

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY, 1887.

NUMBER 7.

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.

RELIGION, and this really includes morality, is a matter which from its original, nature, and object, lies entirely beyond the reach and control of the State proper.—*Schuettle*.

In his speech at the late National Reform Convention, Rev. T. P. Stevenson remarked that,—

"Every reform is rooted in some principle. The Reformation was rooted in the great principle of justification by faith. The great doctrine of religious liberty rests upon the basis of the inviolability of the conscience—that God alone is Lord of the conscience."

That is all true. The progress of the Reformation in the sixteenth century and onward has been but the progress of truth. Each successive step in reform has been but the development of one more principle of truth. No movement can be a genuine reform if it subverts or repudiates any principle of reform already developed. Now the great doctrine of religious liberty is inseparable from the Reformation. It is just as essential a principle as justification by faith, itself. It rests indeed upon the *inviolability* of the conscience, and upon the truth that God *alone* is Lord of the conscience.

But this so-called National Reform repudiates this fundamental principle of the Reformation. It declares that the State has "the right to command the consciences of men." It refuses to be comforted with a Constitutional acknowledgment of God, because such acknowledgment would *not* "impose any restraint on the conscience." But if the State has the right to command the consciences of men, then God is not alone Lord of the conscience. And if men have the right by civil enactment to impose restraint upon the conscience, then there is no such principle as the inviolability of the conscience.

Therefore this so-called National Reform, in repudiating this fundamental principle of the Reformation, shows itself to be not a reform at all, but subversive of the Reformation and a return to both the *ante* and *anti*-Reformation principles of the Papacy.

The Prospects of National Reform.

To THE regular readers of the SENTINEL we need offer no argument here to prove that the success of National Reform will be the union of Church and State in this Government. This has been amply proved in preceding numbers of this paper; yet if there are any of our new readers who have not seen the proofs of it, we are prepared to furnish the evidence, upon demand, in any quantity, and at short notice. Knowing therefore that the success of the National Reform will be the union of Church and State, it becomes important to all people to know what are the prospects of its success. This is especially important in view of the *fact* that the movement is even now on the very eve of success. To set this fact forth as it shall be the purpose of this article.

1. The movement is supported by "all evangelical denominations." The Association has one hundred and twenty vice-presidents, *eighty* of whom, including Joseph Cook, are Revs. and Rev. D. Ds., and Rev. D. D., LL.Ds., and some are even *Right Rev. D. D., LL.Ds.* Of these *eighty*, *eleven* are bishops made up from the Episcopal, Evangelical, and United Brethren Churches. Besides these *eighty* divines, there are in the list *ten* college professors, *one* governor, *three* ex-governors, *nine* justices of Supreme Courts, *two* judges of Superior Courts, *one* judge of the United States District Court, *one* brevet brigadier-general, *one* colonel, and *seven* prominent officials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

2. The W. C. T. U. is counted, both by themselves and the National Reformers, as one with the National Reform Association. Miss Willard, Mrs. Woodbridge, Mrs. Bateham, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Mrs. Clara Hoffman, Mrs. Mary T. Lathrop, and Mrs. W. I. Sibley, of the Union, are all vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. In the Pittsburg National Reform Convention, May 11, 12, 1887, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman* and corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association, in his annual report made the following statement of the co-operation of the W. C. T. U. with National Reform:—

"Two years ago Miss Frances E. Willard, president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, suggested the creation of a special department of its already manifold work for the promotion of sabbath observance, "*co-operating with the National Reform Association.*" The suggestion was adopted at the National Convention in St. Louis, and the department was placed in charge of Mrs. Josephine C. Bateham, of Ohio, as national super-

intendent. Mrs. Bateham has since, with her own cordial assent, been made one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association.

"One year ago your secretary placed in the hands of President Willard a memorandum suggesting the creation of another department 'for the retention of the Bible in the public schools,' and assigning reasons for such action. This step was recommended by Miss Willard in her annual address before the late National Convention at Minneapolis, and was adopted in so far that a committee was appointed to make preliminary inquiries during the coming year, with Miss Willard herself at the head of the committee.

"It was your secretary's privilege this year again to attend the National W. C. T. U. Convention, and it would be unjust and ungrateful not to acknowledge here the cordiality with which for the sake of the cause he was received. A place was kindly given for an address in behalf of the National Reform Association, and thanks were returned by vote of the convention. A resolution was adopted *expressing gratitude to the National Reform Association* 'for its advocacy of a suitable acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ in the fundamental law of this professedly Christian nation.'

"In the series of 'Monthly Readings' for the use of local Unions as a responsive exercise, prepared or edited by Miss Willard, the reading for last July was on 'God in Government;' that for August on 'Sabbath Observance' (prepared by Mrs. Bateham), and that for September on 'Our National Sins.' *Touching the first and last-named readings* your secretary had correspondence with Miss Willard before they appeared.

"A letter has been prepared to W. C. T. U. workers and speakers, asking them, in their public addresses, to refer to and plead for the Christian principles of civil government. The president of the National Union allows us to say that this letter is sent *with her sanction and by her desire.*

"The heartiness and intelligence, the faith and courage, with which these Christian women embrace and advocate the fundamental principles of Christian government are most gratifying. Mrs. Woodbridge chose for her theme at Ocean Grove and Chautauqua, 'Shall the United States Acknowledge Christ as Sovereign?' Miss Willard loses no opportunity of declaring that 'the Government is on his shoulder.' Similar expressions are constantly on the lips of their leading speakers and writers. . . . Mrs. Woodbridge, in her address to the Workingmen's Assembly in Cleveland, appealed to them to join hands with the temperance forces in placing this 'Government upon the shoulder of him who is Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, and in crowning Christ our Lord as the Ruler of Nations.'"

3. The workingmen. It will be seen by the above that the National Reform Association

has not only gained the Union itself, but that through the Union it is making strong bids for the Knights of Labor and other workingmen's associations. Indeed, it was stated in the late convention that "the Anarchists, the Socialists, and the Catholic Church are all trying to catch the workingmen, but *National Reform must secure the workingmen.*" And we are safe in saying that National Reform will secure them. Even though the Roman Church should secure the workingmen's associations, bodily, that will be no hindrance to National Reform's securing them, for of all the bids for support that the National Reform Association is making the strongest are made for the support of

4. *The Catholic Church.* Thus says the *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884:—

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

And again:—

"We cordially, gladly recognize the fact that in South American republics, and in France, and other European countries, the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity, and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism. . . . In a world's conference for the promotion of national Christianity many countries could be represented only by Roman Catholics."—*Editorial before quoted.*

Now let us read a word from Rome. In his Encyclical published in 1885, Pope Leo XIII. says:—

"We exhort all Catholics who would devote careful attention to public matters, to take an active part in all municipal affairs and elections, and to further the principles of the church in all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert the utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usage of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled to the principles of the true church. All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose for an instant from view the above prescriptions. All Catholics should redouble their submission to authority, and unite their whole heart and soul and body and mind in defense of the church and Christian wisdom."

