

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

“Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.”

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER, 1887.

NUMBER 10.

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.

Prussia at the Pope's Feet.

THE Pope has sent out a note of rejoicing over his triumphant conquest of Germany, upon which, under the above heading, the *Christian Advocate* comments as follows:—

“One of the most pitiable spectacles presented in these latter days to the world's gaze is that of Prussia—great and Protestant Prussia—doing obeisance to the Pope of Rome.

“If any human force could make Martin Luther and Philip Melancthon arise from their graves beneath the marble slabs in the Wittenberg church, it would be this. But, alas! so bound hand and foot is their land to-day, that not one strong voice in the whole country dares to sound the alarm and tell the whole civilized world what is going on in Berlin.

“The climax has just been reached in the Pope's allocution, which came by cablegram from Rome. His holiness appeals to the whole world to hear his cry of victory over German Protestantism. Here are some of his jubilant notes:—

“We felt more concerned at the evils of this religious struggle with Prussia, and as we were unable to remedy them by striving alone, owing to the obstacles which impeded our power, we invoked the co-operation of the German bishops and the Catholic deputies in the Prussian Diet, from whose constancy and concord the church derived great fruits, and expects still greater. Thanks to the equitable and pacific sentiments of Emperor William and his counselors, the Prussian Government removed the more serious inconveniences, and then accepted the various practical conditions of peace, by which some of the former laws against the church have been repealed and others mitigated. Something remains, but we must rejoice at what we have obtained, and, above all, in regard to the free action of the Pope in the government of the church in Prussia.”

“If Bismarck is not entirely blind to all Protestant sentiment, and is not utterly consumed by his love of Prussian imperialism, whatever becomes of the people, he must have some sense of shame when he reads the Pope's allocution—that this triumph of Romanism in Germany is made the basis of an appeal to Italy to range herself on the side of Papal interests. Germany more Catholic than Italy! That is the picture now, and the world is told so by Leo XIII.”

The Throne of David.

It has heretofore been shown in the *SENTINEL* that Christ is to possess, at different times, two distinct forms of kingship: one, a priestly kingship, after the order of Melchisedek; the other a national or civil kingship, after the order of David, or, more properly, as the successor of David on his throne. The radical defect in all the professed arguments of the professed National Reformers is, that they make no distinction between these reigns, either as to time or nature. They liberally quote those prophecies which refer to Christ's reign on the throne of David, and apply them to his present reign on the throne of his Father in Heaven, as priest after the order of Melchisedek.

In the Old Testament Christ was represented by these two kingly personages, Melchisedek and David. Melchisedek was both king and priest. Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, abundantly proves that Christ is now fulfilling the kingly priesthood in Heaven. *And that is the only kingship that he now has.* At least one National Reform writer saw the difficulty attending their position in regard to Christ being king of the nations while he is mediator, and attempted to meet it; and how? By referring to Solomon, who was king of Israel and king over the nations! A more lamentable failure could not be made, for Solomon was not a mediator, or priest, as Christ is. But who can do better on that side of the question, where no proof is to be found? That difficulty is insurmountable, forever barring the way of the National Reform theories.

In the May number of the *SENTINEL*, in answering certain assertions of the National Reformers, we noticed at some length the priestly reign of Christ, and showed by the Scriptures that while he is a priest on the throne of his Father, he is *expecting* that the nations will be given to him. Surely this expectation has not yet been fulfilled, for his mediation is not yet concluded. Now we will notice his other kingship, namely, on the throne of David.

Let it be borne in mind that *David had no priesthood.* No one ever acted as priest who sat on his throne. One, Uzziah, essayed to act as priest, but was smitten with leprosy for his presumption. And Christ will not be a priest on the throne of David, for no priesthood belongs to that throne. The question then rises, Is Christ to occupy two distinct thrones, at different times? Yes, that is exactly what the Scriptures teach. The proof

is found in his own words, as follows: “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me *in my throne*, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father *in his throne.*” Rev. 3:21.

There is no question or difference of opinion as to the present position of Christ; he is acting as priest on the throne of his Father. And if the people were not “slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken;” if they gave ready heed to “all scripture,” as they should, there would be no question about Christ yet occupying his own throne—the throne of David, to which he was born heir. In regard to this throne, and its occupancy, we will listen to the Scriptures.

The angel, in foretelling to Mary the birth of Jesus, said: “The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” Luke 1:32, 33. Peter, speaking of the resurrection of Christ, shows that it was in the fulfillment of the promise to David. Of David he said: “Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.” Acts 2:30, 31.

To this throne Christ was born heir. When David died, the throne descended to his son; and each son, in turn, lost his right by death. Jesus also died, and would have lost his right had he remained dead. But the Father “raised up Christ” to sit on David's throne. There is significance in the expression, “The Lord God shall *give unto him* the throne of his father David.” It was his by birth; it was resigned in death; and it was restored to him in the resurrection. And now, as long as Jesus lives, no other can claim that throne. It is his by heirship, and it is the one upon which the faithful overcomers will sit with him, after he resigns his position on the throne of his Father in Heaven.

In Rev. 11:15 is a declaration often quoted by the National Reformers, and always by them misapplied. We will examine its terms: “The seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in Heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever.” In immediate connection, verses 17, 18, are words which the Reformers never quote in this connection.

They are the words of the four and twenty elders: "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth."

1. "The seventh angel sounded." There are seven trumpets in the book of Revelation, bringing to view facts concerning the nations, covering the entire period of the Christian dispensation. The seventh is the last, and closes up the dispensation. This is an undisputed truth. It is confirmed in the following:—

2. "Thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged." Paul at Athens said that God had "appointed a day in the which he will judge the world." The seventh trumpet opens this appointed day. The error of the National Reformers is, their *misapplication* of the prophecies. They press them into the service of their cause without any regard to their connection or relation. This is an error, and the source of error; it is perverting the Scriptures. So Satan quoted Scripture to the Saviour; but all who read Ps. 91 will readily see that he misapplied it. That psalm did not refer to the Saviour, but it does refer to the saints in the coming time of trouble, during the pouring out of the plagues of God's wrath. See Rev. 16. We have no doubt that if the Reformers were asked if they believed the appointed day of Judgment has arrived, if the time of the judgment of the dead has come, they would give a negative answer. All these things come under the seventh trumpet, under which dominion over the nations will be given to Christ; but not while he is priest, not during human probation.

3. "And that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets," etc. This can refer to nothing less than the resurrection of the prophets when they, with all the saints, will receive the full blessing of immortality. See 1 Cor. 15:50-54. Jesus said to his disciples, "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:14. And again, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27.

