also quotes from the decision of the Supreme Court of Ohio in the somewhat celebrated Cincinnati school case, from which we copy the following in regard to teaching religion in the public schools:—

It "violates the spirit of our constitutional guaranties, and is a State religion in embryo; that if we have no right to tax him [the citizen] to support worship, we have no right to tax him to support religious instruction; that to tax a man to put down his own religion is the very essence of tyranny; that, however small the tax, it is the first step in the direction of an establishment of religion; and I should add that the first step in that direction is the fatal step, because it logically involves the last step."

All of which confirms the declaration of Horace Mann, that "the principle involved in such a course is pregnant with all tyrannical consequences."

And yet our modern Reformers insist that that is just what we need,—religious instruction by the State, and a State religion,—to cure

all the ills of the body politic. In answer to this it is enough to say that many if not most of the great criminals of the day were brought up under religious instruction. Let them ponder the following statement from the *Church Union*:—

"Chaplain Bass, of the penitentiary in Brooklyn, says that twenty years ago only about five per cent. of prisoners had previously been Sunday-school pupils, but that now seventy-five per cent. of actual and suspected criminals have been such. It is a sad showing. Pastor Crafts gives an account of an inebriate asylum where the per cent. is eighty, and another of fallen women where all have been in Sunday-schools. This is a growing evil. It is a most ominous one. A generation in Sunday-schools of habitual neglecters of the sanctuary is growing up. The term formerly applied to the school, 'the nursery of the church,' is getting to be a ghastly satire. What shall be done? A hearty recognition of these facts and of the extent of the evil is of prime importance."

It is not *more* religious instruction, certainly not *compulsory* religious instruction, that is needed, so much as a *higher standard* of religious instruction. Compulsion in religious instruction never wins respect, and State religion is necessarily of a low type, as may be easily shown. We cannot possibly have any guaranty that the State will teach *the true* religion; that will depend altogether on the standing of the majority who decide *whose* religion shall be taught. And when we consider that the largest and most powerful religions in the world are the most corrupt, we leave it with the reader that, to take religion from the domain of individual conscience, and make it a subject of legal decisions, is a most hazardous proceeding.

J. H. W.

The Pope in American Politics.

THE following remarks we select from an article by James Powell, D. D., under the above heading, in the *Advance*. The article was called out by the action of the Pope summoning priest McGlynn to Rome to answer for his part in the Henry George campaign for mayor of New York City, last fall.

"The fact is, the Pope claims the right, and exercises it, to interfere directly with American politics. This fact ought to be a startling message to the whole country. If any queen, king, or emperor on the face of the earth were to interfere with the politics of the country, as the Pope has done in this case, the war fever would take possession of the land inside of twenty-four hours. The silence of the press on this point is almost entirely owing to the dangerous character of the political teachings championed by the priest in advocating the clecting of Henry George. Socialism is a justly dreaded evil because of its destructive doctrines, but the truth or falsity of political doctrines affects not the principle that *foreign powers must not be allowed to interfere with the rights of American citizens*. We give that principle away, when, without protesting against the interference, we commend the Pope for dealing with Father McGlynn as he has.

"Suppose that the priest had been silenced, and ordered to Rome to answer for openly defending our public-school system in opposi-

tion to the direction of his archbishop, where would be the difference so far as the principle is concerned? It would not be any more an interference than in the case under consideration; yet had it been so, from one end of the land to the other, the press and pulpit would have been heard speaking out. Interference of any kind, and to any degree, with American politics, on the part of the Pope, should be resented not only by popular protest, but by the State Department of our Government at Washington. The Pope should be given to understand that when he summons an American citizen to answer in Rome for political acts and words performed and spoken in the exercise of his political rights, he assails the Republic.

"No jugglery of word definition should be allowed. Rome is well up on that little trick. She knows how to make the word religion elastic enough to mean anything that is wanted. She can easily make a definition to mark any political theory she wishes as "contrary to the teachings of the church," and then, under the pretext of discriminating between religion and politics, proceed by anathema and excommunication to carry out her purpose. The Republic is not called upon to accept her definitions. It is intelligent enough to make its own, and strong enough to stand by them. This incident of Father McGlynn is a providential opportunity to hold up the Papacy before the people as it really is,—a foreign power claiming the right to interfere with Governments. It is the old story.

"It will not do to say that Rome does not allow its priests to mix in politics. It does. It has done it. Priests are all the while mixing in politics. So long as they are fighting our common-school system, the very bulwark of our free institutions, not a word is heard from the bishops; they are all in it themselves. Nor from the Pope; that is in the line of his temporal policy. But when a priest takes a political position that antagonizes the theories of Rome, then politics becomes religion—a definition does it—and the poor priest, if he fails to see it in this light, is declared to be disobedient to the holy mother church, and exposed to all the censures and punishments that belong to the heretic. And what is that? The loss of his soul. So he himself and all good Catholics must regard it. What a terrible engine this for working mischief in the Republic! Whatever the outcome, whether Father McGlynn submits or leaves, the incident is full of meaning and significance. Press, pulpit, and platform ought to give it full ventilation."