From the above quotations from the *Statesman* it is seen that in European and South American countries the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of National Christianity. National Christianity is the object of the National Reform movement; our Constitution and legislation have to be remodeled before this national Christianity can be established; to remodel our Constitution and legislation is the aim of National Reform; but this is exactly what "all Catholics" are by the pope *ex cathedra* commanded to do, and not to lose sight of it for an instant. What the National Reformers propose to do with our Constitution and legislation is precisely what the Roman Catholics in this country are commanded by the Pope to do. Therefore the aim of National Reform and the aim of Rome

are identical, and of course they will "gladly join hands."

5. The Prohibition party as such. The National Reform report before mentioned says on this point:—

"The national platform of the Prohibition party adopted in Pittsburg in 1884, contained an explicit acknowledgment of Almighty God, and of the paramount authority of his law as the supreme standard of all human legislation. The Rev. Dr. A. A. Miner, D. D., of Boston, an eloquent and devoted friend and *one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association*, was a member of the committee which framed the declaration. After that presidential campaign was over, and before the State conventions of 1885, Professor Wallace, of Wooster University, wrote to your secretary, suggesting that all diligence be used to secure similar acknowledgments and kindred declarations on related points, in the Prohibition platforms of the several States. Under this most judicious and timely suggestion, a large correspondence has been held with the leaders of the party, and its chief workers in many States."

And then of the State and county Prohibition Conventions that have "incorporated into their platforms" distinct acknowledgment of National Reform principles, there are named the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Maryland, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Colorado, Texas, and Connecticut; and the counties of Washington, Lancaster, and Chester, Pa., and Belmont, Ohio.

WHAT SHALL BE THE ISSUE?

Now take the voters of "all the evangelical denominations;" the voters of the Prohibition party; the voters of the workingmen's associations; and the voters of the Catholic Church; and it is perfectly clear that they compose an overwhelming majority of all the voters in this nation; and much more would it be so if the W. C. T. U. should secure their demanded right of suffrage. *And against this thing there will be no "solid South."* Take, then, all the voters that are here represented; take with them an issue upon which all will heartily unite; veil National Reform under that issue; then bring that issue to a vote at the polls, and it is absolutely certain that it will carry by a vast majority.

Is there then any such issue in view? There is such an issue, and that already clearly defined and well developed. That issue is THE UNIVERSAL DEMAND FOR SUNDAY LAWS, or, as otherwise expressed, laws enforcing the observance of the "Christian Sabbath." Every one of these bodies that we have named will almost unanimously support whatever demand may be made for Sunday laws, even to the subversion of the national Constitution to secure them. The reader needs not to be told that all the churches are in favor of rigid Sunday laws. It is well known that one grand aim of the W. C. T. U. is to secure the enactment and enforcement of strict Sunday laws. The Baltimore Plenary Council, indorsed by the Pope, commands the observance of Sunday, and the Romish Church will heartily support any movement to enforce its observance by national laws. It is this very thing that makes the National Reform Association so anxious to secure the help of Rome.

Both the Catholic and the National Reform papers urge upon the workingmen that as they have already struck for eight hours for a day's work, now they must strike for six days for a week's work, and Sunday secured by law.

In the late National Reform Convention, it was not only stated as we have quoted that "National Reform must secure the workingmen," but it was also said that "they could best be secured through the agitation of the Sabbath." And they are securing them by this very means. The Illinois Legislature, which we believe is yet in session, had before it for passage a Sunday law framed by the preachers of Chicago—it might well have been framed by the Inquisition itself—and a petition, said to represent 25,000 Knights of Labor, was sent up urging its passage. Nor does the movement stop with the Knights of Labor and other workingmen's associations, but even the Socialists join themselves to the movement and are welcome, as the following from the *Christian Union* testifies:—

"It is very clear that if our Sabbath [Sunday, of course] is to be preserved at all—and we are sanguine of its preservation—the *non-religious sentiment of the country must be brought in to re-enforce the religious demand* for Sabbath [Sunday] rest, and it is increasingly evident that this is entirely practicable. And, curiously, what renders this practicable is that horrid 'Socialism' which keeps some good people lying awake o' nights in fear and trembling."

Are not the Legislatures of all the States already being besieged at every session with demands for the enactment of rigorous Sunday laws with no respect whatever to the rights of conscience? Only the past winter such demands were made upon the Legislatures of California, Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Illinois, and we know not how many other States. Such laws were secured in Massachusetts and Tennessee, and passed the House in Illinois sweepingly and with cheers—we have not learned the result in the Senate. But State laws will amount to but little while national statutes are wanting. And now Congress itself is to be besieged. Reformed Presbyterianism and National Reform are identical—each is t'other—and of the action of their Synod held last month, the dispatches tell us this:—

"The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of America, in session here, has adopted a resolution declaring that the violation of the Sabbath by the Post-office Department is one of the greatest sins of the Government, as well as one of the greatest causes of the Sabbath desecration throughout the whole commonwealth, and calling upon the *organization of all evangelical bodies in the United States* to combine in order to secure the *entire abolition* of whatever in the Post-office Department is a violation of the *Sabbath law.*"

And the National Reform Committee of the United Presbyterian General Assembly, also held in June, passed the following resolution:—

"Resolved, That the moderator and clerks be directed to append their signatures in behalf of the Assembly to the [National Reform] petition requesting Congress to pass a law instructing the Postmaster-General to make no future contracts which shall include the carrying of the mails on the Lord's day."

Of course under the Constitution as it is, Congress can pass no such law, because the passing of all such laws, whether by Congress or by State Legislatures, is essentially religious legislation, and is prohibited by the Constitution. Therefore it is that the National Reform Association wants the Religious Amendment adopted, making the Constitution to recognize the Christian religion, and so give a basis for Sunday legislation.

Here then is the situation. The National Reform Association proposes a Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Through such an Amendment there will be formed a union of Church and State. Under cover of the universal demand for Sunday laws, the question of the Constitutional Amendment can be made a question of national politics, and can be brought to a vote of the nation. When it is so brought to a vote, the National Reform Association can bring to the polls, in its support, the voters of "all evangelical churches," the voters of the Prohibition party, the voters of the Catholic Church, the voters of the Knights of Labor, and the workingmen generally, and with these the Socialists and all the rest of the non-religious rabble, and the whole thing sanctified by the sweet influences of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and so can carry it as sweepingly as inquisitorial Sunday laws are now carried in some of the State Legislatures.