"The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ." This declaration needs a more extended examination. It will be observed that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of *our Lord*, as well as of *his Christ*. The elders praise and thank God because he *has taken to himself his great power and has reigned*. This our model reformers entirely overlook. They see nothing but Christ taking power over the nations, by a popular political vote! But, in the fulfillment of this prophecy, they see no relation to the Father taking his power to himself; no relation to the sounding of the

seventh trumpet, to the judgment of the dead, or the time of giving reward to the prophets. It is their reckless method of quoting Scripture that leads them into their grievous errors; and that is the source of most of the religious errors and schisms of the day.

In what sense may it be said that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ takes to himself his power? In what sense do the kingdoms become his under the seventh trumpet? To determine this question we must inquire into the origin, and examine the changes, of earthly dominion.

It is not a doctrine of the Bible, nor of the church, that God is directly the Creator of every man. He created man, the father of the race, and established the laws of generation, by which the race is multiplied and perpetuated. And, though men become sinners, even desperately wicked, their lives must be respected because life is the highest gift of the Creator. In like manner God established a dominion of man upon the earth in the beginning; and though the dominion has passed into the hands of the wicked, "the powers that be" must be honored, out of respect for their origin—for the ordinance of God. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth." Gen. 1:26. Here is the origin. But where is the succession? We cannot imagine that God ever resigned to anybody the right to or proprietorship of the earth. Only a certain extent of power, a limited dominion was conferred upon man. But Adam did not long retain his rule. Beguiled by Satan, he turned away from his Creator and Benefactor, took another for his master, and threw away his life. All other blessings, all privileges and rights are comprised in this. When Adam lost his life he had no more to lose. His dominion had passed away.

Now the question arises, Did Adam, by his sin, by his transfer of allegiance, resign his dominion to Satan? The Scriptures show that he did. God did not take it back to himself, but put it under a curse. Christ calls Satan "the prince of this world;" Paul, "the god of this world;" and John said, "The whole world lieth in the wicked one." Most decisive of all is the evidence afforded by the temptation of Christ. When Satan showed him all the kingdoms of the world, he said, "All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will, I give it." Luke 4:6. Jesus had undertaken "to destroy the works of the devil;" to redeem man and his inheritance from the curse. Eph. 1:13, 14; Ps. 37:11. To accomplish this object he knew that he must lay down his life. But Satan tempts him to take the dominion which Adam lost, without passing through death. The honor and wealth of this world have been the bait with which he has lured the sons of Adam to destruction. When Christ took "upon him the seed of Abraham"—the nature of Adam, —Satan thought to overthrow him by the same means.

It is generally considered that Satan's words were false; that it was not in his power to bestow the kingdoms and glory of this world. But if not, how is he the prince and god of this world? how is it that the world lieth in the wicked one? and why is it that to love the world, and the things of the world, is to be the enemy of God? But if Satan's words were false; if he had not become possessed of the dominion given to Adam, the Saviour certainly knew it, he then knew it was a false pretense. How, then, was it a temptation? Surely there can be no temptation in a promise which we know is impossible of fulfillment. In this, and in this only, can we find a solution of Rev. 11:17. This is the rule which the Lord God Almighty takes back to himself; this is the power which he rescues from the great usurper, and confers upon "the second Adam." Then Satan is bound, and Christ redeems the inheritance and bestows it upon his faithful ones. But what do the National Reformers propose to do? They propose to take this work into their own hands; to vote the power out of the hands of Satan, and to vote Christ into his kingdom. And anything else? Ah, yes; to vote to themselves all the honor, the power, and the glory of the kingdom, and to disfranchise all who will not acknowledge their right! Never was a greater effort made to turn sacred things into a farce. But, to the minority, the farce will end in a tragedy.

All the Scriptures show that the history of this present world will end in war and carnage. The kingdoms of this world are the enemies which the Father will give to the Son. See again Ps. 2:7-9; 110:1; Heb. 1:13; 10:12, 13. When the kingdoms are given to Christ, the nations are angry, and the wrath of God is upon them. Rev. 11:14, 15, 18. When the God of Heaven sets up a kingdom—which setting up consists in conferring the dominion upon his Son, and thus restoring the throne of David—"it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. 2:44. The same is shown in Jer. 25, where "all the kingdoms of the world, which are upon the face of the earth," are caused to drink the wine cup of God's fury. We know that this refers to the consummation, because it is said they shall drink, "and fall, and rise no more." All the kingdoms of this world will be utterly destroyed, for they are all the enemies of the pure gospel and reign of Christ. And the same is found in Rev. 15 and 16, where the plagues of God's wrath are poured upon the kings and nations of the earth, which are gathered "to the battle of that great day of God Almighty."

Want of space forbids our carrying this subject further. We trust, however, that every reader—especially every reader of the Bible—must see that the conclusions of the National Reformers are based upon wrong interpretations and misapplications of the prophecies, which amount to perversions of the Scriptures. But their theories are pleasing to the ambition of bigoted professors, who find it more congenial to their spirits to forcibly compel their neighbors to conform to their opinions, than to conform themselves to the gospel of peace, and to use only "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." J. H. W.

Christian Liberty.

"THE TRUE DOCTRINE IS NOT OUR RIGHT TO THINK FOR OURSELVES, BUT THE RIGHT OF THE OTHER MAN TO THINK FOR HIMSELF."

THE impression very widely prevails that the battle for Christian liberty has been fought and won. So far as regards precaution of the more active kind, this is the case in the larger part of the civilized world. The right of the minority to free speech and free action in the line of conscientious conviction is, in theory, at least, conceded.

But it is a mistake to assume that because harsh laws have been softened, human nature has been radically changed. The grosser forms of persecution have disappeared, but subtler forms remain. The intolerant spirit has survived the death of many institutions by which intolerance was once manifested. Christian liberty is still, in a considerable degree, conceded only in theory. Men still endeavor to punish those who have the temerity to differ with them.

There is no cause for astonishment at this manifestation of inconsistency. It is one of the curious things in human history to see how generally the persecuted have become in turn persecutors the moment the power was lodged in their hands. And why? Because the true principle of Christian liberty had not been grasped, and is to this day apprehended by only a few. The right of any body of men to differ in opinion from others has always been claimed by them; there is no novelty in that. From the beginning, every Christian sect that has arisen has vehemently contended for its right to differ from others. It has protested against persecution—that is to say, the persecution of itself by others. But in few cases has any sect conceded the right of others to differ from it, or forborne to persecute when it had the power. And in our own day each man is prompt to claim and assert the right to think for himself, but how loth most are to concede the equal right of all other men to think for themselves. Everyone resents any attempt to coerce him into the avowal of anything that he does not honestly believe, but how few of us fail at one time or another to attempt thus to coerce others.

