

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST, 1887.

NUMBER 8.

The American Sentinel.

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

E. J. WAGGONER, } - - - - - EDITORS.
ALONZO T. JONES, }

J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

AMONG the nations past and gone there is not one people which, if ever free to govern themselves, preserved their freedom. They either did not value properly their inherent right of self-government, and deservedly lost it, or they were meanly deprived of it by dint of false doctrine and fraud, or by force of arms.—*Schuette.*

THE provisions of the Covenant of 1643 were introduced by the following words: "Having by our great oath declared the uprightness and loyalty of our intentions in all our proceedings," etc. In like manner the National Reformers declare their loyalty to the Government, and the uprightness of their intentions, and that they do not wish harm to anybody. We may charitably suppose that they are as honest as the Covenanters were, but their honesty will not change the result. The result of the Covenant was a Protestant Inquisition that differed from the Papal Inquisition only in degree. It proved, what the centuries of Papal oppression should have taught them, that when religion becomes a matter of politics, the religion is corrupted and the State is made no better, while the people are oppressed.

The case stands just this way: No one can be so blind as not to admit that when Church and State are united, even to the slightest degree, evil may result, and men may be oppressed. This may be the case even when good men hold the reins of power, for good men are liable to be mistaken, and may persecute as deadly error that which is in reality truth; and evil is certain to result when bad men hold the reins of power. And even allowing that those who lead out in the movement are honest and that honest men cannot do wrong (a thing not supposable) no one can tell how soon their places may be filled by men of the baser sort. Therefore if these would-be reformers really do wish well to the country, they will learn a lesson from the past, and will forbear to forge chains for evil-disposed men to place upon the necks of the innocent.

Convicted on Their Own Testimony.

A GENTLEMAN in Ohio, having received a copy of the SENTINEL, sent it to his pastor, requesting him to give his opinion of its sentiments. Accordingly the pastor writes to us, giving his objections to the teaching of the SENTINEL. As his objections and arguments have been answered time and again in these columns, it is not necessary to formally answer them here; but we will quote one paragraph from his letter. He says:—

"I should say at the outset that we are both members of the National Reform Association, in opposition to which your paper seems to be published; and as for myself, I preach National Reform doctrine on all proper occasions. Moreover, we are both lineal descendants of men who, in the days of the tyrannical Stewarts, [*sic.*] contended for 'Christ's Crown and Covenant;' and for that civil and religious liberty which makes it possible for you to publish the SENTINEL to-day. This being the case, it cannot be supposed that we are in favor of a 'union of Church and State,' which you so much fear, for this is the very thing which our fathers contended against even to the death."

The main point in this paragraph is the admission that the National Reform movement is identical with that of the Covenanters. This being the case, and it is the simple truth, it is easy to ascertain whether or not National Reform aims at union of Church and State, and how much religious liberty it stands for. We wish first, however, to call attention to the statement that the Covenanters contended for that civil and religious liberty which makes it possible for us to publish the SENTINEL to-day. Well, granting for the moment that that is true, what do the National Reformers want more? Since their movement is identical with that of the Covenanters, and we now have the liberty for which the Covenanters contended, what reason is there for the existence of the National Reform Association? Or do they want something else? Are they like the physician who, when he found that his patient slept well, and had a good appetite and good digestion, said, "Well, we shall soon change all that." Let them answer. But it is not necessary for them to answer. Their boast that they are descendants, lineal or otherwise, of the Covenanters is sufficient answer. We are well assured that if National Reform principles were in force to-day, it would not be possible for us to publish another SENTINEL. Now for the proof.

The Encyclopedia Britannica gives the following brief history of the Covenanters:—

"Covenanters, in Scottish history, the name

applied to a party embracing the great majority of the people, who during the seventeenth century bound themselves to establish and maintain the Presbyterian doctrine and polity as the sole religion of the country, to the exclusion of Prelacy and Popery. . . . There were several successive covenants, similar in spirit and expression, the most important being the National Covenant of 1638 and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. These were both based upon earlier documents. . . . The Solemn League and Covenant was established in the year 1643, and formed a bond between Scotland, England, and Ireland for the united preservation of the Reformed religion in the church of Scotland, the reformation of religion in England and Ireland, 'according to the word of God and the example of the best Reformed churches,' and the extirpation of Popery and Prelacy. It was sworn [to] and subscribed by many in both nations, approved by the Parliament and Assembly at Westminster, and ratified by the General Assembly of Scotland in 1645. King Charles I. disapproved of it when he surrendered himself to the Scottish army in 1646; but in 1650 Charles II. by a solemn oath declared his approbation both of this and of the National Covenant; and in August the same year he made a further declaration at Dunfermline to the same purpose, which was renewed on the occasion of his coronation at Scone in 1651. In the same year also the Covenant was ratified by Parliament, and subscription to it required from every member,—it being declared that without such subscription the constitution of the Parliament was null and void."—*Art. Covenanters.*

Lest any should think that this is prejudiced testimony, we quote what W. G. Blakie says in the Schaff-Herzog Cyclopaedia. This is Presbyterian testimony. After speaking of the "Solemn League and Covenant," Blakie says:—

"This Covenant, besides binding the subscribers to maintain the Reformed church, in its integrity, according to the word of God, pledged them 'to endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy (*i. e.*, church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and power of godliness, lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and his name one in the three kingdoms.'"

Here we have Church and State union in the most narrow sense, the union of a denomination with the State. But this will appear still more plainly when we read the following exact copy of the "Covenant" above referred

to, and which every member of Parliament was required to sign:—

“ASSEMBLY AT EDINBURGH, AUGUST 30, 1639,
SESSION 23.

“Act ordaining, by Ecclesiastical Authority, the Subscription of the Confession of faith and Covenant with the Assembly's Declaration.

“The General Assembly considering the great happiness which may flow from a full and perfect union of this kirk and kingdom, by joining of all in one and the same covenant with God, with the King's Majesty, and amongst ourselves; having, by our great oath, declared the uprightness and loyalty of our intentions in all our proceedings; and having withal supplicated his Majesty's high Commissioner, and the Lords of his Majesty's honorable privy council, to enjoin, by act of council, all the lieges in time coming to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Covenant; which, as a testimony of our fidelity to God, and loyalty to our king, we have subscribed: And seeing his Majesty's high Commissioner, and the Lords of his Majesty's honorable privy council, have granted the desire of our supplication, ordaining, by civil authority, all his Majesty's lieges, in time coming, to subscribe the foresaid Covenant: that our union may be the more full and perfect, we, by our act and constitution ecclesiastical, do approve the foresaid Covenant in all the heads and clauses thereof; and ordain of new, under all ecclesiastical censure, That all the masters of universities, colleges, and schools, all scholars at the passing of their degrees, all persons suspected of Papistry, or any other error; and finally, all the members of this kirk and kingdom, subscribe the same, with these words prefixed to their subscription, ‘The Article of this Covenant, which was at the first subscription referred to the determination of the General Assembly, being determined; and thereby the five articles of Perth, the government of the kirk by bishops, the civil places and power of kirkmen, upon the reasons and grounds contained in the acts of the General Assembly, declared to be unlawful within this kirk; We subscribe according to the determination foresaid.’ And ordain the Covenant, with this declaration, to be insert in the registers of the Assemblies of this kirk, general, provincial, and presbyterial, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*. And in all humility supplicate his Majesty's high Commissioner, and the honorable Estates of Parliament, by their authority, to ratify and enjoin the same, under all civil pains; which will tend to the glory of God, preservation of religion, the King's Majesty's honor, and perfect peace of this kirk and kingdom.”