We pretend not at all to say how soon this may be the grand question in national politics. It *can* be done very soon, but whether soon or late, we know, and so everyone else who will look at this thing exactly as it is, may know, that whenever the day comes that it is brought to a vote it will as surely carry as that day comes. That that day will come is as sure as that these facts exist. And when it does come, then there comes with it a union of Church and State, with its whole train of attendant evils in this Government. And in that day, liberty—whether civil or religious—will forever take her departure from this dear land, her last and happiest home on earth. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." And *now* such vigilance is demanded as never before in the history of the nation. May God arouse the people to a sense of it.

A. T. J.

NATIONAL REFORM District Secretary J. M. Foster says:—

"The same cry that aroused the crusaders in the eleventh century to rescue the holy sepulcher from the hands of the infidel, will awake the hosts of Immanuel to rescue this land from the powers of the world, and incorporate it in the *City of God*."—*Christian Statesman*, June 2, 1887.

We have an idea that that is just about the straight truth in the matter as it will be when National Reform gets to its full tide of progress. Then, as like causes produce like effects, we may expect to see again enacted some of the fanatical scenes of the crusades. Says Waddington: "The crusaders exclaimed, 'It is the will of God!' and in that fancied behest, the fiercest brutalities which the world ever beheld sought—not palliation, but—honor and the crown of eternal reward."

The Question Met—and Evaded!

THE Religious Amendment party has utterly failed to vindicate itself under the indictment which we have brought against the movement. The SENTINEL has taken up the leading declaration of what they "propose" to do; it has analyzed it, and clearly pointed out its tendency, and its unavoidable results; it has examined the main points in their own reports of the speeches of their leading men; it has followed the *Statesman* in its editorials and in its correspondence; and while they have maintained an apparently studied silence in regard to our exposure of their errors and sophistries, they console themselves with asserting that our arguments do not "meet the question." We now propose to show that the question has been meandering in the hands of its friends, and can only be met by crossing its winding track.

A National Convention of the Amendmentists was held in Pittsburg in 1869. In the call for this convention are found the following words:—

"The National Association, which has been formed for the purpose of securing such an Amendment to the National Constitution as will remedy this great defect, indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the nation, invites," etc.

In the Cincinnati Convention in 1872, Dr. T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, and Recording Secretary of the National Association, delivered an address on "The Legal Effect and Practical Value of the Proposed Amendment," in which he attempted to guard the expression of the above "call" as follows:—

"It will furnish a legal basis for all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our Government. . . . It is all Christian laws, institutions, and usages *in our Government*. We do not propose to find a basis for the laws and institutions of the church, of Christian families, or of the closet, in the National Constitution; but for that great body of laws, institutions, and usages, *in our Government*, which are of Christian origin."

This disclaimer is worthless, for two reasons: 1. It is neutralized by other statements of the "Reformers," and of Doctor Stevenson himself, as we shall show. 2. There is no "great body of laws, institutions, and usages in our Government, which are of Christian origin." In fact, there is not a single law, institution or usage in our Government which is of Christian origin, as we shall presently notice.

In the second Pittsburg Convention, held in 1874, Hon. Felix R. Brunot, president both of the association and of the convention, announced the object of their movement as follows:—

"We propose 'such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States (or its preamble) as will suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the author of the nation's existence and the ultimate source of its authority, Jesus Christ as its ruler, and the Bible as the supreme rule of its conduct, and thus indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an

undeniable legal basis in the fundamental laws of the land."

President Brunot quoted the above words from their previously made declaration of principles. The limitation for which Mr. Stevenson made his plea was not inserted. We shall give reasons for believing that there was no intention to have it inserted.

Regarding this declaration of principles a letter of inquiry was addressed to the *Statesman*, asking if they meant what they said; if, inasmuch as baptism and the Lord's Supper are "Christian institutions," it was their intention to have these placed on a legal basis. But, instead of "touching the real question," they evaded it, and gave the following as the enumeration of the points at which they aimed:—

"Among these are the laws which regulate marriage, and those which forbid and punish blasphemy, the offering of prayer in our National and State Legislatures, the maintenance of religious worship and instruction in our asylums, reformatories, and jails, the observance of public thanksgivings and fasts, the use of the oath in courts of justice, and many others. All these, moreover, are proper to the State, and cannot, in any candid mind, be confounded with baptism and the Lord's Supper."

No; these are not to be confounded with baptism and the Lord's Supper, because these latter are "Christian institutions," while those enumerated by the *Statesman* are not! Not one of the things mentioned by the *Statesman* is peculiar to Christianity. When the question was raised as to what would be the effect of the Religious Amendment on the Jew, an officer of the association replied: "We are not a Jewish, but a Christian nation; therefore our legislation must be conformed to the institution and spirit of Christianity." And yet it is a fact that the Jewish nation had every law, institution, and usage which the *Statesman* enumerated, which can be drawn from the Scriptures. Of late a conference of Jewish rabbis appointed a committee to draw up a petition to be presented to Congress, urging that body to pass a national marriage law. And yet our model Reformers tell us that marriage is a Christian institution. The truth is, that the origin of marriage is given in the Hebrew Scriptures, and the institution antedates Christianity. And so of the other points named.

But, we inquire, what effect did the inquiry have on the National Reformers? It led them to be yet more guarded in their platform, and it now reads thus:—

"The object of this society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government, to promote needed reforms in the action of the Government," etc., "and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government," etc.

We might safely challenge them to show that there are any "Christian features" in our Government—anything that is peculiar to Christianity. But the point we wish to notice now is, that this platform does not really express their designs. In the Pittsburg Convention Dr. Stevenson gave an address on "The Ends We Seek," before President Brunot took the chair and announced what they "propose" to do. Dr. S. said:—

"Through the immense largesses it receives from corrupt politicians, the Roman Catholic Church is, practically, the established church of the city of New York. These favors are granted under the guise of a seeming friendliness to religion. We propose to put the substance for the shadow, to drive out the counterfeit by the completer substitution of the true."

This language may seem much or little; we shall have to interpret it by other statements which more clearly reveal their designs. In this same address Mr. Stevenson said:—

"Our hopes, too, look beyond the mere maintenance of our Christian institutions as they are. We must do more than merely arrest the current which is bearing us away from God and religion. We must begin to make progress in the opposite direction. The success of our movement will be the introduction of a springing and germinant principle into the Constitution, which will yet redeem American politics from all unholy influences, and enable us to attain to a complete and consistent character as a Christian nation."

