

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL

"Corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

VOLUME 2.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER, 1887.

NUMBER 12.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING HOUSE,
OAKLAND, CAL

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

J. H. WAGGONER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

Entered at the Post-office in Oakland.

WE have no sympathy with the land theories of Henry George and Dr. McGlynn, but with the following propositions which the Doctor presents in the August number of the *North American Review*, we heartily agree:—

"Only common schools and common charities should be supported by the common treasury.

"The doctrine of equal taxation should be applied to all corporations, civil and religious, without exemption in favor of any church, charity, or school, or, in a word, of any institution that is not the property of the people, and controlled for some public and common use by public officials."

Concerning this doctrine, the *Independent* makes the following just comment:—

"It is the only doctrine that is consistent with justice to all the people, or with the fundamental principles upon which government is organized in this country. If religious sects, whether Catholic or Protestant, choose to establish a system of 'parochial schools,' for the purpose of teaching therein their peculiar religious tenets in connection with secular education, then let them do so at their own charges; but let not a dollar of the public money, raised by taxation, either directly or indirectly, be used for the support of these schools. It is enough for the general public to pay the expenses of the public schools organized by the State, without being saddled with those of private schools for religious propagandism. So, also, in the matter of taxation, there is no good reason why a religious corporation, owning private property which it controls for its own uses, and which is protected by civil society, should be exempt from taxation any more than a bank or railway corporation. Such exemption necessitates a heavier rate of taxation upon other property that is taxed; and it compels the people by law to contribute to the support of churches, and that, too, as really as if an annual appropriation of public funds were made for this purpose. The exemption is unjust on both grounds. Taxation, in order to be equal, should as nearly as possible apply to all private property."

It is especially refreshing at this time when National Reform sophistry is clouding the perception of so many men in public positions, to hear this clear utterance from so influential a journal as the *Independent*. It will be a good thing to quote when the *Independent* comes out on the other side.

An Examination of Principles.

THE columns of the AMERICAN SENTINEL have often contained quotations from the speeches and writings of National Reformers, which have thrown light upon the aims of the National Reform Association. Although none of the statements quoted, some of which are very damaging to the claim for innocence and piety which the Association makes, have been disavowed by the organs of that Association, it is possible that some may think that the persons giving utterance to them are not qualified to speak for the Association. Accordingly we have concluded to go to the fountain-head of authority, and set before our readers just what National Reform, so-called, is, as set forth in its own constitution. Following is the preamble:—

"Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of Nations, and that the revealed Will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs;

"Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established;

"Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath, Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion;

"Viewing with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and the disregard of moral and religious character in those who are exalted to high places in the nation;

"Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government;

"We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves," etc.

The object of the Association is given in the second article of the Constitution as follows:—

"The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed Reforms in the action of the Government; touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure

such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

This preamble and constitution stands in every issue of the *Statesman*, and is the document to which National Reformers point with pride as showing the justness of the work in which they are engaged. We propose to examine these articles in detail:—

1. The first statement, namely, "that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government," may be true or false according as it is interpreted. If it be interpreted to mean that God has ordained that there be civil government among men, or that he himself exercises overruling power, or, as Daniel says, "removeth kings and setteth up kings," we accept it as true. But if it be interpreted to mean that all civil authority comes direct from God, and that he himself directs and controls civil government, then it is manifestly untrue. Every nation on the earth has a civil government, but there is no nation on earth of which God is direct ruler, nor has there been any such nation since the children of Israel rejected God by choosing a king for themselves. It is a fact, as Paul says, that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" but it should be remembered that this does not mean that they are necessarily ordained as God's deputies in the moral government of the world, but that it means simply that government in general is in accordance with God's design. Proof of this is found in the fact that when Paul wrote these words, pagan Rome was mistress of the world, and the Emperor Nero, who represented that greatest of all earthly Governments, was the very embodiment of wickedness and cruelty. Yet even the Roman Empire governed by the infamous Nero, was better than anarchy.

If it were true that God is the civil governor of this world, then there would be only one form of government. But the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God" is universally true. It is as true of the Government of England as of that of the United States, and of the Government of Germany and Russia as of that of either of the other countries. All civil authority comes from God; that is, neither emperors, kings, presidents, or councils would have any authority to execute penalty upon the evil-doer, if God had not ordained that civil government

should exist among men. But the very statement that God "is the source of all power and authority in civil government," even though given the broadest construction that National Reformers can put upon it, shows that the authority of the officers of the State is limited to civil affairs. The word "civil" is from the Latin *civis*, a citizen, and has reference solely to the relations to one another, of citizens of a State. Civil government is simply the guiding and regulating of the relations of men to one another, and has no reference to their special duties to God. It is charged with the duty of seeing that, so far as outward acts are concerned, men obey the injunction, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Beyond this it has no right nor power.

2. With the second statement, namely, that "the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations," we take direct issue. We have no hesitation whatever in pronouncing this to be false, because it is contrary to the Scriptures. Out of the abundance of scriptural proof on this point, we shall at present refer to only the following:—

(a) Christ is now acting as priest and not as king. Heb. 8:1. He is sitting at the right hand of God, but it is as "a priest upon his throne." Zech. 6:13. His work now is that of an intercessor (Heb. 7:25; 9:24), and he has no other office.

(b) Christ himself likened his going to Heaven and returning again, to a nobleman that "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return," and who after a time "returned having received the kingdom." Luke 19:11-15.

(c) God the Father is represented by the prophet David as saying to Christ, "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Ps. 110:1. And Peter (Acts 2:34-36) makes application of this to the present time, when Christ is sitting at the right hand of God. If he were now the ruler of nations, he would not expect anybody else to make his foes his footstool. They would either be his footstool already, or else he would reduce them by his own power.

It is true that Jesus said, just before he ascended to Heaven, "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18); but the next statement, which follows this as a conclusion, shows that it was not civil power that was given to him. Let us read the entire passage: "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:18-20.