Notice that this act ordained “a full and perfect union” of the church and kingdom, and the suppression of error “under all civil pains.” We cannot but smile when our friend tells how the Covenanters contended for liberty of conscience. They contended for liberty for themselves, that is true; but having obtained it, they were not content therewith, but must needs force their liberty upon everybody else! They reasoned, no doubt, that what suited them was good for everybody else, and if other people did not chance to think so, why then they ought, for the good of their own souls, to be compelled to accept the Covenanters' liberty of conscience.

To show how completely the church ruled the State, we quote again from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. After having described the manner by which the Act of 1639 was secured, the writer says:—

“The church was now secure. She had

gained the day, because on this occasion the zeal of the ministers and the interests of the nobles had been both enlisted in her service. The victory had been won in her name, and the influence of her ministers was vastly increased. For the spiritual tyranny which they introduced, the reader should refer to Buckle's famous chapter; or, if he think those statements to be partial or exaggerated, to original records, such as those of the presbyteries of St. Andrews and Cupar. The arrogance of the ministers' pretensions, and the readiness with which these pretensions were granted, the appalling conceptions of the Deity which were inculcated, and the absence of all contrary expressions of opinion, the intrusion on the domain of the magistrate, the vexatious interference in every detail of family and commercial life, and the patience with which it was borne, are to an English reader alike amazing. ‘We acknowledge,’ said they, ‘that according to the latitude of the word of God (which is our theme) we are allowed to treat in an ecclesiastical way of greatest and smallest, from the king's throne that should be established in righteousness, to the merchant's balance that should be used in faithfulness.’ The liberality of the interpretation given to this can only be judged of after minute reading.”—*Encyclopedia Britannica*, art. *Presbyterianism*.

It will not be denied that Buckle was not partial toward religion; yet since his statements are supported by the records, and he gives the authority for them all, no one can deny that he has written the truth. Accordingly we quote one paragraph from the “famous chapter” to which the *Britannica* refers. It will show the effect of the “full and perfect union” of that “kirk and kingdom:”—

“According to the Presbyterian polity, which reached its height in the seventeenth century, the clergyman of the parish selected a certain number of laymen on whom he could depend, and who, under the name of elders, were his counselors, or rather the ministers of his authority. They, when assembled together, formed what was called the Kirk-session, and this little court, which enforced the decisions uttered in the pulpit, was so supported by the superstitious reverence of the people, that it was far more powerful than any civil tribunal. By its aid the minister became supreme. For, whoever presumed to disobey him was excommunicated, was deprived of his property, and was believed to have incurred the penalty of eternal perdition. Against such weapons, in such a state of society, resistance was impossible. The clergy interfered with every man's private concerns, ordered how he should govern his family, and often took upon themselves the personal control of his household. Their minions, the elders, were everywhere; for each parish was divided into several quarters, and to each quarter one of these officials was allotted, in order that he might take special notice of what was done in his own district. Besides this, spies were previously appointed, so that nothing could escape their supervision. Not only the streets, but even private houses were searched, and ransacked, to see if anyone was absent from church while the minister was preaching. To him all must listen, and him all must obey. Without the consent of his tribunal, no person might engage himself either as a domestic servant, or as a field laborer. If anyone incurred the displeasure of the clergy, they did not scruple to summon his servants and force them to state whatever they knew respecting him, and whatever they had seen done in his house. To speak disrespectfully of a preacher was a grievous offense; to differ from him

was a heresy; even to pass him in the streets without saluting him, was punished as a crime. His very name was regarded as sacred, and not to be taken in vain. And, that it might be properly protected, and held in due honor, an Assembly of the church, in 1642, forbade it to be used in any public paper, unless the consent of the holy man had been previously obtained.”—*History of Civilization in England*, Vol. 2, chap. 5.

We who have never experienced the rigors of ecclesiastical supremacy, can scarcely believe that such a state of things could ever exist. Yet all know that under Papal supremacy the Inquisition carried on the most barbarous system of espionage, and why should we wonder that it could be done under Presbyterian supremacy. A Catholic is no worse by nature than a man of any other belief. The Catholics did not persecute because they were by nature worse than others, neither was it because their religious tenets were erroneous, but because by their polity they were bound to enforce their religious tenets, right or wrong, upon everybody. If the Catholics were not bound by their superiors to carry their religion into politics, they would be just as good citizens as men of any other denomination. And when men of any or all denominations try to enforce their opinions, no matter how true those opinions may be, upon others, nothing but persecution can come. So the Covenanters contended against Catholic Popery, but established a Protestant Popery that was equally bad.

We do not quote these things for the purpose of bringing Scotch Presbyterianism into disrepute, nor for the purpose of holding the Covenanters up to scorn. We simply wish to show the inevitable result of a union, no matter what its nature, between religious bodies and the State. We know that the National Reformers say that they do not want a union of Church and State, but a union of religion and the State; but, as we have many times shown, this is a distinction without any difference. That was all the Covenanters wanted. It is sufficient at this time to remind the reader that there can be no religion where there are no people to profess religion. Religion cannot therefore be exhibited abstractly, but only in connection with some religious body. And so, when you have a union of religion and the State, you necessarily have a union of some religious body or bodies and the State.

The last quotation we made showed the power which the ministers arrogated to themselves. The way in which this came about was very natural. They had been foremost in the fight against Catholic oppression, and thus were looked up to with great reverence as in a sense the saviours of the country. Then when freedom from Catholic rule was gained, they were loth to lay down the power which they had acquired, and which the people readily acknowledged. All history and experience show that when any man once gets power in his hands, he imagines that the people can never be so well off with that power in any other hands. So the Protestant clergy, believing that the religion which they pro-

fessed was "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," and having the power in their hands, enforced their religion, even to the smallest minutia, upon the people.