The true doctrine of Christian liberty is not our right to think for ourselves, but the right of the other man to think for himself. There is no danger now that our right will not be insisted upon and enforced, particularly if our thinking happens to fall in with that of the majority. It is the other man's liberty that is in danger, particularly if he happens to be in the minority. It is his liberty that demands defense at all hazards; for, if liberty is denied him, how long will it be conceded to us?

To demand liberty for the other man, even when he differs from us, is not to admit that truth and error are essentially one, or to deny that it is of great consequence what the other man believes and teaches. It may be our duty to oppose with all our might what he teaches, to denounce it as deadly error. But this may be done without identifying the man

with what he teaches, and without the display of the spirit of intolerance and persecution. We need not try to make the man odious because his opinion is odious to us. To be loyal to the truth, and yet faithfully to recognize the equal rights of all men to free thought and free speech, is not always an easy task. The two may, however, be combined. And nothing can be more certain than that the preservation of Christian liberty for any is conditioned on the concession of that liberty for all.—*N. Y. Examiner.*

Not "A Daniel Come to Judgment."

THE State of Louisiana has, in common with many other States, been doctoring its Sunday laws, and now has a law requiring that, with certain exceptions, all places of business shall be closed from 12 o'clock on Saturday night until 12 o'clock on Sunday night. A case recently came before the Supreme Court of Louisiana, in which the law was claimed to be unconstitutional. The court held the law to be valid, and the following is a portion of the opinion delivered by the Judge:—

"We take occasion promptly to say that if the object of the law were to compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, we would not hesitate to declare it to be violative of the above constitutional prohibition. It would violate equally the religious liberty of the Christian, the Jew, and the infidel, none of whom can be compelled by law to comply with any merely religious observance whether it accords with his faith and conscience or not. With rare exceptions, the American authorities concur in this view. . . . The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned, because in the exercise of a wise discretion, it has chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this State, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observe as a day of rest."

The *New York Independent* quotes this, and adds the following words of approval:—

"This is an exceeding lucid statement of the theory which underlies all legislation that requires the suspension of ordinary labor on Sunday. The object is not to enforce religious observances of any kind, but simply to establish a uniform day of rest for the general good of the whole people; and this is no interference with the religious rights of anybody."

It may seem very presumptuous for a non-professional man to criticise the opinion of so great a person as a Judge of a Supreme Court, but nevertheless we have no hesitation in saying that the opinion quoted is nothing but sophistry, and such sophistry as could be dealt out only by an adept in the art. This we think can easily be made apparent; and it is the more necessary that this should be done, because the Sunday-law mania has now become quite prevalent, and just such sophistical arguments as those quoted above will be relied on in securing the enactment of those laws. These arguments will be used for the reason that they are the best that can be offered in favor of an unjust law, and also simply because they have been used before.

Even the Louisiana judge himself did not pretend to originate them, but contented himself with giving the view in which nearly all "American authorities concur." If American legal business were not becoming more a matter of precedent than of common sense, Sunday laws could never be enacted; but the idea seems to be that whatever has been done ought to be done; and precedents for oppressing people under the guise of charity are not wanting.

The claim is made that the Sunday law does not compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, and that therefore it cannot be contrary to a Constitution which forbids religious tests for office or citizenship. But the fact is, Sunday is primarily a religious institution, and its observance cannot be enforced except as such. It cannot be separated from its religious (not *sacred*) character for the purpose of special legislation concerning it. It matters not what such legislation is called, whether a police regulation, or a law in the interests of the workingman, it is legislation concerning an institution of the church.

To make it evident that Sunday laws are laws in behalf of religion, three things only need to be borne in mind: 1. Sunday rest originated in the church. Catholics universally claim the church as the sole authority for Sunday observance, and many Protestants agree with them in this. The *Christian at Work* says: "We rest the designation of Sunday solely on the church having set it apart of its own authority." But if the claims of those who say that Christ and the apostles set the day apart as a day of rest, were true, that would make it emphatically a church institution. 2. The observance of Sunday is generally considered by church people as the essence of religion. In the Sunday-law contest in California five years ago, the *Christian Advocate* spoke of Sunday as "the foundation of our holy religion." Regarding Sunday rest as the memorial of the resurrection of Christ, they think that without it there would be no evidence of the truth of the gospel. 3. The churches and the churches alone are at the bottom of all Sunday legislation. No one ever heard of such a thing as a Sunday law being proposed by anybody except a zealous churchman or a deputation of ministers. It is true that, by pretending that Sunday laws are in the interest of labor, they are inducing labor and socialistic organizations to clamor for such laws, but these organizations come in only as allies to the church. Everyone who knows anything of the history of Sunday legislation, knows that it is *always* instigated by the churches.

Now in the face of these things, to say that Sunday laws do not compel men to observe Sunday as a religious institution, is not only sophistry, but it is positive untruth. Since the day as a day of rest is nothing else but a religious institution, how can it be enforced as anything else but a religious institution? It cannot be enforced as something which it is not. True, it is said that when the State enforces the observance of Sunday,

it makes it a civil institution, merely a legal holiday. Well, nobody contends that the State law makes Sunday a religious institution; it is that already. We freely admit that the State law in its behalf is only a civil ordinance, for the State could make nothing else but a civil ordinance; but, mark it well, what we do claim, and what all candid minds must admit to be the truth, is that a State Sunday law is a *civil ordinance* enforcing the observance of a *religious institution*.

Some years ago the city of San Francisco had a notorious mayor, who engaged in certain transactions that were inconsistent with his official position. His defense was that he did those things as an ordinary citizen, and not as mayor. It requires no argument to show the absurdity of such a statement. The man was mayor, and he could not separate himself from his office within the time for which he was elected. But this is just on a par with the argument that Sunday legislation is not the enforcement of a religious institution. If the friends of so-called National Reform admit such a plea, they must be prepared to see it carried out to its legitimate conclusion. They must expect to see the vilest rakes elected to office in their model government, under the plea that they are not bad citizens, but are simply bad men.

If anything further were needed to show the flimsy character of the arguments by which Sunday-law advocates attempt to make it appear that they are not working for an ecclesiastical establishment, it may be found in the last sentence of the judicial opinion first quoted. Said the judge:—

“The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned because, in the exercise of a wise discretion, it has chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this State, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observe as a day of rest.”