Note the following points: 1. These words were spoken, not to civil rulers, but to private individuals whose sole office was that of "ambassadors for Christ," to *beg* (not force) men to be reconciled to God. 2 Cor. 5:20. 2. The statement made by Christ, namely, that all power was given unto him in Heaven and in earth, was for the sole purpose of encouraging the apostles in their work of teaching the peo-

ple the truths which Christ had taught them. Said he, "All power is given unto me,"—"Go ye therefore, and teach." The power to which he referred was his power as "Mediator between God and men." It is not all civil power, but all spiritual power.

Note also the following point: If our National Reform friends persist in the claim that all civil power was given to him, then they must admit that his ministers have also civil power, and that by virtue of their civil power they are to teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This is self-evident, for it is by virtue of the power that was given to Christ, that the apostles were commissioned to preach the gospel. We know that this claim has actually been made by prominent National Reform advocates. But such a claim is nothing less than a claim for the union of Church and State; indeed, it is a direct claim that the church and the State are one.

(d) Christ does not receive his kingdom until just before he returns to this earth, and he receives it not from men but from the Father. See Dan. 7:13, 14; 12:1. The first of these passages, with the context, unmistakably refers to the last great Judgment, and it is at the close of this that Christ appears before the Father to receive "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." The latter text speaks of the standing up of Michael, who is Christ. Now the standing up of a king is an expression used in Scripture to indicate the taking of the reins of government. See Dan. 11:2. But the prophet says that when Michael shall stand up, that is, take his kingdom, there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time, and at that time every one of God's people shall be delivered. This time is yet in the future.

(e) The Father himself says to the Son, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Ps. 2:8. And the next verse states that when he thus becomes the ruler of nations he shall "break them with a rod of iron," and "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." This dashing and breaking of the nations will constitute the time of trouble such as never was.

(f) In harmony with the texts quoted above, we read that under the sounding of the seventh trumpet, during which time the nations become angry, the dead are judged, the reward is given to the saints, and the wrath of God is manifested in the destruction of them which corrupt the earth, great voices are heard 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." Rev. 11:15-18. In Rev. 19:11-21 we have a prophetic description of the smiting of the nations and the ruling of them with a rod of iron, with the statement that *then* Christ bears the title, "King of kings, and Lord of lords." And Christ himself (Matt. 25:31-46) states that when the final separation between the righteous and the

wicked shall take place, when the wicked shall be sent into everlasting punishment and the righteous shall be called to eternal life, it is when he shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, and that *then* "he will sit upon the throne of his glory."

All these texts, which constitute but a small part of the argument, show most conclusively that Christ is not now ruler of nations; that he will not be the ruler of nations until he receives the kingdom from his Father just before his second coming, in power and great glory; that when he receives it he will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips, and will call the righteous to inherit his kingdom with him. Therefore, for any individual to say that Christ is now ruler of nations, is to deny the plainest declarations of Scripture; and to make the claim, as many National Reformers have done and still do, that man can have any part in giving the kingdom to Christ, is nothing less than blasphemous presumption.

Next month we shall continue this examination of the National Reform Constitution.

E. J. W.

The Christian Statesman Speaks.

THE *Christian Statesman* has found a voice at last, and to some purpose too, as will be seen. It says that the SENTINEL is published by the Seventh-day Adventists, and that—

"This people hold not only to the seventh day of the week as the true and only Sabbath, but to certain peculiar interpretations of the prophecies contained in the book of the Revelation. They believe themselves to be the witnesses who are to be slain in the period indicated by the sounding of the sixth trumpet, and the ground of this persecution is the observance of the seventh day."

Oh-h-h-ho-oh! where did the *Statesman* learn that? It must have drawn very heavily upon its inner consciousness to have evolved such excellency of wisdom as that. We know something about the doctrine of the Seventh-day Adventists, we have heard some of their preaching, and have read some of their books. When we read this in the *Statesman*, we went and got the very last book in which that people have printed anything on that subject, and that is in 1887, and we find that their view is, that the sixth trumpet ended in 1840, and that the prophecy concerning the two witnesses applies to the Dark Ages and the Papal persecutions. In view of this, the *Statesman's* exposition of the belief of that people is grand! Howbeit, it does not speak very well for the *Statesman's* knowledge upon the subject, and yet we think that the *Statesman* knows about as much on this subject as it does upon the principles of government and of law. We hope that the editor of the *Statesman* will read the SENTINEL some more, and try again.

Again the *Statesman* says:—

"Their apprehensions take on wild and excited forms, and many things seem to them significant which have no significance at all. For example, they believe that National Reformers are bidding for the support of the Roman Catholic Church."

"They believe" this, says the *Statesman*. Well, why shouldn't we believe it when the *Statesman* and the National Reformers say it. The *Christian Statesman* in an editorial, December 11, 1884, speaking directly of the Roman Catholics, said:—

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

Again, in the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester S. Scovel, a leading National Reformer, and a vice-president of the National Reform Association, said that—

"This common interest ought both to strengthen our determination to work, and our readiness to co-operate in every way with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first profers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Catholic Church will consent to strike hands with other churches, as such, but the time has come to make repeated advances and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation."

There is precisely what the National Reformers say on that subject, printed in the columns of the *Christian Statesman* itself, and yet, in the face of these things, the editor of the *Statesman* leans back and with an air of injured innocence gravely charges the SENTINEL with believing that National Reformers are bidding for the support of the Roman Catholic Church, and that this, among other things, the SENTINEL thinks significant, while it has "no significance at all." Very well. If the *Statesman's* editorial utterances and the official propositions of National Reformers "have no significance at all," then perhaps we are to blame for believing that National Reformers are bidding for the support of the Roman Catholic Church. But then, we cannot see how we are so much to blame, either, for how should we know that what the *Statesman* and National Reformers say has "no significance at all"? We confess that it is a new thing in our experience with men and journals, to find that a paper with the pretensions of the *Christian Statesman* exists for the publication of things which have no significance at all. We believe they signify exactly what is shown in these quotations. Notice the article in last month's SENTINEL on the action of the Saratoga meeting in relation to the Roman Catholic Church. Perhaps the editor of the *Statesman* will be telling us next that that action "has no significance at all."