Now let it be remembered that the National Reform Association has set for its model the work of the Covenanters; that the leading National Reformers boast of their descent from the Covenanters; and that the liberty which was had under the "Covenant," is the liberty which they wish to establish in this country, and then decide whether such "liberty" is better than that which we now enjoy. That the National Reformers do expect to have a Protestant hierarchy, who shall rule with as much despotism as did the Covenanter clergy, or the priests of Rome, is evident from the following utterance of Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, one of the leading National Reformers:—

"If our nation will accept God as the source of all authority, Christ Jesus as the nation's king, and his law as of supreme authority over them, its creed is orthodox. The theological questions referred to do not belong to the nation as a civil organism, nor to our movement, which is a civil and not an ecclesiastical one; *the churches must settle these questions among themselves and with each other, and at least we will not allow the civil Government to decide between them, and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws.*"—*Christian Statesman, Feb. 21, 1884.*

"We will not allow," etc. Nothing shall be enacted which *we* ministers do not approve. This is the language of ecclesiastical despotism. Plenty more might be given to the same effect, but this is sufficient to show that National Reform success means not only a union of Church and State, but a union with the State subordinate to the Church, and bound to carry out the commands of the clergy. That means "liberty of conscience"—to those who are in the ascendancy—but galling oppression to all dissenters. We know of no higher ground upon which we could base a request to the people of this country to support the AMERICAN SENTINEL, than that it is firmly set for the defense of the people against such "liberty" as the National Reform Association would give us. E. J. W.

PROTESTANTS, generally, are too apt to suppose that there is something in their creed which protects them against those hurtful extravagancies which have been, and, to a certain extent, still are, practiced in the Catholic Church. Never was a greater mistake. There is but one protection against the tyranny of any class; and that is, to give that class very little power. Whatever the pretensions of any body of men may be, however smooth their language, and however plausible their claims, they are sure to abuse power, if much of it is conferred on them. The entire history of the world affords no instance to the contrary. In Catholic countries, France alone excepted, the clergy have more authority than in Protestant countries. Therefore, in Catholic countries, they do more harm than in Protestant countries, and their peculiar views are developed with greater freedom. The difference depends, not on the nature of the creed,

but on the power of the class. This is very apparent in Scotland, where the clergy, being supreme, did, Protestants though they were, imitate the ascetic, the unsocial, and the cruel doctrines, which, in the Catholic Church, gave rise to convents, fastings, scourgings, and all the other appliances of an uncouth and ungenial superstition.—*Buckle.*

Superficial Criticisms.

A LETTER has been received from Ohio, criticising our positions taken in the SENTINEL. We do not give the name of the writer, because we do not know that he has any standing among the National Reformers. But he speaks as the Reformers speak, and labors under the same difficulties of mental vision which afflict all, or nearly all, of that order, and therefore we will give him some attention. The reader will notice that we have already examined the same points as set forth by writers in the *Statesman* and *Nation*.

The writer is astonished that we make a distinction between morality and religion. We, in turn, are astonished that anybody can be found who denies or doubts that such a distinction exists. The difficulty is to so simplify the subject as to bring it down to the comprehension of the average Reformer. But we will make another effort.

Our critic acknowledges that moral laws, such as, Thou shalt not kill, or steal, existed before Christianity existed; but he insists that they are a part of Christianity because a man cannot break these laws and be a Christian. Now we know that Christianity enforces morality, but in its nature it is distinct from it. To prove his point he offers the following as an illustration:—

"A man commits a theft; we say that he has violated the law of the land which says, Thou shalt not steal. Did this country originate that law? No. But it is a part of the law of the country."

Now there must always be some analogy, or likeness, between an illustration and the thing intended to be illustrated. But in this case there is none whatever; hence there is no illustration. Christianity is a religion—neither more nor less. Our Government is not a religion, or a religious system. There is a Christian religion, but there is not an American religion, or a United States religion. No such religion was ever instituted. Again, Christianity is a remedial system; its whole design toward man is to recover him from his fallen condition, for if man had not fallen Christianity would not have existed. But our Government is not a remedial system, in any sense, nor to any degree. It is a civil, legal system. It does not, it cannot take hold of man's moral nature; it cannot recover him from any fallen condition. Its object is solely to keep the peace; to restrain men from overt acts of aggression upon the rights of their fellow-men. The very fact that this writer presents Christianity and this Government as parallels or analogous systems, proves that he has not the remotest idea of correct distinctions in morals and religion.

While we cannot draw a parallel between

Christianity and our Government, we can present an illustration in the action of our Government in case of transgression. A man has transgressed—sinned against our Government. Every step in the trial, conviction, and pardon of the accused is a recognition of the claims and authority of the law. All is for the enforcement of law. The verdict of the jury is, "Guilty." Guilty of what? Of violating the law. The judge pronounces sentence. For or upon what? Violation of the law. And the governor issues a pardon. Pardon for what? For violation of the law. But the law is no part of the verdict of the jury, the sentence of the judge, nor the pardon of the governor. Our critic asks, "How can the gospel enforce that which is no part of itself?" How could the President's proclamation of amnesty uphold and enforce the Constitution unless it was the Constitution, or the Constitution was a part of it? And how can people be convinced of the principles and relations of Government, if they have not the power to comprehend them?

Speaking of our positions, he says:—

"The conclusion must of necessity follow that you want none of the laws of Christianity put on a legal basis, and to be enforced by legal penalties."

That is the conclusion, exactly. Anything beyond that culminates in the Inquisition. The Author of Christianity never commissioned any man nor any set of men to enforce the gospel by civil laws and civil penalties. To attempt to do so is to usurp authority, to pervert the gospel, and to commit an outrage on human rights. We repeat, that the highest office given to the servants of Christ is that of ambassadors, to beseech men to be reconciled to God. 2 Cor. 5:20. We ask to see their commission to act as judges and executioners. We read: "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." And again: "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart." But these Reformers, following their prototypes of the Dark Ages, are not content to occupy the position assigned them by the Lord, but must needs usurp authority over the consciences of their fellow-men, and essay to compel men to obey the gospel under civil penalties. Was more ever done by the Inquisition than they aspire to do?

Our critic thinks himself wise, no doubt, in endeavoring to place us on the side of infidels and anarchists. Thus he says:—

"The cry of the Anarchists is, Kill the law. All the infidels of the land will help you to abolish the Sunday laws and put all the days of the week on the same legal basis. A large per cent. of the Mormons and Spiritualists will aid you to abolish the marriage laws, and let everyone be governed in this matter by his religion or inclination. All murderers and thieves will join your ranks to abolish the laws, Thou shalt not kill or steal."