“A wise discretion,” indeed! The State has chosen the day which a large majority of its inhabitants, under the sanctions of their religious faith, voluntarily observe as a day of rest, and, at the instigation of that majority, has undertaken to enforce its observance as a day of rest, and yet this is no more in the interest of religion than if Monday or Thursday had been chosen! Such a monstrous assertion needs but to be quoted to be refuted. A man must be sadly blinded to put such a statement forth as a sober legal argument; and men must be pre-determined to have Sunday laws, or they could not be deceived by it. Suppose that the State had, in the exercise of its “wise discretion,” chosen Saturday instead of Sunday; would there not have been protests without number? Indeed there would. People would call it a law in the interests of the Jews and other Sabbatarians, and no argument could convince them to the contrary. “But” says one, “such a law would really be unjust to the great majority who observe Sunday as a day of religious rest.” Indeed! Then by the same token a law enforcing Sunday observance is

unjust to those who observe Saturday, or who do not choose to observe any set day. The discriminating reader can see that it is the word “majority” which catches the judicial fancy. It seems to be the idea that Sunday legislation cannot be wrong, because the majority favor it. As much as to say that a thing is necessarily right if it is proposed by a majority of the people. But no majorities can ever make a wrong right, and State laws in behalf of an establishment of religion are always wrong. The question whether or not Sunday ought to be observed as a day of rest, does not enter into the case at all. We believe in the God of the Bible, as the majority of people in this country profess to do, but we should emphatically protest against a State law to compel all people to recognize him as such.

Here is a point that should not be lost sight of: If Sunday laws are not for the purpose of compelling the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, for what purpose are they? The claim is that they are in the interest of humanity, so that laboring men may have the rest which their physical nature imperatively demands. Very well, then we suppose it will be admitted that it is within the province of the State to compel men to observe the laws of their being. Now it is just as certain that man’s physical nature requires that he should take a definite amount of sleep every twenty-four hours, far more imperatively than it demands that he shall rest one day in seven. Will our Sunday-law friends admit that the State has any right to decide how many hours a man ought to sleep, and to enact a law compelling every man to sleep at least seven hours out of every twenty-four? Unless they are ready to advocate such a measure as this, let them say nothing more about enforcing Sunday rest on the basis of the necessity of man’s physical nature. We have presented this view of the case before, but we do not expect ever to see Sunday-law advocates attempt to meet it.

Now one word concerning the *Independent’s* statement that Sunday legislation “is no interference with the religious rights of anybody.” We say that it is a positive and unjust interference with the religious rights of everybody who conscientiously observes any day other than Sunday. Here are laboring men who believe that when the fourth commandment says, “The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work,” it means just what it says. They are conscientious in their observance of the seventh day of the week; and the needs of their families demand that they should spend the other six days in labor, as the commandment allows. According to the fourth commandment, it is their religious *privilege* to labor six days of the week, just as much as it is their religious *duty* to rest on the seventh. Therefore if the State steps in and *compels* them to rest on another day also, no matter on what grounds the rest is enforced, their religious rights are interfered with. And if those men shall be punished for continuing to make Sunday one of their six working days, their

punishment will be an act of religious persecution. No assertions to the contrary can change the truth of this.

From the very nature of the case, Sunday legislation must interfere with the religious rights of some. For, Sunday as a day of rest is beyond dispute a religious institution; legislation enforcing its observance is legislation enforcing an establishment of religion; and when any religious tenet is enforced, the religious rights of all who do not hold that tenet must be interfered with, and oppression must result.

We hope that the people in those States that still allow full liberty of conscience, will take the time and trouble now to become well informed concerning the arguments used in behalf of Sunday laws, and will learn how to expose their fallacy, so that when the Sunday-law mania shall seize their State, as it surely will, they will not allow their liberty to be taken away without making a well-directed, intelligent protest.

E. J. W.

Church and State.

THE whole mission of the church of God is to preach the gospel. Its career lies within the kingdoms of earth, but it is not of them. When the policy of the nations is such as to give the church free scope in its work, the church does not become an appendage to the State, but rather uses this liberty to preach the gospel. When her work is opposed, and she is persecuted by the world, she may petition or remonstrate against being hampered in her mission. But whether this avail or not, she must go onward faithfully in her great work.

The work of the State (whatever form it assumes) is to supervise the life of citizens, and to legislate and enforce those things which are necessary for upholding right and punishing crime. They are both ordained of God. The two must never be confounded. Our Master said, “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s; and unto God the things which are God’s.”

And yet the church does shed down upon the arena of civil life a benediction. It by grace qualifies its members to be honest, sober-minded citizens, and sends them forth as such. But she can have nothing to do with politics. She can have no relation of mutual support established between herself and the State.

The State has in all ages tried to bribe and guide the church, that it might secure control through her of the members. Let us see. In the Southern States the negro Baptist preachers, and perhaps others, are very ignorant, very venal, and have great control over their people. In nearly all sections of the South, in closely contested elections, the effort is made to bribe the preacher and through him control the congregation. This effort is largely successful. Few negroes can resist a bribe. The church is prostituted, for money, from its high mission, to be the servant of corrupt political partisans.

The English prelatial church, and other established churches receiving from the civil power protection and support and honor, pay

it back in loyal protestations and service. The church serves the State as its master. Note the loyalty of the Anglican Church to the Stuarts. Note the Toryism of the Episcopalians during the Revolutionary war.

Several of the Protestant churches of this country have voluntarily sold themselves, or bestowed their church influence to the furtherance of some political issue. And various denominations, protesting their loyalty to the present government, have sought, by way of return, to shape its policy. They memorialize it about how to treat the Mormons, prohibition, Knights of Labor, etc. Of course this is apart from the proper work of the church. The church teaches her members to be good citizens, but she has nothing to do with dogmatizing about forms of government or questions of civil policy. Whenever she has done so she has blundered, and her shame has sooner or later become manifest.

But chiefly the Romish Church has sold herself to the governments of earth. It is her policy in every land. Through her priests she controls her people. Everywhere she traffics with the civil power, to enhance her ecclesiastical prerogatives. In the United States she sells her votes to the party that is most subservient, and that gives the largest returns in the way of money and influence. In Ireland she, so far as she dares, throws her influence with the Home Rule party, to maintain her power over them. In Germany she sells her influence to despotic Bismarck, that she may increase the influence of her bishops. Such is her policy. Everywhere, for her own advancement, she bargains and traffics with the powers of the world. And it is to that shameless and persistent policy that she owes her worldly grandeur and power. And now, these facts being notorious, let us consider them in the light of the following statements:—

1. Such a policy is, so far as it is pursued, betrayal of the gospel. There is but one work that God has imposed on the church. There is but one Master that is tolerated. There is but one motive controlling all service.

2. If a church is zealous of worldly honor it must lose in spiritual power. Grand edifices, parade of wealth, political power, the suffrage of the influential, may appeal to the people of earth, but the church that seeks these things and boasts of them is turned away from God's service, and is become shorn of spiritual power. It can no longer do its great work singly.