Yes, the press, the pulpit, and the platform ought to give it full ventilation, but they will not. Instead of giving this menace full ventilation or any ventilation at all, press, pulpit, and platform will pay assiduous court to Rome, and invoke her further interference. Rev. C. C. Stratton, D. D., one of the foremost men of the Methodist Church on the Pacific Coast, visits the Archbishop of San Francisco to form an alliance, in a political measure. The late Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D., one of the

foremost men of the Presbyterian Church in all the country, only a little while before his death proposed a like alliance, to force religion into the public schools. The National Reform party, composed of "all evangelical denominations" and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, bids for the help of Rome, and pronounces itself willing to suffer rebuffs to gain her help to amend the Constitution of the Nation so as to make it recognize and enforce a national religion. The press of the Nation publishes whole columns of cablegrams from Rome, telling how imposing are the parades and ceremonies of the Pope, what crowds of people attend, how they fall on their knees as the Pope enters in state, how many kiss his hand, and to whom is granted the sublime dignity of kissing his toe. Government vessels of the United States, carrying official representatives of the Government, put the Papal flag in the place of honor, instead of the Stars and Stripes. And this is the way in which the pulpit, the platform, the press, and the Government, give "full ventilation" to the interference of the Pope with American politics!

A. T. J.

Remains of Popery.

It is curious to observe how tenaciously the ecclesiastical mind still holds to some of the principles of Popery which were not uprooted by the Reformation. In the minds of many Protestants the functions of civil rulers are in part spiritual, and they are ready to invoke the sword of government in the enforcement of religion.

The *Christian Instructor*, published at Philadelphia, and representing the conservative wing of the United Presbyterian Church, looks with a jealous eye upon every ritualistic innovation as a dangerous step toward Rome. In particular it deprecates the introduction of the organ in the praise service of the church as Romish in its origin and tendencies; and with a fidelity to its convictions that does it honor, gives the organ a sturdy opposition. It is however to be feared that the *Instructor* is going Romewards in another direction much faster than its contemporaries of ritualistic tendencies.

Last year the governor of North Carolina issued a Thanksgiving Proclamation over which the *Instructor* rejoices, and expresses its approbation by saying, "We could wish we had more governors like him." The features of the proclamation that call forth this ardent indorsement are as follows:—

"Believing that God Almighty is the source of all authority and power in civil government, and recognizing him in the person of his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of mankind and the giver of every good and perfect gift," etc.

The confession the governor makes which so greatly pleases the *Instructor* is: (1) A confession of the governor's faith individually, and (2) a declaration by whose authority he appoints a day of worship.

As to the governor's formal confession of his faith to the world, we have only to say that if that duty is inseparable from the functions pertaining to civil office, then it fol-

lows that no one but a saint of God can perform the duties and be eligible to civil office. That the governor's confession is one that no one but a Christian can make, is clear from the declarations of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures. In Romans 10:10 it is said: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Also 1 John 4:15: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God."

It will be seen, therefore, that no one but a Christian, except he be a detestable hypocrite, can act as a civil officer, if his duties are such as Governor Scoles has performed to the intense gratification of the *Instructor*. Let it be known generally that National Reform principles, if fully carried out, would make every man ineligible to office, who is not a professed Christian, and it would instantly fall to the ground. A government founded upon National Reform principles would simply offer office as a bounty for the most detestable and Heaven-daring hypocrisy.

The *Instructor*, in indorsing Governor Scoles's avowal that his appointment of a day of worship "by the authority of almighty God, through Jesus Christ his Son," goes Romewards further than the Ritualists can do, for it is the very essence and foundation of Popery. Do not misunderstand us; we recognize God Almighty as the source of all power and authority; we know it, and do not quarrel with Governor Scoles about that. What we deny is that God has ever given the civil ruler power to appoint days of prayer, thanksgiving, praise, or any other part of divine worship. The assumption by Governor Scoles of this power is the same in kind, and only differs from that of the Pope in extent.

That Christ, the king and head of the church, has commissioned his church to appoint such days as are indicated in the providence of God, there can be no doubt. In thus doing they have the promise of the presence of Christ to direct them by his Spirit, and he binds in Heaven what is thus bound on earth. Has Christ, the head of the church, given the same authority to the civil ruler? We compassionate the man who has so little brains or is so hopelessly swayed by prejudice as to so assert.

If the civil ruler has power to appoint one day for worship, he may appoint any number of days, and the church as an organization separate from the State is useless. His government being purely spiritual, in a conflict of prerogative with the State, she must succumb, or the State carries the sword to compel obedience to its appointments. The power assumed by Governor Scoles is the same as is described in 2 Thessalonians as the man of sin, "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." We do not unite with the *Instructor* in the wish that we had more such governors.

Let the *Instructor* present any argument possible for the right of the civil ruler in the name of Almighty God through Christ as

Mediator, to appoint days of worship, the argument will be equally valid for the appointment of any worship that men can render. We think, therefore, that those who are laboring to inaugurate a system of civil government, the avowed object of which is to interfere in spiritual things, and to enforce them by penal enactments, are further on their way to the Papacy, and infinitely more to be feared, than the Ritualists. It is clear to the writer that if the civil ruler is clothed with authority in the smallest particular in spiritual things, *to that extent he is Pope.*

ORIENT.

Morality and Religion.

AS RELATED TO THE STATE—SHOULD SUNDAY OBSERVANCE BE COMPULSORY?