But we do not believe that these things have no significance at all. We believe the National Reformers are ready to do just what the *Statesman* said. We believe they are ready to join hands with the Roman Catholic Church whenever that church is willing, and will gladly join hands with them. We believe they are ready to co-operate in every way with their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We believe they are ready to make repeated advances, and to suffer repeated rebuffs, to gain the consent of the Roman Church to strike hands with them. We believe that when Rome is ready, they will gladly accept her co-operation in any form in which she may be willing to exhibit it. We do believe these

things because the *Christian Statesman* and the National Reformers have said so. And we do not believe that these things "have no significance at all," even though the *Christian Statesman* does say so. We know that it is "one of the necessities of the situation," and that if the National Reformers are to win, they will have to win by the help of the religio-political intrigue of the Church of Rome. The *Statesman* may spend its time if it chooses in publishing things which it deems to have no significance at all, but to us these things have significance, and they have a deep significance also to the people of this nation, and the SENTINEL is going to point out their significance, and set it before the people just as long as the *Statesman* furnishes the material for us with which to do it.

Then, the *Statesman* quotes from the SENTINEL of July our statement of the prospects of the success of National Reform, in which we stated that the universal demand for Sunday laws is the issue upon which National Reform will be brought to a vote, and under cover of which the union of Church and State will be accomplished here. And upon this it says:—

"Sabbath laws have been a conspicuous feature in the American Government from the beginning, and have never led to persecution."

This statement is on a par with the others that we have noticed, but, perhaps, like what the *Statesman* has said in other things, this may "have no significance at all." But be that as it may, it is not true. It is true, to be sure, that Sunday laws have been a conspicuous feature in the early colonies and in certain places in the United States, from the beginning. But they have never been a feature of the American Government, because the American Government is forbidden by the Constitution to have anything to do with laws respecting religion or religious things. Neither is it true that these laws have never led to persecution. They led to persecution in New England, when, under them, men were compelled to attend church, and to have spies set upon their track to see how they conducted themselves at their homes or wherever they might happen to be staying, during Sunday. They have led to persecution in Pennsylvania not many years back; and within the last three years, yes, within the last two, they have led to persecution in Tennessee and in Arkansas, such persecution too as is a shame to civilization. But, undoubtedly, this is a thing which to the *Statesman* has "no significance at all."

Then the *Statesman* mentions that in many States the keepers of the seventh day are exempted from penalties attached to Sunday laws, and says:—

"This exemption we have always approved and sustained, and shall seek to make universal."

That is to say, "We will take these people under our charge, and will see that they have all that belongs to them, because we are the ones who have the power to grant it to them." Oh, yes! Only the other day the whole of Ireland, the National League and all, was proclaimed under the Coercion Act. Some of the supporters of that Act tried to excuse themselves

under the plea that they thought that the power of the Coercion Act was a good thing for the Government to have, but that they did not expect the Government to use it, and advised against its use. But Sir William Vernon Harcourt very aptly replied that such persons "ought to have known that to give the Tories a Coercion Act, with advice not to use it, would be like putting a tiger in a cage with a man, and enjoining him not to eat the man." So say we to the purring pretensions of the National Reformers. They ask the people of this nation to surrender into their hands all the rights which they have under the present Constitution, kindly promising that they of their benevolence will generously bestow upon dissenters all the privileges that they ought to have. This is plainly shown in what follows.

Again says the *Statesman*:—

"Our conflict is not with the keepers of the seventh day, but with national atheism and its upholders."

Yes, that sounds very well. It is becoming quite fashionable lately in National Reform circles and conventions to pass resolutions something after this manner:—

"Resolved, That the welfare of the community and the law of God require further safeguards for the civil and Christian Sabbath, not inconsistent with the rights of those who observe the seventh day."

These things look very pretty on the outside, and they sound very nice to those who are not well acquainted with National Reform, but when it is understood what the National Reform idea is of the rights of those who observe the seventh day, then that puts a different face upon the matter entirely. That it may be seen just how these things stand, we quote from a National Reform speech by Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., a representative National Reformer, in a National Reform Convention in New York City, February 27, 1873, which is still officially sent forth as National Reform literature.

After naming in order the atheist, the deist, and the Jew, Mr. Edwards says:—

"The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

"These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first named [the atheist] is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry—the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party. . . . What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. . . . Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon. The atheist

may live, as I said, but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the civil institutions of all this fair land! Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent."

By this it is seen that the rights of the keepers of the seventh day are the rights of the atheist, that the rights of the atheist are the rights of the lunatic and the conspirator, and the toleration that he is to receive is the toleration that the lunatic and the conspirator receive, and that there is nothing out of hell that should not be tolerated as soon. In view of this, the *Statesman's* word that "our conflict is not with the keepers of the seventh day, but with national atheism and its upholders," is one of those things "which have no significance at all," because the keepers of the seventh day are upholders of national atheism. Also, it is evident by this, that their nicely framed resolution on this subject is likewise one of those National Reform sayings "which have no significance at all," because the keepers of the seventh day have no rights at all. It may be that they think they shall catch some of the keepers of the seventh day with such honeyed phrases, and they may think that they will even catch the SENTINEL, but we can tell them, Not much. We have read many times the sweetly-toned invitation, "Will you walk into my parlor? said the spider to the fly." No, no, dear *Statesman*, it may all be that your utterances have no significance at all, but to the AMERICAN SENTINEL they have so much significance that we do not propose that the National Reformers shall slip their noose over the heads of the American people without the people being warned of it. Whether or not it be the rights of the keepers of the seventh day which are directly involved, is not the question. It is true that these are the particular class of Christians who are singled out by the National Reformers as the object of their tolerant attentions, along with other "atheistic" "lunatics" and "conspirators," but as this is solely because they choose to differ from the opinions and aims of the National Reformers, it is evident that what is said of these by the National Reformers is equally applicable to everybody who chooses to oppose the work of national corruption which is carried on under the guise of National Reform. And as everybody ought to oppose the work, it follows that this question concerns everybody else just as much as it does those who keep the seventh day or those who keep no day.

Then, the *Statesman* asks—

"Does the SENTINEL espouse the secular or infidel theory of government?"