3. The world honors in word, and fawns upon, the church that it uses. But in its secret heart it despises such a church. Note how politicians treat politely and deferentially the negro preachers, and yet when their backs are turned sneer at them for their venality. Note how the secular press respectfully and gravely records the Romish parades and ceremonies, and yet read between the lines the contempt felt for Romanism as a spiritual religion.

From all which we gather the injunction that the church keep itself unspotted from the world, rejecting its bribes, refusing its yoke.—*Rev. J. A. Scott, Jr., in Christian at Work.*

The "Christian Cynosure" Again.

OUR readers will remember that in the April SENTINEL we reviewed some National Reform arguments of the *Christain Cynosure*. Well, the *Cynosure* has replied, and expects us to reply to this also. We shall do so. And as the *Cynosure* issues beforehand its *pronunciamento* that, "If the AMERICAN SENTINEL wishes to be read by the *Cynosure* editor, it must deserve to be read," we shall go very softly and shall humbly endeavor to make our reply so that it may deserve the august notice of the *Cynosure* editor. First the "*Cynosure* editor" says:—

"Our Constitution forbids Congress to 'make any law concerning an established religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' Taken literally, this forbids laws prohibiting 'the free exercise' of polygamy and assassination by Danites or Blood Avengers at Salt Lake; or the multitudes of religious murders by the Kofong, Purrow, Bondoo and other religious secret societies which cover Africa. Insert the word *Christian* before religion, and our Constitution would recognize exactly what the framers meant and supposed they had done, viz., 'the free exercise' of the religion of Christendom, that is, of the Bible."

Now the first thing that we wish to say is, that we respectfully submit to the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL that it is a most discouraging thing to have to argue about the United States Constitution with a person who cannot quote it correctly. Mark, he says, "Our Constitution forbids Congress to 'make any laws concerning an established religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'" Mr. Editor, the Constitution does not do any such thing. The Constitution forbids Congress to make any "law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The difference is very material; we confess, however, that we have little hope that the *Cynosure* will detect it. Nor for that matter do we care particularly, whether it does or not; what we want is that the editor of the *Cynosure* should by some means gain sufficient knowledge of our Constitution to quote it as it reads.

Further he says that, "Taken literally, this forbids laws prohibiting 'the free exercise' of polygamy and assassination by Danites or Blood Avengers at Salt Lake." To this we can only say as we did before, Does the *Cynosure* mean seriously to assert that the Constitution of the United States guarantees polygamy and assassination as it guarantees the free exercise of religion? In other words, are "religion," and "assassination" synonymous terms, so that the free exercise of the one is the free exercise of the other? Is the free exercise of religion the free exercise of assassination? Does the prohibition of assassination, or any other crime, prohibit the free exercise of religion? Is it possible that a distinction must be made between these things, that the *Cynosure* may be enlightened? It seems strange that anybody, much less an editor in this age, should know no such distinction.

But more, and just as bad, he continues, "Taken literally, this forbids laws prohibiting

'the free exercise' of . . . the multitudes of religious murders by the Kofong, Purrow, Bondoo, and other religious secret societies which cover Africa." Well, suppose that all this were even so, what harm can it do? What on earth has our Constitution to do with either allowing or prohibiting the murders, whether religious or otherwise, by "the Kofong, Purrow, Bondoo, and other religious societies which cover Africa?" Suppose the editor of the *Cynosure* could have our Constitution actually prohibit the murders by the religious societies that cover Africa. What good could it possibly do? That would be decidedly a prohibition that would not prohibit. It *could* not prohibit, because our Constitution has nothing, and can have nothing, whatever to do with the secret societies, nor with anythings else, that cover Africa.

Now let not the *Cynosure* whimper over this as it did over our strictures upon its desire to prohibit the religion of Dahomey. That is exactly what it has said. We have only copied *verbatim et literatim*, its own words. And by these words, its demand is that our Constitution shall have a religious amendment, so that laws can be made under it, which shall prohibit murders committed by the "secret societies which cover Africa." The *Cynosure* may, perhaps, say that that is not what it means. Then what *does* it mean? We have no way of learning what it means but from what it says. Yet we do not so much blame the *Cynosure* editor, for it seems to be the prime property of National Reform to so confuse the ideas of its advocates that they become incapable of putting together sentences in plain English, that shall tell what they do mean.

Once more, he says: "Insert the word *Christian* before religion, and our Constitution would recognize exactly what the framers meant and supposed they had done." This is the "single word" the insertion of which the *Cynosure* declares is all the addition that National Reformers want to make to our Constitution. Let us try it and see how it would then read, and how it would work. Here it is: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of *Christian* religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Then under *that* Constitution Congress could make laws respecting an establishment of any religion on earth, except the Christian religion. Under that Constitution the Mohammedan religion, the Chinese religion, or any other except the Christian religion, might be made the established religion of this Government, only so that the free exercise of the Christian religion was not prohibited. Is *that* "exactly what the framers meant"? Is *that* "exactly" what they "supposed they had done"? If it is, then that they were mistaken is the happiest thing that ever befell this Nation. But the mistake was not with the framers: they did "exactly" what they meant to do. The mistake lies altogether and solely with the "*Cynosure* editor."

Next the *Cynosure* says:—
"As to Seventh-day Baptists and Adventists who insist on keeping Saturday and working on Sunday, the *Cynosure* holds that 'Man needs and God requires a Sabbath.'"

But that is not all that the *Cynosure* and National Reform hold, nor is that as they hold it. The *Cynosure* and National Reform hold that "Man needs and God requires" *Sunday* as a Sabbath. And when "Seventh-day Baptists and Adventists" and Jews or any others have kept Saturday as Sabbath, as "man needs and God requires," the National Reformers want to compel them to keep Sunday besides. The National Reformers declare that all that God requires of man in this connection is one-seventh part of his time, or one day in seven, and then when these people religiously and conscientiously render to God the one day in seven that he requires, the National Reformers want laws to compel them to render another day also. Although, according to their own principles all that God requires of man is one-seventh of his time, they will compel all seventh-day keepers to render *two-sevenths*, unless they yield their consciences and accept the interpretation of the National Reformers. But in that case men's right of conscience and of interpretation of Scripture is destroyed, and the National Reformers impose themselves and *their* interpretation upon men's consciences in the place of God. And that is the Papacy over again.

Yet says the editor, "The *Cynosure* is opposed to coercing conscience." That may be so, but National Reform is *not* opposed to it. And as the *Cynosure* is pledged to National Reform, we doubt very much whether it is indeed opposed to coercing conscience.

Again the *Cynosure* editor avows:—

"We are opposed to imprisoning or fining any decent law-abiding man, who has kept Saturday, because he does not keep Sunday also. The *Cynosure* would help pay such a man's fine, petition for his instant relief from jail, and instruct the Legislature to repeal the law which imprisoned him."