CAN laws which guard religious rights and protect religious privileges be considered oppressive to non-religionists? By no means. It is the duty of every Government to guard all rights, and to protect in the exercise of all privileges which may lawfully be exercised. This is not oppressive to the non-religionist. But religion is a voluntary matter; under coercion it is worthless and a mockery. Nations, States, or individuals cannot be voted pious. That which is a privilege to one, being a matter of conscience, is no privilege to another, whose conscience is not exercised in the same manner. A law to compel the non-religionist to observe religious rites and rules because they are privileges to his religious neighbor, is oppressive. It is an injustice to the man and an injury to religion.

The duty of the Government is not exhausted when it has protected the rights of the religious. Governments are not established for the benefit of any class of their subjects. It is no more the duty of Government to protect the religionist than it is to protect the non-religionist. The non-religionist has a citizenship; he acquires property; he builds a house; he pays taxes; and he has the same right to be protected that his religious neighbor has. He has no right to disturb his neighbor, or hinder him from living out his religion; and his religious neighbor has no right to disturb him in the peaceful possession of his home, because he is not religious; he has no right to compel him to observe religious rites in which he does not believe. Neither has any class of religionists any right to disturb others because they profess a religion different from their own. And it is equally the duty of the Government to protect them all in their rights, whatever their religion may be, or whether or not they have any at all.

In its broadest sense religion is any system or method of worship, without regard to what the object of worship may be. In this sense the angels are religious, for they worship God. But in Christian lands the word is used in a more restricted sense. He is not counted religious, who does not believe in God, his Son Jesus Christ as the only means of salvation, and the Bible as a revelation of God to man. But religion is not to be confounded with morality.

Morality is obedience to the revealed will of God, whose law is a moral law, the only moral rule. Had man retained his innocence, he would still have been a religious being, according to the primary sense of the word, and would have worshiped God as the angels now do. But religion in the commonly-accepted sense would not have existed. There would have been no need of a Saviour; Christ would not have died, and Christianity would not have been. Alexander Campbell, in his debate with Bishop Purcell, said the ten commandments are a synopsis of all religion and morality. Webster says the ten commandments are a summary of morality. Both statements are true, if we consider religion according to its primary signification. But the ten commandments do not contain within themselves the Christian religion; for this is remedial, and a law cannot be remedial. No system which does not contain pardon can recover from guilt and its consequences; law cannot pardon; Christianity does. Therefore the law is not a religious instrument in this sense.

The ten commandments as a whole are the moral law. Each one contains an elementary principle or truth. Though they are all moral, they are also religious, using religion in its primary sense only; that is, obedience to, or worship of, God, such as holy and un-fallen beings could render. But they differ in this, that the religious element predominates in the first four, because they relate more directly to our duty to God; and the moral element predominates in the last six, because they relate more directly to our duty to our fellow-man. But they cannot be so separated that a man may be truly religious and violate any of the last six, or be truly moral and violate any of the first four.

But Christianity is a religion in quite another sense. It is purely remedial; it grows out of the sole fact that man sinned. It is essentially different from the moral law, and its rites and institutions are religious only. They have no moral element. For if they were moral, also, they could not belong to a remedial system, as they would then be a duty on their own account. When the precept was announced, "Repent and be baptized," it was not declared because it was an original or moral obligation, but because of sin; and thus it was added "for the remission of sin." We now come to an important consideration, namely, the relation of the State to religion and morality.

Though the ten commandments are moral, only a moral governor can enforce them on a moral basis. This is shown by considering that the tenth commandment, which is among the moral precepts, because it relates to our duty to man, cannot be enforced at all by civil government; of its violation man can take no cognizance. Human governments are, in this respect, quite limited in their scope. Pure morality has respect to intention as well as to action. In the sight of a moral governor, hatred is murder and lust is adultery; but in the sight of civil governments these are no crimes until they take the

form of actions or open violation of the law. It is for this reason that covetousness cannot be prohibited by human governments. As soon as it takes the form of action it comes under the eighth commandment, which forbids stealing.

Thus it will be seen that a civil government which pretends to enforce the morality of the ten commandments will find itself hedged in by impossibilities; it is compelled to govern only on a civil basis; and if it attempts to go any further than this, it will usurp the prerogatives of Him who alone knows the secrets of the heart.

Now, inasmuch as Christianity is secondary, or remedial, in its nature, and its laws and institutions have no moral element, being purely religious, it is a matter of conviction, of the heart, and does not come at all within the scope of civil government. Without conviction, without the heart's full and complete acquiescence, it is nothing. It is a matter solely between God and our own souls. Man has no right to restrain it, and it is impossible for him to enforce it. Any attempt on his part to do either is a presumptuous usurpation of the rights and prerogatives of the Creator.

The sentiment that the State should support Christianity is not a new one, but this does not demonstrate that it is not a dangerous sentiment. Dr. Talmage, in a recent sermon upon the subject of God in our politics and in our Government, to the supposed objection that there may be somebody who does not believe in God, says:—

"Well, my friends, there are a great many people who do not believe in chastity, a great many who do not believe in the sanctity of the marriage relation, a great many who do not believe in the rights of property, a great many people who do not believe in any style of government—people who would rob and steal and murder. Do you refuse to make laws against criminals because they are criminals? Will you refuse to recognize God in the Government affairs because there are men who do not believe in God?"

We have a regard for the Bible and Christianity, but we protest against that persecuting spirit so foreign to true Christianity, which places an unbeliever because he is an unbeliever, on a level with adulterers, thieves, and murderers. There was a time when "the church" declared that "heresy is the highest crime." Do we wish to return to such a state of things?

