

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER, 1887.

NUMBER 9.

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.

THE American people have only to apply the principle avowed by Mr. Madison to our public schools, and this would be the end of the whole discussion on the subject. The conclusion would be that, as a State agency to attain certain temporal ends, the public school has nothing to do with religion, and religion nothing to do with it. The government employing it has no religion to teach, not being a government for Christians any more than for Deists, or for Protestants any more than for Catholics. It is not its business, as a government, to affirm or deny, to teach or support, any religious system.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D.*

THE tithe question is making no small stir in Wales. The case stands thus: The Church of England being a State church, derives its income from the country, just the same as the general Government. The tithe is the tax which the church imposes for the support of its ministers. Now many of the farmers of Wales are dissenters, and while they may be willing to give even more than a tithe for the support of the gospel, they do not wish to be forced to pay, nor to pay tithe at all for a religious establishment with which they have no sympathy. Accordingly the English Government proceeds to sell their property for delinquent church taxes, and the farmers rebel. The same thing would be done in this country if the National Reformers had their scheme in running order. Everybody, Jew, Gentile, and Christian, would be *compelled* to pay for the support of the ministers of the State religion, just as they now have to pay for the support of the civil Government. While all men ought to help support the Government which protects them, no man ought to be *compelled* to contribute for the support of any religion. And the injustice is increased when the support is demanded of one who is not in sympathy with the ecclesiastical establishment. But justice in any particular is not to be expected when religion is made a matter of politics.

A Principle to Be Remembered.

AN editorial in the *Christian Nation* of October 27, 1886, on “The Henry George Movement,” contained the following sensible remarks:—

“Let those who feel tempted to vote for George remember that at its commencement the French Revolution was inspired by ideas much more moderate than those of George, and that its early heroes were greater and better men than he. Yet these men could not control the rebellious spirit which they had aroused, and soon fell victims to its fury. A very ordinary person may be the means of stirring up class jealousy and hatred, but no man can control the masses when once saturated with that feeling, or tell what horrors they may commit before their passions are satiated or their power to do evil can be checked.”

These words are worthy of careful consideration. In truth, Henry George is an Anarchist under a very flimsy disguise. In a speech recently given near the place of this writing, he disavowed the intention to confiscate the titles now held to lands. He would only confiscate the rent or use of them! The man who has toiled to obtain and improve a farm may be graciously permitted to retain his deed; but others shall be at liberty to use the land at their will, without any recompense to him whose labor made it available and valuable. You may retain the title to the house you built, but you may not claim any special right to its use. But the fact is well known that they who use property for which they never toiled, especially if they have no disposition to toil, use it recklessly. A house which would last many years in the care and use of its builder, who has a freehold right to it, would last but a few years under the care or neglect of one who never toiled for it, and could have no special right to it. He might soon be dispossessed by one stronger than he, and all incentive to preserve property would be taken away. And when it was destroyed—when there was a general wreck of the usable property first confiscated—who would furnish the next supply?

But it is not *the land* that these Anarchists want; it is the avails of other people's labors. There is a vast amount of land in the domain of the United States, open to them to possess if they want it. But they do not want *that land*. It will take labor and pains to make it usable and available, and labor is the very thing which they are determined to avoid. They want that which has been rendered valuable and available by the toil of others. Theirs is the spirit of theft and robbery under another name. But their plan would prove

more disastrous than ordinary stealing; it would not only take your property without leave or remuneration, it would prevent your accumulating any more. It would destroy all property rights, upon which society and Governments are established. The first generation of Anarchists might thrive for a while upon their ill-gotten gains, but their children would have to return to honest labor or starve.

But there is another class of Anarchists which we must notice in order to faithfully apply the principle involved in the quotation we have made. They would indignantly reject the name, yet they are easily identified. These are *speculators*. While they fear the ravages of *more violent Anarchists* than themselves, they are yet *practical Anarchists*. They set the bad example of taking the avails of the labors of others without rendering any equivalent. They appropriate means for which they never labored—which they never earned. There are men who roll in wealth, who boast of their millions, who never spent a day in honest toil to accumulate their possessions. They speculated in stocks, or, may be, in the necessaries of life; they manipulated the means for which others labored, without adding one penny to its value, or giving a penny in return for it. What is this but an example to Anarchists, an incentive to the reckless and violent to forcibly take from them the abundance which they have fraudulently taken from others.

These men are so blinded by selfishness that they do not know that they are the instigators of anarchy. Their wrong has been done so quietly, so peacefully, that, to them, it does not seem possible that it should lead to the disruption of society. But they must see that there is a growing restlessness over this state of things, and when it breaks forth the result will be fearful. And they need not think that the cause is not sufficient to produce such a result. These are the very things which arouse the jealousies and the fiercest passions of the reckless—which stir up the spirit of anarchy. One man may start a stone at the top of a mountain, which all the world cannot stay in its progress of destruction. A child may make an opening in a dam, which soon becomes a torrent which no human power can check.

But we would have it distinctly understood that we do not use the word *speculator* as synonymous with *capitalist*. The enterprising, public-spirited capitalist is a boon to any country. In his sphere he is as necessary to the growth and improvement of the country,

as he who labors with his hands. True, capital without labor is useless; but labor without capital is inefficient. Ten thousand laborers would never dig a canal nor build a railroad, without skill and capital to direct and keep them in orderly activity. It is as impossible, in a growing, civilized State, to make labor independent of capital as to make capital independent of labor. All combinations professedly having in view the freedom of the laborer from the calls of capital, are sheer deceptions. There is more coerced servility of laborers in the Knights of Labor, trades unions, etc., than can be found in the republic under the dominion of capital. Thousands of men are often compelled to leave positions of profit, without any complaint against their employers, perhaps to lose their situations altogether, at the caprice of some "supreme head" or "grand master."

During the crusade of the misnamed "Workingmen," in San Francisco, a few years since, contracts to the amount of \$3,000,000 were canceled because the capitalists were not willing to place their property where it would be subject to the fury of an angry mob, which was threatening destruction to the city. This \$3,000,000 ought to have gone into the hands of *bona fide* laborers, and circulated among the trades-people, who, in many cases, suffered for the want of it. At that time the worst enemy of the workingmen was Denis Kearney, the leader of the rabble, who was making money by duping the credulous with hopes of more than the inexorable laws of trade would afford them for their labor. While he was denouncing the capitalists, and encouraging idleness and discontent, the capitalists were giving remunerative employment to thousands, which was a greater benefaction than if they had given their means to the rabble, stopped their public works, and gone to work with their own hands. For surely he who keeps a thousand hands employed is a greater public benefactor than he who only labors with his own two hands.