But there have already been a number of instances, in two States, where just that kind of men have been imprisoned, fined, and shamefully treated, for that very reason and no other; and yet the *Cynosure* never offered to help pay any of the fines, it never petitioned for their relief at all, nor did it ever "instruct" either of the State Legislatures to repeal the law which imprisoned the men, and robbed women and children. True, while the *Cynosure* did not believe that there were any such cases in existence, it was so bold as to observe that "nothing could be more abhorrent to our Constitution than such persecution." But when *facts* were presented in its own columns by a trustworthy citizen of its own city, who himself saw some of the persecutions, then the *Cynosure* instead of helping to pay the fines, or petitioning for the relief of the persecuted, or instructing the Legislature to repeal the persecuting law, calmly folded its editorial hands and concluded to "wait for confirmation of the facts before commenting upon them." Then when the facts were confirmed by the public records clear to the Supreme Court of the State, and even to the halls of the State Legislature itself, the *Cynosure* has never even to this day offered a single word of comment upon the subject, and the persecution continued for

more than a year—it continued in fact till the Legislature repealed the law and so put a stop to it. And although the Legislature repealed the law, it never received a word of instruction from the *Cynosure*, to do so. Mr. Editor, words are very cheap, and until your acts show differently on this subject from what they ever have shown, your professions will amount to nothing, though your words may charm never so wisely—"The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart: his words were softer than oil, yet were they drawn swords."

"But" says the *Cynosure*, "if the Arkansas cases of persecution are just as given, and not the result of religious squabbles, and law perverted by sectarian or neighborhood fights, then the severest strokes of the SENTINEL will but second our own."

Those cases of persecution were exactly as given, if not worse. But that is not the question at all. Suppose they were entirely the result of "religious squabbles" and of "law perverted by sectarian fights." It is for that very reason that they ought to be utterly condemned. For what business has the civil law to be made the channel through which shall be poured out the venom that is engendered "in religious squabbles"? By what right is it that the State shall be made the tool of the irregular passions of sectarian bigots who happen to be in the majority, in their "sectarian fights"? It is against this that the SENTINEL wars. It is the principle of the thing which we condemn. Whether the victims of the persecution were Seventh-day Baptists, Seventh-day Adventists, Indians, or Chinese, the principle is the same, and is utterly perverse. But to make such a thing universal in all this Nation, is the direct aim of National Reform and of the *Christian Cynosure*. For such will be the inevitable result of the religious amendment to the National Constitution. Therefore the SENTINEL opposes the so-called National Reform, and shall ever oppose it to the very utmost.

Then as was to be expected the *Cynosure* swings back upon the subject of secret lodges, and says:—

"Several Legislatures have passed laws against imposing secret oaths by secret lodges. The New York Reports, Wendell, Vol. 13, and the testimony before the Rhode Island Legislative Committee give these oaths in the terms imposed in the lodges, *sworn to by Masons*; and published by John Quincy Adams as given. These oaths swear men to have their throats cut if they violate the by-laws of their lodges."

That may all be true. We shall allow that it is true at any rate, for the sake of argument. Yet however true it may be, here is something that is just as true as that can be: The taking of such an oath is wholly a voluntary act. No man in the world was ever compelled to take any such oath, much less was anyone ever compelled to take it under penalty of forfeiture of citizenship and all rights of conscience. Yet to compel men to conform to their will, or else suffer the weight of such a penalty, is precisely what the National Reformers will do if they ever succeed in their project. And this is why that, although se-

cret societies and their oaths are bad, National Reform is worse; yes worse than they ever can be unless they should set about to do as the National Reformers are trying to do.

The *Cynosure* says in effect that if our reply does not suit, it will notice the SENTINEL no more. Very well, we earnestly hope that this our reply will suit: yet if it does not the SENTINEL will survive the calamity we are sure. So dear *Cynosure* if it must be so,

"Then fare thee well;
And if forever,
Then forever
Fare the well."

A. T. J.

National Reform and Woman's Christian Temperance Union Assembly.

THIS Assembly was held at Lakeside, Ohio, August 18–21. Lakeside is situated on a beautiful peninsula extending into Lake Erie, about nine miles from Sandusky, and is becoming every year more and more popular as a summer resort, having connected with it religious meetings of various kinds, such as Sunday-school encampments, camp-meetings, Christian assemblies, etc. In fact it is becoming widely known as the "Chautauqua of the West." The population of this summer city reaches at times up to four and five thousand inhabitants, and it is abundantly supplied with hotels, cottages, restaurants, etc. It has two large, permanent, open-air auditoriums, lighted with electric lights, and able to seat three thousand, and fifteen hundred respectively. The city is supplied by a system of water works with pure lake water; this with its sanitary arrangements and its naturally fine location on the lake shore opposite Kelley's Island and Put-in-Bay make it withal a very pleasant, comfortable summer resort.

We arrived on the grounds Thursday, August 18, in time to listen to the opening address, "The Work of the National Reform Association," by the Rev. David McAllister, LL.D. The subject was introduced by an extract from the *Pittsburg Commercial Gazette*, dated August 16, in which it was stated that the Germans were making an organized effort for the repeal of existing Sunday laws in that State, and that in Allegheny County circulars had been sent to some 30,000 Germans to enlist them in this effort. To counteract such influences was the work of the National Reform Association, and the only hope of gaining its object, he said, was by having God and the Bible recognized in the Constitution of the United States, inasmuch as those who seek to break down the Christian character of the Nation, intrench themselves behind its non-sectarian character. And he was glad to say that the National Reform movement was gaining adherents and supporters among all denominations, and even outside of the denominations. The Association recognizes the authority of God over the State and the National Government, and also that the moral law is supreme over man in every relation. The corruptions that exist among office-holders, the laxity of present divorce laws, and similar evils, makes it necessary, he argued,

that earnest work be done in the line of National Reform. "Those who oppose this work now," said he, "will discover when the religious amendment is made to the Constitution, that if they do not see fit to fall in with the majority, they must abide the consequences or seek some more congenial clime."