If anything were wanting to prove the blindness, or duplicity, or both, of these model Reformers, such language as the above would fully answer the purpose. Not an expression, not a sentiment has ever appeared in the

SENTINEL which would justify such a slanderous accusation. We have always been explicit in our statements that it is the duty of civil Government to protect its citizens and secure the rights of all classes and persons. We have distinctly said that it is the duty of the Government to protect the marriage institution, and that there ought to be a uniform or national law respecting divorce. We say this, *because marriage is not a Christian or religious institution.* If it were, then none but Christians would have a right to get married, and then it would belong to the church alone. But it is not an institution of that nature; and when National Reformers talk about "the Christian law of marriage," and when they say that the race is indebted to Christianity for the marriage institution, we know that it is spoken in ignorance or perverseness.

Here we will copy from the *Christian Statesman* of February 24, 1887, a double item which appears under the head of "Clashing Voices:"—

"In short, the incorporation of religion into the laws of the State, marks the decline of religion in the hearts of the people. And this is what the Religious Amendment party is trying and pleading to bring about. Every American citizen should fight such an enactment to the last man."—*D. C. Marr, in St. Louis Republican.*

"If so, then to prevent the decline of religion, we must blot from our legislation all laws against murder, theft, and Sabbath breaking, for these are religious principles taken from the decalogue, and incorporated into nearly all our State constitutions. Your blunder is in supposing that the State cannot adopt the moral law of the Bible without uniting with some church."—*M. A. Gault.*

The characteristic "clashing" in this and other utterances of Mr. Gault is a clashing with common sense. If they will not be convinced of their errors, others may be made to see them.

If there were a nation of infidels to erect a Government, we should expect them to enact laws against murder, theft, adultery, and perjury, because these are offenses, not merely against religion, but *against human rights.* These laws are founded in our natures; they rest upon the relations instituted by the Creator when he created the race; they do not belong to any nation, Government, or religion. They are no more peculiar to Christianity than they are to Mohammedanism. But if that nation should enact laws in favor of baptism or the Lord's Supper, we should all be surprised, for these are Christian institutions, with which infidels have nothing to do. We should not expect them to enact laws concerning the Sabbath, blasphemy, or worship of any kind; because these, though a part of the decalogue, are religious laws,—they relate to our duty directly to God, not to our fellow-men.

NATIONAL REFORMERS CONDEMNED BY WEBSTER.

On the word "religion," Webster's dictionary says:—

"Religion, *as distinct from* virtue or *morality,* consists of the performance of the duties we owe directly to God, from a principle of obedience to his will. Hence we often speak of

religion and virtue as different branches of one system, or the duties of the first and second tables of the law."

But this refers to what is properly called *natural religion*, for the precepts on both tables of the law grow out of relations established in creation. In this respect they are entirely unlike Christian precepts, which grow out of our relations *as sinners.* This paragraph from Webster, though it casts light upon the subject under consideration, as it marks a clear distinction between religion and morality, does not reach to *the whole truth* after which we are inquiring. We read again from Webster on the word "religion:"—

"Any system of faith and worship. In this sense, religion comprehends the belief of pagans and Mohammedans, as well as of Christians; any religion consisting in the belief of a superior power or powers governing the world, and in the worship of such power or powers. Thus we speak of the religion of the Turks, of the Hindoos, of the Indians, etc., as well as of the Christian religion. We speak of false religion as well as of true religion."

Webster also says:—

"The practice of moral duties without a belief in a divine Lawgiver, and without reference to his will or commands, is not religion."

These declarations are plain as they are truthful. It takes so little reasoning power to recognize this distinction that we are inclined to believe the denial of it by the Reformers is mostly perverseness. "Rev. M. A. Gault" is one of the most persistent in his disregard of this distinction, and we shall not attempt to locate him in either class—the ignorant or the perverse. Sometimes it would seem that he belongs to both. He has even gone so far as to say, in the *Statesman*, that if our Constitution forbids religious legislation, then we cannot legislate concerning murder and theft, for these are religious questions!

We have never expressed any desire to have all the days of the week put on the same legal basis; we are not opposed to the Government making the Sunday a legal holiday. But we are opposed to enforcing its observance on all classes under the misleading name of "the Christian Sabbath." The Sabbath, as given to us in the Bible, is an institution as old as creation; instituted before the fall of man; and therefore it antedates Christianity. It is no more a part of, or peculiar to, Christianity, than is marriage. There is no such institution as the Christian Sabbath. And no class of religionists treat the Sabbath as they treat Christian institutions. This point we will demonstrate, but, not to lengthen this article unduly, we will defer it for future consideration.

One more point in the letter of our critic we will notice:—

"Let us see what religion is. James 1:27: 'Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.' What is this but morality?"

Very well said. And now will the writer be so kind as to inform us if he wishes to put this article of religion "on a legal basis"? Would he compel, under civil penalties, all

classes of citizens to visit the fatherless and widows? Will he ask the Legislature to make a law that all people shall keep themselves unspotted from the world? and if such a law were enacted, will he inform us by what means he would have it enforced? Satisfactory answers to these questions will prove that he has intelligent ideas concerning the enforcement of religion by civil law. But until we receive such answers, we must be permitted to doubt on that subject.

J. H. W.

Civil or Religious, Which?

LAST month we showed that the universal demand for Sunday laws is the wave upon which National Reform will ride to success and that this is the issue under cover of which the unsuspecting nation will be plunged into the evils of a union of Church and State. We showed that the passing of all laws enforcing the observance of Sunday is essentially religious legislation, because Sunday is wholly a religious thing, and laws enforcing its observance must be based upon religious grounds, for the thing itself exists upon no other grounds. Of course the National Reform Association itself does not propose legislation, whether in favor of Sunday observance or anything else, upon any other than religious grounds. But there are thousands of people who pretend to stolidly oppose any such legislation, yet who, at the same time, strive most strenuously to secure the enactment of laws enforcing Sunday observance, under the plea that such laws have nothing to do with Sunday as a religious institution, but entirely as a "police regulation;" that such laws have nothing at all to do with religion, but are wholly in the interests of health, education, patriotism, etc. But every such plea is a sheer fallacy. We have read a good many arguments based upon this plea, even in court decisions, but never yet have we read one in which the plea was fairly sustained. Nor can the thing ever be done, because to do so there has to be *established*, that which is always attempted, a distinction between what are called the civil and what the religious aspects of the day. But no such distinction can ever be shown, because it does not exist. They may call it Sabbath, Christian Sabbath, Lord's day, or whatever else they please, the institution is wholly a religious one. Its duties and its obligations pertain solely to the church, and it has no civil aspects, and never can have any.