The SENTINEL espouses the Christian theory of government; the theory enunciated by Christ: that man shall render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things which are God's; the theory that so far as man or civil government is concerned, the heathen, or the infidel, or the atheist, has just as much right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as the Christian has; the theory that under civil government any man has just

as much right not to worship God as the Christian has to worship him; the theory that, though a man be a Christian, he is not thereby entitled to authority or lordship over other men's consciences or rights; the theory that will reach all men by the power of truth, in love and persuasive reason, and not by the power of the sword or of civil law, in bitter persecution and oppressive force.

That is the theory of government which the SENTINEL espouses. Does the *Christian Statesman* agree with it? If not, why not? Come now, don't dodge. A. T. J.

Christianity Means Honesty.

It is told of one of the patriots of the American Revolution that, having a suit in court, he employed a lawyer who tried to advance the cause of his client by taking advantage of a technicality by which he hoped to evade a fair issue. Instantly the hero arose and rebuked his lawyer, declaring that he never hired him to take unfair advantage of his opponent. This was no more than strict integrity, but such strictness is seldom seen, even among those of whom we have every right to expect it. True Christianity presents the highest form of uprightness; yet we have to record that many profess to represent the highest type of Christianity, who are not ashamed to dissemble, and to resort to the most unworthy methods to advance their cause. Everyone knows that God is not honored, and his cause is not advanced, by evasions and deceptions. When men resort to unworthy methods to, professedly, advance the cause of God, we may be sure that they are either deceiving or deceived; that their motives are selfish, and not founded on principle.

The American people are not so far from the days of the Revolution as to have entirely outgrown a regard for the sentiments that inspired the illustrious founders of our Government. But that they are guarding with jealous care the principles that fired the hearts of their forefathers, cannot be said. A half century ago, one of the mottoes most commonly in use was this: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." But it has been entirely thrown aside, because the necessity for vigilantly maintaining that for which our father's suffered and died to bequeath to us, is not appreciated by the mass of our population. Having lived nearly two-thirds of the entire period of our national existence, I feel qualified to speak from observation.

When Richard M. Johnson presented the celebrated "Sunday Mail Report," it was considered an able State paper, clearly vindicating the grounds of our civil, and especially our religious, liberty. But so many have lost the real spirit of American independence that they suffer themselves to be cajoled into compliance with projects which tend to subvert our liberties, and are not at all alarmed at the encroachments of the enemy.

The SENTINEL was correct in its saying that some respect is yet paid to the opinions of George Washington; but that respect is not

deep enough to cause the people diligently to inquire if those opinions are worthy to be vindicated at the expense of a strong effort. The expression that the SENTINEL recently quoted will bear repeating:—

"I have often expressed my opinion that every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."—*Washington*.

This language is as plain as it is reasonable and just. None can misunderstand it—none should find fault with it. But there is a class, fast increasing in numbers, who, while enjoying all the privileges of our benign Government, in the full exercise of their religious freedom, indulge the feelings of Haman; they cannot enjoy even the richest blessings, if Mordecai has his share of the same. And they resolve in their hearts that Mordecai shall retire from the king's gate or be hanged.

But will they rise up and denounce this declaration of Washington? By no means. That would be an open avowal of their designs, which might prove fatal to their cause. If not frank, they are shrewd and diplomatic, and have well studied the course to pursue to best accomplish their purposes.

If we enter into the councils of certain bodies of clergymen, we hear them declare that Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, "the very foundation of our holy religion." They loudly bewail its desecration, and resolve to take steps to secure its universal observance. They agree to preach on the subject, and they make an appeal to their brethren in the ministry to assist them in their efforts to arouse the people to action. But they are painfully aware of the fact that their pulpit utterances have lost their power to take deep hold of the consciences of the people. Some more effective measures must be devised. The State must be called to their assistance. Rigid laws must be passed to compel the people to observe the Christian Sabbath.

But will the people submit to compulsory observance of religious institutions? Will they consent to religious legislation? Can they be led to ignore the sentiments of Washington, and to reverse the fundamental principles of our glorious Government? Perhaps not; but if not, that circumstance must not stand in the way of their success.

There is a people who ply a vocation which is one of unmixed evil. They deal in alcoholic drinks. Seven days in the week, almost the entire day and night, they are firing the brains of half-insane inebriates, stimulating them to deeds of evil, beggaring wives and children, and luring the youth to ruin. What shall be done? The answer comes: "Down with the Sunday saloon! The business of the Sunday saloon must be stopped!" But, query, Why not down with the every-day saloon? Why not put the saloon of other days on a footing with the Sunday saloon? And again, If you separate the Sunday saloon from the saloon of other days, why not separate the Sunday saloon from the useful trades of honorable people? But no; the demand

is made that the law shall have the same effect on other business that it has on the Sunday saloon. And why? Because the Sunday saloon is a curse! And then they call upon the people to make and uphold such a law as the great remedy for the evils of intemperance! And even though men may be working zealously to put down saloons every day in the week, they are still denounced as enemies to the cause of temperance, unless they advocate the Sunday law. This we label Deception No. 1.

Very soon we find the same clergymen who declared that a law for the observance of Sunday is the only safeguard of religion, again declaring that a law for the strict observance of Sunday is not at all of the nature of religious legislation. Rest is necessary for health; therefore a compulsory Sunday rest is purely a "sanitary regulation." No matter if a man has rested on the day preceding, every man stands in physical need of a rest on Sunday. We will label this Deception No. 2.

Besides this, the State has already recognized it as a holiday, in which men may not be compelled to work; now it must take one little step more, and *compel them not to work*. Although such action is not consistent with the idea of a legal holiday, the necessities of the case require that it shall be so considered. And then the Sunday law becomes purely "a police regulation." "Only that, and nothing more." Now from the same pulpit from which it was announced that a Sunday law was demanded in the interest of religion, the people are assured that not at all as a religious question, but as one of loyalty to the State, they are required to keep Sunday. This we will call Deception No. 3.

But they are confronted with the fact that some good citizens, in every way meeting the requirements of Washington's declaration, peaceable, industrious, honest, and proverbially temperate, conscientiously observe the seventh day, claiming authority for so doing from the decalogue, which says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Is not this strict Sunday law which the State is asked to enact, contrary to the avowal of Washington? and to the spirit of our national Constitution? Will it not infringe upon their religious rights? Not at all, is the reply of the clergymen. The Sunday law will not deny them the privilege of keeping the seventh day. We shall compel them to keep Sunday, and after that they may keep as many other days as they please. Our law interferes with no man's rights of conscience. Here is Deception No. 4.