At 2:30 p. m. the Rev. A. B. Leonard, D. D., delivered a very eloquent, stirring address on the subject of intemperance and prohibition, using as his text, "The Upas Tree." At 7:30 p. m. Rev. J. M. Foster delivered an address on the principles of National Reform. He stated that there are two theories of civil government: (1) The infidel, that regards it simply as a secular matter; (2) the Christian, that places it on the basis of the Bible. The French adopted the first, for a day and an hour, but the results were such that they were glad to return to the other and recognize the authority of God in civil government. He proceeded: "Ours is a Christian nation. Christianity is the common law of this land. A Christian nation ought to have a Christian government. The State has a mighty power, but this it receives from Almighty God. The civil government is simply the arm of Jehovah dealing with man. If this is so, then it is the duty of the Nation to recognize the fact that God is the source of power. The laws of the State come from God, and are based upon the divine law of God, which was given upon two tables of stone to indicate its perpetuity. Those commandments are not obsolete; they are still in vogue. The State is the divinely appointed keeper of the decalogue, and should regulate its affairs in harmony with its individual precepts, thus recognizing God as the source of law, preserving the sanctity of the Sabbath [Sunday], guarding the family relations, prohibiting murder by the revolver and by rum, etc. But our fathers made two mistakes in setting up this Government; first, in permitting slavery, and second, in ignoring the claim of the King of kings as the author of civil law. Slavery has been abolished; and now the other mistake must be corrected, and in doing this the speaker maintained that the Nation would act the part of wisdom as to her national salvation."

The Rev. M. A. Gault's "Talk on Bible Politics" given at 4 o'clock, in a hall called Bradley Temple, was mainly an effort to prove a similarity between the Jewish State and our Government, and to show that some of our principal laws are nothing but adaptations and modifications of laws given by Moses. The speaker held strongly that the moral law, the decalogue, is still binding upon mankind, and should be enforced upon the people by the State. And, in fact, these statements were repeated time and again by other speakers, so that if we had not known just the object of this movement, we might have thought ourselves in the midst of a people that wished to magnify the law and make it honorable, a people that especially kept the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. And here we apprehend will be the secret of their success. A direct appeal to the moral law, the ten commandments, has still a deciding influence upon the minds of a great many professed Christians who do not see that the enforcement of moral precepts is beyond the power of civil governments.

The time on Friday evening was occupied by several speakers, among whom were the Rev. R. C. Wylie, and Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, and recording secretary of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Mr. Wylie presented in a ten-minute speech the principles of National Reform, and Mrs. Woodbridge followed with a short

address, in which she remarked: "Those who have heard our brother outline the principles of the National Reform Association, will see how closely allied it is with the Woman's Christian Temperance Union."

The next day, the 20th, was given to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. In the forenoon addresses were made on the subject of woman's suffrage, on prison work, on the flower mission, and on the subject of Sabbath observance. Mrs. Bateham, superintendent of the Sabbath Observance Department of the W. C. T. U., spoke on the last mentioned subject. She stated in brief, that this was one of the most important of the forty different lines of work that the W. C. T. U. had in hand, and that considerable work was being done in this direction; that thirty-six States and Territories had already adopted this department of the work, that State superintendents and agents had been appointed, and were out in the field, and that encouraging reports were being received. She stated that their aim was not to effect a union of Church and State, but to secure the right for every man of having one day in seven. All unnecessary labor and traffic should be prohibited on Sunday, and the people should be led to see, that the safety of the Nation lies in the maintenance of this day as a day of rest.

In the afternoon Mrs. Munsol delivered an address, and in the evening Mrs. Fannie W. Leiter read a paper on the value of scientific temperance education.

The next day, Sunday, which was the last day of the Assembly, Rev. W. J. Coleman preached in the forenoon a National Reform sermon, based on Rev. 19:11-16. His points were in brief as follows: "Every reformation in the past has been brought about when the people have obtained a new view of Christ. This must also be the case before a reform in national affairs can be secured. The Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations, and this is the fundamental principle of national religion." To prove that Christ is the ruler of nations, reference was made to such expressions as "the son of David," "he shall rule them with a rod of iron," "the Lord shall make his enemies his footstool," "the Prince of Peace," "there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom," "every knee shall bow," "King of kings and Lord of lords" etc.—passages that undoubtedly refer to Christ, but not until he has taken his everlasting kingdom into his possession; not until he has come the second time, to punish the wicked and reward the righteous; not until the "prince of this world," Satan, has been conquered, and He shall rule, whose right it is to reign. It seems to us that these National Reformers are making just as grievous a mistake in regard to Christ and his present position, as the Jews did in regard to his first advent. The Jews applied the prophecies relating to Christ's second coming in glory and power, to his first advent. And so these zealous, but mistaken reformers apply to Christ at the present time, passages that refer to his future glorious kingdom, when sin and sinners are no more, and when Christ shall reign supreme.

Referring to the sacrifices made to secure the abolition of slavery and to conquer the Rebellion, the speaker said that there ought to be a mighty army ready to pour out treasure, and blood, if need be, to vindicate the authority of Christ. "The Bible should be adopted as a standard to decide questions in political life, to decide between right and wrong. The idea of a divine law and a divine Christ should be forced into politics. There is now no religion in the Constitution of the United States. Our aim is to bring this Nation to Christ, and to place it under the divine law.

Our fundamental principles are: Christ is king of the Nation, and the Bible is the rule of action. When this is recognized in the Constitution, it will settle the question of prohibition as well as every other moral reform. And this is the reason why the National Reform question, should be agitated and pressed in connection with that of prohibition."

The address in the evening by Rev. J. B. Helwig, D. D., on the subject of the "Sabbath Question" was an effort to prove the necessity of maintaining and preserving the Sabbath [Sunday], pointing out some of the dangers which threaten it at the present time. At the close of the sermon, farewell words were spoken by a number. Rev. James P. Mills stated that he had planned that next year a grand eight or ten days' National Reform Assembly should be held at Lakeside, if possible earlier in the season, so as to secure a larger attendance, and that this Assembly should include the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the twin sister of the National Reform Association, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Ohio Divorce Association, various Sabbath leagues, anti-secret societies, etc. Such a grand Christian Assembly would, he said, "set the groves of Lakeside ablaze with Reform ideas, the people would become enlightened, and would return to their homes prepared to carry on the work among their neighbors and friends."

The advocates of National Reform are alive and busy at work, agitating, creating sentiment, enlisting prominent and educated men in their ranks, and above all are very sure that their cause will triumph. There are two things which they themselves regard as very potent factors in bringing about the objects they have in view: 1. The close sympathy and union existing between the National Reform Association and the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the hearty cooperation of this mighty army of women in furthering the aims of the Association. 2. The prospect of securing the right of suffrage for women, a line of work to which the W. C. T. U. are devoting their energies, and which the N. R. A. does not object to. And we were impressed that these two assistants, with others, might prove to be mighty agents in bringing about the changes in our Constitution which they demand. A. B. OYEN.

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.

DIPHTHERIA:

ITS CAUSES, PREVENTION, AND PROPER TREATMENT.

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

THE increasing prevalence of this devastating disease, and its alarming fatality in so many cases, renders the subject of its Nature and Treatment one of the greatest importance.