Thus far on the subject of the *Nation's* comment on Henry George. But the ideas presented by the *Nation* look in another direction and have another application. It truthfully says: "A very ordinary person may stir up class jealousy and hatred, but no man can control the masses when once saturated with that feeling, or tell what horrors they may commit before their passions are satiated, or their power to do evil checked." And it is a fact that no class jealousies have been so bitter, no persecutions so unremitting, as those which have been raised and carried on in the name of religion, professedly for the glory of God and for the upbuilding of his cause. And it is not to be disputed that the spirit of bigotry and religious intolerance is abroad in the land. The rapid growth of this National Reform movement, is the very strongest proof of this. In the early days of this movement, the *Statesmen* ridiculed the fears of the Seventh-day Baptists and the Seventh-day Adventists; it said the Amendment they propose, if carried into effect, would never touch a hair of their heads; and that there was no reason why

these parties should not co-operate with the "Reformers," as they were seeking security for the rights of "all classes." But after a season they grew more confident, and a prominent speaker in their National Convention said that the Seventh-day Baptists were to be classed with atheists! only to be "tolerated" while they did not conflict with "my faith." If this is not the spirit of Popery, we do not know where it shall be found.

Let the reader turn again to the April number of the *SENTINEL*, to the speech of Senator Crockett, of Arkansas, and consider what Seventh-day Baptists and others had to suffer in that State, for *keeping the seventh-day Sabbath*, just as the commandment reads. It is useless to say that they were being punished for working on the first day of the week, for there were many citizens working on that day; but the officers, *instigated by professed Christians*, REFUSED to entertain charges against any but those who had kept the seventh day! Read Senator Crockett's speech for the facts, and consider that similar scenes have been enacted in other States, and that in all cases *prominent members of the churches* have opposed such changes in the laws as would make such religious persecutions impossible! Now mark the consistency and liberality of the National Reformers; not a single one of their papers, nor any paper in sympathy with them, nor any officer of their association, as far as we have been able to learn, has spoken a word in condemnation of these persecutions. No; they well understand, and ardently desire, that what has been done in a few States shall be done in all the land, under the authority of Congress, against dissenters from "the characteristic faith of the nation," if they succeed in having their Amendment adopted.

As the *Nation* said, that "the French Revolution was inspired by ideas much more moderate than those of George," so the horrors of the Inquisition were ushered in by professions and reasons as mild and plausible as those of the National Reformers. When we consider the general diffusion of knowledge, both secular and religious, the recognition of civil and religious rights, at the present time, as compared with the time of Loyola, of Justinian, or of Constantine, our National Reformers suffer by comparison with the advocates of "National Christianity" in those days. Well would it be for our country if they would lay to heart the words of the *Christian Nation*, that "no man can control the masses when once saturated with that feeling" of "class-jealousy and hatred." The whole bent of the National Reform movement is to lay a solid foundation for "that feeling." Even now they avow the purpose to render ineligible to office in the Government, and to disfranchise, those not "in the faith"—the religious faith—to be adopted by the Government. They coolly talk of "tolerating" other Christians, earnest and consistent Bible believers, but only on condition that they do not come in conflict with the "established religion;" tolerate them as they would tolerate "the insane," only as long as they "did not rave" about their own religion, or publicly advance their own con-

scious convictions. Surely, perilous times are at hand, when such sentiments grow and spread in the land. We can only contemplate with horror what scenes of relentless persecution will be seen, what bitterness of fury will be manifested, when the masses once become "saturated with that feeling," when a constitutional provision shall set loose their passions, and clothe the bigoted and prejudiced with power over their weaker neighbors. "God to the weaker pity send" in that day.

J. H. W'

A "Virtual Theocracy" Promised.

It has been the aim of the *SENTINEL*, not only to set forth the principles that underlie the National Reform movement, and the loss of freedom that would follow its success, but also to arouse the people of this country to a sense of the fact that that movement has already acquired alarmingly large proportions. To this end we have repeatedly stated that the movement is by no means confined to the body of men called the National Reform Association. The Prohibition party and the Women's Christian Temperance Union are fully committed to the movement, and these are endeavoring, with good prospects of success, to beguile the Knights of Labor into the movement. It is through the combined action of these various societies, as societies, and of the Protestant and Catholic Churches, as representing the Christianity of *America* (not of *Christ*, be it understood), that National Reform ideas will be made realities in this country. That National Reform ideas will prevail when these classes unite their forces, is too evident to call for proof.

The Women's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association have been wedded, so that the aims of one party may be said to be the aims of the other. What the ultimate aim of both is, is incidentally revealed in the following, which is part of the last paragraph of an article by Miss Willard, in the *Chicago Advance* of June 30:—

"We of this matchless epoch are preparing material for future orators, who, as they descant upon 'the wonder that shall be,' will point to these days of the saloon, the prize-fight, the trampled Sabbath, the grinding monopoly, the disfranchised womanhood, as a period of semi-barbarism from which they thank God for deliverance into the New Republic with its virtual theocracy and universal brotherhood in Christ."

Miss Willard is the spokesman of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, so that the above may safely be taken as setting forth the aim of that association. Her statement is identical with that of the National Reformers themselves, who talk of the republic with Christ as its king. She confidently expects "a virtual theocracy" when these various "reform" associations and parties become consolidated, which she predicts will be in '92 or '96. Now "a virtual theocracy" is nothing more nor less than a union of Church and State, with some other name, and with the church element the controlling power in the union. National Reform evasions cannot conceal this.

Such a state of things cannot fail to be followed by disastrous consequences. We care not by whom it is brought about, the result will be the same. We are not impugning the motives of the gifted ladies who compose the working force of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, nor would we be understood as being one whit behind anybody in our admiration of their efforts in behalf of true temperance. What we deprecate is the fact that they have thought to enlarge their sphere of usefulness to the extent of bringing about the millennium by National Reform methods. We have no notion of detailing in this place the evils that *must* result from any union of Church and State; what we want to emphasize is the fact that those evils will be none the less because the proposed union will in large measure be the work of so good people as the ladies of the W. C. T. U. If a child in its innocent play draws the live coals from the grate and scatters them upon the carpet, the effect will be just the same as though the coals were scattered by a malicious incendiary. So these good people may think that "a virtual theocracy" will be the best thing for this country, but that will not lessen the evil. We cherish the hope that some of them, at least, may see whither they are drifting, and may recover themselves. But, in view of the position of the leader of the powerful organization known as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, will anyone who knows the evils of Church and State union, dare say that we are sounding an unnecessary alarm? E. J. W.

Sunday Laws and Liberty.

DR. CRAFTS asks a very important question, to which we should be very much pleased to have some Sunday-law advocate give a consistent answer. Here is his question:—

"But how is it consistent with liberty that those whose religion requires them to rest on the seventh day are compelled to give up public business and public amusements on the first day?"