That this is a deception of the rankest kind is readily seen. By such sophistry as they adopt, any abomination might rightfully be forced upon the servants of God. The officers of Nebuchadnezzar might have used the same argument with the three Hebrews, and with an equal show of justice. "We do not propose to interfere with your religion. It is your duty to 'honor the king.' By a police regulation you are called upon to bow down to the golden image. Having done this, you are at liberty to worship Jehovah as much as

you please." Now there is a controversy among the churches on the subject of baptism. By an appeal to the lexicons, the Baptists appear to have the argument. So the State decides, and in addition to its law for the observance of the Christian Sabbath, it makes a law enforcing Christian baptism, thus requiring all her citizens to be immersed. To this the great majority of the clergymen herein referred to demur, as they do not believe in immersion. They and their children have all been sprinkled. The law, they claim, is an interference with their religion. But they are assured that they are altogether wrong. Washing in water being necessary to health, this law is purely a sanitary regulation; and, being enacted by the State, it thereby becomes a police regulation. For these considerations they must obey it. And besides this, it cannot infringe upon any rights of their religion. True, it requires them to be immersed, in accordance with the faith of the Baptists; but having submitted to this, they are at full liberty to sprinkle and be sprinkled as much as they please! No coercion of conscience, at all; they are at liberty to carry out their own religion to their heart's content. It is needless to ask what they would think of such a law, or of such a reason for enforcing it. When certain ministers who declared that it was no infringement on the rights of those who kept the seventh day to compel them to keep Sunday, because they were at liberty to keep the seventh day also, were asked if they would be willing to obey a law compelling them to keep the seventh day on the consideration that they would be at liberty to keep the Sunday also, they promptly answered, No! Thus they confess that Deception No. 4 is a sheer deception of the basest kind; it is unworthy of those who make the slightest claim to be honorable men; much more so of those who claim to be Christians.

But the observers of the seventh day are inclined to do just as these clergymen say they would do under their circumstances; they say that while the decalogue commands them to keep the seventh day, and they are in conscience bound to keep it, the same law says, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." They say that they need the avails of the labor of the six days to support themselves and their families; they deny the right of any earthly power to deprive them of this. He who commanded them to keep the seventh day, gave them a legal permission to work six days; he gave his own example for the institution of the Sabbath; he created all things in six days and rested the seventh day. On these facts is based the precept to work six days and rest the seventh day. Therefore their right to work six days, as well as to keep the seventh day, rests on the authority of the Creator. Now if the advocates of the Sunday law are not convinced of their duty to keep the seventh day, they must surely respect such reasoning, honor such regard for the authority of the Creator of Heaven and earth, and admire the spirit which leads people to bear so heavy a cross to

carry out their convictions of duty to follow the word of God. But do they? No; they affect great religious zeal, and denounce them to the people as a "pestilent sect," as disloyal to the Government, as "needlessly peevish" to maintain their "whimseys," as traitors to the laws of God and man; they denounce them as heretics, and class them with atheists; as men who would join hands with Anarchists to destroy society. Do they really believe these gross charges? do they not know that that people as a class are law-abiding to the extreme? that it is solely out of respect for law and authority that they suffer loss and bear reproach? Yes; they know all this. What, then, shall we say of their affectation of righteous indignation over their course? We must set it down as Deception No. 5. It is the very climax of all deceptions. But we find it in those who profess to respect nothing as highly as religious consistency and a high regard for the law of God.

But there are some who come out boldly and say that our national Constitution is wrong; that the Sixth Article and the First Amendment contain the germs of anarchy and national destruction. They say that it is the duty of Congress to adopt a standard of religion to which all the people must be compelled to conform. That this strikes at the very life of our religious freedom—at the very foundations of our Government—cannot honestly be denied. And yet, as the SENTINEL has proved over and over again, the innovation is sought to be thrust upon the people by a series of evasions and deceptions of the most dishonorable nature. And the half has not been told. It has error for its spring, and it can only be upheld by deception.

If we were ready to grant that we need a national religion, which we are not, or believed that it was for the welfare of the Government and of religion, which we surely do not, we could not adopt a system which is so ready to resort to the most unworthy methods,—and which rests so largely on evasions and deceptions. It may be *religion*, but it is anything but *Christianity*. We insist that Christianity means honesty. J. H. W.

Busybodies.

MR. SECRETARY GAULT was preaching National Reform out in Wisconsin, in October, at the same time that President Cleveland passed through that State on his tour of the Western and Southern States. Mr. Gault preached twice in Menomonee, and in one of his sermons he argued in favor of governmental enforcement of Sunday-keeping. In the *Cynosure* we find a highly commendatory report of it, and among other things we find this:—

"Brother Gault was very much exercised with regard to the course of President Cleveland last Sunday at Madison. He, together with Postmaster-General Vilas, was expected to attend a certain church. Pews were reserved and decorated, and ushers were waiting; services were delayed a long time, but no President and no Postmaster-General appeared. The fact was that when the bells were ringing for church, Grover was still in bed,

and at 11 o'clock he was taking breakfast. He should have risen early, Brother Gault thinks, and studied the Sunday-school lesson for one hour before breakfast, and then after breakfast sallied forth to Sabbath-school and addressed the school. Then after dinner he should have visited and addressed the Y. M. C. A., and in the evening gone to some church. Instead of this he spent several hours of the afternoon dictating official correspondence; and doubtless a good many besides Brother Gault and myself will not vote for Grover Cleveland."

This is a perfect illustration of the spying meddlesomeness that will be obtruded upon the people, and of the forms that will be exacted of them, when the National Reformers obtain the power which they are now so zealously seeking. How did Mr. Gault find out that the President was in bed when the church bells were ringing, and that he was at breakfast at 11 o'clock? How does he know that the President "spent several hours in the afternoon dictating official correspondence"? And even though it were all true, what business is it of Mr. Gault's, or of the National Reform Association, or of all the religionists of Christendom together? Macaulay truly says: "Nothing is more galling to a people not broken in from the birth than a paternal, or, in other words, a meddling Government, a Government which tells them what to read, and say, and eat, and drink, and wear." But this galling thing is just what the National Reformers aim to establish in this land.