We believe in making laws against "criminals because they are criminals," but for no other reason. We do not believe that heresy, or unbelief, or infidelity, is a crime with which human laws have anything to do. To set up such a standard of crime is menacing to our liberties both civil and religious. The present efforts to secure a stricter Sunday law are "straws" in the direction indicated above. Mr. Cook, in the prelude to a recent Monday lecture, said: "You will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest unless you preserve it as a day of worship. Unless its observance be founded upon religious reasons, you will not long maintain it at a high standard." Shall the civil law enforce a religious

institution? Will such a course increase men's piety? Can the people of Massachusetts be made Sabbath-keepers by a few strokes of the pen by our legislators? Nay, verily. Compel a man by law to perform a religious act contrary to his convictions, and you make a hypocrite of him. If he resist the law and it be enforced upon him, you have inaugurated persecution. If my conscience impresses upon me the conviction that I should observe Sunday, let me do it as best I may, but never should I lift my hand to compel my neighbor to pursue the same course. If I can convince him that it is right, that it is a Christian act, and he ought to do it, well and good, but coercion is not the prerogative of the individual or of the State in such matters.

Mr. C. says: "Let us bring the whole population to the church and Sunday-school." Now if we are right in "compelling all, by law, to rest so that we may secure the liberty of each to rest," why not compel all by law to attend the church and Sunday-school? Yes, why not go a step farther and compel all to be baptized?

Again Mr. C. says: "Let church members be instructed in the full scientific as well as biblical significance of Sunday observance." Here we apprehend is where a difficulty will arise. The conscientious Sabbatarian intrenches himself behind the fourth commandment of the decalogue, which says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work." But Sunday is the first day, and he insists that its "biblical significance" is a myth. Shall such be compelled to observe a day which to them has no religious significance whatever?

Again, will the unbeliever, the infidel, or atheist be made pious by compelling him to religiously observe the Sunday?

We can but admire the first amendment of our national constitution. We cannot imagine how the actual and necessary limitations under which human Governments rest can be better expressed than they are in that amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishing of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." In no one part of that instrument is the wisdom of the founders of our Government shown more than in this first amendment. And if we prove ourselves worthy of such an ancestry, we will preserve it just as they left it to us.

Neither Congress nor the Legislature has any right to erect a false standard of religion, and it is not their prerogative to enforce a true one.—*D. A. R., in Worcester (Mass.) Daily Spy.*

It is interesting to observe that our Master, though several times importuned to declare himself to take issue with public evils of the most patent enormity, and to exert his influence on pressing politico-moral questions, on every occasion palpably declined to do anything of the kind.—*W. W. Harris, D. D.*

"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work." Titus 3:1.

The Doings of National Reform.

WE herewith present to our readers a report of the doings of National Reform assembled in convention in the city of Pittsburgh, and also a summary of the work of the Association for the past year.

The Convention assembled Wednesday evening, May 11, at 7:45. After the formalities of opening there was a speech by Rev. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, and one by Rev. J. P. Mills, the Methodist Episcopal "District Secretary" of National Reform; after which Dr. McAllister closed the evening meeting with a statement and an appeal. The statement was that the Association began the year with a debt of between \$2,500 and \$3,000, and that the work had been carried forward on so broad a scale that there had been a little added to the debt, although the receipts had been over \$7,000. Four men had been laboring all of the time, and three others a part of the time. One man had preached 150 sermons, delivered 60 addresses, and had written articles by the score.

He stated that the successful work in the South had awakened enthusiasm in the North, especially in Pittsburgh. He said: "There is developing one of the grandest movements the world ever saw,—a work that is to bring the North and South together. It will bring together all patriots. If we can unite the Christian sentiment of North and South, we shall bridge what has been called the 'bloody chasm.'" The appeal was then for funds to carry on the work. "In the South men of all the different denominations are ready to take hold. There ought to be three or four men to go all through the South, to organize the work. The cause is worthy of your confidence and your means."

"Secretary" Weir is the man who has just made a tour through the South, and an account of his trip was made the special order for the evening session on the morrow.

The first thing after the opening exercises on the morning of the 12th, was the annual report of the Corresponding Secretary. He stated that "the past year has been memorable in the history of the cause, because never before was there such a readiness to receive our speakers. We had speakers at Ocean Grove, at Chautauqua, and at Saratoga. At Saratoga was the most hearty reception. Arrangements have been made for an all-day session at Ocean Grove the coming season, also at a popular resort in Maryland, and near Chicago, and for a three days' session at Lakeside, Sandusky, Ohio. The *Christian Statesman* has been placed in 289 reading-rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association. More than 30,000 of the old series of National Reform documents, and 5,000 of the new series, have been distributed. So that, including the *Christian Statesman*, there has been circulated by systematic and habitual distribution 2,710,000 pages of National Reform literature."