In his answer he separates the Jews from other Sabbath-keepers, and says:—

"In the case of the Jews the case is not as difficult as many have thought. If he cannot do more business in five days in Great Britain and the United States than in six days elsewhere, *he is free to remain elsewhere*. If when he comes into Great Britain or the United States he finds by experiment that a 'conscientious Jew cannot make a living,' *the world is all before him to choose where he will dwell*."

And so it appears that whether a man can be an inhabitant of the United States, is to depend altogether upon whether he will keep Sunday. Compel a man to stultify his conscience or leave the country; and yet the cause of all this has nothing to do with religion!

Rabbi Wintner, of Brooklyn, applied a touch-stone to this thing which in an instant proves its "true inwardness." In reply to questions and proposals of Dr. Crafts, looking to the adoption, by the Jews, of Sunday instead of Sabbath,—

The Rabbi proposed "a compromise be-

tween Christians and Jews, by agreeing on 'a neutral day in the middle of the week' as a sabbath for all—showing that he is willing to give up Saturday and take some other common day, his national prejudice against the Christian first-day Sabbath being his only reason for preferring the third or fourth day to the first, a prejudice which *of course the law cannot recognize*."

But why "of course"? If Sunday laws have relation simply to "health, education," etc., cannot these be promoted just as well on Wednesday as on Sunday? If not, why not? Cannot the laboring man rest just as well on Thursday as on Sunday? And if the rest is to have no reference at all to religion, nor to the "religious aspect of the day," then why is not the proposition of the rabbi eminently proper? You ask the Jew to give up the day which he observes; he only asks that you do likewise. He proposes to meet you half way; certainly nothing could be fairer, but "of course" it cannot be recognized. Oh, no, "of course" everything must be given up for Sunday, and every man's conscientious convictions must be crushed out that Sunday laws may have free course to run and be glorified. And all this without any reference to the religious aspect of the day? Nay, verily! For the "opinion" of these people "is very decided for freedom [on Sunday] from anything that could shock a *thoroughly Christian community*."

Of other seventh-day keepers, illustrated by his citation of the Seventh-day Baptists, he says:—

"So, also, the Seventh-day Baptists, being only one five-thousandth of the population, can hardly ask to have the laws changed for them."

Why not, pray? Is it not just as proper for the seventh-day keepers to ask that the laws be *changed* in their behalf as it is for the Sunday-keepers to have those laws *enacted* in their behalf? Or is it true that all rights, civil and religious, human and divine, are summed up in the National Reform Sunday-law advocates?

Again:—

"It would not be reasonable for the Legislatures to compel the other ninety-nine-hundredths of the population who do not regard *Saturday* as a sacred day, to stop business for the few who do."

True enough. But suppose that those who "regard *Saturday* as a sacred day" were the *majority*, then, according to the premises of Dr. Crafts, and the Sunday-law people generally, it *would be* reasonable for the Legislatures to *compel* all who did not so regard it, to *stop business* on Saturday. But will they admit the reasonableness of this logical conclusion from their own premises? Not for a minute. Suppose, for instance, that in the State of Ohio the Seventh-day Baptists, the Seventh-day Adventists, and the Jews were the majority. Then suppose that they should unite and secure the passage of a law compelling all the people of the State to rest on the seventh day (Saturday), what a roar of indignant protest would immediately arise from united Christendom! Such exclamations as "religious bigotry!" "Destruction of relig-

ious liberty!" "Violation of the rights of conscience!" etc., etc., to the end of the catalogue, would fill the air. And justly so, say we. But if the claims of the Sunday-law advocates be just, where would there be any wrong, where any injustice, in such an action? If it would be wrong for Saturday-keepers, when in the majority, to pass laws compelling Sunday-keepers to rest on Saturday, wherein then is it right for Sunday-keepers, when in the majority, to pass laws compelling Saturday-keepers to rest on Sunday?

And, too, in answer to all their protestations, they could say, Why, dear sirs, you need not make so much ado. This is no restriction of your rights; this is no invasion of your liberties. Your right to rest on Sunday still remains to you. You are at perfect liberty to refuse to work on Sunday. Our action is entirely "consistent with liberty." We do not by this law compel you to keep Saturday *religiously*; this statute has "nothing to do with religion." This does not compel you to go to church; you are at "liberty" to stay at home. This law has nothing to do with "the religious aspects of the day," it only has relation to your "health," to your "education," to your "home virtue," and to your "patriotism"! Now, reader, we ask you candidly, Is there in all the United States one person who regards Sunday as a sacred day, who would accept any such reasoning as that? And yet those who do so regard Sunday are the very ones who offer this reasoning (?) and expect us to accept it as conclusive, *for the reason* that they are the majority, and for that reason alone.

But if it be thus, as Mr. Crafts says, that "laws for protecting the worshiping day of the prevailing religion from disturbance, are then "vindicated," who does not see that laws for the protection of the institutions of the *prevailing religion* are vindicated in the same way, whatever and wherever that religion may be? And then is not the Mohammedan, in his own country, fully justified in enacting laws compelling Christians to shut up their places of business, and rest on Friday, his Assembly day, and saying to them, in the words of Dr. Crafts, "If you cannot do more business in five days in Turkey or Arabia than in six elsewhere, you are free to go elsewhere. If you find that in Turkey or Arabia a conscientious Christian cannot make a living, the world is all before you to choose where you will dwell." Every man who has the least conception of liberty will say that that would be oppression. Yet these same Sunday-keeping Christians, who would unambiguously pronounce that oppression in Turkey, will do the same thing in America in behalf of Sunday, and call it liberty. And wherever a voice is raised against their action, it is immediately branded as the "brazen despotism of a loud and low minority," even though the opposition be made by a *majority* of the inhabitants of a whole State, as in California in 1882. And for this these free citizens of the State of California are called by this Sunday-law champion, "this oligarchy of *foreign liquor sellers*." Hear him:—

"In California this oligarchy of foreign

liquor sellers was *actually allowed* to repeal the Sabbath law, as a 'league of freedom.'