There is no mistaking this language. To expect to exclude "unholy influences" from American politics, and yet maintain the republic—allow the right of suffrage to the people—is the sheerest folly. The truth is that the success of their schemes will leave scarcely a vestige of the present features of our Government, which is "of the people, by the people, and for the people." And here we will let President Brunot put a quietus upon the idle assertions of recent writers in the *Statesman*. They present the Government of Israel as the one after which they wish to pattern, and declare that it was a republic, and that under it the people had larger liberty than we have in this Government. In President Brunot's address in the Pittsburg Convention, February 4, 1874, he said:—

"Up to the Christian era no nation permitted freedom of conscience in religion. The government of the Israelites was a theocracy. The laws came directly from God."

This is the truth; but to the same extent that these words are true, to that extent the words of the writers referred to are false.

Particular attention is called to the statement of Doctor Stevenson, that it is *not* their intention to merely maintain "the existing Christian features in our Government," whatever that expression may mean. The adoption of the proposed Religious Amendment would be the introduction of a "germinant principle into our Constitution;" it would be only the beginning of the complete subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power in the nation. Listen to another avowal from the *Christian Statesman* of November 1, 1883:—

"An acknowledgment of God does not of itself impose any *restraint on the conscience*, nor fix a single law requiring obedience. We have it in our State Constitutions, and it has little or no force. . . . But we do not stop here. This is simply the foundation for an imposing structure. These principles are only premises; the conclusion is yet to come, and it has the dangerous character of the syllogism, that the conclusion *must* come, and come with invincible power."

We have found that these reformers often publicly claim much less than they mean, but their words are too significant and strong

to permit us to believe that they ever mean less than they claim. The conclusion which has "the dangerous character of the syllogism," and which *must* "come with invincible power," is the self-same conclusion which was involved in the Councils of the Catholic Church, and wrought out practically by the Inquisition.

We hope that American citizens do not need any argument to prove to them that the civil Government has no right to put "any restraint upon the conscience." Yet this is exactly what the National Reformers demand; they affirm that "the church" shall determine what restraints the Government shall put upon the consciences of religious minorities, of dissenters, as well as of the non-religious.

Now while we have taken up the various items of their platform; the published speeches made in their National Conventions; the editorials and correspondence of their papers; and the reports of their "district secretaries;" we have analyzed and shown the tendency of their utterances, their professed arguments; and we have carefully set forth the necessary and undeniable results of the success of their movement—they have not taken up and reviewed a single article of the *SENTINEL*; they have not met a single argument we have presented on the tendencies and results of their movement; they have not attempted to justify their absurd statements wherein they not only confound religion and morality, but religion and crime; and yet they have the effrontery to say that it is unnecessary for them to notice our arguments, because we do not meet the point! Some time since, when this assertion was reiterated, we invited them to frankly and plainly tell us what the point is; what is the question at issue; and if it is not found in their platform; in their published speeches; in their weekly organs, either as editorials or correspondence, to just indicate where we might find it, and we promised to notice it fully and at length, but all in vain. From their actions we might infer that they had joined a perpetual "mum social."

There are many intelligent and inquiring people carefully watching the progress of this controversy. And the number of such is fast increasing. And the self-styled Reformers may rest assured that, in the eyes of the real inquirer, accusations of ignorance of history, of the Bible, and of government, in which they have freely indulged, are poor substitutes for argument. We would be glad to know whether they ever intend to try to "meet the question," fairly and squarely on its merits.

J. H. W.

GOVERNMENTS have it not in their power to do their subjects the least service as to their religious beliefs and mode of worship. On the contrary, whenever the civil magistrate interposes his authority in matters of religion, otherwise than in keeping the peace amongst all religious parties, you may trace every step he has taken by the mischievous effects his interposition has produced.—*Burgh*.

A Little Comparison.

THE *Christian Statesman* of February 24 says:—

"The constant struggle for place and pelf and power in American politics, closely resembles the struggles for the throne in the last days of the Roman Empire, and every thoughtful student of history must be struck by the correspondence."

Very true; and the thoughtful student of history will be struck by another correspondence which the *Statesman* forgot to mention. In the last days of the Roman Empire many professed Christians, whose zeal outran their piety, thought that politics would be vastly improved if only the church were placed under State patronage, and were allowed a controlling voice in public affairs. Accordingly Constantine did for the church just what the National Reform Association is trying to accomplish in these days. What he did, and its consequences, is thus told by Eugene Lawrence:—

"In the last great persecution under Diocletian the bishops of Rome probably fled once more to the catacombs. Their churches were torn down, their property confiscated, their sacred writings destroyed, and a vigorous effort was made to extirpate the powerful sect. But the effort was vain. Constantine soon afterward became emperor, and the bishop of Rome emerged from the catacombs to become one of the ruling powers of the world. This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishop drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna, and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot, and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the religion which he professed.

"The bishopric of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud. The bishop was elected by the clergy and populace of the city, and this was the only elective office at Rome. Long deprived of all the rights of freemen, and obliged to accept the senators and consuls nominated by the emperors, the Romans seemed once more to have gained a new liberty in their privilege of choosing their bishop. They exercised their right with a violence and a factious spirit that showed them to be unworthy of possessing it. On the election day the streets of Rome were often filled with bloodshed and riot. The rival factions assailed each other with blows and weapons. Churches were garrisoned, stormed, sacked, and burned; and the opposing candidates, at the head of their

respective parties, more than once asserted their spiritual claims by force of arms."

Much more might be given to the same effect. The struggle for place and power is not yet so openly shameless as it was in the days of Rome's decline; but once let the church, as a church, enter into politics, and the climax will be reached. The lesson which the thoughtful student of history will draw from this, is that men cannot be converted by the forms of religion, and that if the State is controlled by unprincipled men, a union of Church and State will simply result in the church's being controlled by the same wicked men. The unregenerated human nature that is in any man will make itself manifest whether he is in the church or out of it.

E. J. W.

"At It Again."

THIS is the title of a very appropriate cartoon inserted in *Puck* for November 18, 1885. It represents the Pope with the triple crown on his head and himself crawling through the ballot-box, to pull down that clause in the Constitution which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." Just above the crawling Pope, suspended from the wall, are extracts from the Papal Encyclical.

1. "Every Catholic should rigidly adhere to the teachings of the Roman pontiffs, especially in the matter of modern liberty, which, already, under the semblance of honesty of purpose, leads to error and destruction."

2. "All Catholics must make themselves felt as active clements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs."

3. "All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church."

With this picture the motto of *Puck* is very appropriate—"What fools these mortals be."

In the coalition about to be formed between the Papists and the Protestants, this picture well represents the case. It is through the ballot-box that the National Reformers propose to amend the Constitution. And the National Reformers well understand that they can do nothing of the kind without the aid of the Roman Catholics. The Roman Church looks to the subjugation of all earthly Governments. This she has publicly stated many times, and, with a mixture of haughtiness and effrontery, she still urges forward her claims to political power, and to the right to dictate to politicians and statesmen and Governments what policy they shall pursue.