Tampering with the Constitution.

THE editor of the *New England Evangelist*, after noticing the recent celebration of the centennial anniversary of the completion of the Federal Constitution, proceeds with the following words, which we heartily indorse:—

Speaking of the Constitution brings to mind the insane idea that there was a fatal mistake in its construction, in that there is contained in it no recognition of the Almighty, nor of the Christian religion; and that it is the consequent duty of all Christians, and of the church as such, to endeavor to amend that charter of our civil Government by securing therein a proper recognition of both. To this end there exists a national organization of persons whose conceptions of the things of Cæsar and of God are so imperfect or confused that they imagine that the former must acknowledge the latter in his secular affairs, else the divine kingdom may perhaps perish from the earth! Now, for our part, we believe that it was God's will that his name be left out of that *Magna Charta* of the land of liberty, and that he was on hand to see that it *was* left out. We appreciate the mistaken zeal with which some are laboring to correct God's mistakes; but we would say to any such that their efforts would better avail something for the good of mankind in this case, if they would devote themselves to getting the name of God written in the hearts of men, rather than upon the pages of the civil Constitution. The Lord has never told us to seek by such means to promote the glory of his name and kingdom.

Of the same nature as the before-mentioned effort to amend the national Constitution in the supposed interest of the Christian religion, is the endeavor to secure primary or additional legislation to enforce the observance of the Lord's day, or so-called Christian Sabbath, as a religious institution. Probably many who are active in this endeavor do not advocate it with the purpose of forcing a religious institution upon any, but to make the observance purely a *civil* one so far as the law is concerned. Nevertheless, it is essentially a *church* movement, and its supposed benefits are not expected to be social or political, but spiritual. With the establishing of a civil day for rest we have nothing to do, except as citizens of a free country; and it may be considered as a matter of social and political expediency, as in a hundred other things. But as to the church, and the establishing of a day of religious observance, we would dispose of the whole question by saying that if God has ordained any day to be kept, it must be that there is abundant inherent power in the religion itself to maintain it, for God does not call upon the civil authorities to uphold the ordinances of his church.

The growth of Christianity would have been small indeed in the early centuries of its era if it had depended upon the enactment of a Lord's day or Sabbath observance by Nero and the Roman Senate. We have no hesitation whatever in maintaining that Christian people have no more warrant for endeavoring to secure and enforce the legal observance of a day of Christian worship as such, or as a matter of church interest, than they have to secure and enforce a similar enactment that people shall be baptized and observe the Lord's Supper. It would be well if those who are zealous in getting the civil power to back up the traditions of men, would look to the end whence they are tending.

Rome's Work.

OWING to the continued pressure upon him from Rome, Dr. McGlynn has begun to grow resentful, and is telling some things that he knows about Romish affairs. In an interview, June 23, he said:—

"The people may know, what I can tell them on the highest authority: The Roman machine is to-day most anxious to have a minister of the Pope accredited to, and received by, the Government at Washington. Such minister would be an archbishop and one of the Italian ring, in whose hands it is the Roman policy to keep the power. His presence there could not fail to be a fruitful source of corruption and enslavement for the Catholic Church in this country. The Pope is also trying to have diplomatic relations with Queen Victoria, in order, as he is alleged, 'to be able to get accurate information about Irish affairs.'"

We have not the least doubt that this is the exact truth. Nor have we the least doubt that the Pope, under cover of the Irish question, will yet succeed in establishing diplomatic relations with England. Nor have we *much* doubt that the Papacy will yet have an accredited minister at the capital at Washington. When the Papacy shall have been

recognized as a sovereign power by all the powers of Europe, and thus becomes a personal factor in all the affairs of European States, exceedingly plausible reasons can be produced to show that this Government ought to receive an accredited ambassador from one of the chief sovereign powers of the world. It might well be counted the height of presumption for the Government of the United States to refuse recognition to a sovereign power that was recognized as such by all the world besides. These arguments would be exceedingly "convincing" to politicians, when backed by the solid Catholic vote of the nation.

False Reform.

IN the November SENTINEL we noticed National Reform District Secretary W. J. Coleman's answer to the following question asked at the Lakeside National Reform Convention:—

"Does your movement not appeal more exclusively to the educated classes than to all classes in general?"

Doctor McAllister's answer to this question is this:—

"I say that a question like this must begin with the educated classes. When you get a few educated men, they will reach others."

What a pity it is that the Saviour did not work according to National Reform methods! What a grand success he would have made in his efforts to convert the Jewish nation if he only had secured first of all the indorsement of the high-priest, the rabbis, the doctors of the law, the scribes, and the principal Pharisees! When he had gained these, through them and their influence he could have gained others, even the great body of the nation, and then if there had been any remaining who would not receive him, they could very easily have been compelled to receive him, or else go to some wild, desolate land, and stay there till they died; and thus the whole nation would have been converted, and that would have been then a "Christian nation," don't you see? But, alas! alas! he who made man, and who knew what was in the hearts of all men, deliberately began with all classes in general, and tried to reach the common people, even ignorant fishermen, first! What could ever have been the reason of the Saviour's acting so? What could ever have induced him to act so openly contrary to the very first principle of all reform—National Reform we mean?

Well, the secret of the whole matter is, that of all the questions that the Saviour had to bring to the notice of men, not one was "*a question like this*;" consequently it was not necessary for him to "begin with the educated classes" through whom he would reach others. The Lord Jesus would have every man to believe on him and to confess him, from honest *conviction*, and not from the *influence* of the proud, or the powerful. And the fact that there is such a radical difference between the method of Christ and the methods of National Reform demonstrates completely, and at a glance, the proposition that the Na-

tional Reform movement is not in any degree whatever connected with the work of Christ, and that consequently it is not in any degree whatever a work of genuine reform.