His application here to the "League of Freedom," is as false as any of the other of his claims. The *Rescue*, the organ of the Good Templars, said of the Sunday plank in the Republican platform, that it was an "entire blank, *acceptable to the League of Freedom, and entirely in their interests.*" And Dr. McDonald, president of the Home Protection Association, said that he was "disgusted with the Sunday-law plank in the platform;" that it was "too treacherous and unsafe," etc. And the Home Protection Association was the most active opponent of the League of Freedom. It "is a consummation devoutly to be wished," that, while these folks strive so strenuously for their *Christian Sabbath*, they would show some respect for the Christian duty to "speak the truth," and to "not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

They were "actually allowed," he says, to "repeal the Sabbath law." "Allowed!" By whom? That Sunday law was repealed by virtue of an issue that was carried by a majority of 17,517 votes, in the State election. And the governor and other State officers who were "actually allowed" to be elected in that campaign, were also "actually allowed" to conduct the affairs of the State for four years. And by the same token, and on the same day, Secretary Folger was "actually allowed" to be beaten for the governorship of New York by a majority of about 200,000. We should not wonder if Dr. Crafts would one of these days volunteer the information that the people of the United States were "actually allowed" to abolish slavery! After this display of erudition, we are not at all surprised to find him, in the very next sentence, calling the repeal of that law an act of *oppression*. See:--

"This *oppression* of masses by margins *must be stopped.*"

So, then, a condition of affairs under which all people are at liberty to keep the day as they may choose, without the *slightest interference*, is *oppression*. But if only a law could be enacted *compelling all* to keep the Sunday, under penalty of fine, or imprisonment, or confiscation of goods, or banishment, that would be LIBERTY. To quote his own words, it "leaves a man's religious belief and practices as *free as the air he breathes.*" Yes, it does. As free as the air that was breathed in the Black Hole of Calcutta.

And in leaving "a man's religious beliefs and practices" so free, "it only forbids the carrying on of certain kinds of business on a certain day of the week, . . . in deference to the feelings and wishes" of a certain class. It therefore was no restriction whatever of the "religious beliefs and practices" of the apostles when the priests and Sadducees laid hands on them and put them in the common prison, and commanded them not to speak at all nor to teach in the name of Jesus. That was perfect religious liberty! And for the apostles to oppose the will of the majority as they did, was the "brazen despotism of a loud and low minority," we suppose. Acts 4 and

5. The priests and Sadducees and the Council did not command them to not *believe* in Jesus and his resurrection. They did not command that they should not worship him. They only commanded that they "should not *speak* at all nor *teach* in the name of Jesus." The Sadducees were the "majority," and as the preaching of the apostles disturbed their "thoroughly" Sadducean religion, "this oppression of masses by margins" had to be "stopped." And thus might Dr. Crafts and the National Reform party justify every act of oppression, and condemn every work of reform that has ever been in the world.

A. T. J.

Church and State.

EDITORS SENTINEL: In your last number I saw an article headed "Church and State," copied from the San Francisco *Chronicle*. I thought it erroneous as well as incorrect in its statements, and therefore wrote a short article to the *Chronicle* in reply. It was thrown into Mr. DeYoung's waste-basket. I am thankful to be assured by you that a brief and similar writing will not share the same fate by the editors of the SENTINEL. My statements must be brief, so I hope they will be accurate.

1. I have been familiar with the National Reform movement from its first inception, and I think its object is not the union of Church and State either in form or in fact. No member of the association says it is; not one man in the association desires it; and the movement has no tendency towards it.

2. If the movement and the National Reform Association are approved and indorsed by the Women's Christian Temperance Union as well as by leading ministers of most of "the evangelical denominations," as the "prominent clergyman," the informant of the *Chronicle* reporter, says, the movement is not presumably very dangerous. Miss Willard is not a very dangerous woman except in the estimation of the saloonists and such like. Neither she nor the ministers of the evangelical denominations desire a union of Church and State; and if the movement tends to it, surely they have sense enough to see it. The presumption, therefore, is that the SENTINEL's fears are groundless.

3. It is true that the National Reformers are opposed to the secular theory of Government, but it is not true that their avowed intention is to afford a basis of organic law "for the general enforcement of Sunday observance." The Reformers do not differ from the great mass of Protestant Christians all the world over. They all hold that in Christian lands the civil law should protect the people in their right to rest on the Christian Sabbath and to worship God without molestation by others. Neither National Reformers nor others dream of compelling men to observe the Sabbath religiously. They all believe, however, that the State should be the conservator of morals; and they assume that the law of the fourth commandment is a *moral law*. And who that believes in Christianity at all does not know that if the Christian Sabbath should be abolished there would soon be neither religion nor Christian morality. Moral anarchy and chaos would result. The friends of the Sabbath, therefore, are the best friends of the nation and of the people.

4. The "prominent clergyman" who answered the *Chronicle* reporter's question, "Which one of the religious denominations takes the lead in this movement?" shows that he knows little about it. He should post himself before he presumes to post others

through the secular press. Rev. Dr. Gibson, of San Francisco, is not known to be one of the vice-presidents. I presume he never was at a National Reform meeting, and never spoke in public or preached in favor of it. He does not even take the *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the association. And the statement that it is Dr. Gibson's "intention, on his return from Europe, to organize a State branch in California," etc., will, no doubt, be news to himself. Indeed, I do not know that there is a minister in San Francisco, and almost none in Oakland, who has ever written or spoken a word in favor of the special object of the National Reform Association. So that manifestly the *Chronicle's* "prominent clergyman" is an alarmist who himself needs to be instructed. And I am sorry that the SENTINEL borrows trouble from the *Chronicle*.

5. That a wine and liquor paper, such as the San Francisco *Chronicle*, should like to make capital against the W. C. T. U. and the Prohibition party by arraying them with the National Reform movement, might be expected. But that the SENTINEL should indorse the *Chronicle* in such an effort seems strange to one who knows that the editors of the SENTINEL are the fast friends of temperance, and presumably of prohibition also.

6. General Grant never opposed National Reform nor the Amendment advocated. In his Des Moines speech he spoke what may have displeased Roman Catholics, whose influence in the State he feared; but it is unfair to array him and Sumner and Andrews as opposed to the Reform so feared by the SENTINEL. On the contrary, Senator Charles Sumner, in the early years of the movement, gave public testimony in favor of it. That they all opposed a union of Church and State is presumed, but it does not follow that they opposed National Reform. So far as they knew the value of Christianity, so far they knew that "righteousness exalts a nation."

A REFORMER.

The above communication is from one for whom we entertain sincere respect, and for this reason, as well as because the SENTINEL can afford to be more than fair, we give it a place in our columns. We have no desire except for truth; and if anything that anyone could write would overthrow any of the positions which the SENTINEL has taken, we would publish it as willingly as we did those positions. But although we have unbounded confidence in our correspondent's honesty, we think he is not so well informed on the question of National Reform as we are, and we shall therefore review his statements *seriatim*.

1. Positive argument would be much more conclusive than our friend's modest disclaimer. He *thinks* that the object of National Reform is not the union of Church and State; we *know* that its object is the union of Church and State, to the fullest extent that such a union ever existed. We say we know this, and so we do, if we may believe the statements of those who seem to be at the head of the movement. It is true that no member of the association says that a union of Church and State is the object of the movement; on the contrary, they emphatically declare that it is not; but at the same time they most urgently demand a condition of things which would be nothing else. It is possible that they do not know what would constitute a union of Church and State, and imagine that if they give some other name to that which

they are working for, no evil results will follow. But we care not for names; the mere name of Church and State union can do no harm, but the thing itself can, by whatever name it is called.