That she has done this in time past, none will deny; that kings and emperors have sat at the feet of the Pope and done his bidding, all history attests; but to a great extent this galling yoke was broken in the progress of liberty and Protestantism since the Reformation. But now Protestantism proposes to undo all her past good deeds, by making religion an element in our national Constitution; and this the proposed Amendment will in effect accomplish. They proclaim to the world their willingness and even their ardent

desire to cast this fire-brand of religious controversy into the arena of political strife, thus signifying to all that they wish to have a hand in once more inaugurating wars of extermination, similar to those of the Dark Ages, when Peter the Hermit preached extermination of the Turk, or such a war as the bigoted Philip of Spain confidently entered upon, when he built his huge ships and sent his Invincible Armada to frighten Queen Bess out of her Protestant ideas of allowing her little island to become a safe asylum for religious refugees from the Inquisitions and Bastilles of the continent.

The Sigismund of 1414, who violated his word with Huss and Jerome, and such monarchs as Philip II. of Spain, decided in religious controversy as to what church or what doctrines all should accept; and the Church of Rome is responsible in a large measure for the course pursued by kings and emperors and States of that age.

When a church uses its influence to corrupt the State, that moment the church becomes responsible to God for the blind, mistaken course any Government will enter upon in the administration of religious affairs; and once established, laws of this kind will not be relinquished by the State without a struggle. Such power once attained is a boon to legislators who stoop to any device to gain honor, wealth, or preferment; hence such power as the Amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposes to vest in civil rulers, has dangerous precedents.

Such power, the National Reformers affirm, was vested in the Hebrew State; and certainly all will admit it was evil when bad rulers administered it. So here, we cannot expect to elect good and holy men to the offices of Government; therefore, it will be with us as it was with Israel when Ahab reigned. Elijah will have to flee forty days' journey into the wilderness, and many Protestant amendmentists will bitterly rue the day they amended the Constitution; for the Government is already under Papal rule to some extent, and it will be wholly so when the Amendment is carried out. Then will Protestant bigots realize the part they have acted in helping the Pope to crawl through the ballot-box. Well does one artist say, "At it again;" in other words, "History is repeating itself."

JOSEPH CLARKE.

IN a note on the annual meeting of the National Reform Association and its demand for national religion, the *Christian at Work* makes the suggestive remark that "it is noteworthy that nothing is said as to the deterioration of religious life in the family, nor is any allusion made as to the means for supplying that deficiency." That is true. Likewise there is nothing said of the deterioration of genuine godliness in the church. All the lack is in the hypothetical individual which they call the nation; that is the butt of all their complaints. They may plaster the national Constitution all over with Religious Amendments, but such methods will never plant practical religion in the family nor sup-

ply the lack of vital godliness in the church. They may plead that it is by increased godliness in the family and in the church that they expect to get the Religious Amendment to the Constitution. But it is not so. That association is making no effort to increase godliness in either the family or the church. Its methods and its aims are wholly political, not moral. And this movement being so largely indorsed by the churches is proof positive and confessed that those churches are powerless to do the work which God gave the church to do. Nor will a Constitutional Amendment supply the power. True, it will give the churches the power to force upon the ungodly their own form of godliness without the power, all which will only increase unto more ungodliness. And from all such people and their work the word of God commands to turn away. Look at 2 Tim. 3: 1-5.

The State, the Church, and the School.

WE have received from the author, C. H. I. Schuette, A. M., a book entitled, "The State, the Church, and the School." It is quite a full and free discussion of each of these institutions in itself, and in its relation to the others. He first discusses "The State"—"Its Nature and Office," "Its Chief Arms," and "Its Sphere of Jurisdiction"—and he does it well. Next he treats of "The Church"—the rights of religion, the "Essence and Forms" of the Church, "Its Object and Its Methods," "Limits and Powers of Action"—and he does that well. Next he shows their "divinely ordered relation," and that too he does well. Next he discusses their "humanly ordered relation," which of course is their vital union. This he does, if anything, better than all. First he refutes, and splendidly, too, the arguments for their union, whether under the form of a particular church organization, or under the form of Christianity as a whole. Then he presents a series of excellent arguments directly against any such union. Next we have not the least valuable chapter of the whole book,—giving copies of the sections of the National Constitution, and of all the State constitutions that relate to religion. Then, last of all, he discusses "The School"—"Parental Duties," "What It Is and Should Be," "Its Relation to State and Church," and "The American School"—this likewise he does well.

At this our readers may wonder why we did not say at once that it is an excellent book, and so send forth our hearty commendation. Well, this we should have done had we found the book consistent with itself. To use a familiar and homely illustration: It is all very well when we see a cow give a large quantity of excellent milk, but it is not at all well to see her lift her foot and kick it all over. It is a pleasure to read a sound treatise on an interesting subject, but it is most painful, while reading such, to find your author suddenly turn a complete somersault and subvert every principle which he has established, and labored to illustrate. And this is precisely the predicament in which we found this

author when we reached section 15 of this book, pages 281-296.

After critically discussing the sound principles of Government and Religion, and their relation to each other, or rather their proper separation from each other, and after showing this proper separation as illustrated in the theory of our own Government, he finds, as anyone may find, certain practices, especially in our State governments and legislation, that are inconsistent with the sound principles which he has established. But instead of allowing them to be exactly what they are, "inconsistencies," and allowing them to stand condemned by his principles, as inconsistencies, he undertakes to justify them. And in his attempt to justify the inconsistencies he is compelled to use arguments that subvert every principle that would stand against a union of Church and State, and which subvert the very arguments which he himself uses against such union.

Of these "inconsistencies" he selects three, and names them thus:—

"The law of the observance of Sunday, the law punishing blasphemy, and the law creating chaplains to the Government—these are the specimen statutes now to be reviewed with a special reference to the question whether they are in full harmony with the principles of a perfect religious freedom and with a complete legal separation of State and Church."

Then of the law of Sunday observance he very properly argues as follows:—

"Were we to inquire, for example, why we have a Sunday by the law of the land in which we live, we venture to say that nine answers out of ten would point us to the decalogue. In other words, we would be told that whereas God has instituted the Sabbath, our Government, as a matter of course, must command its observance. Yet no answer made could be more fallacious, and, in its logical workings, more disastrous to our theory of Government. And here we do not refer to the question whether or not the divine law of the Sabbath is of universal application—a matter on which Christians themselves are divided—but to the utterly false political principle on which the answer is based, to wit: that whatever God has forbidden or bidden must also for that very reason be forbidden or bidden by the law of the land. On such grounds every biblical injunction and precept would have to be embodied, as an integral part thereof, in our legal code; and whither such a procedure would lead us, it is not difficult to foresee. The distinction between politics and religion, the State and the Church, would thus be completely wiped out, and there would ensue a condition of affairs more woful than the world has ever known. In our day, and in our land especially, because Church and State are separate, no civil statute can be based directly upon purely religious grounds."