But perhaps as good a way as any to show this would be to set down some of the arguments that have been made in the endeavor to justify Sunday laws on a civil basis. One of the most prominent, and perhaps the best known, of the advocates of this theory, is Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, of Brooklyn, New York. He has written a book entitled "The Sabbath for Man," which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union commands to be kept in constant circulation. He tries to make it appear that Sunday laws and their enforcement have nothing to do with religion, but have "relation to health, education, home virtue, and patriotism," and his attempt is crowned with the

usual success of such efforts, that is, to prove emphatically the contrary. He says:—

"Such a day [as is secured by *well-enforced* Sabbath laws] causes rich and poor to meet on the platform of"—What suppose you, reader? On the platform of "health" interests? of "educational" interests? of the blessings of "home virtues"? on the platform of "patriotism"? Not at all. But "causes rich and poor to meet on the platform of *religious* equality." Yet Sunday laws *well-enforced* have no relation to religion! Again:—

"Liberty allows the majority no right . . . to enforce its religion upon others. But inasmuch as more than three-fourths of the population are members or adherents of Christian churches, and so accustomed to set apart the first day of each week for rest and religion; and inasmuch as it is the conviction of this majority that the nation cannot be preserved without religion, nor religion without the Sabbath, nor the Sabbath without laws, therefore Sabbath laws are enacted," &c.

Let us analyze this. (a) The nation cannot be preserved without *religion*. (b) But religion cannot be preserved without the *Sabbath*. (c) But the Sabbath cannot be preserved without *laws*. Now if these laws are to preserve the Sabbath *that* the Sabbath may preserve *religion*, it inevitably follows that all such laws are enacted in the interests of religion solely.

To obtain proof that Sunday laws "in relation to health" are justifiable, Mr. Crafts sent out the following question:—

"In your observation of clerks, mechanics, and other employes, which class are in the best physical and mental condition for the renewal of business on Monday morning, those who are church-goers, or those who spend the Sabbaths in picnics and other pleasures?"

To secure testimony to show whether Sunday laws are justifiable on the score of health, he inquires which class has the better health on Mondays, *church-goers* or non-church-goers! and yet Sunday laws have no relation to religion!

But what answer did he get? He says he received written answers from about one hundred and fifty persons, and "the general answer is 'church-goers.'" One says, "The church-goers are worth twenty-five per cent. more on an average." Another says, "Church-goers. Their conscience is void of offense. Their mental peace and comfort impart increased power and endurance to the physical system." Another says, "Many workingmen have told me that a short, practical sermon rests them." Another says, "The church-goers are as fresh as larks, while the pleasure-goers have aches in the head, heart, and home, and so come into the week all out of breath." Mr. Clem. Stuebaker answers, "My observation is, that clerks and mechanics who spend their Sabbaths in church and Sabbath-school work are the best fitted for the duties of the office or shop on Monday morning." And Col. Franklin Fairbanks answers, "Those who attend church and Sunday-school on Sunday are the most valuable in our business. I can tell the difference between them and the others by their work in the shop." And last, Dr. Crafts says, "Scores of manufacturers and merchants on both sides of the sea, agree

that those who go to church on Sunday are best fitted to go to work on Monday."

Now we do not object at all to these statements. We do not doubt in the least that such is the fact in the case, as a rule. We freely admit that Sabbath-keeping, church-going people are better off in every respect than are those who are not such kind of people. It is not at all to the statements, nor to the fact, that we object. But we do most decidedly object to the use that he makes of them in his argument. For if his argument proves anything at all, it proves positively that laws should be enacted compelling everybody to go to church on Sunday.

Mark, his proposition is that "laws requiring that the people shall rest on Sunday from the exciting pursuit of gain and amusement are consistent with liberty in the same way as other health laws." But all his proofs show that it is the church-goers who above all have the best health. The only conclusion therefore that can be drawn from his premises is that the State should enact laws compelling everybody to go to church on Sunday, and listen to a short, practical sermon to rest them, because their health will be twenty-five per cent. better than if they don't. And so all such laws "are consistent with liberty in the same way as other health laws." And yet Sunday laws well enforced have no relation to religion! And so will end, logically, every argument that is ever made to justify Sunday laws on a "civil basis." We say again, There is no such basis, and nothing is needed to more plainly prove it than do these attempts to prove that there is, which always end in proving the opposite.

Thus says Mr. Crafts:—

"Sabbath laws for protecting the worshiping day of the prevailing *religion*, . . . are vindicated."

And so he goes on, insisting all the time that Sunday laws must have "no relation to religion," yet proving by every line of argument, in spite of his propositions, and in spite of logic, that such laws are wholly in the interests of religion. So it is, and always will be, with everyone who attempts the task. All of this goes to show that the animus of the whole discussion is the Sunday as a *religious* institution, and the enforcement of its observance as such. A further illustration of this is seen in the above quotation. Notice, he says the "majority has no right to enforce its religion upon others." Then without the slightest break, or hesitation, he goes right forward and declares that a majority "are members or adherents of the Christian churches, and have set apart the first day of each week," etc., etc., and winds up with the demand for laws for the enforcement of Sunday "for the preservation of religion, in obedience to the will of that majority."

After all this we are not surprised to find him sanctioning an exposition(?) of the first Amendment to the Constitution, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." He calls it "that much misunderstood article of the National Constitution," and says:—

"President Charles E. Knox, D. D., of the German Seminary at Bloomfield, N. J., in a *very able paper* on the 'Attitude of Our Foreign Population toward the Sabbath,' urges that this Amendment needs to be expounded everywhere to our foreign population. It should be shown to them that while Congress possesses no law-making power in respect to an establishment of religion, it *may*, and *does*, and *always has*, passed laws which have respect to religion."

Then our foreign population are to be informed, are they, that Congress "may, and does, and always has," violated the Constitution? That would be an exposition of this article indeed. This will be news to the National Reform Association, too, as well as to the rest of us. We feel almost sure that if Dr. Crafts can convince that Association of the truth of this exposition, he will be promoted to great honor. However, we doubt his ability to do it. First, because this statement of Mr. Knox is notoriously false; and secondly, because the idea advanced by Mr. Crafts himself that the enactment of Sabbath laws is "not in violation of this article," stands contradicted by the United States Senate, in that, when in 1830 it was petitioned to legislate on this very subject of Sunday, it declared that such action would be unconstitutional.

A. T. J.

Church and State.

EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT FOR THEIR ALLIANCE.

THE following interview published in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 4, is a very becoming item for the national holiday, and shows that the National Reform movement is not passing along unobserved. It likewise shows that that movement is not always going to have the plain, smooth sailing it has had hitherto. We hope the *Chronicle* will go on with this good work, and not weary of such well doing.

"Are you aware," said a prominent clergyman of this city to a *Chronicle* reporter yesterday, "that there is a great and growing society in this country called the National Reform Association, the object of which is the practical union of Church and State?"