To show that we have reason for saying that we *know* that the National Reform movement does design a practical union of Church and State, we re-quote the following specimen statements made by prominent National Reformers, and published in the official organs of that association:—

In the *Christian Statesman*, in March, 1884, Rev. J. W. Foster said, among other things: "According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for and to serve the purpose of the church;" and again he affirms that in the ideal National Reform State, "The expenses of the church in carrying on her public, aggressive work, it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury." This means the taxation of the people to support the church as a branch of the government. How a more complete union of Church and State could be made, we cannot imagine. And right in harmony with Mr. Foster's statements, but far more explicit, is the following from the *Christian Nation*, July 14, 1886:—

"It is the duty of civil rulers, in subordination to Christ, to recognize the church, its ordinances, and its laws. It is not merely that the existence of such an organization is owned and tolerated, but a statutory arrangement, confessing the divine origin of the church, and the divine obligation resting on the nation to accept its doctrine and order, and engaging to regulate their administration in conformity with its constitution and object."

In the same article we read:—

"Civil rulers owe it to their supreme Lord and to society to encourage and to stimulate the church in its work of faith and labor of love, and, when it may be necessary, to give pecuniary aid to its ministers, that the gospel may be preached in every part of their dominions, and to all classes without respect of persons."

And then the writer proceeds to say that there would be no injustice, but that it would be perfectly right, "to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed." That is, it is right according to the National Reform idea of right, which idea seems to be that everything that the majority may do is right, if the majority chance to be National Reformers, and that the minority have no rights of any kind.

These statements were not made in the heat of debate, but are part of a sermon written by Wm. Sommerville, of Nova Scotia, and after his death edited from the original manuscript by Rev. R. M. Sommerville, of New York, and then published in one of the organs of the National Reform Association. So we must take them as the sentiments of that association.

We might multiply quotations to the same effect, from leading National Reformers, but it is not necessary in this connection. If National Reformers do not believe in nor desire a union of Church and State, and if they

wish to set themselves right in this matter, they may publish in the columns of the *SENTINEL* a repudiation of these and other quotations which we have made from their leading men. So long as such sentiments are expressed, however, it is useless for them to say that they do not want a union of Church and State.

2. It does not necessarily follow that because there are good and able men in the National Reform Association, and because the movement is indorsed by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, it cannot be dangerous. Our correspondent would evidently have us believe that a good or an honest man, or even a wise man, cannot be mistaken or blinded by feeling or prejudice. We are perfectly willing to admit that very many (we cannot include all) National Reformers are sincere in their motives, and desire only good for the people of this country; but that by no means proves that they have chosen the true way to accomplish the good that they desire. Whether or not Miss Willard is a dangerous woman, depends upon how she uses her vast influence. If she uses it to help the majority to put a yoke upon the consciences of the minority, then she is dangerous, no matter how upright her intentions may be. A little child is not a very dangerous creature, nevertheless a match which it may ignite in its innocent play, may cause as great a conflagration as a match in the hands of a hardened incendiary. Honesty of purpose may secure to a person immunity from punishment for an imprudent act, but it cannot ward off the evil consequences of such an act.

3. When our friend says, "It is true that the National Reformers are opposed to the secular theory of government," he virtually admits that they do desire a union of Church and State. The opposite of the secular theory of government is the ecclesiastical theory, which National Reformers favor. So then his disclaimer amounts to this: National Reformers do not desire a union of Church and State; they simply want an ecclesiastical government.

It is mere nonsense to say or to imply that what the National Reformers want is that "the civil law should protect the people in their right to rest on the 'Christian Sabbath,' and to worship God without molestation of others," for the civil law does that already. There is no law in the United States that would compel a man to work on Sunday, or that would for a moment uphold any man or any set of men in attempting to force anyone to do so. More than this, the laws do protect all religious bodies in their right to worship God without molestation by others. If any religious congregation in any city in the United States should be molested in their worship, whether on Sunday or any other day of the week, the intruder would be landed in jail as soon as a policeman could be summoned, and he would be very fortunate if he did not receive the severest penalty. Our laws do at the present time protect *all* people in their worship; but they do not compel those who

have no religious convictions to conform to the practice of those who do, and they will not do so until National Reform principles shall prevail.

Again our friend says: "They all believe that the State should be the conservator of morals." "*They*" may believe it, but we do not. The person who thinks that the State can act as the conservator of morals has either a supremely exalted idea of the power of the State, or an extremely low standard of morality, or else he has not really given the subject any careful thought. It will not be questioned but that the ten commandments contain the sum of all moral duties. Then if the State is the conservator of morals, it must see that every one of the ten commandments is obeyed by its citizens. As a matter of fact, however, the State can do nothing of the kind, no matter how virtuous its law-makers are, nor how just its judges. Let us consider an instance or two.

The tenth commandment says, "Thou shalt not covet." Will any National Reformer claim that it is the duty of the State to keep a man from being covetous? or that it is within the province of the State to punish a man for covetousness? The thing is an impossibility. The State has no power, in the first place, even to determine whether or not a man is covetous. But covetousness is immoral; therefore in this respect the State cannot be a conservator of morals.

Again, the Bible tells us that "covetousness is idolatry." Now while the State has the power, although not the right, to restrain men from falling down before images, it cannot prevent their being at heart the grossest kind of idolaters. And who shall say that in the eyes of the only Judge of morals, the ignorant image worshiper is more immoral than the scheming, covetous Pharisee?

Take for instance those commandments in regard to which the State has a certain duty. The sixth commandment says, "Thou shalt not kill." It is the duty of the State to prevent murder as far as possible, by executing severe penalties upon those who take human life. But we are told in the Scriptures that he who gives way to unreasoning anger, or who secretly cherishes hatred and envy in his heart, is a murderer. With this, the State can do nothing. Is the man who takes the life of another in the heat of passion, and possibly after great provocation, any more immoral than the one who for days and perhaps years cherishes murder in his heart, perhaps longing for a chance to commit it, and only deterred by lack of opportunity? Everybody will answer in the negative. Yet the State executes the first and pays no attention to the second. Why? Because the first has interfered with the rights of society, while the second, although probably more depraved, has injured no one but himself. The first has committed an uncivil act, which is also immoral, and comes in collision with the civil law, which punishes him, not for his immorality, but for his uncivility; while the second, although basely immoral, has violated

no civil law, and is therefore not answerable to the State.

The seventh commandment says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." It is within the province of the State to punish the man who openly commits adultery with his neighbor's wife; yet that man may not be half so corrupt as another one whose every thought is impure, and whose soul is rotten with meditated vice which he has not the power or the courage to openly practice, yet upon whom the State can lay no hand, because he has invaded no household. Then let no one say that the State is or ever can be the conservator of morals. All it can do, and all it is appointed to do, is to punish those whose unrestrained vices interfere with the rights of society.