Now Sunday is purely a religious thing, and laws for its observance must be based on purely religious grounds, for the thing itself exists upon no other grounds—it is wholly an affair of the church. In view of this quotation, therefore, the query very properly presents itself. How can our author justify civil laws for the observance of Sunday? He attempts it thus:—

"The true *rationale*, therefore, of laws such as have a religious significance, and as we have named above, must be sought elsewhere."

That is to say that the *rationale* of laws having a *religious* significance must be sought elsewhere than on *religious* grounds. How could things having a religious significance be found anywhere but on religious grounds even if they were sought? How can things having a religious significance grow out of any but religious grounds?

But the grounds upon which he seems to seek this "true *rationale*" are that the majority of the people demand it, and that is enough, whether their demand be well founded or not. Thus he argues:—

"Whether the religious belief which leads the great majority of the people to demand the legal sanction of Sunday be well founded or not, or whether their motives be pure or not—these are points on which it is not the business of the law and the law-makers to decide. The mere fact that the general body of the people wants a day of worship is enough to give a solid foundation to the law which respects the will so expressed."

How it would be possible to frame a proposition that would be more destructive of every principle of justice or of right we cannot imagine. Whether the demand be well founded or not, or whether the motives of those who make the demand be pure or not—these are points that cannot enter into the question at all! They are the majority, and the majority demand it, and even though it be an unjust demand, wickedly intended, "that is enough to give a solid foundation to the law"! According to this there never has been, and there never can be, in any place where the majority could or can make their demands to be heeded, any law that did not, or that would not, rest upon "a solid foundation." According to this even the crucifixion of the Saviour rested upon a solid foundation. For was there not "a great multitude" with the chief priests and the scribes and the elders, who demanded his crucifixion? To Pilate was this not the majority? Whether the demand was well founded or not or whether their motives were pure or not—these were not points on which it was the business of Pilate to decide. The mere fact that the great multitude wanted it, was enough to give a solid foundation to the act of Pilate, which respected the will so expressed. We submit that this is a valid argument under the proposition laid down by this author in support of Sunday laws. It is an infamous proposition, that is all.

And further, immediately following the words above quoted, he says:—

"Especially must the popular will be heeded in this matter, because of its religious nature, on the ground that religion is the source and strength of all true morality."

This, too, not five pages from where he wrote that "no civil statute can be based directly upon purely religious grounds." That is to say: "No civil statute can be based directly upon purely religious grounds," but civil statutes must be enacted in favor of Sunday, "especially," "because of its religious nature"! If the inconsistency which he attempts to justify is any more glaring than that which appears in his justification, our Government must be in a pitiable condition.

We have not the space to notice his justification of laws against blasphemy. Suffice it to say that he disallows Blackstone's definition of blasphemy, in civil jurisprudence, and proposes one of his own that does not relieve the matter a particle, and he sustains it by argument that would justify criminal statutes against everybody who should choose to openly disagree with the religious belief of "the great mass of our people" (page 292). And as he himself condemns the appointment of chaplains by the Government, it is not necessary that we should notice that.

The truth is that in his section on "Inconsistencies" the author of "The State, the Church, and the School," has attempted to do what cannot be done. Webster defines "inconsistent," as "irreconcilable in conception or in fact." The things which our author mentions as inconsistencies, *are* inconsistencies. And his attempt to reconcile them is simply an effort to reconcile the irreconcilable.

Yet there is a way in which his credit for consistency as a writer may be regained and maintained, and by which the standing of his book may be assured. Let him blot out his attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable in these two places in section 15, let the "inconsistencies" stand as they are, and let them stand condemned as they are by the sound principles of the book throughout. With those parts blotted out, we verily believe that the book would stand as the best treatise in existence on the subject with which it deals; it would well deserve a place on the table of every household in the land; and we would gladly do our best to see that it had that place. But as it is, the book only condemns itself, as it ought to be condemned by every person who loves human right and religious liberty.

The book is issued by the Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. A. T. J.

National Reform Association.

THE above is the title of an organization that seeks a union of Church and State. Despite all their disclaimers, in their demands for changes in our Government are found embodied all those ideas that lead logically to a union of Church and State as fully as that which exists with the Mormons in Utah. The papers and the ministers of this association abound in arguments that point unmistakably to such union.

We had, during our colonial days, several examples of such union, the fruits of which we read in the hanging of Quakers, and the various civil disabilities imposed upon men whose faith was not in harmony with orthodox creeds. They could not act as jurors, could hold no office, were not allowed to testify, and had no vote. By the time our Constitution was framed, these disabilities had become so odious in the popular mind that it was determined that the separation between Church and State should be made complete, and that no religious tests should be allowed.

We often hear this omission imputed to Jefferson, who is reputed an infidel; but the

truth of history is, that the framers of that instrument were nearly all, if not quite all, believers in Christianity, and Jefferson was not in the convention, nor in this country when it was made. From the days of Constantine to that time no case could be cited in which the union of Church and State had not proven pernicious to both. Dr. Crosby has put the matter well when he says: "The moment you put religion in the hands of the Government you do what Constantine did, and will bring about the dark ruin of the tenth century." Conversely, when you put the Government under church control, the history of the Roman church in its wars and persecutions, the Inquisition of Torquemada, the fires of Smithfield, and the bloody records of witchcraft and hanging of Quakers is prophetic of what will follow. These unions have never purified politics, always have degraded religion.

We know it is claimed that the age of persecution is passed. 'Tis not so. We see around us constantly reminders that human nature is always the same—and as long as we have bigots in religion we will have the spirit of persecution that would employ fire and fagot if it dared. How often do we hear it claimed that only members of church are fit for public stations. All pains and penalties and disabilities imposed for lack of belief in dogmatic theology, whether it be by the State or by the Church, is against the genius and spirit of American institutions; and he who advocates it is disloyal to that freedom of conscience which every truly good citizen claims for himself and freely accords to others.

Man's religion is a matter wholly between the Creator and the creature; and homage is voluntary, belonging to a realm over which no human authority extends. Neither State nor Church can coerce men into piety, or subjugate individual reason. "Each soul, as to its faith, its thoughts, and affections, and the obligations which bind it to God, is as free from the rightful control of human authority as it could be if no such authority existed. This is what is meant by religious freedom; not from God's authority, but man's authority; so that each one is left to follow the dictates of his own conscience." All the rightful duty of Government in matters of religion, is to *protect*.