Says Dr. McAllister: "A question like this *must* begin with the educated classes." Yes, that is true, but it only goes to prove that "a question like this" can never be for the benefit of the body of the people; it only proves that *this* question does not embody any real reform. The words of Wendell Phillips fit in here precisely: "No reform, moral or intellectual, ever came down from the upper classes of society." Yet this is the very way in which this National Reform question "must" be carried; and one of the main reasons is that by means of the upper classes the lower may be reached. And *that* is the secret of the long list of Rev.'s, D. D.'s, LL.D.'s, Ph. D.'s, etc., etc., which composes the figure-head vice-presidency of the National Reform Association. The *influence* of that figure-head list of names has done and will do ten times more to give currency to National Reform than any appeal to the sober *convictions* of men can ever do. And that is the very use that is made of it too. When in examining the proposals and claims of the National Reform movement, anyone sees the danger to religious liberty and our free institutions, that inheres in it, they at once propose to silence all objections and delay all fears by some such astonished (?) argument as this: "What! would you pretend to imply that such eminent divines, such distinguished and influential men, as these would do anything which for a moment would endanger the liberties of any person? Impossible. Nothing could be more abhorrent to these eminent men than such a thing as that." And then under the direct influence of the names of these influential men, they deliberately set forth such abominable propositions as that the civil power has right to compel the consciences of men; that all dissenters from National Reform doctrines shall be treated as lunatics and conspirators and sent to the devil in some wild, desolate land, where they shall stay till they die; and that the Roman Catholic Bible, instruction, and worship, shall be established in the public schools wherever the Catholics are in the majority. In the estimation of all fair-minded men such propositions as these are enough to condemn to universal detestation and eternal infamy any association that would set them forth. Yet under the influence of the names of these eminent men these very propositions, and many more of like tenor, are published throughout the length and breadth of this land, almost entirely unquestioned, and with scarcely a protest, except by the AMERICAN SENTINEL alone; while the men who advocate the infamous propositions are received and indorsed by ecclesiastical bodies, welcomed by the churches, and fraternized and supported by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

"But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Christianity under Our Constitution.

THE American Churches have no official connection with the State. They stand on a basis of perfect equality before the law. They are all equally protected by the State in their rights of property and in the public exercise of their religion according to their conscientious convictions, but none is supported or ruled by the Government.

The first amendment to the Federal Constitution is the *Magna Charta* of our religious liberty. It abolishes the tyranny of a State religion, and cuts persecution by the root; it forbids the establishment by law of any particular Church or sect, and, at the same time, guarantees full freedom in the exercise of religion to all denominations of Christians. This is all the Church can desire and ask from the State. She is thrown on the principle of self-support and self-government, as in the first three centuries, and enjoys, at the same time, the protection of the law, which was denied her in those centuries of persecution. Here we have not the odious distinction between churchmen and dissenters, conformists and nonconformists, Churches and sects. Here no one need apologize for being a "dissenter," as even in liberal England, where dissent is tabooed and socially ostracized. No Church has a right to say, "*We are the Church, or the American Church; all the rest are sects.*" Such language has no legal meaning; it is simply presumptuous and absurd.

But while the State has no official connection with the Church, and no right to interfere with her internal affairs, the nation, in an unofficial way, is as closely allied to Christianity as, yea, more closely than, in any European country where Church and State are united. The reason of this lies in the fact that religion grows and prospers best in the atmosphere of freedom. Compulsory religion is apt to breed hypocrisy and infidelity. Our American infidelity is mostly imported from the State Churches of Europe. This is a significant fact, and a strong argument for free Churches.

De Tocqueville, one of the most philosophic observers of the democratic institutions of America, and a liberal Roman Catholic, expressed the conviction that "there is no country in the whole world in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America." A forty-four years' residence in the United States, and a dozen visits to nearly every part of Europe, have brought me to the same conclusion, or, rather, I formed it long before I read De Tocqueville's "Democracy in America." In Roman Catholic countries and in Russia there is more historic faith and superstition in the lower classes, more skepticism and indifference in the higher classes, than in Protestant countries. Germany, Switzerland, and Holland are honeycombed by rationalism. In England and Scotland there is more vital Christianity than in any part of the Continent, because there is more religious freedom there. But in the United States Christianity has the strongest hold upon all classes of society.—*Prof. Philip Schaff, D. D., LL.D.*

VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM.

PACKAGE NO. 1, 184 PAGES, 20 CENTS.

This package contains thirteen tracts treating upon the various phases of the National Reform movement, as follows:—

NO.	PAGES.
1. Religious Legislation,.....	8
2. Religious Liberty,.....	8
3. National Reform and the Rights of Conscience, . . .	16
4. The American Papacy,	16
5. Bold and Base Avowal,.....	16
6. National Reform is Church and State,.....	16
7. Purity of National Religion,.....	8
8. The Salem Witchcraft,.....	8
9. What Think Ye of Christ?.....	8
10. National Reformed Constitution and the American Hierarchy,.....	24
11. The Republic of Israel,.....	8
12. National Reformed Presbyterianism,	32
13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity,.....	16

The above package will be sent post-paid to any address for twenty cents.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

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.

"IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS."

WE give below a very few of the hundreds of testimonials received. Please read what others say:

"The most reliable and important book of its kind that has ever been issued."—*Joaquin Miller.*

"The illustrations, the text, the whole atmosphere of the volume, are worthy of their great subject, the Yo Semite. What can I say more?"—*Rev. Joseph Cook, Boston, Mass.*

"Reads with all the charm of a romance."—*S. F. Hotel Gazette.*

"I have nothing but praise and thanks for your delightful narrative."—*Chas. T. Whitmell, Inspector of Schools, England.*

"Never before has Yo Semite been so strikingly brought to view in illustration."—*Sacramento Record-Union.*

"The thought-pictures behind the types are even more to the life than those drawn by the pencil."—*M. Louise Thomas, Philadelphia.*

"The descriptive portions of the work are breezy and interesting."—*Sacramento Bee.*

"Mr. Hutchings knows more of Yo Semite than all the world besides."—*Rev. Joseph Worcester, S. F.*

"Your descriptions are so real that when reading them my husband and I agreed that we were again back in the Valley on our last year's pleasant trip."—*Beatrice E. Rose, San Rafael, Cal.*

"It is a truthful, interesting, and instructive work."—*Galen Clark, for sixteen years the Valley's guardian.*

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL

AND TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, devoted to the dissemination of true temperance principles, and instruction in the art of preserving health. It is emphatically

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE.