The very expressions "civil laws" and "civil government" define the extent of the State's jurisdiction. As to the *morals* of the people, it is impossible for it to take cognizance of them, even if the right to do so were given it. The State may overstep her prerogatives, and enforce the customs and ceremonies of religion, but in so doing it will be making hypocrites, and will seriously interfere with the work of the gospel, by making men believe themselves to be moral, and in no need of conversion, although they may be, in reality, as corrupt as the inhabitants of Sodom.

4. As to Dr. Gibson, it is a matter of very small moment whether he is personally connected with the National Reform Association or not. If the *Chronicle* reporter was misinformed, that ends that matter, but does not affect the main question in the least.

5. The *SENTINEL* has never sought to make capital against the W. C. T. U. or the Prohibition party by arraying them with the National Reform movement, although we are sure, as our correspondent tacitly admits, that it is to their discredit that they are so arrayed. It should be understood that the *SENTINEL* deals first, last, and all the time with the National Reform Association, and has no crusade to make against any other association. As a matter of fact, the *SENTINEL* is heartily in favor of the W. C. T. U. as far as it adheres to its legitimate temperance work, and we have mentioned that organization only to show how rapidly the current is setting toward National Reform principles. We regard it as a great calamity that an organization with such power for good as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union should lend itself, however innocently, to the furtherance of National Reform designs. When the W. C. T. U. does this, then to that extent it necessarily brings itself into the same condemnation as the National Reform Association.

6. We have not the data at hand to verify or disprove the statement made concerning the attitude of Grant, Sumner, and Andrews toward National Reform, and it is of little consequence anyway. It matters not how certain men, no matter how great, have regarded this question. We are discussing the case on its own merits, and if the National Reform movement is intrinsically wrong, as we believe it is, it cannot be bettered by the ad-

herence of any number of eminent men. We do not borrow trouble from the *Chronicle* nor from any other source. There will be no necessity for any lover of justice to borrow trouble so long as the National Reform Association exists. We speak the things which we know, and do not take our information at second hand. We consider it our duty, however, to let our readers know how other journals regard the movement which the *SENTINEL* is combating; but in giving their opinions we do not necessarily become responsible for all their statements. That the *SENTINEL*'s charges against the movement are incontrovertible is evidenced, we think, to some extent by the fact that not a single National Reformer has ever attempted to demonstrate the fallacy of one of them. E. J. W.

Some Facts about National Reform.

THE *Christian Nation* of July 13, 1887, presents an argument to show that "National Reform is non-sectarian." It presents "three facts" and then says:—

"The National Reform Association is not asking the nation to recognize Calvinism, Arminianism, Catholicism, or *any other ism*."

On this point of "any other ism" we have a word to say, and we shall say it, after the manner of the *Christian Nation*, by presenting a few facts—more than three—for the consideration of the people in general and of the *Christian Nation* in particular.

First fact. The first step that was ever taken, the first paper that was ever presented, in favor of the National Reform movement, or the organization of that association, was by a Reformed Presbyterian.

Second fact. Until within about the last three years, all the active public workers—the District Secretaries—of the National Reform Association have been Reformed Presbyterians, and all but three of them—Leiper, Weir, and Mills—are now Reformed Presbyterians.

Third fact. Both of the editors of the *Christian Statesman*—Dr. McAllister and T. P. Stevenson—are Reformed Presbyterians. Dr. McAllister is a professor in a Reformed Presbyterian College, and Mr. Stevenson is pastor of a Reformed Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia.

Fourth fact. Mr. John W. Pritchard, by whom the *Christian Nation* is "conducted," is a Reformed Presbyterian; and for two years or more was the Reformed Presbyterian Synod's "Financial Agent for National Reform."

Fifth fact. Both the *Christian Statesman* and the *Christian Nation* are recognized church papers of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, as well as organs of National Reform.

Sixth fact. The *Reformed Presbyterian*, for the month of January, 1870, published to the world an article by Rev. James Wallace, in which are the following statements:—

1. "This important truth of the Lordship of Jesus Christ over the nations, was attained by our reforming and martyred Fathers in Scotland, . . . and has been transmitted down to us sealed with their blood, and is the precious and peculiar inheritance of the Re-

formed Presbyterian Church, and distinguishes her from all the other evangelical churches in this and other lands. No other church professes to maintain this great principle in its practical applications."

2. "The distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are the principles, *and the only principles*, of National Reform."

3. "Now the Association for National Reform simply proposes to have these distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church adopted into the Constitution of the United States, annulling any parts of that Constitution that may be inconsistent with these principles. . . . The adoption of this Amendment into the Constitution would be the Government doing . . . the highest honor to the Lord Jesus Christ, and the greatest benefit to our church."

4. "The principles of National Reform are our principles, and its work is our work. *National Reform is simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the nation.*" (The Italics are his.)

Seventh fact. These statements are confirmed by Rev. J. R. W. Sloane's account of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, in the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," in which he says:—

"The more special and distinctive principle of this church, the one in which she differs from *all others*, is her practical *protest against the secular character* of the United States Constitution. . . . They take the deepest interest in that reform movement which has for its object the amendment of the United States Constitution in those particulars in which they consider it defective. Indeed, they feel specially called to aid in its success, at whatever cost or personal sacrifice."

Eighth fact. The Reformed Presbyterian Synod of 1886 in its report on National Reform said:—

"It is ours to hold up the ideals of God, *which have originated the National Reform cause.*" And the Synod of 1885 said of National Reform, that "This is the tap-root of the Reformed Presbyterian Church."

Therefore the sum of all this matter is—

THE UNDENIABLE TRUTH, that National Reform is nothing under heaven but Reformed Presbyterianism—and that in politics.

In view of these facts, the statement of the *Christian Nation* that "the National Reform Association is not asking the nation to recognize Calvinism, Arminianism, Catholicism, or *any other ism*," looks rather queer as a representation of truth. And all the more so as it is so exceedingly difficult to understand how it can be that the Reformed Presbyterian conductor of the *Christian Nation* does not know of these facts.

In proof of the "non-sectarian character of the National Reform creed" the *Christian Nation* proposes the fact that "the membership of the National Reform Association embraces representatives of almost every evangelical communion. Joseph Cook and Dr. Miner, Dr. Leonard and Bishop Littlejohn, Frances E. Willard and Julia McNair Wright, and thousands of others . . . find room and welcome on the broad platform of National Reform." But it proves nothing of the kind, because the "broad (?) platform of National Reform" is composed only of the narrow distinctive principles of the Reformed Presby-

terian Church," and when these people of other communions step upon that platform, they in that adopt the distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and so far make themselves Reformed Presbyterians. And when they of other communions push the National Reform movement to a successful issue, they are only pushing to a successful issue the distinctive principles of Reformed Presbyterianism; they are only fixedly planting in the soil of our national affairs "the taproot of the Reformed Presbyterian Church."