We have written these things because of the efforts being made by the National Reformers to change our Constitution, under which men enjoy full liberty of conscience, and have prospered more than another people, and because we fear Pharisees more than publicans and harlots. Better let it be—let well enough alone, and take no steps in the direction of the conditions in the time of Constantine, Louis XIV. of France, the Commonwealth rule in England, or the Puritans in Massachusetts.—*Eaton (Ohio) Register*.

THE church has no need, no call, no business whatever, to turn farmer, tradesman, speculator, politician, distributor of prizes, comedian, cook and caterer, or anything of the kind, no matter how excellent the opportunities and how golden the prospects may appear.—*Sch.*

The Promoter of Sin.

THE author of the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation" truly says: "All happy obedience must arise from affection, exercised toward the object obeyed. Obedience which arises from affection blesses the spirit which yields it, if the conscience approve of the object obeyed, while, on the contrary, no being can be happy in obeying one whom he does not love. To obey a parent, or to obey God, from interested motives would be sin. The devil might be obeyed for the same reason. All enlightened minds agree to what the Bible confirms, and what reason can clearly perceive without argument, that love for God is essential to every act of religious duty. To tender obedience or homage to God, while we had no love for him in our hearts, would be dishonorable to the Maker, and doing violence to our own nature."

Than this we know of no paragraph in all literature that more clearly reveals the essential wickedness of all enforced conformity to religious duties, and therefore the wicked cruelty of all State interference in religious things. "No being can be happy in obeying one whom he does not love." Therefore for Governments to compel men to conform to duty toward God while bearing in their hearts no love for him, is only to compel men to sin, because, saith the Scriptures, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." While for the State to offer inducements to men that would lead them to conform to religious duties from interested motives would also be sin. "To tender obedience or homage to God while we have no love for him in our hearts, would be dishonorable to the Maker, and doing violence to our own nature." Now such is precisely what the National Reform scheme proposes to do to the people of this nation. The National Reformers propose to compel men to tender obedience and homage to God, while they have no love for him in their hearts. Therefore the direct result of the triumph of National Reform principles will be to compel men to dishonor their Maker and do violence to their own natures, and thus vastly to increase the ratio of sin in the nation and hasten its destruction.

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. The following are the names of the tracts:—

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.

One copy of each of the above excellent tracts will be put up in a neat package which will be sent post-paid to any address for 15 cents. Or eight packages for \$1.00. They can be obtained from any S. D. A. City Mission, State T. and M. Secretary, or Pacific Press Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

OUR GENERAL AGENTS.

Alabama and Mississippi—Elder C. W. Olds, 520 Sixteenth Street North, Birmingham, Ala.
Australia—Echo Publishing House, North Fitzroy, Victoria.
British Guiana—George Amsterdam, Georgetown, British Guiana, S. A.
Canada Tract Society—R. S. Owen, South Stukely, P. Q.
Colorado Tract Society—167 Clement St., Denver, Col.
Connecticut—S. J. Edwards, Middletown, Conn.
Dakota Tract Society—Vilas, Minn. Co., Dakota.
Delaware and Maryland—D. C. Babcock, Frederica, Del.
District of Columbia—International Tract Society, 1831 Vermont Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.
England—The *Present Truth*, 72 Hencage St., Grimsby, Eng.
Florida Tract Society—Box 232, Jacksonville, Fla.
Georgia—Charles F. Curtis, 229 South Pryor St., Atlanta, Ga.
Hawaiian Islands—International Tract Soc., Honolulu, H. I.
Illinois Tract Society—3632 Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Indiana Tract Society—33 Cherry St., Indianapolis, Ind.
Iowa Tract Society—603 East Twelfth St., Des Moines, Iowa.
Kansas Tract Society—Cor. of Fifth St. and Western Avenue, Topeka, Kan.
Kentucky Tract Society—Elsie Scott, Cecilian, Hardin Co., Ky.
Louisiana Tract Society—321 Second St., New Orleans, La.
Maine Tract Society—No. 1 Johnson St., Bangor, Me.
Michigan Tract Society—Hattie House, Sec., *Review and Herald* Office, Battle Creek, Mich.
Minnesota Tract Society—336 Lake Street E., Minneapolis, Minn.
Missouri Tract Society—2339 Chestnut St., St. Louis, Mo.
Nebraska Tract Society—1505 I. St., Lincoln, Neb.
New England—N. E. Tract Society, South Lancaster, Mass.
New York Tract Society—Box 113, Rome, N. Y.
New Zealand—International Tract Society, Turner St., off Upper Queen St., Auckland, N. Z.
North Pacific—N. P. Tract Society, Box 18, East Portland, Or.
Norway—*Sundhedsbladet*, Christiania, Norway.
Nova Scotia—Elder I. E. Kimball, No. 69 North Park St., Halifax, Nova Scotia.
Ohio Tract Society—173 Warren St., Toledo, Ohio.
Pennsylvania Tract Society—5 Madison St., Wellsville, N. Y.
Switzerland—Imprimerie Polyglotte, 48 Weiberweg, Basel, Switzerland.
Tennessee Tract Society—Springville, Henry Co., Tenn.
Texas Tract Society—Mrs. Lee Gregory, Sec., Denton, Texas.
Upper Columbia—U. C. Tract Society, Mrs. L. A. Fero, Sec., Walla Walla, W. T.
Vancouver Island—Bernard Robb, Victoria, B. C.
Vermont—Lizzie A. Stone, South Lancaster, Mass.
Virginia—Lillie D. Woods, Quickelsburgh, Va.
Wisconsin Tract Society—1209 Jenifer St., Madison, Wis.

THE SABBATH QUESTION

IS THE

LEADING SUBJECT OF THE DAY.

THE GREAT DEMAND OF THE HOUR, FROM THE PULPIT AND THE PRESS, IN SOCIAL CIRCLES AND IN LEGISLATIVE HALLS, IS

That the Sabbath be more strictly observed. To assist the intelligent-minded of our land to have correct views of this important question, a book has been prepared which thoroughly discusses the Sabbath institution in every conceivable phase. Such is the valuable work entitled

"History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week."

By ELDER J. N. ANDREWS.

This great and exhaustive work is the result of ten years' hard labor and historical research. The book contains 548 12mo pages, and is printed in clear type, on good paper, and is well bound. Price, post-paid, \$2.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

A 16-PAGE RELIGIOUS FAMILY JOURNAL, PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT OAKLAND, CAL., FOR THE INTERNATIONAL TRACT AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

THIS journal is devoted to expositions of prophecy and the dissemination of general Biblical knowledge. Its contents are of the most varied kind, the departments embracing Editorial and General Articles, Health and Temperance, Home Circle, Sabbath-school, Missionary, and Secular and Religious News.