"Certainly not," was the reply. "Is there any movement of that sort on this coast?"

"No, not as yet, but I understand that a branch society is about to be organized in this city, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which is in close affiliation with the National Reform Association, has a numerous following on this coast. The headquarters of the association are in Philadelphia, where its organ, the *Christian Statesman*, is published, and there are State branch organizations in many of the States. The organization is a strong one. It has among its 120 vice-presidents eighty prominent clergymen of different denominations, including eleven bishops, ten college presidents and professors, one governor, three ex-governors, nine Supreme Court justices, one Judge of the United States District Court, and seven prominent officials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, including Miss Willard, its president. Two years ago, at the suggestion of Miss

Willard, the National Convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union created a special department of its work to co-operate with the National Reform Association, and Mrs. Bateham, of Ohio, one of the vice-presidents of the National Relief Association, was made general superintendent."

"What are the objects of this so-called Reform Association?"

"A fundamental change in the national Constitution by means of what is called a Christian amendment, which will practically overturn the secular character of the Government and unite Church and State. Its avowed intention is to afford a basis of organic law for the general enforcement of Sunday observance, the reading of the Bible in the public schools, etc."

"You do not think there is any probability of its effecting its purpose, do you?"

"Certainly I do. Having secured the co-operation of the Woman's Temperance Union, it is now bidding, through the union, for that of the Knights of Labor and other workmen's organizations. At the Workingmen's Assembly in Cleveland, O., Mrs. Woodbridge, an official of the Reform Association and Woman's Union, made an appeal and proposition to that effect, which, it is stated, received favorable consideration."

"Do all of the clergy and religious press favor this movement?"

"No, not all. A few of us are opposed to it, but the majority of the clergy and the religious papers favor it. They have a mistaken idea that it would enhance the power of Christianity, whereas, I believe, it would weaken it greatly."

"In what way?"

"By awakening a strong current of popular opposition to Christianity, and developing in the church an arrogant and overbearing spirit. The whole history of Church and State unions confirms the fact that they are not only bad for the State but bad for the church. It was for this reason that the founders of our Government provided in the Constitution for their complete separation."

"Which one of the religious denominations takes the lead in this movement?"

"The Presbyterian, perhaps, but all, or nearly all, the denominations called 'Evangelical' favor it. The Reformed Presbyterians and United Presbyterians are particularly interested in the movement. Rev. Dr. Gibson, of this city, Moderator of the last General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, is a vice-president of the National Reform Association, and I am told that it is his intention on his return from Europe, where he now is on a vacation, to organize a State branch of the National Reform Association in California, in which the different evangelical denominations will unite."

"Are there any other widespread organizations which favor this Church and State movement?"

"Yes; the Prohibition party is committed to it, in its national platform, adopted in Pittsburg in 1884, and the platforms of the State Prohibition Conventions in Massachu-

setts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Texas, and many other States contain a distinct indorsement of National Reform measures. Now, while one of these organizations, working alone, might give no cause to fear its success, there is, in my opinion, ground for apprehension that they may, by uniting their forces, eventually accomplish their object. But it will not be without a fearful struggle, such as this country has not yet seen, except on the slavery question, and there are many who look for another civil war from this source before the close of the present century. General Grant once said that if there was another civil war in this country it was more likely to be on this issue than any other, and in one of his last speeches, that at Des Moines, he emphatically reprobated the proposed union of Church and State. Senator Charles Sumner and Governor John A. Andrews, of Massachusetts, are among these master minds who have foreseen this danger to the republic and advised guarding against it."

The Evils of National Religion.

THAN the evil of confounding common morality with Christian ethics, of mixing politics with religion, of connecting State and Church, there is none which in itself seems more insignificant but which in its workings has proved itself more disastrous to all the interests of mankind. That it is an evil at all, the mass of mankind has been astonishingly slow to learn; and there are not a few even in our time who as yet do not recognize it as such. But now that the mistakes of the past are before us and generally seen in their true light, and looking back upon the long and wearisome days of instruction and discipline, how inexpressibly cruel has been the mode of teaching and how enormously great the price of learning!

Clearly distinguishing between the things belonging to Cæsar and those belonging to God, the good and wise Master bade all to render to each his due. And for centuries his own obeyed the precept. Not so the pagans. These, rejecting the knowledge of the true God proclaimed to them, and thus refusing to render unto God the things that are God's, sought to prevent his own people from doing so also and required of them to do homage unto the national gods. And paganism ruled the world. *Pontifex maximus* of its religions no less than sovereign in affairs of State, emperor followed emperor in directing every power at his command against the Christ of God and all who dared to name him Lord. Then Christians, more than can be numbered, rather than deny their faith, sealed it with their blood. The honor to die for the Lord and his cause some coveted, others accepted, while suckling babes were not spared.

Alas, that the Christian Church of those days, and later, profited not by its own bitter experience—that Christians ever forgot the precept of their Master! There were then, and there have been at all times, those who did not forget, who closely distinguished between the provinces of politics and religion,

who deprecated all interference of the one with the other, and who condemned persecution. But their voices were raised in vain. No sooner did the opportunity offer than, O day of evil! the Christian religion itself was made a matter of politics, and politics a matter of religion—than the Christian Church gave itself to the State and the State to the Church. Whether for better or worse, history must tell.

During the past centuries the power of the State had been employed against the Church; now with the time of their courtship and marriage came also the day of retaliation. Had the sovereigns of this world thus far repressed the Christian religion in deference to paganism? now began they the work of exterminating the heathen superstitions in deference to Christianity. But the means and methods adopted for its doing were little better than those before employed against the very religion they now sought to propagate. Following his victory over Maxentius, a political rival and a vehement defender of official heathenism, and ascribing his success to the God of the Christians, *Constantine* at once enlarged the *Galerian* edict of toleration and proclaimed religious liberty throughout his domain.

The all-absorbing question which then agitated the minds of men concerned the power of State. Paganism struggled with might and main to retain its hold and Christianity was determined to seize it. The latter obtained complete dominion; and thus for the first time in their history was the marriage of State and Church effected—a relation which has continued with little interruption, but with ever varying phases and fortunes, up to our own time. And what has been the fruit? Certainly the little good which has come of it might have been achieved without it, and much more too, and all in a manner legitimate; but the amount of evils and wrong-doing of which it has been the cause or occasion, direct or indirect, is simply incalculable.

The very thought of the deeds perpetrated in the name of justice and holy religion, and committed for their apparent benefit, is sufficient to rend the human heart with feelings of shame and indignation. Much has been said, and something can be said, in palliation of the mistakes then made and of the atrocities committed; it has been maintained that the accounts given of them are exaggerating; and that this be so, must be the fond hope of everyone humane of heart. But the facts, as far as they are known with certainty, alone are more than enough to show whither men will drift and what men will do as soon as they follow their own counsel rather than the wisdom of God.