The logic is perfectly easy. By their own words, we have the following syllogism:—

MAJOR: Reformed Presbyterianism "originated the National Reform cause."

MINOR: "The distinctive principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are the principles, and the only principles, of National Reform."

CONCLUSION: National Reform is only Reformed Presbyterianism. And when the National Reform Association asks the nation to recognize National Reform, it asks the nation to recognize Reformed Presbyterianism, and no "other ism."

The *Christian Nation* ought to adopt some other form of denial. It might have better success in getting at the truth. A. T. J.

As to a Religious War.

• A CORRESPONDENT asks the following questions:—

"What effect will the success of the National Reform have on the unbelievers at large? We heard one say that they would raise a little army and fight, before they would submit to the authority of a church. Another said he would get out his old shot-gun and 'shoot down a few of them.' Will there be enough of that spirit to bring on a religious war? A. R. S."

As to the first question we can say that according to the words of the National Reformers themselves, the success of National Reform will "disfranchise every logically consistent infidel." Notice particularly that it is only the "logically consistent" unbeliever who will be disfranchised. That is to say that though he be an infidel, if only he will silently submit to the dominance of National Reform ideas, or even openly, though hypocritically, favor the National Reform scheme, he will not be disfranchised. But if he shall be at all "logically consistent" and oppose the work or the rule of National Reform, or shall express his dislike of the National Reform government and its so-called "Christian features," then, according to the words of the National Reformers, all such unbelievers must "go to some wild, desolate land, and stay there till they die."

But if they refuse either to play the hypocrite, or "to go to some wild, desolate land," and propose to resist, as these mentioned by our correspondent, then that brings up the alternative of the second question, upon which we can only say that we have no idea how much of this spirit of violent opposition there will be against National Reform. We know, however, that the question of a religious war all depends upon the opposition—the Na-

tional Reformers are ready for it, and are coolly calculating the bloody chances. On this very subject the "Rev."—mark it—the Rev. M. A. Gault, one of the most representative of National Reformers, says:—

"Whether the Constitution will be set right on the question of the moral supremacy of God's law in Government without a *bloody revolution*, will depend *entirely* upon the *strength and resistance* of the forces of anti-Christ."

Therefore, as the question of a religious war depends "entirely" upon the forces of resistance to National Reform, and as we have no idea how much forcible resistance there will be, we cannot form any estimate of the probabilities of the coming of a religious war. It may be that through the immense premium that National Reform will put upon hypocrisy, the forces of resistance will be, if not entirely vanquished, so far overcome as to avert a religious war. For be it distinctly understood that the AMERICAN SENTINEL proposes no violent nor forcible resistance to National Reform. Our opposition is, and ever will be, conducted strictly and entirely upon Christian principles. We unsparingly point out the evil of it, and warn our fellow-men against it; knowing the terrible nature of it, we persuade men to avoid it, and whether they will hear or whether they will forbear remains entirely with them. Should National Reform succeed in its designs, and establish its shameful rule, we shall offer no violent resistance. In things pertaining to God, however, we shall forever disobey it, and shall forever persuade others to disobey it. But it will always be a disobedience that consists in obedience to the commandments of God and the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ. It will be disobedience without resistance. If others choose to resist it by force of arms, we are not responsible for that, and shall take no part in it nor encourage it. Our work now is to expose the essential iniquity of the thing, that it may not be slipped upon the nation unawares. And if, after all, it shall succeed, then our work shall still be to expose the iniquity of it, and to set the example of open, but non-resisting, disobedience to its Papal-political precepts. A. T. J.

PLAIN FACTS FOR OLD AND YOUNG

—EMBRACING—

NATURAL HISTORY AND HYGIENE OF ORGANIC LIFE.

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

Member of the British and American Associations for the Advancement of Science, Editor of "Good Health," and Author of Various Works on Health.

NEW EDITION REVISED AND ENLARGED,

CONTAINING OVER 600 OCTAVO PAGES.

No work ever issued from the American Press has met with such a cordial reception by the people. It is indorsed by the highest authority as a standard work. It is a necessity, not a luxury. Indispensable to those who would preserve the health and morals of their own children.

BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS.

Sex in Living Forms—Reproduction—Sexual Hygiene—Uncertainty—The Social Evil—Solitary Vice—Etc.—A chapter for boys—A chapter for young men—A chapter for old men—A chapter for girls—A chapter for young women—A chapter for wives and mothers—Diseases peculiar to women.

100 CHOICE HEALTH THOUGHTS.

"Plain Facts" is sold only by subscription.—Agents wanted. For sample copies, territory, and terms, Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal. General Agents for the West.

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS.

By J. M. HUTCHINGS.

THIS new work is a complete historical and descriptive summary of the wonderful Yo Semite Valley and Big Tree Groves. The author, Mr. Hutchings, is an old pioneer, and has for more than 20 years resided in the Valley. He took the first sketches of it that were ever taken, and was the first to make its

MARVELOUS GRANDEUR KNOWN TO THE WORLD.

The work is complete in one volume of nearly 600 pages, and is illustrated with over 150 illustrations, 28 of which are

BEAUTIFUL FULL-PAGE ARTOTYPES.

These artotypes are the most charmingly characteristic of any illustrations ever produced, and are perfectly true to life, having been photographed from nature.

Sold only by subscription. Agents wanted everywhere. For prices and terms,

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

VINDICATION OF THE TRUE SABBATH.

By J. W. MORTON.

FORMER MISSIONARY OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH TO HIAITL.

THIS pamphlet is an able treatise on the divine appointment of the Sabbath of the Bible. The personal narrative of its author contains a noble instance of self-sacrifice and devotion to the truth for the truth's sake.

The reader of this little work will find breathed throughout its pages a mild and Christian spirit, worthy the imitation of controversialists of every name; while at the same time, its candid, convincing, and logical arguments challenge refutation. Paper covers, 68 pages, sent post-paid for 10 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

MODERN SPIRITUALISM

ITS NATURE AND TENDENCY.

By ELI. J. II. WAGGONER.

THIS is a thorough *expose* of the system of Spiritualism. The author has carefully studied the subject, and has given such copious extracts from a large library of Spiritualist publications, as to fully condemn them in their teachings and in their practices, by their own testimony.

It is also shown from the prophetic scriptures that Spiritualism is one of the most impressive signs of the times. 184 pp Price, 20 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

BIBLE SANCTIFICATION:

A CONTRAST OF

TRUE AND FALSE THEORIES.

By MRS. E. G. WHITE.

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

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

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.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH

AND FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

By ELI. J. N. ANDREWS.