"Besides the regular lectureship of the Association, there have been nearly fifty volun-

teer lecturers, who have given about 100 lectures. The greatest help has been by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Two years ago the Union established a department of Sabbath observance. One year ago, at the suggestion of National Reform, the Union established a department on the Bible in public schools." The secretary himself had addressed their National Convention, and they had thanked him. "Of the monthly responsive readings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, three were in the line of National Reform—one on God in Government, one on Sabbath observance, and one on national sins. Miss Willard loses no opportunity to declare that the Government rests on His shoulders. Both Miss Willard and Mrs. Woodbridge addressed the workingmen and introduced National Reform ideas. And not the least gratifying sign is the fact that for the first time in our history the fear of God has found a place in political platforms. And that this opportunity might be made the most of, the following memorial had been framed, and is to be sent to every person that can be reached; to be signed and returned:—

"The undersigned, who have sympathized and acted with the ——— party, desires that the future platforms of that party shall not fail to contain an acknowledgment of Almighty God as the source of authority and power in civil government, of Christ as the king of all nations, and of the supreme authority of his moral laws; together with declarations favoring the prohibition of the liquor traffic, the defense of the Sabbath, the Christian features of our public education, and a national marriage and divorce law in harmony with the law of Christ. The names of women are desired as well as the names of men!"

"This with the special design of pressing the subject upon the attention of all parties at their next National Convention."

Also last fall an "admirable draft" for thanksgiving proclamations in the name of Christ had been sent to all the governors, but the request had been complied with in only one instance, and that was Governor Scales, of North California. In conclusion he stated that "never before were there echoes of National Reform from so many, nor so influential, quarters," and referred to statements made by Dr. Talmage, "Sam" Jones, Joseph Cook, and others.

Next there was given the reports of District Secretaries. Secretary Foster reported 135 sermons, 65 lectures; interviewed 10 presidents of colleges, 30 professors, and 12 editors; preached in 12 Presbyterian and 11 Methodist Churches, and lifted collections averaging \$109.78 a month. And the people ready for National Reform!

Secretary Wylie reported for "three months, spent mostly in Michigan and Indiana, especially in connection with the Prohibition Campaign in Michigan. Delivered 25 sermons, 39 lectures, visited 2 annual conferences of the United Brethren Church, and 1 of Free Methodist, and 3 colleges. No difficulty to get a hearing in colleges."

Secretary Weir reported that from April 1, 1886, to February 4, 1887, he had addressed in the aggregate over 7,000 people, received

over \$500, traveled 6,400 miles, held 97 interviews, and addressed 4 synods, 2 colleges, and W. C. T. Unions in 3 places. All signs he said point to this as the hour when these things should be pressed upon political parties. "If our enemies say these things shall stay out, we must be determined that they *shall go in*." He spoke of "the workingmen, whom Socialism, and Anarchism, and Catholicism, are all trying to catch." But in the Executive Committee the day before it had been decided that National Reform must secure the workingmen, and that they could best be secured through the agitation of the Sabbath, for workingmen do not want to work on the Sabbath.

Secretary Mills reported seven months' work principally in his own conference, Northern Ohio, and chiefly among M. E. Churches. He published a small sheet himself to help spread his views; gave 12 lectures a month on National Reform direct; collected in all \$375.

Secretary Coleman had addressed 9 meetings, 2 ecclesiastical bodies, and 5 colleges. The coming year the way is open to reach twice as many colleges. He said, "The bad are growing worse, and the good are growing better."

A series of about twelve resolutions was introduced. But neither in the resolutions nor in their discussion was there anything developed that had not been covered in the speeches and reports, except in the one in which the convention complimented the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. One speaker caused a good deal of sparring by saying that he "would not have the ballot put into woman's hands." Mr. Stevenson remarked that he foresees far larger results from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union influence in National Reform than even they themselves realize. Within five years they have laid their hand on the legislation of twenty States, and have secured scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. Another speaker said: "This movement is bound to succeed through the influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union."

Another said: "When we get women and Christ in politics, *and they will both go in together*, we shall have every reform, and Christ will be proclaimed King of kings and Lord of lords."

The chairman closed the debate on this resolution by saying that "when woman undertakes anything good she will do it. And if she attempts anything bad she will accomplish that. What Ahab would not do Jezebel did. And what Herod would not do to John the Baptist otherwise, his wife caused him to do." No one attempted to explain just exactly where, in this observation, there lay the compliment to the W. C. T. U. It seemed to the SENTINEL representative that the compliment was rather backhanded. And yet we could not help wondering whether in the end the observation might not prove true and the simile appropriate, even though it be not pre-eminently complimentary as it stands.

Rev. Mr. McConnel, of Youngstown, Ohio, proposed the formation of "a Praying League,

to be composed of all who are interested in this movement, to covenant together to offer a prayer at the noon hour, wherever they may be, every day till our prayer is answered in the abolition of the liquor traffic, and till this nation is made God's kingdom." The proposition was heartily endorsed by the convention, and Mr. McConnel was given charge of the concern.

Thursday evening, the closing meeting, Secretary Weir occupied in giving the account of his Southern trip. It began February 24 and closed May 11. During this time he delivered 42 addresses, visited 7 States, traveled 2,800 miles, addressed 7,700 people, collected \$157.07, and held 103 interviews, three of which were with the governors of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. The others were with preachers, professors, officials of Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, and editors. Meetings were held in 6 churches of different denominations. Out of the 42 meetings 24 were in these churches; some were even union National Reform meetings. In Raleigh, N. C., the Methodists and Presbyterians united. He gave addresses in 16 educational institutions, 9 of which were colored, and he never had, he said, more attentive listeners. His reception throughout was cordial. "Never," said he, "was I better treated than by the people of the South. All denominations, *every one of them*, all gave a hearty welcome to the cause of National Reform." He only met three people who flatly opposed National Reform, and all three were ministers.