By its victory over heathenism and its exaltation, if such it can be called, to the dignity of a national religion, Christianity had indeed subdued but by no means as yet destroyed its old and bitter foe. The struggle was as yet not ended. Besides, by its very deliverance from this, its old thralldom, it was imperceptibly subjected to another and new condition of servitude, and it is not difficult to say which

of the two in the end proved to be the worse. The church, like a persecuted slave, first set free and then wedded to a self-willed lord, was delivered from the heavy hands of an imperial *pontifex maximus* only to be placed into the strong hands of an imperial *summus episcopus*—there to remain for many long and weary days.

Its new lord and lords, while they slowly and surely assumed control of the church, first tolerated but soon took it upon themselves wholly to drive out and destroy such of its enemies as were left. By imperial decree the temples of the gods were plundered and closed, destroyed, or re-opened for Christian worship; pagan sacrifices were forbidden under penalty of death; the property of the disobedient was confiscated, while they themselves were sent into banishment, apostasy and return to the old superstition were branded officially as crimes and high treason, a premium was put upon connection with the church, and many civil advantages were connected with offices ecclesiastic. Too well did the husband protect the newly-acquired wife; lavishly did he provide for her wants, and zealously did he indulge her reasonable desires and her whims as well—so great was the ardor of first love.

Meanwhile, as the wife sometimes obtains the mastery over the husband, so here. At first their relation assumed the character of a *Caesario-papia*, then followed the *Papo-caesario*. First the State presumed to dictate to the church; but gradually the latter asserted its rights not only but it began to dictate to the State. In the East, to be sure, the sovereign lords of State generally maintained their dignity, that is, they continued to toy with the church pretty much as they pleased; and a lucrative employment they found it to be, goodly sums being paid them quite frequently for the office of a bishop, and for like favors. But in the West affairs assumed an entirely different phase. Here slowly and wearily, but steadily and surely, the Papal hierarchy established itself—that monster prolific of a thousand woes to the States and churches of the world, even to this day.

Alas, how the once pure and lovely bride had degenerated! Espoused to one husband after another, and these devoted to politics, to intrigue, and to the waging of wars, why marvel that she herself forgot both her station and mission, that her virgin graces and peaceful habits gave place to Amazonian passions and outrageous excesses. Then was the word of God bound, lest the people should be undeceived; and in its stead was set up the *ignis-fatuus* of uncertain tradition. The entire fabric of the church was gradually reconstructed from top to bottom. Even the Old Foundation, cleft and precious, was rejected. Yet not altogether rejected. In view of past service and of probable present usefulness, the venerable Corner-stone was not wholly left out of the new structure: fitted and framed anew, it was fixed in a place, high and dry, like a trader's sign, and for no better purpose.—*State, Church, and School.*

Sunday Prohibition.

THE report of the "Committee on the Sabbath," at the late Reformed Presbyterian Synod, says:—

"Sunday saloons rob the working classes of their week's pay, and turn the working-man's home into a very hell."

Indeed! It is the *Sunday* saloon that robs people! It is the *Sunday* saloon that turns people's homes into a hell! What a wicked thing that *Sunday* saloon is! Annihilate it by all means before next Sunday comes, so that the working classes may be perfectly secure in their money, and the workingmen's home may be made happy. But by all means let the dear, good, honest, week-day saloon, that makes gentle the brutish husband, that makes kind the cruel father, that protects the promising youth, that turns the workingman's home into a paradise—let it remain, and touch it not, for a blessing is in it. Robbery and hell are found alone in the *Sunday* saloon.

But what makes the *Sunday* saloon so intensely bad that it must be denounced more than any other saloon? Any saloon at all is an unmitigated curse. Then why condone it on week-days by condemning it only on Sunday? If the *Sunday* saloon can be abolished, why cannot all be abolished? There is quite a large class of people who, realizing that the sale of intoxicants cannot yet be absolutely prohibited, propose to cut off as many saloons as possible by high license. This the Prohibitionists denominate "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell." Very well. Then these same Prohibitionists will loudly denounce the *Sunday* saloon and demand laws that shall close the saloons on Sunday but let them run full blast all the rest of the week. What is that then but "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," just as much as is the other? The high license folks say, "If we can't yet abolish all, we will abolish all we can." This the Prohibitionists denounce in unmeasured terms, and then say the same thing, only in other words. We wish the Prohibitionists would stick to their text, and not so stultify themselves. Prohibition absolute, everywhere, all the time, and forever, say we.

BIBLE-READINGS.

IN TWO NUMBERS EMBRACING A PORTION OF THE BIBLE COURSE AT HEALDSBURG COLLEGE.

BY ELD. E. J. WAGGONER.

THESE Readings were prepared especially for the use of copy-ists and those who intend to conduct Bible-readings in missionary fields, and they present a connected chain of argument upon the fundamental doctrines of Present Truth.

NUMBER ONE contains 57 pages, embracing sixteen readings, as follows:—

Daniel 2	No. Ques. 93	The Law of God, No. 4	No. Ques. 32
Daniel 7	93	" " " 5	31
Daniel 8	60	Ephesians 2:15	26
Daniel 9	94	Romans 6:14	23
The Sanctuary	179	Romans 10:4	17
The Law of God, No. 1	30	Galatians 3:13	19
" " " 2	31	Romans 3:20	10
" " " 3	28	Tithing	99

NUMBER TWO contains 46 pages, embracing twenty-two readings, as follows:—

The Sabbath, No. 1	No. Ques. 51	2 Corinthians 5:8	No. Ques. 18
" " " 2	49	Luke 28:39-43	16
" " " 3	42	1 Peter 3:18-20	10
Colossians 2:14-17	19	Luke 16:19-31	37
Psalms 118:24	13	Living Souls	14
Penalty of Transgression	10	Nature of Man	18
Sanctification	43	Punishment of the Wicked	70
Second Coming of Christ	61	Work of the Spirit, No. 1	47
The Resurrection	59	" " " 2	51
Immortality	18	Church Membership	61
Philippians 1:23	5	Missionary Labor	52

Price for the Two, 50 Cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

THE GREAT CONTROVERSY
BETWEEN CHRIST AND SATAN

DURING THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

BY MRS. E. G. WHITE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 ELD. 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.

HEALDSBURG COLLEGE,
HEALDSBURG, CAL.

A MODEL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION,
ESTABLISHED IN 1882.

FIVE YEARS OF GREAT PROSPERITY BECAUSE FOUNDED ON SOUND PRINCIPLES. LABOR COMBINED WITH STUDY.