THIS WORK CONTAINS A MINE OF INFORMATION.

THE Bible record of the Sabbath; the secular history concerning it; the successive steps by which the change to the first day was made, and the work of restoration, are given in detail.

Every text of Scripture concerning the Sabbath is commented on at length; and the complete Testimony of the Fathers in regard to the Sabbath and first day is given. The comparative merits of the seventh and the first-day Sabbaths are fully shown. A copious index enables the reader to find any text, or the statement of any historian.

Should be read by everybody. 548 pp. Price, \$2.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER, 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.

In this number of the SENTINEL we print in full another letter from a National Reformer, and also the answer to it. We are glad to do so, because we are willing that our readers shall know what the Reformers can say for themselves. The letter we printed before, the *Christian Statesman* took bodily from our columns and gave its readers not so much as a hint that there was ever any reply made to it. We write this note especially to say to the *Christian Statesman* that unless it can print both the letter and the reply to it, we want it to let the letter itself alone. If the *Statesman* cannot afford to be fair, we desire that it shall at least be honest.

It is announced from Rome that the Pope has decided to take part in the coming political elections in France, and that he hopes to secure a strong party in the Chamber of Deputies. Yes, he hopes to secure a strong party in the Chamber of Deputies so as to hold the balance of power and virtually control legislation in France, and control it too from Rome. And France dare not resent this political interference of a foreign religious power. How long will it be before the Pope will decide to take part in our political elections? Only let the National Reform religio-political party succeed in its design of establishing a constitutional basis for religious legislation, and this question will answer itself.

Puritan "Rights."

REV. GEO. C. ADAMS, writing from St. Louis to the *Advance* about the Sunday law, says:—

"The charge is freely made that it is an effort to make a 'Puritanical' Sunday, and so it is; for the Puritan certainly believed in equal rights for all, and was not willing to allow any privileged classes."

Yes, indeed! The Puritans of New England "certainly believed in equal rights for all" Puritans, but they just as certainly believed in no rights at all for anybody else, not even the right to *live*, in New England. They were indeed "not willing to allow any privileged classes" except Puritans. In them were summed up all rights and privileges, even to the right and privilege of hanging Quakers and witches, whipping Baptists, and banishing dissenters of all kinds, under pain of death. Theirs was the right to compel people to go to church on Sunday and listen to sermons such as, said one of the victims, "was meat to be digested, but only by the heart or stomach of an ostrich." Theirs was the right to tie women to the tails of carts and drag them through New England towns, at the same time lashing them upon the bare back

with heavy two-handed whips made of three thongs "of twisted and knotted cord or cat-gut," while one of the "privileged" preachers looked on and laughed at such an infliction as, if suffered to be completed, would have amounted to one hundred and ten lashes each, as the poor women were dragged through dirt and snow half-leg deep, and the weather bitter cold. And all because the women had the impudent presumption to claim the right and privilege of being Quakers. In this case when the poor, tortured women had been lashed through three towns with ten stripes each in each town, the people arose in their righteous indignation and set the "ghastly pilgrims" free.

Oh, yes, the Puritan was indeed "not willing to allow any privileged classes"! But may Heaven protect this dear land from any revival of Puritan rule, or any other rule according to Puritan principles.

We are sure that this nation does not one-half—half! no not one one-hundredth part—appreciate the wonders that National Reform proposes to accomplish for her. Just think of it. When National Reform shall have succeeded in setting its buzzard securely upon the Nation's Capitol, in place of the American Eagle, then, O then,

No pestilence shall ever croak,
Nor famine flap its wings;
No earthquake e'er shall walk abroad,
Nor cyclone scatter things.

This is not exactly as they express it, but it is the substance of what the Reformed Presbyterians promise the Nation by National Reform, and they know all about it, for Reformed Presbyterianism is the mother of National Reform. And in their late Synod at Newburg, N. Y., their committee on National Reform said that when the nation shall have accepted the National Reform condition, "Revolution will not overturn the Government; pestilence will not spread its wings over the people; famine will not scorch the broad acres, nor blight the waving field; the earthquake will not shake down cities, nor the cyclone tread homes into ruins."

And these are the men who talk of "folly and fanaticism" in those who oppose National Reform!

MR. M. A. GAULT says in the *Christian Nation*:—

"Let us say for the thousandth time that we are eternally opposed to uniting Church and State in the sense of compelling men by civil law to observe church regulations as such."

"In the sense, etc.," and "as such," to be sure. They are opposed to the union of Church and State "in the sense"—but why are they not opposed to it in any sense whatever? Why is it necessary for the National Reformers always to leave themselves a loop-hole through some saving clause or qualifying phrase? The reason is manifest, they are not opposed, either eternally or temporally, to the union of Church and State in some sense, and so they always conveniently leave the way open for themselves to explain in just what sense they are opposed to it.

And, too, they are opposed to compelling

men by civil law to observe church regulations "as such." Of course. But if only the church regulation can be enforced by the civil law as a "police regulation," as is proposed with the "Christian Sabbath," for instance, then it is all right, and anybody who opposes that is a "brazen despot" and a "political atheist."

Not a Godless Nation?—Why Not?

THE *Christian at Work* declares of France that "the nation is not godless," and in proof of the statement adduces the fact that there was celebrated in the Paris churches "the other Sunday, the *Fete Dieu*, or God's Festival." It says:—

"The Madeleine Church was especially decorated for the occasion, and the ceremonies, closing with a procession, were performed with the scenic splendor of the Roman ritual. . . . The procession, as it wound along the rear of the edifice, presented a most striking and effective picture, with the priests in gorgeous vestments, the acolytes, or altar boys, and choristers in their snowy surplices and crimson girdles, and the numerous school-children in white veils and dresses, who carried banners and pennons. . . . A well-dressed man who was looking on, neglected, either unintentionally or with design, to take off his hat. He was instantly set upon by a dozen persons, whose religious enthusiasm had been suddenly kindled by the music, the flowers, and the incense, and was severely beaten. He escaped, all bleeding, from their hands, and his clothes were torn almost to shreds."

Oh, no! France is not godless. Neither is China, nor Hindostan, nor any other Catholic or heathen nation. And in all these lands their "godliness" and their "religious enthusiasm" find expression in about the same way. In view of this report it is a happy thing that we have the assurance of the *Christian at Work* that France "is not godless;" otherwise we might be inclined to doubt whether such actions were a manifestation of the genuine righteousness that becometh a nation. But this undoubted assurance, supported by such signal proofs, we suppose establishes once for all the important fact that France is a godly nation; which fact, with the proofs, we commend to the National Reform Association. The United States alone among nations is "godless." But in that respect may she remain forever just as she is. We have no desire to see here Popish processions or anything else that shall kindle the "enthusiasm" of violent national religionists.

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.