Mr. Weir described the outlook as most promising. He said: "Any man can take National Reform principles and carry them safely and satisfactorily all through the South. In Atlanta, among all the leading people, there was no need to *explain* National Reform. They understand it, and are ready to join hands with us. I believe it is going to be a walk-over in the South. A confederate brigadier said, 'I am a Southerner, was a confederate soldier, a secessionist. But all that is past now, and I am ready to join hands with you at once.' And nine out of every ten will do the same thing."

Mr. Weir then closed with the impressive appeal: "Don't we see in this our opportunity—an opportunity such as seldom comes to any cause? It will have a welcome everywhere. Don't we see how it will build for the unity of the nation? Don't you see in this the unifier of this nation? Some say prohibition will unite them, but *this it is that is to do it*."

And we could not possibly say but that it is true. We have not space for any further comment, but only to remark, that in view of these plain statements of fact in the progress of the National Reform movement in a single year—all given in sober earnest, and none with any air of extravagance nor of braggadocio—how much longer shall the movement have to prosper so, how much longer will it have to grow, before the American people will awake to the fact that the National Reform movement, which bears in its train the union of Church and State, with all the evils that

accompany such an illicit connection, is on the eve of a fearful success? How long shall the AMERICAN SENTINEL have to stand alone amongst the journals of the nation in pointing out the dangers that threaten religious liberty in this land of freedom? How long?

A. T. J.

What Is the Remedy?

AN appreciative reader of the SENTINEL, in Hamilton County, New York, who says that he has read the SENTINEL from the first of its publication, and has also read everything that he could get hold of on the National Reform side, sends us the following clipping from the New York Times, as an indication of the great straits to which men in high positions are driven "in order to avoid the show of religious persecution in the enforcement of the Sunday law:"—

SUNDAY LAW FOR JEWS.

"J. P. Solomon, the editor of the *Hebrew Standard*, recently wrote to the mayor regarding the enforcement of the Sunday law against those Hebrews who kept Saturday as the Sabbath. In his response the mayor says:—

"The Sunday law has been the subject of judicial construction, and it has been decided that it is not based upon religious principles, but upon public policy, and that it is to be observed by all citizens without regard to condition or religious belief. It does not deny to any portion of our citizens the right to observe the Sabbath-day, and it does not compel them to do so. It merely provides that one day in seven shall be a day of rest, and inasmuch as that day cannot be made to suit everybody, a day is selected which suits the majority. Doubtless this inflicts a hardship upon the minority, but under our theory of government it is a hardship which cannot be avoided. . . . The remedy is for these citizens, whom you regard as unoffending, to obey the law which will give them immunity from arrest. I can assure you in conclusion that I have a great respect for the rights of conscience, but if the doctrine were once admitted that the law is to give way to every man who puts in the plea of conscience, the law would become a nullity."

Dr. Franklin said that it is a very convenient thing to be a *reasonable creature*, "since it enables one to find or make a *reason* for everything one has a mind to do." There is not the slightest doubt but that any good Catholic could demonstrate to his own satisfaction the reasonableness of attending mass every Sunday, and if the majority of the people of the United States were Catholics, they could compel the minority to conform to their custom; but in such case the rights of conscience would be outraged, although not more than in the enforcement of Sunday rest upon those who do not believe in it.

Mayor Hewitt admits that the enforcement of the Sunday law will necessarily inflict a hardship upon the minority who observe Saturday, but he says: "Under our theory of government it is a hardship which cannot be avoided." With all respect for his honor, we must say that that statement indicates a very slight knowledge of our theory of government. Has he never read the Declaration of Independence? Does he not know that that declaration, which made us a nation, and of

which the Constitution of the United States is but the outgrowth, was based upon the self-evident truth that "all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?" Perhaps he has read that statement without knowing what it means. It means that in this country the laws must give equal protection to all; it means that the powerful majority must not pass laws to suit their own convenience, regardless of the rights of the feeble minority. The Declaration of Independence is founded upon the principles of justice, and justice works no hardships to a man simply because he is in the minority. A law that works injustice to a single individual is an unjust law.

We can tell exactly how to avoid inflicting a hardship upon the minority who observe Saturday; do not enact Sunday laws. "But this would not meet the minds of the majority." Perhaps not; but it would not hinder the majority from keeping Sunday, and why should one man be compelled to do a thing which he does not want to do, simply because two other men wish to do it? The injustice of such a proceeding is the more marked when we learn that the two can do what they want to, whether the one does it or not.

But reasoning will have no effect to stop a proceeding which outrages reason. Just because there can be no just reason produced for laws enforcing the observance of Sunday, or any other religious ordinance, those who are committed to the enactment of such laws will carry them through. We write with the hope of increasing the number of the minority who will at least *protest*.

What Sophistry!

WHEN we consider the course of action marked out by the National Reform Association, and the object at which they are aiming, and compare them with their avowed statements that the success of their work will not produce a union of Church and State and bring about religious persecutions, we are all led to exclaim, What sophistry!