FOUR courses of instruction, classical, scientific, biblical, and normal; also preparatory instruction given in a primary and a grammar course.

Instruction thorough and practical, not only in the collegiate courses but especially so in the preparatory courses.

Discipline rigid, yet parental, combined with strong moral and religious influences.

Expenses moderate. The whole cost to the student for tuition, board, lodging, lights, washing,—all expenses except for books and clothes, from \$16 to \$22 per month of four weeks.

Fall term begins July 26, 1887. For descriptive catalogue and further information, address the secretary,

W. C. GRAINGER,
Healdsburg, Cal.

THE MINISTRATION OF ANGELS.

Also giving an exposition of the origin, history, and destiny of Satan; containing 144 pages. Price, 20 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST, 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.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to the SENTINEL are now coming in in a way to delight the hearts, not only of the publishers, but of all who believe that the SENTINEL has an important work to do. Every mail brings in scores, and some, hundreds of subscriptions. That it does occupy a position second to none in importance is conceded by all who are awake to the issues of the day. Let its friends rally to its support.

THE following from an editorial in the *Christian Nation*, June 15, we insert exactly as it is. Comment is unnecessary:—

“When the State becomes positively Christian in constitution, and Christian men are elected to make law, something like this will be done: A street-car company's charter will be granted conditioned upon the running of cars free on Sabbath for the accommodation of Christian people on errands of worship, of necessity, and of mercy, even as bridge toll is at present remitted on the Sabbath in some places. To this it will be objected that others than Christians will ride for other than Christian purposes, which is very true, but the sin will be upon their own souls. The company will suffer no hardships, the men employed will be God's messengers for good, and ‘in that day there shall be upon the bells of the horses, holiness unto the Lord.’”

It seems that the germs of the Church and State pestilence are everywhere. The *National Presbyterian* makes no pretensions to National Reform, and has never directly mentioned the subject, yet it has the root of the matter in itself. The July issue contains an editorial in approval of the resolution of the United Presbyterian Synod, relative to Sunday mails, in which it urges the following reasons why there is hope that such a movement may be successful:—

“The present is a favorable time for a movement of this character. The country is at peace and there is nothing in our circumstances as a nation or as a people that could be presented as an excuse for opposing it. The President, though not a member of an evangelical church, has been bred to the Presbyterian idea of Sabbath-keeping, and the influences of his household are in favor of a scriptural view of this subject. For some time past, to a greater extent perhaps than in former years, there has been a disposition on the part of both the great political parties to insist upon religious or moral qualifications for the more important offices of the general Government. A majority of the Justices of the Supreme Court are members of evangelical churches. If our information is correct, more than half of them are Presbyterians. If the movement suggested by the Reformed Synod could be made with a good degree of unanimity and earnestness, there is strong ground for hope that it might be successful. Let the movement be made.”

We do not say that its hopes are well

founded, nor do we think that the possible Presbyterian proclivities of President Cleveland will aid in bringing about the result; but we do say that when religious journals begin to talk about religious qualifications for the important offices of the general Government, and confidently expect that men in public position will conduct the public business in accordance with the beliefs of their church, it is high time that lovers of civil and religious liberty should awake to the danger.

Religion and Politics.

THE following letter shows how Protestantism is following the ways of the Papacy:—

EDITOR SENTINEL: During the month of June I spent a few days in Humboldt County, Cal. While I was there some significant meetings were held in Eureka. The leading denominations of the place came together, as stated in the first meeting, to consider the matter of a more perfect union of their forces for political purposes. The speakers said matters were continually coming up which the church did not like, but she was powerless to do anything because they were not united and thoroughly organized. Now what they propose was to so unite that they could carry their points at the polls.

It was proposed to canvass the whole town, to ascertain to what church each individual belonged, or favored. If any were found of Baptist proclivities the canvasser was to report them at once to the Baptist minister. And so with all the denominations. Those found who were not members of any denomination were to be requested to attend some church. In the carrying out of this plan there was a committee of three chosen, who were to select fifty persons to go from house to house, and at once take a religious census of the town. On the question being raised whether those making the canvass should be men who could carry salvation to the houses as they went, it was decided that that was immaterial to the purpose. That could be attended to by the workers who might afterwards be sent. So the matter passed from the open meeting to the committee.

As to all of the results of this canvass we are not yet informed. But a statement was made by one of these ministers working in this scheme, in his pulpit, on the Sunday following the census-taking, that there were three thousand infidels in Eureka. That is about one-half of the inhabitants. On what ground they based the charge of infidelity, whether on a direct avowal of unbelief in the Bible, or a disagreement with the scheme this politico-religious party proposes to carry out, the writer was not informed. The object to be gained being one to carry religious ideas by the aid of the ballot-box, seemed to me a different move for the propagation of the gospel than the method of our Lord, who declared that his kingdom was “not of this world,” and that those who took the sword (to enforce their religion, we suppose he meant) should perish by the sword.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Bound to Succeed.

WE are all quite familiar with the idea that a man's heart and pocket can be most certainly reached through his stomach; it has remained for National Reformers to propose reaching his head by the same route, a Fourth of July W. C. T. U. National Reform basket picnic having been arranged for Valley Camp, Pa.

We hope the effort will succeed. Much talk has been indulged in from time to time about popularizing National Reform; Vice-President Frances E. Willard and Secretary Weir are to be congratulated upon this excellent device for bringing about that end.—*Christian Nation*.

We see no reason why the National Reform movement should not succeed, now that its managers have discovered some substantial argument. If they hope to succeed, they would do well to stick to the new plan, for certainly they will be able to reach people's heads by this indirect means much quicker than by any direct means which they have heretofore used. All the National Reform arguments that we have ever read have left us feeling as though we had been fed upon the east wind. Their new argument will be far more “filling.”

THE papers announce that “the Pope grants unprecedented honors to Queen Victoria.” It was very kind indeed in the dear, good Pope to condescend to “grant” honors, unprecedented or otherwise, to the queen of Great Britain. The unprecedented honor in this case is that the Pope has “entirely of his own accord, and without any hint from Cardinal Manning, issued a rescript which ordains that on Jubilee day, June 21, high mass and a Te Deum shall be performed in all Roman Catholic Churches in England.” It is said that “his holiness could not have done more in the case of the most faithful Catholic sovereign.” And then it is suggested, very innocently, of course, that “the English clergy might return the compliment on the occasion of his holiness's approaching jubilee.” Yes, they might, nor should we be much surprised if they do so. Of course some such thing as that is just what the Pope is fishing for, and only if it should be so at the official direction of the queen, such a recognition on the part of England would be of great weight in the longed-for universal recognition of the Papal sovereignty.

LET us preach and teach that liberty in the truth is the only abiding freedom.—*Rev. L. A. Abbott*.

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.