Containing what everybody wants to know, and is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is unlimited, embracing everything that in any way effects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and housekeepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by all. Price, \$1.00 per year.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS, Publishers, Oakland, Cal.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER, 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 the *Christian Statesman* of September 22, 1887, "District Secretary" Weir, speaking of the Lord Jesus, exclaims:—

"To him be glory and dominion and power forever in our American politics."

And thus they make him, as stated in their own words, "the divine politician." There seems to be place here for a very fitting application of the scripture, "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself."

THE National W. C. T. U. is circulating for signatures three petitions to Congress to be presented this month, asking for national legislation on the Sunday question. It is under cover of the demand for Sunday laws that this nation is to be put under the tyrannical heel of the National Reform Church and State movement. If you want to help establish Church and State and a man-made theocracy, here, then sign these petitions. If you don't want to engage in that enterprise, then give these, and all similar petitions, the widest possible berth.

ONE of the "fundamental truths of theism" which the National Reformers propose to have taught by putting the Bible in the public schools is, as stated by themselves, "The deathlessness of the human soul." Very well, let us suppose the Bible is put into the schools as the supreme standard and textbook; and suppose that the pupils read there Ezekiel 18:4, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," and Romans 6:23, "The wages of sin is death," and scores of similar passages; then we would inquire, How can the proposed National Reform teaching agree with the plain word of God which the pupils have read?

It is with devout thanks to God that with this number the SENTINEL closes its second successful year. A year ago we stated that there had been more than 136,000 copies of the SENTINEL circulated in that year, and that we hoped to see more than 250,000 copies circulated in 1887. And now at the close of 1887 we are happy to announce that our hopes have been realized. More than 255,000 copies of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, by actual register, have been printed and circulated in 1887; 1,651 paid subscribers were received in October alone. The SENTINEL is a success. It has come to stay. Its field is constantly enlarging; its work is growing constantly more important. Everybody needs the paper. And, reader, we bespeak your good offices in helping us to see that everybody gets it. (1) By subscribing, or renewing your subscription, yourself; and

(2) by getting your neighbors and acquaintances to subscribe or to renew their subscriptions. For terms to agents and in clubs see previous page. A good many subscriptions expire with this number. Look at the little tab on the paper and see if yours is one. If it is, please renew without delay, so that we shall not have to remove your name from our list at all. We hope to make the SENTINEL for 1888 still an improvement over that of 1887. We hope to see more than 500,000 copies printed and circulated in 1888, and we shall see it if you will help us.

DID you know that the fourth commandment was abrogated more than a year ago, and that, too, by the Ohio General Assembly? Well, sir, that is a fact—that is it must be so, because the Ohio Prohibition Convention, held last summer, said so. Thus says the report:—

"Wild enthusiasm arose when, amid the opening songs of the Convention, someone pinned on the great banner at the back of the stage a copy, in big red letters on brown wrapping paper, of the fourth commandment with this addendum: 'Abrogated May 14, 1886, by the Ohio General Assembly.'"

Now the AMERICAN SENTINEL is heartily in favor of prohibition—not prohibition on Sunday alone, but prohibition all the time—but we just as heartily wish that some Sunday prohibitionist would tell us what the Ohio General Assembly, or any other earthly assembly, can properly have to do with either abrogating or affirming the fourth commandment. The obligations of that commandment pertain solely to men's relation to God, and with it Cæsar can have nothing at all to do, in any way whatever. And yet this Prohibition Convention must needs go "wild" with enthusiasm over such a silly proposition as that the Ohio General Assembly "abrogated" the fourth commandment.

IN the procession at the centennial celebration of the Constitution at Philadelphia last September, the National Reform Association asked to carry a banner with this inscription:—

"The Fifteenth Amendment secures the rights of man. Let us have another securing the rights of God."

Do the National Reformers mean to imply that God is in a condition similar to that of the men whose rights are particularly secured by the Fifteenth Amendment? Do they mean to assert that God is as helpless toward securing his rights, as impotent in the assertion of them, as were the slaves? If not, then where is the propriety of their plea?

Another banner which they proposed to carry in the procession was one bearing the inscription:—

"Christ the King of Nations, and the Bible the Supreme Law."

Their application was denied, and "Secretary" Foster in intended condemnation of the act of the Commission in denying the request says:—

"Perhaps it was well enough, for it would not have looked well for such a banner to follow Gambrinus and the Beer Barrel."

Indeed, it would not have looked well, and we can only wonder in astonishment that men pretending to have any respect whatever for the Lord Jesus, should want to carry such a banner in such a procession, either going before or following "Gambrinus and the Beer Barrel"! All these things go to make clear the fact of the perfect barrenness, in the National Reformers, of any just conception of God, or of Christ, as well as a sad dearth of ideas of propriety in things pertaining to the character or the work of the Most High. The Centennial Commission did itself lasting honor by denying the request.

WE are happy to acknowledge the receipt of valuable documents from "The Central Committee for Protecting and Perpetuating the Separation of Church and State." This is an organization of citizens of the State of New York, irrespective of party or denominational ties, associated together "for the purpose of securing an amendment to the State constitution, so that it shall conform to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States in prohibiting any future legislation 'respecting an establishment of religion.'" Such an organization is made necessary by the persistent, dangerous, and successful encroachments of the Romish Church in the State of New York. This necessity and this danger are just now materially increased by the proposed alliance of the National Reform Association with the Romish Church for the avowed purpose of securing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, by which the Catholic worship, Catholic instruction, and the Catholic Bible, shall be established in the public schools and other public institutions of the country, wherever the Catholics may be in the majority. And yet there are people who think the SENTINEL is performing a thankless task in calling attention to these things! We wish this New York committee a hearty Godspeed. We shall take pleasure in inserting in our columns extracts from the documents received. The office of the committee is No. 30, Bible House, New York City.

IN the Pittsburg Convention Dr. McAllister said of National Reform:—

"This movement is bound to succeed through the influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union."

We are afraid that it is too true.

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.