In a pamphlet published by the association we find that Article 2 of their Constitution reads thus: "The object of this society shall be to obtain such an amendment of the Constitution of the United States as shall suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the source of all power and authority in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and the revealed will of God as of supreme authority in civil affairs." The *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the association, also declares that one object for which they are working is to "place all the Christian laws, institutions and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

Mark their statements: "The Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations;" "the revealed will of God as of supreme authority in civil affairs;" "all the Christian laws" on a "legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." It is indeed surprising and not a little

amusing to hear any organization put forth such statements as the foregoing, and then watch their ebullitions of apparent indignation when we tell them their work will produce a union of Church and State. We have never heard them say so, but it is quite evident from their platform that if they are *not* working for a union of Church and State, they mean to have it *all* Church and *no* State. Perhaps that is a secret of the organization as yet in the background.

There is one point that we cannot get clear in our mind, and that is, If the Reform party succeeds in getting all Christian laws and usages on a legal basis in the law of the land, do they not also intend to enforce them by civil power? And if they do not intend to enforce them by civil power, why put them on the basis of civil law? Again we ask, *Why?*

If Christian laws are enforced by civil enactment, there is no reasoning that can show that such a condition would not be a union of Church and State. *Sophistry* might think to show differently, but unsound reasoning has no blushes, and what it lacks in reasoning it makes up in bombast and ridicule. Let the leaders of the movement step forward and tell us why they want "all Christian laws" on a civil basis if they do not mean to inflict civil punishment upon the transgressors of those laws? And if they do want to inflict civil punishment upon the transgressor of Christian laws, how is it, then, that the Church is not in union with the State. The Church decides the penalty, and the State inflicts it. If this is not a *union* of the two, will some one kindly show us wherein is the *disunion*?

Some more of this sophistry is shown in the following: Pres. J. B. McMichael, D. D., of Monmouth, Ill., made the following significant statement: "To kiss Him (the Son) in any other way than through the regenerated hearts of its citizens, the nation wouldn't survive the wrath of God an hour longer than though it hadn't kissed Him at all." To which the Rev. M. A. Gault replied through the *Statesman*: "There is no one proposing to have the nation kiss Him in any other way than through the regenerated hearts of its citizens, except you and other enemies of National Reformers, who persist in thus misrepresenting the movement in order to excite opposition to it. The movement is laboring to first educate in the minds and hearts of the people submission to Christ; and it does not want the national confession until it comes through the regenerated hearts of the people."

This is only a sample of their sarcastic indignation. Laying aside the sarcasm, let us apply a little reasoning and see how it comes out. We fully agree with President McMichael. But if, as Mr. Gault says, the National Reform does not propose "to have the nation kiss Him in any other way than through the regenerated hearts of its citizens," why have the Christian laws on a legal basis in the law of the land? Will not the regenerated hearts obey all the requirements of God's word without being forced by civil authority? If a man is regenerated in *fact* and not in *name* only, he surely will. Then wherein is the need of

having the Christian laws on a civil basis?

In place of uselessly spending our time and talent trying to *legislate* the "Lord Jesus Christ" into the position of "ruler of nations" in this world, would it not be well to listen and give heed to some of Christ's own words? "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." John 18:36. To undertake to legislate Christ into the position of king of the nations of this world, when God in his word has given us such plain statements as the above, would be the most absurd folly. It would be as foolish as the action of France during the "Reign of Terror," when they passed a law that there was no God. Yet God existed, and still exists, the French law to the contrary notwithstanding. And when Christ has expressly said, "My kingdom is not of this world," can finite man *legislate* to the contrary, and cause the Son of God to acquiesce in opposition to what he has so positively and plainly declared? O sophistry, where is thy blush! A. O. TATT.

Time to Renew.

PLEASE examine the address label on your SENTINEL and if it reads *June* or *July* please send us your renewal this week. Our terms are, cash in advance, only *fifty cents* per year, or if you will send us two *new* subscriptions we will send *you* the paper one year *free*.

Assorted Back Numbers.

Now is the time to do missionary work with the AMERICAN SENTINEL as most everybody is willing to read about the Sunday Question, Constitutional Amendment, National Reform Party, etc.

We will send assorted back numbers of the SENTINEL, post-paid, for \$1.50 per hundred copies. Address, Pacific Press, Publishers, Oakland, California.

Religious Liberty.

A SPEECH of the Hon. Robert H. Crockett, in the Arkansas Legislature, in behalf of a bill which he had introduced into the Legislature, granting immunity from the penalty of the Sunday law, to those who observe the seventh-day Sabbath. The speech itself explains the situation which made the bill a necessity. We have compiled an *eight-page tract* from the speech as it appeared in the *Signs* and AMERICAN SENTINEL (April number) and will send the tract, post-paid, for \$1.00 per hundred copies, or that issue of the SENTINEL at three cents per copy. Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

Sentinel Tracts.

THE Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., has just issued some new tracts treating upon the subjects discussed in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, which they will send, post-paid, at the rate of one cent for each eight pages.

Religious Liberty, 8 pages; National Reform is Church and State, 16 pp.; The Republic of Israel, 8 pp.; Purity of National Religion, 8 pp.; What Think Ye of Christ? 8 pp.; Religious Legislation, 8 pp.; The American Papacy, 8 pp.; National Reform and the Rights of Conscience, 16 pp.; Bold and Base Avowal, 16 pp.; National Reform Movement an Absurdity, 16 pp.; The Salem Witchcraft, 8 pp.; National Reform Constitution and the American Hierarchy, 24 pages.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JUNE, 1887.