IT CONTAINS NO PAID ADVERTISEMENTS,

And is full every week of fresh, new matter. Among expository journals it takes the lead, both in quality and quantity of matter. It has proved of unusual interest to its tens of thousands of readers, who everywhere pronounce it a *live religious paper*; a reliable expositor of Scripture; and a household journal, the contents of which are pure and elevating.

Each number contains a characteristic article from the pen of Mrs. E. G. White.

All who see it agree in pronouncing it first-class in every respect. Send for free sample copy, and circular. Terms, per year, \$2.00. Three months, trial subscription, for 50 cents.

Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

OUR COUNTRY—THE MARVEL OF NATIONS.

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

By U. SMITH.

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

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

The Sunday Question, Modern Spiritualism, and National Reform

ARE PROMINENT AMONG THE TOPICS ABLY DISCUSSED IN THIS WORK.

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, JULY, 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 Bible says, "If one man sin against another, the judge shall judge him; but if a man sin against the Lord, who shall entreat for him." But the National Reform doctrine is that whether one man sin against another, or whether he sin against the Lord, the judge shall judge him anyhow. The fact of the matter is that nothing can be truer than that National Reform is directly opposed to the Bible.

"DISTRICT SECRETARY" REV. M. A. GUALT says he is "proud to belong to a denomination which appropriates \$10,000 of its funds for political agitation each year." We do not doubt it in the least. But, Mr. Gault, "Pride goeth before destruction," for "Everyone that is proud in heart is an abomination to the Lord; though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished." To the American people we say, When these proud political agitators come to you, remember that "Blessed is that man that maketh the Lord his trust, and respecteth not the proud."

In the Cleveland National Reform Convention, 1883, the Rev. Frederick Merrick, D. D., said:—

"Given any form of government, and human nature what it is, and the temptations of office what they are, and corruption is inevitable."

Of course it is. And yet with human nature exactly as it is, and the temptations of office precisely what they are, these men actually teach that a National Reform form of government will bring the millennium. But even though the thing could last a thousand years it would only be a millennium of corruption worse corrupted. There is no danger however of there ever being a millennium of National Reform. It would be literally impossible for human society to bear for any considerable length of time the weight of corruption that would be heaped upon it by such a form of government.

THE National Reform Association proposes a Constitutional recognition of Christianity as the national religion, and to provide the church "funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home and in the foreign field." The following words from Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, are true and most appropriate just now:—

"State recognition and State support lead inevitably to pride, bigotry, and intolerance. And this may easily pass into a divine-right consciousness that shall use the stake, the rack, the torture, to vindicate the arrogant claim, and bring protesting heretics to their

senses. Happily we are rid of all this. Let us thank God for it, and keep it so. Let us pray that that bitterest and bloodiest of all wars, a religious war, be spared us. Let us say instantly and firmly to any grasping hierarchy coveting State recognition and aiming at exclusive privilege, 'Hands off! No public money for sectarian use.' Let us keep Church and State clear of each other. It has been our glory and our peace thus far."

THE National Reformers tell us that they do not want their Constitutional Amendment until they can get it by a free vote of the people. They do not want Christian institutions and customs enforced by civil laws, until it is the will of the people that they should be so enforced. Very well, that looks mild enough, and people certainly ought not to complain of the results of laws which they themselves enact. But let us examine the case a little more closely.

What do they mean by the will of the people? Do they mean *all* the people of this land? If so, what necessity will there be for placing Christian laws and usages "on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land"? If *all* the people accept Christianity of their own free will, what need of laws enforcing Christianity? At any rate, if that is just what they want, they could save time by saying nothing about laws at present. Let them exert all their energies to get men converted as soon as possible, and then when all are converted, they can introduce their scheme of a legal recognition of Christianity.

But it is not at all probable that any National Reformer would claim that they expect to get every person in favor of their scheme before they put it through. They do not expect that *all* the people will ever voluntarily accept their theories. What they mean by having the Amendment a free expression of the will of the people, is that they want a clear, working majority. In other words, they don't want the Amendment until they can have a large enough majority in favor of it to *compel* dissenters to accept it, "under all civil pains."

Unbearable Usurpation.

THUS says Prof. O. N. Stoddard, of Wooster University, Ohio, and a leading National Reformer:—

"The State must begin the cultivation of morals at the cradle's side, and continue till mature manhood and womanhood have completed the lesson."

That is to say that the State must step between the parent and the child even at the cradle side, and at the very first begin to instill into the mind of the child doctrines which the parent abhors because he knows in his heart they are false. What can the parent do? If he protests then he is separated entirely from his child, as one whose influence is contaminating and dangerous to the interests and the authority of the State.

Do not think that this statement of Professor Stoddard's is a slip of the pen, or exceptional among National Reformers. It is straight out National Reform doctrine. In

their Cincinnati Convention, 1872, Rev. A. D. Mayo said:—

"But why not divide this work, and leave the moral and religious part of the education of the citizen to the parent and priest? Because you cannot hold the parent or the priest to any public responsibility to educate the child into that practical form of religion and morality essential to good citizenship in a republican State."

So therefore under National Reform rule the State must supplant the parent. And under such rule we shall be inducted into the times of Louis XIV., when parents were robbed of their children, because "The will of the king is that there be no more than one religion in this kingdom; it is for the glory of God and the well being of the State." Or the times of the Covenanter rule in Scotland, when "the preacher reprehended the husband, governed the wife, chastised the children, and insulted over the servants in the houses of the greatest men."

If there was ever a more wicked scheme devised outside of the Papal Church than is set forth in this National Reform iniquity, we know not where in all history it can be found. And to realize that such a wicked thing is today supported in its aspirations by the moral influence of "all evangelical churches" and by the active influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is astounding.

A GENTLEMAN in Indiana, who is both a lawyer and the editor of a paper, sends us a letter, from which we take the following extract:—

"I have just finished reading the May number of the SENTINEL. I like it very much. It seems to oppose the National Reform nonsense as a Christian should, and not as an infidel would. I dislike the so-called reform, because I think it dishonors my Saviour, not because I don't believe in him. Whatever dishonors Christ, brings misery to men. I like your arguments, and wish you great success. Many ministers in my church are carried away with this heresy, and are injuring their usefulness. My church is the United Presbyterian; it is near of kin to the Covenanters."

Our friend has the right idea of National Reform, and he has hit exactly upon the secret of the SENTINEL's opposition to it. May there be many like him, not only among the United Presbyterians, but among the Covenanters themselves. No one who truly desires to honor the Lord Jesus, will wish to see his religion degraded to the level of politics, nor to have national acknowledgment of Christ secured by the help of the votes of selfish and worldly men.

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.