This work gives a concise account of the Nature, Cause and Modes of Prevention, and also

THE MOST SUCCESSFUL METHODS OF TREATMENT

Of this prevalent and fatal malady. It should be in every household, as its instructions, if faithfully carried out, will save many a precious life. Price, in board covers, 25 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER, 1887.

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

THE *Christian Union* commenting upon the Mormon Constitution for the proposed State of Utah, which pretends to prohibit polygamy, says:—

“Shutting polygamy out of the State Constitution will no more make Utah a Monogamous State than putting God into the National Constitution would make the United States a pious nation.”

That is a most apt illustration of National Reform and its pretensions. It is the whole National Reform scheme in a nutshell.

READ the report of the Lakeside (O.) National Reform Convention, which appears in this number of the SENTINEL if you think that the National Reform movement is only a bugbear, and that there is no danger of its attaining sufficient proportions to warrant giving it any attention. Dr. McAllister's statement that their amendment will be secured by 1896 at the latest, and that it may come in 1892, is not a wild one. The leaven is working in all classes of society, and yet people are asleep to the danger. The SENTINEL did not enter the field a day too soon. It will do all that it can to sound the alarm; who will second its efforts?

WE have a verbatim report of all the addresses delivered at the Lakeside National Reform Convention, and also of the questions and answers. Thus we have a good stock of the latest utterances on National Reform, by those who are at the head of the movement. The answers to some of the questions reveal very fully the real spirit of the movement, and we shall give some of them to our readers in the next number. We design to make the next number of the SENTINEL the best that has ever been issued, and that is simply in the line of our purpose to make each number better than the one which preceded it.

A FEW days ago we received five hundred and ninety-four subscriptions for the SENTINEL, accompanied by the cash, from a single canvasser. This is the largest list yet sent in by any one man, but we hope it will not long remain the largest. There are scores of men who could do as well. The publishers give a liberal commission on SENTINEL subscriptions, because the journal is not run for the purpose of making money, but for the purpose of warning the people of the United States of the impending danger. Where are the men who see this danger, who will help sound the alarm by increasing the circulation of the SENTINEL?

PRUSSIA's hobnobbing with the Papacy has begun already to bear the unfailling fruit of a legal recognition of Romanism. A Lutheran minister in Prussia was recently sentenced to nine months' imprisonment for “insulting” the Romish Church. The insult consisted in publishing a pamphlet in which he remarked that the Romish apostasy is “built upon superstition and idolatry.” And for such “insulting” remarks as this, to prison for nine months their author had to go. And this in the land of Luther! Let Prussia be called no more a Protestant country. She has been surrendered bodily to the Papacy, and Rome rules there, and that in Rome's own wicked way.

THE National Reform scheme still gathers strength as it goes. Hitherto the *Christian Union* has been opposed to it, but now it too has fallen into line. In an editorial, September 8, endorsing a National Reform circular, the *Union* strikes the genuine sanctimonious-political tone of the regular National Reform key, thus:—

“The political aim of Christianity is to bring forth a time in which Christianity shall control the caucus, religion shall control politics, the politicians shall be saints, and the polls shall be holy ground.”

“This know also that in the last days, perilous times shall come. For men shall be . . . blasphemers . . . having a form of godliness.” 2 Tim. 3:1, 2, 5.

THE Rev. F. S. Hatch, of Hartford, Conn., telling in the *Congregationalist* of the success of the Connecticut law forbidding railway trains and traffic on Sunday, says that “Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, and Roman Catholics have united with Congregationalists in the successful attempt to secure this reform.” He says the condition of affairs is not yet perfect, but that “it is a fresh illustration of the familiar truth that no evil in our midst can stand against the determination of the united Christian Church.” And if the supposed evil happens to be a good, it is all the same. This is a pointer which shows how this church affair may easily be made national when the work of National Reform shall have progressed a little further.

BESIDES the Lakeside National Reform meeting mentioned elsewhere, there was also a most important one at Saratoga Springs, August 15, 16, and 17. This was a meeting almost altogether of ministers from different parts of the country. Dr. Price, president of the Young Ladies College, Nashville, Tenn.; Dr. Cowles, president of Elmira Female College, New York; Rev. J. H. Smythe, New York City; Dr. Parmelee, Jersey City; Dr. Kerr, Richmond, Va.; Dr. McFarland, Virginia; Dr. Herrick Johnson, Chicago; Dr. Smith, Baltimore, Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly 1887; Rev. Mr. Foster, Saratoga; Dr. Dowd, Temple Grove Seminary, Saratoga; Dr. Leech, Saratoga, ex-chaplain New York Senate; Rev. Samuel McLanahan, Baltimore; Rev. Mr. Winn, Petersburg, Va.; Dr. Niles, York, Pa.; Prof. E.

N. Jones, principal Saratoga Public Schools; Rev. Mr. Tufts, Munson, Mass.; Rev. Mr. Sawyer, East Hampton, Mass.; Rev. Mr. Lanphear, Beverly, Mass.; and Joseph Cook, the Boston Monday Lecturer, were the prominent speakers in the meeting. Dr. Herrick Johnson presided. Preserve this list. You will have use for it in the future.

AN exchange says:—

“The law cannot make a man moral, but it can make him dreadfully uncomfortable when he is immoral.”

Well, that depends. It is true that the law cannot make a man moral; and if it is the law of the land that is referred to, as we suppose it is, then we know that a man may be terribly immoral without suffering the least inconvenience from the law. The trouble is, people have a very low standard of morality. If a man does no open violence, nor cause any serious inconvenience to his neighbor, he is called a moral man; whereas, a man may do nothing for which the law could molest him, and still be as corrupt as the grave. It should be understood that civil laws cannot make men moral, and are not for the purpose of punishing immorality, but simply for the purpose of protecting the rights of people; in short, to deter men from acting in an uncivil manner.

A WRITER in the *Evangelical Churchman*, of Canada, makes a strong plea for the Canadian Legislature at its next session to pass an Act authorizing the Governor-General “to issue a proclamation prohibiting all Sunday railway traffic throughout the entire dominion, at such a date as a similar Act shall come into operation in the United States.” He says that “when the people of the United States know that Canada has passed an Act against Sunday railway traffic, which must remain inoperative until their own Congress passes a similar Act which in connection with the Canadian one would stop all Sabbath desecration by railway and steamboat companies, and when they are appealed to as they will be by pulpit and press, they will say, ‘This thing must be done.’” This appeal by pulpit and press is even now being made, loud enough to be heard even to Canada. How long will it be before the thing shall be accomplished?

CHRIST's kingdom is not of this world. The church is not a Police Board, not Caesar's lieutenant, but a saviour of lost sinners. Its simple, sole, glorious mission is to bring sinners to Jesus by preaching the gospel to them with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven.—*St. Louis Observer*.

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.