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

THOSE who wish to learn what "National Reform" really is, and who wish to become thoroughly familiar with every phase of it, should read the AMERICAN SENTINEL. A single issue of the SENTINEL contains more National Reform argument (always refuted) than both of the National Reform organs do in a month. The *Statesman* has now taken to copying from the SENTINEL articles which National Reformers have sent to us, and which we have reviewed. It is perhaps needless to say that the *Statesman* never favors its readers with the reply of the SENTINEL. It well knows that its only strength consists in keeping its readers ignorant of the argument against its theories. In this respect National Reform closely follows its exemplar, the Papacy. The SENTINEL will still continue to publish "both sides," always being careful to indicate clearly on which side truth and justice stand.

In his report from North Carolina, "Secretary" Weir takes occasion to eulogize Governor Scales, because he alone accepted the sample thanksgiving proclamation which the National Reform Association sent last fall to the governors of the various States. Mr. Weir says of him: "He is, of course, greatly interested in National Reform, although not yet familiar with its doctrines and work. To use his own language, he is for 'whatever will advance the honor of the Lord Jesus.'"

If that is the case, he will do well to let National Reform alone. Christ cannot be honored by any such cheap means as voting him king, even of all the earth. Whatever power Christ has or ever will have is solely by virtue of his being the Son of God, and any action that man may take will not affect his state in the least. If every man on earth should say, "We will not have this man to rule over us," his power would not be diminished; and if they should all vote to make him king, they would not add a feather's weight to his power and glory. On the contrary, a vote to recognize the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, would be dishonoring in the extreme; for it is inconceivable but that in the most perfect campaign possible among mortals, some would vote through policy or desire for gain. And in no way is Christ more dishonored than by hypocritical professions of loyalty to him.

WE stated above that it would be impossible but that in any general election that could be held, some votes would be cast, not from principle, but from hope of gain. The following quotation from a speech by a Dr. Browne, in the Pittsburgh National Convention of 1874,

shows that the National Reformers themselves do not expect that all who join their movement will do so from purely unselfish motives:—

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

And when with such help as this they have voted Jesus Christ king of this republic (!) then they think they will have given him all the honor that is his due. We can only pity the blindness of those who have so low a sense of the honor due to Christ the Son of God. The only way that he can be honored is by humble obedience to his requirements, and this must be the voluntary tribute of each individual for himself. Says Christ: "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

Legislation by Clamor.

It is already evident that one feature of the "new time" into which we are hastening will be the subjection of Legislatures to the pressure of groups of persons who are capable of controlling newspapers or combining votes. Under the old notions of Legislation, the duty of legislators was to study carefully the details of proposed legislation, to debate and discuss measures, and so, by deliberation, to arrive at decisions as to what should be enacted. The notion was that the statesman should know what he intended to do and should consider the proper means of reaching the desired result. This theory of legislation never has been very thoroughly put to practice anywhere, but now the idea seems to be that it is antiquated, that we do not intend to seek a more complete realization of it as a reform in legislation, but that we abandon it altogether.

At the same time, therefore, that there is a vast extension of the field of legislation, we abandon all sound traditions as to the method of legislative activity. Legislative bodies not only lay themselves open to be acted upon by outside influences, but they submit to clamor more than to any other influence. The tendency can be traced through the legislation of France, England and the United States, during the last twenty years. If a faction of any kind assails the Legislature with sufficient determination, they carry their point, although the sincere opinion of nearly all who vote for the measure may be that it is foolish, or idle, or mischievous, or crude, or irrational, or extravagant, or otherwise improper to be passed.

Opinions differ greatly as to what it is which is "falling" or "going to decay" just at present. These phenomena support the notion that it is "the State" which is passing away. On the one hand, the highest wisdom of those who

want anything now is to practice terrorism, to make themselves as disagreeable as possible, so that it shall be necessary to conciliate them, and those who appeal to reason find themselves disregarded. On the other hand, the public men seek peace and quiet by sacrificing anyone who cannot or does not know enough to make a great clamor in order to appease a clamorous faction. It is thought to be the triumph of practical statesmanship to give the clamorers something which will quiet them, and a new and special kind of legislative *finesse* has been developed, viz., to devise projects which shall seem to the clamorous petitioners to meet their demands, yet shall not really do it.—Prof. William G. Sumner, in *Independent*.

If the triumph of National Reform theories were dependent upon the efforts of the body known as the National Reform Association, the lovers of "pure religion and undefiled" would not be called on for very strenuous opposition, for although it boasts a great many names, it cannot boast many original ideas. Both the *Christian Statesman* and the *Christian Nation* seem to have long ago exhausted the argument for National Reform, for were it not for the Constitution of the National Reform Association, which they keep standing, the reader would often be at a loss to know why the papers are printed. But what are called National Reform principles are not confined to the National Reform Association. There are individual women of the W. C. T. U., who are doing more for the advancement of those principles than all the men connected with the National Reform Association. And the W. C. T. U. is not the only additional factor in the work. George Parsons Lathrop, writing of national Christianity, in the May number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, said: "It has not been tried yet, and it is not one of the least hopeful signs of the times, that a disposition to give it a serious probation is developing simultaneously in several quarters." The movement will receive some of its most powerful assistance from quarters where it would least be expected, for politics makes strange bedfellows. National Reform heresy is developing as though, like a physical pestilence, the germs were in the air, and men who love liberty need to be awake and guarding every point.

"ONLY he who respects the liberty of others is worthy of liberty."

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.